

# **NOTICE**

**Materials in our digital Oral History collections are the products of research projects by several individuals. USF Libraries assume no responsibility for the views expressed by interviewers or interviewees. Some interviews include material that may be viewed as offensive or objectionable. Parents of minors are encouraged to supervise use of USF Libraries Oral Histories and Digital Collections. Additional oral histories may be available in Special Collections for use in the reading room. See individual collection descriptions for more information.**

**This oral history is provided for research and education within the bounds of U.S. Copyright Law (Title 17, U.S.C.). Copyright over Oral Histories hosted by the USF Libraries rests with the interviewee unless transferred to the interviewer in the course of the project. Interviewee views and information may also be protected by privacy and publicity laws. All patrons making use of it and other library content are individually accountable for their responsible and legal use of copyrighted material.**

USF 50th (2006) Anniversary Oral History Project  
Oral History Program  
Florida Studies Center  
University of South Florida, Tampa Library

Digital Object Identifier: U23-00045  
Interviewee: Dr. Roy Francis  
Interview by: Yael V. Greenberg  
Interview date: June 17th, 2003  
Interview location: USF Tampa Library  
Transcribed by: Renee Perez  
Transcription date: May 31st, 2017 to June 1st, 2017  
Audit Edit by: Renee Perez  
Audit Edit date: June 1st, 2017  
Final Edit by: Carla Butel  
Final Edit date: March 8th, 2018 to March 12th, 2008

**Yael Greenberg (YG):** Today is Tuesday, June 17th, 2003. My name is Yael Greenberg, oral history program assistant for the Florida Studies Center. We continue a series of interviews here in our studio with former faculty, students, and alumni, in order to commemorate 50 years of university history. Today we will be interviewing Dr. Roy Francis, who came to USF in 1974 as a professor of sociology and German, and he was also hired as the chair of the sociology department.

**Roy Francis (RF):** Not professor of sociology and German, just professor of sociology.

YG: Okay. Good morning Dr. Francis.

RF: Good morning.

YG: Let's begin by you taking us to the year you arrived in Tampa and what circumstances brought you to the University of South Florida.

RF: I came here in '74 from the University of Wisconsin in Milwaukee. I had been at the University of Minnesota. My real start was at the University of Wisconsin in Madison, but I was a professor of sociology and statistics at Minnesota for several years. Then I moved to Milwaukee, where I was dean of the College of Letters and Science. When I tired of "deaning" or they got tired—higher administration got tired of a guy always fighting for his campus, I was named Brittingham Professor of Sociology, and I went back into—well, I hate to say teaching because I make a distinction between being a teacher and a professor.

A teacher trains people, but a professor tries to get the individual to learn how to ask answerable questions, whereas a teacher gives you other people's answers to other people's questions. I was more concerned about getting the student to find him or herself. I'll attempt to use the male pronoun because the dictionaries used to say man [for] just human being. I had a grade school teacher that told us—you know a one-room country grade school—that boys are unfortunate because man meant both. But women were special because they had the word "woman," and that was unambiguous, whereas "man" was ambiguous; it could be either. So I grew up with that, but I also grew up with a feeling that women were just being unfairly treated. My parents were Swedish immigrants, although they met in the United States. Dad was a blacksmith; although, at the time we were growing up, I was on a farm. My mother was called a seamstress and males would be called tailors. So, as a seamstress, she was always subservient. She couldn't be boss, and that really rankled me because she could walk down—there's a little bit of truth—she could walk down a street and see a woman's gown in a dress and make it for any individual woman.

She was creative and really good at that, but she was woman, and so she was always in the second place. I got that irritation with me all the time, and my parents taught us we couldn't be prejudiced. This was wrong. We didn't have many Negroes, as they were called then, but there were American Indians, and we had to treat them with the same respect as Whites. This is fairly important because, throughout my life, several important times, I was called a "nigger lover." You don't get that title by accident; it's because you're standing up. Some Whites stood up and faced the racists, the Ku Klux Klan, and they were called nigger lovers. So it was a title you wore with a certain amount of honor. I mention that because that is part of me. Part of me also was this commitment to humor because I learned as a smarter than the average—at least book smarter than the average, not genetically smarter—that if you were bookish as a boy you were called a sissy or identified as a girl.

