YOUNGSTOWN STATE UNIVERSITY

ORAL HISTORY PROGRAM

YSU Historians Project

Biography

O. H. 420

DR. LOWELL J. SATRE

Interviewed

by

Donald E. Hovey

in

May-June, 1975

O. H. 420

YOUNGSTOWN STATE UNIVERSITY

ORAL HISTORY PROGRAM

YSU Historians Project

INTERVIEWEE: DR. LOWELL J. SATRE

INTERVIEWER: Donald E. Hovey

SUBJECT: Childhood, Augustana College, Jobs, Graduate School, University of South Carolina, Visiting Professors, Martin Gilbert, Marriage, MA Thesis and Ph.D. Dissertation, England Trip, YSU Faculty, Courses, History Department Chairman, OEA, Work Habits, Duties, Interest in History of Leisure, Historical Models, History and Community Relations, Articles, Interests

DATES: May 13, 15, 20, 29, 1975
June 3, 1975

H: This is an interview with Lowell J. Satre for the Youngstown State Univeristy Historians Project by Donald Hovey.

Have you ever written anything on Winston Churchill?

S: I did a paper in graduate school for a seminar on the liberal government from 1905 to 1910. Churchill played a main role there. Also, a paper that I'm trying to get published right now is on British Army Reform from 1900 to 1903, in that Winston Churchill plays a main role. Immediately upon entering parliament he became a gadfly and started hounding his own conservative government over Army reform in this period. He was already an expert, at least in his own eyes. Having served in the Army four or five years and then having been a newspaper correspondent at the same time that he was in the Army . . . he also served as a newspaper correspondent for the Morning Post I think it was.

H: What I would really like to ask you to do, if you feel like it, would be to sort of go over your whole life up to now, and talk about the things that seem to you to be interesting.

S: Okay. Interrupt any time if there is anything you want to ask me about. I was born and grew up on a farm in

Northeastern, South Dakota. It was very much a rural community. I mean the whole area. The largest town was about twenty, twenty-five miles away and had a population of about 2500. We had some smaller towns close to us, Veblen, South Dakota, with about 500 people. That was the largest in the area. I am the youngest of four children. My oldest sister is twelve years older than I am, and the others are in between. My parents, as far as their education goes. My mother had a four year high school education, then she got a teacher's certificate by going, I believe, six weeks one summer to a normal school in Aberdeen, South Dakota. My father had an eighth grade education because that was fairly common at that time. He is a fairly old man now; he is about 77 or 78 years old. My mother is now in her seventies too. I went to a one-room country school for eight years. There was one teacher for all eight grades.

H: Same teacher?

S: One teacher for all eight grades. I had two teachers over that eight year period. I know I was very fortunate, because they were both very good teachers. There are certain advantages to going to a small, one-room, country school, if you have good teachers. If you have bad teachers, it is a terrible disadvantage because you can get eight years or, you know, many years of terrible schooling.

H: How did you feel about it?

S: I enjoyed it. I liked it. I had good teachers. The most we ever had in the eight grades was fourteen students. In my class there were three. You learn a lot from simply listening to the other students who are ahead of you in the higher grades reciting. Let's say we had spelling that day, and the older class in spelling, the grade I was in, would probably last about ten or fifteen minutes and that would be it. She always started with the lower grades and moved up. There you were in the third grade and you would listen to the fourth, fifth, sixth, seventh, and eighth graders spelling, and you learned of course, from them. It was the same way with social studies or history. You always listened to those ahead of you. I think you learned a lot. There are disadvantages, in that we never did anything in science. We never did any real experiments that way, which I think the teachers were probably capable of doing, but those types of things take too much time. They simply didn't have it.

From that country school, by the way, there have been a tremendous number who have gone on ultimately to college, and many of them to do post-college work. There are, I can immediately think of a medical doctor, at least one Ph.D.,

there may be others. I know of only myself who has gotten a Ph.D. from there. I know several have gotten Master's Degrees and this advanced schooling is really quite unusual coming out of such a rural setting. I'm convinced that it happened to us because we had very good teachers over the years. There were neighboring schools where the number of students who went on to college and graduate work were not nearly so great. I think they didn't have the teachers.

I went to high school in the large town in northeastern South Dakota which is twenty-five miles away. It's kind of peculiar I guess to go to a school that is far from home. I never thought of it at the time, but it is only after that time since I left that area, I have mentioned this to others that say that is so unusual. I lived in town when I went to high school. I rented a room in a house and paid ten or fifteen dollars a month for the room. The high school itself, which had about 350 students I guess in the four grades, had a lunch and supper which it served. I would have about twenty cents to twenty-five cents for each of the meals. I ate breakfast downtown in a little cafe. You got two eggs, bacon, and toast for thirty-five cents.

H: What year was this?

S: 1957 through 1960. I graduated from high school in 1960. I would say of the 350 there were probably 100 of us who were living in town renting a room at that time.

H: What was your family doing?

S: The folks were farming. I would go home on the weekends. I would go home on Friday or Saturday and help out on the farm and then come back to town Sunday night to go to school Monday morning. Actually, the last three years in high school I worked in my aunt's bakery. I did a variety of things. I did a lot of book work; I did her bookkeeping and kept financial records. I used to go in once in a while at four o'clock in the morning and help in the bakery in the back, and I would occasionally deliver bakery goods, especially on Saturdays. I would work from seven in the morning till three or four in the afternoon delivering goods.

H: You didn't live with your aunt's family?

S: Actually there was one year that I lived with her.

H: What was it like living on your own at that tender age?

S: I rather enjoyed it. It gave me more freedom. I started

high school when I was just thirteen years old. I never had any hours or special time that I had to be in. I think by that time I was really a very disciplined person. I don't think I abused the freedom I had. I perhaps thrived on it. I enjoyed it immensely, I did. I don't think a lot of students at that time probably thrived on it; they didn't study. I enjoyed it. My brother and my two sisters went to high school under the same circumstances, living in town.

H: They were all older than you?

S: Yes.

H: What was your family like? How do you remember it as a kid?

S: I had a really good family life. I have always had good relations with my mother and father and my brother and two sisters. They were all fairly older, my brother is six years older than I am and my sisters are nine and twelve years older, so I am the baby of the family. No quarrels really within the family that I am aware of. There probably were some, but I was young enough that they were hidden from me. They certainly would have been hidden from me in the family. My mother has always worried a lot. She still worries a lot. I have tended in high school and in college--if I had any problems--never to tell my parents about them. Truthfully, I don't think I have ever had any major problems. I don't think I have repressed too much that way, but at the same time I never did--if I was having trouble with a subject or I couldn't get along with somebody--tell my parents about it.

H: Did you talk to anybody with things that bothered you?

S: I think with other friends that I had in school I did.

H: Up to this time, if you were going to have a serious conversation with somebody, who would it be with and what would it be about?

S: The serious conversations would have come with classmates rather than with the family. I think primarily because my brothers and sisters were so much older. By the time I was in seventh grade my brother was a senior in high school or something like that. When I was in eighth grade he was already in college. I guess later on when I was in high school I might have a serious conversation with my brother and occasionally with my folks, certainly.

H: What would you talk about?

S: Maybe about politics. I was very conservative, very much Republican, and I was very much a Republican as far as politics went until I got into graduate school.

H: Then you were active?

S: Not really. I know when I was very young, about nine or ten years old, I was really worried that Eisenhower was going to lose to Stevenson in the election of 1952. I don't know why. I have no idea why I would have been upset except for my parents. There had been supposedly no communists in South Dakota . . .

H: Where did the town of Veblen get its name?

S: I don't know whether it had anything to do with Thorstein. I don't know where it got its name.

H: What did the world look like from South Dakota in 1960?

S: I didn't know very much about it. I read a little bit. I suppose it was half a dream world more than anything. I don't think I got out of northeastern South Dakota in that very small community until I was . . . I remember going down to visit my sister who was married and living on a farm near Sioux Falls, South Dakota. That a town at that time probably close to 50,000 and that would have been in the late 1940's. 1948 or 1949. I was only six or seven years old and I guess I perhaps got into Sioux Falls at that time. That's the first time I ever got into a large area. I don't think I ever went to a really large metropolitan area like Minneapolis and St. Paul which were 220 miles away until I was probably sixteen or seventeen years old, well into high school.

H: Looking back at high school, what do you remember about the teachers and the subjects? Was it very interesting?

S: I don't know how good they were as teachers, but they actually were probably fairly good teachers. They were very nice and very pleasant to have as teachers. I think teachers are very important. I do remember some of my history and social studies teachers. They were very conscientious, very much concerned with the students. I sang in the chorus . . .

H: In church or the . . .

S: No, in school, in the chorus at the school for the first three years until I finally recognized that I could no longer sing. I probably never was able to. I do remember that the first year, the freshman year, there was a new chorus director and she was just out of college, Concordia College in Morehead, Minnesota. She was not very much of a diciplinarian. Just fine probably as a director, but so many of the students

took advantage of her. There were probably about 50 or 60 of us in the chorus and if they wanted to sing they would sing, otherwise . . . I remember a friend of mine always read the paper. He would read the newspaper that he had picked up in the morning during chorus. She was brought to tears over the conduct. She lasted one year, that was all. I remember her name even, Miss Carlander, but I don't know what happened. She probably went on and became a very good teacher. I'm sure that, on the other hand, I wouldn't have been surprised if she quit teaching after that year.

I do remember a lot of friends that I made. I made a lot of very good friends in high school. Most of them were older than I was. By the time I was a senior I didn't have many friends left. I shouldn't say that, I had about twenty close friends, but by the time I was a senior I had five or six. The other had all gone on to college.

H: What did you like most about high school?

S: There were a lot of extracurricular activities. I enjoyed the studying, but I also enjoyed drama. I worked at the bakery the last couple of years and I enjoyed that.

H: What did you enjoy about this time?

S: About everything. I enjoyed all the subjects. I took four years of math, three years of science, and four years of English. I couldn't take any language because we didn't have any. I got along with everybody, all the teachers. When I first started high school I was going to be an athlete, but my 5'2", 100-pound frame didn't lend itself.

H: I don't believe it.

S: I didn't grow until my junior year.

H: Is that right?

S: I took part in the intramurals, basketball especially.

H: Did you have any idea of what you wanted to do in life such as a career?

S: I knew that I wasn't going to be a farmer. Not that I didn't like farming, I enjoyed growing up there, but I had such a bad case of hay fever. It was impractical to ever think of growing up on the farm, or making a life out of farming. It was an awfully tough life. My father never made very much money. We never had to

worry where our next meal was going to come from. We never had running water, indoor bath, or anything like that. I probably didn't recognize that such a thing like that really existed until I was five, six years of age or older. Materially, I don't think it was especially rewarding, but I don't think that I really thought of the family as being poor.

H: Did you ever subsequently think of them that way?

S: I know by the time I was into high school and began associating with many more people, I recognized that we were basically poor people. Not destitute by any means, not that. I can remember having taken only one vacation and that was when we went to the Black Hills in South Dakota and that was all the way across that state, 400 miles. It was probably a three or four day trip and that was a big thing for me. It also cost us what we thought was a considerable amount of money to stay in a motel for two or three nights. I don't think I suffered from it. I think that there were certain advantages I would have gotten if we would have had a little bit more money, maybe more trips, or maybe a few more books, but there was probably enough intellectual stimulus.

H: What did you feel that you were going to do, outside of not going into farming?

S: As soon as I was in high school, I planned on going to college because my brother was already into college by that time. My older sister had gone through one year of college and then got married. She went to college back in 1947 or 1948. My next sister had gone through three years of nurses training and was a registered nurse. My brother was in college by the time I started high school. He went on to college and then he went on to the seminary and became a Lutheran minister. I knew automatically that I was going to go on to college.

H: How did your parents feel about that?

S: They very much approved of that. I do remember that my younger sister was graduated from high school. She had worked at a bank and was a teller for a couple of years after school and on Saturdays and made a little bit of money. I think they were probably a little upset that she gave up that job and went into nurses training or got into something else. She made up her mind and then they were very much in favor of it. They are very much encouraging as far as education. They gave us what money they were able to. I paid for much

of my education. By the time I started college, I had saved probably a couple of thousands of dollars working at the bakery. When I was young I belonged to 4-H. I had a couple acres of flax one year and it was a bumper crop and I saved a couple of hundred dollars like that. I had a sow one year that had ten pigs and I raised them. I made $200 or $300 out of that. I probably saved a few hundred dollars my last year in high school. I did come up with probably a couple of thousand dollars by the time I entered college and I had probably $300 in scholarships. My parents probably provided by that time after the first two years; I think I paid for the first two years mainly by myself. They probably gave me $300 or $400 for each of the last two years. Plus, I took loans, National Defense Education Act loans when I was in undergraduate school. I worked my last two years of college, ten or fifteen hours a week, basically for spending money.

H: This was Augustana College?

S: Right. It is a small, private, Lutheran school in Sioux Falls, South Dakota. We had about 1300 to 1400 students when I was there. It cost me probably an average of$1400 a year, which was fairly expensive at that time. It was certainly far more than any of the state schools. On the other hand, it didn't cost nearly as much as a school like other private schools in the area like St. Olaf or Carlton, but I think it was a good school.

H: How did you happen to go there?

S: My brother had gone there. My brother went there. I think they offered him a $200 of $300 scholarship at that time. I believe it was partly based on that he was very good at singing and he became a member of the choir at Augustana College. They have a very famous choir and it would tour the United States every year for about three weeks or so. I beleive that he had a music scholarship.

H: What was college like?

S: I enjoyed it. I lived in the dormitory for freshman and senior yeras. The last year I was a dorm counselor so I got my room free. The second and third years I lived off campus. I did my own cooking, had one or two roommates. As soon as I entered college I was a history major, although I did consider at one time switching to biology, and maybe even going into medicine. There were a lot of those who were majoring

in biology or chemistry who were going on to medical school from college. I was a history major to start with and for the first year or two I was very much considering entering the ministry. By the sophomore-junior year I decided that instead I would go on to graduate school and go on to college teaching. Again, I think I enjoyed almost all of my courses. I can't really think of anything right now offhand that I disliked.

H: Were there any instructors there that you remember quite well?

S: There was one of the history teachers, Dr. Oyos, who was a very outstanding teacher. I remember him as being very well-organized, a good lecturer, and also very good at leading discussions in the class. He was a hard teacher, very demanding. We read a considerable amount. We frequently wrote papers for him, or book reviews, or both.

There was a one-man philosophy department, and I ended up taking it. I guess I ended up with a major in philosophy too. I don't know how much I learned as far as philosophy. My heart was never set on it. I think philosphy is one of those type of courses that I just slid through and perhaps half enjoyed it, but came out of it really not knowing as much about it as I should have. I took a seminar on Immanuel Kant. I don't remember a thing about him. It was an undergraduate seminar; there were eight of us in the class. We read books--it was our junior or senior year--and critiqued them. We did some practical reading and the teacher kept saying that it loses something in translation. It was extremely difficult. We had to write a paper a week. We would read a book and it would probably take two or three weeks to get through one of these books and he would throw out seven or eight questions, and say, "Satre, you write on this one. Snook, you write on that one and that one." I had a horrible time answering these questions. My closest friend, Don Snook, used to help me write. We would be sitting three hours before class started trying to write a paper for me. I really did perhaps slide through some of those philosophy courses, but I enjoyed it. I think I remember something about some of the philosophers, especially the ancient philosophers. I probably enjoyed the Greek philosophers more than anybody.

I will never forget an examination that I took. I think it was in something like contemporary philosophy. We had been reading Alfred Jules Ayres' book Language, Truth and Logic, which was perhaps ten times more difficult than Alfred North Whitehead's book, Science

in the Modern World, which we had just completed. I didn't understand the book at all and he gave us a true and false examination. To make it even more difficult, if we left the answer blank, there was only one point off. If we guessed at it and it was wrong, there were two points taken off. I remember that it was probably the most difficult examination that I ever took. He must have thrown the results out the window because I don't think any of us passed the exam.

H: Is there anything that you got interested in as time went on?

S: I was very active in the extracurricular activities. I wrote for the newspaper. I was the sports editor for one year; I was also the managing editor one year of the school newspaper. Perhaps I could have become the editor of it had I wanted to stay with it, but it was too much work. I didn't know why anybody would want to be the editor of a university newspaper. They were paid, I think they were paid tuition, which would have been $300 to $400 a semester, but it was a 50 hour job and you had to remain a full-time student. Those editors almost destroyed themselves. I decided by my sophomore, junior year that I would not become the editor. I was active in school year book; I think I was the editor of the sports section my senior year there.

I was sufficiently active so that I was selected to be a member of the Blue Key honorary society. It was more than an honorary society, it was a real work organization. We produced a telephone book every year. It was a fascinating thing. It was very effective. We ran a photo, a separate photo of all the students in the university. There were 1300 to 1400 photos. Under each of the little photos, about one inch by one inch there would be the name, the university address and phone number, and I believe the home address (not probably the entire home address but at least identify the town that they were from). It was extremely handy when you were trying to find out who a certain girl was in your class. You would get to know everybody in that book. It wasn't that large of a school; it was 1300 to 1400. It was a very handy book. The photos of the students were taken by the school photographer during registration, probably in the fall, and he would develop them and give us these little things and we would have to cut them out and paste them in. We would type it up and have it reduced down and printed. We started working on this in late September and we had it on the market by late October. We sold it for a dollar a copy and we made $400 to $500 for Blue Key. I don't know what we did with the money. I believe perhaps we did have a scholarship of some type. It was really quite a lot of work. I still have maybe three copies at home. They went

on every year bigger and better. When I came here and they produced a telephone book, faculty and staff, I was always baffled on why they couldn't get it out until January or February when we worked like mad for a month but had gotten out a very worthwhile, incredible book.

