



2010

# Blum, George Oral History Interview

Neil Lark

Follow this and additional works at: <https://scholarlycommons.pacific.edu/esohc>

---

## Recommended Citation

Lark, Neil, "Blum, George Oral History Interview" (2010). *Emeriti Society Oral History Collection*. 31.  
<https://scholarlycommons.pacific.edu/esohc/31>

This Book is brought to you for free and open access by the University Archives at Scholarly Commons. It has been accepted for inclusion in Emeriti Society Oral History Collection by an authorized administrator of Scholarly Commons. For more information, please contact [mgibney@pacific.edu](mailto:mgibney@pacific.edu).

FACULTY EMERITI INTERVIEWS  
UNIVERSITY OF THE PACIFIC ARCHIVES

**Blum, George (1962-1999)**  
**Professor of Social Sciences (1962-1980)**  
**Professor of History (1980-1999)**



November 9, 2010  
By Neil Lark

Transcribed by Kelly Gerhold, University Archives

Subjects: Beginning and development of Raymond College, curriculum development, History Department of College of Pacific, scholarship, governance, publications.

## UOP ARCHIVES FACULTY EMERITI INTERVIEWS

Blum, George—History Department

November 9, 2010

Neil Lark: This is Neil Lark, the interviewer for George Blum, who's referred to as "the narrator" here. Today's date is November 9, 2010. The interview is being conducted in my home, which is just off the University campus. George, let me ask what years you served at the University, and what were your official titles?

George Blum: I came to the University in the fall of 1962 and served at Raymond College until 1980, advancing from Assistant Professor of Social Sciences to Professor. After that I joined the History Department and served there as Professor of History until my retirement in 1999.

Lark: Before you came to Pacific, how did you learn about it, and how did you learn about Raymond College, how much did you know before you came?

Blum: That's an interesting story. I had never heard of College of the Pacific, University of the Pacific, or Stockton. I knew of Stockton-on-Tyne in England, but not of Stockton in California. And so, I think, I would have never really been alerted to the position here if it hadn't been for the fact that at the time I was a Danforth Graduate Fellow. Due to that relationship with the Danforth Foundation, a contact was established because Warren Bryan Martin, who was the provost of Raymond College and was trying to assemble a faculty in 1962, went to the Danforth Foundation and asked for a recommendation of a historian. Quite likely, he preferred someone who was broadly trained in European history. My name was recommended, and in March of 1962 I received a letter with a little brochure on Raymond College, asking me if I would be interested in this kind of position. I looked over the material and was impressed by the academic rigor of the new college that was being proposed as Raymond College, and so I was quite intrigued and interested. I went to my major history professor at the University of Minnesota and showed him the letter and also the brochure. He thought about it just a moment and said, "University of the Pacific, huh, oh! That must have been College of the Pacific, where Amos Alonzo Stagg was coaching for a while!" My next question was, "Who was Amos Alonzo Stagg?" He responded, "Well, I guess you are not that well-versed in sports," so he just briefly explained to me who Stagg was. I had no idea what significance that would have for later on when I joined Pacific.

Lark: George, could you tell me whether you came to the University for an Interview before you made your decision?

Blum: Yes, in fact I was quite quickly invited for an interview after I had expressed my interest in the position at Pacific, specifically at Raymond College. And so, on the first of April, 1962, a Sunday, I came out to California. Minneapolis, after a record-setting winter, still had snow and ice on the streets. California, specifically Stockton, looked quite balmy, and in fact it got quite

warm at times during the few days that I was here for the interview. When I arrived at the Stockton airport I was met by Liz Martin, then Provost Martin's wife, who immediately took me to a social gathering. Here Provost Martin introduced me to the President of the University, Robert Burns, and some of the other guests. I even had a brief introduction to Mrs. Knoles, who was present at that social event. So, that was sort of the opening for me when I came here for the interview. Of course, the following day the more specific activities of the interview got underway. I was quite impressed by the appearance of the campus, even though a lot of construction was underway, but I was even more impressed by the individuals that I met. There were no Raymond faculty members in existence at that time, because the college hadn't opened yet, except the Provost and the new Dean of Student Life, Ed Peckham, who at that time was still a member of the History Department at Pacific. But, I met several of the more notable faculty members at College of the Pacific. I became quite well acquainted with at least one of them, Walter Paine, a Latin American historian. As historians we had some things in common. Other COP faculty members included John Tucker (biology) and, let's see, Jack Mason (sociology). These faculty members certainly were among the more notable ones of the University. Most of my contact was naturally with Provost Warren Bryan Martin. He generally was known as Dick Martin once one became well acquainted with him. He asked me penetrating questions about what my role would be in the college program, if I were to come to Raymond, and I think the answers I gave him were apparently quite satisfactory to him. I was also impressed that he was willing to do whatever was possible to make my stay here quite pleasant. When I inquired about the possibility of perhaps trying to find a position for my wife, Beverly, who was a graduate student at the University of Minnesota in anatomy and was also certified to be a high school teacher, he immediately put me in contact with the placement officer of the Stockton Unified School District. The placement officer became quite quickly interested when he heard that Beverly was trained to teach in the sciences. So that opened up an opportunity which resulted in a one-year teaching appointment, by Beverly's choice, at Stagg High School.