So in order to be superior, I learned that if you could joke then they'd be on your side. So I carried that with me when I was in the Army or wherever I was. Humor has always been an instrument of my thinking. Now when I became Brittingham professor, I went back to this academic world. I had been involved in television because a former student of mine in Minnesota whose father owned a radio/TV station. I got involved in TV actually in the 1950s. I've been in it for 50 years. When I was at Milwaukee, I created a course called Commentary Film Making. I got an NSF [National Science Foundation] grant to get me the equipment. The idea was to develop and be able to get students, and later faculty, to write what I call commentary films. They were to write essays. It wasn't going to be a documentary and just repeat what the facts were, but you'd be able to develop an argument.

So in one sense I was one of the early pioneers in TV on the campus. When I was at Milwaukee, I learned that I had angina, a heart condition, and I was told it would be helpful if I'd go outside and exercise. But, I never did like—Oregon is not a really cold state, where I grew up. I didn't like the winter coldness, so we decided that we would move to a warmer climate. I examined

California, examined campuses in Arizona, and all these other things. Then here was USF. It was a new campus, it was starting off, and this was exciting. So I decided to come—well particularly, they offered me the chair and they promised me distinguished professorship, which never materialized. I soon learned that here, as elsewhere, there was a fight between administration and campus. That wasn't too big of a surprise, but I came here and it was a totally different place.

If you go here now, you can hardly recognize it. The land is full but then it was more park like. It was open and there were a few buildings, but you knew there was promise. You knew there was a struggle going on, but in my mind this could be an urban university. We could be different. We didn't have to be held back by the past. We could be oriented to change. I was a demographer and into sociology, the studying of social change, so it could be oriented to that. But also there was this thing of feminine equality that was always in my being, and racial equality, that we could be different and women should have a chance. There were some on the campus—women faculty—but they were more put down in the structure and out of the way. At that time, the university world was changing. It had grown up, and I had matured in the “publish or perish.”

That was a good slogan. When you published, it was supposed to be a creative development of your discipline. It wasn't just hack out stuff, but it was supposed to be a development route. Research and learn. I got a grant to develop commentary filming for equipment and that stuff, and other people were getting grants. Then slowly publish or perish turned into grant or grovel, and if you didn't get a grant you were put out of the way. This wasn't in the '70s, it became in the '80s. Now of course if you aren't a grants man, and I say man purposely there, if you aren't out getting grants you're disregarded. In fact, the universities tend to serve themselves out to anyone who gets a grant.

And if you get a big enough grant, you can buy almost anything on any campus. That's now. That wasn't what it was when we came. When we came here, it was going to [a] university—I had hoped it would be truly urban and that our athletic program would not be this semi-professional football and baseball stuff that was man dominated anyway, but that we can have it reflect a new student body. Blacks and Whites and women, but all students. They would be students first. They wouldn't be pupils. They would be active here on the campus. I got involved in things like that. I got involved in the way courses were organized and the way grading—from there, I got active in the campus as I did when I was in Minnesota or in Milwaukee. I was in campus politics, and I got on the faculty senate. I got into all sorts of different committees.

I would get very active in student—I was kind of, more or less, a student spokesman trying to get things changed, to get courses organized differently than they were, not always in these three hour [blocks]. We even got started in the pass/fail and different kinds of courses so that we could be adaptive and changing but at the same time quality. We didn't want to just turn loose. You see, if you don't have quality driven by people who are—. I was going to say missionaries: people who really believe in what they're doing. You can fall back and get it easy and then you do it the easy, sloppy way. This is always the danger. At the same time—remember there was a big split

between the male and female world, and most of the faculty were men, but there were active women, the faculty wives.

My wife works for example, and others—I don't want to mention names, you know, because it's not a naming contest, but they got involved. They formed a faculty women's club and it became very active in the campus. What was happening was they got supportive of the library. They got supportive of all sorts of programs. There was a Madrigal Dinner<sup>1</sup> program and [the] Guarneri Quartet came, and the women's club was a big sponsor to that. They got pushed to that, and they got very involved in making sure that the library was going represent what a university could be like. I think that when we do the history of USF, that group should really be examined very carefully because I think they made a major contribution as to what the campus could really be like.