I was involved in Student Government. I don't think I was ever in any dramatics. I did take part in a society. There were no national sororities or fraternities, but there were local societies. I guess for a couple of years we were kind of known as the egghead group. I think it kind of bothered them--that is, other students--because for the first two or three years of my college life this egghead group used to win most of the athletic competitions. I don't know, I think there were probably two divisions in the society, the athletes and the students. Most of us were very good students and also very active students. We did a variety of things. A lot of us in the society went on to higher education after college.

H: How did you happen to decide that?

S: To join that society or go onto higher education?

H: To go on to graduate school.

S: I think by the time I was a sophomore or a junior I decided that I would enjoy being a college teacher. I liked the environment. It was a residential school that I was going to, a nice campus, and I thought that I would enjoy very much the life of a college teacher.

H: A college teacher? Did you have any feelings about any particular subject area?

S: I always knew that it would be history. For some reason I never took much American history. I took the survey course and I may have had one other division, I can't remember. Everything was concentrated in European history. I don't know why, maybe because it was quite new to me. By the time I had gotten through high school, I probably had some understanding of American history so that western civilization and European history was very appealing. It was kind of a new world. When I entered graduate school I didn't know what area I was going to concentrate in, so I just took three or four basic courses the first year and decided at that time that I would go into English history.

H: This was at South Carolina?

S: Right, at the University of South Carolina. If you're wondering why I went to South Carolina, it was basically

because they offered me the most money. I couldn't go to graduate school without financial aid. I bet I applied to 30 or 40 universities all over the United States and I ruled out those that required money for the application. I may have applied to two or three places that required five or ten dollars, but I don't think I spent more than twenty or twenty-five dollars on applications.

H: It was simply the most money at that one?

S: Yes, I had offers. I sound as if I was in great demand, which I wasn't. I was offered an assistantship at Omaha University. Omaha University was only a master's program at that time. Now Omaha is a branch of the University of Nebraska. I had a tuition scholarship plus, I think, $1000 a year offered from the University of Wisconsin. That was only a one-year shot, although it could perhaps have been renewed. The University of South Carolina offered me a National Defense Education Act Scholarship for three years. It provided tuition plus something over $2000 per year, plus a little bit more the second and third years, and that was tax free, plus a nominal stipend for summer school work if I wanted to go there. Naturally, I took that because it provided me with the most security.

H: Why do you suppose they offered you that?

S: I think one of the things that helped me was that they were looking for somebody out of state. They were offering two NDEA fellowships a year. I think they tended to take one person from in-state and one person out-of-state. I had a good undergraduate record, especially in history, probably all A's or maybe one or two B's in the classes, but I had a good academic record. I'm guessing now, but probably something like an A- record. I took the Graduate Record Exam. The results were not especially brilliant. I did not do very well in the verbal part because I have never been strong in the verbal part. The verbal part and the writing part have always been my weakness. I remember the quantitative part was very high, well into the 90th percentile. In the history part I was perhaps the 70th or 80th percentile. There were 20% ahead of me who had taken it nation-wide and had done better than I did on the exam. This isn't a bad score, but I do remember there were four or five of us from Augustana who took the G.R.E. in history, and I was probably the lowest of the lot. There was probably one other who was about the same as I was. I remember there was one who got 99 right across the board in every part of it. I guess all four of us now have our Ph.D.'s who took the G.R.E.

H: From Augustana?

S: Yes. One of them went to the University of Nebraska. I am really not certain that they have their Ph.D.'s, but if they don't they are certainly very close to it. One went to Brown University, although he might have gone ultimately into political science rather than history. The other one, I know received her doctorate from the University of Hawaii. I think, in fact, of those four, three of us received the NDEA Scholarships. There were a lot of students from Augustana College that did get fellowships. Those, for instance, who majored in biology and got a B average in biology courses, could probably virtually guarantee themselves assistantships in graduate work at a university.

H: Was the university active in this process of placing students in graduate schools?

S: I don't know how active. They certainly encouraged us to apply for graduate work and of course they wrote us recommendations. Now how active they were, I really don't know. I think the students were coming out of there with good enough academic records and did well enough on the examinations that they had to take so that they kind of placed themselves.

H: It wasn't a matter of your professor calling someone?

S: No. For instance, nobody knew anybody there from South Carolina where I went and I don't think that they knew anybody at Brown, or the University of Hawaii. No, they didn't I do know those, for instance, in biology who went on to medical school had absolutely no trouble in medical school. There were a lot of them that I knew of from other universities that frequently did have trouble in medicals chool because it was very demanding. When the students from Augustna came out of the biology courses, they knew their biology. They lived over there. They had a course in histology, the study of cells, that when they got to graduate school, it was a dream. They learned it all in undergraduate school. That's why if they came out with a B average, they would do all right.

H: What part did the church and religion play up to this point?

S: It played really a role throughout my undergraduate career. It played actually an important part in my life. I went, of course, to a Lutheran school. I had been brought up very much in a really religious environment. While I was at college I went to church regularly. I frequently went to chapel--not all the time, it wasn't required--probably two to three out of the four or five days a week that it was

offered. A lot of my friends went into the ministry and they are still very close friends. I still visit two or three of them who are now in the ministry. It played an important part in my life. I don't knowhow to say how formative it was. I suppose certainly it affected the moral part of life, more than anything, my activities.

H: I'm not sure I understand.

S: I don't know what more I should say about how if affected me. Even when I went to graduate school, we were active members of a church. After we came here to Youngstown in 1968 we were active in the First Presbyterian Church for two or three years. I was a deacon in the Youngstown church for one or two years. I kind of became disenchanted or disturbed over parts of the church. Here, specifically in Youngstown, it was too much concerned with the building, too much concerned with the structure of the church, and we felt the church was not nearly concerned enough about the social aspects.

H: The mortgage and this sort of thing?

S: Yes. It didn't have a mortgage; it was paid by the time it was done.

H: This church here?

S: Right, I don't think it had a mortgage. I think it was paid for. The building was constructed in the early 1960's and I believe it was paid for before it was completed.

H: You have decided not to enter the ministry?

S: Right.

H: During college?

S: Right. By the sophomore year I decided that I would prefer to be a college teacher.

I might mention before I started college I had some interesting jobs. I worked as a food concessionaire and traveled around the carnivals in the summer. I suppose you could say that I was a "carni" except I never ran any of what were called the jip joints, but I was always involved in food concession business. I specialized in foot-long hot dogs and I worked for a person out fo Fergus Falls, Minnesota. I became acquainted with this business from a friend of my brother. We traveled throughout two or three of the Canadian provinces. We were at the small fairs at

Portage La Prairie and at Estavan. Those are small towns in Manitoba and Saskatchewan. Then we went to the larger fairs in Edmonton, Alberta, a fairly large town, Saskatoon, and Regina, both of which are located in Saskatchewan. I sold foot-long hot dogs at each of those locations. We had three stands. We traveled in a truck and slept in a sleeping bag wherever possible. On a nice day you would sleep out under the stars or go to a park in the carnival area. If it was going to rain you would sleep under the truck, maybe in the grandstand, wherever possible. They were tremendously long hours. Ten or eleven in the morning we would open up and try to close down by one of two the following morning. I spent virtually the full day in the stand, maybe get enough relief to run up to the bathroom once or twice a day and probably grab a bite to eat. But I ate a lot of foot-long hot dogs, and I still like them. They are a very good product. We bought really the best hot dogs available and sold them at a reasonable price. Fried onions, we would fry the onions in a good oil like Wesson oil. People would smell those onions and would just crowd into the stands. We recognized that a good part of our profit was in repeat business so people would keep coming back. We figured perhaps 30% of our business . . .

H: The quality . . .

S: We were quality-oriented and it made it much easier for me to work that way. If we were serving out junk I probably would have been disturbed. We were serving real quality foot-long hot dogs as mush as that is possible, and then we sold orange drink with it. There were quite a few college students who were involved in this food concession company. When we were in Canada there were probably five or six of us all together working. I would earn at the large provincial fairs $60 a week plus 5% of the gross of the stand. The gross of the stand, I remember taking in $300 a day or more by the people who had bought 25¢ hot dogs at that time. That meant I sold 1200 hot dogs in a day, most of the time doing it all by myself. You became very efficiency-oriented. You had your hot dog buns, and we steamed them to warm them up and make sure they weren't too dry. We had enough of a turnover, we had such volume that all our products were very fresh, but we heated them up and they liked that. It, the hot dog stand, was a very primitive thing. We had two kettles with burners underneath. I was right-handed, had the buns on the left, had a large grill in the middle with the onions, then the kettle with the hot dogs on the right. You would flop a hot dog in there, add some onions,and you would serve it up and let them put on their own ketchup and mustard. You got to where you could really serve hot

dogs in a hurry. When you would have 30 people out there waiting for hot dogs you wanted to take care of them as quickly as possible. I sold foot-long hot dogs for three summers. I went to Canada for at least one month. If we stayed beyond a month we would have to pay an extra $300 or $400 tax of some type for operating a concession stand in Canada. For the other month to a month and a half we were moved from one part to antoher in the midwest, Montana, North Dakota, South Dakota, Wisconsin, Minnesota. I sold everything from foot-long hot dogs to cotton candy, snow cones, caramel apples, and coke.

H: What were the people like in the carnival that you were traveling around with?

S: I got to know some of them, especially when we would book into a smaller carnival, one of these that were set up on the main street of the town and has seven or eight rides and four or five clip joints. I would get to know some of them, very nice people, very pleasant, but rough frequently, very much protective of their property; they would go to fight for it. It was in a small town in North Dakota and it was the first stop in the year. It would have been in June, and a couple of us were selling foot-long hot dogs there. In the bus that we were traveling in, and old, converted bus, I heard, "Hey, rube. Hey, rube." They were shouting. "Hey rube," was the fight call.

H: Was this from the natives?

S: No, this is "hey rube," a term used by "carnies" to prepare for a fight. I looked out the window and there were some young people walking up from downtown and they took off. They turned around and beat it uptown again. I in fact, did not join. I wasn't really a part of the carnival. I was an outsider, but I booked in and I happened to get to know some of them. I got to know perhaps a little bit of the jargon, but I also got to know when they defended, why they defended. I found out at that time that the night before that somebody from the town had cut the wires from the engine for the ferris wheel. Apparently there had been some other troubles between the "carnies" and the townspeople. They were prepared that night to defend. In fact, I think that when they yelled "hey rube," they were already just standing quietly in the shadows of their stands waiting for this to happen. One of the local people from the town had turned around so rapidly that he left his loafers behind. I remember that they were still there the next day at noon which probably meant that they didn't dare come back. There was probably

some "carnie" that had his eye on those shoes; if he would come back, they would be able to identify him. One of the people on the shows had killed somebody. There had been some problem in a town. This had happened two or three years before and they had destroyed some stand or something. When the carnies were chasing after the vandals, one of the carnies had taken a hammer and thrown it and hit him right in the back of the head and killed him. He was not found guilty of any wrongdoing. He was not imprisoned; he was found defending his property. Very pleasant people.

I remember one person who I got to know fairly well was Bill Carter. He ran the girly show with the Art B. Thomas show. His wife was the star attraction. Mitsy And Her All Girl Blue Garter Review, I think was the name of it. I used to help set up the tent. I used to earn a little bit of money on the side. I would put my stand up in a hurry and I would go to work for Bill for two or three hours and he would probably pay me $10. I never did go to any of the shows. I met his wife, got to know that they had a very nice trailer. I remember that he had a big Cadillac and I would occasionally go into town with him instead of taking a big truck. I would run into town with him if I needed some supplies. I very distinctly remember his driving. He had a foot that went up and down. He would put his foot down and would go up to 80 miles or 70 miles an hour and then he would let up on it and go down to 50 miles an hour. That thing must have gotten about five miles to the gallon on gas because he drove that way all the way into town.

I have another employment that I haven't come to yet.

H: What's that?

S: I worked as a combine driver, combining peas for the Del Monte Corporation also for two summers in Illinois. I worked for six weeks for two summers. I worked over 100 hours per week at a wage of $1.30, time and a half overtime over ten hours a day. That was long, hard work; that was ninety degree weather with 90% humidity. Working over 100 hours per week doesn't leave very much time for anything else in one's life. The most I ever put in in one day I recall was nineteen and a half hours. Plus there was a half hour off for lunch and a half an hour or hour off for dinner so you're up there 21 hours of the day. Some people had great difficulty staying awake and would fall asleep on the tractor. The tractors run very slow. It was a half a mile to a mile an hour. The year after I quit working there one person was killed. People had been killed before, from what I understand. They fall asleep and fall off of the tractor and get driven over by the machine.

H: Did they move around?

S: We moved around from one field to another. There were five of us in a crew, five of us driving combines. The first year I was there there were only ten combines. They still had what were called viner stations where they would cut all the pea vines and haul the vines to a central location. They had big machines that would beat the peas out of the pods there. The combines, of course, were new; that was in 1963 or 1964. Those were the summers that I worked there. Now, for instance, they use all combines.

H: You weren't married at this time?

S: No. In fact, that's where I met the lady who was to be my wife. She was a cashier in the company cafeteria, that's where I met her.

H: So she is from Illinois?

S: Yes. I went to Augustana College in Sioux Falls, South Dakota for my undergraduate work and she went her first two years to Augustana College in Rock Island, Illinois. They were both at one time the same school. In the 1870's or 1880's the two groups of Lutherans had a quarrel apparently and the Norwegian Lutherans went one way and the Swedish Lutherans went the other and split up into two schools. The school that I eventually went to kind of wandered around the midwest from one town to another for several years until it finally settled down in Sioux Falls, South Dakota.

H: She is Lutheran too?

S: No, she was Presbyterian, but she went to this Lutheran school that is a very good school.

H: You had some notes that you wanted to talk about.

S: Do you want to go to graduate school from here?

H: I thought we would complete through to the present and then subsequently we can go back and pick up some of these things in great detail. If anything is particularly striking to you, let's talk about it.

S: The next thing that really happened to me was graduate school. It was next in line chronologically.

H: Where is this in connection with the combines?

S: The year after I graduated from high school and the summers after my freshman and sophomore years of college, those three summers I worked at the carnival. The following two summers after I completed my junior year in college and after I had graduated from college, those two summers I worked for Del Monte as a combine driver. That following school year then after the second year I had driven the combines, then I started graduate school the following year, in the fall of 1964.

H: That was in South Carolina?

S: Right. You might wonder why I went to South Carolina, which is a logical question. I applied to ten or fifteen graduate schools and I went to the one that basically offered me the most money. Did we talk about this last time?

H: Yes.

S: That's why I went to South Carolina.

H: Did you go down there site unseen?

S: Yes.

H: Did you run into any surprises when you got down there?

S: No, not really. I was glad to leave. In many ways I was very glad to get out of the midwest. I never traveled down to the south, never been in that area at all before in my life. I was very much looking forward to graduate school.

H: You were still not married at this point right?

S: No, I wasn't married until after the first year of graduate school.

H: What did graduate school involve?

S: The first year, as far as just the living conditions, which is a big part of any schooling, I lived in a dormitory, a graduate dormitory the first year. At that time, my wife to be had transferred from Augustana College to South Carolina, so she was in an undergraduate dorm that first year.

H: What a fortunate coincidence.

S: It wasn't a coincidence. She had decided that she would move down there too for that year and we would wait another year before we got married. It made it a lot easier having her there rather than if she had remained for her third year at Augustana College. I think it would have made it a lot more difficult in graduate school. This way both of us were there, both of us were still going to school. That was very nice that way.

H: These were all history majors you lived with going for Ph.D.'s?

S: Yes. Actually, the roommate I had yes, he was a history graduate student. Others in the dormitory, for instance, were from all disciplines at the university. The ones, for instance, that I became most closely associated with were the other students working on the M.A. and the Ph.D. degree.

H: Did they have a terminal Masters degree there?

S: Yes, they did have a terminal Masters; they had both the Masters and the Ph.D.

H: Was it a fairly distinct sort of thing that this is our incoming class and you knew who all these people were? How many were there?

S: I don't know. I would say that when I came in there were maybe ten or fifteen new graduate students in history.

H: Both Masters and Ph.D.?

S: Right. Most of us came in for the M.A. level and a lot of us stayed there and continued right on until Ph.D; although now that I think of it there were at least two or three that came in with their Masters degree after the Ph.D. program, one of whom became one of my two closest friends down there. He came in with an M.A. from Arizona State University.

H: Was it pretty tough?

S: Yes, I thought it was very difficult. In fact, I think the Masters degree is more difficult than the Ph.D. This is what I got out of graduate school, that it is an endurance contest. You have to have certain basic intelligence, but I think the stick-to-itness was as important as anything, sitting in there grinding out the papers, attending classes, keeping up with the material, working, to me anyway, extremely long days. My whole life was the university. There were a lot of people . . . I don't know that there were a lot of

people that failed in the courses. Somewhere along the line, even before a lot of them finished their Master's degree, they just kind of were worn out.

H: They just disappreared?