Lark: Raymond College encouraged close student-faculty relations, with faculty having some meals with students and a very small community. One aspect of this was some of the faculty lived in the dormitory, and you were one of those. Can you tell us about that?

Blum: That was another interesting aspect that, if Beverly and I were to come to Raymond, we would be able to or in fact would be encouraged to stay in a dormitory apartment. Since we didn't have any children that was something that appealed to us because it provided an opportunity to have economical living accommodations. And so, for two years, we lived in one of the dormitory apartments in Quad E (later named Ritter House), next to Wemys House. Now, the difference between our experience and some of the other Raymond faculty couples who were living in the Raymond quadrangle (Price House, Farley House, and Wemys House) was that the students in our dormitory were not Raymond students but COP students. As I understood Provost Martin, we were not supposed to be the regular "house parents" of these students but only to help out in case of emergency or unusual circumstances. We had an excellent resident student

assistant who performed the normal duties extremely well. So our contact then was really more with Raymond students who were living in the adjoining dormitories. I think that put us at a greater distance from immediate contact with and involvement in Raymond students' lives.

Lark: Now in our closeness with students and faculty, we had a rather interesting experience in the opening term of Raymond College.

Blum: Well, this is an anecdote of sorts, quite well known among those who were here at that time or heard about it later, but less well known among the broader community. Provost Martin was intent on assembling a faculty that was promising, as well as already accomplished. So there were some senior faculty members that he hired and junior faculty including you, Lark, and me. Probably the most distinguished faculty member that he was proud of getting for the College was a colleague of his at Cornell College, where he had been teaching before he came to Raymond and Pacific. And that was Walter Hipple. He was an English professor who came to Raymond from Cambridge University where he had held a prestigious Guggenheim Fellowship. As a scholar, Hipple was noted for his book, *Beautiful, Sublime, and Picturesque in Eighteenth-Century British Aesthetic Theory* (Southern Illinois Press, 1957). He also had an eye for the beautiful in college coeds. He fell in love with one of the Raymond freshmen, whom he met the first day in his fall English classes. This faculty-student romance became quite quickly known and presented the College and University administration with a major problem. To illustrate the attitude of that time: Hipple was asked to stop seeing the student and to continue living with his wife, his third at that time, until the end of the fall term. He rejected the proposed arrangement, saying that it would be immoral for him to continue living with his wife when he was no longer in love with her. He resigned after just a few weeks at Raymond College, in late October, and so did his student friend a week or so later. In late November the *San Francisco Chronicle* carried a story, "A Professor, 41, Weds Student, 18." It reported that the romance between the faculty member and the student had started on the University of the Pacific campus, at Raymond College, and had now led to a civil marriage ceremony in a judge's chamber.

In the end, the fourth marriage of Walter Hipple apparently also lasted only a few years.

Lark: Another interesting event, which we both could speak on, was the very first class meeting of the students and faculty at Raymond College.

Blum: Yes. Raymond opened in the second week of September, 1962, and what was notable was that we came to a curriculum that was prescribed. All of us who accepted faculty appointments here accepted a slot in the curriculum. One of the first courses in the fall term was called Introduction to the Modern World. In that course, you, Lark, Mike Wagner and I were team teachers, and we were also the first ones to open the college with the very first class meeting of Introduction to the Modern World. By way of disciplines, your background was in physics, Mike Wagner's in economics, and mine in European history. Coming from different disciplinary backgrounds, we tried to do the best we could to integrate the problems of the

modern in a broader context in our presentations in an effort to avoid merely offering three parallel courses. You left the team after the fall term to teach mathematics and John Tucker, a biologist, took your place in the next few years. With Mike playing the dominant role, using more anthropology than economics, all three of us eventually worked out a better integrated interdisciplinary format of IMW. Because of Mike's strong philosophical ideas, students came to call the course "Introduction to Mike Wagner."

Lark: I wanted to ask, what role do you feel you played in the development of Raymond's curriculum overall. It was not an absolutely rigid thing when we first came.

Blum: First of all, perhaps I should briefly describe the structure or format of the Raymond curriculum. It was an intensive liberal arts program, covering the humanities, social sciences, and physical sciences, which enabled students to graduate with a B. A. degree in three years. We had a ten-month academic calendar, divided into three terms. A normal student load per term consisted of three five-unit courses. Classes met for one sixty-minute hour, with extra time allowed for further discussion. Students had to pass twenty-seven courses, among which twenty-two were core courses and five electives, for the B. A. degree. All students were required to take a foreign language and the prescribed courses in mathematics and the natural sciences offered in the curriculum. Students who wanted to obtain a full major in a subject had to allow for study beyond the three years. At Raymond such students could develop only a specialization in specific areas.

