N O R T H T E X A S S T A T E U N I V E R S I T Y

O R A L H I S T O R Y C O L L E C T I O N

N U M B E R 11

I n t e r v i e w w i t h

H o m e r P . R a i n e y

A u g u s t 1 9 6 7

Place of Interview: Boulder Colorado

Interviewer: Dr. Kendall Cochran

Terms of Use: "Open"

Approved: Homer P. Rainey

Date: Feb. 5, 1968

Oral History Collection

Dr. Homer P. Rainey

Interviewer: Dr. Kendall Cochran

Place of Interview: Boulder, Colorado

Dr. Cochran: This is Kendall Cochran, Professor of Economics at North Texas in Boulder, Colorado. I'm visiting with Dr. Homer P. Rainey, Professor of Higher Education at the University of Colorado. Dr. Rainey, let me emphasize again how pleased I am to be here, and how very much we appreciate your taking time from a very busy schedule to visit with us.

Dr. Rainey: Thank you very much. In turn, I'd like to express to you and your institution my gratitude for inviting me to participate in this Oral History Program, dealing with some of my experiences as President of the University of Texas and later my candidacy for the Governor of Texas in 1946. I'm very grateful to you and the University for this privilege.

Dr. Cochran: Well, it need not be re-emphasized; it's a well known fact in Texas History. Dr. Rainey was brought to the University of Texas as its, I believe, twelfth President wasn't it, in 1939, following a two year search. He was the unanimous choice of a faculty committee, a committee of the alumni, and then a committee of the Board of Regents. But in ensuing years, the political complexion of the Board

changed; then Dr. Rainey began to have his share of controversy with the Board. Dr. Rainey was a devout champion of academic freedom and tenure, and during his years he fought to protect his integrity, his dignity, the faculty from harassment by the Regents. But after a long controversy with the Board, he was fired. And as he knows, and we all know, he later ran for Governor of Texas. Would you then, Dr. Rainey, fill us in briefly or think of something of your background, where you were born, where you were raised, your education, important facts which you think might have some bearing in looking back in that respect on your later life. First, where were you born? Where did you grow up?

Rainey: Well, I should be glad to reply to that request. Actually I was born in Clarksville, Texas, up in northeast Texas, the first county seat west of Texarkana. But my father and mother moved from there when I was only two years of age (incidentally, I was born in 1896). And they moved from there to a little town called Eliasville on the clear fork of the Brazos River between Graham and Breckenridge.

Cochran: You were just a young chap then.

Rainey: I was only two years of age when we moved out there. And I grew up here and went through the public schools there. There was an old water mill there on the river, and my father ran this old water mill for a number of years. He also was a tenant farmer--we were poor people--and I have often said that the only opportunity I had for an education was that provided by a generous public--the public school system. My father never would have been able to have given

me an education otherwise, so I have often said that I am very grateful for this public school system of ours.

Cochran: Isn't that one of the real strengths of our society?

Rainey: Oh, no doubt, it is one of the greatest assets that this or any other society has ever had. I've gotten appreciation of that in many ways since that time. I've worked, for example, with some of the Latin American countries on their educational problems, and I have been able to see the contrast between our educational system and theirs.

Cochran: Well free public education here through the University is really unique isn't it, in the world?

Rainey: Oh yes, it is, and as I say, I think it is the greatest institution any society has ever evolved for their welfare and well being.

Cochran: Well, that was just a general grammar school you went to?

Rainey: Yes, I went to a one-room rural school here, and we had two or three churches; and they were the center of the life of the community. I've often thought it's a very unique community. It was one of the pioneer communities in that part of Texas, and it was settled by three or four families there that were the backbone, so to speak, of the community.

Cochran: When did they come there, do you know? Do you remember?

Rainey: No, in the 1870's I think, as I recall. And these families were all very fine people. They were religious people; they were devout people, and there was a strong moral and spiritual atmosphere of the community.

Cochran: Was it predominantly any one particular religion?

Rainey: No, I don't think it was. There were Presbyterians, and Methodists, Baptists, and Christians--we called them Campbellites (chuckle) in those days. My earliest recollection is my father loading us into an old farm wagon, driving us about three and a half miles into this little village Sunday School on Sunday morning. And there's where my education started. There...in this Sunday School of course, the Bible was the basic text, but they also stressed the old Westminister Shorter Catechism--this was a Presbyterian Sunday School, my father was a Presbyterian--and I actually memorized that old Westminister Shorter Catechism before I entered the public school. I got a prize...I got a prize for it at a little Sunday School picnic. This is a very unique document.

Cochran: You were reading then, considerably, before you went to school.

Rainey: No, I learned it by heart. They (chuckle) taught it to me. It was in catechismical form and starts out...It has about a hundred and eight or ten questions and answers. And these are the basis for the Calvinistic theology, really. I remember a lot of it even at the present time. It starts out, "What is man's chief end?" The answer, "Man's chief end is to glorify God and to enjoy Him forever." "What is God?" "God is a Spirit, infinite in power and wisdom and glory." And this goes on with about a hundred more questions like that. It filled my mind with a lot of great concepts, really, religious, moral concepts before I ever entered the public school. And I thought about it many times. Living out on a farm, dragging a heavy cotton sack up and down the rows, or plowing a three horse or mule team, my mind was working on a lot of these

great issues, even as a youngster.

Cochran: Well, it had quite an influence really...

Rainey: Oh, it had a marvelous influence on my life. Years later, I was reading James Truslow Adams, The Epic of America. He was discussing the influence of Puritanism on New England, and the effect that it had on New England way back there in the early days. And he made a remark that caught my attention in which he says, "Whatever else one might think about Puritanism," he said, "it taught the New Englander to think." Well, when I read that, I laid the book down, and I said, "Well, by the way, it taught Homer Rainey to think, too." And that was one of the great functions that it served. So, as I look back upon it, this community was a powerful influence in my life, as a youngster. And it's a unique community; there's been a study made of it from a cultural point of view. Statistically, these things never would have happened. There have been three college and university presidents come from that community.

Cochran: Just from this little old community?

Rainey: Just from the little community of Eliasville and the area about it, just three or four miles radius. Three college and university presidents, and Walter Webb, who, of course, was the great historian at the University of Texas and was President of the American Historical Society.

Cochran: Did you know him as you were growing up there?

Rainey: Oh yes, I've known him a long time...

Cochran: That's interesting...

Rainey: Then dozens of teachers and ministers and missionaries...It's a

unique community. So I owe a lot, I'm sure, to it.

Cochran: To what particular quality of the community would you attribute this? Was it their emphasis upon education or religion?

Rainey: Well, both. It was emphasis upon religion, first of all; it was a religious community, strongly that. But the Presbyterians have always emphasized education. They've been among the greatest supporters of education. And Protestants, generally, have supported education, of course, but the Presbyterians notably. They've sponsored colleges; they've been rated, I think, as about the highest per capita givers for education we know. So I grew up in that atmosphere. I lived on a farm adjacent to one of these fine families, and they farmed a little hundred and sixty acre farm, sent about six of their children to Austin College at Sherman. And I was in their home a good deal, and so I heard of Austin College from my earliest youth, and there never was any other idea in my mind but that I'd go to college. I just thought that that was absolutely essential to anything worthwhile in life.

Cochran: Have either of your parents been to school...to college?

Rainey: No. No, neither my father nor mother. They just had an elementary education. And so I looked forward to the time...getting an education. I wanted that more than anything else.

Cochran: By the way, to go back, do you remember who the other two presidents were who came from that community?

Rainey: Yes, there were three...

Cochran: I'm sure I know which one...I can identify one, (chuckle) but...

Rainey: Yes. (chuckle) Well, one of them was president of Abilene...the

Baptist College at Abilene, Dr. Richardson. And the other two, of course, were Dr. Yandall Benedict, whom I succeeded at the University of Texas.

Cochran: Dr. Benedict came from there?

Rainey: At the time I became president of the University, there had been only two native sons of Texas as President of the University. We both came from this community, which I think is quite unique. (chuckle) I commented on that the day I was inaugurated as President of the University, that this little community had produced such an array of people, where I'll say that, statistically, nothing like that would ever (chuckle) happen.

Cochran: Did you know Dr. Benedict as you were growing up?

Rainey: Well, I knew of him, yes, knew his family and so forth. We lived a few miles apart. So when my time came to go to college, I knew I had to work my way through, for we had no money to go.

Cochran: You were the first child of the family to go...

Rainey: I was the oldest, yes. I was the oldest of four children. I had one brother and two sisters younger than I. I reasoned this way, that I was going to have to make my way in life whether I went to school or not, and I reasoned that if I could work my way through college...take care of myself at the same time I was getting my college education ahead and that certainly proved to be the case. I entered college in the fall of 1914. In those days, Texas high schools weren't affiliated very well, so I had to take a final year of high school work in their preparatory department, so I was actually there five years as a student. I graduated in 1919.

Cochran: Did you major in anything particular?

Rainey: Yes, I really had a double major. I majored in history and English, wrote two undergraduate theses, that were required in those days. I had a marvelous experience in college. It was just a glorious experience for me from the time I landed there until I graduated. I have often looked back upon it as being really a glorious period in one's life; I covet it forever.

Cochran: I know my own personal experience. My studies were the most exciting, coveted period of my years...

Rainey: Austin College was small in those days. It was just a men's college at that time; it later became coeducational. In fact, my class in 1919 was the last class that wasn't coeducational. It became coeducational right at the end of World War I. Being small, we all knew every other student, and we knew all the faculty people, and they called us by our given names and all that sort of thing.

Cochran: A great deal of personal contact.

Rainey: Yes, they were just like additional parents to us all. The President of the college was Dr. Clyce, at that time. He had been there, oh, a long time, and I look back upon him as one of the great influences of my life.

Cochran: What was the student enrollment then? Do you remember?

Rainey: Only about two hundred.

Cochran: That should make for a very intimate, personal atmosphere.

Rainey: Yes, that's right. And that, I think, is an incomparable value in college. We are suffering today a lot because of this so called alienation of students. They don't get to know any faculty people.

Cochran: Thinking ahead quite a bit, and we'll come back and talk about it later, but wasn't this--while I'm thinking about it--wasn't this somewhat what you were trying to do when you created the Plan Two program at the University to create the small college atmosphere within the broader confines of the University?

Rainey: Yes, yes, it had a great success. I think a lot about these days, our experience here. I sometimes think that students live across the street, so to speak, from the college campus. They come over to class and go back. We go out of our offices and meet them in the classroom and then we come back. I had an experience two or three years ago that really impressed this upon me. I had a class of about ninety-five students in it at the beginning of a new term, and I was telling them the first day that I wanted to get acquainted with them so that I could identify them, and so forth--that I was going to call the roll just for the purpose of...not for checking attendance, but to start this process of identification; and I told them what my office number was and gave them an invitation to come and told them I wanted to get acquainted with them personally and so forth. So, when I got through calling the roll, one student, way in the back said, "And who are you?" (laughter) Well, that really exploded me, because here was a student who was taking a course and didn't even know who his instructor was. So since that time, I've always opened the class by telling them who I am. Well, I think that gives you some idea of the transition that has taken place.

Cochran: Yes, it's becoming in many many respects it's an impersonal thing from the beginning to the end, no real contact with the professor...

Rainey: That's right. Well, Austin College being small, and I was an activist. I guess. I was in everything that came along. I played all the athletics that were available in the college.

Cochran: You were quite a baseball player, weren't you?

Rainey: Oh, yes.

Cochran: Pitcher?

Rainey: Yes, that was one of my great sports. I achieved more in that than anything else. Actually, I pitched two seasons of professional baseball. I don't know whether I should mention that or not.

Cochran: Oh, yes, I had forgotten it. I was remembering part of it myself, but I had forgotten.

Rainey: Yes, that was an interesting part of my career.

Cochran: Was this after you were out of college?

Rainey: Well, I pitched one season between my junior and senior year, and then I pitched a season--part of a season after I had graduated, in 1919.

Cochran: What team was this?

Rainey: Well, the Houston team, the Texas League. There is an interesting incident connected with that. I went back to Austin College as a teacher in the preparatory department in the fall after I graduated; and next spring when baseball season came along, the Houston management sent me my contract to play the next season. Well, by that time, I had decided that I wanted to go on with teaching; and I didn't want to play professional baseball as a career. So I sent my contract back unsigned. Well, that meant that I went on what they called the "voluntary retired list," and that was my status

until I went back to the University of Texas as President. And when all the publicity about my coming was in the press, this baseball history of mine was mentioned.

Cochran: You mean for all these years they kept you on voluntary retirement.

Rainey: Yes, I was on the voluntary retired list for all these years. Well, some enterprising reporter down in Houston got to digging around in the records and found that this was the case--that I was still on the voluntary retired list. And so he cooked up an idea with the Houston management of bringing me down there to Houston some night of a game and giving me a formal release. Well, that had never been done. So this started a very interesting chain of circumstances. They came up to Austin, made a trip to Austin to see me to get my consent to participate in this.

What I had to do was to write the American Baseball Association and ask to be taken off the retired list. I had gone off voluntarily, so I had to make the request to be taken off. Well, I promised them I would do that, and they assured me that this would be done with dignity in line with my profession as President of the University and so forth. Well, I wrote to the association and got a letter right back saying that I would be removed from the voluntary retired list. Well, when that happened, then Houston had two alternatives. They either had to give me a contract to play, or they had to give me a release. Of course, they had planned to give me a release, but they had overlooked one very interesting point. Before they could release me, they had to ask waivers on my services of all

the other clubs in the league; (laugh) and that's where the fun started. All the clubs signed the release, except Shreveport, that was in the league at that time. And Shreveport said, "No, we'll take him on the waiver price." (laugh) And then the Houston's management's face began to get red.

Cochran: The management of Shreveport was just having fun with all this, weren't they?

Rainey: Oh, yes, and it was just fun. They were jabbing at Houston, of course.

Cochran: Sure.

Rainey: But the management of Shreveport made one of the cutest remarks that one could have thought of. It was just about that time that they sent the President of LSU to the penitentiary. Remember that Long machine down there in...in Louisiana...so he says, "Well, if he can't pitch baseball, we need a first class educator over here. (laugh) And we will farm him out at LSU."

Cochran: Oh, that's wonderful.

Rainey: Oh, it was a lot of fun. Well, finally, of course, they came through and signed their waiver release; then Houston had me down there one night. They put me in the box and let me pitch the first ball so that actually I appeared in the official line-up after about seventeen or eighteen years. Then the manager rushed out and took me out immediately, because it was an official pitch, and the next man might (chuckle) hit it over the fence.

Cochran: Did the batters cooperate with you?

Rainey: Well, I took care to throw it outside where he couldn't reach it. (laughter) Well, that was one of my interesting experiences in baseball.

Cochran: Delightful story.

Rainey: I love baseball. And I did all kinds of other activities. I was president of the YWCA one year and things of that sort.

Cochran: I bet not the YWCA...

Rainey: No, (laughter) not the YWCA.

Cochran: Well, then you went back and taught at Austin College for a year?

Rainey: I taught three years there.

Cochran: Oh...is that right?

Rainey: And at the end of my first year, Mrs. Rainey and I were married. And then we taught two more years. She taught in the public schools of Sherman. And in those three years, we saved up enough money to start us on our graduate work.

Cochran: Where did you meet Mrs. Rainey?

Rainey: Well, I met her in her home town. After about seventeen years out there in this little Eliasville community, we had about four years of drought out there, and things got to be pretty bad. And so my father had a sister living in Lovelady, Texas, down between Palestine and Houston. And so we moved down there, and we lived there, then, for about six or seven years. And this was Mrs. Rainey's hometown. I met her there, of course.

Cochran: In Lovelady?

Rainey: In Lovelady.

Cochran: Does that mean...My memory fails me on this. I, for some reason, always...I remembered she was from Alice. That's just incorrect, I guess.

Rainey: No, no, she never did live at Alice. She was from Lovelady. Then after two more years of teaching at Austin College, I say, we saved up enough money to start us on our graduate career at the University of Chicago. And I went there, then, for two calendar years--1922 through...the summer of 1924. I got my Master's Degree in 1923, and my Ph.D. at the end of the summer term of 1924. Had an interesting experience as a graduate student tutor there. I had some help from the University; I worked in the library and things of that sort. I also sang a lot in those days -- music was one of my interests -- and I had a fine opportunity with the old Chicago Opera Company there. It was in full swing in those days. They gave the University of Chicago about twenty usherships, and I was fortunate in getting one of them for the two years. So I heard every opera that was given for two whole years there and heard most of the great singers of that period. And that in itself was a wonderful experience for me.

So I tell my students sometimes here, that about my interest in music and so forth, and I tell them that they might be interested to know that I had two years with the Chicago Opera Company. They look impressed, and (chuckle) then I tell them that I was an usher. (laughter) Then at the end of my first year there, I was invited to teach in the summer term, which flattered me, of course, at the

University of Chicago; and then that summer, the General Education Board of the Rockefeller Foundation granted me a scholarship for the next year to help. They had a fund that they used for helping southern students doing graduate work at that time. I was fortunate enough to get one of them. It paid all of our expenses for the last year.

Cochran: Oh, marvelous.

Rainey: So we got through with my graduate work without going into debt at all, and that was one of the most fortunate things that ever happened to me.

Cochran: Now, you were majoring in education...

Rainey: Majoring in educational administration...yes.

Cochran: Who were some of the professors that you recall?

Rainey: Well, the outstanding professor at the University of Chicago, at that time, was Dr. Charles Hubbard Judd, who was Chairman of the Department of Education. He was one of the outstanding leaders in American Education during that period. And Dr. Bobbitt and men of that caliber were all leaders in their fields at that time. William S. Gray, who was one of the great leaders in reading...the field of reading...Then immediately after that, I was offered a position at the University of Oregon.

Cochran: That would've been a long way away.

Rainey: A long (chuckle) way away. So I went out there. Actually, my mother thought that we had gone to a foreign country when we went out to Oregon. (chuckle)

Rainey: And there again, I had a very happy experience for two or three

years there on the faculty. It was a very wonderful environment -- Eugene's one of the most desirable places to live that we've ever lived in. We fell in love with Oregon. And at the end of three years there very suddenly one morning, I got a call to come to the President's Office. And I'd never had an experience like that before, and I didn't know what that meant, and I was a little nervous.

Cochran: This was your first full-time teaching job, after you got your degree.

Rainey: Full-time teaching job after I got my degree, yes. After a greeting in his office, he said to me, "Mr. Rainey," he said, "I'm a graduate of Franklin College in Indiana. My college is looking for a President now, and would you permit me to suggest your name to them?" This came just like a bolt out of the blue. I'd never thought about being a college president and it had never occurred to me. I'd settled down to having a proper sort of career. I was doing quite a bit of research and writing at that time. Well, of course, I told him that would be all right. Within a month's time, I had been elected President of Franklin College in Indiana, at the tender age of thirty-one.

Cochran: That was quite a challenge then.

Rainey: Well, it surely was. I got a lot of publicity at that time, about being, perhaps, the youngest college president in the United States. I often said, "Well, if that was a fault, it was one that time would soon correct." (chuckle)

Cochran: Yeah. Now you made...didn't you suggest...mention yesterday that one of your life-long friends taught at Oregon who is now here at Colorado?

Rainey: Oh, yes. I ran into Dr. Harl R. Douglass who was on the staff there, at that time -- Professor of Secondary Education, and head of the Practice School there connected with the University of Oregon -- and we had offices next door to each other for these three years. And we became good friends with his family, and that friendship has lasted all these years. We've had many associations in the past. Of course, he was largely responsible, I'm sure, for my being out here because he was dean of the school here. I taught three different summers here before I came on the full faculty.

Cochran: Would you want to tell the anecdote now that you were telling me last night about your bridge club? Or hold that off for later. (chuckle)

Rainey: Yes, this is an interesting anecdote, I think. Mr. and Mrs. Douglass and two other families and we formed a little bridge club there, and we played once a month. We moved around from home to home, and the ladies prepared the dinner. We didn't have enough money to go out and buy our dinner in those days. And while the women were getting the dinner, we men usually talked around in the parlors.

Cochran: What would your salary be then? Do you have any idea? I think there's historical interest, if you remember...

Rainey: Yes, I...my first salary there, an associate professorship, was thirty-two hundred and fifty dollars a year. Three thousand and two hundred and fifty dollars -- I've thought about that many times. Well, Mr. Douglass tells this anecdote; I had forgotten it. He says that one evening while the women were preparing the dinner, we men were just sitting around talking, and somebody proposed a kind

of toast. If you could have any job in American education that you'd like -- we were all young men, of course -- which one would you rather have? And when it came my turn, he says, I had forgotten it, as I say, he said I said that I'd rather be President of the University of Texas than any other institution I could think of in the nation. And, of course, they wanted to know why, and I explained to them that I thought the University of Texas had, perhaps, the biggest potential of any University I could think of, down in that great Southwest territory and so forth and all that land endowment and things of that sort. So it never did occur to me, of course, that I'd ever be even a college president, much less President of the University of Texas.

Cochran: That was quite a prescient remark, wasn't it?

Rainey: Well, it was, and I've thought about it many times since he reminded me of it. Of course, it wasn't even a dream on my part.

Cochran: 'Cause you'd really just settled down to being a college professor.

Rainey: College professor...that's right. And so I was thrown into this presidency at Franklin College with no experience.

Cochran: Now, your field was educational administration.

Rainey: Administration...I did know, theoretically, the principles of administration.

Cochran: You got these problems suddenly in practice.

Rainey: (chuckle) That's right. You've really started me on a line of thought, and that was this. I raised two questions with myself. One was, "What is the real meaning of a liberal education?" I'd gone through a so-called liberal arts college, but I'd just taken

it for granted. I'd never really thought about it much. But when I found myself with one on my hands to administer, I raised these two questions: "What," first, "What is the meaning of a liberal education in a democracy?" Now that's very important, and second, "What's the role, then, of a liberal arts college in our society?" It was around those two questions that a great deal of my thinking revolved for a long time -- not only there at Franklin, but later. I went back and studied it, historically -- what the Greeks said about it, and what the Romans said about it, the medieval period and the renaissance and on down -- so that I came out, I thought, with a pretty good concept of the historical development of...it.

Cochran: Would you summarize it now, or would you like to do that later?

Rainey: Oh, I'd be glad to summarize it.

Cochran: Now, this was just before and after you got to Franklin.

Rainey: After I got to Franklin. With one on my hands to administer, I began to try to see what was the role and function of this college-- what ought we to be doing?

Cochran: And what did you envisage at the time, then, that it should be?

Rainey: Well, as a result of all this investigation and reading, I found that the key to the whole thing was that the very term "liberal education" goes back to that ancient Greek setting in the golden age of Greece, when Greece was divided into two classes of society mostly. There was the upper class made up of about twenty-five percent of the population. And they were known as the "Liberalis." They were the free men in that society, and the rest were serfs

and laborers and so forth. Well, now this term "liberal education" was the term that was applied to the education of those free men, as contrasted with the type of education that was given to the slaves and workers. These free men were in charge of that society. They were in control of it; the others didn't vote, they didn't participate in it at all. But these free men had the whole responsibility for that society. So, it was a dynamic type of education. That was the thing that I found about it that meant a lot to me later on. Take Plato, for example, in his Republic, he raises such questions as these: What's the best way to organize the state -- to govern the state? What's the best way to defend the state? What's the best way to educate the people of the state? What's the best way to protect the health of the state? Well, those are contemporary problems with us still, you see.

Cochran: To Plato, the idea of all these questions was to maintain the free state for the free man?

Rainey: That's right, for the free man. And so that became a great inspiration to me. And then, as I say, I put the phrase "in a democracy" into it, because that's very important. Because in our society, we say there ought to be no slaves. Every man is to be a free man; every man is called upon periodically to cast his vote for the organization and control and direction of society. So that it seems to me, that in a democracy, if you're going to have every person a citizen, he must be brought up to the level in his education where he can participate intelligently in the society.

Cochran: If this is going to work, it...demands intelligent free men?

Rainey: Exactly. And furthermore, after we formed our government in this country in the late eighteenth century, when we declared this principle of freedom, and every man was a free man and so forth with inalienable rights, then it dawned upon our leaders that this thing wouldn't work at all unless every man...got an education. So you began to find men like Washington and Jefferson and Madison and Adams and Franklin and all that group stressing the absolute necessity of an educational system comparable with this political system that we had created. And that idea increased and spread so that beginning along about 1820, after our second war with Great Britain, this idea of a universal education began to grow and grow and grow. And finally, it dawned upon the people that after all, you couldn't depend upon individual families to educate their children; it was too big a job. You couldn't depend upon the churches to do it because it was too big for them. They had carried a great part of the load during the colonial period. So the conclusion finally was reached that this was a job for the whole society -- to provide this education for all the people. Well, you can see how that inspired me. Horace Mann, of course, picked that idea up, and he universalized it there in Massachusetts and became what we call the "father of the public school system" of this country.

Cochran: How early was it? I don't recall, except from my own meager knowledge, one...so much out of every sixteen or something like that, for the...

Rainey: Yes. That started in the famous land grants in 1785, 1787. Congress set aside all this vast western territory, and they provided in that that one section of every township should be set aside to support public education. And that was one of the greatest moves that our government has ever made, to provide a foundation for universal, free, public education.

Cochran: Now I knew it was fairly early, but I didn't remember it was quite that early.

Rainey: 1787, that was when it was finally crystallized. Now this land grant program has been a very fascinating one. Every state that came into the Union had to set aside this land for public education. Some of the states actually set aside as many as two, three, and four sections of these public lands for the public schools. Texas has been particularly blessed with this. They have a tremendous endowment down there for public education.

Cochran: You mean the University of Texas?

Rainey: No, the public schools and the University. Of course, when Texas was still a nation of its own, they set aside a million acres of land for the development of the University there in the state. It's an interesting story. This land was mostly over in the eastern part of the state. And as the settlers came in there, you know, they settled on this land before they surveyed it. And when they got around to surveying it for the University, they found it was practically all taken up in that fine farming valley, through the river valley, through eastern central Texas. So they were in a quandary about what to do about it...Finally, it was suggested

that, why don't we just surrender this land and go on out into western Texas where it's unsettled and give to the University this land in the western part of the state?

Cochran: It was a fortuitous...

Rainey: Well, there's another interesting factor in it. When they decided to do that, they thought because this West Texas land was so unproductive, relatively, that they doubled the ante, giving the University two million acres of land out there. (chuckle) And, of course, it was in the 1920's that they discovered oil on this land, and the rest of the story, I think, is well known to everybody. Texas now has the second or third largest endowment of any college or university in the nation, and it's getting bigger all the time. It's an amazing thing that has happened. Well, that land grant was one of the great factors in the development of public education. Texas has been very fortunate; it and Minnesota, I think, have preserved their endowment better than any other two states in the nation. Many states have squandered it and that sort of thing. Texas and Minnesota have preserved theirs almost entirely.

Cochran: Well, what happened to this idea of the liberal education as in the time of the Greeks? Did it get abandoned?

Rainey: Well, that's a very interesting question. Yes, it did. It prevailed pretty much during the Greek period and the Roman period. Rome, in her height and prestige, held pretty much to this same idea. And Rome made a great contribution to it in law and government, as we know. Well, then when Rome fell, in the fifth century

or somewhere along there, the idea really went into decline. The church took over after the fall of Rome, and for this emphasis upon contemporary life here, the church substituted an other world concept. So we went into a long period known as the Dark Ages and so forth; for a thousand years, almost, this idea was lost...and the emphasis, as I say, upon the future life, the other world. Then another great thing happened in Western Europe. That is the so-called revival of learning or the Renaissance; it started around the twelfth century. It started in a rather remarkable way through the re-discovery of some of those great Latin and Greek classics -- they'd been lost for a thousand years or more -- and when the scholars got to digging around and found these great classics, they just brought new life to Western Europe, because they found this emphasis on the contemporary works.

Cochran: Was this St. Thomas and that group?

Rainey: Yes, and Petrarch, and a lot of the other leaders of that early Renaissance period. And so it just brought new life to Western Europe. This concept again of life here, solving the problems here, and then the Renaissance, of course, spread all over Europe and the Western world. It brought revival of education, and universities began to spring up...

Cochran: The contact with the East about this time probably reinforced the...

Rainey: Yes, it did...So out of the Renaissance and then followed by the Reformation pretty soon after that, which also called for a new emphasis upon education. Martin Luther argued that if a man was to be his own priest, he had to be able to read the scriptures and interpret them for himself. So that meant that you had to have a

lot of emphasis upon education, and so he virtually started a program of universal elementary education...

Cochran: Guttenberg helped a bit in here, too...

Rainey: Oh, yes. The printing press came along at that time. And so by the sixteenth, seventeenth century, this idea of education for this life solving the problems of contemporary life, was a pretty well-founded one. And that was where I got my great inspiration for the meaning of a liberal education, one man expressed it this way: to enable each of us to deal masterfully with the factors of our environment. In other words, to control our environment rather than be controlled by it. And that's, I think, the most dynamic factor that's hit the world in several centuries.

Cochran: Now certainly to express it in one sentence certainly does separate the Middle Ages from the modern era.

Rainey: That's right. And so I pursued that idea from Franklin, I went on to Bucknell as president, and then, of course, when I got to the University of Texas, I had my great opportunity there to try to relate the University to the life of the state and to make it powerful...a powerful factor in the history of the state. In other words, relating the University to the problems of the state, solving the problems of the state -- that's what the University ought to be doing, it seems to me. That's why the people created it -- to do something for them that they couldn't do for themselves.

Cochran: There, if you would like, are a couple of ideas that I'd like to have you explore -- where you learned them or how you came by them -- you aren't born with these things. One was, what were the basic

ideas of administration? What were the theories that you had learned, that you wanted to put into practice, so far as administration is concerned. And secondly, we'll explore later, perhaps, where did you pick up the importance of the idea of academic freedom and tenure? That's been deemed tremendously important.