S: They just disappeared. A lot of them, by the way, who didn't complete their Master's or later on didn't complete their Ph.D. degrees were basically . . . it was due to a Master's thesis that was required. There was also, of course, a Ph.D. dissertation. It bogged down in either one or the other. It would differ from one professor to another, one mentor to another, but usually the thesis involved a tremendous amount of self-discipline. You're pretty much on your own. Certainly your professor would help you, but you more or less initiated it. You went to see your professor and you said, "Can I hand in a chapter?" If the professor wasn't driving the person, as is usually the case, the student would just let it slide. It would slide for so many.

H: This wasn't a setup where the professors would give you a little chunk of work that they were doing and tell you to do it?

S: Very seldom. I'm not aware that that happened at South Carolina. You were not working on a pet project of the professor, no. Maybe that's better.

H: It was pretty challenging?

S: Yes, I thought it was very challenging. I was taking only twelve semester hours every term, which was a very heavy load. I didn't have any assistantship duties; I had a fellowship. I could devote full time; I didn't have to do any teaching on the side or correct any papers.

H: How many hours a day were you working?

S: I worked from 8:00 in the morning until 10:00 or 11:00 in the evening. Ordinarily, I'm sure I averaged seventy to seventy-five hours of schoolwork.

H: This is not sitting around shooting the breeze with other graduate students?

S: I suppose for those seventy some hours there were probably four or five hours that I went in for shooting the breeze. That was inevitable. There was a little bit of that, but I never did very much of that. Some of them did considerably more of that.

H: Did it seem at all exciting?

S: Yes, I enjoyed it. I had some teachers that were not very good, but I had some that were very good. That's one thing that made the graduate school interesting, they always had a visiting professor every semester. The university had an apartment which was assigned to the history department. The visiting professor would get to use that apartment. It was very nice, a two or three bedroom apartment with a big study. It was in an apartment very close to the university. They were to have a visiting professor every semester. The first semester I was there it was a visiting professor from the University of Wisconsin, Chester Easom, who is in German history and modern European diplomatic history. I had him for the first seminar I ever had, the first semester I was there. It was a research seminar. It wasn't only research, it was a book a week, I think, we were reading and reporting, plus a major research paper. It about drove me out of my mind, the amount of work we had to do. I had four classes, and I was busy. I was introduced anyway, that way, to a very good teacher.

The second semester I was there I had a visiting professor from Oxford. The second semester every year the University of South Carolina has a visiting professor from Oxford. The first visiting professor they had, which was several years before I became a student there, they had Professor David Ogg from Oxford University, who is a historian mainly of the early modern Europe, 16th, 17th Century. Once they had started that program they continued it. Generally I think it was the second sememster every year somebody from Oxford University came. One year when I was there they had Felix Markham, the Napoleonic specialist. The second semester I was there the teacher I had was Mr. Martin Gilbert, who is from Merton College at Oxford. Gilbert was about at that time 28 or 29 years old. Of the eight or ten of us in the class perhaps half of the class was older than Gilbert. He had published five or six books by that time. He was on the book-of-the-year plan. He is now, by the way, the official biographer of the life of Winston Churchill. I don't know if you're acquainted with that. Winston Churchill's son, Randolph Churchill, started writing the official life in the late 1960's. He wrote the first two volumes of the life of Churchill. Randolph Churchill, Winston's son, died the same day that Bobby Kennedy was assassinated. Gilbert had been his research assistant, Randolph Churchill's research assistant. He took over then as the official biographer of Winston Churchill. He has now brought out an additional volume of Churchill's life. By the way, they have made it all the way up to 1916 with the first three volumes of Churchill's life. I would think the narrative part would probably end up being ten volumes, eight to ten voulmes, on his life. Plus they are putting out companion

volumes, documentary volumes. So far, with the first three volumes they have put out six or seven volumes of documents to accompany the first three volumes of narrative. Gilbert was an exciting teacher. He was the one who especially got me interested in English history. He was very much a political historian.

H: He was exciting?

S: He was exciting. He was twenty-nine years old; he knew Churchill. Churchill died that semester that Gilbert was teaching the class. I think Churchill died in January of 1965. That's when the seminar started, January of 1965. He knew Churchill; he knew MacMillan or Eden; he had talked with them. Gilbert had, I believe, attempted once or twice to become an MP to parliament. He had run on the Labour ticket. He had not been successful, but here was somebody who was very much alive. He knew a lot of people in England; he knew a lot of historians in England; he knew A. J. P. Taylor. In fact, I believe A. J. P. Taylor was his tutor. That was exciting. There are so many things he could tell about, so many things he could tell us aobut people in England that you wouldn't find it in a textbook. He gave a very interesting speech on the Royal Family, which some of the things you probably wouldn't find in print. He was the person who really got me interested in English history.

H: What was it about English history that . . .

S: I'm really not certain what drew me to it, if it was English history or if it was the professor who made English history so interesting. I would guess it was probably the teacher that made it interesting.

H: What sort of contact did you have with Gilbert? Was this in seminars and class?

S: Primarily in the class. I did visit him a couple of summers later when I went to England to do some research on my dissertation one summer. We stopped by, my wife and I. I had written ahead to him and we were in Oxford; I was doing some research at one of the libraries there and I contacted him and we met him. He took us in to Merton College. He is very proud of the library at Merton College. It is in fact the oldest of the libraries at Oxford. He just cherished that library. He was so proud of it. He took us through. It was in the evening and nobody else was there. He took us through and showed us some of the very old books that still have chains on them and are chained to the shelves. They still leave a few of them there as an example of what it was like for the students in the late medieval period. That day when we were there he had gone punting on the Thames. Are you acquainted with

the term punting? You just get on this boat and pull along. He had gone up the river and had taken a few sheets of paper with him and a pencil and gone up a couple of miles and gone up on shore and sat under the tree and had written all afternoon. That is, by the way, the way he wrote. When he was at South Carolina over Easter vacation, he took a week or two and went down to fort Lauderdale or someplace warm, one of the beaches in Florida. All he did was take his pencil and paper with him, no notes. By that time, he basically wrote by digesting. He would have amassed this evidence and he would go through the cards. He basically knew what he wanted to say and he would put it down on paper, writing it without using the notes. He would leave spaces for writing down quotations. He would remember certain quotations that were important.

H: Have you ever tried that?

S: Yes, I have. I think it's a fairly good way to write except you really have to master your material because otherwise you are going to be making statements that aren't quite reflective. I have tried to do that to a certain extent. I have never tried it, certainly, for an entire paper. I think Gilbert is capable of sitting down and writing maybe fifteen, twenty, thirty, forty pages a day. I can't do that, but on the otherhand if I can do a part of a paper, let's say three, four, or five pages, I will occasionally try. I will write it without using the notes. I will have gone through the notes, tried to digest them, figure out exactly what I want to say and then write it without using the notes. Only later on would I go back and footnote that. It's kind of nice if you can do it that way because then you are not taking it directly off those note cards. You might make a far better transition and phrase when you aren't picking it . . .

H: It eliminates a lot of the choppiness you get.

S: Yes. He told us a lot about writing. I think he helped the class very much as far as how to write.

H: Style?

S: Yes. He would make corrections. He would try to tell us how to write, although I really learned how to write when I started on my thesis--Master's thesis--which was very difficult. The thesis was a large task, a big task. I think the first semester my second year I took mainly thesis research and writing. Of course, I researched like mad and went to the Library of Congress a week or two to pick up materials I hadn't been able to get in

South Carolina. Here I had two or three weeks left in the semester to put all this stuff together and I sat down at the typewriter and probably banged out 100 to 150 pages. My two advisors were actually reading it and they handed it back. It was a piece of junk. They said, "You've got to redo this." By this time it was in to the second semester and I was back to twelve hours with the thesis hanging over my head my second year. What I had to say was let's leave it until summer. I'll finish it during summer school, and they said fine. In to my second summer then I worked on it; I redid it and really learned how to write that second summer. They came back in the fall, they read it, and they said, "Fine, very good."

H: Was it mainly the writing?

S: It was really difficult in writing, writing style, verb usage, a lot of pretty basic things that I should have learned during college and I don't think I had. I just had to learn how to write. The only way you learn how to write, I'm convinced, is to write and write and write. It never came naturally to me; it still doesn't come naturally. Some people can sit down and just dash it off.

H: What did you do your Master's thesis on?

S: I did it on politics and army reform in England from 1900 to 1903. It was the initial reforms that grew out of the shortcomings of the English army in the World War. What I did was write on a failure, although after getting in to it I did recognize that while he certainly failed, some of his failures paved the way later on for reform until Haldane, who carried out army reform from 1906 to 1912.

H: Did these reforms fail politically?

S: They failed mor for political reasons, I think, than for military reasons. The English army has always been very, very much a political instrument to the extent that the officers were from the aristocracy. The aristocracy in the late 19th and early 20th century England was still very, very powerful. I think a lot of people think of the 19th centruy as the democratization of England, yet if you look at the cabinets of late 19th century England you quickly notice that perhaps a half of the people in the cabinet were still peers, still members of the aristocracy. The amazing thing about the aristocracy in England was how it managed throughout the 19th century to retain power. Certainly they did give up power, but they still remained at the forefront of political life in England.

H: Was there a thesis in this thesis?

S: No. What I was trying to do in the thesis was to show what reforms had been attempted as an outgrowth, as a cause because of the Boer War, and why these reforms failed. Was it the shortcomings of the Secretary of State for Wars? Was it due to social pressure, social problems, or due to economic problems within the country, the fact that there was simply not enough money to carry through what was far too grandiose a scheme for army reform? He started patterning it on the German Army Corps.

H: Who was this?

S: The name of the Secretary of the State of War was St. John Broderick.

H: How does St. John come out in old American English?

S: Saint John.

H: Why did you care about that whole thing anyway?

S: This was a topic that I think, indeed, one of the directors of my thesis, Dick Rempel, suggested. We were talking over possibilities. I, at one time, toyed with doing a study of the relationship of the German Royal Family to England in the late 19th century, specifically on Wilhelm and his relations. Easom, Chester Easom, had done some work on that. The first seminar of graduate school I had become interested in that topic, in that subject. When I was in Gilbert's seminar, again this topic, relationship of Germany and England from 1890-1914 kept popping up. So I was sort of fairly interested in especially that period and from late 19th up to about World War I. I probably spent a few weeks looking into the possibility of writing on Wilhelm, but I decided that my German wasn't good enough to warrant that topic, because I would have had to use a lot of German resources. Instead, I chose to go into something which was truly domestic England where I would not need the language, although I did use some German resources when I was studying the English army. I read and used, for instance, Die Grosse Politik, which is the forty to fifty volume collection of German diplomatic documents in the period from 1870 to 1914. But I used almost purely English sources.

H: German was not a second language to you at all?

S: No, languages have never come easily to me.

H: You don't have a second language?

S: I can't. I haven't used German now since I got out of graduate school.

H: Your family didn't speak any other language?

S: My mother could speak Norwegian; she still can, but we never learned it; we never spoke it.

H: You didn't speak it around the house?

S: No, never. My mother, for instance, was a case where she didn't know how to speak English when she started day school, even though she had lived in the United States her whole life. She was born in the United States, but she couldn't speak English so she had to pick it up; she had to learn English when she started school, elementary school. But I was not in that situation. Languages have never come easy to me. Although, interestingly enough, the best teacher I've ever had in my life was a language teacher. German was the first language I had. I had taken two years of German in undergraduate school and that is the first language in graduate school that I passed an exam for to satisfy one of the two languages I needed for the Ph.D. The second language I took was Spanish. I could have taken either Spanish or French. I did quite a bit of work in graduate school on Latin American history. I thought, well, why not pick up Spanish. The teacher I had for Spanish was one fantastic teacher. Mary Berelli was from someplace in Ohio and she had moved to South Carolina. She and her husband both taught in the language department. I don't remember what he taught. I think he taught Italian and she taught French and Spanish. The course I took was a cram course for graduate students. It was designed for them. You had to get at least a B in the course and that would satisfy the language requirement.

H: Did you have to take an exam?

S: Yes. There was an exam at the end of her course that you had to pass with at least a B, but no exam outside of that course. She had all her own textbooks that she had written. She had her Spanish grammar book, Spanish idiom, and Spanish workbook. Every day we had an examination of only ten minutes to fifteen minutes. She would pass out a sheet and we could always use a dictionary. We could use anything we wanted to to pass the examination. What she was doing was gearing us up for that final examination. We got so used to taking examinations that when we came in for the final examination it was just another examination. She made it so exciting that you looked forward to this class, to this language class. You felt tremendously guilty if you didn't come prepared. The semester was sixteen, seventeen

weeks. She also had it designed so that there was an exam at thirteen weeks, so that if you passed that exam with a B that satisfied the course. Here were all these graduates who had been gunning to get out of that class three to four weeks early. We got to know Mary Berelli really well because my wife played in the symphony with her there, the University of South Carolina Symphony. We became personal friends. She always told me that it was the most delightful class she had to teach because she had this highly motivated group of people who would just break their necks to get out of that course; I shouldn't say to get out of it, it wasn't to get out of it, but to pass it early so they could get back into their own disciplines. I think just about everybody who ever took her for that course probably regarded her as one of the best teachers they had ever had. Later on, after I completed Spanish, the last year when I was writing my dissertation and I had a little bit of spare time I took a course in French. I enjoyed the Spanish course so much. Actually, that semester after I had had the Spanish course I was taking a course of Dr. Calcott's on Mexico. I was reading books in Spanish.

H: You're kidding?

S: I could not read it word for word; it would have taken me far too long, but I was hitting topic sentences in these books.

H: This was with just one semester?

S: One semester. I would read at least topic sentences and any paragraph that looked important or that I felt was important, then I would read the entire paragraph. It certainly took me a long time to read a book, but I could easily master articles without any trouble, ten or twelve page articles in a relatively short time.

H: Why do you suppose that class seemed so exciting?

S: Again, it was the teacher.

H: Personality, what she was doing, or knowledge?

S: A certain knowledge and the fact that here is this teacher . . . there was never any doubt that she knew the material because you used her textbook. They were great textbooks; I still have them. In fact, I think I have loaned them out occasionally for one of the colleagues in the department here who I believe had to take a Spanish at one time for his doctoral work. There is a Spanish idiomatic workbook which lists virtually every idiom you're going to need. It's indexed. It's just fine. Plus it's a little workbook. You get to practice these idioms. I think it was first of all that she had so beautifully designed the course. She was, in

fact, a very energetic person. She would be marching up and down in front of the class. There were forty or fifty students in the class; it was a big class. She knew everybody by name within a week or two. She would call on you. She knew the people who were having trouble and she would probably call a little bit more on them. At the same time you never felt embarrassed if you couldn't, if you hadn't prepared that day. You probably felt a little guilty if you hadn't done any preparation for that day, but on the other hand if you were simply having trouble you knew that she was there to help you, and you knew also that you were going to pass that course if you did what she told you, if you came every day, if you did those exams, if you learned the vocabulary she stressed.

H: You could actually see that you were making progress?

S: Right. Every day you had a test; every day you started out just terrible. It kept getting better. She would say, "Okay, if you got ten wrong today you're doing all right." Because not only did we take the exam, but then after we were done taking it, it was fifteen minutes out of the hour at the end of the hour, then you also corrected your own exams. Then we would all go up to her and she would go through it and say give us the correct interpretation. It was all on your own and she would go through and you would just check off your own paper of what you were doing right and wrong. You knew how you were doing. She was just so exciting. It was tremendous.

H: Then you finally finished this Master's thesis?

S: Yes, I got done with that.

H: Was it a painful experience?

S: Yes, it was. It was actually the end of my second year that I completed that. I, in fact, was not awarded the degree I completed at the end of two years until into my third year. I didn't get my diploma, for instance, or in any listing of my M.A. degree until 1967, and I got my Ph.D. in 1968, which is misleading. At least in South Carolina there was no distinct break for me between the work on the Master's degree and the work on the Ph.D. because there were no classes where there were only Ph.D. students. The M.A.'s and Ph.D.'s took classes together.

H: Everybody?

S: Everybody.

H: What size, fifteen students?

S: Right. We could also take what were called swing courses, especially I guess on the Master's level. I would be in a class where there were also some undergraduates. These were basically lecture courses. I think the last six or seven courses I took were almost all graduate students only, both M.A. and Ph.D. I don't think I was ever in a class with more than twelve students.

H: I guess they had prelims or qualifying exams or something like that?

S: For the Master's degree you had to pass the written examination. I had to write for four different people for my Master's. I ended up writing for two people I had never had in class. I just knew what area they covered and I went to talk to them and they said, "Well, you better bone up on this one and that." I did some reading, and probably got some . . . I don't know how I prepared for them. I think I resorted to the use of some very good detailed, general books on an area. I probably read through a few monographs, but I wrote eight hours for my M.A. for those examinations, two hours apiece.

H: Was this all on English?

S: No, one was British Empire and commonwealth; one was English history; one was more or less 20th century Europe. I was examined basically in modern Europe, in modern England. There were no oral examinations for the Master's, but there was of course then the thesis. There was no examination on the thesis either; it was a written exam and a thesis. For the Ph.D. I did not have to take qualifiers because of my successful completion of the Masters examinations. They qualified me then for the Ph.D. candidacy. Other students who came in with an M.A. had to take qualifying examinations.

H: Those M.A. exams, I guess that's why they were so extensive?

S: That could be; I guess I really never thought of it at that time. A bunch of us came to regard the M.A. degree as more difficult in South Carolina than the Ph.D. because by the time we got in to the Ph.D. we had just done a lot of work and it was basically more of the same. More of the same, by that time, was easier.

H: Did you have any course work at this stage?