So what did a Raymond student's program look like? In the Freshman Year it included a year of foreign language (German, French, Spanish, or Latin), a term of English, two terms of mathematics, Introduction to the Modern World, followed by two terms of either Readings in World Civilization or Readings in World Literature. In the Intermediate Year students took World Civilization or World Literature (depending on what they had elected in the first year), chemistry, biology, advanced mathematics or science, fine arts, philosophy, and religion. The Senior Year covered psychology, sociology, economics, U.S. history, political science, American Civilization, and areas of specialization according to a student's election. All students had to take comprehensive examinations after the Freshman Year and at the end of the Senior Year.

Now coming back to my contribution to the Raymond curriculum. As we mentioned, you and I were team teaching with Mike Wagner in Introduction to the Modern World. Mike was not due to develop his contribution to the curriculum in economics until the third year, and so in the first and second year he and I, in addition to IMW, were teaching Readings in World Civilization, one term Western and the second non-Western, in individual sections. I was chiefly responsible for the contents of Readings in World Civilization I, the Western part, and developed the curriculum there. I relied on my interest and preparation in history of political philosophy at the graduate level in selecting the readings for the course. They started with Plato's *Republic*, which, by the way, freshmen read in its entirety, and continued with extensive selections from or entire shorter works of Aristotle, St. Augustine, St. Thomas, Machiavelli, Thomas Hobbes, John Locke,

Rousseau, Marx, and Lenin. The theme of the course was the individual in the state or society. In contrast to traditional undergraduate course readings, Raymond students were to be exposed to original works rather than textbooks. Since our classes were seminar size, as teachers we relied heavily on guided class discussion in our teaching.

When Mike and I started planning Readings in World Civilization II, which was to encompass non-Western studies, we faced a bit of a dilemma, for neither of us had any preparation in this area. We had to come up with a format that would address non-Western issues responsibly. Mike proposed to offer a series of lectures at the outset of the course on economic development, which would provide students with a conceptual framework. After that we would ask students to choose a non-Western state or society on which they would spend the large part of the term doing research and preparing an extensive research paper. Students had to present periodic reports on the progress of their research to the entire class, and toward the end of the term they presented a full oral summary of their research findings. In my class section, there was no duplication of the developing countries that students selected, drawn from Latin America, Africa, the Middle East, and Asia. At the end of term I received readable papers from at least two of the very able freshmen that set a record in length: Bud Gerber presented a written report of 90 pages on Israel and Karl Van Meter one on China, 70 pages in length. *Life* magazine at the time published a series of respectable studies on many of the developing countries of the world. These books provided students with introductory material and a good bibliography, and those of us who were evaluating their papers with some basic background material about these societies. I think this course format turned out to be quite a successful contribution to the Raymond curriculum.

Lark: Did you have any students do independent studies with you in Western European history?

Blum: Yes, I had a number of students who took independent study from me. They covered broader aspects of 19<sup>th</sup> or 20<sup>th</sup> century Europe or more specific topics like the political philosophy of Georg Wilhelm Friedrich Hegel or Karl Marx. I also had occasionally students who were interested in aspects of German history, especially Nazi Germany. Independent study with me entailed regular meetings with these students for discussion of their readings. They also had to write a lengthy term paper. Here I remember especially one student, Bill Wacker, who wrote a brilliant paper on Hegel. Tragically, a year or two later he died of an overdose. Independent studies with these students provided many of us who were teaching the core courses in the Raymond program with an opportunity to remain in touch with our disciplinary specialization.

Lark: Now, as the curriculum sort of solidified for several years, but in the mid and late '60s, there was more and more pressure from students who were aware of the unrest and the free speech movement kind of doing-your-own-thing approach to life from Berkeley and other places to loosen the curriculum, and eventually in 1970, there was a major curriculum revolution in the College. Would you like to comment on that, George?

Blum: The ten-month academic calendar of Raymond College with the required core courses continued until 1969, when it was replaced by a nine-month academic calendar, coinciding in length with the University's two-semester system. However, the Raymond academic year continued to be divided into three terms until 1973. What became more and more a challenge for the students were the foreign language and the mathematics requirements. The foreign language requirement was abandoned in the late 1960s, but the mathematics requirement lasted a bit longer. Nevertheless, pressure to loosen the curriculum further persisted and led to the drastic curricular change in 1970-71. With the influx of new faculty members into Raymond College our ranks increased from the original nine or ten to about twenty by 1970. Some of the more recent younger faculty also came with new ideas if not different curricular philosophies. Several of them argued that the Raymond program with its required courses was too rigid and no longer served the students. The continuing enrollment decline seemed to support their position. There was also considerable pressure from students to open up the curriculum and modify some of the core courses.

The outcome of several heated faculty debates, accompanied by student voices, culminated in the adoption of a new Raymond curriculum in 1970. It no longer required students to take specific courses but offered a choice of courses spread over the humanities, social sciences, and natural sciences. To maintain the integrity of the B. A. degree in the liberal arts, faculty advisors were expected to induce their students to distribute their courses over all three general areas. Within this new program faculty modified some of their core courses or even abandoned them and were encouraged to develop new courses to enrich the program offerings. Fortunately, the quite liberal academic leave program of that time allowed us to pursue new interests and new directions in our teaching. For me, this was one of the most creative periods in my teaching career.