Rainey: Yes, that's right. Well, that grew, of course, from a number of sources. Over the years, we have developed here in this country, I think, a pretty generally accepted theory of administration. The control of education in a democracy is an interesting study. These institutions are supported by the public -- by tax funds, public funds -- and therefore, we think the public ought to have control over them. But how shall they exercise that control is still an unsolved problem with us. We tried two things. One we've tried the army theory of having a hierarchy of administrators with a chain of command, you know, as the army does. That's been one set of ideas. The other has been the corporate principle -- corporation, the business corporation as we developed in this country. The business corporation has been a dominant factor. There you have the idea of an over-all administrative board -- professionals and so forth -- to administer the corporation; and you have a great mass of people who are stockholders and so forth, that have really very little to do with the actual administration. So from those two sources, we've got our principles of school and college and university administration, I think pretty much. It finally boiled down to this -- that you have an over-all board that really is a policy-forming board, and that the details should

be left largely then, to your professional administrative officers.

Cochran: Doesn't a university differ in one major respect from a business corporation? At least from my point of view as a faculty member, that that policy-making board, at least in broad outline, ought to be to a large extent the reflection of the faculty, and you're not going to find that in a corporation. Now, how would you react to that idea?

Rainey: Well, you're exactly right. A university is a unique institution. It existed before any government--modern government--existed. It has seven or eight hundred years of its own tradition. And it's been independent of government from the very beginning. Way back in the beginning stages, these institutions were autonomous.

Cochran: Independent?

Rainey: Totally independent of the church and the state or society, in general. But during all that time, they built up their own traditions of control, and it was largely faculty control. The faculties made all the policies and so forth. And here we come to one of the greatest difficulties in the university administration: tension between faculty, who are professional people, and these over-all policy-making boards. The faculty think they ought to run the institution.

Cochran: Yes. (chuckle) I think that's the best idea.

Rainey: You might be interested to know, the University of Texas is also almost unique in this respect, because when the University of Texas was founded as I later discovered the history, the first faculty

of the University of Texas all (I think there were about twelve of them) all of them came from the University of Virginia and the University of North Carolina. They were in the great Jeffersonian tradition. Jefferson had founded the University of Virginia, you know. That was one of the great things that he took credit for.

Cochran: One of the (chuckle) thousands of things that he took credit for...

Rainey: That's right. He founded the University of Virginia. Well, he founded it on the principle that he stated himself -- "We dedicate this institution to the illimitable freedom of the human mind." Well, that's where this academic freedom really comes from. You're not to put any restrictions on the human mind, and that's really the best statement of academic freedom I've ever come across. So this tradition was brought to Texas in the founding days of Texas. You might be interested to know that, for the first twenty years or so, the University of Texas didn't have a president.

Cochran: I didn't know that.

Rainey: It just had Chairman of the Faculty. And it was about 1895, or 1896, I think, before they had a president. So the faculty was in control. I've often said that the University of Texas has had greater faculty control than almost any institution I know anything about.

Cochran: They started off with this as a tradition?

Rainey: They started, and believe me, the faculty tried to stand for that tradition ever since. They're very jealous of any interference of any sort.

Cochran: Well, rightly so.

Rainey: Well, that's the real basis, I think, of academic freedom--that you set up an institution here devoted to the discovery and propagation of truth. And to do that, you've got to have freedom. If you limit the man's research, why, you're limiting the discovery of knowledge; if you limit him in his teaching, you're limiting the spread of truth and knowledge and information. So the two things are just inseparable, seems to me. In other words, one implies the other.

Cochran: You mean sound administration and academic freedom and tenure...

Rainey: Yes.

Cochran: Would you like to stop for a minute or take a break? Any time you want to, just raise your hand.

Rainey: Well, we're still going all right.

Cochran: Fine.

Rainey: My voice may get a little tired as we go along. The tenure principle is an interesting one. As that has been worked out over the years, as you well know, I'm sure. It was organized really to protect this principle of academic freedom, so that a man wouldn't be subject to the whims and caprices of a given board or a given administration, and so forth, so that he could feel secure in his job and go ahead and do his work and know that his job was not in jeopardy. And as it has worked out, it means about this at the present time: that we have four ranks, as you know, in our administration--professors, associate professors, assistant professors, and instructors. Well, the tenure principle has applied to those who reach the level of associate professorship. By the time anyone gets up here, he's demonstrated his capacity as a scholar and as a

teacher. And then it's almost automatic now at most of our universities, when a man achieves associate professorship rank, that tenure goes with it. That means that he's employed--not re-employed year after year, but he has what we call permanent tenure. He can be removed from his position only when charges have been filed against him, and he's had a chance to be heard on those charges. He can even have counsel if he wants. And so they have to prove the case against him.

Cochran: It's just a one word, in my mind, it's just a one word substitute for due process.

Rainey: That's what it is.

Cochran: It doesn't mean permanent employment. It just simply means that once you reach that status, then they have to go through the due process--rather involved process.

Rainey: That's right. And many people have said to me, "Well, does it mean you can't ever fire a man?" It doesn't mean that at all. For immorality, or for incompetence, or various things, charges can be made against him. You go through the due process of giving him a hearing, facing his accusers and all that sort of thing is what's involved.

Cochran: And it's a very important distinction, I think, that we in the academic community need to make to the public. And I'm sure there's a great deal of confusion on that point.

Rainey: Oh, yes. The public hasn't understood it--don't understand it even today. Many people don't understand the principle of academic freedom and tenure. There's another interesting thing, and I've thought

about it many times, about academic freedom. Many people think it's just something that the professors have devised for their own protection. In fact, some of the Regents there at the University of Texas in our fight referred to it as "the teacher labor union" and so forth...the labor union idea. But it means far more than that.

Cochran: Oh, yes.

Rainey: Much more. For an example, I think the citizens themselves have much at stake in this...in this freedom of research and teaching. For example, a citizen has to be intelligent, as we said earlier, to vote, participate intelligently. Well, he can't do all the things that are necessary as an individual. So I think he's created these universities and conferred upon them some of his sovereignty. He's a free man; he has freedom of speech and this, that, and the other. So he creates these universities and confers upon them some of his rights and sovereignty as a citizen, so that can do things for him that he wants done that he can't do for himself.

Cochran: Very interesting idea. I never thought...

Rainey: So that I think the citizen has a great interest at stake here.

Cochran: Oh, I think society has a great interest at stake.

Rainey: Well, I'm sure they do. But as I say, it's far more than just protection for some professors that want an easy life or something of that sort...it means far more.

Cochran: It's integral really, to the university.

Rainey: And it's the same thing for students. Students have a great interest here, at stake in this thing. Students come in, for example, and they want a good education; they want to know, and they want to read

anything that's available. So they ought to be free to study, free to read what they want--freedom in the classroom; and they ought to be free to raise any question with the teacher that they want to raise.

Cochran: How much influence should the students have over the policy-making and functioning of the university? There's a great deal of interest on that point today.

Rainey: Oh, indeed. That's one of the great real issues in our education today. The students want more and more freedom, first of all, for themselves; then they want actually to have more to do with the policy making of the institution. And I think they're going to get more--they are getting more, as we go along. For example, here at this university now, we're experimenting with what we call joint boards, on which faculty and students sit together to control things that are of interest to the students.

Cochran: What would be an example or two of that kind of a board?

Rainey: Well, for example on our newspaper--we have a very fine University newspaper here published five days a week, I believe--we have a joint board for the control of the student publications--faculty and students on that board.

Cochran: This was true of the Daily Texan, wasn't it? Wasn't that a joint board or was that just exclusively students?

Rainey: Yes...it was a joint board. So I think that is a sound principle--faculty-student participation on a joint board. It's working very well here.

Cochran: Do the students have any influence on hiring, promoting, and the

firing of professors?

Rainey: No, it is not direct. They have a lot of indirect influence, of course. We have a very interesting system here, at the University of Colorado, where at the end of each course--that's particularly true here in the School of Education--at the end of each course, we give students what we call a green sheet, and they evaluate the course, the professor, and so forth. And it's anonymous on their part so that they are free to express their real feeling about it. And that has a remarkable influence, I think, on quality of teaching and so forth.

Cochran: Now to whom does this go? Just to the professor or...

Rainey: Well, it goes first to the Dean. The professor doesn't see it until after he turns in his grades; it goes to the Dean. And after the Dean has seen it, then he sends them all to the professors so that the professors get to see them. I have a great stack of them here accumulated over the years, and they've been very helpful to me. I can get good ideas of where my weaknesses may be and the weakness of the course itself and things of that sort.

Cochran: Do you think this is also of value to the Dean when it comes to promotion and...

Rainey: Very valuable. In fact, the Dean comes around every spring and sits down with each of us individually and goes over those things with us. It's a part of the whole process of promotion in rank and salary, and it's worked very well with us here.

Cochran: Do some of the faculty resent them?

Rainey: Oh, a few have. I've heard a few statements of resentment, but it's

been quite generally accepted.

Cochran: Is this something relatively new, or have you done it here for a long time?

Rainey: Well, it's been going on here now for--in this department--for about ten years--long enough that we've had satisfactory experience and able to evaluate. The students, too, here, several times have made their own evaluations, just on their own--taken polls about courses and asked students to report on courses and so forth. I made a study two years ago for the administration on this whole matter of teaching. We had heard so much about this emphasis upon research and publication, and we were afraid teaching was being downgraded. So we made a study here that proved to be very interesting. We asked all the graduating seniors of that year--some eighteen hundred of them--to list in one, two, three order, the finest teachers they had had in the University in their four years here. We thought that would be a good criterion. And they were graduating; they were free to express their opinions. And we got some very interesting results from that. One was, out of about seven or eight hundred members of the faculty, some four hundred and seventy-five faculty members were mentioned at least once in that category, which gave the University authorities a feeling that a lot of fine teaching was going on around here. Then we were able to break it down also in to certain categories. There were about ten members of the faculty that just stood out above everybody else.

Cochran: Did they represent any particular school or...?

Rainey: No, scattered quite well through the university. Then there was a

second classification of about twenty-five in the second group that was quite a distinct group, so that it gave the university, I think, a pretty good indication of, first of all, the amount of good teaching that was going on, second, where it was taking place. So I'm sure that it's been some help to the administration in dealing with the faculty members.

Cochran: Were these ten that were selected as or seen as outstanding in the classroom, would they have been likely to have been chosen by, say, the president and his vice presidents and deans. Had they make up a list, do you think it would have been the same list?

Rainey: Well, I've thought a lot about that, and I think in the main, I'd say yes to that. I think we all know who the good teachers are. As an administrator over the years, I...although we've never been able to go into a teacher's classroom and so forth, I think we know who they are...who the good teachers are.

Cochran: Well, this is always a supposition that the really outstanding teachers on the campus are, after all, well known by the students and teachers and faculty and deans alike. And that's interesting that this group did turn out to be substantially the same.

Rainey: That's right...It was essentially the same group. I've often thought as an administrator about the matter of good teaching. I've also said a few times that if an administrator can have twenty-five percent of his faculty who are good teachers, he is lucky.

Cochran: Oh, yeah. I think very lucky. (laughter)

Rainey: Yes, that's right. (chuckle)

Cochran: I mean really outstanding gifted teachers...

Rainey: So I often boiled my duties down as an administrator to two problems: first, to get the best faculty I could get with the money that I had available to me. And second then, to set the conditions of their employment--to make it as favorable as I could for them to do their best work. That means to control the environment in which they work and their academic freedom is one of them. So I long said that an administrator just had two jobs--to get the best faculty he can, and then second, to set the conditions of their work so that they can do it under the most happy circumstances.

Cochran: Those are two big orders.

Rainey: That's a sum and total it seems to me, of college...university administration. A lot's involved in that, of course.

Cochran: Was this basically what you had in mind when you went to Franklin, or was this something that emerged over the years?

Rainey: Well, this emerged really, out of my experience. The selection of faculty is so important, in the first instance.

Cochran: In a large university, how important a role should the president play in that...a large university of several hundred faculty?

Rainey: Well, naturally, in a large university the recommendations have got to start down in the departments. You've got to depend upon the chairmen and the leadership in the departments to interview men, know where they are, and do the preliminary investigation. But the president has the final shot at them before he recommends them to the board for appointment; and he certainly, before he recommends them, ought to be completely satisfied of their qualities and qualifications. One principle that's emerged with me over the years is

never to employ anybody you don't see. I've always had a policy of having them come to the campus, spend several days on the campus, give the whole department and other faculty members an opportunity to see them.

Cochran: Oh, that's an admirable idea. It makes it certainly difficult sometimes when the state won't provide funds to bring them in.

Rainey: That's right. Well here in our department, for example, we employ three or four new faculty a year. They always come here and spend several days on the campus; they come around, and we all get acquainted with them and then the dean, after they've gone, asks us for our evaluation. So it's kind of a community process, in a way.

Cochran: Which finally...it does end up on the president's desk?

Rainey: Oh, yes. He has to make the final recommendation.

Cochran: How did your theories work when you got to Franklin?

Rainey: Well, most of my theories were evolved from my beginning at Franklin. (chuckle) I had an experience the very first year I was there, and I didn't get there until about the first of August, and school was opened in September. And I had one vacancy to fill, and it was in the music department; and I took a man completely on recommendations without being able to see him. He had wonderful recommendations and so forth, but he turned out to be a complete flop!

Cochran: Somebody trying to get rid of him somewhere? (laughter)

Rainey: So at the end of that year I just couldn't re-employ him. And so from that time on, since I had gotten so badly stung on that, I made an invariable rule that I'd never employ another faculty member without seeing him. So it grew out of a rather bitter experi-

ence--that principle.

Cochran: How long were you at Franklin?

Rainey: I was there four years, from 1927-1931.

Cochran: That was a denominational school?

Rainey: Yes, it's a Baptist college of Indiana, and I went there in the fall of 1927, and stayed through '31, when I was elected president of Bucknell University in Pennsylvania. Bucknell is a similar type of institution in a way. It was organized by the Baptists of Pennsylvania, New Jersey, and Delaware in the early days. But it's gone through an evolution of becoming independent of church control, so it's more or less an independently endowed institution. These were the Depression years. I piloted Bucknell through the Depression, and I learned a lot (chuckle) about management and financing and so forth during that Depression.

Cochran: Did you have the responsibility there for raising money more than you would...

Rainey: Yes. That was our problem, naturally, during the Depression, when institutions were having an awful time meeting budgets and so forth.

Cochran: Did either Franklin or Bucknell have a stronger tradition of faculty participation than Texas did, say?

Rainey: No. Not anything like it. As I said earlier, Texas has about the strongest tradition of faculty control that I know anything about, in American higher education. I learned a lot about college finance at Bucknell due to the stringent circumstances under which we had to work. For example, Bucknell got about ninety-two percent of its income directly from students--not from endowment. It had relatively

a small endowment. And the endowed universities during that depression were the ones that were hardest hit because endowment income was the first to go down, and it went down further than any other type of income. For example, I was talking with President Hutchins of the University of Chicago about this. They had a big endowment. Well, he said, for example, they had about eighty thousand shares of Standard Oil of Indiana that Mr. Rockefeller had given in the original endowment. When this depression hit, they were paying two dollars and a half a share dividend. Well, they cut it down to one dollar a share at one time. That meant a dollar and a half cut off; that was a hundred and twenty thousand dollars just lost off of their income all at once. I got another insight into it at Princeton, one year there--I think it was 1933--Princeton turned off about two hundred and fifty faculty members and reduced salaries forty-five percent...

Cochran: My gosh...

Rainey: ...at one time. So the universities were just simply in a terrible situation during that time. Well, we were fortunate at Bucknell in that student enrollment didn't go down as fast as endowment went. We lost only two or three hundred students at Bucknell at the time, and they didn't go down as far. So we got through that depression better than any school in the East. And we had less endowment. So, as I say, I learned a lot about that. And even some of the big foundations like the Rockefeller Foundation, as a result of that experience during the Depression, make a restudy of their endowment policies and actually revised their policies of giving endowments

to colleges and universities. For example, they had given endowments to hundreds of colleges and universities in the country on a perpetual basis that they would keep it, and they had to match it, often times, to get a certain amount of endowment. Well, as a result of this restudy, they went back and released every one of those institutions from that commitment...from the permanency of it. They said, "Now you can use this money any way you want to." So we went through an evolution there in our thinking about college and university financing. And, of course, we're still going through a lot of it now. These colleges are having an awful time. But at Bucknell, we were so happy about our situation. We didn't turn off a single faculty member, and we took only a ten percent cut straight across the board. Everybody shared. We adopted as a policy that we would keep everybody we've got; we will all take this thing together. And we took only a ten percent cut.

Cochran: That's marvelous.

Rainey: It was a remarkable situation, really. I learned something about that later when I was president at Stephens College in Missouri. They, too, had no endowment--practically none--and they got <u>all</u> their income from students. And the result was, their financial situation was much better, again, than those that had big endowments. So, I think we've come pretty much to the idea that money given to universities ought to be given with as few strings attached to it as possible. Leave the universities and colleges free to use their intelligence in meeting their problems as they arise.

Cochran: Would that be true of the state legislature, too?

Rainey: I think so, yes. I've been concerned a great deal in recent years about this whole matter of increasing tuition for state universities. I think we've almost gotten to the place where we've given up this idea of free higher education that we started out with, that it would be free all the way through the university. Here again, the University of Texas has been very fortunate. There's a clause in the constitution of Texas that says they can't charge any tuition at the University of Texas. Believe me, the students have ridden herd on that (chuckle), as we say, and made sure that that didn't happen. So I've often thought that education at the University of Texas is the finest and cheapest education that you can find any place in the world. They charge only entrance fees down there.

Cochran: And they're remarkably low.

Rainey: They're very low...and no tuition. We have a pretty high tuition here now. It's nearly four hundred dollars for in-state students, and it's about twelve hundred dollars now for out-of-state students.

Cochran: Is that for a year?

Rainey: For a year, yes. But you see, that's not free education.

Cochran: No, it surely isn't.

Rainey: It's limiting the number of people that can go to these educational institutions simply for lack of money. Of course we're trying to make up for it with a lot of scholarships and things of that sort--with federal aid and all of that. But it's still leaving a lot of high school graduates that can't go on to college.

Cochran: Well...it's...Texas, still as a whole, has a strong tradition of

very low entrance fees or tuition fees or whatever you want to call them. They're remarkably low--fifty dollars a semester where I teach. That's not free but fifty dollars a semester is still...I don't think that would ever...I don't think that alone would ever keep anybody from going to college.

Rainey: No, if they really wanted, they can find that much money someplace--with the loan policies. The University of Texas, for example, had a big loan fund that was given by the Hogg family. And I think at the time I was there it would have amounted to about a hundred and twenty-five thousand dollars. And it was never used up.

Cochran: Was it the cost of books and food and lodging and things like that are significant in themselves? A fifty dollar entrance fee is not going to keep somebody out. A student can raise the three or four hundred dollars a semester it's going to take to, minimum, to eat and buy books, well he can get fifty dollars more. But if he has to raise three or four hundred for food and lodging <u>plus</u> three or four hundred for tuition, then it just becomes...

Rainey: Then we have another fine tradition from which I benefited, and that is the tradition of working one's way through. Just hundreds and thousands of students work part-time or full-time, and so forth. I, for example, waited on tables in the dining room the four years I was in college, for my room and board. Well, just think what that means. And our tuition at that time, I think, was about ninety-six dollars or something, so it was really cheap education in those days. And the tradition of working one's way through has been so generally accepted. Students have been fa-

vored; they give them jobs.

Cochran: How did you get along with your faculty (one) and your regents or trustees or whatever they were called (two)? With these two antagonistic bodies, how did you get along with them at Franklin and Bucknell?

Rainey: Well, splendidly. We really didn't have any trouble at all. There's been a tradition in those institutions for rather large boards. And the larger the board, the less likely they are to take direct administration. So they leave it more to the administration and the faculty. I had wonderful relations with both boards of Franklin and Bucknell. As a matter of fact, when I left Bucknell to take this job in Washington as Director of the American Youth Commission, they elected me a member of their board (chuckle) of trustees at Bucknell.

Cochran: Well, this has pushed something into my memory. Was it Mr. Woodward, I believe, who...

Rainey: Yes.

Cochran: ...later...after you got fired, later said that you had bad...

Rainey: Trouble at Bucknell? Well, I didn't. There wasn't any trouble at all at Bucknell. Of course, we had little differences of opinion here and there. But he got a hold of the one man in that old judge that had some questions about my policies and so forth. He blew that up and out of all proportion. The fact that I was elected (chuckle) a member of the board refutes that idea.

Cochran: Wasn't that judge later sent to prison for...

Rainey: Yes, he was...he was and demoted...his judgeship taken away from

him. Mr. Woodward went clear off the deep end on that.

Cochran: Well, I think it's tremendously important, what you're just saying (when we get back with the tape recorder, now) that you did go through this experience...later Texas--although we've jumped ahead now, on our chronology--but not to carry away any bitterness or hatred out of it; that you're able to continue with your...what you refer to as a policy of faith and religion, and carry forward your daily as well as your political and educational life.

Rainey: Yes, I think out of all these experiences we've been talking about, two great ideas have emerged--one in the field of religion and the other in the field of education--and they're both really the same principle that is policy. I had a policy of Christianity and a policy of education. I had to decide early at Franklin College, for example, what really mattered in religion and what didn't. Because I found there when I went there really a very cynical bunch of students.

Cochran: Now this was in the late twenties.

Rainey: This was in the late, so-called "roaring twenties," you may remember. Franklin College, was a traditionally church-related, denominational college, belonging to the Baptists of Indiana. Well, they had had a problem there over the years of this matter of student dancing, for example. And they tried to hold on to the tradition of "no dancing" and the prohibitions against it. Well, over a period of years the students had jockeyed the administration into this sort of a situation. "All right, we don't dance <u>on the campus</u> (number one). We don't dance (two) when the college is in session."

Well, that had some very interesting results.

Cochran: They still were going to dance somewhere.

Rainey: They still were going to dance. In fact, they were dancing all over the place. They didn't dance on the campus but they were only twenty miles from Indianapolis where they had good hotels and good bands and automobiles and good roads. So there was no problem about dancing on the campus. They had plenty of opportunity to dance off the campus, and they were using it. The second principle, "We don't dance when the college is in session," had some interesting implications. For example, the administration had declared college open, we'll say, on Wednesday morning. Well, they registered on Monday and Tuesday. Well, the college wasn't officially in session so the fraternities and sororities would come in there for registration on Monday and Tuesday, and then they'd have their big dances on Monday and Tuesday nights.

Cochran: Did they go to Indianapolis for this or...

Rainey: Go to Indianapolis or some other near-by place or even there in Franklin...in their local community they'd have their dances. It wasn't on the college campus; the college wasn't in session. Well, then come along Thanksgiving. And I, as president of the college, had to declare the college officially closed at five o'clock on Wednesday afternoon before Thanksgiving so that they could have their big dance, their Thanksgiving dance, (chuckle) on Wednesday night.

Cochran: They couldn't have had any in between then?

Rainey: No. No dancing in between, unless there was a holiday of some

sort. If there was a holiday, then they could have a dance. Well, that seemed so far-out to me; it was so hypocritical that the administration was in that embarrassing position. And it just occurred to me...seemed to me that there's no use talking to those students about moral and spiritual values and ideals when the college was in that kind of an embarrassing situation. So I could stand that just one semester. At the beginning of the second semester, I sponsored a dance in the college gymnasium while the college was in session. I took that (chuckle) rather daring method to challenge this hypocritical situation.

Cochran: Wasn't that quite a step for a thirty-one year old...

Rainey: Well, I was young and inexperienced (laughter) at that time. But the thing about it...there were several interesting things about it. One is naturally there was quite a protest from certain quarters, and some of my board even questioned it, but they backed me on it. And a group of Baptists from the southern part of the state actually sent a delegation up to see me and protest this policy that I had taken. I was careful to explain to them the situation, and that I was just as much interested in religion and spiritual values as they were, but that I couldn't see the college contributing anything at all to the development of their spiritual life and moral life when it was in this embarrassing position, and I had to clear away a lot of that before I could get back to something positive and something meaningful. Well, they went along with me. They finally said, "Okay, we'll..." I pled with them to give me a chance to work it out, and they finally said, "We'll do it." And

they said, "We'll go back and tell our constituency what the situation is, and we'll give you a chance to work it out." So that proved to be very effective, and it started me then on a study of my own which has lasted even down to the present time. What are the real essentials of Christianity? What's a positive approach to Christianity? In fact, I worked out a commencement address that I gave before I left Franklin under that title, "Positive Christianity." And I was doing it, first of all, for myself. I felt that if I was going to furnish any religious or spiritual leadership to that student body, I had to know myself what was important and what wasn't. So, as I said a moment ago, has carried on through over the years with me to get back to a positive religion or a positive Christianity. And I think we need that...

Cochran: An integral part of education.

Rainey: Yes, and its relation to education. So that has been a very meaningful experience for me, all through the years, and has resulted in a philosophy, on my part, about what real religion is all about. And I carried that further into a concept of what I call "spiritual hygiene."

Cochran: Would you care to explain that?

Rainey: I'll try.

Cochran: Okay.

Rainey: I've argued that religion is one of the great areas of human experience. It certainly is historically and every other way, it seems to me. Therefore, religion ought to have its own credentials. That is, we have science and the scientific method; science has

its credentials in the discovery of truth and so forth. So I've argued that religion ought to have its credentials, if it has any meaning at all, and that it's a matter of the development of the human spirit, is what religion is all concerned about. And so I've finally come around to this concept of "spiritual hygiene" based upon the idea of religion having its own credentials, and that there are certain laws that control the development of the human spirit that are just about as inviolable as the laws that operate in the natural universe. And if you can discover what those spiritual laws are, that's the problem of religion and theology. Then if we can live in harmony with those laws, we have normal spiritual health and spriitual growth.

And I've used the analogy of physical hygiene. Our bodies are created to function in a certain way. We have a whole area there of physical hygiene. "Hygiene" means the laws of health. If we live in harmony with those laws, we have normal health. You get the idea of normality. You don't have illness; your body functions as it's intended to function, and so forth. But we have the germ theory of disease where germs get into our body and interfere with this functioning, and we have to rid our body of these enemy bacteria, I call them. And we have a whole science today, of the germ theory of disease and so forth. Our body's constantly having to fight these enemy bacteria that get in here.

And the blood stream has a marvelous function in this thing. The

blood stream has two functions. One is to feed the body--to nourish the body, and the other is to cleanse it of these impurities. I read a marvelous book on this a number of years ago by Carrell on Man, The Unknown. And he described the operation of this physical blood stream and these two functions. He said we have two types of corpuscles in our blood stream: one to serve the food function and so forth, and the other is to rid the body of impurities. And these two corpuscles...the red corpuscles do one thing, and the whites do the others. And the body has a marvelous capacity of miltiplying these white corpuscles to fight these bacteria that get into it. There's this big battle going on all the time to keep the body pure and rid of these impurities and so forth.

Then I moved from that to the analogy of mental hygiene. It's a great field of science today, as you know...mental hygiene. Well, what is mental hygiene? Well, it's based on the same idea that the mind is created to function in a certain way, and you get the idea of normality. When it functions that way, you've got a normal mind...functioning as it was intended to function. Also, we have the idea of abnormality. We have a whole field of mental science today called abnormal psychology, as you know. What is abnormal psychology? It's dealing with the mind that gets off the track, so to speak. You see, something has gotten in there to derange it, to interfere with its proper functioning. Well, then from that it seems to me just a natural step to this concept of spiritual hygiene. We have a body, we have a mind, we have a spirit. And the

theory with me is that this spirit has its own credentials and has to function according to the nature of its self. And then when it functions according to its nature, you get a normal spirit; you get a normal growth and development. You get a lot of things, again, that interfere with it, with its proper functioning, and you have to rid the spirit of those things, you see, that interfere with its functioning. And that has led me to a wonderful approach to this whole problem of religion and spiritual growth and development. That what are these great spiritual laws that, as I think, are just about as inviolable as any that operate in the physical universe.

Cochran: What are they? Could you summarize them?

Rainey: Well, I can give you an example of them. For example...and I get my great inspiration from Jesus, here. He taught this positive approach. He just rang the changes on the religious leaders of His day. Because He said, "You strain at a gnat and swallow a camel. You say, 'Thou shalt not do this and thou shalt not do that,' but I say unto you..." And every time He said, "I say unto you," He substituted a positive approach for their negative one. And He enumciated these principles. In the great Sermon on the Mount, for example, in the Beatitudes--you've got to have a pure heart, blessed are the pure in heart. You have to keep this spiritual bloodstream pure. These imputities get into the spirit and rob it of its functioning. Hatred is one of them. I was talking to you earlier about that.

Cochran: Oh, it's terribly crippling.

Rainey: ...the human spirit just simply can't carry hatred around with it. So there's that principle of the pure heart, for example. He said on another occasion that if you bring your gift to the altar and there remember your brother's got something against you, you've got to leave your gift, go and become reconciled to your brother, and then come and offer your gift. In other words, you don't get any spiritual growth and development out of that thing until you meet the conditions of that law, you see. He said it in many ways. He said the so-called law of the second mile. Said if a man compells you to go with him a mile, go two. Well, that sounds like silly talk, doesn't it? And yet, you don't get any benefit out of this principle until you meet the conditions of the law, you see. He said the same thing about prayer. He said it's no use standing on the street corner and praying aloud so everybody can hear you. The way to pray and pray successfully is to go into you closet and shut the door and there come into direct communication, you see. This principle of the second mile, I've thought about it many times. He says if a man compells you to go a mile, go two. How are you going to find out whether there's any truth in that or not? Well, I think the only way to do it is to put it to the test.