S: I had course work my third year. I had a visiting professor from the Federal University of Rio de Janiero. She taught a course on Brazil. Her name was Eulaliah Lobo. I had her for a course and she was a very good teacher. She was really an economic historian. Those visiting professors, I thought that was one of the best things they did in South

Carolina. I was trying to think of some of the others they had down there. I had three or four of them over the four years I was there. After my third year I went to England for the summer to do research on my dissertation. My dissertation was simply an expansion of my Master's thesis, which made it very nice. I think it made it possible for me to get through both my M.A. and Ph.D. programs in slightly under four years.

H: You actually completed the dissertation by the time you left South Carolina?

S: Yes. After my third year, my wife and I went to England and we were about six or seven weeks in England where I went through private papers of basically government leaders from the period of 1895 to 1905, that period in which I was doing army reform. That, by the way, to me was exciting. That is something, to get in the real raw material of history.

H: It's just like out in somebody's home.

S: I spent most of my time at the British Museum where a lot of the papers are deposited. I spent some time at the India Office, which is also in London, a little bit of time at the Public Record Office. I spent some time, a couple days, at the Bodleian Library in Oxford. I spent three or four days at the Library at Christ Church College in Oxford. I was using the Salisbury papers. Salisbury was the prime minister during the period I was studying. I remember asking the librarian if anybody had been using the Salisbury papers very much or if there was any life of Salisbury that was going to come out. There is not really a good, solid biography of Salisbury that has appeared ever since his daughter or relative wrote a four volume work on him, which has a lot of information but is not especially a critical biography of him. He said, "Well, somebody had started, had used the papers and had done extensive work on Salisbury, but he finally gave up because he found the subject too boring." Here is the most powerful man probably, one of the two or three most powerful men in England from 1880 or 1885 to 1905. He found him too boring to continue working on him.

H: How did you find him?

S: I don't know that I found him boring; on the other hand, I only had to spend two or three days of my life with him, that's his time. You don't get quite so bored in that amount of time. I don't know that I was bored with any of these people because I found reading these letters really exciting, and it's something we are missing today simply because of the use of the telephone I guess more than anything. They

had the telephone, but they didn't use it.

H: People actually wrote each other?

S: Oh did they write notes, these mammoth, long notes that they wrote. If you were fortunate Salisbury didn't write the note, he dictated it to his secretary, because some handwritings are almost illegible. Salisbury's isn't too bad. He was kind of shaky by this time; he was in his late 60's. I could decipher his handwriting. One person's handwriting I could not understand was King Edward's. I could not understand it. Fortunately, all of his papers were also typed. The other person's handwriting I could not understand was Lord Curzon, the Viceroy of India. I couldn't understand it. Again, fortunately, all of his letters to the Secretary of State for India were typed. Curzon was located in India and he was sending back long messages to his boss, the Secretary of State for India, who was located in London and a member of the British cabinet. I guess after the letters got to England they were typed up. I just could not decipher the handwriting. There is something so exciting about those letters; you get the feeling that you're living in that period. These voices are really speaking to you.

I think probably the most exciting part of my education has been living in England. Certainly the course work I had done in English history before that time certainly prepared me for living in England and doing research in England. I think for a basic understanding of the English people, and of English history, you have got to live in England. The first summer we were there we spent about six or seven weeks, then we spent eight weeks on the continent traveling, which again was exciting. I'm convinced, for instnace, that I am a far better teacher of western civilization or a teacher of any of the modern European history courses because I've been to Europe. I can talk about the cathedrals now more authoritatively because I have been in them. I still can't express . . . . I'm talking perhaps about this because this morning in my western civilization class I gave a slide lecture on the Gothic cathedral. I really love giving this slide lecture, but yet I go out of it knowing that it is so totally inadequate. Have you been to Europe?

H: I never have.

S: The Gothic cathedrals, you can't believe them until you see them. There is nothing that I think reflects more this age, the medieval period, than the cathedrals. We can't appreciate the overwhelming role of religion of the church. We can say the church was important and you can talk about how secular and religious life was intertwined.

You only recognize its importance when you step into those cathedrals and realize that this structure dominated this little town. When you come to Chartres Cathedral, Chartres was located maybe forty or fifty miles to the west of Paris. There can't be nowadays more than 20,000, 30,000 people in the town. There probably weren't that many during the late medieval period. The cathedral was built in the 11th and 12th centuries. Even today when you come in on the train, from a distance you suddenly see this immense structure. Even today, with all the buildings in these towns, the cathedral dominates the town. This cathedral, when it was constructed, it was the greatest tribute man could pay to his creator. He was doing homage to God. There are a lot of other things that obviously tied into it. The cathedral was also a part of the competition among towns. Literally, they were going to build a cathedral that was bigger and better than their neighboring town had constructed. Even that way the cathedral still represents the medieval period. The cathedral is an overwhelming experience. It is so large; it is so beautiful. It is technically such an amazing building, how they could construct this with what were certainly meager tools? I think I'm a much better teacher of western civilization for having been in Europe, on the continent, for over six or seven weeks on the continent.

H: If some magician or sorcerer actually enabled you to go back and visit some particular scene in each age, history, you could see that same thing being done successive times, what sort of thing would it be?

S: When would I go back or what age or what would I see?

H: Yes. What particular type of thing would you choose to to see being done at different times in history?

S: That's quite a question. If I were to go back to the medieval period I would want to see what the church was like at that time. I think I would be more interested in that, and to really see how the people are related to the church. I have some idea how they related to it. I guess that's what I'd like to see more than anything.

H: Do you think what goes on in our churches today tells you a lot about our society?

S: Yes, I think so.

H: And what doesn't go on?

S: What doesn't go on I was going to say more than anything. I guess the church today, in the United States for instance, still tells us certainly something about the United States' society. We are still far more of a religious society, church oriented, than for instance Europe today. The number of people in the United States that go to church, whether you're talking about twice a year, Easter, or at Christmas, or go regularly, that number is so much greater than in Europe.

H: In France too?

S: I think so, yes, even in France. In statistics in England two percent of the people consider themselves active members of the church. Scotland is higher; it's up to sixteen or seventeen percent. We spent two or three weeks in that summer in Norway and Sweden and Denmark, that's where my ancestors were from. We actually stayed with relatives. Nobody went to church there. The only reason, from what I can tell, there is a church in Norway or in Sweden is that the Lutheran church is the state church. The same or only reason that I guess any of the churches are open in England, any of the Anglican churches are open in England, is that it still gets a certain amount of state subsidy.

H: Have you ever been really interested in religious history?

S: Not especially. No more than, for instance, what I do in western civilization. There I do, actually, talk about the church a great deal when I teach, especially the first part of European civilization. I spend a tremendous amount of time on the church because it is the most important institution in European history until the 18th century.

H: What happened when you came back from England?

S: I completed my three years of fellowship and they got me a teaching position, one class, for each of the two semesters, the two semesters I had left. I taught a class; it was very nice. I had a class from 8:00 to 9:00 three mornings of the week so I got a little bit of teaching experience, the first teaching experience I had. They paid me enough to make it possible for me to survive. I was done with my research by that time because I had completed those six, seven

weeks in England. It had been extremely productive. I had worked again from the instant the museums would open in the morning until they closed. The British Museum was from about 9:30 or 10:00 in the morning until 5:00 in the afternoon, seven hours. Seven hours of concentrated work was more than enough. I was really exhausted by the end of the day. I generally did not take a lunch break; I just worked straight through, seven hours. I came back with a tremendous amount of material. All I had to do was basically take that thesis which already had provided a framework, the Master's thesis provided the framework, and work in this new material, these primary resources I had gotten in England. It certainly changed the thesis in many ways, I think. Although, one of the interesting things I think was that there wasn't very much going on behind the scenes in English history. I had used public records, parliamentary debates, and parliamentary papers, all public documents. What they were saying in private, in the letters passing between each other, wasn't really all that much different than what was going on in public.

H: That's amazing.

S: It is rather amazing. When I went to England that first time in 1967 to do research, I had written ahead to Martin Gilbert. I went again a second time in 1970. Maybe it was in 1970, but it still illustrates this point. I asked Gilbert, "Am I going to be able to get access to the Churchill papers on the subject of army reform?"

H: Winston's papers?

S: Yes. He just entered parliament in 1900. He was a critic of the attempted army reform. He was trying to earn a name for himself is what it amounted to. The army happened to be a very handy instrument; it was part of it anyway, a motivating factor. Martin Gilbert wrote back and said that, "Really the papers wouldn't be very valuable to you that way." He said, "Churchill, really, pretty much throughout his whole life, was not writing anything different than what he was saying in public." He was in that way very much a public man.

H: It makes it a lot easier to remember . . .

S: I haven't done enough work on a later period of Churchill to really verify that and I don't know if Gilbert will modify in view on that as he continues working. So far his research on Churchill now wouldn't be going up to 1920, 1925. I don't know what he's going to say about Churchill during World War II, whether he was doing a lot at that time which he didn't make public. I am, by the way, reading a biography of Churchill now. It is written by Henry Pelling. It just came out. It's a 500, 600 page work. I find it very fascinating reading Churchill on this period where I've done a considerable amount of work. I think I know Churchill pretty well on his first ten or fifteen years of public life, parliamentary life. It's a good biography of Churchill, really fine.

H: Does he agree with your picture?

S: Yes, he does. He really doesn't do much in army reform. To write a 500, 600 page life of Churchill on army reform, it looked big to me. It's minute; it's a niche at most in Churchill's life.

H: Did you get the feeling that history seems much more important than your own life? That's the feeling that I'm getting.

S: I always get back into history rather than what I was doing as far as . . .

H: Did you ever feel that at the time, that that was your life?

S: It was my life. History was my life. I devoted all my hours when I was in graduate school to the study of history. I spent more time on history when I was in graduate school than I do now.

H: Does that bother you?

S: I don't know if it bothers me. I do feel that I did more reading in graduate school than I do now. I think I do miss that reading part of it, because I was not preparing for lectures for instance, and preparing for lectures, preparing for class, takes a lot of time. It involved far more than just reading the book; you have to be taking extensive notes on the book and then after you get done with the notes you have to decide what of all that stuff that you've taken down is of importance. I can't sit down and just pick out a book and skim through it and jot down notes as I go and when I'm done I have this nice, little

lecture. I've got to read a chapter or a book, or chapters here and there, and take notes at the same time. Then when I'm done I probably have ten or fifteen pages of notes. I've got to distill that down and take out parts, decide no, that's not important, that's too much material. I've got to select this as an illustration rather than that. I don't do as much work on history, I'd say after I started teaching, as when I was in graduate school. On the other hand, I know far more about history now than when I was in graduate school. To me, teaching is the best learning tool I've ever had.

H: That's seems paradoxical.

S: Maybe it is, I don't know. The point is that when I was in graduate school I did a tremendous amount of reading. I read a lot. I took a few notes maybe rather sketchily, but I took notes for the courses. I was preparing for examinations, for instance. By the way, I completed my examinations before I went to England so I didn't have to worry about any written or oral examinations over course work or over fields, that I completed. It was very nice to be able to go to England over the summer and not have examinations hanging over my head. Preparing for those examinations I just read a lot of books, took a few notes, but not many.

H: These weren't the same ones you had taken for the Masters?

S: No. This is the Ph.D. exam now that I passed at the end of my third year.

H: What was that all about?

S: Again, I had to write for four instructors. The examinations took me two days. I wrote approximately four hours for each of the instructors, so I wrote sixteen to twenty hours. I did very well on the written examinations. It's interesting, I remember very distinctly I had had Dr. Calcott for Latin American history and I always thought I was doing so well in his courses and I never ended up with the grade that I had thought I had earned. I got B's from him. I enjoyed the courses; he was a very good teacher, but for some reason--and I don't blame him for it because he was a fine teacher--I could never quite click in his classes. I wrote for him on the Ph.D. examination. I was worried about him more than anybody else. I did better for him on that Ph.D. examination than I did on English history. I did all right in English history. I actually did really well on

my written examination, but you can get an E, which meant excellent. That was above satisfactory plus. The only E I got was from Dr. Calcott in Latin American history. I can remember afterwards he was almost surprised that I had done such a good job in Latin American history. Then I had oral examinations also, a week or so after.

H: Before your dissertation?

S: Right. This was all before my dissertation, before I went to England. I didn't do very well on the orals.

H: Were these over a field?

S: These were over, again, the same four fields. My fields, by the way, for the Ph.D. were modern England, modern Europe, modern America, and that was basically 20th century America, and Latin America, all of Latin America. I wrote examinations for those four. I wrote essays for those four. Then on the oral I had those four plus an individual who sat in outside the department, a cognate field. I had taken international relations, international studies. I had taken two or three courses in that department. You had to do a little bit of work outside of history as a cognate field. So somebody from international studies sat in on the oral examinations; there were five people there. I guess the exam lasted perhaps a couple of hours, but I didn't do well at all. I don't really think they cared how well I did unless I totally bombed the exam, which I didn't. I did all right, but I didn't do anything like I had done on the written exam. As long as I didn't choke completely or I couldn't tell them my name or anything like that . . . They were probably going to pass me because I had done so well on my written.

H: You had that all out of the way before you went to England?

S: Yes. The thing that really threw me for the loop early on the oral examination was Dr. Ochs, who I had two or three seminars in modern America for. I had always done well for Ochs; he was the chairman of the department. He was a very good teacher, a fine chairman, loved down there. He retired a couple of years ago as chairman. I had a seminar on the New Deal, and I had one other seminar on nativism, I think it was. It was basically on America from 1890 to 1914. I had written a paper in that course for him on nativism in the United States and their response to Italians coming in in the 1890's. I wrote specifically about an incident that occurred in New Orleans in the 1890's

and it ended up costing twelve or thirteen Italians their lives, linchings, mob linchings. In the 1890's there was an economic depression, and that was a part of it. Plus, there was a huge influx of people from Eastern Europe at that period. Nativism was so rampant; there were a lot of people killed.

H: In the south? I've always thought of this as being northern.

S: No. I think there were about a dozen killed. In fact, it led to a "manufactured" war scare with Italy, the United States and Italy in the 1890's. It was really a lovely paper, a lovely subject to work on. I had to use the New Orleans Times Picayune newspaper that I got on microfilm. Dr. Ochs really asked me some questions on immigrants in the United States in the oral exam. I was not prepared at all for immigration history. I had never studied that. He fumbled around at that for awhile and he finally recognized that I wasn't doing too well on that so he graciously moved on to something else. At somewhere along the line he threw out some names. What do these names have in common? He threw out four or five names. He would give the names with the first initial and then the last name. The names sounded vaguely familiar, but I drew a blank on all of these too. It was only after it was over, and he almost kind of apologized when it was all done, "But I really thought you would have known some of those things. I wasn't trying to throw a curve to you or anything like that." What he finally did was to move in to Hoover, and F.D.R., and Truman. I was fine there. I finally did all right on those. What I realized was that he was giving me initials and the last names. If he had given me the entire name I would have recognized a lot more of those people. Whenever I read a Master's exam or if I ever sit in as a questioner on our Master's examination here, I never give just a last name. I try to give the whole name, or I give the name that is commonly used because I was sufficiently tense in the examination that I didn't pick up just the last name. K. Rölvaag, if he would have said Karl Rölvaag I would have known him immediately as somebody who had done a lot of work, Giants of the Earth, which was a study on Norwegian immigrants and when they settled in the midwest, in Minnesota and South Dakota. That I would have known, but K. Rölvaag doesn't sound like Karl Rölvaag. I did mediocre on the orals, but good enough so that there was no danger actually. When I had gotten done they said, "Would you please leave; step outside." I walked out and a friend of mine was waiting

for me to come out. I was kind of worried because I hadn't done too well in some areas, but I knew everything was fine; the mentor came out within thirty to forty seconds after I stepped out of the door. He came out right away and I knew I made it. If there had been any real problem of me making it they would have been sitting in there far longer than one minute. I made it and it was a great relief to have that out of the way. A friend of mine, who I have always regarded and I still regard as a very, very brilliant historian, he took the exam; he passed the written. He always knew far more than I did, and I'm sure he still does. He took the oral exam a week after I did and he failed. I'm always very grateful that I took my orals before he took his because had I known that this brilliant friend of mine had failed his orals and that I had to go in, I would have just clammed up and couldn't have done a thing in there. If this friend of mine who knew far more than I did had failed his orals . . .

H: What do you have on your note cards?

S: Actually, the notes I had made were basically what I had done since I came to Youngstown.

H: You came here directly from South Carolina?

S: Yes.

H: How did you come to Youngstown?

S: I heard of Youngstown. I knew the position was vacant here which was kind of in modern Europe and English history. I went to the Southern Historical Association meeting in Atlanta. I was job hunting by this time. This was my last semester of my last year of graduate school and I was about to receive my degree. I was job hunting. I went to Atlanta and there was a notice that Youngstown State University in Ohio had a job in an area that I was interested in so I went there and Al Skardon was there interviewing. I was basically introduced to Youngstown. I applied to a number of other schools for positions. Then later on I went to the American Historical Association which was meeting in Toronto. I interviewed with a great number of people. I think there were six or seven people from Youngstown State who were at Toronto interviewing.

H: When was this?