Among the new courses that I offered in the 1970s, I can mention some of the following: French and Russian Revolutions: a Comparison; Psychoanalysis and History; From Hegel and Marx to Lenin; Russian Intellectuals; Darwin, Nietzsche, and Stalin; Totalitarianism; Soviet Russia. I had always had an interest modern Russian history and this time allowed me to acquire some competency in that area. When in 1973 Raymond switched from its three-term academic calendar to the 4-1-4 semester system of College of the Pacific, our courses also became readily available to students outside the College. As a result, my courses attracted a number of COP students.

Lark: Thinking about big changes, Raymond began with a unique grading system, and later modified it. Would you like to comment on this?

Blum: Raymond College from the very beginning shunned letter grades as a way of evaluating a student's work. We evaluated students in term letters, commenting on their achievement in the course as well as their strengths and weaknesses. Quite early most of us, I think, used short-hand terms like 'superior,' 'satisfactory,' (further qualified by 'high' or 'low'), and 'unsatisfactory' to



characterize the student's performance and then added a narrative about their work. The problem came when the students were getting ready to apply for graduate school. Quite often the graduate schools said, "We don't want these term letters. We want grades!" So in quite a few instances we had to provide a translation of the term letters into traditional grades. This was often done by a faculty committee when the author of the term letter was no longer available to do so. The College however retained the term-letter evaluation system until it closed in 1980. Some of us kept backup grades for term letters to make it easier for the administration to provide an accurate transcript of a student's record when requested by outsiders. And such requests continued years after the student had graduated or left, even after Raymond ceased to exist. Overall, Raymond remained true to its philosophy of treating students as individuals who deserved an evaluation that went beyond a mere grade symbol, even though some concessions had to be made in communicating our evaluations to the wider public.

Lark: During the time that the College had a tough sophisticated curriculum that provided a screening for applications for admissions, we tended to get very strong students with high expectations of themselves, who went on to achieve remarkable honors as graduates. How's your memory of what was involved?

Blum: Let me illustrate this a little bit by referring to the achievement of the first graduating class of Raymond College. I have the program of the Awards Dinner before me. Of the 65 entering freshmen in 1962, 39 graduated as seniors in 1965. Fourteen of them received various awards and fellowships. Among them were three Fulbright Fellowships, one NDEA Fellowship, two Rockefeller Foundation Fellowships, and other scholarship awards. A number of the graduates were admitted to pursue graduate work at Harvard University, Union Theological Seminary, Emory University, University of Denver Law School, and other institutions. Several graduates had been accepted by the Peace Corps. I think this class was the best and highest in achievement that we ever had among Raymond graduates, even though some future Raymond graduates also earned distinctions. Interestingly, one member of this first class of graduates is not mentioned here as an award winner, Adrienne Sherrill Cupples, who very recently won very high professional honors for her work in epidemiology as professor at Boston University.

Lark: From the second and third classes there were also a good number who have gone on to very responsible positions.

Blum: Yes, as graduates of medical schools and college professors, even though in later classes high achievers were more sporadic in numbers.

Lark: Part of it was the self-selection process. This, again, is my impression based on my own data keeping. The average SAT scores of students dropped by over 100 points when the curriculum became wide open. Over a period of two years, there was an Intermediate Year in which the change occurred. This wasn't well publicized, but within a two-year period there was a very definite drop in the academic quality of entering students.

Blum: You have data here, Neil, to explain what some of us also noticed in the classroom. The question is why was the required curriculum phased out and replaced by a wide open curriculum? As mentioned above, attitudinal changes among some faculty members and a good number of students were a very important factor. But certainly declining enrollments were another even more weighty practical consideration that called for a reexamination of the program to see if it could be made more attractive to prospective students. Since their beginning the cluster colleges at the University were not achieving full enrollments, as they had originally been planned, to make them economically viable. In the early sixties there was much national interest in experimental and diverse education, resulting in the creation of nontraditional educational programs and colleges at many universities, private and public. But in the later sixties and in the seventies societal attitudes began to change, when vocational and professional preparation became increasingly a concern of parents and students. Enrollments in nontraditional college programs declined and eventually numerous newly created colleges within universities disappeared. Raymond College was no exception. At first much blame was put on the demanding required curriculum for the drop-off in enrollment, and the hope was that a wide-open educational program would attract more students. In actuality, this proved to be true temporarily in the first half of the seventies, even though the quality of students declined. But in the end, this did not save Raymond College or the other cluster colleges at the University.

Lark: I was one of the earlier faculty members who made a transfer from Raymond College to College of the Pacific. How about you, George? When was your transfer? Was that only when Raymond closed?