Live in harmony with it and find out whether...And I've used the principle of hydrogen and oxygen making water. I go into a chemistry class as a young student knowing nothing about chemistry, and the first day the teacher is telling about the marvels of mo-

dern chemistry; and in his discussion he says, "You can take two gases, hydrogen and oxygen. You can't see either one of them, you can't smell them, you can't taste them. But you can put them together in a certain way that makes water, H_2O." And I said, "I don't believe that. I never heard of anything...such a thing as that." So I say to my students, "What would a good instructor do?" He'd say, "If you're an honest and sincere student, here's a laboratory, and here are the materials, and here's a manual of instruction, and let's go in the laboratory and find out." And so he takes me through all these steps, and I learn a lot of things about it; I learn that it is true. And it's H_2O. It's not H_2O_2; it's not H_2O_1. It's H_2O. It's rigid. You have to obey it to the letter of the law. Well, that's a wonderful analogy, it seems to me, with this principle of going the second mile. It sounds like silly talk, and yet how are you going to know whether there's any spiritual growth in it or not until you put it to the test. So it's a matter, then, of taking these principles into your daily life...

Cochran: And you obviously from the time way before you went to Austin College began to apply those same ideas to your educational process and educational growth as well as to your spiritual growth.

Rainey: Yes, that's right...that's right. So I've come out with two great sets of principles. That is a positive religion, on the one hand, and a positive approach to education, on the other. And there are principles of educational growth and development, I think, that are just about as inviolable (chuckle) as these other laws that we talked about. And you've got to live in harmony with them to get

results. For example, I think that education in the final analysis is a learning process. It's student-centered. Students have got to get involved; they've got to participate actively in harmony with the laws of learning, whatever they may be. And we know them now pretty well, I think--what these laws of learning are--and we've got to live in harmony with them. So that brings us here to the whole field of educational methodology. And a lot of people kind of "pooh-pooh" it and think it isn't important, but it's very important.

Cochran: Oh yes, this is a great deal of what John Dewey was talking about.

Rainey: That's right. John Dewey was trying to discover these laws of learning, and so forth. And if you live in harmony with these laws, you get good results; if you violate them, you get some... you get the opposite results, of course. So those concepts have meant a lot to me. I'll give you another example of my experience at Bucknell.

Cochran: Please do.

Rainey: When I went to Bucknell in 1931, right in the depth of the Depression...Interestingly enough, I piloted Bucknell through the Depression, I mentioned earlier, and I piloted the University of Texas through World War II. (chuckle) So I've often thought that I didn't have quite a fair opportunity because I was dealing with abnormal problems. Now, at Bucknell, I found there what I thought was about the most <u>unsound</u> educational principle in operation that I've ever seen--before or since--and it had to do with an absence system. The University had an absence system that worked like

this--that if you were taking a three hour course, for example, they would give you three free cuts--absences that you were just entitled to, and you didn't have to explain or account for. But if you cut more than those three absences and couldn't get excused from the absence some way, then they began to subtract from your credit in the course, of all things. In other words, a student might come up with two and nine tenths credit on a three hour course, or two and eight tenths or maybe even (chuckle) one and six tenths or something of that sort.

Cochran: Was this a sound educational philosophy?

Rainey: Well, I thought that was about the most unsound educational philosophy, because it relates education to time. And actually, it seems to me there's very little relationship between education and time. So I thought we just had to revise that policy some way. It resulted in all kinds of difficulties which I'll try to explain. If a student were absent before a holiday, it counted two cuts or if you were absent after a holiday, they doubled it and counted it two cuts. And you might have come up for graduation which required a hundred and twenty credit hours and you might have a hundred and nineteen or a hundred and twelve or something of that sort. So you had to take another course or so to make up that deficiency. Well then it worked this way: students soon learned that the best way to get excused from the absences was to go down to the health service and get on the health service list for that day or days, whatever they were. And usually the faculty would accept that as a legitimate excuse. But you can imagine the students arranging

great use for that.

Cochran: Oh, indeed so.

Rainey: Well, it actually got to the point--you just wouldn't believe this, probably--where the health service had to put out a bulletin and distribute to the faculty so that the faculty could check off the student's story about whether or not he was in the health service and distribute it around to the faculty. Well, it was an awfully unsound principle all the way around. Students were going down there and getting on the health service when they weren't ill at all. (chuckle)

Cochran: It was forcing them to be liars.

Rainey: Yes, that's right. Forcing the immorality on them. Well, there again, I couldn't stand that, and I began to work to get it removed, to get back to something that really mattered, positive. And I realized I had to get rid of that absence system before you could make any other progress. So I worked on that for about two years before I finally got the faculty to approve it. And they did, and it's had some marvelous results. In the first place, we (chuckle) had better attendance in classes afterwards than before, if you can believe it.

Cochran: Oh, I can...I sure can.

Rainey: And in the second place...

Cochran: You made the students responsible for their own morals.

Rainey: That's right...had better attendance. In the second place, so far as I know, Bucknell has never gone back to an absence system. We just put the students on their own responsibility to come to class-

es and so forth. And the third thing that was very interesting, after it had been in operation about a month, the head of our health service, who was a fine doctor--we had a fine staff there--came into my office one morning with a smile all over his face and said to me, "Well, I sure do like this new absence system." And I said, "How's that?" He said, "Well, it's reduced the work of the health department about sixty percent the first (chuckle) month." We had that many fewer people going to the health service. Well, then he said--and this is the clincher--he said, "I've taken out my pencil, and I've done a little figuring, and I estimate that we've had about eighteen hundred fewer student lies told this month than any month (chuckle) since I've been here." Well, you see it's immediately transferable into moral values as well as educational values. We were perpetuating a system there that was unsound educationally; it was unsound morally. It was encouraging immorality, and so forth, on the part of the students. Well, situations like these make some kind of a positive educator out of you. That is, you've got to get down to things that really matter.

I had another experience at Bucknell which has been one of the great experiences of my life and has also opened up another wonderful field for me. That's in the field of the arts. At the end of my first year at Bucknell, I had a bad case of hay fever. And about this time of the year, in August, I went up into the mountains nearby there for a few days to get some relief from hay fever. Well, one morning about daylight, a car drove up to the

cabin where I was staying. It was one of the professors from Bucknell, and he said, "Get you clothes on and hurry down!" He said, "Old Main is burning!" The Old Main Building was on fire, and I got down there just in time to see it tumble in. Well, this was the heart of the University, in a way. It had been built way back in the 1850's, and a lot of sentiment was associated with it, and so forth. So before the day was over, this local judge, that I mentioned earlier here this morning, lived there in Lewisburg and he began to put pressure on me before the day was over to start a campaign among the alumni to restore Old Main. He thought that would make a great emotional appeal to the alumni. Well, somehow I resisted it; I never did know why. I kind of have a general resistance, I think (chuckle), to fund raising, anyway. I'd rather give somebody a dollar than to ask them for a dollar. Well, I resisted it; and finally I was forced to rationalize my resistance, use some rationalization for it.

And so this was the rationalization I developed. I said, "Before I turn a stone in rebuilding this building, I want to make a study of the future development of Bucknell--what its needs are education-wise, first of all--and then what it means in terms of campus buildings and equipment to meet those needs. And I'd like to go out and hire a first class architect to come in here and plan...help us plan a development for this institution for the next long period." Well, to make a long story short, the board approved that idea and told me to go and find my architect. Well, I searched all around that

fall. I must have interviewed two hundred architects over there in the eastern part of the United States. Finally I found the man that really appealed to me. He was Jens Frederick Larsen. He was the man that had built Dartmouth College, and he had some theories about architecture in relationship to the University that just appealed to me tremendously, and they were these: one was that you should, if you're going to have arts in your educational institution, the place to start with was your landscape and your architecture--build beautifully and create a beautiful environment. And that made a great appeal to me, this conditioning the environment to bring out the value that you want. The second principle there was that a college or university like that ought to pick up the best tradition of its environment and maximize it. He had done that at Dartmouth. That was a colonial environment up there, and he'd built Dartmouth. If you've ever been on the Dartmouth campus, you know what I'm talking about. A beautiful American colonial campus--it's just a magnificent place. Well, that appealed to me greatly, too. That was the other idea of his to have...So we began to dig around. What is the tradition of this environment here? Bucknell vicinity...Well, we soon found an answer to that.

There were two great German settlements in Pennsylvania. One was in the Lancaster Valley. We had a great bunch of German farmers down there, the best in the nation, perhaps. And this Buffalo Valley, where Bucknell is located, was the second largest one. And it was the Pennsylvania Dutch, really, the Pennsylvania Dutch tradi-

tion. And it's very distinctive and unique. So we thought, "Now, if we're going to build here, and Bucknell ought to be the best expression of the tradition of this whole environment, we ought to build, therefore, and maximize this Pennsylvania Dutch tradition." So we adopted that form of architecture for that tradition--to build beautifully in that tradition. And to let, as I say, Bucknell represent the best in that tradition. Well, we settled on that.

He had another concept that made a great appeal to me, and that was that architecture ought to be functional. Your buildings ought to be functional, serve the needs that that building was to be designed for. And that makes sense, of course. So we started working; he drew up a plan for the future development of the campus, and then we made a model of it and put it on a big...on display, on a platform there...

Cochran: Was this to be over several years in projection?

Rainey: Oh, long, long range building program. And so that was adopted, and we started on it while I was there and built a building or two. The first building we built was a Language and Literature Building, the language arts and literature. And before he put a pencil on the paper, he came and stayed about three weeks on the campus and met with all the faculty that were going to be in this building. What do you want in this building? What function do you want it to serve, and so forth? And when he got all that together, he planned the building and we built it. After we'd been in it about

two years, the chairman of the division came into my office one morning and he said, "Well, I just want to tell you that if we had this building to build over today, I can't think of a single change we'd make in it."

Cochran: Well, that was (chuckle) marvelous.

Rainey: Well, that was a remarkable validation, so to speak, of this approach. That led to so many other things. Then I wanted to develop the arts then. I've always accused the liberal arts colleges of being liberal, but they've had (chuckle) no arts. I've often said that they might be liberal--and I've doubted that sometimes--but they've never sponsored the arts, the liberal arts colleges. The arts have had to literally fight their way into American colleges and universities. They were out on the fringe of things. So I made a speech to the American College Association in St. Louis about that same time, and this was my theme--that the American colleges, liberal arts colleges ought to really get in and do something about this whole field of the humanities and the arts, and so forth. I used at that time an example of the way we taught freshman composition. I told them that we had taught freshman composition for a hundred years or more in American arts colleges, and I could name them a hundred colleges, in this country, that had taught freshman composition for a hundred years and didn't have a single creative writer among their alumni. Well, that kind of jolted them (chuckle), you know. But that's the literal truth! It's been a sterile type of teaching. It hadn't been functional and so forth. Here again, I get back to John Dewey. He made a

functional educator out of me. That is that you've got to have some real purpose and function. So when we began to get into this field of the arts, folklore became very important. I reasoned that most of the great literature of the world has grown out of folk material, out of the traditions and heritage of the people, and so forth. That was true of the Greek...the great Greek tragedies and so forth. Music is the same way. The great music of the world has been based upon folk music. Some great creative writer or artist takes this folk material and raises it to the level of a fine art, by his creative skill, and so forth. So I said then we ought to start with the universities. This is the place to start, and that this university ought to be the center then, for the collection of this heritage of this environment. And it has a wonderful one. Pennsylvania, you know, has every European culture represented. And they've brought their traditions with them--their songs and their dances and all of their crafts and arts and so forth. So that led to the formation of a Pennsylvania Folk Festival. We organized a Pennsylvania Folk Festival.

Cochran: There at Bucknell?

Rainey: At Bucknell...in which we encouraged the search for these folk arts whatever they were. And then we had a festival every year, where we had a chance to exihibit them and so forth. As an example of the collection of these folk materials, we had a man there who was especially interested in the miners' ballads of Pennsylvania. There's a mining area, you see, up around Scranton and Pottsville

and Wilkes-Barre. So he went up there and collected and published two volumes of these old miners' ballads. We put him on the faculty at Bucknell and gave him a special status to do just that thing--to collect the folk materials of Pennsylvania. We had another man there in our music faculty who had taken his degrees at the Eastman School of Music in Rochester, who wanted to do composition. So we gave him a tape recorder and sent him around through all of that environment...to record...not the lyrics but the music. And he brought them back to the campus.

Cochran: With the folk people singing them for themselves?

Rainey: They sang them for themselves. Those old miners sang those old ballads for him, and he recorded them. So we brought them back and stored them there at the University, and they became the basis for some musical composition. He transcribed them for an orchestra; he transcribed them for a chorus, for example. And the chorus was singing, and the (chuckle) orchestra was playing them. He was following this great tradition of musicians using folk materials to create a fine art out of it. And so we got a lot of inspiration out of that.

Cochran: This again was relating the role of the University to its immediate environment.

Rainey: To its immediate environment, and its heritage, maximizing the heritage of that envirnoment. So then we got the idea here that if you are going to have arts, you've got to have them on the basis of their credentials. And we figured that there were about three levels of art, really, that you could distinguish--art appreciation,

for example. One was listening to music or going to the theater and looking at it and so forth, talking about it. That's non-participation, just experiencing it in that form. Well, that's important up to a point. But then we identified the second level, which is actual participation and the re-creation of an art. And we think that's a higher level of understanding of the art and appreciation of it. For example, if a student takes part in an orchestra in reproducing a Beethoven symphony, for example, he's never the same afterwards, having taken part in the re-creation of it. We figure the same thing in drama. It's a different thing when you actually get on the stage and try to recreate the art, and so forth. It's a higher level of understanding and appreciation. And then we figured there's still another, and that's the creative level, where one actually creates an art. He writes a poem, or he writes a musical composition, or he writes a play, or what have you. So then we said from that that a college or university, if it's going to have the arts, it must have all levels of these opportunities open to it.

Cochran: At all three levels.

Rainey: At all three levels. You have...you have fine orchestras; you have fine choruses; you have a theater where people can see at that level. Furnish that for your environment. Then you have opportunities for students to participate: <u>play</u> in an orchestra, or <u>play</u> in a theater, and so forth. Then you have opportunities for faculty and others at this creative level to actually create the art. So that meant a lot to me in terms of an educational philo-

sophy, and then I began to try to work that out. And for example, there at Bucknell in the theater and in the music, too, we were close enough to New York that we could go over and bring out... over artists from New York, to sing with our chorus or to play with our orchestra.

Cochran: Sounds marvelous.

Rainey: And you had a combination of amateurism with professionalism and that raised the level of your performance, and they helped the community. The community got a better result and more enjoyment out of it. The student got an opportunity to participating with these professionals, and it just raised the level a lot. So we did a lot of that. Then when I went to Texas, again, I had what I thought was a marvelous opportunity down there. Because Texas has had this fine folklore society in operation for many years headed by Dobie and other men of that type. And I said, "Now here's another opportunity to really 'go to town.'" And we had just put in a department of fine arts there and brought Doty there to head it from the University of Michigan. And we began to talk about all these possibilities of development in the fine arts field there. Painting the same way, you know, opportunity for creative work among the artists, to actually paint. And for example, we wanted to do things like this: to give faculty members in the arts time off to go out and paint, like you'd give a scientist or anybody else time off for research. Give them opportunity to paint. And for example, I had a concept. We had all those blank walls around there. I thought we could...the college itself

could sponsor...the University could sponsor this art by letting them paint murals, for example, on the walls. You'd get two results out of that: you'd get a more beautiful environment, and you'd give the creative artists an opportunity to contribute to it.

Cochran: Were you able to do much of that?

Rainey: Huh?

Cochran: Were you able to do much with that?

Rainey: Well, I didn't get to (chuckle) stay there long enough. We were well on our way.

Cochran: Have you seen the University of Mexico City?

Rainey: Yes, I have.

Cochran: That's a shining example of what you're talking about.

Rainey: Yes, that's right. We brought a man in there who...we brought him in from Iowa, as I remember, who wanted to do some writing in the drama field. And he wanted to get into all this folklore of Texas, about the law west of the Pecos. And he wrote a drama based upon the law west of the Pecos. And with Texas with all of its rich tradition, folklore tradition, is a marvelous opportunity for your creative artists, and music, and drama, or what have you. J. Frank Dobie made a profession out of collecting all of that folklore of the Southwest, and so forth. So we did make some progress, and we developed a fine school of music; and that was the first building built after I got there...was to build a music building.

Cochran: It's a wonderful building.

Rainey: It is a wonderful building. It was the first building that we air conditioned, incidentally (chuckle), so we started that.

Cochran: I remember that.

Rainey: Then we began to bring some creative artists there on the music faculty. We brought Dalies Frank there, you know, who's an outstanding pianist and artist-teacher. That was another argument that I made. We ought to have artist-teachers in here, you know. Let them teach part-time and perform their arts for the rest of the time. So you have an artist-teacher like you have a scientist in the other sciences--the creative scientists and so forth. Well, then we got over to the field of painting. We brought in some professional painters in there who worked at Taos, New Mexico, in the summer and so forth. They were beginning to create local art around there and that sort of thing. I made a speech about that time to the annual meeting of the Chamber of Commerce there in Austin, and I developed this theme that I'm talking to you about. And I used as a background a book that I had read a number of years ago about A City That Art Built, and it was the story of the development of Florence in the Renaissance period. It was art, really, Renaissance art that built the great traditional Florence. Well, I tried to sell the people of Austin on that idea of Austin sponsoring a symphony orchestra, for example...the city sponsoring the arts. Build beautifully; have a city plan and build beautifully for the future, and so forth. Sponsor all the arts; that the city could become famous for, that sort of thing, you know. Well, we were getting along pretty well, and I actually had gotten the offer of a five thousand dollar gift from one of the big studios in California to develop a full time theater there at Texas. We were well

on our way to it. We had developed this experimental theater, as I mentioned, and we developed a theater in the round. And we were well on our way to having a full time art program...drama program.

Cochran: Year around theater?

Rainey: Year around theater where you'd have the students have all these opportunities to see and listen but also to participate and to give the faculty an opportunity for creative work. Well, that was my dream. Well, of course, my dream came (chuckle) suddenly at an end. Then when I went to Stephens College, where I had the opportunity that I had been seeking. When I got there, I got there just at the time they were dismantling one of those big army camps there in Missouri, and we bought five of those surplus army buildings and moved them to the campus. And in one of them, we built a theater--a little theater, about two hundred and twenty-five seating capacity. And we went into New York and employed about four or five professionals in the theater. One was a stage manager who built a beautiful modern stage and equipped it and so forth. And then we employed about four <u>actors</u>--professional actors--and brought them there and put them on the faculty to teach literature and drama, and so forth, and then the rest of the time they acted.

We formed two groups--an A group and a B group--and we put on a play for twelve consecutive nights, three weeks, four nights a week. This A group would put this one on, and the B group would be in rehearsal for the next one. And when they got through, the B group would take over. So we developed a full time drama pro-

gram, of thirty-three weeks in the year and that was the realization of my dream about the college and the arts, and its relation to the arts, and so forth. Building beautifully, first of all, building in the tradition of the environment--and Texas University, of course, has got a fine tradition there in its campus. That building stone is among the most beautiful building stone in the nation. So, that was all a great inspiration to me, to relate the University that way to the life of the state, and to maximize the great heritage, folk heritage and so forth. As a result of all that, I was President, for about fifteen years, of the National Folk Festival.

Cochran: Oh, I didn't know that.

Rainey: We had a national folk festival, and I was President of that for about fifteen years. I got a great inspiration out of all that. In other words, making their college or university a complete educational unit, so that the student could have a complete educational experience...

Cochran: And focus toward the specific needs and values and traditions of that...that area.

Rainey: Yes...that's right...that's right. Well, I followed through on those ideas wherever I could.

Cochran: Well, not to interrupt this particular line of thought but since we are about to wind up your tenure at Bucknell, I know that your next move was to Washington, D. C. Although this is a break in your academic career, I know that it had a valuable amount of experience for you, and we'd like to have you comment on that, if

you would.

Rainey: Well, I'm glad to. I think it would be better to say it was a break in my administrative career, but not my educational career or academic one. What happened was this that: during the Depression, of course, from '31, to '35, when I was at Bucknell right through the whole depth of it, we had at that time around six and a half to seven million youth in this country between the ages of sixteen and twenty-four out of school and completely unemployed; and that was getting to be a severe national problem. So the American Council on Education located in Washington, which represents primarily the higher educational institutions of the country, conceived a project to make a study of the needs of American youth, in those days, and to recommend a comprehensive program for their care and education. That was the charge that was given to the commission, to make a study and to recommend a program for their care and education.

They got a large amount of funds from the General Education Board, which is a Rockefeller Foundation. Actually, we spent in all nearly two million dollars on it over a period of four or five years. And they approached me to become the director of this commission. And, of course, I accepted it, and it turned out to be one of the finest experiences I ever had, because it gave me a chance to study a great problem on a national basis with a lot of (chuckle) Mr. Rockefeller's money. And that was a very fine opportunity. I remember when they approached me about taking this directorship, I

said, "Well, I think I understand something about the problem of education, but what do you mean by this word 'care' you've stuck in here--to recommend a program for their care and education?" Well, (chuckle) they kind of smiled and said, "Well, we thought a lot about that, but we finally put in the word 'care' to include everything that education does not!" (laughter) Emphasizing the fact that it was to be a comprehensive study of the needs of youth. Well, we went to work on it.

Cochran: Now this is the people of the American Council on Education?

Rainey: The American Council drew up this project, and it was under their sponsorship, so I lived in Washington four years. We made a lot of studies about the conditions confronting American youth. And we published, I guess, altogether nearly twenty volumes. Interestingly enough, we included a large study of Negro youth and the needs of Negro youth at that time. I look back at those volumes now, and if we'd taken advantage of some of the things we recommended, then we'd be a lot better off than we are now, I think. So it was a wonderful experience.

Then at the end of about four years, one afternoon I was asked if I was free for an appointment, and three regents of the University of Texas descended on me (chuckle) there in Washington and said they were out looking for a President and they wanted to interview me. Evidently someone had called me to their attention. And that was the first that I ever knew about any possibility of ever being President of the University of Texas. As I said previously, it

never had occurred to me. Well, I went home that afternoon and told Mrs. Rainey. I said, "You can't guess what happened to me today." And she said, "No, what happened?" I said, "Well, a committee from the regents of the University of Texas approached me about the possibility of my being President of the University of Texas." (chuckle) This is one of the jokes of our experience. She threw up her hands and said, "Oh, my goodness! We can't go back down there!" (laughter) I said, "Why?" She said, "Well, somebody'll look up my record and find I wasn't a Phi Beta Kappa!" She was a graduate, you know, of the Univeristy of Texas. Well, we joked a lot about that. To make a long story short, it was in December of 1938, when I was actually elected. But I couldn't take over until the next June, first, because I couldn't leave The American Youth Commission without working out some of the problems. It had one more year to run; it was a five-year project. So I spent about four years on it...a little over four years.

Cochran: On this selection as President of the University, was this a unilateral decision of the regents or were there other groups involved in that?

Rainey: Well, I'm glad you asked that question because I've thought many times and said many times that I went in there as President under what I thought was the finest auspices a man could go under. They appointed three committees: a committee of the faculty, a committee of the alumni, and a committee of the Board. There were three members on each committee, as I recall. And these committees worked for about two years while they had an acting President, an

interim President--Dr. Calhoun--and they finally recommended me, and they said I was the unanimous choice of all the nine members. So I went in there with a fine backing from the faculty, the alumni, and the Board itself. And a man couldn't ask for more, you know. I went there under very favorable conditions.

And I went really with a great enthusiasm--great hopes and expectations. As I've stated in the background of this, because I thought the University of Texas just was almost an ideal institution to carry out some of these things that I really had come to believe in so firmly. So I went into it with great hopes and expectations and inspiration. And I tried, in my inaugural address, at the time I was inaugurated (I was not inaugurated until November after I had taken over in June) I tried two things: One is I organized around this induction program a big conference, and I invited in a number of outstanding leaders in education and other fields, to come in there and sit down with us and consider the University's future in all these areas--what it could do in the environment there and by serving the people of Texas. In other words, we were trying to answer the question basically, "Why do a democratic people pay taxes to support an institution of this sort? What do they want to get out of it? What do they hope to accomplish?"

So we had this marvelous conference--I've forgotten now--it seemed to me there were over 2,000 people who attended that conference. We invited in citizens from all over the state and educators from

all over the state. We had a wonderful conference. Then I tried in my inaugural address to pull that together, and it has been published by the University of Texas Press under the title of The State and Public Education in which I tried then to state these principles, or try to answer the question really of "What is the function of a university supported by the people..." And I came to the simple conclusion, rather simple I think--simply stated at any rate--that the function of a university in an environment of that sort, was to improve people's well being. That's why the people want it; they use it as a great instrument to serve their needs in all of these various fields and aspects.

Cochran: Believe you said somewhere in there that one of the aims--I'm paraphrasing, of course--but one of the aims of a university is to help define the goals of society.

Rainey: Yes.

Cochran: That is not a universally accepted position is it?

Rainey: Well, it is in my mind. It may not be universally accepted. I think there is some question about whether a university ought to get out and advocate policies and plans and things of that sort.

Cochran: I agree with that but as you know, about the next topic we will be turning to is your relationship with the Board of Regents and I wager that would not set well with at least the later Board. To the later Board it is obviously going to be a major source of irritation.

Rainey: Well, at least a university, it seems to me, can approach that problem indirectly if not directly. I can give you some examples

of that. For example, we set up there and created, four or five research institututes as the University. One we called "chemical research." Another we called "municipal research"--we created a bureau of minicipal research where we could help deal with the municipal problems in the state, and so on around. And in that way, we could do some of the basic research that was necessary and then use various methods of institutes and publications and things of that sort to distribute that information to the people. And you didn't actually have to advocate a policy like that, a policy or plan. You could let people draw upon these resources and maybe do their own planning. But we could actually help with city planning if we were asked to. For example, the city of...I remember, the city of Wichita Falls had a big water problem out there. And they came down and asked us for help in solving their water problem. Well, we could do that. We had another invitation from the legislature when Texas was faced with a big problem, cotton root rot, that was devastating the cotton fields. They appropriated about $15,000 and came out to Texas University and asked if we didn't have some scientists that we could put to work on that. And we did. And in less than two years' time, we had the problem licked. Well, the University could just do all kinds of service like that, you know.

Cochran: Excuse me for interrupting, but $15,000 investment to lick cotton root rot was a pretty cheap investment, wasn't it?

Rainey: Oh, yes. We commented on that a lot. Actually, as we know, Texas has been the great cotton-producing area of the world for genera-

tions, and this root rot was really devastating the cotton fields, reducing the yield in some cases to as low as 50 percent of what it had been, and naturally, it was a great economic loss. So after we got through with it, we took out our pencils and did a little figuring, and we came up with the conclusion that that $15,000 investment would actually return to the economy of Texas every year more than all the University had ever cost the people.

Cochran: My gosh.

Rainey: So, one just has no conception, it seems to me, of what a university can do for a people.

Cochran: A program for imagination and creative thinking?

Rainey: That's right. Another example of the same thing, we made a study out there of the grazing land of Texas. Texas has been a great cattle raising industry from the very beginning. Well, we made some studies there, and we came up with another conclusion that if we could improve the grazing land of Texas just 5 percent, through fertilization, through better land use, and that sort of thing, that we could return to the economy of Texas again every year, more than the University had ever cost the people of Texas. It's fabulous when you come to think about it. We talk a lot in this country about an industrial revolution, and we've had one that was remarkable. But we've also had an agricultural revolution, the like of which the world has never known. And the university's great agricultural and mechanical colleges have made gigantic contributions to the development of our agricultural production. That's fabulous today--the same way.

So this was a great challenge and inspiration to me to get the University functioning in the life of the people to improve their life and well-being. It's still one of the most thrilling opportunities I think we've got. Research today has just simply taken over. We've become so devoted to research because it is so productive. And then there's another area today that is just full of potentialities. The economists I'll say now have discovered higher education. By that I mean, they've found out that it is economically productive to educate people. Professor Shultz at the University of Chicago, who is head of the Department of Economics at the university, was president of the American Economics Association a few years ago. And you may recall that in his presidential address the title of it was "Investment in Human Capital." And he made some studies of what we had gained by our investment in educating people. And he came to some startling conclusions. One was that over, oh, I think about an 85-year period, from 1885 down to the present time, that our investments in education have been three and a half times more profitable than any other investment we've ever made. And then he came to the other remarkable conclusion, and that was that the economics of the future, whereas in the past it had been based upon the development of material resources, that in the future, the economy of this nation would be dependent upon the investment in human capital. Well, you have to think of what a conclusion that is. And what an opportunity it is for an educational institution, like a university, to function in a situation of that sort.

Cochran: Well, really, Shultz is just saying, from the standpoint of the economist what you've been talking about all morning, that's not a new idea.

Rainey: That's right. It's just applying it in economics. I've been talking about the field of arts and sciences, religion, and so forth, It's just kind of rounding out the picture. But it gives great validation to our theory of public education. It validates all that we've ever dreamed about.

Cochran: Yes, it's heartening to me as an economist to see the president of AEA say that, too. But it's what one of your professors and friends, Clarence Ayres, has been saying for a lot longer than Shultz has ever thought about.

Rainey: That's right. And I got a lot of inspiration from Clarence; he had some of these insights that were remarkable.

Cochran: Yes, that idea is old hat to any student who has ever sat in Clarence Ayres' class.

Rainey: Yes, that's right. Well, just think of the matter of developing the natural resources of Texas, for example, through all the scientific research and so forth, that a university could do. Texas is producing about 55 or 60 percent of the oil and gas. It has about that much of the oil and gas reserves in the nation. And the opportunity is there to build an industry around that. Then we made some studies, for example, on the cattle industry, the use of cow hides. And I got into this whole field of discrimination in freight rates out of that study. For example, Fort Worth--we'll take Fort Worth as an illustration--is the center of a lot

of the cow industry. Well, cow hides are used essentially for making leather to make shoes. But did we have a shoe factory in Texas? No. Those cow hides had to be shipped to Chicago and Boston and manufactured into shoes, and then they'd send them back as a manufactured product into Texas, and Texas was losing both ways. We actually found that because of these freight rate discriminations, that you could send cow hides from Fort Worth to Boston and manufacture them into shoes and send them back to Fort Worth and sell them cheaper than you could manufacture them in Texas and sell them in Boston or Chicago. Well, you couldn't have any manufacturing industry in Texas with those discriminatory freight rates. No, I didn't say that quite right. You could ship these cow hides to Boston and manufacture them into shoes cheaper than you could manufacture the shoes in Fort Worth and send them to Boston and sell them. They could undersell you. That's what I meant to say.