S: This was December of 1967, but they were hiring them for

the fall of 1968, for the following year. I interviewed there and then later on I was asked to come to Youngstown here to interview. That was late January then. I managed to stop here for a couple of days and then I continued up through Marquette, Michigan, Northern Michigan University, where I interviewed for a position there. I ended up with maybe four contract offers; this is still in the days when you had a choice of where you could go. I had contract offers from Youngstown, Northern Michigan University, St. Cloud State, Minnesota. I think I had an offer from one of the Wisconsin state university schools, I don't know Whitewater or Stevens Point, one of the Wisconsin state university systems. Then I also had an offer, just site unseen, from Montana State, Eastern Montana, or something like that. I chose Youngstown mainly because of the faculty. The history faculty was young. I could teach what I wanted pretty much. They told me if I needed some books to order for the library I could order those.

H: And you took them up?

S: I took them up. It was funny, I had three offers and all of them offered the same amount of money, right to the penny.

H: Is that right?

S: The same teaching load, twelve hours, same salary. Had I to do it over again I would have asked for another $500 to $1000 from Youngstown. I probably would have gotten it.

H: You could have gotten it?

S: I probably would have, yes. That's why, basically, I came here. In spite of the fact when I came here to interview it was one of those really dreary, Youngstown, wintery days. I came in and it had snowed maybe three days before. It had melted by this time and there was this black soot all over the snow. It looked terrible. Youngstown can look awful in the winter. It smelled quite a bit. The history offices were over in the library and they just had partitions, not unlike what you're living with over there in the School of Business.

H: The present library?

S: Yes, the present library.

H: Looking over the stacks?

S: Yes, the stacks were next to the offices and if you looked

the other way, you looked at Kilcawley. It was hot, no air conditioning at that time in the library, but this was in the winter so it was probably not ungodly hot at that time. The conditions around here were really pretty miserable. Looking back I kind of wonder why, but it was simply over the faculty. I met everybody here. When I came here to interview there were probably nine or ten in the department at that time. It was a very enjoyable group. I was very much sold on the faculty. It was the faculty that did it.

H: How did you feel about coming here after you got here?

S: I haven't regretted coming here at all. It took two or three years to really feel a part of the community. I've reached a point now where I defend the city of Youngstown. Some people look at me and say, "Wow!" For the first year or two we got to know some more people at the university. We are very much community involved now, which is important. We have as many friends, or more, outside the university as we do inside. We're active in the community. We've been active politically, both in national campaigns for presidential candidates, statewide campaigns, local campaigns. My wife played in the symphony for three or four years. We just have a lot of friends in the town now. I live in the city, on the north side of Youngstown. I love being close to work. I just have absolutely no desire to live in the suburbs. I wouldn't mind living on a farm actually, but not in between. I have no desire to live in Boardman; I have no desire to live in Liberty. When we bought a house finally, we did go out to the suburbs and kind of look around, but I decided that wasn't for me. One of the things that is interesting is that I looked at Liberty and Liberty turned me off; no sidewalks. I like to walk; I like to ride a bike. I've always wanted my kids to ride bicycles and they couldn't ride a bicycle in Liberty, not at the age of five. Both my kids have learned to ride a bicycle at the age of five, and now they have a whole block to go around, six-tenths of a mile.

H: How do you feel about Youngstown academically or from the standpoint of your professional life here?

S: Our academic life is divided into three parts: teaching, research, and university service. That's an easy way to look at it. As far as research goes, I probably haven't been as active in research as I would like to. I did have an article accepted recently, but there are a lot of research facilities available here. We have superb holdings in English history. That's one thing the history department has here, and that is an excellent library.

H: Who got those?

S: When I came here they asked, "Is there anything you think we ought to have?" How about the London Times? Sure we'll get it. Ten thousand dollars, just like that, for the London Times; they coughed it up. I don't know where it was. We have the Parliamentary Papers from the 19th century, which is for research. That's sixty-three thousand dollars worth. Again, we got that since I came here. There are others, Dr. Smith, who of course teaches English history too. We have Parliamentary Debates from the 19th and 20th century. We have gotten all of this since 1968. We have the research facilities in a lot of the fields, not only in English history. Dr. Ronda would say that he probably couldn't find better resource materials for colonial America at any university in the state of Ohio, that's including Ohio State. I would guess that Dr. Domonkos would say that the holdings here in medieval history are probably as good as any in the state. French history, Slavin has built a beautiful collection of French material. That's true of most areas. So as far as the research facilities, fine. As far as the time to write, that's limited. This is a teacher oriented university. I don't especially mind the twelve hour teaching load because we don't have a lot of students in those twelve hours. Most teachers have probably a hundred students in the three courses. Kent, or Ohio State, or some of the others have eight hour teaching loads, but they probably have three or four hundred students frequently. I feel that I'm a far more effective teacher in small sections than in large sections. Western civilization sections, there are generally no more than forty students, and even that is a lot of students. It's a lot better than a hundred.

H: Bring us up to date since you have come to Youngstown?

S: As far as the teaching goes, I have actually taught quite a variety of courses here. Survey courses have been European civilization. On the upper-division level, the first year I was here I taught the upper division modern European courses of Europe, 1870 to 1914, and from Europe 1914 to 1945, but I have not taught those courses since the first year since we've brought in a person who is more specialized in that area. I switched over completely to British Empire, which I had planned on in the first place. I teach a two-part course in the British Empire. I have recently started teaching in economic history of modern Europe. I have offered that once. I have also developed a course on the history of leisure in modern England, which I have offered,

thus far, twice. I have offered also a one shot course in European imperialism in Africa. I offered that about four or five years ago. I think that is probably the best and most enjoyable course I have ever taught since I was here. It was made up of twenty-five students. There were so many students that what I had to do was to break it up into two groups. We met only two days a week; we met only two hours a week even though we got four hours credit. I had to split it up. Within those groups then, ten or twelve in each group, they each reported on a book a week, and they wrote a one to two page review of that book which they read and then submitted to me. This was an undergraduate seminar where they read ten books, not light books either. They reported on them in class, they wrote a report, and we discussed. I centered it around a common theme. Every week we would have a different theme, so we had ten themes throughout the quarter. For perhaps the first two weeks we talked about causes of European imperialism. It has been so long now I can't remember what types of themes we operated on. We had one week on the impact on the natives of European imperialism. We had a week on European protests to imperialism. It was such a delightful course. I had twenty to twenty-five students who were so hardworking; they just broke their backs in that course.

H: Why did you have to split it?

S: Twenty-five was simply too large. It was set up as a discussion group, discussion course. It should have been, I believe, cut off at fifteen, but we forgot to. Somewhere along the line I forgot to tell the chairman to cut it at fifteen or tell the secretary to cut it at fifteen or she forgot. Whatever it was, suddenly here is your class list and you have twenty-five students.

H: Do you believe in hard work for students?

S: I certainly did at that time, and the students seemed to enjoy it immensely. They all saw me before the course began; they had to see me. To enroll one had to have consent of the instructor, so they all saw me. I explained to them what they were going to be doing in the course. I would say of those twenty to twenty-five students, two-thirds at least or more had had me already for a course, either in a survey course or in an upper-division course.

H: Can you tell me about some of the other things you have been doing either here at the university or just in Youngstown since coming here?

S: One other thing as far as the development of a course

goes at the university has been the development of the history of leisure in modern England, which I first offered two or three years ago. I'm not sure how I became interested in that; I simply cannot recall, except that in the reading of 19th and 20th century English domestic history I kept running across the leisure activities on the part of the people, activities which stood out especially as far as the aristocracy went. The English aristocracy worked hard at play. I think there is still that element in England which works very hard at play, a very, very wealthy class that has the time and the money to spend on their leisure acticities.

From there I started studying middle-class leisure activities and it wasn't very long before I became interested in the working class. I thought suddenly, this is the logical course. It is a part of history which until very recently, until within the last ten years, we have almost totally ignored, that is the leisure and recreational activities of man. In England, when you speak of the aristocracy, they are the leisure class. It probably made up over fifty percent of their life. We've been missing fifty percent of the life of the powerful, ruling class in England. It's very definite leisure activities. Again, the middle class spent a great deal of time on their leisure activities, and the same thing with the working class. By the time you get into the working class it's hard to separate their leisure activities from recreation which is just directly tied into the work itself. I might explain this. In preindustrial, and even in the early industrial era, we're talking here about the 16th, 17th, and 18th, and even into the 19th century, recreation was tied in to the work; that is, a man generally did not have set hours of work, or he would take an hour off for lunch, or two hours for lunch, and in that time end up playing games with fellow workers, perhaps drinking with them. After work was completed, the recreation might consist of a glee club made up of his co-workers. In other words, the recreation that the individual participated in was very closely tied to his work, or if if wasn't tied to his work it was tied to social makeup or social pressures. An example is that of activities related to the church. For a person they were recreational probably, not work. They were tied very much to his life style, and he was obligated to do such things. When you think of, really, leisure in the modern concept, we are thinking of something an individual does which he is not legally or socially compelled to do. In other words, the person here under modern lesiure has a distinct choice. He can do it or he doesn't have to do it, and he makes up his mind himself.

H: Was this true of the upper classes?

S: The upper classes were pretty much tied in with the social class on what they had to do, although the aristocracy has always had its eccentrics. I guess that's why they're such a delightful class perhaps. There have always been so many oddballs in them. The class of English aristocracy is that they had enough money and they had enough free time so they reached a point in time where they said, "I don't care what somebody else thinks of me, I can do what I please." Maybe that's a nice position to be in, where you have so much power, so much time that you can do it without caring about what others do care about you.

H: What about class basis for this? This isn't some Marxist interpretation of it is it?

S: Truthfully, I don't know that I've gotten that much in to the study of leisure activities, recreational, to be able to say that I'm of any specific school yet on interpreting recreational activities.

H: The class seems to be a legitimate basis for sorting out different kinds of activities.

S: I think in a lot of cases class is a way to divide them. Except you can go in to various things, like the music hall that emerged in the 19th century and filled a real need for recreational and leisure activities on the part of 19th century England. As they got more money they had more time to spend, more money to spend on activities. The music hall, many music halls, seemed to have distinguished not so much between classes, but between respectability versus unrespectable. There are people from middle class who are as unrespectable . . .

H: Is this family type entertainment versus . . .

S: No, this is not so much family. For a long time it was male oriented, very much male oriented. The point is that as long as a person from the working class, lower class, was respectable, he could frequent the same place, the same music hall for instance, as somebody from the middle class. If he was not respectable, and he was from the middle class, he would not be welcomed. There was certainly, in some of these institutions, a crossing of class lines, so hence you cannot say that . . . I, in fact, when I treat the history of leisure in England, I have thus far tended to divide much of it on class lines. It has been, I guess for a convenience sake, especially when you first start off on your course; you have to break it up some way; you have to get a handle on it. This was the easiest way for me to do it, was to break it up at least partly on class lines. Again, when you come to the railroad, which made

a major impact on leisure activities in the 19th century, this again had to cross all class lines, and the railroad was used by all classes. The railroad was ultimately responsible for the development of the sea resorts in England.

H: Different classes could ride in the same cars?

S: No. They had first, second, third, and at one time, I believe fourth class. So indeed they were segregated that way. Although, I think a respectable lower-class individual probably could buy a second-class ticket, a lot of them couldn't afford it.

I've been trying to get around to some research project this year. I've wound up with a couple that have not been connected with recreation and leisure activities and I'm trying to devote more and more of my time now to leisure. I'm getting out of what has been tended to be a politically oriented history on my part, to a social orientation, and specifically leisure activities. This is due partly to the resources we have here, and partly because I do have, I think, a pretty good political background, a good political understanding of England. I have made some initial inquiries and readings in to trying to discover to that extent the power classes in England, specifically the aristocracy and the middle class, tried to control leisure activities in order to control the masses. Thus far, I just haven't been able to get a handle on if this did exist. I have a hard time thinking that it didn't exist, let's put it that way, because I think Disraeli and Gladstone and the other English leaders of the 19th century were very astute politicians. They very much understood power, very much so. I think they were pretty much concerned about defending their classes, aristocracy and the middle class.

I have read some parliamentary debates and I've laughed at some parliamentary papers, but it's just one of those things. You do a lot of digging when you first start out in a project, and indeed I might do a lot of work and find out no, I can't see where they used this power to regulate leisure activities. Except I know in some cases, for instance, that they woulnd not permit a lot of the . . . for instance the British Museum, they would not permit it to be open on Sunday. I've read a couple of debates on the opening hours for the British Museum. In spite of the people saying look this is great education, this is the only time when a lot of the members of the written class can attend, can go to the British Museum, open it up. What complicates this is that while there were probably many politicians who were afraid of letting people in to

such an institution for fear that some damage might result, there might be some type of riot, or they--masses--might use it for political ends . . . This debate I'm mentioning here took place in, I think, 1855, and that's only six or seven years after the tremendous Chartist agitation in england. It was very much in their mind yet, the power that the masses could generate. I can't distinguish whether that is what they were concerned about, or if it was rather the tremendous pressure put on by the Sabbatarians in England, those who wanted to maintain a pure, unadulterated Sunday. The forces wishing to keep all businesses, or most businesses, and any place of recreation or leisure closed on Sunday, theses forces were powerful in the middle of the 19th century. Thus far, I haven't been able to find out if in fact it was the Sabbatarians who were putting so much pressure on the politicians that the politicians didn't dare permit some activities to be open to the masses on Sunday, or whether in fact the politicians wanted to keep it closed and they were simply using the arguments of the Sabbatarians.

H: When you approach a problem like that do you get in to any comparative sort of things with other countries or with previous periods? How do you go about finding out why the Boy Scouts are being encouraged or why hiking is being encouraged?

S: That I could start on, too, is the founding of the Boy Scouts. I probably haven't done as much, first of all, comparative study of recreation with other countries, for instance, as I should have. On the other hand, you get the rise of what you really call modern leisure. The first country that had that arising is England because England was the first country to undergo an industrial revolution. It was really the industrialization of society that structured society so much, that brought about specific working powers. It was during the industrial revolution that work and recreation became separated. So that's why I probably really haven't as much comparison with other countries as I should have because England, from what I can tell, is really first in the emergence of leisure activities. By this I mean the music halls emerging in the 19th century, the mass spectator sports that emerged in the 19th century, soccer, rugby, cricket, a number of things that emerged in the 19th century. They've been around for a long time, but they have been amateur sports. There were a lot of sports connected with rural England, by the way, which died out in the 19th century, bear baiting. Are you familiar with these, bear baiting or bull baiting? How they would basically stake a bull, put a ring in the nose and drive a stake into the ground and hook the nose up to the stake and then

let dogs run in and try to bite and get the bull. Then there would be wagers being taken on which dog would survive. It was awfully brutal.

A lot of the rural sports declined in the 19th century. There was a very good book that just came out on that a couple of years ago by Malcolmson (I think he is at the University of Western Ontario, or he may have been at one time) on popular recreations in England from 1700 to 1850. He has pointed out how these sports declined. They were rural-oriented and England became much more of an urban-oriented society by the 19th century. Many of these sports were tremendously brutal sports, bull baiting, the ratting which was done, the betting on the rats. The dogs would be in the rat pits and see how many rats they could catch. There was tremendous humanitarian pressure in the 19th century to do away with these sports. The Royal Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals was started in, I think, 1820, something like that. It put a lot of pressure on parliament and also on the local officials to do away with these sports. In some cases, parliament did, I believe, intervene. Anyway, I just find this whole idea of leisure very, very interesting.

I now notice that Victorian Studies, which is one of the most eminent of the publications in England history and English literature in the United States, is having a special issue in 1976 which will dwell on recreation and leisure in the 19th century. The history of leisure activities has reached that point now where they'll devote a whole issue of a journal to leisure. Asa Briggs, who is one of the major 19th century English historians, now has a book coming out on the growth of leisure in England from 1850 to 1960. I would say within the next ten or fifteen years this will be one of the areas of real thrust, not only I would think in English history, but the emphasis on the study of leisure will spread to, I think, virtually historians in all countries; it has to, if only because so much of our society today is leisure oriented. In fact, I think it's one of the things that we have failed to develop in this country, and that is how to use leisure time. Here's a guy who works forty hours a week and he has many, many hours of which to devote time other than work. We probably tend to have in the United States very much a work oriented culture. People hold not one job, they hold two jobs. Some people teach in the business schools and take history courses on the side, for instance. There tends to be a work orientation in the United States, and maybe it's because . . .

H: What would be the difference?

S: England is no longer the competitive society that we have

in the United States, or in fact that England had at one time. Life is not as hectic; it is not as competitively oriented; I think that's one of the reasons why the English economy seems to be so messed up nowadays. It's because they are having trouble competing in a world economy that has still to today remained extremely competitive. There are a lot of people in England, and I would guess probably the majority, who have gotten to the point where they are willing to put up with a lower standard of living if it means they can live a less competitive life. I've lived in England for not very long, two summers maybe, a total of five months all together. It was a very different pace of life in that country. There were articles in the Manchester Guardian a couple of months ago and one of them said that I just can't make it, it's too costly. I'm going to have to move to Canada. The other one said, it's tough, I'm a journalist. I think he was an American who moved to England ten or twelve years ago. He worked in England for five or six years, but he found that he wasn't earning nearly as much money as he could in the United States or in the European continent so he moved to the continent for three or four years. He earned a lot of money, but he couldn't stand it, he moved back to England. He had reached a point where he was very willing to put up with a lower standard of living to be able to live with what he called a more relaxed and a more decent life. English societies, their people certainly have a lot of shortcoming, but from my contact with the English people they are so decent in the best sense of the word. I think it has to do partly with that lack of competitive nature in their society. When I first got on a train in England, here were two people with a little cart, something you would expect to come out of the 19th century. One guy was pulling this dolly, another guy pushing it. This is how they were moving goods in the train station. I just kind of stood there with my mouth open because in the United States and on the continent you would have forklift tractors. Not in England, they were pulling this little, inefficient thing.