Blum: Yes. I was one among the faculty members who helped open Raymond College and I (laughter) was among the last ones who closed Raymond College. Sometime in the 1970s the University administration decided to phase out the cluster colleges. This process was spread over several years. As enrollments declined further, Raymond College and Callison College, which had been created in 1967 with a curricular emphasis on International Relations and International Studies, were combined as Raymond-Callison College in 1977. Under this new umbrella, both Raymond and Callison, with their respective faculties, continued with somewhat modified versions of their original programs. Students at Raymond-Callison could earn a B.A. degree in Interdisciplinary Studies or a B.A. in International Studies. At the end of 1979-80, Raymond-Callison College ceased to exist as an autonomous unit within the University. Some components of the two-track program of this college continued at College of the Pacific in two newly established centers: The Center for Integrated Studies and The Center for International Programs.

What became of the faculty of the defunct college? When Raymond College was merged with Callison College, the Raymond administrators and one faculty member left Pacific. All tenured modern language and most science faculty members, including you, Lark, had already transferred to their disciplinary departments in College of the Pacific, when the foreign language and mathematics requirements at Raymond were dropped. Mike Wagner had also joined the COP economics department after the mid-1970s. History repeated itself at the end of Raymond-

Callison, with the administrators either resigning or retiring from Pacific and most tenured teaching faculty members finding a place in their respective disciplines at College of the Pacific. Personally, I had kept in touch with the History Department during my tenure in the cluster colleges. When I came to Raymond, I had an informal understanding with the chair of the History Department, Malcolm Eiselen, that I would be allowed to teach an occasional graduate course in German history in the Department. Starting in 1965 I was ready to offer such a course, but it became clear that there was no demand for it at the graduate level and so I only taught it as an undergraduate course from time to time. In later years I added courses on Totalitarianism and on Soviet Modernization, when the Department was without a Russian historian for a few years. Thus my transition to full time teaching in the History Department in 1980 was quite smooth. Malcolm Moule, a distinguished teacher in the Department, normally taught most of the courses in my area of specialization. But in the late 1970s his health began to fail. On several occasions I was called to take his classes on short notice and within a year or so after I joined the History Department he decided to retire. I assumed responsibility for courses on 20<sup>th</sup> century Europe, modern Germany, European intellectual history, history of socialism, in addition to the standard sequence of Western Civilization. The most notable course that I developed in the Department program was History of the Holocaust.

I would like to comment in general on my change from Raymond-Callison to the History Department. In many ways, I welcomed that change in career, because it was a bit of a change in career. The cluster college community was fairly small, whereas the College of the Pacific community was many times its size. But most important were the different emphases in the programs and, to an extent, the character of the students. I enjoyed the opportunity to teach in a more traditional setting where I was assigned a defined area in the history program. Raymond classes had generally been seminar size in which students became socialized to participate actively in discussion. These students were used to reading original works rather than textbooks, and they accepted lengthy reading assignments. At College of the Pacific I had some smaller classes, too, but students were less ready to engage in a class dialogue and expected to have some kind of textbook for their basic reading in addition to short selections of original works. Quite a few of the History Department courses had a large enrollment, even though we tried to maintain an enrollment ceiling of no more than thirty-five students. Here it was necessary to resort more to lecturing than carrying on class discussions. Another significant distinction in the readings and teaching was the strong emphasis on interdisciplinary approaches at Raymond in contrast to a predominantly disciplinary approach in the COP history program. Wherever possible I tried to use shorter novels, selections from original writings in political philosophy and related areas, to expand historical vistas in my courses at College of the Pacific.

Lark: You eventually became chairman of the History Department, didn't you?

Blum: Yes, I became temporary chairman in the spring semester 1989 when Paul Hauben went on leave. In 1991, I was elected chair of the Department, three years later reelected, and continued until I retired from Pacific in 1999.

Lark: How did that go for you? Did you enjoy being chair? ...Thankless jobs.

Blum: Actually I did not mind serving as chair. For me it entailed doing something that was different from teaching yet related to supporting the teaching enterprise. Surely, there were tedious paperwork chores but also opportunities to interact with colleagues and some students in the Department and outside that I would otherwise not have had. Attending numerous committee meetings was sometimes tiresome. However, I felt it was necessary to know what was happening in the University in order to keep my colleagues in the Department informed and the history program functioning effectively within the College and the University. I especially appreciated having an excellent Dean in Bob Benedetti, who was supportive of chairs and involved them meaningfully in the administration of the College. During my tenure as chair the Department changed quite dramatically in personnel when most of us older faculty retired and were replaced by very able young colleagues. I helped coordinate five national searches and thereby learned much about the stark realities of the historical profession outside the University. For me personally, it was gratifying to see the Department passed on to very promising successors.

Lark: How did you get involved in the College and University General Education program after you made the switch to College of the Pacific?