Well, there's a good example of this. Then another area, for example, that was very fruitful, was this idea of the use of our soil, rotation of crops and things of that sort. I was born on soil in Clarkesville, Texas, that would produce a bale and a half of cotton to the acre. And at the time I was at the University of Texas, that same soil was producing less than a third of a bale of cotton per acre. What had happened? They hadn't had any instruction in soil conservation, and they had just let that good rich soil go down the rivers of Texas, and denude almost the richest land in the world. Well, our schools weren't teaching our children any-

thing about soil conservation. Where I grew up, for example, I never heard of soil conservation. I can remember when they first began to put in county agents, if you remember, to help farmers out there. Why some of those old farmers out there thought this was a ridiculous idea. We had a famous anecdote out there that one farmer said, "I don't need any county agent to tell me how to farm. I've had forty years of experience in farming. In fact," he said, "I've worn out three good farms already." (chuckle) Well, there was that kind of an attitude. You had to change people's attitude about this thing. And the emphasis of universities today upon research is the most fruitful thing that we've ever found. It's been so fruitful that it's almost become the major function of a university.

Cochran: When, really, Dr. Rainey, does a society need to have a university?

Rainey: Well, I've done a lot of thinking about that, and I discussed that very point in my inaugural address in which I was trying to, in broad general terms, define the function of a great university in society. One of the arguments I made at that time was simple that a university is not essential to the <u>being</u> or <u>existence</u> of a state, because states have existed many times without a university, but that whenever they decided they wanted to improve their well-being, then they've never found anything that's as helpful to them as a great institution of learning of this sort. That was my main argument. And it was around that idea that I tried to construct my whole program there at the University of Texas, as I've said before, to relate it to the life and welfare of the state of Texas,

and my, what an opportunity and a thrilling inspiration you get out of the situation. Because the opportunities of that sort are just almost illimitable in the servicies that a university can render. I think it's generally conceded that a university has three functions, mainly. One, of course, is to advance knowledge through research. Second, through teaching--passing on what has been accumulated. And the third is this area of service to the people. And it's in this area that I thought we had such great opportunities there, as well as in these other fields.

Cochran: Innovating, really, new ideas?

Rainey: Yes.

Cochran: On that point I'd like to ask you to...it may be embarrassing; it may be a difficult question. A few moments ago you were talking about the importance of soil conservation and raising the productivity of crop lands and how this...to make it work, a university had to help change the attitudes of the people. And this just was an important function of a university. Let me read a sentence from your inaugural address and let's explore that for a moment. You said at this time: "I'm willing to admit that we are now achieving only a fraction of the benefits of science for this purpose, but it seems to me to be a denial of the primary function of intelligence to argue the results of science; and invention cannot be used in determining the social goals." Now this is a hot potato in 1967, as well as in 1939. And what is involved here, Dr. Rainey, in defining a great university? I can be sure farmers ought to listen to the advice of agronomists in defining their

goals in respect to better farming. But should I, as an economist for example, is this my function to define to society what its goals ought to be?

Rainey: Well, I think that argument is inescapable. I don't see why you should limit the functions of a university to a few areas. We have medical schools; we have colleges of business; we have schools of music; we have schools of architecture, schools of education to help the educators of the state--of the nation. Why stop at the point of helping them with their economic problems or their social problems? It just doesn't make sense, it seems to me, to say you're going to shut it off at a certain place.

Cochran: Is this a source of difficulty between the university and the community at large, though?

Rainey: Quite often, yes. Because you run into vested interests and naturally those vested interests are going to try to protect themselves. I've often said in talks about Texas that you just have to know four or five things to know what makes Texas "tick," so to speak, (I've used that phrase) and they're rather simple. One: Texas has got the greatest variety and amounts of natural resources of any comparable piece of land in the world. Literally, you couldn't draw a line around any piece of land anywhere in the world and include in it the abundance and variety of natural resources that are in the state of Texas. That's point number one. Point number two is that these great industrial organizations that make use of these great resources want access to them. And you can use whatever words you want. They either want to develop them or they

want to exploit them. We've had a lot of both, of course. Some legitimate development...We've had terrible exploitation of our natural resources, as everybody knows, in this country. So they want access to these resources. The third factor in this picture is that the government is the key to this access or control of these resources. Through the laws that it makes and the administration of those laws they set the rules of the game, in other words. The oil industry is a good illustration of this. They control the production of oil. Well, these people that want this access to these resources naturally want to control the rules of the game. And if they can get control of the legislative process, and they can get control of the administrative process in the state; then they can make these rules to suit themselves, pretty much you see. And there's where the government comes into this thing or politics comes in. They want to make sure that they have a friendly legislature or friendly governor and the people that make these rules. The governor is the key to this thing because he appoints so many of these boards of administration and things of that sort. His prestige is great in legislation. But beyond that you've got some other people that are very...in very strategic positions. The lieutenant governor, for example, presides over the senate. He appoints all of the committees. He can actually direct legislation, where it goes, by sending it to certain committee. He can kill it, or he can help its passage.

Cochran: He's a very powerful man.

Rainey: He's a very powerful man. The same thing is true of the leader of

the House of Representatives...So that they want to go out and get these people that are favorable to them. They try to see that their friends are elected to the senate and the house of representatives and the governor in the first place. All right. Then there's another step, and I've listed it number four. And that is they need to have a friendly press or a friendly communications system. So they go out, and they do many things, as we all know, to influence the press. Through buying of advertisement and many other ways, they get a friendly press and a radio or television. And that's a very important part of this whole thing. For example, Texas has the famous Texas quality network made up of about four of these big stations--Fort Worth, Dallas, Houston, and San Antonio. And they also have the big press in the state. And at the time I was there, three of these four radio stations were attached to these big newspapers--in that same center--so you had a tightly knit communications system. And I'll tell you a little more about that when we get into this governor's campaign, because I dealt with that situation; and I took a case to the Federal Communications Commission just to get around this tight control of the networks. And furthermore a fifth and final step is education. They know that people vote. They influence all of the business of legislation and so on, so they want to control the way people think. So naturally, then, they're interested in the type of education their children are getting. So they go out wherever they can to control school boards, control boards of these educational institutions, and influence wherever they can.

Cochran: Now how does this...how does this philosophy you're just stating... how does this square with our discussion several hours ago about the Greek concept of a liberal education and your concept of a liberal education?

Rainey: Well, I think there is a very close relationship here. In our democracy, every citizen is a free man. He votes; he's exercising sovereignty. So naturally these people want to control the way people vote. For example, this whole business of a poll tax, down there for voting, has limited the voting in the South, and in Texas and these states. Sometimes as low as fifteen percent of the eligible voters...otherwise would be eligible voters. Well now, that's not a democracy, of course. But that poll tax is a good illustration of how they have manipulated this situation to their own advantage. And, of course, it's very noteworthy of those so-called kingdoms down there in Texas--the Parr machine and all that sort of business you know--where a relatively small percentage of the people ever vote. Am I talking to your point?

Cochran: Oh yes! Indeed. Sure. I was going to pick up at that point, to the extent that there is an establishment, a clique, I don't know what word we use in these days to describe the power structure in Texas...describe it rather in the late 1930's to the extent that there was a political power structure...establishment that wanted to run the system. How are they going to tolerate a young man coming down to be President of the University with ideas like the ones we started off on a moment ago--namely that well it's okay for agronomists to tell farmers how to farm, but what about econo-

mists telling people what they ought to do with their economy in the Depression? Is the establishment really going to tolerate the ideas of a young man like that?

Rainey: (chuckle) Well, actually I ran head-on into it, as you probably know.

Cochran: Well, relatively soon, didn't you?

Rainey: Relatively soon. I've long been contemplating writing up this story, and I think I've got a marvelous title for my book, and I've got the manuscript fairly complete. And I'm using the title The Tower and the Dome--the "tower" representing the University and the "dome" representing the capitol or the political aspects of the thing. And my sub-title is, "The Conflict of the Ideals of a University with a Prevailing Political System." So that's exactly what developed there, was the conflict between the ideals of a University that had been developing for hundreds of years, running head-on into this political system that wanted to control everything--including education, including the University!

Cochran: How do you account, Dr. Rainey, for the fact that the Board of Regents in apparently late '37, to '39, looked at great length for a new president and came to the conclusion that you were the one they wanted? Your ideas and values and principles and concepts were surely known to them and then within a year, a year and a half, they started clamping down on you and raising ruckuses, the details of which we'll talk about soon. But what happened to change the stature of the Board there?

Rainey: Well...

Cochran: It doesn't seem to me possible that you changed that radically between your inaugural address in 1939, and when you began to have difficulty with the Board in 1940, '41.

Rainey: Well, one possible explanation of that, it seems to me, is that at the time they were considering a president and considering me for president, they probably considered only my educational qualifications and my character, my reputation and things of that sort, and they didn't raise any questions about my political ideas. And up to that time, I had taken no part in politics, directly. I had been an educational person, and I was interested primarily in education. And when I got into a <u>state</u> system of education...(I had been in private schools and church related schools up to this point) ...and when I got into a state situation, like a state university, it naturally just evolved in that way that I had to be concerned with the relation of the University to the whole life of the state. That's one possible explanation.

Cochran: Well, do you think the Board reacted negatively almost from the beginning? I mean, did they understand what you were saying in that inaugural address, for example?

Rainey: Well, I don't recall a single negative response to my inaugural address from anyplace--the Board or anybody else.

Cochran: I would think you could recall the thousands of good compliments on it. It was a wonderful address.

Rainey: Oh, yes. But as I say, looking back on it, my memory may not be accurate; but I don't recall that my inaugural address stirred up any argument at that time.

Cochran: Well, did you ever get any static from the Board about...difficulty from the Board, controversy from the Board about things that people in agronomy were doing, or people in...You mentioned an hour or two ago about the, what was it? The people over in botany that came up with a solution to cotton root rot...

Rainey: No, no, we got a lot of praise and credit for that sort of thing, you know...

Cochran: When the Board began singling out people for...

Rainey: Well, I'll tell you when it all started, really. It started when Governor O'Daniel was elected a second time in the fall of 1940, he was elected governor the second time. And then he...this is all a matter of record. The Senate took...set up an investigating committee after I was dismissed in November of 1944, and they went into all of these things. And one of the things that came out in that investigation was that when Governor O'Daniel was re-elected in the fall of 1940, between that time and his second inauguration, he called together a group of about twelve outstanding business-industrial leaders in Texas. We know who was there. He made them a little speech. And he said, "Now, gentlemen, the time has come for you representing these big organizations (that I'm talking about) to take control of education in Texas and the University of Texas in <u>particular</u>," he said, "because that's the place where all these radical ideas are coming from." And there's where the whole thing started. The first move that he made--and there was some pressure on him to do this--was to remove Major J. R. Parten from the Board. His term expired at the end of that term, and there was pressure on him from his advisors, political advisors, to not

reappoint Major Parten. He was one of the finest supporters I ever had. In fact, I've said many times I think he was the best public servant that I've ever had anything to do with. So they got rid of him, and they got rid of other members on the Board that were there when I was elected, and appointed some of their own.

Cochran: Well then, by 1941, '42, it was a different Board.

Rainey: It was a different Board, and they came in there with the expressed purpose of running that University. Now I've got all kinds of proof of that. For example, when this new Board assembled for the first time, one of these new members the very first meeting of the Board sitting across the table from me with the chairman of the Board in between us at the end of the table, he reached into his pocket and pulled out a three-by-five card, passed it across directly to me--it didn't even go through the chairman of the Board, and it had the names of four full professors of economics on it--not a one of which had been there less than fifteen years (all of them were honorable men, well respected, and known outstanding men on the faculty)--passed that card across to me and he said, "We want you to fire these men," just like that. Well, I was amazed. I said, "Well, why in the world do you want to fire these men?" "Well," he said, "we just don't like what they're teaching." I said, "Well, what's that got to do with it?" I said, "Aren't they honorable men?" and that opened up the whole idea of freedom of teaching and so forth right from the start.

Cochran: Well then, the controversy from beginning wasn't between you and the Board, it was between the Board and what was going on at the University.

Rainey: Exactly. And it was only the controversy developed between me and the Board when I couldn't go along with what they wanted to do. I said to him, I said, "I can't do this." I said, "You've got traditions of a University here, for hundreds of years, you've got your own rules that have been published here for forty years."

Cochran: Didn't he understand anything about their own tenure regulations?

Rainey: No, they didn't know it. I had explained to them what this principle of tenure meant. These men were all tenured faculty members, of course.

Cochran: It sounds to me, Dr. Rainey, like you weren't being a good paid employee; you weren't carrying out their orders.

Rainey: (laughter) Well, there's where I...the thing all started at that point when they wanted me to do things that simply were completely out of line with the ideals and traditions of a great university. I actually found later (and this will be hard to believe) that they had posted people in some of the classrooms of those professors to take notes on some of the things that they had said. In other words, they were spying on them.

Cochran: Well, I don't find that a bit hard to believe, personally.

Rainey: Well, it was the actual situation. They had placed students or somebody in the room...in the classroom to get quotes from these people, you know. And one of them, of course, was famous. And that was Dr. Robert Montgomery. He had been teaching a course for years there on corporate management.

Cochran: Corporation finance, wasn't it?

Rainey: Corporation finance, that's right. Corporation finance. And he was one of their main targets. He was a...first of all, he was a great teacher, and he was the kind of a teacher that had disciples.

(chuckle) So they went out for him, and they were out for two or three others. They were out for Mr. Clarence Ayres who was another great teacher. And we had an agricultural economist there on the faculty. And I can tell you one of the most interesting anecdotes that happened.

Cochran: That would be Professor Wiley, wouldn't it?

Rainey: Yes, Professor Wiley. Soon after this thing got started, one of the leading insurance men in Houston came to see me one afternoon, and he was an alumnus of the University. I think this bears upon your major questioning. His proposition to me was that we ought to do away with this Agricultural Economics Department--just do away with it and not have any Department of Agricultural Economics. We had a professor there in agricultural economics. Well, I listened to his arguments for quite a long time and I...finally I approached him like this. I said, "All right, tomorrow I'll fire this man as professor of agricultural economics. But at the same time, then I'm going down here into the school of business and do away with the department of insurance." (chuckle) And he looked at me in amazement and he saw the whole point. He broke out into a smile and said, "Okay, you win." And he just walked out; we left good friends. (laughter) Well, there you have it, you see. They wanted to do away with the things that they're not interested in, but certainly he wanted me to instruct these people in the whole field of modern insurance. Well, a university, if it's going to be a university, has got to deal with every aspect of a life--not limit it to a few select areas. So the battle was on.

Cochran: And so you were just the focal point whether you tried to educate the Board...Did you try to educate them? You mentioned a moment ago about tenure. What did you do...

Rainey: Oh...I made every possible effort I could to explain to the Board and to educate them. For example, this man that wanted me to fire these four professors.

Cochran: Would you feel free to say who it was?

Rainey: Yes, it was Mr. Strickland who was an outstanding lobbyist, well-known lobbyist for the big interstate theaters there in Texas, and for other...railroads and other...He was just a high-powered lobbyist and had been for years.

Cochran: Was he a new appointee to the Board?

Rainey: Yes. He was one of the new appointees to the Board.

Cochran: Well, this had been one of his very...it <u>was</u> his very first meeting.

Rainey: <u>Very</u> first meeting of the Board. That's significant, seems to me, because he's carrying out this order, almost, of the Governor to get control of this university. Well, I didn't know that at the time. I didn't <u>know</u> that the Governor...this all came out much later. So I just had to begin to piece things together. Well, when he said...when he asked me to do that, I said, "Well, we can't do this. These men have tenure." And then I had to explain this whole principle of tenure to them. I explained the principle of academic freedom, what it meant, and how important it was to a great university. Well, he pushed that pretty hard. Finally he said, "Well, these are our rules, aren't they?" And I said, "Yes, they are." And he said, "Well, we can change them if we want to, can't we?" (chuckle) And I said, "Yes, you can." But then I began to

tell him what the consequences would be if he changed them, that we would run into all these ideals of the academic profession. I explained to him what the Association of American University Professors was and their role in this thing. And we actually, later on, had the executive secretary of the AAUP come down and meet the Board. And he went through all of this and told them what the significance of doing away with this tenure system and would...violation of principles of academic freedom.

Cochran: Who would that have been at that time? Do you remember the executive secretary?

Rainey: Yes, it was Ralph Himstead. Anyway, we went through a long period there of trying to, so-call, educate the Board about what a great university ought to be and how it ought to be operated, and so forth.

Cochran: Well, what did you explain the consequences would be if they...?

Rainey: Well, I told him there'd be two great consequences. I said, "In the first place, if you violate these principles of the academic profession, they'll come here and make an investigation as they usually do, as their procedures are, and if they find that you are not living up to these, they'll put you on a censured list, and that will have two very great consequences. One is that...well, the basic one is that faculty members don't want to work under a situation of that sort, and you'll lose a lot of your good faculty. They'll go other places when they get offers to go. The second one is you will have a very hard time getting people of comparable quality to take their places, because that censure business acts as a red flag to the whole profession. It's a notification to the whole profession that things are not right at this institution." Well,

there was an interesting sideline developed about that (chuckle). That was this same Mr. Strickland, that didn't impress him much--that argument. Because he said, "Well, we don't have to fill up this faculty with professors from Harvard, and Princeton and so forth. We'll use our own Texas products here." In other words, make a local institution out of this University.

Cochran: I was just going to...I was starting to jot down a note but on that topic, let me interrupt. It just...it had never occurred to me before that these are men of intelligence, I would assume.

Rainey: Oh, yes.

Cochran: They were men of dedication and devotion to their own aims and field. Well, this is a lot of speculation; you may not even want to comment on it. But it's just conceivable that once you explained to them what the consequences of censure were, if their aim really was to destroy, shackle higher education, well, they said to themselves in effect, "Well, that's just exactly what we wanted. We'd like to be censured; we'd like to get rid of all the troublemakers."

Rainey: Well, in effect that's what he said. He said, "We can...if these people want to leave--let them leave. We can...we've got some other fine people here in Texas. We don't have to depend upon professors from Harvard and Michigan and Illinois, and so forth." In other words, "We'll reduce this to a local institution here in Texas." Well, I had to combat that idea. I told them that the University of Texas is <u>not</u> a local institution. It's a great...part of the great system of higher education in this country. And I pointed out that the University of Texas at that time was the only institution that belonged to the Association of American Universities south

of the Mason-Dixon line between North Carolina and the West Coast. In other words, it was down there in this great territory, and it was serving the whole area, rather than just one state. And I explained to them that the ideals of a university aren't determined locally; they're determined wherever great universities exist.

Cochran: And they have existed for hundreds of years.

Rainey: And they have existed for hundreds of years. So I had to combat that idea of the local nature of an institution as opposed to a, almost, universal nature of an institution of that sort. Why, we were drawing graduate students there from all over the South, for example. There wasn't a single Southern institution at that time that could compete with the University of Texas for salaries, for example. We could draw from any Southern institution, almost, that we wanted in terms of salaries. And I pointed out to them that we weren't competing with any institution in Texas; we weren't competing with any institution in the whole South. That we were competing with the great universities of the country--California, Illinois, Michigan, Minnesota. Those were our competitors, you see, at that time. So it was a process of trying to get these people to see what a real university ought to be.

Cochran: Well, did they finally just abandon their attempts to change the tenure regulations?

Rainey: Well, no, they didn't. They used several interesting strategies to try to win their point. For example, Mr. Strickland said, "Well, we can change these rules, can't we?" And I said, "Yes, you can," as I said a moment ago. But then I told him about all of these consequences that might happen, and when he thought those over, then he began to modify his procedure. For example, he said,

"Well, we'll revise these rules instead of doing away with them. We'll revise them." And he actually wrote out a revision of them, and it was at that point that we invited the executive secretary to come down from Washington, and he met with them and told them about all this. So we went through a period there when we were trying to consider a revision of the rules to more or less modify, so to speak, their wishes in this matter. Well, the next step in that was that the faculty got into it, of course, at that point and opposed this modification that was proposed. Well, then they finally said, "Well, these rules are actually violating our commission to run this University. The constitution says so, and so the statutes say so, and so that the regents are in power here." And so they were. They had all the legal power to run that University. And so they read those things to themselves, and those words sounded like, "Well, we're in charge here. We'll run it the way we want to." But I had to try to tell them, "You can't run it that way and run a great University."

So they finally said, "Well, why don't we appeal to the Attorney General and see if he won't say that these rules are contrary to the constitutional and statutory authority given to the Board of Regents and that actually they're unconstitutional." Well, the Board then decided to make such an appeal to the Attorney General. And Mr. Gerald Mann was the Attorney General at that time. So at that point, I and the faculty got excited about it, and I proposed to them that, "Well, if you're going to do this, let me and

the faculty submit a brief to the Attorney General at the same time to accompany yours," that our brief would try to explain our points of view to the Attorney General, and put up the arguments, in other words, for this system as it has evolved. Well, the Board agreed to that. And I appointed a very fine committee of three outstanding members of the faculty--one from the law school and two other very fine people on the faculty there. And I worked with them, and we drew up such a brief and sent it along to the Attorney General with their request. And the interesting thing there was that when the Attorney General handed down his opinion--we had made four points in our brief to him--and when he handed down his opinion, he upheld us on every single point in that brief that we made. Well, that was a big victory, and it gave them a real jolt when he said, "These rules are perfectly legal; they've been drawn up in a legal manner and so forth and so on." So that was a jolt to the Board. It was a real set-back because they had kind of thought that, "Well, now, here's our final out on this thing, so to speak."

Cochran: About when was this, do you recall?

Rainey: Well, this must have been around 1942. I'd have to check to be exact...the exact date but probably in the year 1942.

Cochran: It had been going on...

Rainey: It had been going on nearly a year. Well, when this happened, they ran up against stone wall, after stone wall in their effort to get control of the situation and change it to meet their own desires. Then they started a process of what I call just harassment--harass, harass. They just began to pick out everything they could to harass

me because I was the leader in blocking their attempts. They just used every means. For example, when, early 1942, when we got into the war with Japan (actually December 7, 1941) there was a big conference held in Dallas called by a lot of leaders in Texas to deal with the war effort. And the announcements that went out for this meeting (it was to be on a Sunday afternoon, as I recall)...the announcements that went out had some very strong statements in there about organized labor and the role that organized labor was playing or would play in the war effort. And it looked like the meeting was stacked against organized labor, in the publicity, as I say, that went out. Well, one of the things that happened was that there were three university young economics instructors there at that time, that picked up this announcement in the Dallas News and wrote to the leader who was going to be chairman of this meeting in Dallas and pointed out that this looked like it was an anti-labor statement, and they asked for permission to have just, I believe, three to five minutes to appear on the program to correct this impression of this law that was going to be passed...or proposed. Well, Mr. Hoblittzelle at that time was to be the chairman of this meeting.

Cochran: Would you want to identify who Hoblittzelle was?

Rainey: Yes. Mr. Hoblittzelle at that time was the owner, director, and the great leader of the Interstate Theater open in Texas, incidentally, I think one of the tightest monopolies that we had in the state at that time.

Cochran: The reason I brought it up because you just identified Mr. Strickland, a moment ago, as being a lobbyist...

Rainey: He was the lobbyist for this...so there was a tie there in that. Well, Mr. Hoblittzelle turned them down. He refused to give them a place on the program. Said the program was filled, and so forth. Well, these three boys, young...I call them boys, they were just young instructors, at that time...they drove to Dallas for this meeting and again when they got to Dallas went to see Mr. Hoblittzelle before the meeting started and again asked for just a very short time to appear on this program. And again he turned them down. So these young instructors took their places in the auditorium and said nothing more and listened to the program.

But after the program was over, before they started back to Austin, they went into a cold drink parlor there in Dallas and got them a Coke or something, and they got to talking about this situation. The result of it was that before they left, they wrote out a statement about the meeting--their reactions to it--and gave it to the Dallas News. And the Dallas News featured it the next morning. These three young instructors made this charge against the meeting, and it put them in a very difficult position, really, with regard to it. Well, there was a flare-up then, against these instructors and Judge Davidson,in Dallas at the time, wrote a strong letter of protest to the Board of Regents telling the Board that they should take some action against this kind of activity on the part of the instructors at the University of Texas. Well, the Board picked that up, and they really persecuted these young fellows. "Persecuted" is the only word that will describe it. They threatened to fire them right off, and I tried again to persuade them not to do it. And

finally, as a result of my appeal, we appointed a committee of the Economics Department to make an investigation of this whole situation and report back to the Board. And I appointed this committee. And the committee, after investigating it for a while, came back with the report that they could find nothing to condemn these instructors for, and gave them literally a clean bill of health, so to speak.

Cochran: Now this would have been Peach, and Gordon, and Foster.

Rainey: That's right. They were the famous three young instructors. Well, this became a major incident, of course, and the Board weren't satisfied with that at all, and they went over the recommendation of this faculty committee and over my recommendation and refused to reappoint these men. And, as I say, that made a major incident out of it. Of course, these men had no tenure. They were on just a year-to-year basis so the Board had...was acting within its rights, of course, to do this thing.

Cochran: Did they make a point with you that they were acting perfectly legally here as opposed to the tenure system and these men had no tenure...

Rainey: Oh, yes...that's right. But they couldn't fire the tenured men but here were some instructors that they could fire. And so they used their power--what looked like legitimate power. As I say, I put this in the realm of beginning a harassment of the faculty. Another incident came up very soon following that, and that was the famous John Dos Passos incident. They began to look for everything they could, and they found on the reading list, the sophomore reading list in literature--English--the book...U.S.A. by John Dos Passos.

Somebody called it to their attention and said, "Here's a vile book filled with all kinds of obscenities and things of that sort." And they pointed out paragraphs there in the book, you know, and how it was anti-industrialist and all of this, that, and the other. And the Board jumped on that. Mr. Bullington, who was one of these new appointees at that time from Wichita Falls, he brought copies of the book to the Board and read them some of these "terrible" passages, so-called, in there you know.

And the Board called a special meeting to deal with just this book, and they wanted to know who was responsible for putting this book on the reading list. (It had been on there for years.) So they called in a committee of the English faculty. I think there were three members of the faculty who had had this as their responsibility for making up these reading lists. The Regents spent an <u>entire day</u> with that committee trying to pin personal responsibility on some one person for having that book on the reading list and said over and over, "If we can find out who did it, we're going to fire them, outright," like that. And the committee insisted that, "We don't know who did it; it was committee action. It was done years ago. This book has been on here a long time." And so the Board was frustrated at that point. They couldn't pin it down on any particular person. So at the end of the day, after a whole day of this sort of thing, they took direct action and authorized the removal of that book from the reading list, themselves, which again was a very unusual act on the part of a Board.

Cochran: Now, was the Board unanimous on most of these things?

Rainey: No, not quite unanimous. But they had enough power and majority to do it. Well, there was a very interesting incident that followed immediately on that action. Lutcher Stark, who was a unique character down there, he knew immediately what that was going to mean--that that would call attention to this book, and it would make it the most popular book, perhaps, (chuckle) in Texas. And actually, within two weeks time you couldn't buy a copy of that in any book store in Texas. Everybody wanted to see that book. Well, Lutcher knew that. And just as soon as the action was taken, he sent the Secretary of the Board, who was in the meeting, down to the two book stores on the so-called "drag" there, and bought every copy that was available in those two book stores, (laughter) and brought them up to the Board meeting and autographed them and gave each of us an (chuckle) autographed copy of John Dos Passos's U.S.A. Well, of course, it became a great incident. It spread...as I say, it made it a popular book. And it came out again in the Governor's campaign later, you know, and I'll tell you about that when we get into the political aspects of this thing. But it was an amusing thing, in a way, but it was a high-handed action on their part.

Well, those are examples of the type of harassment that they followed after that, and they had many opportunities for doing it. For example, they met once a month, and I had to prepare for them an agenda for each meeting of the Board and send it to them a week

in advance so they'd have time to study it. Many times those agendas would include items...as many as a hundred, sometimes a hundred and fifty or more items on an individual agenda that they had to pass on before they became legal. All I could do would be in the meantime to say I would recommend these things to the Board. And I would have them numbered and classified on the agenda.

Cochran: Now this would be...this was a new thing?

Rainey: A new thing. I couldn't...for example, I couldn't raise the salary of a secretary or a clerk in any of the offices, five dollars without their approval. It didn't become legal until they had actually approved this.

Cochran: Now was this the ordinary, to digress a moment, to where the Board of Regents had at that so-called legal authority, and they would just ordinarily tackle that sort of thing? Was this the ordinary, for a President to take a detailed agenda like that to the Board or?...

Rainey: Well, it's absolutely required, legally, because the Board had <u>all</u> the legal power. The President doesn't have any. And it wasn't legal until they had passed it, you see. So usually, <u>normally</u>, a Board will just go through that agenda and say, "We approve. We recommend that the agenda be approved." But not so with this Board.

Cochran: I mean a detailed agenda wasn't some invention of this Board. You mentioned that.