H: How does that kind of life appeal to you, does it appeal to you?

S: It does appeal to me.

H: Is it the kind of life you try to live here?

S: I guess to a certain extent I do. I'm pretty jealous of my weekends and what I do on the weekends. I don't work all the time. I do proudly put in a fifty to fifty-five hour work week in fact, which is a considerable amount of time. I probably put in ten hours a day, five days a week.

H: What kind of work is that?

S: I just mean as here as far as teaching, the teaching, the administrative duties. Before I was an administrator I was spending more time on teaching, and doing some research, but not as much as I would like. I'm kind of jealous of my weekends. In the summer we go canoeing and camping. I spend a lot of time with the kids. I am involved in the community activities. I do work around the house, partly to save money, but also because it's rather enjoyable. I build cabinets, put in the suspended ceiling in the kitchen, and a variety of things that way, which is kind of relaxation to me. That's kind of connecting, obviously, relaxation and work, but it's something different.

H: Can you see the English doing that sort of thing for relaxation?

S: I think some of them do, yes. There's this element of you do some things in your own house. Again, it's probably to the point where they can't afford to do anything, but to do this work themselves. The English, for instance, save money all year for their two or three weeks at the beach in the summer. They very much cherish that vacation. I think they do cherish their free time. I kind of cherish my free time too.

H: Do you think of yourself as a very private kind of person?

S: No, not really. I am, in fact, in many ways, pretty much a social animal. When we go camping we tend to go camping with other people, or at least I like to go.

H: These are not trips in some wilderness?

S: No, I wish they would be actually. I would love to do it, but thus far this is only the second summer we canoed. We haven't been able to, but I would think by next year we will probably be taking a canoe trip, a three or four day canoe trip. We have some friends who have done it, and I'm sure we'll end up. Yet, you almost have to go with two or three families together because of simply the transportation problem of ending up at one end of the lake. You have to have somebody waiting to go back and get the other cars to carry the canoes.

H: Would this be in Ohio that you do this?

S: No, I don't know if it would be in Ohio. We could go in Ohio; the Muskingum River system I guess is possible to do. I would think we would probably end up in Wisconsin or even in Canada.

H: You're involved in some things outside of the university, outside of the department, in the community, what are some

of these things?

S: within the university I have been active in a lot of departmental and university committees. Probably the most involved I have been since I was here was as a member of the OEA, the Ohio Education Association, which was the agency responsible for bringing collective bargaining to the campus. I was, in 1973, 1974, treasurer of the organization and a member of the executive board.

H: And that took a lot of your time.

S: Yes, it did. It was ten or fifteen hours a week probably, which is really quite a large amount of time. It varied considerably. Some week there might be very little of it.

H: How long did it take doing that?

S: We had perhaps one, sometimes three executive meetings every week. There were always problems coming up, decisions that the executive board had to make. There was always the treasurer's bill to be paid, the treasurer's report to be made out to keep the books in order, which was quite a job. There was a lot of money coming into the organization. Some of the old books had to be straightened out and all that took a certain amount of time.

H: Are you pretty good at that sort of thing?

S: As far as keeping books?

H: I mean the financial end of things.

S: I really don't know if I'm good at it or not. I think I've kept a fairly decent set of books.

H: It doesn't bother you doing that sort of thing?

S: Oh no, not at all. When I was in high school I used to keep books for my aunt in the bakery. I don't know what kind of ledger system we had, double entry or whatever it was. I can do things like that without any difficulty. I just despise filling out those income tax forms though. They just drove me out of my mind to file for income tax exempt status, which I had to do. That took me a lot of time.

H: Why did that bother you?

S: I just didn't enjoy it. I couldn't find it creative. There are some things I don't really find too creative, that was one of the things--trying to figure out how to master this income tax form. It's something that had to be done, and

since I was the one in charge of that I had to do it. There's nothing creative about it. It's like my wife a few years ago, maybe five years ago or something, said, "We've got to get a dishwasher." I said, "Okay." She said, "You just can't be creative about washing dishes." It has got to be done. There are some tasks that I don't really especially enjoy as chairman; there are some tasks I don't enjoy. I probably like my job 80 percent of the time; 20 percent of the time I probably don't enjoy it. All this paper junk that comes across the desk, I've got to look at it. Just to shuffle through this takes fifteen, twenty minutes a day to go through and figure out what you can throw away or to read something three pages long, single-spaced. you have to read the whole thing to find out if it's important or not. It would be nice if they would underline the important parts of the document.

H: You don't have your secretary do that.

S: She takes care of a lot of the material that comes in. Anything that she can take care of, anything with regards to the catalog or anything that's really secretarial that's just sent to the history department, she takes care of that. She's very good that way. In spite of that there is still some paper work that comes across that you have to look at. There is a certain feeling of helplessness in the job too, but not from within the history department or the history faculty. It's somebody calling and saying you're going to be moved from one room to another, you aren't going to be in those classrooms next year, that's being shut down, they're being made into offices. Instead, you're going over to such and such a building, which may not be a very pleasant building, going from good classrooms to bad classrooms. You know at the same time that that person on the other end of the line had simply been told that we're closing this classroom so you've got to find other space for those people who have had classes in there. You can't get angry at that person because she is carrying out what she is supposed to be doing.

H: You typically wouldn't be consulted about your classrooms being taken away from you?

S: Right.

H: How do you feel about that?

S: I disliked it tremendously. I made what calls I could and for what reason I know not why. We didn't end up in that place we were going to end up in, and I don't know why we didn't end up there. I made two or three calls. I called the person back who is in charge of rooms and talked to that person, and the person was very nice about it and understood

my point. Indeed, that may have been why we were moved to another area. Maybe it made an impact, maybe she called the person above her and said should I make every effort and get history out of that building. Whatever it was in fact it was changed.

H: You are moving out of Tod Hall?

S: Yes, we're moving out of Tod Hall. They're making that into executive offices; that's where the vice-presidents are going. Indeed, maybe even the president is going there. To me, it makes absolutely no sense. I cannot see why you take away what are perfectly good classroom buildings, classrooms that are still needed, and make them in to other offices. I don't think they really know what they're going to do with the library itself. If they want to make that part the huge reading room and the reference room there, if they want to divide that and make it up into executive offices fine.

H: That would make an excellent throne room.

S: (Laughter) Right. Why go messing up good classrooms? It's those types of things that . . .

H: Is this something that you think the dean is consulted on?

S: I went to see him right away. He called one of the persons in charge of planning and he said, "I knew that Tod Hall was going to be made over into offices, but it's not going to be made over that soon is it?" I think maybe his first response was, "That's kind of dumb to do with perfectly good classrooms." The guy on the other end of the line said, "I agree with you." (Laughter) Perhaps the dean that I talked to said call back the person who is in charge of assigning classrooms and see if you can convince her to move you out of it. He may indeed then have called and tried to persuade somebody else to keep history out of there.

H: This sort of thing, how do you feel about doing that? Was that creative or frustrating?

S: It's something, again, that has to be done. I think it's logical that the chairman do this. I don't think the faculty would want this type of thing to be assigned to any committee. That's the last thing they would want.

H: It didn't give you any feeling of triumph that you . . .

S: No. Some people may enjoy that type of work, I don't, as an adminstrator such as I am.

H: Did you enjoy when you were on the OEA, the sort of things that you did there?

S: I enjoyed parts of it on the OEA. Again, when it came to do certain things or making out tax forms, it was necessary to do it. I didn't find it especially creative and I didn't like to do it, but I did it. With regards to the chairman's job, I probably enjoyed it 80 percent of the time, as I said. Teaching I probably enjoy 90 percent of the time. Before I became chairman I probably enjoyed teaching . . .

H: What don't you like about the teaching?

S: Grading all of those blue books.

H: I was curious as to whether there is any connection that you feel between your work as a historian and you activity in the community or the university? Do they seem to relate at all?

S: As far as being a historian and the activities in the community if they're related, it hasn't been deliberately connected as far as I'm concerned. The involvement may come from my involvement in history.

For instance, we've been involved in a citizens' adoption group, which has tried to bring about the reform of the system, make it more available to the people, make it service the people better, and especially make it service the children better. Those are the ones that count; they're the ones whose lives should be taken care of in this situation. This group we belong to is not a large group; it is incorporated in the state of Ohio and there are chapters in six or seven of the larger metropolitan areas in Ohio; yet within each chapter the number of people really active is very small, anywhere from four to five people up to maybe twelve or thirteen or fourteen really active in each of those places. We're talking throughout the state seventy-five to a hundred really active people. A lot more people come to their meetings. Yet, it's a very influencial group; it has gotten a certain amount of things done in the state. Maybe historically I do recognize the power of the small group.

H: This is certainly no overwhelming connection.

S: No, no overwhelming connection.

H: I would be interested in knowing if you have a particular point of view as a historian.

S: I guess I don't belong to a specific school, if you're thinking of Marxist, for instance, or concensus historian

like Daniel J. Boorstin. I don't know if you're acquainted with him. He has written The American Experience, The Democratic Experience, and things like that. He is basically a concensus historian, that is in comparison or in opposition to what you would call a historian who stresses conflict and change arising out of conflict. I just don't know if I can put myself in any specifc school like that. I have been primarily a political historian on the other hand, involved with the political process in history and specifically in English history. I am not coming more and more to be concerned with social history, and within that social history I am gradually coming around to focus more and more of my attention on the working class. Whether that will evolve into more of a Marxist interpretation, for instance, since it will be very much hopefully a working class orientation, I don't know. It could be. Especially in the social history, I've only within the last couple of years really gotten my feet wet. How I'm going to go I'm not certain.

H: When you were working on reform in the British army in your doctoral dissertation, did you approach this from the point of view of advocating a thesis or defending a thesis?

S: I was more, first of all, interested in the events to try to find out why they happened, why things didn't happen, what went right, went what wrong in this. The thesis was, if you want to call it a thesis, an examination of basically why army reform failed in the period of 1900 to 1903. Sometimes it's very hard to come up with what you can call a specific thesis in something.

H: Did you feel there were any specific identifiable problems in this question?

S: I came across them soon enough after starting the research. In some ways there was very much inherent opposition to change within, for instance in this case, the English military and the English unionist or Conservative or Tory party, whatever you want to call it. It's ironic because here was the Unionist party which had been the imperialist party more so than the Liberal party, imperialist in both parties certainly, but which especially emphasized the strength and the need to maintain the defenses to protect Britain and her empire. It was this party that was unwilling to make change which would have brought about substantial military reform and an improvement of the defense structure. Finally, they did something.

H: Does that strike you as a paradox?

S: Not really because the most importatnt part of it is the class that the Unionists view their support from, and it was inherently a conservative class. While there were also many imperialists included in the party, first and foremost it was a conservative party, and conservative means conservation. You only change when it's absolutely necessary. I still say it was absolutely necessary and they still didn't change it for a few more years.

H: In approaching the problems of explaining why things worked out the way they did in reform, did you have the feeling that these were pretty well-defined problems that you were working on or were they rather vague?

S: I think the problems were rather fairly defined. I can go into the opposition to change, the opposition on the part of the Royal Family for instance, which is always a headache. It was always an element involved. There was the fact that during this period England was in somewhat of a trade depression which restricted the amount of money available for army reform. There were certain imperialists who felt that England should cooperate more completely with what had come to be called the self-governing or the dominion colonies. That is, when we set up a defense structure we shouldn't be only thinking of England, but we should be attempting to incorporate elements of Canada's defense structure, what militia they had, Autralia's, New Zealand's. What it amounted to were a lot of little things working against a secretary of state who unfortunately wasn't very competent. The guy couldn't win. There were real personality problems with the secretary of state for war too. There were identifiable problems, and I could find them. The hardest things to be to identify at times were the personality problems. Broderick was quite deaf, and he had problems in debates where he would misinterpret what someone had said. Somebody might be making a joke and in every good sense of the word the joke would obviously occur as frequently in parliament. It makes the place bearable. Broderick, because he didn't catch the inflection, or the tone in which it was said, responded rather bitterly to the speaker.

H: How could you tell?

S: I could not tell, obviously, from reading debates. It's pretty hard, but I would finally catch it in newspaper reports, for instance, newspaper reporting on the parliamentary proceedings, or the editorial comments on them, or occasionally in the private letters that I was reading, I think, might say, "Poor Broderick, he didn't quite understand what was going on yesterday, " or "He

missed the point of the joke." Then eventually I ran across the point where the guy was quite deaf, and I had to start putting some of these things together.

H: Now in doing this you apparently weren't conscious of having a particular approach that you are taking to this problem? It was basically a political analysis?

S: Right, it was basically a political analysis of the army reform, politics and army reform.

H: This wasn't linked in any broad or sweeping sort of historical development or theme?

S: No, it was tied in with the South African War because it is out of the South African War that it emerged. I certainly tried to keep in mind as I always had to the economic setting of the period, the political setting, some of the social problems that would influence this. I guess it is a case probably where there are too many doctoral dissertations that work this way. I sometimes think looking back, it could have been better.

H: Did you have any feeling that you were having to construct a new point of view in dealing with this problem?

S: Not really, this hadn't been done before. I was pretty much breaking new ground. People tend not to write about failures. There was a lot written about Haldane, for instance, who was the Liberal war secretary who came into office three years after Broderick was in, and he was successful. There has been a lot written about Haldane. It's valuable to that extent, but there is a lot of material in this dissertation, quite a lot was happening. What didn't happen?

H: When you were in graduate school, were there any models of historical accomplishments, great works in history, anything like that that you felt tended to establish what kinds of problems to work on and what kinds of history was more acceptable to produce?

S: I became basically a political historian primarily because of the influences of the teachers. Much of the department, much of the faculty down there was politically oriented, and of course I've already talked a great deal about Martin Gilbert, who I had in seminar. That was completely political history, interesting political history. He was a political historian who brought in the economic and the social and everything, how this comes to play and has a bearing on politics. Most of the faculty down there were politically oriented. I still read a lot of political history; I enjoy political history. I enjoy reading especially

biographies of people involved in politics. I've become more and more concerned with what you call social history. For me, anyway, it's more meaningful. that's one of the nice things about history, everything is meaningful. Some things are probably a little bit more meaningful or become a little bit more meaningful.

H: What would have been your idea at the time you were working on your dissertation, for example, of a really well-done history?

S: It's not an English history, but a work that I have found remarkably well-done is Garrett Mattingly's The Spanish Armada. It's a brilliant job of research, and there's even a better job of writing. It's as gripping as a novel, and it's as well written as a very good novel. Yet, it is superb history. That is one that I've . . .

H: Superb history?

S: It's exciting. It's well researched and it's well written. It's a combination that does not happen very often.

H: Is that your definition that goes with what is good history?

S: I all too often have to read books that I don't enjoy reading. You do it too, I'm sure. There are times when there is an important book, it's on an important era, it's on an important subject, I've got to know the material, and the book is boring. Manningly's is on a subject that is important and it's fun to read.

H: That part of it you feel is important?

S: I think it is important, I really do. I say this coming from someone who is not a good writer, maybe that's why I appreciate good writing because I'm not a good writer.

H: Are you interested with telling a bible kind of story?

S: Yes. I think it should be interesting. History is inherently interesting.

H: You don't see history as basically a scientific document?

S: Scientific to the extent that you use what are hopefully objective standards, criteria on what you are using. When using information you do not use that which simply goes along with the point you have preconceived about something. I'm going to write about this and I know this is the way it's going to turn out. It would be all too easy to go in there and find all the material that supports you and forget about the rest of it. I don't think that's scientific or

objective and I think to use all of this material and to use it fairly and not to ignore the inconsistencies, that's being scientific.

H: That's essential for good history?

S: It certainly is, yes.

H: To what extent do you agree or disagree with the notion that history is basically interpretation? Is that consistent at all with you?

S: No, it isn't. What I'm doing here, what I'm telling you here, responding to you on these questions with regards to history, I am interpreting basically all the time, or at least I'm making judgments. I have to make judgments on what I'm going to tell you; I can't tell you all I know. I have to decide what is important and what isn't. That is making a judgment and it is also interpreting. While interpretive I still think in many cases there is a place where history is narrative. Something can be both, I guess, narrative and interpretive. It is very hard to blend the two.

H: Something can be very useful, interesting history that simply told what happened without being concerned with supporting an argument?

S: Yes, I definitely think so. I don't know that in some cases it is perhaps worth as much as something interpretive, yet a lot of times interpretive history, analytical history, has got to have, somewhere along the line, some introduction to much of this material. A lot of that comes in narrative form.

H: How about the role of primary research, is that essential to a historian's work? How about in your own work?

S: I have always done a lot of work in primary resources. At the same time I don't ignore the secondary resources at all because so many times you make so much more sense out of the subject or the era, I feel, if you're acquainted with all the secondary works and are introduced to them. If you remember secondary works, you're going to come up in most cases with several different points of view, and having that knowledge going into certain areas is going to open up your eyes a lot more. I remember, this was suggested by somebody who had been writing, and yes, this does help explain this primary document that I'm working on. I think most students here find history far more exciting when they're introduced to some primary resources because they can finally get into that raw material of history.

H: I still don't know if I have this right, where a problem starts for you. You're not concerned with, say, taking someone else's interpretation of an event and going out and seeing if it really holds up, but you've kind of started fresh with your own. Is that correct?