Blum: From the beginning I was fully involved. I adjusted quite readily to the General Education program at College of the Pacific and the way it was set up. For one, it was, as you remember, a bit more formally structured than the later program at Raymond but also flexible in practice. College of the Pacific students had to pass courses spread over the humanities, social sciences, natural sciences, and behavioral sciences with several options of grouped courses. Faculty advisors were expected to help students make prudent choices for their general education. In that respect my role as an advisor was little different from what it had been at Raymond. As for courses, Western Civilization was my main contribution to the General Education program, but many of my advanced history courses were also open to freshmen and outside students provided they had a strong interest in the subject and were reasonably well prepared to do work in the company of upper classmen. In 1993 a new General Education program was introduced at the University. It featured so-called Mentor Seminars as an essential component, which in modified form continue to the present. All freshmen were required to take Mentor Seminar I and II in their first year. Mentor Seminar I concentrated on timeless questions confronting the individual and served as an introduction to the humanities, whereas Mentor Seminar II studied issues of (American) society and was an introduction to the social and behavioral sciences. Mentor Seminar III was offered in the last year of a student's education as a capstone, which related ethics to respective disciplines. The rest of the General Education requirements were presented in "paths" under headings that encompassed the three divisions of the humanities, social sciences, and natural sciences. I taught Mentor Seminar I several times and enjoyed it because in some ways it was similar to my Readings in World Civilization I at Raymond College. Mentor Seminar II, though interesting, was not a good fit for me and I participated in it only once.

Lark: Now, you've always been respected by your colleagues as someone who was an active scholar, not someone who had fallen into a routine and worked straight through your career with little change. Have you been satisfied with the balance of scholarship and teaching which you've had at the University? Has it made a difference, and do you think it's what the University expected and what you wanted to do?

Blum: Yes, by and large. My scholarly research was really primarily directed towards preparation for teaching. So I kept up in my areas of expertise and was especially interested in making sure that our library had good holdings in the areas in which I was teaching or developing courses. I think one of my contributions to the university program was that I initiated more book orders for the Library in modern European history and history of political philosophy than any of my colleagues. This became possible because in the early years I had an excellent supportive relationship with Jim Perrin when he was the order librarian at the University library. He quite often found money for my requests outside of the regular limited book budget of Raymond College and also of the History Department. -- But coming back to my direct involvement in scholarship. I had several opportunities to do research in archives in Germany and Amsterdam (at the International Institute of Social History) and also at the UC Berkeley and Stanford libraries, but did not publish much more from this original research than what I used in book reviews (some of which were extensive) in scholarly journals and in my teaching. Since the early 1960s I have also been a regular reviewer of books in my areas of research and teaching for *Choice*, a library journal, and continue to the present.

I started publishing regularly in the late 1980s and continued until after my retirement. My articles, essays, chapters in books, and contributions to various reference works and encyclopedias were designed largely for college students. These publications presented the current state of scholarship on topics from the rise of fascism to World War I and II. In the mid-1990s Greenwood Press invited me to prepare a reader containing my interpretive narrative, selected documents, photographs, cartoons, and an extensive bibliography on European fascism. It appeared in 1998 under the title: *The Rise of Fascism in Europe*. After I retired, I published a memoir of the first twenty years of my life in which I related my experiences in Lithuania and Germany during WW II and the immediate postwar period in the context of the historical developments of that era. It appeared under the title *Coming of Age in War-Torn Lithuania and Germany*.

Lark: Who published that?

Blum: That was published by Trafford Publishing in 2008.

Lark: Could you give us the information on where these books can be found so that anyone listening to or reading this interview would be able to find them?

Blum: The first one is in the University library and the second will hopefully soon be added. They are also available commercially, especially through Amazon.com.

Lark: I've enjoyed reading them both myself. -- One area that we haven't talked about yet is your involvement in university governance. You've been a respected and active participant in university governance at department, college, and university levels. Would you like to comment on this?

Blum: When I came to Raymond College, I was not inclined to be one who would just say, "Well, there's Raymond College, and that's all there is to it, that's where I'm going to spend the rest of my time and effort." I became interested in some university committees quite early, and that was one opportunity for me to meet colleagues outside of Raymond College. Surely, there were numerous ad hoc and a few regular committees at Raymond throughout the years. But I was interested in moving beyond the cluster walls. I quite early joined the American Association of University Professors and actively participated in the University chapter of this organization, holding most of its offices. As the years progressed I became active on the Faculty Compensation Committee, Faculty Grievance Committee, Library Committee, Academic Affairs Committee, and University Awards Committee, all of which I also chaired. In addition I served terms on the Academic Council, College of the Pacific Council, University Committee on Promotion and Tenure, and Council on Teacher Education.