Rainey: Oh, <u>no</u>. Oh, <u>no</u>. I had made up this agenda on the basis of requests and so forth that had come to me in the meantime. And I had to stick my neck out in a way, in saying to faculties and others that I would

recommend this to the Board, you see. Well, it gave them a chance to just harass me on it. They could just pick out some of these little old items, you know, and take off on it and talk for thirty minutes and just embarrass a President and threaten not to pass it, you know. Well, that in itself puts the President in a very difficult situation. Once they don't approve his recommendations, that means they've lost confidence in him, and in a way, it's an invitation for him to go some place else. Some Presidents have taken the position, for example, that any time a Board turns down one of his major recommendations, that they can have his resignation. Well, that's a matter that each President has to decide for himself... the importance of that sort of thing. But I went through two or three years there of that sort of thing. I got to where I just dreaded the Board meetings because there were so many opportunities there for them to just harass, harass. Believe me, they took advantage of it.

Cochran: Was Stark one of O'Daniel's appointees or was he already there?

Rainey: Well now, I'm not quite sure. At that time he'd been on the Board for about twenty years or more. He served actually about twenty-four years--four six-year terms.

Cochran: So he wasn't a new member?

Rainey: No, but he was certainly in harmony with all that they were doing. He was one of the ones that voted against me finally for removal from the presidency. So he was...whether he was reappointed by Mr. O'Daniel, I've forgotten at this point. We'd have to check the record on that.

Cochran: Now several things that I bring up like this are just for the purpose of getting it on the tape so that we can later stick it in.

Rainey: Well, let me give you another idea of what I considered a major issue. At the first meeting of the legislature after I got there as President, I made a big appeal to the legislature for more funds for research at the University, and I got a fine grant for the University...from the legislature for expanded research in the University in line with what I'd hoped the University would do. Well, I worked out a system of dispensing those research funds. We appointed a research council, as it were, under the dean...graduate dean. And that council was divided in two groups--a science group on the one hand, including the major sciences, and a social science group. And they screened all the projects that the faculty wanted to present to do research and get grants from this fund. And each faculty member that wanted research money would propose a project, and it would be screened by one or the other of these groups, which ever one it naturally fell in. And then it was screened also by the graduate dean, and then came up as a recommendation to me, and finally at my recommendation after all this procedure, to the Board. Well, there one summer, it must have been the summer of 1943, when I presented the budget for the next year at the July meeting of the Board, we sent up about thirty-three projects that had been screened in the way that I've indicated here, for approval to the Board. As I remember, those projects were almost equally divided between sciences and social sciences--some thirty-two or thirty-three of them. When they came before the Board they

approved everyone of the projects proposed in the sciences, and, as I recall, turned down all but three of the social science projects. Just said, "We don't want that kind of research going on at the University, you see." Well, that was another blow to me, of course, that they wouldn't follow the faculty's recommendation. They wouldn't follow the dean of the graduate school's recommendation with my endorsement. So that created a real problem for me.

Cochran: Was that the beginning of what we were talking about earlier this morning--of the willingness of the establishment to accept, quote, scientific research the natural applied sciences over the social sciences...

Rainey: Well, they just said frankly on some of those projects, "We just don't want that kind of research going on here at the University."

Cochran: Do you recall as an example, one or two of them?

Rainey: Well, I identified those in my sixteen charges that I made against the regents, finally, on that.

Cochran: The economics department seems to fit into its peculiar share of difficulty. Was that true of any of the other departments in particular in the social sciences?

Rainey: Well, the Sociology Department, of course, was a close ally to the Economics Department. Those two were the ones that they were more vitally concerned with than any other. So this process of harassment went on and on and on until it finally just became unbearable. And it came to a climax in a meeting with the Board early in September of 1944, when they attempted to put a gag rule on me, as President of the University. During the time that I was there, I had

made numerous appearances and speeches all over Texas and elsewhere. I remember the first fall I was there in October, (chuckle) I made twenty-four off-campus speeches in the state of Texas, alone, in one month.

Cochran: In one month?

Rainey: I remember I was telling one of my friends about it, and I commented that I had made twenty-four speeches in October. He said, "Well now, Homer, wouldn't it be more correct to say you made one speech twenty-four times!" (laughter) I said, "Yes." But I spoke all over the country, and the thing that brought this to a climax was that I was invited to New York to Dr. Sockman's church in New York. He held annually there some sort of an institute on religious and social problems, and he invited me to take part on this institute. And I made a speech in his church in New York. The title of my address was "Fulfilling the Commitment of Christianity, Democracy, and Modern Science." And my theme in that paper was that we had in the past comitted ourselves to the great ideals of Christianity and democracy, and that we'd committed ourselves to the techniques of modern science. And that when you put those two things together...those three things together, the democracy and the Christianity giving us our ideals, and science giving us our techniques, we had developed this great society of ours and made it what it is. And in these commitments we had aroused in the hearts and minds of the masses of people--of our own people, and the masses of people around the world--the most deep-seated hopes and yearnings and aspirations that the human heart knows.

And this had resulted in the so-called revolt of the masses. The masses of the people had now accepted these as their ideas--these great ideas of equality, liberty, and freedom and they were trying at every point to get a greater and greater fulfillment of those. And that dealt with our minority problems, for example. Our minority had those same ideals and aspirations aroused through our commitments to Christianity and democracy. And then I raised the question, "Now what's our role at this point in society?" We've committed ourself to these ideals. They're not fulfilled. We're a long way from the fulfillment of them. And I simply said that the answer to that was that we had to go forward and find more and better ways to realize the fulfillment of these commitments. That was my thesis. Well, I got a lot of publicity about it. It was published in the papers of Texas, of course not the whole thing. Well, this caused a lot of comment.

They began then to say that I was some kind of a socialist or a red or something, or worse. And Mr. Strickland picked that up, and he made an issue of it at the Board meeting...and on a Friday. And following the Board meeting on Friday, he called up the Vice President, who was Dr. Burdine at that time, and sat in the Board meeting with us, and he had a long telephone conversation with Dr. Burdine. And in the conversation he told Dr. Burdine that the Board was concerned about my making so many speeches. And particularly he said to religious groups over the state, and he thought that Dr. Burdine ought to tell me that I should quit making so

many speeches off campus and to these particular religious groups. Well, that was the last straw as far as I was concerned, when he attempted to put a gag rule on me.

So Dr. Burdine when he told me about all of this conversation on Sunday morning--it was a long conversation--then he and I put our heads together for the next two or three days. Then I decided that the time had come for me to bring this issue between myself and the Board into the open. And I carefully prepared in the next two or three days this statement of sixteen accusations that I made against the Board, and I called a special meeting of the faculty and invited the press, and I prepared this document carefully. I sent it to the Board members in advance so that each one of them had a copy of it before I presented it. And then I presented it to them at a special meeting of the faculty, gave it to the press-wide circulation and so on. Well, this just rocked the Board back on their heels, literally, because I had taken every one of these sixteen examples <u>right out of their own minutes</u> and documented everyone of them carefully, so that they had no refutation. There it was just spread out where everybody could see it.

Cochran: Would you run over those sixteen points briefly?

Rainey: Why, yes, we can. I've got a complete copy of it here if you would like...

Cochran: I would just like to have it in this particular transcript when you get it in the library at North Texas if you could.

(A copy of the sixteen points can be found in the library, with the Oral History Collection.)

Rainey: Yes, I can give you a complete transcript of it. Well, as I say, this simply rocked them back on their heels--put them on the defensive. The Dallas News, for example, I think the next day or two or three days later, published a very strong editorial, in which it said that now, President Rainey has put his case before the public, and it's the Board's move--it's up to them to defend themselves or present their point of view. Well, they had none really because, as I say, there it was where everybody could see and then in the meantime between...this was the twelfth of October, and I was fired on November the first. Well, in the meantime, of course, all kinds of actions were taken to try to work out this situation. Everybody knew that there was a crisis. They either had to fire me or they had to do something. So the faculty went into action, they passed a resolution. The alumni association met; the students association met, and there were all kinds of efforts made in that two or three weeks time to adjust them.

Cochran: What kinds of resolutions did they...?

Rainey: Well, as I recall, it would be on the record, we've got copies of all of them. So far as I recall now, everyone of them was supporting my policies on that and that, of course, was a great disappointment to the Board. So I tried personally, all during that time, working with the Board individually--we didn't have a Board meeting--individually with the members to try to find some adjustment to the controversy. Well, we didn't, and they called a special meeting of the Board in Houston, twenty-nineth and thirtieth of November, I believe it was, and the whole thing was reviewed

there at that meeting. I thought...often thought it was quite interesting that they chose Houston for this place of meeting because they had more support themselves in Houston than anywhere else. They didn't dare meet in Austin where the faculty, student body, where my friends were concentrated. So the choice of Houston, I think, was an interesting one from their point of view. And, of course, these two days and nights down there were a terrific ordeal.

Cochran: Well, the sixteen points included, as I recall, such things as beginning with the dismissal of the three economics teachers...

Rainey: Yes, and I mentioned all of these things that I have been mentioning to you--the incident of the three professors and Dos Passos and other incidents of that sort, this turning down these science... social science projects--all of those were included. One of the main efforts that they made in these two days down there, was to get me to withdraw those sixteen statements. They had put every conceivable pressure upon me to withdraw these...the word withdraw. And I told them, "Why, there's no such possibility to withdraw them. They were made in good faith and sincerity, and they have been published generally. I can't think of withdrawing them. What kind of a person would I be if I made these statements and then withdrew them?" Well, as I say, they put every known pressure on my family, my religion; they appealed to everything to try to get me to withdraw them. And they tried to make their point that withdrawal didn't mean repudiate them.

Cochran: What were they doing--just trying to save face?

Rainey: Well, of course. They wanted...Well, they said, frankly, "We can't continue to function with these charges extant." So as you know, it's a matter of record that when they finally came to the impasse and decided to fire me, then after the vote was taken, six members of the Board indicated their resignations and turned in their resignations. And three of them were ultimately accepted. And for some reason that we don't know yet, pressure was put upon three others to remain on the Board. And the Board had to be reorganized, of course. And Governor Stevenson was the Governor by that time, and he had to reorganize the Board.

Cochran: Who were the three that remained, do you recall? We can add that later; it's not important.

Rainey: Yes, well...

Cochran: Did Strickland remain?

Rainey: Yes, Strickland and Bullington, and I believe Mr. Schreiner. But I'd have to check the records on that. But three of them finally stayed on.

Cochran: You think they intended to all along?

Rainey: Well, of course, I don't know. I thought there that night that their intentions to resign were as...as far as I could tell, were sincere. Because three of them went ahead and actually went through with it, including the chairman of the Board. And he, incidentally, had voted for me...for my retention. But I suppose that he saw that there was no chance to salvage much out of that situation, and he didn't want to be held responsible for it any further so he resigned.

Cochran: So they...

Rainey: Then the Board had to be reorganized, of course, between November first and the time of the January meeting of the Board. It was done, and Mr. Dudley Woodward was finally chosen to be the new chairman of the Board.

Cochran: And that meant Governor Stevenson appointed this new Board?

Rainey: Governor Stevenson...he had to appoint three new members of the Board and he did. And I don't hesitate to say that he didn't improve the situation (laughter) when he appointed these other members. They were just the same type as the ones that went off. In fact, I think they were in some cases worse. I've often felt that Mr. Woodward's role in this thing was a very sorry one, if I may use that word. He played a very poor role in the thing. He tried to defend these regents in that action that they'd taken, and he made a long three or four hour speech at the first meeting of the Board in which he tried to discredit me in every way and my past. He went back to Bucknell where I had been President and tried to indicate that I had trouble there and that, in effect, I had left under pressure at Bucknell when I resigned to go to take this directorship of the American Youth Commission and so forth. So it was a sorry performance, on his part.

Cochran: This was the thing that you referred to yesterday, isn't it. Didn't he cite this letter from the Judge who was later...

Rainey: Yes, Judge Johnson there, was a member of the Board at Bucknell at the time, and he had objected to some of my policies at Bucknell, but it was never very serious. And, of course, the crowning thing

in my favor was that when I resigned to take this new position, the Bucknell board elected me a member of the Board of Trustees, which was an expression of confidence in me. So I had all of that in my background. And the use Mr. Woodward made of that was a sorry spectacle because this same judge later on was impeached from his job. He had no character and reputation among his profession. So they just picked on him for his chief witness against me. It fell flat, of course.

Cochran: Well, related matters what we were talking about earlier this morning clearly, (and you would agree with this, whether they did it for the right reasons or not) it was very clear that the Board of Regents does have the legal constitutional authority to fire a President--whether it's for good reasons or bad reasons. But according to their own rules and regulations, they couldn't fire you as professor of education.

Rainey: That's right. There's no question about these boards' authority. They have it--according to the constitution.

Cochran: They may have in your judgement--I know in mine--they may have fired you for the wrong reasons.

Rainey: Well, that is where the whole controversy really comes. It was over the ideal that the University on the one hand up against a controlling...completely controlling group on the other hand. So we had nothing but moral power on our side. I've often thought that a President of a state university--he has no legal power at all. He has only moral power and moral prestige that grows out of...what he is in himself and what he stands for. But I saw, too,

in the long run that moral power is the greatest of all powers. And I figured it illustrated itself in this case.

Cochran: Would you comment briefly on the point related to that. I would be interested in that a President of a state university is going to face up to a Board of Regents that represents businessmen and laymen and his authority and prestige with that Board does, I'm sure, represent only a moral power. Now to what extent does that moral power enhance for instance, reflected if the President really does have a strong faculty backing him, participating, and supporting him. Obviously that's a leading question but I would just like to get your comment on it.

Rainey: Well, it just means everything. If I hadn't had the backing of the faculty, I wouldn't have had any case at all. And that was the greatest source of strength to me, of course--moral strength--for this faculty was behind me not quite unanimously, but almost. As a matter of fact, after the Board fired me, the faculty had a special meeting on a roll call vote. Ninety-two percent of them requested my reinstatement, because I was a great source of strength to them and satisfaction...the student body, of course, the same way. They put on a demonstration there at Austin, the like of which the city of Austin had never known before or since that great academic freedom parade they put on, all a matter of record. So that meant a lot to me, of course. Then the backing of the AAUP again was a great source of strength to me. I felt confident that I was on the right track educationally and morally and every other way.

Cochran: The AAUP did also censure the University of Texas for this, did they not?

Rainey: Oh, yes, and as I say, they had worked with me before this thing came to a climax to try to find a solution. When the action came with the Board...the AAUP sent a committee as a regular part of their procedure down there to investigate it and eventually, on their recommendation, put the University on their so called censured list, and it stayed on there for about nine years. The Southern Association of Colleges and Secondary Schools also made an investigation and put the University on probation. I think they removed it after about one year, but they censured the University. The Phi Beta Kappa Chapter, a national council, sent a delegation down there and also investigated it and condemned the University for this action. So everything from that side was all in my favor and gave me great moral support, as I've said.

Cochran: How did the press as a whole in the State of Texas react after this?

Rainey: Well, that was an interesting thing. And this manuscript that I am preparing, I have a whole chapter of nothing but quotations from the Texas press, and the reaction of the national press as well because it became a national issue. At the time I was fired, the Texas press and the national press were virtually unanimous in support of my administration--The Dallas News, papers like Waco, and Wichita Falls, El Paso...

Cochran: What about the Houston papers?

Rainey: The Houston papers, particularly the Houston Post, were trying to

be a bit more cirtical of me, and that's why I think they held this meeting down there. Jesse Jones, of course, was the big power in Houston at that time. And there's an interesting fact here that I've never told before. I think it's worthy of consideration. Jesse Jones at that time was head of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation in Washington, and literally, I think he was probably the second most powerful man in the government--next to President Roosevelt. Well, he had an ambition to have a doctor's degree, an honorary degree conferred upon him at the University of Texas. And he actually promoted it through his friends on the Board. And there's an interesting story there. It's very questionable whether state universities ought to give honorary degrees or not.

Cochran: Does the University of Texas? I didn't think it ever did.

Rainey: Well, I'm going to tell you what happened. Just prior to that, the University of Texas, just a short time before that, had given an honorary degree to Vice-President Garner. And this, so far as I can recall, was the first and only time the University of Texas had ever given an honorary degree. And certainly, it's questionable whether it ought to go to a politician or not, because it just opens up the whole thing. Immediately the Board--after it had granted this degree, I think, found the mistake that they had made--and immediately adopted a policy of no more honorary degrees. That was an indication, I think, of the seriousness of the situation.

Well, Mr. Jones, even in the face of this policy, through his friends put pressure upon the Board to give him an honorary degree.

Members of the Board privately--they didn't want the thing to come to an open discussion in the Board meeting--so they came, some of them came to me privately and said, "Don't you ever let this come before the Board," this petition or recommendation to this effect. One of the members of the Board, I'd rather not identify, was in a very critical position with respect to Mr. Jones' influence. He made a personal trip to Austin to see me and to implore me not to let this ever officially come before the Board, because he said, "I'll have to support it if it comes." He said, "This man has such power over me, in the business that I'm in." Fortunately, it never did come before the Board. But Mr. Jones was naturally disappointed, he and his friends, and in Houston. He was in control of practically everything in Houston at that time. And there was more support for the Board in that area than any place else, I think, at that time. The Dallas News, the old gentlemen who had been the dean of Texas journalism for so many years, was one of my strongest supporters. He was a great source of help.

Cochran: Who was that?

Rainey: Oh, no. He's the father of the man that's there now.

Cochran: The point you just made, and I've jotted down my notes to ask you, as you know, no, you wouldn't probably, not being there because I think we're still talking about it so much. The last legislature passed a rule saying that all public boards, including Boards of Regents, had to have open, public meetings. They could no longer have secret meetings. And this is now the law of the land. So every time the Board of Regents meets, it has to have--conduct all

of its business in public, representatives of the press, etc., there. How would this have affected--has this been the law of the land, if you could look back and speculate--your having this increasing harassment by the Board, and I would assume...

Rainey: Well, that became an issue while I was there. The Board did have a few what they called "executive sessions," when they even excluded me, from them. Well, that was an affront to me, of course, and raised some very serious questions about my relationships with the Board. But there was strong opposition to these executive sessions. Some members of the Board themselves, for example, Mr. Parten, while he was on the Board and when he was chairman of the Board, just said there was going to be no executive sessions. "We're going to have this open, with press and everybody else there." That's the ideal way, I think.

Cochran: Oh, so these were open meetings, when they were conducting all this harassment?

Rainey: Oh, yes. Yes, they were. There were one or two times when they would call an executive session, but it was the exception. Most of these sessions were open sessions.

Cochran: And you think that's good?

Rainey: Oh, I do. Yes, in a state university or any institution that draws public support and so forth. I think that their business ought to be open to the public. It certainly is here. The press, faculty, and everybody else can attend Board meetings here.

Cochran: Is that right?

Rainey: Yes. So it was becoming an issue at that time, but I must say they

didn't use it but very few times that I recall.

Cochran: Although they could fire you as president, and indeed they did, but they couldn't fire you as professor of education. So, did you go on teaching?

Rainey: That's an interesting point. These university presidents have no tenure as president. We're just subject to the will of the board, day by day. So the policy has grown up fairly generally across the country that when a president is appointed now, he has two appointments; he's appointed as president, and then he's usually given a professorship in whatever department is appropriate to his background and training. For example, here, at the University of Colorado, our president now is a noted scholar in the field of French literature. So when he was appointed president, he was given a professorship in this area. And the granting of a professorship is for the very purpose of protecting him against this kind of summary action that the board might take against his presidency. Well, that's true in my place.

When I was appointed president, I was also given a professorship in school administration in the School of Education, which was my whole background, training, and experience. And that was approved by the Dean of the School of Education. I went personally and talked to Dean Pittenger who was the dean at that time, before I accepted the presidency. And I had taught for him two different summers before I became president; in the summer session, he and I were good friends. We knew each other, and he gave his complete

assent to my being given a professorship in the School of Education. So, when I was fired as President, nothing was said about my professorship, and they didn't fire me from my professorship because then they would have to go through all this procedure--bringing charges against me, and I had to have due process--a committee appointed to investigate it and make charges. Well, they didn't go through that so they made no mention of it. So there was a period there between November first, when they fired me, and the next meeting of the Board in January, when my tenure question wasn't very definite. Many people asked me during that period, "What's your status now? Are you going to remain as a Professor?" Well, I didn't know, and I couldn't answer.

It was during this time, too, that a charming anecdote came to my aid. I'll put it in the record, because I've told it many times. It's so apropos to the situation. It's the story of a half-witted boy that lived on the outskirts of a town, and being half-witted, he was unemployed. And he had the habit of sitting on the curb in front of his house which was the main thoroughfare in and out of town. He developed the habit of sitting there and wearing a kind of a silly grin and greeting all the people going into town. Well, the town fathers got a bit concerned about this, according to the story, and they thought it wasn't good practice to have a half-witted boy as kind of an unofficial greeter to people. So they put their heads together and decided to give the boy a job. So the mayor called him in one day and said, "John, how would you like

to have a job?" Well, that appealed to the boy right off. "What do you want me to do?" And he said, "Well, see that cannon out there on the city square?" He says, "That monument's been here a long time, since the Civil War days, and we've let it run down. We haven't taken care of it at all--it's dirty, and we'd like to have you take the job of polishing this cannon and keeping it in first-class condition." And they made him a proposition--to pay him some wages. So it appealed to the boy, and he eagerly took it. So as I told this story during this period, this boy polished that cannon faithfully every day for about five years--that was about the period of my presidency (chuckle). And one day he went in to the mayor and took the mayor by surprise by telling him that he was quitting his job. And, of course, the story varies a little from mine at this point, but the mayor said, "John, what's the matter? Why are you quitting if you like your job?" Yes, he liked his job all right. "Has the pay been satisfactory?" "Yes, the pay's been good, satisfactory." The mayor said, "The conditions of your work, vacations and so forth been satisfactory?" The boy replied, "Oh, yes, it's all been satisfactory." The mayor said, "Well, why are you quitting?" Well, the boy said, "I like my job, and everything's been satisfactory; the pay's been good. In fact, I've saved up enough money and I've bought me a cannon, and I'm going into business for myself." (laughter) Well, that little anecdote helped me over a lot of rough spots at that time. Some of my friends, when they greet me now, in Texas here, say, "Are you still polishing that cannon?"

Cochran: Oh, that's delightful.

Rainey: Well, the culmination of that whole incident was that when this new Board took over under Mr. Woodward's leadership, he raised a few questions about it. It was up for them to decide whether they were going to honor my professorship or not. He raised some questions, and he said, "Has Mr. Rainey taught anything while he has been here? Has he had any duties as a professor?" I said the answer was, "No, I hadn't taught anything here, hadn't been assigned any duties as a professor." So his solution was, "We'll keep him on as a professor if he wants to stay, but we'll not assign him any duties, and we'll not give him any salary." So that was the way the thing--he finally solved it in that way.

Cochran: Well, when did your salary stop then, the day they fired you?

Rainey: It stopped the day they fired me. I got no salary at all after November first. And as a result of the Board's action not recognizing my professorship and to clear the desk, so to speak, I turned in an official resignation from my professorship. And that closed that incident.

Cochran: When did you have to leave the president's home then?

Rainey: Immediately. I got out of the president's home immediately, and we rented a cottage out in the western part of town and lived there for the next two years.

Cochran: Do you think the president ought to have tenure as president?

Rainey: No, I think the system is probably all right, theoretically. The great problem here, as I've identified it, is the great gap between the legal authority and administrative responsibility. The

president has no legal authority, but he has practically all the responsibility for running the institution. And it's this gap between authority and responsibility which creates many of the problems. As I've said earlier, about the only power he has is moral power. Depends upon the quality of his personality, his leadership, and the validity of his recommendations, and things of that sort. That's all he's got to depend upon. And I think, in the main, that's all right. I never objected to it in any of the other positions I had. Now the thing that will make that thing work--this gap--the only thing that will make it work is to agree upon certain principles of administration. The school superintendents are in the same job, same position. And over a long period of years here, we have worked out a set of principles of the administration. And, in the main, that says that the Board is to be a policy-making board and not an administrative board. They make and approve the general policies, usually recommended by the superintendent or the president, in this case. And as long as they can accept these principles of administration and adhere to them, the thing works very well. But the moment a board begins to violate these principles, as they did in this case, as I've documented over and over, then everything just goes to pot. So the only thing that'll make it work is an acceptance on the part of the official board that they are not an administrative body but a policy-forming body.

Cochran: It wouldn't be a solution then, in your judgment, to, say in this case, where the Board wanted to fire a professor of economics, you pointed out to them all the details and procedures they had

to go through to do it, that that same protection wouldn't have been useful, helpful if it applied to the presidency. The point being that it's not that the board can't fire a professor, it's just the procedure that they've got to go through to do it. And you don't think that should apply to a president?

Rainey: No, I think in the long run, a president--he's the executive director of the board, and that thing will work as long as there is real effective harmony between him and the board. And the moment this harmony disappears, the board loses confidence in the president, and the president loses confidence in his board. Then I think it's time for him to move on or resign.

Cochran: The harmony or disharmony between the board, and a professor is unimportant. It doesn't make any difference whether the Board of Regents likes me or I like them; we just don't have to have any contact with each other?

Rainey: That's right. It's certainly of less importance, I'll put it that way. But it's of the utmost importance in this relationship between the executive director of the board and the board itself. There must be complete confidence there to make this thing work.

Cochran: To go back again to your inaugural address, you said in it, and let me quote if I may, for just a moment, continuing with this line of thought about the Board of Regents and their relationship with the president, I'd like to refer back once again to your inaugural address and read a quotation from it. You said, "It is worth noting here, also, that they are no less universities, that is, state universities, for being democratically sponsored. It was commonly

thought for a long time that because the state universities belonged to the people, and were under the control of people's government, they could not become true universities, that they could not enjoy proper academic freedom, that they could not further significantly search to promote genuine scholarship." And you go on then to say that you don't think this is true, as you are now about to assume the presidency of the state university, and they can be just as truly free as a private university.

Rainey: Well, in the first place, I think they should be truly free as a private university. And then I think if properly understood by the general public, they can be as free as any other university. Of course, that's been the big problem of universities from their very beginning. Any would-be...I've often said that any would-be dictator, the first thing he wants to do almost is get control of education within his state or his nation. I was in Germany, for example, for practically the whole summer after Hitler took over. And I studied the university situation there. Hitler moved in and one of his first moves was to take over those great universities. And I was in one of these universities where he hauled the library out in the street and burned the books. I walked into that great library there one morning while I was there, in a room thirty or forty feet wide--the entrance way, and over that entrance way was a big placard painted on a big sheet across there. And what do you think was painted on this? "The only official greeting permitted in this library is 'Heil, Hitler.'"

Well...so this has been a problem of state universities, and I recognize that. It is, in a way, a dichotomy to have a public institution under public control and yet at the same time, have the things we're talking about--the ideals of a university--prevail, including academic freedom. It is, in a way, an anomalous situation. But, my confidence is still unshaken that we can have it--we should have it, in the first place--and we can have it. And many of our great American universities, I think, have demonstrated--such universities as Minnesota, and Wisconsin, and Illinois, and so on. We've had a big flare-up recently, of course, in California which involved some of these factors of social control. This has often led me to say that, actually, we've not yet developed a satisfactory means for controlling these universities because of this very problem of public control on the one hand and the ideals of a university on the other.

Cochran: Do you have any thoughts about how we might move in that direction?

Rainey: Yes, naturally, I have. This whole matter of a Board of Regents, for example, the manner in which they are selected, the number on the Board, and their tenure on the Board--I've thought a lot about these. For example, the question of election of members for the Board of Regents versus the appointment by governors. We still have a few states left that elect these Boards of Regents at a regular popular election, and they actually, here in this state, run on a partisan ballot as a Democrat or a Republican. That, I think, is not the best way. In fact, I'd say it was about the worst known one in my judgment, to select a Board. In other words,

we ought to try to keep these institutions, if possible, out of partisan politics. Now, we've tried to do that with our public schools; the same problem exists there--they're supported by public taxation. But even there now, where we elect Boards of control in our local public schools, they don't run as partisans; they run as non-partisans. Furthermore, they have the election of school boards not at the time of the general political elections. They have their own special times for them, you see. So that's a means of divorcing the school system from partisan politics. I think every step possible ought to be taken to separate our state universities system from partisan politics. I don't think they ought to run as a Democrat or Republican, for example. Then I think their term of office is an important one--where they're appointed. Most Boards now are appointed.

Cochran: You obviously do favor appointing the board of regents.

Rainey: Yes, I do, even in spite of the experience that I had there. The size of the Board and their appointment is very important. For example, I think, probably a seven to nine member Board is about an ideal. We had a nine-member Board there. Some Boards are larger than that. California's Board, I think, has fifteen or sixteen. The New York Board of Regents has about thirteen, I think, something like that. In the first place, they ought to be an odd number. We have an even numbered Board here at Colorado elected politically, as they are. And the rule is here that the President presides over the Board, which I don't think he should do. And in case of a tie vote, he breaks the tie vote. And time and time

again since I've been here, the President has been put in that position of having to break a tie vote. In my judgment, he should never be put in that position. So there ought to be an odd number on the Board.

Cochran: Well, administratively, if I could ask you to comment on that, how could a President be a presiding officer and also act then, as the agent of the Board?

Rainey: Well...that's right...

Cochran: ...What we were talking about earlier about the president being the agent of the Board...

Rainey: It's an anomalous...now what's the word I want to use there...situation. It just doesn't fit in with anything. And when a President has to break a tie vote, as this happens here again and again, he alienates the other half of his Board everytime he does it, you see. And so it's just a ready-made situation for conflict between the President and the Board. I don't think a President should preside over the Board. I think that they ought to have their own presiding officer, and he's their executive official. Now the other thing, the term of office is very important. I like the New York system and the California system. New York is a good example. I think they have thirteen members of the Board, and they serve thirteen years, their term of office, and only one goes off a year. So that there's continuity there on the Board--there's only one new member possible to come on a year--and no Governor, therefore, can get control of that Board during any term of office, you see. It has the effect of separating it from politics. Now the Cali-

fornia situation is almost identical. They have a large Board of fifteen or sixteen. They have three or four ex officio members out there. But their Board serves the length of time of the number of the Board, and only one changes a year so that no Governor could get control of it. But Texas was a made-to-order situation. When a Governor of Texas was elected for the second time (he was elected every two years down there), he had an opportunity of appointing three members of the Board every time he came in. So at the beginning of his second term, he could appoint the majority of the Board. That's what happened in this case.