S: I basically did, right, on, for instance, my dissertation. That was pretty much afresh. There have been some secondary works that touched on the area of reform. Halévy, the Frech historian who wrote so much brilliantly on 19th century and early 20th century England, and who is especially concerned with institutions of elements in England and especially, for instance, how parliament operated. He spent some time on this person, the secretary of state, who I wrote about. I don't know that some of it is interpretation of the event. He identified a lot of the problems that I think are basically confirmed. Whereas he had two or three pages on this, I wrote 200 pages. It certainly qualified a great deal of what Halévy said.

H: Did you get in to Halévy after you had gotten on to reform?

S: No, I had known of Halévy before. It is a standard interpretation of English history that everybody has to tangle with if they get into English history. I had read Halévy, R. C. Ensor who wrote England,1870-1914; again a very standard work in this area. I had gone to other books dealing specifically only with politics, others only with army. I had done all this. I had gone through a tremendous amount of secondary resources before, in fact, I went in to the primary resources.

H: This was before you decided to focus on army reform then?

S: No, I had tentatively decided on army reform; that, I had done because I knew, first of all, that virtually nothing was done on that. I knew, on the other hand, that I was going to pick up a page, two, three, four pages here and there in some of the secondary works. I felt that I needed a perspective of those other historians and that I would do well to go through those types of resources before I started on the primary resources. I really do think this is important. You've got to get some type of background. You have to get an understanding of not only somewhat the specific problem, but all the events surrounding it. All these events affect it one way or another.

H: The fact that this was virgin territory was rather important to you?

S: Yes, it was. This is usually the case in a doctoral

dissertation of history.

H: It has to be really original?

S: Yes, it has to be original. Now in some cases you can do something in historiography. There is a case where you might, for instance, be arguing pro, con, interpretation of a specific event. That is not always original that way. It's original to the extent that all the . . . Let's say you're studying Macaulay for instance, all of the works that he did, of course, are your primary resources because you're analyzing Macaulay. There, obviously, that's going to be very much an interpretive study.

H: I'm not familiar with the batting averages of different approaches of writing dissertations. Are interpretive dissertations regarded as rather risky things by and large as opposed to original?

S: I don't know that they're especially risky, maybe so. I think, in fact, the type of history that I wrote, which was in many ways narrative yet analytical within a narrative framework, it's easier to write it. Let's face it, here I was twenty-four years old starting on my dissertation and I think it was much easier for me to do that. Anything I write nowadays is far more analytical and far more interpretive. I wrote an article; did you read the article on Mafeking? Did you get over that at all?

H: Yes.

S: That's very much narrative in form, but yet there are certain . . . One of the main questions I was doing in Mafeking over the celebration that occurred in England due to the rescuing of this unimportant town in South Africa was was interpretive or analytical to the point that I was trying to find out why, why the celebrations in England over this unimportant . . .

H: Objectively, if not on the surface, you were looking to see any reason for getting excited about . . .

S: Yes, on the surface about this little town, right. The more I kept going into it and getting just primary sources on that . . . The primary sources were newspaper accounts of that event specifically. I tried to get into police records at the Home Office for that specific event, but they were home.

H: They threw out . . .

S: No, I don't think it was even that. It wasn't that they threw it out, it simply was that the number of cases

appearing in the court were so really rather insignificant that there was never a Mafeking file created at any time. They had all the court proceedings the following Monday or Tuesday after the previous Friday and Saturday of what they called the Mafekites, the Mafeking incidents that occurred and they appeared in the court. Here you had hundreds of thousands of people appearing and I probably checked five or six court cases. They had fifteen or twenty people that would appear, and most of them were intoxicated. Most of them were released on first offender accounts. I think in that one I did a fairly good job of figuring out why the incident, why the celebration occurred. A great deal, of it, again, centered around personalities, specifically the personality of Baden-Powell. Lord Roberts to a lesser extent is important. There was the case that it was kind of a redemption or correcting some of the things that had gone wrong with the empire in the previous two or three years and finally something supposedly went right in spite of all the problems and red tape that the English government had set up. It was very much a carnival atmosphere. They just wanted a good time. There is one thing, because I wrote it for a popular journal I couldn't go into it in nearly the detail that I really would have wanted to in a more scholarly journal. There was something very much interpretive I was dealing with here, and that was J. A. Hobson's concept of mass riots and rallies. It seems that Hobson, very much a creature of liberal, middle-class England, and a lot of others living at that time, saw this celebration and other similar celebrations as being manifestations of a growing and powerful, unruly, unintelligent, irrational, lower class. There has been a book written by Richard Price called Imperialism and the English Working Class, A Study of the Anglo-Boer War. That's not the exact title, it's something on that order. He was the one who first really brought it to my attention, I guess, that while there were some working class participating, first of all there were no working-class leaders involved in this specific celebration, Mafeking. They're almost all middle-class. He also pointed out that "jingoism," (and this is what Mafeking is usually associated with, this uncontrolled, irrational bellicose additude on the part of the English), was especially led by the middle class. The only place a person in England where an antiwar orator, and there were a great number of them in England, the only place where that antiwar speaker could get a fair hearing in England was in the working-class areas. He couldn't get it in the middle-class areas. They would boo him out.

H: The working class hadn't sold themselves out.

S: I think Price did a good job of showing that they knew what was going on. The working class was very much aware of where their interests were because the election was

held in the fall of 1900 after the war was supposedly over. It ended up continuing for a couple of years, but it has always been felt that the working class gave the Unionist government a vote of support for what they did in the war, that they had supposedly beaten the Boers. Price, going back through records now, has tried to examine certain working class constituencies and the people who are running in those areas. He is convinced, and I think he does a good job of proving it, that the citizens weren't voting on the attitude of that person with regards to the war; they were voting, rather, on how the person stood on social issues that affected them. If he happened to be an imperialist but also supported social reform, they voted for him. Again, it's an article written for a semipopular journal and the analysis and interpretation probably doesn't come out. There is really quite a great deal of it in that paper.

H: Are you going to try and expand the thing?

S: No, I have no intention right now of ever expanding that, but I have moved into more so, now, with trying to go in to social history from the point of leisure activities in England and especially in the 19th century. Although here again, I think the first way I'm going to approach it, and again here is what I've been doing now for the last four or five months, I'm going to approach it from a political point of view. Again, politics is still my strength. What I'm going to be doing is mixing social developments with political developments. In this case what I'm going to try to find out is to what extent this growing, middle-class parliament imposed its values on the rest of the population. I think one of the areas I can do this in is with regards to leisure activities. I want to find out first of all did they impose their ideas on that. This is very early in the research. Again, as far as what interpretations are involved, nobody has done anything on this. Nobody has done anything on the leisure part of it this way.

H: Do you think in terms, in this case, of a group imposing something on another group? Is this a pattern that seems to hold up in historical suspicions?

S: There is no doubt that class interests have played the vital role in groups. When I'm speaking about groups in this case, I am referring to classes, lower, middle, upper class. England is one of the most classed societies; it still is very much a class society. There is relative mobility within and also movement from one class to another, there is that, but while there has been that mobility for quite some time the class lines have remained.

H: Is power a fairly typical relationship between classes and groups?

S: The exercise of power do you mean?

H: Yes. You spoke of the middle class imposing its values.

S: I should qualify that immediately first of all because too much of 19th century England is seen as middle-class control of England. I shouldn't have said that exactly because the aristocracy remained so powerful throughout all of 19th century England, but it did gradually share more of its power with the middle class until, I suppose, by the end of the 19th century they pretty much equally shared power. Aristocracy remained vital, so vital, throughout all of 19th century England. It retained tremendous power. It retained amazing power considering what a small percentage of the population the aristocracy consisted of and what was becoming increasingly less important economically. It managed to retain a great deal of its power. Also, I think one of the reasons why England did not have a revolution in the 19th century or upheaval in society to the extent that a lot of continental European countries did was that there emerged earlier in England cooperation between the aristocracy and the middle class than there did on the continent. At least from what I know of continental development, a lot of the working class or laboring movements had as leaders members of the middle class, members of a discontented middle class as much during the 19th century, because they had been given a share of the political power.

H: When you speak of being a political historian interested in politics, is that what politics is all about is power?

S: Yes, politics is power.

H: That's what you're studying?

S: When I'm speaking of politics I especially study power. Where is the power, where is the base of that power? Is it economic power, is it social? Obviously, the aristocracy had further acquired social power, while they lost increasingly much of their political power, their economic power during the 19th century, as industry became more important. They retained tremendous power from the social background having for such a long time been the justices, unpaid justices of the peace. They remained unpaid justices of the peace for such a long time. Even the patronizing nature of many of the English aristocrats--their taking care of their tenant farmers and all that--in many ways was social power. I think having been the most important person in the community for

such a long time, having been on top of the social scale for such a long time, having been on the top of that social scale because of economic power for such a long time, even after that economic power declined the social power, for a long time, still remained.

H: They had status and they could dispense status to other people?

S: Yes. Politics is power.

H: Have you ever, in your work as a historian in your writing and teaching, ever felt fearful that what you're saying or writing will be held up to ridicule, would be somehow condemned? Does that ever worry you?

S: No, it doesn't worry me. I'm concerned; I'm obviously concerned when I'm writing something that I better be doing a good job at it. There are historians around to pick it apart if it isn't good. I'll say I may be concerned about it, but I don't worry about it.

H: Have you ever taken a position in your work as a historian that was sort of so far out and unusual that you felt it required real courage?

S: No, I'm afraid I haven't done that. I never felt that I was doing that. If, in fact, I've done something that somebody said how did you have the courage to do that, I'll have to say I wasn't aware that what I was doing was all that courageous or required courage.

H: Do you do things in other parts of your life that require courage?

S: In this past week we have acquired a seventeen year old foster daughter; that requires a certain amount of courage for somebody who is fifteen years younger than I am and thirteen years younger than my wife to come into the family. It's hard. Obviously, first of all, I haven't been through it. We know some people who have older children that they have . . . Well no, we don't know very many in fact. We know there are very many people in their early thirties who have taken a seventeen year old in their home.

H: Let me start out now asking about your habits of work when you're working as a historian. Do you work with a schedule? Do you keep a journal?

S: No, I keep no type of journal. I work, as far as the amount of time that I put in during the week, when school is in session. I probably average 50 to 55 hours a week. I normally put in about ten hours a day, Monday through Friday.

Maybe not quite that much, but then I'll end up with five, six hours occasionally on a Sunday. It runs in that area.

As far as what kind of schedule I have, so far it's a little artificial in that I'm in a new job. This quarter, for instance, I have an 8:00 class. Ideally, I liked to go home a little early some days, and occasionally I will. I'll get out of here at noon once in a while. Or, I might go home at 9:00 or 10:00 in the morning, go home and do some work and then come back at 2:00 or 3:00 in the afternoon and do some work here as far as the administration goes. As far as chairman's duties or chairman's work, I never take any of that home; that's only done here in this office. I've taken it home maybe one or two times all year. I've kind of forced that on myself. When I'm home and working in the evening it is not on administrative affairs.

H: I suppose you would go about writing an article or book differently from how you would go about preparing a lecture.

S: Usually when I'm doing research or trying to write an article I try to do it in fairly large block times. I think I have to have quite a bit of time. Frequently I'll have one day a week when I will not have to teach; this is standard for most people in this department. They are four-hour classes; they meet four days a week, and we try to schedule them so that there is one day off. Especially on that day off, when I'm not meeting classes, I'll get quite a bit of it done. I will put seven, eight, nine hours in maybe on research, whether it's at home or whether it's in the library. I tend to have to have blocks of time to work, at least really three hours to get something done. If it's only an hour here and there it takes me fifteen, twenty minutes to gear up for it and that really doesn't leave very much time.

H: When you make any kind of notes when you're working, is it about things that you're reading or notes to yourself about ideas or approaches?

S: I have a left-hand drawer at home that is kind of an idea box that I will jot down ideas about possible research projects. Even when I'm reading an article or reading something, something might pop in my mind I ought to include this idea in my western civilization lectures. I'll just write it out on a card and throw it in the drawer and hopefully sometime in the future go through the drawer. I get through it once in a while and glance through it.

H: What do you put on the cards?

S: Primarily just a sentence or two saying . . . It might have been when I was teaching a course on history of leisure or reading some political memoirs, a biography or something like that, but I put down just a note simply saying good article would be the leisure of politics. There is that type of the leisure of politics, the leisure and the recreation of politics which has been more common in England than in other countries. That's all I have down on it. I know I originally put down when first starting the study of leisure, try to find out to what extent parliament in the 19th century controlled leisure activities. That's kind of a research project that I mentioned to you earlier that I am working on now, that I've started working on. It's these little ideas that I put down on three by five cards that I throw in there.

H: You don't order them in any way?

S: No, they are just a pile there.

H: Are they dated?

S: No, they aren't even dated. They should be. It would be interesting if you could show the progression perhaps also.

H: I don't know if they should be. I'm just curious.

S: It wouldn't be a bad idea; I'll probably do that from now on.

H: Do you keep a diary?

S: No, I've never kept a diary. Do you keep a diary?

H: No, I don't.

S: I wonder how many people do.

H: It seems to have gone out of fashion.

S: I've sometimes thought that I should.

H: If you can get yourself in the habit of doing it I think it's a great thing. As far as substantive notes about the content of the things that you're digging in to, documents, how do you handle that?

S: First of all, just as far as the notes, what they're like, I use five by eight sheets of paper.

H: Any particular color?

S: I guess I've always used white for no other reason than they're the least expensive I guess. I always put the bibliographical information and all the footnoting reference on the left-hand side. I frequently, in fact, will take a ruler and divide. I'll go about two inches in from the left-hand side and just take a ruler and make a line down there so I block off the area. It's easier for me to keep it neat that way. The document I'm dealing with I will put its date in the uppser left-hand corner. I'll put the date, the reference itself. In the lower left-hand corner I will give some kind of general description of the note. If I'm working on army reform I might say 1903 estimates. As far as the notes themselves go, I have gotten so I take quite a bit of information verbatim, a lot of them through quotations. I've not always done that; I do that more now than I used to because I've found out simply through practice that there are times when it's very nice to have the material down verbatim so you can be a little bit more precise when you come to the writing of it.

H: Do you do this by hand?

S: I do a lot with the typewriter. This assumes that I've got books or material at home. I do most of that note-taking now on typewriter. It's faster for me.

H: How about xeroxing the notes?

S: I do quite a bit of xeroxing; I don't know how much. A percentage of it is done by xerox, probably fifteen, twenty, twenty-five percent of the material I use is obtained by xeroxing. I use more xeroxing if I go elsewhere and I'm pressed for time. If I'm here in Youngstown doing research, that's no major problem. When I was in England those two summers doing research, especially the second time I went, I had quite a bit of xeroxing done because it saves so much time.

H: When do you work most productively?

S: I think the most productive time for me is in the morning. I never work beyond 11:00 in the evening, never.

H: When you speak of the morning what time is that?

S: I get started by 8:00, 8:15. With a good three hours in the morning I get a lot done. I very much prefer, if it's possible, to stay home in the morning, for instance, and do research or writing than come up here

and do administrative work.

H: Can you do that? Are you allowed to do that?

S: Oh yes. When I accepted this position I did not ask what hours I was supposed to keep for fear that I might be told. I think I get the job done. I think I'm available to the faculty members and students a considerable amount. I wouldn't do that every morning, simply come in at noon, but I would like if I could do it once or twice a week. It gives me a certain amount of free time to do the research and to remain sane. At the same time I get to see the faculty and students.

H: What sort of things seem to get in the way of you getting anything accomplished?

S: Meetings.

H: What if you had a month off and you couldn't be working?

S: If I really put my mind to it, as I can, I really don't let anything much get in my way. If I'm off in the summer; I have to teach one term, and I go on vacation for another month, but that still leaves approximatley a month, I think, in the summer. I'll get a lot done in that time. I will often work all morning, take the afternoon off, do some stuff around the house, then I will work again in the evening. Or I might work in the morning and afternoon and take the evening totally off. Seldom when I'm off will I put in a ten, twelve hour day when I'm not teaching classes. I will put in about a seven or eight hour day, but not the entire day.

H: How does your wife feel about this?

S: She does not mind at all. My schedule is really very flexible. If we decide we're going to so something a certain day, I can take the day off in the morning or afternoon or evening.

H: You don't insist on working on some particular day?

S: No, I don't.

H: What have you been reading lately in the last couple of months?

S: I started reading a biography of Winston Churchill the other day, a new biography by Henry Pelling. It's really the first, I guess, one-volume, critical account of Churchill. It's pretty good so far. I haven't finished it. It's terrible how few books I read all the way

through. You're probably that way too, I don't know. It's rather amazing that I just don't get to complete very many books. I get to start a lot of them. I glance through them; I'll probably hit the concluding chapter and a few in between. The number of books to get all the way through is astonishingly limited.

H: When you're reading do you make notes?

S: Yes, I usually take notes. Not a lot, but on Churchill, whom I'm basically acquainted with anyway, I'll jot down a little bit on interpretation. I won't take down any factual material.

H: Do you put those on cards?

S: I put them on slips of paper and hope they eventually make their way to some file where they will be useful. To that extent I'm not always the most organized person. If I'm reading it specifically for research, a research article, then it goes on cards and goes into its proper place. When I'm reading something that is related to my field, English or western civilization, or whatever, 19th or 20th century Europe, I'll usually jot down a few notes. They tend to be filed usually under lectures; that's one of the easiest places for me to file them.