Quite early after coming to Pacific I expressed criticism of the financially and academically costly intercollegiate football program at the University. It soon got to the ears of President Burns who on several occasions phoned me in my office to give his side of the issue. I tried to argue the case for the de-emphasis of this intercollegiate athletic program. Burns had actually attempted to cut back the size of the program in the early 1960s, but "What did it get me," he remarked, "Students burned me in effigy." In his last phone conversation with me he became quite personal and said, "You know, George, football has been *the major issue* that has kept me occupied at this university to the point that it put me in the hospital with an ulcer." So intercollegiate football crept back and continued until two presidents later. At the outset of his administration, President Stanley McCaffrey established several Presidential task forces to study different issues, including the place of intercollegiate athletics, really primarily football, in the University. It included some administrators, faculty, and alumni. I also was placed on this Task Force. After almost a year of deliberations the Task Force issued a report in 1972 or 1973, recommending the continuation of intercollegiate football at the highest regional level of competition. Several faculty members, Fay Goleman, Warren van Bronkhorst, and I authored a minority report in which we argued that the number of athletic scholarships needs to be reduced and academic scholarships increased. The controversial issue of excessive numbers of athletic scholarships and the cost of intercollegiate football continued to vex McCaffrey's and President Bill Atchley's presidencies. President McCaffrey was given a vote of no-confidence by the faculty in the latter 1970s when he publicly denied that additional football scholarships had been awarded outside the regular very high quota. In actuality, he had granted a few of these additional football scholarships. Only years later, severe pressure from the Western Accrediting Association of Colleges and Universities to reexamine, among other issues, the excessive cost of

intercollegiate football at Pacific, at last induced the University Regents to face reality. In 1995, the intercollegiate football program was “suspended” in the first year of President DeRosa’s administration.

Lark: Yes. Now, are there, I have one subject I want to bring up at the end, are there other things that you would like to include that we have not touched on yet?

Blum: Well, let’s see. I think we have covered the territory pretty well. There is just one question, I think, that is raised in the questionnaire, “Who were the individuals at Pacific that were most memorable and why?”

The first one, naturally, that I had contact with and remained in contact until he left Pacific was Warren Bryan Martin, known to most of us as Dick Martin. He was the founding provost (at that time a title often used for “dean”) of Raymond College and designer of the Raymond program, presumably in close contact with Sam Meyer, the academic vice president of the University. In 1966 he departed from the University when he himself became somewhat uneasy about the original Raymond program and wanted to make some changes. Lo and behold, who resisted his proposed changes -- his own faculty! (Laughter) I think he was also contemplating moving into higher education at the national level.

Lark: May I interject a comment here? It seemed to me that what happened was, Raymond was itself an experimental college, as a new experiment itself, but it was not designed like in science to be self-correcting and to be experimenting. I think people who came later to the College were expected to be themselves more involved in experimenting, and they found they were in the middle of an experiment that was succeeding, and so there was strong resistance to change for that reason.

Blum: I think your point is well taken. Some of us probably were a bit too sanguine to think that the original Raymond program was really a good one and should continue indefinitely. Changes became more readily possible under the new provost who succeeded Martin, Berndt Kolker. Larry Jackson, the provost-elect of Callison College to be opened in 1967, served as interim provost for one year at Raymond. In 1967 Berndt Kolker was appointed permanent provost. He had an educational philosophy and personality that was adaptive and so he quite successfully guided Raymond College through curricular and social changes during his ten-year tenure at Pacific. Margaret Cormack, originally a faculty member at Callison College, became provost of the combined Raymond-Callison College in 1977 and presided over it with effectiveness until it ended in 1980.

Bob Burns, as I already mentioned, was one who had a great deal of vision, and was willing to take risks. Without him there would have been no Raymond College or cluster colleges. He was, I think, really a very significant president in Pacific’s history. Sometimes his vision exceeded the realities. I remember how Sam Meyer, the academic vice president, used to say, “Well, we have to hold the coattails of Bob Burns at times so he doesn’t run too fast.” Burns’s original vision

was to have twelve or perhaps more cluster colleges in so many years. In the end, only three colleges were created - Raymond College in 1962, a liberal arts college; Elbert Covell in 1963, a Spanish-speaking college; and Callison College in 1967, an international studies college. Burns concluded that he could not reform the University from the inside but he hoped to achieve reforms by creating competing units around the University. Another consideration that he advanced was, Pacific must grow larger by becoming smaller, i.e. by adding smaller autonomous units with new programs rather than merely expanding existing ones in numbers of students. As long as he was alive -- he died early in 1971 -- he held a protective hand over his cluster colleges. They brought Pacific national recognition for something other than intercollegiate football.

Clifford Hand continues to be well remembered. He was an outstanding teacher of English literature at College of the Pacific and Raymond College. From there he moved into administration and quickly rose from dean of COP to academic vice president and during one year even served as acting president of the University. His untimely death in 1983 cut his role short at Pacific. During the last years of my career Donald DeRosa became President of Pacific and Phil Gilbertson the first University Provost. They led Pacific from an economic low point to secure financial stability and very significantly enhanced its level of academic achievement. At the dean's level, during my time at Pacific, Bob Benedetti was the best administrator that College of the Pacific ever had. His style of leadership and his open relations with the faculty, especially chairs, were remarkable. One of his lasting contributions is the Mentor Seminar program which has given Pacific national recognition for its general education.