Cochran: What is their term of office, then, three years?

Rainey: Six years.

Cochran: Six...yeah.

Rainey: Six years. They're divided into three classes, and three go off every two years. And it gives the Texas Governor a chance to get control of all those Board seats, for that matter. So, I think that ought to be changed.

Cochran: Do you have any thoughts on how a governor might select good men?

Rainey: Yes, I've thought a lot about that. Actually in Texas, for example, I think at the time I was there, it was generally regarded that the Governor's appointment to a Board of Regents of the University of Texas was the finest appointment he had to make and thus the highest honor he could confer upon a citizen of Texas. And I've said a number of times, I don't think any real responsible citizen of Texas would turn down an appointment to the Board of Regents of the University of Texas. That meant, then, that the Governor had

the opportunity to get the best that the state had to offer. He could select the finest leadership that the state had to offer for that Board of Regents, if he wanted to, because of just what I've said--most people would regard it as the finest appointment he had to make. It's a non-paying job; it's an opportunity for fine public service and a high honor.

Cochran: How can we get Governors to select that type of person? In the first place we ought to (chuckle) get good governors!

Rainey: And educate them on what their responsibilities are.

Cochran: Do you think...it's been suggested that, say, the University of Texas, or North Texas, or any such university, there's an appointment coming up. The Governor's going to appoint a new member to the Board. Do you think the faculty at that university ought to have any say-so at all, in terms of advice, direction, or suggestion to the Governor as to who might be a good regent for that university?

Rainey: Well, I think not formally. I don't think they ought to get out and circulate petitions, for example, because after all they're servants of the Board and of the state. And of course, in their individual capacity, they should be free, I think, to comment on this thing. Certainly if they're asked for any help in that direction, they can give it.

Cochran: Well, that's really what I meant. Would the governor being wise and asking a faculty to send up...he has one appointment to come up, to send up five suggestions or something like that?

Rainey: Well, I see nothing wrong with it if a governor wanted to do it,

because I think he can seek advice wherever he wants to get it, and I think he ought to seek that advice. I certainly (chuckle) would say that he ought not to appoint a person into a position of that sort if he knows that it's going to be met with opposition by the faculty of the institution. In other words, just flaunt them with something of that sort. I think that would be very unwise on the governor's part.

Cochran: Well, I was just speculating. In my own mind I don't know...the Governor is going to do it but I was...I was wondering to myself when the governor decides to appoint somebody to the State Banking Commission, to whom does he go for advice to get a good man for the State Banking Commission, or some such thing. It just seemed to me logical that a governor would seek out the professionals in the field. It it isn't just a hack appointment--it it's an appointment of some responsibility. But maybe I'm too optimistic; maybe he just always appoints hacks, I don't know. (chuckle)

Rainey: Well, that's a very difficult problem, of course--where the governor gets his advice and what advice he should get. When I was on these other jobs like Franklin and Bucknell, there their system is a self-perpetuating Board. They had their own committee that nominated new members of the Board when there were resignations or when there were positions to be filled. That's quite a different situation, of course.

Cochran: It would be.

Rainey: There, the President often times would make recommendations for Board members to this committee. But I, as President of the state

university, would not think of doing that because the situation's totally different.

Cochran: Well, one minor issue that remained after they got rid of you as President, how did they set about the arduous and time consuming task of selecting a new President?

Rainey: Well, that's a very interesting story, too. Of course, this thing happened, as I recall, about nine-thirty or ten o'clock at night, when they actually took the formal action to fire me there at that meeting in Houston.

Cochran: Were you at the meeting there when this motion came up?

Rainey: Oh yes. I was at the meeting. It dawned upon them rather suddenly, I think, that now they had a new vacuum to fill here. They had no administration in the University and that was quite a shock to them. As I look back upon it, when it dawned upon them now they've taken this action and yet they've got a gap now, in the administration. And so they discussed that for a few minutes and kicked it around, as we say, a bit, and finally somebody came up with the idea, well, Dr. Painter, who was on the faculty committee down there these two days to help adjust this stiuation, make a very good impression before them. They thought he was a fine man, an outstanding scientist, and I've forgotten what member of the Board said, "Well, why don't we make Dr. Painter President, or acting President--temporary President?" Well, they just jumped at that, and they just took the action almost spontaniously to elect him the acting President of the University.

Cochran: Apparently no fore-planning or fore-thought whatsoever?

Rainey: None whatever! Evidently it just happened on the spur of the moment. So (chuckle) that was a very interesting situation. Dr. Painter was there in a hotel at the time, and evidently he had gone to bed. And they commissioned me to convey this information to him (laughter) that he'd been selected as the temporary President. Well, when I got a hold of him and told him this information, he was the most startled man you've ever seen.

Cochran: Well now, in what capacity was he there at the hotel?

Rainey: Well, he was there as a member of the faculty committee. You see, at this meeting of the Board, the faculty authorized a committee to come down there, and he was one of the members of the faculty committee. The alumni had a committee there--some distinguished alumni of the University. And the student body was represented with the student body president--all there to help the Board and me see if we could work out an adjustment or some sort of a satisfactory solution of this problem--the impasse to which we had come.

Cochran: And so he was simply the...he was a member of this faculty committee?

Rainey: He was a member of the faculty committee, and when he made his presentation, the whole committee was before the Board--the whole faculty committee came in as a committee. And he made a very favorable impression on the Board. He was an outstanding scientist and nationally recognized--a member of the National Academy of Science, and was an outstanding individual.

Cochran: Well, did he make the report for the committee, was that it?

Rainey: Well, I'm a little unclear about that. I think every member of the

committee talked. It was kind of an informal situation. And that was true also with the alumni committee. They all came in and talked back and forth and asked questions; it went on there for hours. Well, he accepted it, but because of this faculty support for me...After they fired me, the faculty had a special meeting and adopted a resolution, as I say, by roll call vote. About ninety-two percent of them asked for my reinstatement. So it created a problem for Dr. Painter; he was in a very embarrassing position on his part, of course. And the result was that he made an agreement with the faculty that he would accept this presidency temporarily and only temporarily. In fact, the faculty wrote out (chuckle) an agreement that he signed and, as I recall, Dr. Walter Webb wrote the document that he signed which stated clearly that he would accept it in this emergency but that he would not accept it permanently if it were offered. He agreed to that in writing with the faculty as a kind of an understanding with the faculty. So this lasted for a period of time; I think probably nearly two years, as I recall, he was in this acting capacity. But actually, Mr. Woodward was the President of the University during that period. He was pulling all of the strings. And for all practical effect, he was the President of the University. And it was a tragic situation, really, from Dr. Painter's point of view.

Well, evidently during this period the Board was unable to find any man of any consequence who would come in there and take the job under those circumstances. And so they eventually offered the full-

time position to Dr. Painter, after a period of temporary leadership. At that point, another crucial factor entered, of course, because he'd made this agreement with the faculty that he would not take it permanently. So I've often thought he made one tragic mistake. When it was offered to him, he took it without going back to the faculty for advice or anything of that sort. Well, that created a very difficult situation between him and the faculty, because he had made this agreement with the faculty that he would not take it. I've often thought he could've improved his stature a great deal if he'd gone back to the faculty and said, "Now look here. I made this agreement with you some time ago. The Board now has offered this position to me and I'd like...I'd like to take it." And if he'd done that with the faculty, I think he would've improved his stature a lot. His moral prestige, I think, would have gone up as it went down the way he did act. So he was in a very difficult position all the time he was there. I've often thought it was rather tragic for him, just due to a whole set of circumstances under which he had to operate.

Cochran: What do you think was really the major long-run effect on the University of the Board firing you then Dr. Painter taking it without going back to the faculty? Did the University slip off into...

Rainey: Oh, it was tragic for the University. The whole experience was tragic. It was a national issue. The national press commented on it again and again. For example, Harper's Magazine, it was De Voto, had two separate long articles in Harper's Magazine about it. The Washington Post had an editorial. The Richmond paper, as I remem-

ber, the Chicago Tribune commented on it. The whole national press... it became a national issue. And actually, when Mr. Woodward took over at this first meeting, he had a stack of correspondence and petitions and recommendations for my reinstatement. As a matter of fact, I think they said there were over eighty separate petitions on his desk at that time, including the ones from the faculty. And they came in from all over the nation. Educational groups around the country sent in petitions for my reinstatement. And as I say, it was stated that there were more than eighty of those individual petitions on his desk at the time. And he had to refute all of that, and that's why he made this three or four hour speech trying to defend the action of the regents and discredit me...

Cochran: Now to whom was this three or four hour speech made? Just to the Board?

Rainey: Well, no. The faculty was represented there, and the press was represented there at this meeting. He made this long speech.

Cochran: This was in...this was in the following January?

Rainey: In the following January, that's right. Now you asked about the long-range effects--they were really serious. As I said earlier, the AAUP sent a committee down there and investigated it and made a report which was published in their bulletin of 1946, in which they recommended censure. And the University was censured, and it stayed on the censure list for about nine years. Well now, during that time the University was in a terrible position with respect to the faculty members leaving--good faculty members leaving. They lost a lot of their best faculty during that period, and then their problem

of getting new comparable people to take their places. So the University suffered--there's no doubt.

Cochran: Do you have any recollection of evidence of the difficulty the University had in trying to get new faculty members to come down there and get refused?

Rainey: (chuckle) Oh, yes. Two or three very interesting ones. Of course, we'll never know how many people they offered jobs to that didn't take them. We could pretty well tell the members that left, because that's evident. But I've often said I'd like to know, for example, how many people were offered jobs at the University of Texas during that period and turned them down. There must have been hundreds of them, really. I have two bits of evidence about it, for what they're worth. For example, I was having lunch one day in Cleveland with President Sproul of the University of California, at that time, and the President of the University of Minnesota. (The three of us were there attending a meeting and had lunch together.) And this all was a matter of discussion. And I remember President Sproul saying something like this to me: He said, "Well, Rainey, you might be interested to know," he said, "I haven't kept an exact count or record, but I would assert that the University of Texas has offered at least fifty members of my faculty jobs since this happened and not a one of them has taken a job down there." Well, now of course, there would be other reasons why people wouldn't transfer to Texas from California. But he was pointing it out as evidence to that effect, that good faculty members wouldn't go there under those circumstances. Well, that's one bit.

Then I remember very definitely another time I was discussing these matters with the President of the University of Oklahoma, President Cross. And he made this assertion to me: He said, "Rainey, you might be interested to know that the University of Texas has offered a position to every single member of my faculty of architecture during this period, and not a one of them has gone." Well, those are just bits of evidence for what they're worth. Of course, there are other factors, naturally, in a situation of that sort.

Cochran: Based on the evidence, they had a poor record in getting men from prestige universities.

Rainey: That's right...that's right. As I've often said, as I said a moment ago, I think it would be worthwhile if somebody could just get in there and get to the records and see how many people had been offered jobs during that period that didn't go. Because that's the way the AAUP works. It is an agency to inform their members that conditions are not favorable and, as I say, it's kind of a warning signal to the whole profession.

Cochran: You must have joined the AAUP when you were at Oregon.

Rainey: Yes, I did. I was a member of the AAUP out at Oregon. When I became President, of course, I wasn't eligible to be a member of the AAUP. But since coming here to the University of Colorado, I've been a member again and actually served as president of the local chapter since I've been here.

Cochran: Oh, good.

Rainey: So I've always had a great appreciation of the AAUP, naturally. I owe them a lot because the report that they made after the investi-

gation was one of the finest bits of support that I had because they went into it thoroughly and dealt with all the major issues involved, and gave me a very fine report. I've always appreciated it, naturally.

Cochran: What would've happened if you hadn't opposed the Board of Regents in the beginning, if you had been their agent and their...

Rainey: Well, naturally I've thought about that a lot, and I've asked myself many, many times, "Now what did I do or that I didn't do that might have helped this situation?" And I just don't know. The way the thing developed, it looks like I had no choice. When they just slapped it down on my desk as Strickland did and said, "We want you to fire these men!" I just didn't have any choice except to try, as I've explained before, to win him over and win the Board over to the basic factors in this situation. I just really had no other choice in the actions I took. Now the question of whether I was astute enough, or whether I handled the situation intelligently, that's for somebody else to decide. That's where, of course, I think the AAUP helped me so much. I had a lot of fine guidance in this thing--faculty guidance. I had all kinds of help from individuals of all description. So I did the best I could. As I look back upon it, I have very few regrets.

Cochran: What do you think now, twenty-three, twenty-four years later? What do you think the Board really was trying to do from the beginning--from the time they fired Gordon, and Peach, and Foster, and then firing you? What was their aim? What was their basic aim?

Rainey: Well, I think the answer to that's very clear. I think that it was

just a deliberate attempt on the part of a political group to take over...move in and try to subject a whole educational system--not the University of Texas, but the whole system--bring it under their control. They got control of the State Board of Education the same way; they got control of the A&M Board. They fired the President of A&M a year before they fired me. So it was a move to bring the whole educational system of Texas, in my judgment, under their complete domination. I don't think they had any other objective in mind.

Cochran: If so, then the question of censure would--as you said a while ago--it would be meaningless. They couldn't care less.

Rainey: That's right. One very clear-cut illustration of this is when the Senate had this investigation following my dismissal. They brought in every member of the Board, quizzed them. They brought in many individuals. Well, they had Mr. Stark, Lutcher Stark, on the (chuckle) witness chair, for example. They asked Mr. Stark the direct question, "Well, Stark, what, in your judgment, was the basic issue out here that caused all this trouble?" And in his frank and honest way he said, "Well, it's very simple." He said, "President Rainey wanted to run this institution according to the best accepted principles of academic procedure, and the Board didn't want to run it that way." (laughter) That's just all in the record.

Cochran: Well, that's pretty honest.

Rainey: That states the whole issue of it. I think that's just what happened. I <u>was</u> trying to run it according to the high ideals and tradition of a great university, and I think I understood what they

were. There wasn't any doubt in my mind what they were. And as Mr. Stark said, they just didn't want to run it that way.

Cochran: They had a different conception of what a university is.

Rainey: That's right. It was to be an instrument of their control to be used by them to promote their interests. It goes back to, what I said, what makes "Texas tick." They wanted to be able to control the rules of the game. And they didn't want any institution or any person running counter to that. And Texas was pretty bold in its politics, in those days. It had a frontier tradition, and they were very direct in their handling of it.

Cochran: Well, this is a dramatic turning point in Texas history, because the year you were fired was also the year the Texas Democrats bolted the national party, wasn't it?

Rainey: That's right. The Texas...Dixie-crats. And since that time, of course, they've been pretty much in opposition to the national Democratic leadership,as you well know. Yes, I think it was, in a way, a turning point. Probably some of these issues will come out when we discuss my political campaign.

Cochran: Well, I...what I'd like to turn to next, if we could get for the record, your manuscript of the charges to the faculty and your relationship to the Board--the famous "sixteen points."

Rainey: Yes, I'll be glad to hand it over...

Cochran: ..."Sixteen points"...we don't need to read it into the tape, but we can just take it in to hear.

Rainey: I'll be glad to make that available.

Cochran: And turn next time then to...well, now that you're out of a job,

both as professor and President, what do you do next?

Rainey: Yes...(laughter)

Cochran: And lead up then, of course, to the gubernatorial campaign in 1946, and explore that in some detail.

Rainey: Yes. Well, I'll be glad to discuss that.

Cochran: Very good.

Rainey: Another interesting chapter in my career. (chuckle)

Cochran: Oh, indeed so. Well, if we could, then, pick up with your career, what you did after you were dismissed from the presidency and they refused to retain you as a professor. I believe then almost immediately began your series of daily radio talks. Is that right?

Rainey: Yes. There was a little lapse in there in which I was naturally trying to figure out what I wanted to do--how I wanted to spend my time and where I might be employed, and that sort of thing. A number of opportunities, or several at any rate, were possibilities. It was during this period when I was thinking things over that Mr. Jacquess of Denison, who had a big saw company at that time, approached me. He was advertising rather extensively on the radio in Texas, and he had a state-wide network program. He approached me to carry on a daily program five days a week. He had fifteen minute periods on the radio and he made an attractive...rather attractive offer to me at that time. And he also gave me an opportunity, again, to talk to the people of Texas about things that really mattered.

Cochran: Now these were fifteen minute...just talks on current issues?

Rainey: Talks...I could talk about anything I wanted to. And that was (chuckle) one of the most...Well, I've often thought it was one of the greatest

intellectual experiences I ever had. To prepare a fifteen minute talk five days a week requires a lot of effort on one's part.

Cochran: Must've taken quite a bit of time.

Rainey: It took a lot of time.

Cochran: Did you write them out--each talk?

Rainey: I wrote each talk out. In fact, I had to have a copy of the speech I was going to make in the hands of the radio twenty-four hours in advance of the talk. So I had to write it out.

Cochran: Now why was that?

Rainey: Well, they required that. That was a requirement of the radio station, so that they could have a chance to see that there was nothing in these talks that would jeopardize them in any way or get them involved in suits and things of that sort.

Cochran: But there was no attempt either by this Mr. Jacquess or the radio to dictate what you'd say?

Rainey: Oh, none whatever...none whatever. I was perfectly free to say what I wanted. They had natural interests; they were subject to possible suits libels, and things of that sort. So that was the only purpose they had--just to make sure that there wasn't anything in there that would jeopardize them in any way.

Cochran: What were some of the ideas that you explored? Do you remember now? It's been a long time ago.

Rainey: Oh my, it has been a long time. That's right. Oh, I think I talked about nearly everything. I talked a lot about the educational system; I talked a lot about the controversy, of course, and academic freedom, and all that was involved in that. I talked

about all these problems facing the state of Texas and their need for a better educational system and the fact that they ranked almost down at the bottom among the states on their educational program and their health program. I talked a lot about the conservation of natural resourses. That's all a matter of record. I have a complete record of all that; these were all put on records.

Cochran: Oh, really.

Rainey: I'd be interested to back--I have thought of that a number times--go back and play these records all over. They're in my collection now at the University of Missouri.

Cochran: It must be quite a pile of records.

Rainey: Oh, it is a pile.

Cochran: It must be seventy R.P.M. records...

Rainey: That's right...that's right...

Cochran: It would take quite a few of those for one fifteen minute...

Rainey: I've even thought about the possibility sometime of transcribing them and maybe putting them in some kind of published form. I think it'd make an interesting project.

Cochran: Well, I think it would.

Rainey: Well, that was a very fine experience. And of course it was during this time that I got naturally involved deeper and deeper in matters relating to the whole state of Texas.

Cochran: Were these talks pretty well received by the people across the state? Did you get letters, cards?

Rainey: Oh, yes. They were very favorably received, and that was one of the factors that ultimately decided me to go into the governor's

campaign.

Cochran: When did that idea begin to emerge, that you might run for Governor?

Rainey: Oh, it was kind of in the background of my mind all along. Various people suggested, "Well, I think you ought to get in there and run for Governor of Texas. You'd have a good chance to be elected," and that sort of thing so it was never completely out of my mind.

Cochran: But who were some of those people? Do you remember now or would you want to identify them for us?

Rainey: No, I'd have a hard time identifying them. The impressions that I remember are a bit indefinite. Those suggestions for getting into it would come from a lot of sources.

Cochran: Sure. Were there any...Was it during this...What...You must have been on the radio then for nearly year and a half or so before you announced?

Rainey: Well, I'd have to check back to be sure of the exact dates but virtually a year...a full year five days a week, fifteen minutes each.

Cochran: But the idea did begin to jell from the beginning that you might use this radio as the platform for your ideas and eventually to run for Governor.

Rainey: Whether I had it in my mind or not, it actually served that purpose. It gave me a <u>marvelous</u> opportunity to talk to the people of Texas on a state-wide network. And I got all kinds of responses from them.

Cochran: Now this was your source during this period of time, your source of financial income also?

Rainey: That's right. It enabled me to live fairly comfortably. He pro-

vided me also with a full-time secretary to help me with the mechanics of all this.

Cochran: Had you known him before this?

Rainey: No, I had not. That's an interesting thing.

Cochran: What do you suppose prompted his generosity and willingness? Was he sympathetic to your ideas?

Rainey: Well, that's number one, I think, plus the fact that he was pushing his business very vigorously, and he saw the opportunity, probably, of getting an increased coverage for his program. He had a very flourishing business at that time.

Cochran: Well, it just seems somewhat unique to me that a man who was going to push power saws, that he would use the far-ranging intellectual discussion of the issues of the state to promote the sale of power saws.

Rainey: (laughter) Well, of course, he had a minute or two at the beginning and a minute or two at the end of each one of these addresses to tell his saw story. And oh, I think he just...in fact, possibly saw this as a good way to get some increased attention to his program. And then I think he was a man of generous spirit. He thought I was making some worthwhile contribution to the life and problems of Texas, and I think he had a generous motive.

Cochran: Do you think he benefited from it financially?

Rainey: Oh, I don't think there was any doubt about it. He ran into some difficulties with some of the financial interests in Texas. For example, he had rather large...that is after I became a candidate for Governor, this happened. He had some rather large loans, for

example, at some of the banks there, and they put pressure on him and that way, by calling the loans. He had to make some financial readjustments. But that didn't seriously hurt him, I don't think. But it cost him something to back me--that's the point.

Cochran: For Governor, that is.

Rainey: For Governor, yes.

Cochran: Now once you decided to run for Governor, well, you dropped the daily talks.

Rainey: Oh, yes. I gave that up, naturally. There was a period between the first of January and the month of May of 1946, when this real consideration began--to run for Governor. And one of the influential factors there was, of course, everybody was doing some speculation about who the candidates were going to be. And there was a young fellow there in Austin at the time named Joe Belden. He had a poll that he ran. And some of his polls indicated that I had a very good chance, possibly, to be elected Governor. Naturally, that was a factor in my thinking. And then I actually did a little polling on my own. I remember I sent out a series of sample questionnaires to a few other people on the Gallup poll idea of sampling. And I got very favorable response from that.

Cochran: Now both of these polls--the ones you just referred to--were before you formally announced.

Rainey: Oh, yes. That's right...they were...My point is that they were influential in my making up my mind to get in there, because I'd never had any political experience, and I didn't have any ambitions politically. I'd never had any. And I had no money, and I had no orga-

nization so I had to give some very serious thought to getting into a campaign under those handicaps, as they were.

Cochran: But as you began to jell your idea, then, you took the polls and saw the Belden poll, did you...were you at this time beginning to build up a group of intellectual, political advisors to talk with?

Rainey: Oh, yes. Naturally I talked with numerous people during this period to get their ideas.

Cochran: Seeking their advice?

Rainey: Seeking their advice.

Cochran: Who were some that you relied on most strongly?

Rainey: Well, I suppose it was by all odds Major J. R. Parten of Houston, who had been chairman of the Board when I was first...was on the Board and then later chairman when I became President of the University of Texas. He has been a wonderful friend all these years, and he's had a lot of political experience himself. He was an independent oil man, and he had been active in the political life of the state and knew it very well, indeed.

Cochran: He's the one who resigned from the Board following your dismissal.

Rainey: Well, he wasn't reappointed.

Cochran: Oh, that's right.

Rainey: He wasn't...this was the first real attack that this new group made was to leave him off the Board because he was the best friend that I had on the Board, and replace him with some of these other people. Another man, of course, was former Governor Allred, James V. Allred, who had been Governor, and he helped me a great deal. Of course, he understood the politics of the state. Then I had a whole group of

younger, what you might call more inexperienced people at that time. Men like the present Senator Yarborough, for example, was very active in my campaign. Then I just had a host of individual friends, students, former students of the University, leaders of the alumni association--they just got in and did yeoman service for me on a voluntary basis. That was one of the great inspirations to me during that campaign because we had no money; we had to make up for it in extra service.

Cochran: The decision to run, you relied on such men as Parten, Yarborough...

Rainey: Parten, Allred...people of that sort. Then too, another important factor in my getting into that campaign was, I had known enough about Texas, having grown up there, to know that a political campaign in Texas is a...really a dramatic platform from which one can discuss the issues of the day, because it gets lots of attention, lots of publicity. And I didn't regard my dismissal at the University of Texas as having settled these issues, if you know what I mean.

Cochran: Oh, sure.

Rainey: I felt that there was still a great need to talk to the people of Texas--not only about those issues, but other things that were in a way either directly or indirectly related to it. And I thought Texas was suffering at that time, because of not being able to capitalize on its own potentialities. I pointed out earlier, you know, that Texas has the greatest variety and abundance of natural resources of any area in the world, and I thought that Texas was not reaping any values for it, that those resources were being drained

off by the great industrial corporations of the country. And Texas, therefore, was not realizing what it might realize from those resources. And I've pointed that out again and again in my campaign.

Cochran: So your campaign, really, was two-fold. One was to continue your process of educating the people of Texas as to what the issues were.

Rainey: That's right.

Cochran: And then, too, though just a very frank hope and aspiration that you could in fact become governor and put those ideas into practice.

Rainey: That's right. I thought it a great opportunity, for example, because the governor is the key, really, to the development of those resources and the development of the life of the state. The laws that he passes and the administration of those laws play a great role, of course.

Cochran: But what I was asking was once you made the dicision to run, it was an all-out decision that you intended to run and intended to win. It wasn't just an educational...

Rainey: Oh, of course, that's right. Sure. Otherwise, you go in handicapped, if you went in with reservations about it. So I put everything I had into it with one exception, and I think that's worth noting. There had been a tradition there a long time that keep education and particularly the University of Texas out of politics--partisan politics. And because of this experience that I'd had as President of the University had been so dramatic, it naturally would be a major issue in almost any campaign--certainly if I were the candidate. But my advisors felt generally that I ought not to bring the University per se into that campaign on the grounds that they didn't want

to get the University involved in politics. Well, I yielded pretty much to that advice and I think, in a way, it handicapped me because whether or not...willy nilly, the University was actually in politics up to its ears. It was a big political issue. And I think I lost some political power and prestige by not going into the campaign, and it was for that reason.

Cochran: Well, what were the main campaign issues that you argued for? Would you tick them off? I can remember most of them but elaborate on them, such as tax program, conservation of natural resources, farm to market roads. Would you...

Rainey: Yes. Better schools, better health programs, welfare programs of all sorts, because Texas, at that time, was way down the line, as I say, in safety and welfare programs.

Cochran: What kinds of welfare programs? Do you, in any detail, remember now?

Rainey: Well, primarily in the field of public health and education--those were two of the...

Cochran: Well, how did you propose to finance these expansions of many of the government...

Rainey: Well, of course, it involves more taxes, and that's where you ran head-on into these big financial interests. I was advocating, for example, a severance tax on that oil at the well...that meant at the well. And that wasn't an unusual thing because, as I remember, the state of Louisiana at that time had such a severance tax.

Cochran: Oh, Texas did too, I believe.

Rainey: Later, maybe, but I don't think it did at that time. Well, I'd

have to check on that to be sure. But I advocated what was... amounted to about a thirty million dollar increase at that time, in appropriations for the educational system of Texas. I remember that rather definitely. It amounted to about twenty-nine or thirty million extra over what they were paying at the time. Well, a few years later, I was back down there at Austin on a visit with some of my friends and the head of the Associated Press in Texas--the legislature was in session at the time--in speaking with me, he said, "Well, Mr. Rainey, you'd be interested to know that the legislature passed the last act that you'd advocated today in the legislature." And the very first legislature, after I had made this request, for a thirty million dollar increase, the very next legislature appropriated twenty-nine of that thirty million. (chuckle) So actually, I think my advocacy of these programs did have a great effect in helping to bring them about because it helped the people understand, I think, what their needs were--on the one hand--and what their possibilities were. So I look back upon it as a measure of success whether I...

Cochran: Oh, indeed, I think so.

Rainey: ...whether I was the governor or not.

Cochran: You charged a great deal, I believe, that the state protected and fostered monopolies and control...financial control by the East, somewhat reminiscent of Walter Prescott Webb's book?

Rainey: Oh, yes.

Cochran: Would you elaborate on that for a while?

Rainey: For example, I got a lot of inspiration out of Walter Presscot's

book, Divided We Stand.

Cochran: That was the one.

Rainey: He outlined the whole issue in that book. He did it so well that, I don't know whether you remember or not, but the publisher took it off the market because it was such a controversial book.

Cochran: No, I didn't know that.

Rainey: Oh, yes. They took it off the market, and you couldn't buy it, at that particular time. But I had read it a number of years before and had gotten a lot of inspiration out of it. In fact, I still use it in my teaching.

Cochran: But what are the main themes or ideas from the book that you used in your campaign?

Rainey: Well, his thesis was very simple. He divided the country, just arbitrarily, into three major divisions. The North and the East--the northeast--from Michigan and Ohio and above the Mason-Dixon line, clear across to the Atlantic coast, taking in the eastern states--that was one division. The other division was the Old South, south of the Mason-Dixon line around including Texas. And the third division was the great central and western sections. So you had three...three sections. Then after making that arbitrary division, he then studied the resources--the natural resources--represented in each of these divisions. And he pointed out, for example, that the Northeast section--number one section that I described--had only about fifteen percent of the natural resources of the entire country, in that area, and that the South and the West combined had the other eighty-five percent. And then he stu-

died the income of these two sections...of these three sections, and he came out with the conclusion (you just reverse the situation) that the North and the East with fifteen percent of the resources had eighty-five percent of the national income at that time. And the South and the West, with eighty-five percent of the natural resources, had only about fifteen percent of the national income. And then, of course, he went into all of the reasons why.

Cochran: Now, was it the reasons that you latched onto, then, in this campaign?