H: Do you have a file for each lecture?

S: Yes, I basically have a file on each lecture, basically each hour lecture. Each lecture is divided into hours; each class is divided into lectures and those lectures are usually an hour long, sometimes two hours. My lectures are designed in the classroom, not that I always do it, but I've gotten to be pretty good at it now; that is, I'll come in with a subject and I'll finish it within fifty minutes, even if there are questions asked and conversations carried on. I will get that material out either through the lecture or through answering questions that the students are raising.

I looked a little bit at Robert Tucker's book on Stalin which came out recently. I looked at Adam Ulam's book on Stalin and I also read some of Solzhenitsyn's Archipelago, again not reading all of those books. Those are very meaty books. They are 500-800 pages each. Ordinarily I would not have the time to get all the way through them. I get some feel for them. I think whether I take notes on them, I don't know if I did take notes on them, but one way or another I know a lot more about Stalin just from having read a few chapters.

H: Did you see that show on channel 45 the other day?

S: No, I didn't. I understand it came down hard against Lenin. It was that Lenin started it all and Stalin just simply carried it on. That's the way Adam Ulam's book on Stalin tends to be. Tucker is quite different on the other hand. He tends to see Stalin as something separate from Lenin.

H: Is this just a coincidence that you read these three books you have been reading?

S: No, it's not a coincidence. I knew of the books and I always thought I should look at them. I talked to Dr. Slavin about them a few times; he wrote a review of three books, two of those three books. He wrote reviews on books on Stalin and also on Stephen Cohen's Bukarin. I've become interested in them partly that way.

I'm always reading books for my lectures.

H: When you prepare a lecture, do you prepare lectures or do you just go into class?

S: No, I prepare. I prepare lectures. I'm not redoing every lecture now; I'm getting to be an old man in the teaching profession and I suppose I have, occasionally, a few lectures that are getting a little yellow, the paper is getting a little yellow. I try to update or alter lectures. There are 35 lectures in a quarter. I probably redo five or six of them in a quarter so that they are all rewritten within five or six years. There are some lectures I probably feel are pretty good that I won't touch for quite some time, but even then, even when a lecture that seems to be pretty much set, I'll still glance over material pertinent to it and slip in a few notes on the edges.

H: When you put together a lecture for the first time, what do you do? What is that all about?

S: On the general topic of the lecture I will try to do quite a bit of reading. I'm not a fast enough reader to devour books for a lecture, for an hour lecture. I may glance at parts of several books and look at articles. I will take notes then on everything while I'm reading it. Let's say I will end up with ten pages of notes for an hour's lecture. After getting those ten rudimentary notes, just the notes on the books, I will go through then and work out a lecture going through those notes that I've taken. I've gotten now so I mainly type all my lectures in outline form. I do not type them out completely. All I do is type out an outline.

H: Is there such a thing as a typical lecture? What does the lecture do?

S: It just brilliantly illuminates everything for the students. They just walk out of there totally awed. Ideally they should be curious I think, when they go out of there. They should have had a few questions raised in their minds which should stimulate them; that's it, ideally. I certainly do not pretend to always do that. What's really interesting is that sometimes lectures that I think are really good, I only find out later through the exams that are written that they didn't go over at all. I do not especially like grading exams, but it's a very good learning experience for me because then I know to what extent students have learned certain things. When students do badly on an exam it's not only the students who haven't done well, it probably means that the teacher has not done very well in presenting certain ideas, especially if a lot of them take, more or less, the same essay and they all do rather consistently bad on that essay. It probably means they do not understand that topic and I should have done a better job either presenting it, well I certainly should have done a better job presenting it, but also I should have been more alert to the fact that they were having difficulties grasping the ideas during the class period.

H: You speak of presenting ideas, where does the lecture fit in relative to readings and so on? Do you see them serving the same function?

S: I think in most cases students, first of all, can pretty much understand what I'm trying to do. They can understand my lecture. In most cases it's easier for them to follow me, in fact, than frequently to plow through the textbook. The textbook, on the other hand, will frequently give them additional ideas or illustrations to support points that I have made in the lecture. It will, on occasion, give them alternative viewpoints, something that I have not brought up in my lectures. It will occasionally help them understand something which they may not quite have grasped and didn't want to or didn't feel up to asking me. I try not to be intimidating in the classroom, but any teacher, to a certain extent, just by the nature of his position, is intimidating, which is unfortunate. It does impede, I think, the exchange of ideas. It doesn't always. Some people just beautifully bring out questions in the classes, and answers, responses.

H: Do you emphasize factual material, interpretations, issues?

S: I bring out quite a few facts in the class, although I like to bring out those facts around interpretation to illuminate certain ideas and to bring in interpretation

at the same time. I am fairly factual, probably not as much as others. I'm probably in the middle as far as facts go, lighter than some, heavier than others.

H: You say you update and alter some of these lectures. What is involved there? Why would you find it necessary to alter?

S: Just to give an example here, for instance, the British Empire, I spend especially for the second part of British Empire, which starts in 1865, 1870, one of the first things I do is to talk quite a bit about the causes of late 19th century imperialism. That's an area in which there are generally still a great number of books coming out. Occasionally the interpretation changes or there is a book that has come out which has two different ideas that I do not necessarily agree with, or I may not even have made up my mind if they're correct or not. I do feel obligated to bring this out to the students, that here is another interpretation that has been introduced; you ought to put this in the scale and weigh it and see what you think of it. A year or two ago a new book came out by Fieldhouse. Fieldhouse has written a new book on imperialism in the 19th century. I have to read that; I haven't finished it. I'll have to read that and take notes on it and incorporate it into the lecture when I give it again in the fall or winter, whenever I teach it next.

H: Does your own interpretation change on some of these subjects?

S: Oh yes, they can change. Most certainly. If there is new material that comes out or some new idea is introduced, or if I simply change my mind on things.

H: Can you give me an example of someting where the point of view of your lecture has changed?

S: I think for a long time my interpretation for the causes of imperialism was heavily economic. That has been altered in the last four or five years to retaining a good part of the economic element. It was important. I have tended to look more and more towards what one might call nationalism as a basis for imperialism in the expansion of Europe. There is one example.

H: That shows up in your lectures?

S: Yes, definitely.

H: Are you familiar with stories of sudden insight such as: Newton and the apple, and the eureka experience?

S: Yes.

H: Have you ever had such an experience?

S: I don't know that I have. I don't think so. Not that I'm aware of now. I suppose when I've been writing a paper, for instance, all of a sudden that's it, especially things like organizational details. I'll be fighting with this and it doesn't flow, it doesn't go this way. All of a sudden I'll know where I can work it in. That type of thing can happen. Or perhaps not understanding something. Why did this man do this politically, it doesn't make sense? Then all of a sudden I'll put together two or three events that I hadn't seen the cause and effect relationship before. That can happen.

H: But not devastating kind of running through the streets naked?

S: No, nothing like that.

H: Is this a specific example you were thinking of, why did this man do something?

S: No.

H: When you're reading books do you ever get the feeling that he has really got it, why didn't I say that?

S: Somebody that really understands this type of thing?

H: Yes. This is a really fantastic, new way of looking at things.

S: I think I get that type of feeling occasionally. I enjoy reading A. J. P. Taylor a great deal. He is a 20th century historian. I really do enjoy him, not that I agree with him. He's very much a controversial historian. He was the one who in the early 1960's came out with the book on the origins of the Second World War. He treated Hitler as simply another politician in Europe who's not especially good, not especially bad.

H: He was a normal member of the species.

S: He was normal, especially sharp, cute, aware man. I really do enjoy reading Taylor. He also wrote a very nice, little book entitled The Troublemakers, Dissent in English Foreign Policy 1789-1945. He put in the preface of the book, "Had I been living among these people, my greatest desire is that I would have been one of them, that I would have been a troublemaker." He starts out right from the beginning where he stands. Indeed, while he has not been one of the troublemakers as far as foreign policy, and that's

what the book deals with, he has certainly been a troublemaker within the historical profession throwing up just a lot of ideas and causing a lot of controversy. A lot of people attacked his idea over the Hitler thing; that raised a tremendous furor and it's still going on.

H: Does this upset you that you could regard him as a normal human being?

S: I still have trouble, in many ways, accepting that, especially over the genocide. Taylor says that what went on internally that way was more or less a domestic policy, a domestic problem, and had little to do with foreign policy. He may be right on that. That's a terrible condemnation of western civilization if what Hitler was doing was not all that unusual.

H: Internationally or in terms of liquidation of the Jews?

S: What I mean is that it's rather incredible that somebody can write a book on the origins of the Second World War and deal with Hitler as much as Taylor does, and at the same time bypass genocide. To me, the slaughter of the Jews is so much connected with Hitler that there are few things I can do; I can hardly talk about Hitler without thinking about that. Perhaps it's more emotional than anything, what I'm talking about. It's a black mark in western civilization.

H: Can you write such a book?

S: Yes, I probably could. How do you mean?

H: Could you write a book about Hitler? Could you write a book about Napoleon in which you didn't treat him as a criminal?

S: I'd like to think that I could.

H: How about Hitler?

S: Yes, I probably could. Without seeing him as a criminal I think I could present a relatively objective history of Hitler. I know one of the things I would emphasize would be genocide. I would try to find out why he did it. What was it in his makeup?

H: Could you deal with that was a rational policy?

S: As Hitler the rational being?

H: Yes. As Hitler as a rational being carrying out that program of irrational policy?

S: I don't know. I think I would have to pay a lot of attention, now to psychohistory, a lot of attention to psychohistory and what has been done. Are you acquainted with the History of Childhood Quarterly? Have you heard about that? It's a new journal. It's in its third year or publication.

H: Does the library get it?

S: We have ordered it several times, but it seems as if the library may have done some type of freeze on orders of new periodicals. There has been a tremendous amount on Hitler and examining him. This History of Childhood Quarterly deals very much with the formative phase of an individual's life, and the formative phase being especially up to twenty to twenty-five years of age. There's a lot of garbage coming out in psychohistory right now; it's sufficiently new so that everybody is kind of jumping into it. A lot of people are jumping into it and they come up with some really weird stuff, but at the same time they come up with some very good material. I would have to approach Hitler through a psychohistory.

H: Would it worry you about what people might think about your conclusion?

S: No.

H: What if you decided that Hitler was a perfectly normal, rational, nice guy?

S: You would ascertain . . . If that's what I came up with, I could live with it.

H: You wouldn't hide it in the bottom drawer?

S: No, certainly not.

H: Do you think Hitler and Nixon compare?

S: Isn't it terrible that I have to stop and think about a response on that as far as comparison of Nixon with Hitler. Nixon was not as evil a man as Hitler. I guess I don't think he was. He didn't do as many bad things as Hitler did, but there are, I guess, similarities involved. Both men are tremendously egotistical, both tremendously power hungry to the extent that they're going to do illegal things in order to maintain power. Both are unwilling to, I really think, admit that they ever made any mistakes. I'm not that well-acquainted with Hitler that I know to what extent we run into depression. I would guess that he was, from what I vaguely know of him, very depressed. I think both of the men can be quite irrational, responding

to events far too many times without perhaps thinking what they were doing. Hitler, to that extent, may have been more plotting perhaps than Nixon. You sometimes wonder what Nixon was up to, what was he doing. It made no sense. Given the political complexion, for instance, of let's say 1972, and the power base that he developed in the country, I don't know why he would do some of these things or have them done or once they had been done approve them. He didn't need it for his political base. This, of course, with regards to Nixon, too many people failed to recognize that what he was doing in 1972 had been done by Nixon associates before when he had run for office. All they were getting in 1972 was something on a little bit larger scale than Nixon had done before. I think it was Ho Chi Minh who was asked what he found most amazing about American politics. He said, "Americans forget."

H: Have you read Albert Speer's memoirs?

S: I've read quite a bit of his memoirs. It seems like a long time ago now. It was three or four or five years ago. I've read part of it and there are smacks of "Watergatish" things, especially the idead of "I was just doing my duty," or "I didn't know what was going on." Have you looked at Speer's book?

H: The thing I got was that all these people were so normal, that they were just mediocre, little people.

S: And not aware, or am I wrong? Did they really know sometimes what was going on?

H: I once had the experience of knowing a guy who got kicked out of the Air Force because he forgot to tell them that he had been a member of the Hitler Youth, and his wife's father was a German general who got kicked out of the Air Force research program because he was accused of performing experiments on the Polish during the war. These people were absolutely delightful, the loveliest people I've ever know in my life. Somewhere along the line I got the idea that you can be a nice guy and still be a son of a bitch. There are a lot of nice fascists; people don't believe that. I think that it comes as an awful shock, the charming fascists. That's what Albert Speer seems to me is all about.

S: Didn't you get that feeling watching the Watergate hearings?

H: Exactly, that these are charming guys.

S: There were some of the Watergate people that didn't come over that way, but you're right. Have you read any of the

autobiographies of the people involved in Watergate?

H: No, I haven't.

S: I've glanced at some of them. We have Magruder's book. I have only glanced at ten or fifteen pages of it. There's tremendous naivete or something involved, even in the writing of the book. Magruder mentions in one case where Liddy came in and threw on the desk the information they had gotten from the bugging of Watergate offices. Magruder looked at it and said, "It's a bunch of junk." There's nothing here, what's wrong." Liddy made the statement that, "We blew it when we first went in there. We were supposed to put the bug on Larry O'Brien's phone and we ended up putting it on the secretary's." Magruder said that that would have been the time to stop. Just having read that paper Magruder just felt that that would have been the end of it and no harm would have been done.

I've read some other political memoirs and there is one that is so funny. He writes for the Rolling Stone, Thompson, Dr. Thompson. Anyway, it was on the campaign trail and he is a guy who is more often enough high on drugs and following the campaign. He went around with McGovern for awhile, with others. He is so funny in his writing; he is so humorous, so tactless in what he writes. I can't remember his first name. On the outside of the cover of the paperback book is a skull and crossbones. It is delightful reading. He, by the way, was one of the guys who was the ambassador to the little island in "Doonesberry." He was the governor who was sent out there. He's still always high, of course, in the cartoons. It's just delightful.

H: When you were doing the history of the English politicians, do you use the same tools, analysis, in dealing with writing the history of Washington in the last five years as you have used in doing your study of parliamentary politics?

S: I think basically I could use the same tools, yes. I think it's always a little bit more difficult when you're writing of something contemporary. It's extremely difficult. Anybody who is writing of events within the last five, ten, fifteen, twenty years better say in his preface this is tentative because he is not going to be able to get ahold of all the material. He simply isn't going to have all the information. As far as the historical tools, the critical nature of the historian, the skepticism, the careful weighing of evidence, that's kind of my thinking. I can transfer that from one area of history to another.

Having done politics in England in the 19th and 20th century, while politics are certainly different in the United States than they are in England, there are enough similarities in the motivations of man.

H: Do you find the same themes running through?

S: Oh, sure. It's pretty much the same whether it's dealing with social problems, economic problems, war, peace, personality problems; there's not all that much difference. The English are lucky to an extent that if a guy is really all that rotten they might be able to get rid of him and not have to wait four years, five years.

H: They wouldn't be too surprised to have someone all that rotten turn up as prime minister. I guess they've had some losers.

S: They've had some losers.

H: If you were to write a history of the period of 1929 to the present, what would be the main themes?

S: Which history, U.S.?

H: American.

S: I would spend a considerable amount of time on economics, I guess in the broad sense and as far as details go. That has been pretty much, I guess, the story of America in the period from World War I to the present. It has been the fluctuations in the economy, the responses to these changes . . . By the middle of the century it was much more of an affluent America. I would go in to the social consequences of these economic changes, how it has affected the individual life, family life, how it has altered the family structure, how it has affected their leisure, recreaton time. I would spend a certain amount on the intellectual or lack of intellectual developments, and I would spend a certain amount of time on politics, probably not as much as I would on economic and social.

H: How does the history that you would now write of the 1940's and 1950's differ from the way you personally saw things?

S: I hardly lived.

H: What do you mean you hardly lived?

S: I was only born in 1942.

H: Let's make it 1950's and 1960's.

S: Let's say in the 1950's I was probably not all that interested in affairs in the United States, but even in 1960, I started college in 1960 and was only seventeen years old. Only after I got into college, in graduate school, I began looking at the wide, wide world. I grew up very much in a traditional community, a traditional setting. By traditional I mean a conservative area, conservative to the extent that things really didn't change very much that I was aware of. I didn't look for change. I don't know that I felt my life was being affected by technological developments or other things. Writing nowadays there is no doubt that I would be much more liberal as compared to very much conservative when I was young. This goes up through college years where I was basically conservative.

H: So you had put into your history a lot of things that you really weren't aware of personally at the time?

S: Right.

H: If you were aware of them your viewpoint then would have been much more conservative than how you would look at it now.

S: I know, for instance, that I would not have looked to the government as a source for answers, for instance, to what social problems I knew that existed at that time. It would have to be the own individual who would have to pick himself up by his own boot strap, because that's what I've been taught all my life.

H: Do you believe that that works?

S: It does for some people. There are too many things happening in an individual's life nowadays that he himself personally cannot control simply because of the size of business, of corporations. It's a magnitude of when a person is unemployed. He can be the most able, most willing, most conscientious worker in the world and he can't get a job.

H: You believe the government should do something about it?

S: Absolutely. I think it's a mark of a civilized society.

H: And that would show up in the history of the human race?

S: Sure it would.

END OF INTERVIEW