As for faculty members, they were the community of the University with whom I was most closely associated. Mike Wagner was a professor who left the deepest imprint on generations of Raymond students. He challenged students not only to think seriously about the subjects he taught but also their philosophical assumptions. When he transferred to the Economics Department of College of the Pacific he similarly left an imprint on students there. As a young faculty member I cherished his intellectual inspiration and his friendship until he died. Gene Wise, who was at Raymond from 1963 to 1968, is remembered by the early classes of Raymond for his teaching of American Studies, which inspired several Raymond graduates to become college professors in this subject. He moved on and attained a national reputation as a leading scholar in American Studies. It was tragic that he ended his life of his own volition all too early. I think you, Neil, made a very important contribution to Raymond College as teacher of physics, broadly defined, and astronomy. In one of your notable courses you explored the relationship of physics and music. You had the high respect of Raymond students and College of the Pacific students as well when you joined the Physics Department. Even though not a Raymond faculty member, Herb Reinelt in philosophy was a strong supporter of Raymond and a friend of many of its faculty. He played a major role in the reform of College of the Pacific and was one of the key designers of the Mentor Seminar curriculum. Walter Payne was a notable teacher and historian and also a leader of the faculty on issues of university governance. Malcolm Moule is



remembered as an inspiring teacher of history and an effective chair of the History Department. Sally Miller is a highly noted scholar in American history and was a strong advocate of women's issues and studies at Pacific. Another colleague with whom I have shared my interest in German affairs throughout the years is Mike Sharp, who is a well-recognized scholar in Austrian literature.

Lark: As one final point, I'd like to pay attention to people who are listening to this or reading it who have known you personally, especially the earlier students at Raymond College who knew your family. I'd like you to comment on your wife's subsequent career and where your children, who were babysat by some of our early Raymond students, are now. I think that's appropriate, don't you?

Blum: Well, in a tangential way. Beverly who was certified to teach biology and mathematics in high school and holds an M. S. degree in human anatomy taught one year at Stagg High School, primarily chemistry and some biology. At that time the expectation in California secondary education was you should be able to teach anything in the sciences regardless of your preparation in a specific area of science. A few years later, she held a part-time teaching appointment in human anatomy at COP. In the early 1970s she decided that her real interest lay in administration of non-profit organizations. She became a co-founder of the first affiliate of Planned Parenthood in Stockton and served as its director for almost twenty years. When she retired from that position in the late 1980s, she helped establish Solar Cookers International in Sacramento, an organization that promotes the use of solar energy in food preparation. She served as the director of this organization for fourteen years, and now, after a third retirement, continues to be active on its board of directors. We had twins, a girl and a boy, in 1964, "the ultimate in family planning," as some of our friends remarked for we stopped at that point. Several Raymond students, now graduates, were our babysitters in those years. Among them were Peggy Braden, Kathy Mumm, Jackie Uttke, Flo Schapiro, and a few others.

Lark: And where are the twins now? What are they doing?

Blum: Alfred is a civil engineer. He has been with the California Department of Transportation for over twenty years. Fortunately, he and his family live in Stockton so we see them regularly. Barbara, his twin sister, spent two years in the Peace Corps in Lesotho after college, and then obtained a Ph.D. in biomedical engineering. She is a research engineer at an orthopedic company in Arlington, near Memphis, Tennessee. It seems the scientific side won out in the professional pursuits of our family. However, Alfred, in addition to his degree in engineering, also holds an undergraduate degree in history that he obtained when he was already working.

In conclusion, it may be worthwhile to mention a controversy that erupted in the open at a University faculty meeting in 1965, I believe, in part triggered by the liberal academic leave plan at Raymond College. Because of the intensity of the ten-month academic year, Raymond faculty members were promised one term of academic leave every three years. At the rest of the

University, there were only a very small number of sabbatical leaves available every seven years. At that time Pacific also did not have an effective faculty governance system. We had monthly faculty meetings at which the President usually gave a report about the most recent developments at the University, but no decisions were taken. There was some faculty involvement in decision-making regarding academic programs or other matters only in a Council of COP chairs. So faculty members who wanted to speak out on issues of concern were basically limited to making statements during the open University faculty meetings. The issue of faculty leaves and other programmatic concerns prompted several of the younger COP faculty like Don Duns, Herb Reinelt, and some others to raise the question of inequities that existed between COP and Raymond College. Both Dick Martin and Harold Jacoby, who was the dean of COP at that time, tried to control the uproar that erupted at a University faculty meeting. This event, I think, helped give some impetus to the curricular reforms at College of the Pacific in the immediate years that followed. After careful planning, a new curriculum and a new academic calendar – the 4-1-4 semester plan -- were adopted at College of the Pacific and some units of the University by the end of the 1960s. What was notable in the COP curriculum was an innovative general education program. And very importantly, now faculty members were able to take advantage of a fairly generous five-year academic leave plan that was a part of the reforms of that time. This academic leave plan has survived in modified form to this day. It was striking that when Raymond College also adopted the 4-1-4 calendar in 1973, its academic program had evolved into a form that was not that drastically different from what the reformed College of the Pacific offered.

Lark: This has been an interview for the Oral History Project of the Emeriti Society of University of the Pacific with Emeritus Professor George Blum of the History Department, interviewed by Neil Lark, an Emeritus Professor from the Physics Department, on November 9<sup>th</sup>, 2010.