Rainey: Oh, yes. I took those basic facts and I pointed out, for example, that Texas itself had the greatest abundance and variety of natural resources of any comparable piece of land in the world and that therefore, the citizens of Texas ought to have the highest standard of living, and they could have the highest standard of living of any people anywhere in the world if they made proper use of what they have to go on. And about that same time, or a few years before, we had had an economic survey of the nation. There was an economic commission created in Washington, and they made a report. And in that report they pointed out that the South--the whole South around the rim of the Gulf of Mexico--was the economic problem number one of this nation. It had more eroded soil; it had more ill health; it had the poorest educational system; all the lower ten states in the Union were in the South--ranked educationally. So, I <u>love</u> the South, and I wanted...I was interested not only in Texas, but in the whole of the South...to build, to bring up the economic status of those people. And the key to it, as I saw it,

was the use of their intelligence...their intelligence applied to this great storehouse of natural resources that they weren't really getting any benefit out of. That was the great burden of my approach to this thing.

Cochran: I think you made that rather pointedly, didn't you once, in a talk over at Breckenridge or somewhere?

Rainey: Yes, I did at the county seat of Stephens County. Early, Stephens County was one of the great oil producing areas in the early explorations down there. And during this campaign, I made a speech on the steps of the courthouse at Breckenridge in which I raised all these questions with them. They had taken hundreds of millions of dollars of oil out of that one county and yet the county was just as poor as it practically had always been. They didn't have but very little improvement in the schools; the hospital and health program--it was nil, almost. And the roads--there was one big highway that went through there from Fort Worth going out west, and that's about all; they had no farm to market roads. Well, that was a classic example really of what the rest of the state was experiencing. So I was trying the best...and then these discriminatory freight rates. I dwelt much on that because that was one of the things holding back this economic development. And while I was at the University, I brought Dr. Zimmerman down there from the University of North Carolina who was perhaps one of the most outstanding men in the world at that time on natural resource development. So it was one of our major themes.

Cochran: If I can digress for just a minute from the campaign, mentioning

Dr. Zimmerman, one of my outstanding idealistic members, the well-known Dr. Zimmerman, how did you find out about him?

Rainey: Oh, I knew about him. The University of North Carolina, I should mention this, I got a lot of inspiration out of the University of North Carolina. He and a whole group of men from the University of North Carolina developed this idea of regionalism. And the University of North Carolina made a great contribution to that concept of developing that region through research and studies of that sort, and Dr. Zimmerman was one of the key men.

Cochran: I see.

Rainey: So that played into this theory that I had of the relationship of the University to the people of the state.

Cochran: So long as we're on a short digression, we could re-edit these and put them back in the proper place later, but North Carolina reminds me of Mr. Cash's book, The Mind of the South. Was he another major influence in your thinking?

Rainey: Oh, yes. I'm glad you mentioned that because his book came out just a few years before that, and it along with Webb's book--Mr. Cash's book on The Mind of the South--is the best analysis that I know of anywhere of the thinking of the South. I've used the South a lot in my teaching by contrast with the little country of Denmark. You know, during the first part of the nineteenth century, this country was being divided between the North and the South. The North had a dream of industrialization--the industrial revolution was getting underway in this country. Well, the South had a dream contrary to that. It was a dream of a Greek democracy around

the rim of the Gulf of Mexico. By Greek democracy, I refer clear back to the ancient Greek setting where they had these rulers, these liberals, the freed men, making up about twenty-five percent of the population--it was built on a slave economy, built on an agricultural economy, the class society. And that was the dream of the Old South, to have this Greek democracy around the rim of the Gulf of Mexico. Well, of course, those two ideas came into conflict in the Civil War, and the South lost the Civil War, as we know. But they held onto that dream; it was a noble dream in many people's minds. And so it has persisted even down to the present time, as we know. It's still part of a controversial situation. Well, at the same time the South was losing this war with the North, the little country of Denmark was losing the war with Germany, at exactly the same time, 1865. They were down and out, too, like the South was, flat on their back. She had lost a great slice of her territory, Sehleswig-Holstein, to Germany in that war. Well, in the meantime, between 1865 and 1937, when the South was declared the "economic problem number one" in this nation, the little country of Denmark, in the meantime, had raised the standard of its people to the highest in the world. And the little country of Denmark doesn't have literally as many natural resources to build upon as a half a dozen of our great Texas counties. Now, what made the difference? This was my argument. The difference was in the way they thought about their problem. I've often put it into a thesis that a people, an individual, or a community, or a nation, or a whole culture is a product of the way they think.

And I was trying to deal with that thinking of the South, about themselves and about their whole culture and society down there. That's a marvelous theme, really, for me.

Cochran: What was the difference in the thinking--the ideals, the philosophies, the values between the Danish people and the southern people?

Rainey: Exactly. I made two trips to Denmark while I was working with the American Youth Commission in Washington to study that very situation. I was primarily interested in the education of the youth. And I got terribly fascinated with the Danish folk schools. And as I say, I made two trips over there to study them. What happened was this. The Danish church at that time was headed by Bishop Gruntwig. And he played a major role in restoring the morale of the Danish people. He saw the condition that they were in.

Cochran: This was in, excuse me, 1860?

Rainey: Yes, 1860's. He saw their condition that they were defeated, discouraged, flat on their backs, and he began to get them together, and he realized that they had to restore their morale. He began to get them together in small groups in their churches, in their homes, wherever he could, and they began to talk about their heritage, their traditions, and they sang their folk songs together; they danced their folk dances, and the first thing you know, he had restored their morale. And out of that, this is briefing it terribly, but out of that came the Danish folk schools.

Cochran: Well, spend as much time as you want. We can get back to the gov-

ernor's race later. I...

Rainey: The Danish folk schools spread all over the Scandinavian countries, as you know, and it's been a marvelous institution. It was a realistic type of education. They taught those people--they had nothing, really, but agriculture and some good land--and they taught those people how to maximize their opportunities through these folk schools.

Cochran: What were the guiding ideals or principles of the schools? What was their educational philosophy?

Rainey: Well, to make education functional in the life of the people. It was a highly functional type of education--how to make two stalks grow where one had (chuckle) grown before, the cattle industry, the dairy industry. As you know, they became the great dairy of the world, of Europe and that area of the world.

Cochran: I know they also make awfully good beer, too.

Rainey: (laughter) Well, it was just a highly functional type of education. And I would say that, if you classify me one way, I've been a functional educator--that is the use of education to improve the people's well-being. I keep coming back to that theme.

Cochran: That's again one of the points you learned from the teachings of John Dewey?

Rainey: Yes...John Dewey.

Cochran: Did you ever know Dewey?

Rainey: Yes, I very briefly, I've heard him talk once or twice, but he was most inactive when I came along. Of course, I've read nearly everything he wrote.

Cochran: Oh, sure. Would you relate, if I could go back to the point that you've made many times in the last many hours, in your own mind the significance of religious ideas and education ideas? Would you say these two were wedded together in the Danish experiment?

Rainey: Oh, yes. Bishop Gruntwig was the leader, the head of the Danish church, at that time. And so there was a close tie-up there between their spiritual life...I use spiritual there in a very fundamental sense--not particularly in the religious sense. He had to restore their spiritual morale. So, I think there's the closest possible relationship between the people's religious concepts and their social cultural development. And, of course, it plays a tremendous role in our culture.

Cochran: Would you substitute for the sentence you just said, people's spiritual concepts compared to religious concepts?

Rainey: Well, I'd like...I think for me the term "spiritual" is broader and more inclusive than religion. Religious...you narrow it down.

Cochran: I mean, do people have to be religious to have high goals and ideals?

Rainey: Well, that's a big issue at the present time. There are a lot of people now that think our society can get along without religion, without God--God is dead and all of that sort of business.

Cochran: What's your reaction to that?

Rainey: Well, my reaction simply is this: that I don't think there's ever been any greater inspiration to a culture than the concepts that we have inherited from our religious background heritage--the concept of God. I use the word "concept" of God and the implications

that grow out of that.

Cochran: Would you tell me--tell us--what the concept of God and its implications are distinct from God?

Rainey: Well, for example, this, in my judgment, is the great contribution that the Hebrew people have made to our culture--the concept of one God over all mankind, the common father of all mankind. Well, just think of the corollaries that follow that. If we've got one God, we're all brothers; we get a concept of brotherhood. And we haven't yet achieved that brotherhood of all mankind. We're terribly racially divided. We get also the concept of man being ultimately responsible to him alone. I've often raised the question (I've had some interesting incidents connected with it) by asking groups, for example, "To whom or to what do you owe your ultimate loyalty?" And that's a basic question in any culture. And in this tradition there's a clear-cut answer. And that is, "We owe our ultimate loyalty directly to God alone--to no <u>state</u>, no <u>church</u>, nothing but we're ultimately responsible to Him." Well, now that's the basis of religious liberty and religious freedom--flows directly from that.

Cochran: It came as an abstract set of ideals that are manifested in mankind and brotherhood?

Rainey: That's right. So it's not whether God exists or in what form He exists; it's a concept that we have created here and the attributes that we have attributed to Him. And from this you get, as I say, inalienable rights because you are children of God. The Greeks got inalienable rights from the concept of the law of nature--

natural law. Well, here you've got...a much richer one, it seems to me, than just the idea of natural laws. John Locke and a lot of them talked about natural law. I could be just as good a democratic citizen under the natural law theory as I could under this other, but his other is far richer to me. It has far more meaning and content in it. So, you get the idea there, as I say, of religious liberty. Then naturally following along, we get the idea of separation of church and state. You can't tie these two great forces together; you get tyranny when you do.

Cochran: Did the Danish church, with their philosophy of God and mankind, tie pretty closely with what you're describing here?

Rainey: Fairly well, but they had had a state church even down to the present time. But we separated church and state way back there when we formed our constitution, and to me that's one of the greatest heritages we've ever had. And from that, also, you get this concept of not only liberty, but you get the concept of <u>equality</u>, <u>inalienable rights</u>. We get the idea that you don't owe your ultimate loyalty to the state, which is the Communist point of view. Communism says you belong to the state, body mind, and soul, you see. Well, we refute that, and we refute it in terms of this tradition.

Cochran: Now, how would these ideas that you were developing compare to what was going on in the South, in Cash's theory and ideas of what developed in the South, especially following the Civil War. Did this stagnate as it surely did? What happened there?

Rainey: Well, as I remember, one of the things that he points out was,

that in this process of the development of the South, they forsook the ideals of Thomas Jefferson. Thomas Jefferson was really the great exemplar of these concepts in our culture. He wanted to free the slaves and he did free his own slaves. Cash points out, I think, in a very powerful way, that the South took another course and didn't follow the concepts and ideals of Jefferson and the constitution that he and others had formulated. That's one factor. And then this other tradition by that time had just become so strong. You had these big planters in the South and they were the ruling class, so to speak, and they made the rules to suit themselves. It's a tragic story, really. I could just grieve, and I have many times, for the South itself and what's happened to the South. It's really a tragedy on a grand scale.

Cochran: Well, this then, was one of the things you will get back on along in with--getting back to the gubernatorial (chuckle) campaign--that you were relating Texas and Texas problems as an off-shoot of what's happened to the South.

Rainey: That's right. I referred to the Old South again and again because Texas was a part of the Old South. It was mostly filled up with migration from the Old South who came in...the settlers came in from the East through Georgia, Alabama, Mississippi, Arkansas, and on to Texas. In fact, my family belongs to that migration. My family settled in...first in North Carolina, and we can trace their migration right straight down across the South. Lots of Raineys in Georgia, and Alabama, Arkansas.

Cochran: Left a trail as they came along.

Rainey: Left a trail as they came along. So whatever else my opponents or enemies might say, I love the South and I had its welfare at heart because on the other hand it has some marvelous characteristics and some wonderful people, of course. Then I think, too, just to be perfectly fair, religion in the South which is a major factor has not been completely functional. That is, somehow, they've been able to divorce some of these concepts from religion and that religion hasn't been relevant to them--this whole slave issue, for example, treating a part of...a great part of their humanity, not as equal but...children under God with inalienable rights. That separation that they have made down there has been disastrous, it seems to me.

Cochran: Well, I know...

Rainey: In other words, it gets down to making religion functional--not only in individual lives but in the life of a culture, as well.

Cochran: Well, your own church in the South, the Baptist church, by and large certainly doesn't represent your progressive, forward looking point of view, in my own judgment, anyhow. It's been a pretty strong influence against change.

Rainey: Well, yes. As I say, it's emphasized an area of religion that's left out what we might call the social gospel, so to speak. It's been an individual type of religion, salvation, personal salvation. But it hasn't carried over, that's my point, as it ought to have in changing the life of the society.

Cochran: Why is that so, do you think? Any guess at all or just a product of the hatred and divisiveness that emerged from the Civil War?

Rainey: I think so. That's possibly the best explanation I can think of. I perhaps might throw one other factor into this. When I started out in college, I thought very definitely I was going into the ministry. But I went through World War I and by the time I graduated from college, I simply intellectually could not give my whole heart to those religious concepts, and so I decided I would have to do something else. And so I went into teaching and education as a substitute for it. But I thought very seriously of going into the active ministry.

Cochran: I wouldn't want to quibble over the choice of a word, but after these long conversations I think...I don't really think I would use the word "substitute" for...That you went into teaching as a better avenue to make your religious principles meaningful.

Rainey: Well, yes. When I came to the conclusion that I couldn't actually give my whole life and heart to that concept, then naturally I had to look around for something else. And education, then, became the outlet for me. As I think I said to you earlier, I've had really two great ideals in my mind -- Christianity or religion on the one hand, and education on the other. And part of my career in these so-called religious or church-related colleges, I've had the opportunity to combine the two.

Cochran: Well, shall we get back to the campaign, now? We've been off on a digression or has it really been a digression? Was that what the campaign was all about?

Rainey: I don't think it's completely a digression because I look upon politics as a social instrumentality to actually get done what people want for themselves. So my interest in being Governor, you

might say, was an indirect one -- not to be Governor per se but what I could do for us in that position, by furnishing leadership to the people in solving their problems. So I don't think it's too great a digression after all.

Cochran: Well, as I recall some of the major points, if you would elaborate on them very briefly, that you talked about -- or at length if you will. I know time is running out, now. Oh, you talked during the campaign about the great Eastern monopolies and what we ought to do about them.

Rainey: Yes.

Cochran: What do you have in mind there? This goes back, of course, to what we were talking about on the Webb thing. What really was the issue there?

Rainey: Well, actually the people of Texas had no control over these resources of theirs. The center of control was someplace else. For example, take the sulphur industry where Texas produces, I think, somewhere around eighty percent of the sulphur of the nation. At that time, this corporation, Texas Gulf Sulphur Corporation, as I recall, there wasn't a single Texan on that corporation board at that time. That's what I'm talking about, you see. And then these great oil companies, their power and headquarters were centered elsewhere. And Texas was really a satellite of the North and the East. That's what it amounted to. A good illustration of that, for example, was a cartoon that came out during this governor's campaign, to kind of pull together this concept of a satellite. It was a cartoon of a map of the United States or that part of it from Texas north and east, as I recall. I have the original copy, incidentally, now in my files.

Cochran: Was it an Eckhardt cartoon, by chance?

Rainey: Yes, it was. Bob Eckhardt...was it Bob Eckhardt?

Cochran: Yes...yes...uh-huh. He's now in the United States House of Representatives, you know.

Rainey: Yes. Well, he pulled this whole concept together in a marvelous way with this cartoon. It was a picture of an elongated cow, stretched across the map from Texas to New York City and the feeding end of the cow, the head of the cow, was centered in Texas. And at the other end, here was an old, poor, emaciated farmer -- looked like he was half starved. He had a pitch fork in his hand, and he was feeding hay to this cow. Well, the milking end of the cow was in New York City and up there were two men. One was doing the milking, and then standing up over him was a big picture of an industrialist representing the big corporations with his morning suit and his big stovepipe hat; he was standing there with his hands up before his mouth and yelling down to this old farmer in Texas saying, "Mo...re, mo...re, mo...re!" Well, you can't improve on that.

Cochran: No, I don't remember the cartoon. I remember many of Bob Eckhardt's cartoons but I can't remember that particular one. But that does describe the situation.

Rainey: That describes exactly the situation. It was just an economic satellite for the rest of the country and I was fighting that idea.

Cochran: Some of the bitter issues of the campaign, because it was a bitter, nasty campaign in many respects...Weren't you charged rather regularly by the rest of being a teetotaler, a socialist...?

Rainey: Oh, yes. They made every charge they could think of against me. I was a "Nigger-lover" and I was a "pinko" or something worse. For example, this same Strickland that caused me so much trouble on the Board of Regents, made a public statement, and it was featured down there that he would rather see a Japanese invasion of Texas than to see me stay there the next twenty-five years. I was a dangerous individual. Well, in a way, he was right. I was dangerous to their interests because I was trying to get some things straightened out. (chuckle)

Cochran: That was a pretty honest statement, really, if I could give Strickland credit for being intelligent because at least the Japanese could be turned back by bullet.

Rainey: That's (chuckle) right.

Cochran: You can't turn back ideas.

Rainey: That's right. That was my reply exactly...yes. I said, "He's more right than he knows, because," I said, "you can stop an invasion of tanks, guns, and ships with other tanks, and guns, and ships," but I didn't know any way to stop the spread of good ideas. So, in that sense, I was a dangerous man.

Cochran: Now were these "pinko" socialist charges, were those made in open public speech or was a great deal of that in literature passed out?

Rainey: Well, that way...yes. For example, during that campaign Mr. O'Daniel put out one issue of his paper -- I've forgotten the title of it now -- but he spread a lot of that in this issue. And I think they put out about two hundred and fifty thousand volumes and sent it all around over Texas. And he just thought up everything he could possibly think of to condemn me in that campaign. So, yes,

I became the kind of the epitome of all that they (chuckle) didn't like.

Cochran: Well, didn't another (again, I'm searching my own memory) wouldn't the...didn't Dos Passos' U. S. A., didn't that come up in this campaign again?

Rainey: Oh, yes. They brought that up, you know, and they used it quite extensively. Grover Sellers, one of the candidates, during the campaign, made use of it. He'd make his main speech, and then he would ask for an after session, so to speak, of men only and dismissed the women. And then he'd go back behind a screen and he's come out with white gloves, carrying this copy of John Dos Passos in his hand (laughter) with white gloves -- it was too hot to hold up. Then he'd read some of these terrible passages, you know, that is to show that this was the type of thing that I was supporting down there -- this kind of freedom, you know, for people to have that kind of literature on the reading list.

Cochran: That they were going to elect a filthy old man, filthy-minded old man if they elected you?

Rainey: Well, I should tell one other very interesting anecdote in connection with that. During the campaign, when this was all going on, I flew into Dallas one morning to make some speeches around Dallas and got off out at the airport there, and got into a taxi cab. And it just turned out that the taxi driver was one of these fellows that likes to talk. And I soon discovered that, and I thought, "Well, now I'll have some fun with this fellow." And so I posed as if I had come in from the North or East someplace, because I thought he hadn't made my identity. So I thought it was a

chance to have a little fun. So I posed as if I had come from the North or East someplace, and I said, "You're having a hot political campaign here in Texas, aren't you, at the present?" "Oh, yes," he said, "we're really having a scorcher." And I said, "What's it all about?" "Well," he said, "it's mostly centered around the former President of the University of Texas that was fired by the Board and he's now running for Governor of Texas." Said, "It seems that he wrote a book and was (chuckle) requiring the students to read it." (laughter) So he actually had...they actually had me writing this book of John Dos Passos! (laughter)

Cochran: Fantastic. What did you say or do you recall...as he charged you...Well, let me digress from that for just a moment? Jester didn't...once the campaign began to shape up, Jester didn't get involved in any of these personal attacks,did he?

Rainey: Oh, no. He tried to be the white knight above all of these controversies, and I think probably he played it politically clever in that he didn't descend to a lot of these. But he let his supporters do it; they did it in great style.

Cochran: What I started to ask, you said you were referred to as, by some of these supporters and such, as the "Nigger lover" but the race issue really wasn't much of an issue in that race, was it?

Rainey: Not much. Although I think I did have the vast majority of the Negro votes for whatever it was worth at that time -- a very small minority of them, of course, voted. And that might have given my opponents some reason to say that I was supporting them or working for them.

Cochran: What about you versus the establishment within the Democrat party as represented by Jester on the issue of the Texas Regulars. That had been a major thing in 1944. How was that issue handled in '46, or was it an issue?

Rainey: Well, I don't think it was so much an issue; I don't recall that I made any real issue of it. O'Daniel, at that time, was in the Senate, and he was spouting off all the time during that campaign through radio addresses and otherwise. And he later became one of the leaders, as you know, of the Texas Regulars and Dixiecrats, where they broke with the party later on. But that hadn't become a real issue up to that point. It was a later development but it was in embryo certainly, at that time.

Cochran: What about your trouble with the tie between the newspapers and the radio stations that ultimately led to your taking it, I think, to the FCC? Is that right in effect?

Rainey: Yes. This was a good example of some of these tight monopolies. For example, as you know, there were at that time four fifty-thousand-watt clear channel radio stations in Texas, in Fort Worth, Dallas, Houston, and San Antonio in what was called the Texas Quality Network. Well, they just covered the state like the dew, almost. Well, three of those radio stations were owned and operated by the leading newspaper in those three cities. So there was this close tie-up in this communications system between the newspapers and the radio stations. Incidentally, I pointed out, too, then and later, of some eight hundred or so radio stations across the nation; over six hundred of them were tied up with the local newspaper. And that had become a real problem in monopoly of newscasting.

So I hit that pretty hard.

Well, the thing that really set it off with me was that before I made my announcement for Governor, for weeks prior to that time, Senator O'Daniel kept sending all kinds of statements back to Texas that he might run for Governor -- he might come back. In fact, he was really asking the people of Texas to invite him back to run for Governor. He was threatening all during that time that he might come back and be the white knight leader for the Texas people, you know, against all these new forces that were coming in -- meaning me in particular. Well, he finally came back to Texas and said that he was going to make an announcement on a given...I believe it was on Tuesday night -- Monday or Tuesday night. And he had the use of this entire Texas Quality Network because he was going to tell the people of Texas that night whether or not he would run for Governor. So they gave him an hour, I think it was a whole hour, of free time that night over that entire network to tell the people of Texas what he was going to do. Well, incidentally, I was coming up, I think, on the following Thursday night, with <u>my</u> statement about <u>my</u> intentions to run. Well, remember they gave him an hour of free time.

Well, on Thursday night following, I and my supporters could not <u>buy</u> commercial time at twice the commercial rates, which were political rates. They wouldn't give me that opportunity even to pay for it! Well, that just seemed to me to set the stage for

the very thing that we've been talking about here. So, I just decided -- I and my supporters decided -- that this thing was so great that we ought to take it to the Federal Communications Commission which we did. And they sent a commissioner down there, and we had a number of big hearings in Dallas in July, as I recall, right in the midst of this campaign.

And some very interesting things were brought out in that campaign -- in that hearing. We got a very fine lawyer who knew a lot about the Communications Commission in Washington and they brought out the fact that these four stations had actually had an agreement among themselves that went back to around the first of January in which they decided upon the rules of the game that they were going to follow during this campaign. In other words, there was collusion among the four stations. And in bringing that out, we really scared them. I have in my possession two large volumes of several hundred pages of testimony that was taken during that period -- during that hearing -- and it frightened these four stations so much that they made -- and I have right here before me -- promises they made the Commission that in the future (chuckle) they were going to abide by the principles of the Commission and that they would be independent in their making of policy. So, I think I did a good public service there in really attacking that big monopoly. It was a tight one at that time.

Cochran: How was that coverage during the gubernatorial campaign versus when you were dismissed from the Presidency?

Rainey: Well, of course, a political campaign in Texas just gets all kinds of attention, and I got my share of it. Most of the big press, wherever I was, of course, reported my speeches quite at length, and some of the press even sent their representatives around with me -- followed me around. And so, I have no complaints about that; I got a lot of publicity. But editorial-wise, these papers were all riding me hard. As a matter of fact, you could divide the press of Texas really into two classes: the so-called "big" press of Texas were out and out against me, but the press in so-called middle size cities (like Waco, and Corpus Christi, and Wichita Falls, and El Paso, and Tyler, and places like that) I had mostly their support -- even editorials. San Angelo...the man out at San Angelo that had the chain of papers at that time including papers like Paris, and Sherman, and Denison, backed me very strongly.

Cochran: Backing...going back to backing, where did you get your money for the campaign?

Rainey: Well, that's another important part of this, of course. We had very little money in contrast to the hundreds of thousands of dollars they had. We had a few men of wealth that backed me -- Major Parten and Mr. Jacquess and men of that type -- but it was a very small part of the campaign. The great backing that I had came from widespread individual freinds all over the state -- people that could give anywhere from one to five or ten dollars, and that sort of thing. There's where we got the bulk of my support.

Cochran: About how much did you spend in the campaign compared to the others?

Rainey: Well, we had to make an accounting, of course, to the Secretary of State. I think...those papers of mine now are in the University of Missouri Library. As I recall, we spent something like a hundred and thirty-seven thousand dollars for newspaper advertising, and radio time and things of that sort.

Cochran: A hundred and something, you say?

Rainey: A hundred and thirty-odd thousand, as I recall.

Cochran: Well, that isn't very much.

Rainey: Not very much (chuckle) for a political campaign. On the other hand, we made some calculations just from what we could calculate from the surface on radio time, and newspaper advertisements, and things of that sort. They spent at least two million dollars on that campaign to defeat me. Oh, we were terribly imbalanced on our funds.

Cochran: These same newspapers that were not supporting you in the Governor's race though had by and large supported you in your dismissal, had you not?

Rainey: That's right. They were almost unanimous at the time of my dismissal but, of course, when I got into this Governor's campaign, they had other (chuckle) commitments that they had to observe.

Cochran: Well, when we get into the second primary, did the nature of the race change a great deal in the second primary as compared to the first? You just had one man to concentrate on that time. Did any of the other candidates come around and support you?

Rainey: One came out for me. Jerry Sadler came out and joined my group and made speeches for me on the radio and other places around the state. As I recall, he was the only one of the former thirteen

candidates in the campaign. The second campaign...I never did attack Mr. Jester personally. I dealt with issues and not personalities. Of course, that was contrary to (chuckle) Texas campaign history. Usually it's a campaign of individuals -- one against another. But I tried to keep this campaign strictly on an issue basis and not a personality basis. And as I recall, Mr. Jester didn't attack me personally. Others did, his supporters did, of course, but I think he tried to keep it on a higher plane. This is my memory of the situation.

Cochran: The campaign was pretty much, though, run along on the same basic issues as the first one had.

Rainey: Yes, I think it did. By that time, of course, the issues had become clear-cut. When you had thirteen people in there, a lot of it was personality. But in this last campaign, it got to be really an ideological campaign.

Cochran: What were the main ideological issues by this time?

Rainey: Well, the ones we've been talking about -- the use of Texas resources and things of that sort, the development of their educational program, and so on and so on. For example, I advocated about thirty million dollars' increase alone for public education in Texas. And (chuckle) although I was defeated, the very next legislature appropriated about twenty-nine of that. So some of the Texas educators commenting on that to me said, "Well, you were worth at least twenty-nine million dollars to the (chuckle) Texas educational system in that campaign."

Cochran: What did Jester argue for during the campaign, or do you recall? I'm sure you didn't listen to many of his speeches; you were busy yourself.

Rainey: Well, I don't recall, at the present time, anything of significance. He just "rode the tide," so to speak. He had all this advantage -- money and support. He just kind of rode it through, as I remember.

Cochran: I think Allan Shivers was running for Lieutenant Governor, at the time, wasn't he? I believe it was Shivers that was Governor after Jester died.

Rainey: Yes, I believe..that's right.

Cochran: Well, that would seem to wind up the major issues and philosophies and principles of the campaign. As we know now, history had its verdict and Governor Jester was elected. What did you do then? What was your next step? Where did you go?

Rainey: Well, I've often said facetiously about that, when two things like the things that happened to me, happen to one in Texas, the best thing to do is to get out as fast as you can. Interestingly enough, I had a very fine opportunity awaiting me. I say "awaiting me" because I made my last political speech of the campaign in San Antonio. I closed my campaign there.

Cochran: This would be in the second primary.

Rainey: The second primary, yes. And the very next morning, I was invited to breakfast by Dr. James Madison Wood, who at that time was President of Stephens College -- a girls' school in Columbia, Missouri. And at this breakfast that morning, he put up to me the proposition of becoming President of Stephens College in Missouri, in case I was not elected Governor of Texas. Of course, that happened. So within two or three weeks' time, I was offered the presidency of

Stephens College in Columbia, Missouri. Mr. Wood and I had been personal friends educational-wise and otherwise, for a long period of time. I had been to Stephens College and spoken there and knew the school very well on its objectives, educational program.

So he made the statement several times that he had had his eye on me for the last ten years to become his successor at Stephens. He'd been there for thirty-five years and built up a great tradition and program at Stephens. So within, as I say, two or three weeks before the month of November was over, I was elected President of Stephens College in Columbia, Missouri and I took it on the spot, so to speak, because I did look upon it as another great educational opportunity, which it is -- and was. It has a unique program developed over a period of twenty-five or thirty years there under his leadership plus the help of another great educator, Dr. W. W. Charters, who was for a number of years Dean of the School of Education at the University of Missouri in the same town-- Columbia. And he had been on the Stephens Board -- Dr. Charters had -- and when they elected Dr. Wood as chairman...President in 1912, and then he had kept a direct connection with Stephens College through all these years and was still on the campus at the time I was elected.

Cochran: Mr. Wood?

Rainey: No, Mr. Charters...as a director of research. And he was the real architect of that Stephens program, which as I've often said, is the best example in American education of a school run almost

completely according to the educational ideals of John Dewey. You can't find in American education a better example of Dewey's philosophy of education in practice than in Stephens College. And he...they had worked it out over a period of thirty or forty years there, working together. They were really a great team. And I've often thought that when the history of education in that period has been written, they're going to have a high place during that period because they worked out some very vital concepts there.

For example, right after the end of World War I, when it was evident then, for two or three reasons, that women were going to play an increasing role in American life, one was that during the war, women had come out of their homes in great numbers, as you know, and had gone into the workaday life of the world during the war. Well, they have never gone back. In fact, the number of people... women employed in our society has steadily increased, and at the present time we have more than twenty-five million women working. Well, that was one big factor. Another big factor was the passage of the suffrage amendment in 1919, right at the end of the war, which indicated that women were going to have a new role in the life of society in terms of citizenship and participation. Well, that was a great time, of course, a great transition. Well, these men put their heads together realizing that women were going to play an important role. So they began to study in a vital way the type of education that women were going to need in the future.

They got a lot of granted funds from one of the foundations to make about a three-year study. And they had the help of the American Association of University Women, and they sampled women on a nation-wide scale, principally on the activities in which they were engaged. What they did, they kept a record for the college, every hour of the day for a long period of time. And finally the college brought all these data together there and took about another year or two to analyze them and diagnose them. And they finally divided those activities of women into about seven major categories of what women do in their society. And when they got to that point, then they said these then will become the curricular divisions of Stephens College and they organized the college around these seven major areas of women's activity.

Cochran: This was in the early twenties by now?

Rainey: In the early twenties. And that's been the great organization of Stephens College down to the present time. It's a highly functional type of education for women, and it was unique in a way but it was dynamic, as you can see. And since that time, they've added about three more divisions by the same process of research and investigation. So Stephens has had that kind of a dynamic program ever since. I've said many times that I've never had anything to do with an educational program that I thought was more dynamic and vital than that was. It's the most satisfying program of education I've ever had anything to do with. So when I had the opportunity, I was happy to accept it.

Cochran: Ought to be a real challenge.

Rainey: It was a real challenge. It fitted so well into my own thinking about what education is all about. So I had a wonderful experience there. At my inauguration, for example, we had Mr. Norman Cousins out there, who was editor of the Saturday Review of Literature. He made one of the principal addresses. And after being there and learning something about the college, he went back and wrote an editorial in the Saturday Review in which he made this statement that this whole Stephens program was based upon what he called "powerful ideas in education." And that was certainly true. They had a lot of powerful ideas there. So I had a very happy experience there, education-wise.

Cochran: You were able to experience there, weren't you, one of the ambitions that started back at Bucknell with your continuing theater?

Rainey: Oh, yes. That was one of the rare opportunities that I had. Stephens...One of these powerful ideas was experimentation. If anybody had an idea that seemed to be worth anything, he could try it out there at Stephens, under that Stephens situation. So this was one of my great dreams, as I told you earlier, I didn't get to see fulfilled at Bucknell or at the University of Texas. But when we got to Stephens, there were some very fortuitious circumstances. One was they were dismantling one of those big Army camps nearby, and we were able to buy about four or five or those surplus Army buildings and remove them. We moved them to the campus. And one of them we turned into a little theater. And we built a first class stage in there. We went to New York and employed an expert in staging and lighting and things of that sort and brought him

out there and built this theater under his supervision. It seated about two hundred and twenty-five people. It was just a nice little unit with a first class stage on it. Then we also employed about four, as I remember at that time, four actors that had professional experience in New York, brought them out there and put them on the faculty, gave them a full-time salary just like anybody else, and we let them use half their time for teaching literature and drama and things of that sort, and the other half they were acting in this theater. So we divided them into two groups--an "A" group and a "B" group--and one group would put on a play, for example, for three weeks, four nights in the week of every week. And while they were putting on a play, the other group were in rehearsal getting ready to take over when these three weeks were out. So we developed a full-time theater there--thirty-three-week program during the year. There is one of the most thrilling things that I've ever participated in.

Cochran: Your cast then made up of professionals from New York and the amateur...

Rainey: Of course the amateurs...student amateurs. And we had two other colleges there. The University of Missouri is located there and we could get a lot of talent from over there--boys, men to play other roles. So it was just a thrilling experience.

Cochran: Oh, I know it was.

Rainey: And that program is still in operation. And it was really the fulfillment of a dream that I'd had developing over a long period of time. And there were so many other things there that I liked

about the Stephens program--this experimental idea that I mentioned--had a dynamic faculty there at that time.

Cochran: It started out as a church-related school, didn't it?

Rainey: Originally, yes, way back in the eighteen hundreds. But it went through the same progression that many other church-related schools--became independent, and self-perpetuating, Board of Trustees. It's church-related only in terms of history and tradition, but not actual. The church has no control but it claims spiritual relationship to the American Baptist denomination.

Cochran: And you then left there in what year?

Rainey: Well, I resigned as President in 1952, after about five years there. I had just a few years of administrative time left but a situation developed that kind of interfered with my functioning. The former President wasn't able to cut loose completely and he and the President of the Board had had a long forty-year or more relationship with each other, and that just created a situation in which I couldn't function completely and autonomously. So I finally decided rather than to cause trouble, the best way to do was to resign, which I did.

Cochran: That's when you came to Colorado?

Rainey: Well, there was a period of two or three years in there before I came. I had taught in the University of Colorado every summer in that interim but I actually came on the full time faculty here in the fall of 1956, as a Professor of Higher Education and served down to the present time. My teaching time was up here in 1964. I reached the full time retirement age but happily for me they

kept me on on a part-time basis these last three or four years. I've had a marvelous time teaching here. I love to teach.

Cochran: That's what you started out to be.

Rainey: Started (chuckle) out to be a teacher. This has been a marvelous opportunity here. I've gotten actually a new appreciation of teaching and the role of teaching in our whole educational system. And in these days where there's been so much emphasis upon "publish or perish" and research, I found a great satisfaction in teaching and getting to know my students. I feel that the great thing in teaching is the relationship between students and teacher. There's hardly any relationship in life that I think is more fruitful than that one. And I've just had a glorious time teaching.

Cochran: Were you able to bring to bear your, what, is it forty-something years of teaching, and administration, and education?

Rainey: Yes, that's been a great service to me in my teaching. Yes. I think that's been one of my great advantages as a teacher here, that I've had all these years of experience, thinking to draw upon...and the formulation of my philosophy about education and this has given me a marvelous opportunity to talk about it, as it were. That means a lot to student, I think. In other words, it's enrichment teaching because I've had all this experience to draw upon as illustrative material.

Cochran: Weren't you able to design, in the last two or three years, in effect a cultural course?

Rainey: Oh, yes.

Cochran: Tell us about that.

Rainey: I've had a fine time doing that. One of the great interests that I've had here has been in this whole culture background of ours, you know, and the role of the school in our society. Here again, I'm a "Deweyite" to the core. John Dewey emphasized again and again that the first function of any school system, as he expressed it, was to pass on the cultural heritage from one generation to another. So this is the first assumption upon which I built this new course on American ideals in education, to deal with our cultural heritage.

Cochran: That's the title of the course, American Ideals and Education?

Rainey: American Ideals and Education--the relationship of education to the carrying on, interpretation, perpetuation of these ideals. The second assumption that naturally follows as a corollary to that one is that the people that ought to know our cultural heritage above any other group ought to be our teachers and our educators because they're responsible for the carrying on of this heritage. So I've developed that course, and I've taught it at least once a year ever since I've been out here in the last ten or eleven years. It's been a great inspiration to me. Personally, I've gotten a great deal out of it by going back and studying our cultural history and what the factors are that have made us what we are as a people.

Then the other course that I've developed here, and I don't know any other quite like it any place--there are a few emerging now--is a course on the relation of religion to education. Of course,

historically there's been a close relationship between religion and education in this country. During the entire colonial period, for example, historically there's been a close relationship between religion and education in this country. During the entire colonial period, for example, education was largely in the hands of the church and religiously motivated and sponsored. We have a great system of education under church support, as you know, and church auspices still. Well, when we developed a public school system we began to run into this principle of religious liberty and religious freedom, separation of church and state, and so forth. So the public schools have had a pretty hard time, particularly in recent years, of operating under this restriction, constitutional restriction. We've had a series of court decisions that have always tended to separate religion from public education. And I've had a fine time teaching that course on the relation of religion to the schools.

Cochran: What's your opinion, as an educator and as a deeply religious man in both contexts, what's your view of the Supreme Court decisions regarding church and schools?

Rainey: Well to start back, to answer that question, I think the concept of religious liberty that's one of our great factors in our heritage, one of the dearest values that we have--religious freedom and religious liberty. And we soon saw that as that idea developed that one of the best ways to promote religious liberty was to separate these two functions--government and religion. I've often thought that wherever you combine two types of power, like reli-

gious power and political power, you almost always result in tyranny. And our founding fathers, I think, were awfully wise in that. They saw that to promote religious freedom, you had to have the separation of church and state. In fact, I have often thought that, and I've heard political scientists say that they think perhaps the greatest contribution that we have made to the theory of political science has been the separation of church and state. And I'm in perfect agreement with that. So I'm a great believer in this principle of religious liberty and separation of church and state as provided for in our constitution and our bill of rights.

Now the big problem we've had, historically, has been "What does that first amendment mean?". And the courts have had to decide that, and they've become ever more and more strict in their interpretation of this principle of separation. For example, they've had to pass many and many times--and the State Supreme Courts, too--on what constitutes a place of worship. Men shouldn't be taxed to support a place of worship; that's a part of this separation that's in the constitution. You can't tax a man to support a place of worship. Well, if you have a religious exercise in the schools and read the Bible, and sing psalms and hymns, and have a prayer, does that make of the school a place of worship? And, of course, they've been ever more and more strict, as I say, in their interpretation of things that do. Does the wearing of a distinctive religious garb, for example, constitute sectarian influence? And the courts have said, "Yes, it does." So you can't wear a

distinctive religious garb in the public schools. So we've just had numerous issues of that sort.

One of the most acute in recent years has been the issue of the flag salute, salute to the flag which has become almost unanimous practice in our schools. Well, the Jehovah's Witnesses, a relatively small religious group, have protested that salute to the flag on the theory that by saluting the flag, a symbol of our nation, you put the nation before them in their responsibility directly to God. In other words, it became a kind of an idol. And they've taken two cases to the...Well, back of that, they've been strong supporters of this whole concept of religious freedom. And in the last thirty years, this one small religious group has taken at least forty-six cases to the United States Supreme Court, every one of which has brought some aspect of religious liberty and religious freedom. And they've won thirty-nine of those forty-six cases. It's a phenonenal situation. And I've often said that we owe a great debt of gratitude to that religious body for insisting upon the protection of this great freedom that we call religious freedom.

And this flag salute case was a good case in point. In Pennsylvania, in the Minersville school district, Pennsylvania had a law requiring a salute to the flag as a part of the morning exercise. Well, they protested, took it through the courts of Pennsylvania in the late 1930's...well, the early 1940's--during the war, as a matter of fact. A good personal friend of mine, incidentally a

member of the Board of Trustees at Bucknell University, was the lawyer for the Minersville school district that carried it through the Pennsylvania courts and all the way to the United States Supreme Court. So I knew him very well, Joseph Henderson, a Philadelphia lawyer. As it went through the first time, this law was upheld by the Pennsylvania courts, and it finally went to the United States Supreme Court and was upheld there--but by a split decision of about five-four, as I remember. Justice Frankfurter wrote the majority opinion at that time. We were in the war, and he said the flag is a symbol of our national unity and upheld the law requiring the salute to the flag. That didn't satisfy Jehovah's Witnesses, so about four years later they got another case, the famous Barnett case that came up from West Virginia, on exactly the same issue before the court again. And this time, the court had changed a little bit I guess, but also the environment had changed. And this is one of the rare cases where the United States Supreme Court reversed itself. And in the Barnett case they outlawed the salute to the flag--the requirement for a salute to the flag--on the grounds that it did violate the concept of religious freedom.

Well, then more recently, we've had these famous prayer cases, one up from Maryland with Mrs. Murray down there objecting to the recitation of the Lord's Prayer and prayers in the schools, and so forth. And that went to the United States Supreme Court and the Supreme Court upheld her contention on that, largely on the theory

that you can read the Bible, they say, as literature, but if you make it in the nature of...anything in the nature of worship it is out, is not permitted, or anything in the nature of religious commitment and that sort of thing. So that's about where we are today. The public schools now can hardly do any religious instruction of any consequence and certainly no religious rites or ceremonies in the schools. And in a way, that has...I think that the decisions first of all are sound. In the second place, it's made the religious people of the country face up to the fact that if they want religious instruction for their children, they can't depend on the public schools to do it, that they've got to provide it in their homes and through their own religious organizations--the churches and so forth. And I think that's a decision of great importance, great significance.

Cochran: As you look back now on a highly successful career as a teacher, and college president, university president, unsuccessful candidate for Governor of the great and sovereign state of Texas, now back to teaching, what are the highlights in terms of principles, or values, or concepts that have really been your guiding philosophies, either from the beginning or those that emerged?

Rainey: Well, that's a very fundamental sort of question, of course, and a very interesting one. Naturally, I've thought a great deal about it. I think one's philosophy grows, emerges, as it were. I don't think you start out full-grown with a philosophy. But as I look back upon it, there have been certain great concepts that have been fundamental to me. I've often said that this heritage of ours,

coming largely from our Judeo-Christian tradition on the one hand, and from our theories of democracy on the other, that I've come to believe in those more profoundly than anything else in the world; they mean more to me today. I think they're the greatest principles that mankind has ever formulated. And I think our culture has really arisen from these two great sources of our heritage. And I've often thought, too, that they've almost grown together as one. When we formed our constitution, they really did come together there, and since that time, you can hardly separate them; you hardly know (chuckle) what's one and what's the other. They've just melded, as it were, in our culture, and they've become such fundamental parts of our culture. I believe in them whole-heartedly. The big problem of course, is to be a Christian and to be a democrat in actual fact. That's the hardest problem.

Cochran: Oh, indeed so. I read some place a description of you. And we are about to wind up, I thought it fitted you perfectly. It's complimentary; you may not want to react to it, but let me ask you to react anyhow. This man, you'll, of course, recognize the source, described you as a "practicing idealist."

Rainey: Yes. Well, in a way, I consider that one of the greatest compliments I've ever had. I think ideals have no value unless you try to live them, put them into practice. Christianity means nothing unless you live it. And that's true of democracy. If you're going to be a democrat, it has got to be in action, in other words. They're both action philosophies. And so I, feeling that way about it, I try to incorporate them into my own life, first of all, and

then I've tried to incorporate them into my administrative practices, educational practices. And I thought that's what he meant--that I had tried in that way to be a practicing idealist. I've also found, and this has been a great source of comfort to me, that there's no real lack of harmony between idealism and what you might call realism. For example, I think they come together, realism and idealism, at the highest point of each which is practice. And therefore, I've said many times, and I believe this profoundly, that idealism in a way is the highest expression of realism; that the best and most realistic way to live is to live in harmony with the best ideals that you know.

I've often put it this way, for example, we have a saying, don't we, that nothing is settled until it's settled right. Well, what does that mean? It means if you settle anything, any issue short of the best that you know, it just won't stay settled. And also I think on the other hand, when you settle an issue as closely in harmony as you can with the ideal, it will endure. And it's the best solution you can possibly make. Now, I'd like to throw into this record one or two illustrations of that that confirmed this, in my experience. When I was President of Bucknell, we had an incident happen there one year that left a profound impression upon me. The president of the student body was a boy from New Jersey, a fine lad. One fall there at the Homecoming exercises, when he was a senior and president of the student body, he had his girlfriend over from New Jersey to spend the weekend there. And to

make a long story short, he committed some, what the community would call indescretions. He had the girl in his room, and there was some...possibly some drinking. But anyway, it violated the standards of the community. I'll just say that and leave it at that without the details. Well, we had a discipline committee of the college there, and by Monday morning of this weekend they had already been cognizant of this and laid a report on my desk Monday morning that this boy had done this and recommending his expulsion from the university. It was that severe.

Cochran: Now was the discipline committee students or faculty?

Rainey: Faculty...faculty committee...discipline committee. Well, that was an awful shock to me, as President of the University. And I just resisted that in my own spirit to send this boy home...president of the student body...a senior with all kinds of potential. I had taken part earlier, when I was at Austin College when I was head of a dormitory there, in sending a boy home, and I've never gotten over it. From that experience, as I said, I'll never send another student home if I can find any other way to solve the problem. You don't solve the problem; you just dismiss it, and you do a great injury to the person. So acting upon that, I just said, "I can't send this boy home until I've tried something else." So, I asked myself this question: "Now, what is the best way to deal with this problem?" And I put it in idealistic terms. I said, "What's the most idealistic way I can think of to solve this problem with this boy?" And the answer came. And that is that when there's a breach in relations between you and me, for example,

if I have offended you, the most idealistic way to solve that is for me to go to you and to admit that I've offended you, and I apologize to you, and I want to be restored to your fellowship. That's the most idealistic way I can think of to solve a breach in relationships, if you want to solve it.

So then I said, "Well, what does that mean in this case? How can I apply that principle to this boy's case?" And it occurred to me, "Well, he'd offended the whole community." And so I said, "Well, the thing that he ought to do then is to come before this student body and faculty." We had a weekly assembly on eleven o'clock on Friday morning. So I hit upon the idea of seeing if he would be willing to go before that student body and faculty on Friday morning and make just such a statement to that whole case. Well, I called him in, and you can imagine his consternation when I made such a proposal as that to him. He just...well, you could see everything springing up in his spirit. In the first place, he argued that he hadn't done anything many other students hadn't done and just hadn't got caught. Well, I argued with him about that--that it didn't really apply. But he had done it, and he was president of the Student Body, and he had offended the community. Well, you could just see his resistance to that idea, and it was a terrible thing. It's an awful thing for a man to get up and confess his faults, and certainly before a whole student body of which he was president--and the faculty.

So we must have had ten hours of conference between Tuesday and Friday noon. I trying to bring him around to this point of view that this was the best way to solve his problem, that I didn't want to send him home. I was trying to conserve the best values for him and for the whole institution. Well, he came down again on Friday morning to my home and this program was at eleven o'clock, the weekly assembly. And we talked until about ten minutes 'til eleven. And finally I said to him, "Well now, I've got to go and preside over this meeting." I said, "What are you going to do?" He got up and looked me straight in the eye and said, "I'll do it." Well, I said, "Get your hat and let's go." Well, we walked up the hill two or three hundred yards, and he walked on the platform with me--I took him up on the platform with me. And after the preliminaries were over, I simply presented him to the student body, and I said, "Your student body president has a statement to make to you." I had no idea what he was going to say. Just turned him loose on that student body. I give you my word, he made the finest statement that I've ever heard before or since. No reserves. He just got up there and said, "I realize I've violated the traditions of this community, and this institution, this student body. I want to be forgiven." If I'd written it out myself, I couldn't have done it as well as he did.

Well, as soon as he finished, I didn't say a word. I just dismissed the assembly and left it at that. The reaction to that was one of the most moving things I've ever experienced. That student body

and faculty were stunned; they'd never seen anything like that. They walked out of there...not a murmur. All you could hear was just the patter of their feet as they went out; they were so stunned about this. And I sat back and waited to see what was going to happen. Well, the next chapter is five o'clock that afternoon. And there was a knock at my office door, and I went and opened the door, and here was this boy. He said, "May I talk to you?" And I said, "Sure, come in." He came in and closed the door. The first thing he said, he said, "I want to thank you for what you've done for me." He said, "This has been the greatest day of my life." And he told me that after that assembly was over that morning, he took to the hills--and they weren't far away there at Bucknell. And he said, "I've spent the whole day out there by myself, in the hills threshing this out." He said, "I've come to this conclusion: it's the greatest day I've ever lived." That settled the matter. He went on; we kept him in school. He graduated the next spring with honors. A month or two after, he married his girl friend and went on into New York and got a good job with one of the banks in New York. And I've had letters from him periodically telling me about his promotions.

Cochran: Um'hum. How about that. Very marvelous, moving story, really.

Rainey: Well, you can see from my reaction what an experience like that means. And it's an example of this thing of realism and idealism together.

Cochran: Put them together. Um'hum.

Rainey: Well I think that experiences like that convince you that idealism

works when you give it a chance.

Cochran: Well, as the man said, if you put it into practice, it can. You can't leave it on the books. You've got to test it in the fire and couldron of daily life.

Rainey: That's right. It's no good as an ideal unless you do live by them. That's been my basic philosophy. Same way about Christianity. It isn't worth a thing unless you live it.

Cochran: No, it isn't.

Rainey: Nothing...

Cochran: You are living example of that, I think, Dr. Rainey. Taking the ideals and precepts of Christianity and democracy...

Rainey: Putting them into practice.

Cochran: Putting them into practice in a practicing idealistic way from day to day.

Rainey: Well, I answered your question. I don't know anything more basic in my thinking than that idea. And when this fellow said that I was a practicing idealist, I consider that one of the greatest compliments I've ever had.

Cochran: Well, I think so, and I think a very accurate one. It's not an idle compliment or an idle statement.

Rainey: Of course, another great satisfaction that I've had here teaching is that in 1964, I was given the outstanding teacher award in the University, and that has meant much to me.

Cochran: Oh, indeed so.

Rainey: It's one of my prized possessions.

Cochran: It was a very, very high honor. "Many years of teaching, religious

practice, administrative practice within these..."

Rainey: There's another...

Cochran: Let me read what it says for the tape, here--"the Development Foundation's outstanding teacher award, 1964, presented to Homer Price Rainey." Very handsome plaque of copper on walnut.

Rainey: Yes. There's another award there on my desk is the Jefferson Award that was given to me for my fight there at the University of Texas.

Cochran: It's a very handsome statue of Thomas Jefferson and it says on the base, "The Thomas Jefferson Award for the advancement of democracy in 1947." That must have been a very proud moment when you got that.

Rainey: Oh, indeed. That was given to me at a dinner at the Waldorf Astoria Hotel in New York. At the same program Mrs. Roosevelt was given an award by the same group for her leadership. So those two awards mean much to me, as you can imagine.

Cochran: Well, they're very well deserved, very high honors for being a practicing idealist. That's exactly what you are, although those two words don't appear on either of them. And you've been President of the AAUP chapter since you've been here.

Rainey: Yes, I have. I've had a wonderful experience here. And aside from my teaching, I've had an active part in the life of the Univeristy.

Cochran: Served on several committees.

Rainey: Oh, yes. I was President of the AAUP chapter for a year, and the last three years, I've been President of the Phi Beta Kappa chapter on the campus, which has been a fine experience for me. I was

also on what we call the Committee of Review here, which is a standing committee of the senate that reviews complaints that any faculty member has that he's been mistreated, and so forth. And that was a fine experience, also. And then more recently I served on a committee, an ad hoc committee appointed by President Smiley two years ago to reorganize the Senate of the University. And that's been a fine experience. So I've had a number of opportunities here. I've been...for several years now I've been the moderator of our church cabinet of the church that I attend. And at the present time, I have the privilege of serving as president of the Rotary Club of about two hundred members. So those are all examples of what I'd say was I've had a good life.

Cochran: I might also say just for the record, also sitting up there on the file cabinet are some awards for bowling success.

Rainey: Yes, we have a bowling league here among the faculty during the winter. We have a bowling team here called "the schoolmasters" in this league. What you're talking about there is an award that our team won as a prize.

Cochran: Well, before we wind up, what's the future of higher education and the future of democracy, and the future of ideals?

Rainey: Oh, my goodness!

Cochran: ...in the United States.

Rainey: If I knew the answers to those questions...

Cochran: Oh, I didn't...optimistic, pessimistic?

Rainey: Well, I'm an optimist. I just think that these ideals have meant so much to us, I can't imagine the American people forsaking them

for long. They may go into eclipse for a bit. This field of higher education has a perfectly fantastic future. We're going to double our enrollment, for example, between 1965, and '72. We're going to double it again by 1980. In other words, we'll have four times as many students going to colleges and universities in the 1980's, as we had in 1965. Well, that's fantastic.

Cochran: Unbelievable, isn't it?

Rainey: It really is, and it's already being said that higher education is the greatest growth industry in the nation at the present time. And that very fact alone--what we call the numbers game--is going to have tremendous impact upon what happens in higher education in the future. And we are already beginning to see some of those things taking shape. Just the question, for example, of buildings, getting enough money to build the buildings that we need. I saw a statistic some time ago that said that between 1965 and 1980, we'd have to build as many college and university buildings as we've built since the landing of the Pilgrim fathers.

Cochran: My gosh. (chuckle)

Rainey: Think what that means in terms of faculty members to staff these institutions. Why, we aren't training enough now to take care of the attrition, much less the new ones we've got to have. Another statistic I saw recently is we're going to build a junior college a week for the next ten years in American society. That means we're going to build probably as many as five hundred new junior colleges. This junior college movement is going to sweep the country.

Cochran: Oh, it is...sure is.

Rainey: And all that is going to change the nature of what the university is. I think we're already beginning to see these changes taking place. The university is going to be more and more an upper division institution with emphasis upon the higher branches of learning and professional and graduate education. And the vast majority of under-graduate education is going to be carried by these junior colleges the first two years than the four year traditional senior college. So you're going to see a change in the nature and function of these institutions. We're beginning to see that already in many ways. For example, medicine is already a graduate study beyond the under-graduate program. Law is rapidly coming to that place. And we're raising our standards now in all of these professional schools, requiring longer and longer periods.

Cochran: What's going to be in this revolutionary period that exists today and in the immediate future, what's going to be the place of the junior college and its close traditional ties with the public school system and the public school concept of the teacher as I think the sharp distinction between the concepts of academic freedom and church?

Rainey: Well, I think the thing is emerging, the concept now, is pretty clear cut. There was for a while a period that you could just add two more years to the high school, a thirteenth and fourteenth year, and make it a part of the public school system as we had traditionally known it. But I think now, the idea...that idea has been given up, and we're going to have the junior college as an independent organization. Our best states now, like California,

Illinois, and others, are creating junior college commissions, separate and apart from the Commission on Higher Education, just to operate the junior colleges. They've made a place for themselves as an autonomous unit and their objectives are clear-cut enough and distinctive enough to have a distinctive unit from the American high schools. Now that's a judgment on my part but I think it's supported by the facts.

Cochran: Well, I hope so. To succeed as an integral part of higher education...

Rainey: That's right...that's right.

Cochran: ...Rather than of the public schools.

Rainey: And as they develop more and more, it means that universities like this one and others, can turn over to them a large part...at least the first two years of under-graduate education.

Cochran: Well, it's going to be revolutionary times, for sure.

Rainey: Oh, yes. There's no time like the next fifteen or twenty years, that are going to be exciting in higher education.

Cochran: Exciting and challenging...My gosh.

Rainey: That's right. Well, may I take this opportunity to express to you, first of all personally, my appreciation of your leadership in these discussions. And also, please express to your institution my great appreciation for their asking me to file these documents with your...

Cochran: Well, the thanks is all really on the other side, Dr. Rainey. I can't begin to tell you how much we do appreciate your taking the many hours we've spent together now in discussion before hand and

putting it down on tape.

Rainey: Well, I told Mrs. Rainey and some other friends of mine just the last day or two that this has been a fine experience for me to review all of this and to kind of see what patterns I have been following. You don't often times, do an assessment of that sort unless something of this sort can stimulate it. And you've done a fine job of that.

Cochran: Well, it's going to make a real contribution to our Oral History Collection, and we're deeply in your debt for taking the time to do it.

Rainey: Well, I'm glad to make a record of it.

Cochran: And we will, of course, send it back to you as soon as we can get it typed for your smoothing out and editing. And if you want to, of course, you delete what you want to or add...

Rainey: Of course, a lot of this, as you recall, I've had to be indefinite at places about...about the dates and about certain personalities. I've had to rely upon my memory which may be getting faulty at this advanced age.

Cochran: Well, no, not faulty. It's just a matter of all of a sudden trying to call up the name of an individual in the mid 1940's. It's difficult to do. And don't forget, as I know you won't, but I want to mention because it's on the tape, that you are going to supply us a copy of your sixteen points to the faculty that will be included at the appropriate time. We won't take it all in the transcript.

Rainey: I will.

Cochran: Well, again thank you very much. It's been a stimulating time for me, a time of bringing up for me many, many fine memories, as you know.

Rainey: Well, it has for me.

Cochran: It's a highlight of my life knowing you and the activities in the mid-1940's.

Rainey: Well, I think I should go even further and remember that you took an active part in my governor's campaign down there, were one of those loyal students, that helped me so much.

Cochran: One of hundreds and thousands...did our small contribution.

Rainey: Well, that was, as I've said before, was one of the great sources of satisfaction to me, was that devotion that that student body and faculty and other had.

Cochran: Well, that campaign changed the lives of an awful lot of young individuals who put into practice some of their ideas and got out and pounded the pavement.

Rainey: Well, if I might philosophize one step further on this. My studies in the American Youth Commission and my experiences as an educator and thinking about the problems of American youth at this period, I think one of the things they need most, young people, are some examples to live by. I remember years ago, Miss Jane Addams, who was so long at Hull House in Chicago, one of her biographers quoted her as saying that the vast majority of people don't get their ideas and concepts as abstractions. She said they've got to see them in concrete form before they're really meaningful. And that's what I'm talking about here. I think the greatest need of our young

people today is some good examples to live by. There is a natural hero worship in all of us but particularly young people. And this came out of our studies in the American Youth Commission that they put their confidence in leaders, and if those leaders let them down, as many have, it becomes a socially disruptive factor of tremendous consequence. So, I'll say one of the greatest needs we have today to help our youth is to give them some good examples to live by. Woodrow Wilson made that statement. I remember...it stayed with me all these years. He said that very same thing--that we have to see these things made concrete, these ideals, made concrete in the lives of individual men and women who in their daily lives are living concrete examples of the thing. And I think that's so important.

Cochran: Oh, I...there's no question about it. Well, again we've taken up all your time. I know it's about time for your lunch, and let me thank you and...

Rainey: Happily given.

Cochran: Appreciate it just tremendously, I assure you.