One of the things that I had hoped for, as I said, was that there would be a change in the athletic program, that it wouldn't be the traditional kind, it would be more oriented to—. I've used the example of the Olympics, where almost anything, any kind of athletic activity would be justified, male or female. But see, there's always a—someone's got to pay for the place. This means there's got to be outside support, and this means always there's going to be a political element. There's going to be that part of the state, and we got put down as we were the intellectuals, we were the liberals, we were the ones who were fighting against the government. Well, it was just a squabble about who gets to control these, who gets to make decisions. That's not unique to Wisconsin.

Although we felt here, and I think correctly—and any new campus finds—I'm sure some of the branch campuses of USF feels it in regards to USF, that we dominate. We want it our way. A lot of the changes that we were trying to get here, the University of Florida and Florida State [University] stopped because either they wanted it, or they viewed it as a threat for whatever reason. I think we have to understand that there was this—. Well, it was a turmoil. But at the same time, it made life interesting and exciting. One of the things that came up about this time was, if we're going to go in the direction of sports and have football, and baseball, and basketball, and the men's stuff, what are the teams going to be called? They're going to be called the Bulls.

Now, I mentioned that I was in the military. I was overseas. I mentioned that humor has always been a big part of my life and the way I'm thinking. Even in the Army, I organized, got started, a program. We called it Holiday Hangovers, and this is going to be a variety show showing all the talent, of course with GI's. Officers could participate if they wanted to, but they didn't want to take orders from noncoms [noncommissioned officers]. Norman Lear was in that program we put on, and I was the emcee and opened up with jokes. So when I got here, I thought, Well why don't we have it here? So I organized, from the very first year, the Faculty Follies.

---

<sup>1</sup>A recreation of the renaissance feasts held in baronial halls throughout England during the twelve days of Christmas.

Now it's important, I think, that people understand when I said faculty, and in the letter to the *Oracle* I made it very clear that, although that was the name that was for the alliterative—Faculty Follies. Staff people could participate if they had any kind of talent. If they had musical talent or any kind of talent, they could participate. All I did was serve as organizer and the emcee. I have a number of—there was one of the programs and I was the emcee, as I said, and I would open it up with a commentary, and I would carry on a lot of my fights through humor through the Follies. This is, I think, one of my motivations for the program. This gave me a legal, acceptable justification for using humor to present my point of view. See, I grew up and in my scholarly work I uncovered a writer, Anthony Ashley Cooper, who was writing criticized Oliver Cromwell, which this is a long time ago, joked about him.

People got angry and published severe editorials condemning him for joking. So then he wrote an essay, "On Raillery and Wit," which has become almost like a Bible to me because he pointed out that if you're deity and cannot stand the test of humor, it could be an idol, i-d-o-l, notion, but every joke should be seriously examined because a good joke contains the truth. In my lecturing here and elsewhere, I changed that last part to be an alliterative also so that if a joke does not contain the truth, it could be an idle, i-d-l-e, notion. So I could play off of idol and idle.

It's a good thing to remember. That was a part of this whole thrust for having the Follies, that I could joke about the serious things and then flip that into making the point. The thing that triggered my mind on this was that one of the arguments that were going on was what we were going to call the athletic team. The argument was for the Bulls. Well, one of my (inaudible). I said, "Wait a minute. What's the feminine of bull? It's cow or heifer. Are we going to say, Here are the heifers playing basketball or here are the heifers playing softball?" Even today they'll say the women's softball team. They will not say the women's bulls because they know that is stupid. As one of my other Follies, I pointed out how maybe we should have called them the steers. If people don't know what the difference between a bull and steer<sup>2</sup>, they're in a tough way.

YG: I want to ask you about the sociology department in 1974. I know that you came in as the chair of that department. How was it organized? What were some of the courses?

RF: It was a standard course, standard department. We were agitating and moving towards, hoping to get a graduate program, and we did. It was first organized around the classroom. It was more teaching rather than research. There was very little research going on. In fact, in most of the departments, there were relatively few people who were really publishing scholars. A number of people who were coming in with me, I wasn't the only one—there were a lot of people coming in who came here because of the promise [that] this an urban university. Here we can be changed, here we can be different, and here we can have some of our ideas fulfilled.

---

<sup>2</sup>While both a bull and a steer are male bovines, the steer has been castrated before reaching sexual maturity.

When I was on the faculty senate and these other committees and counsels we formed, there was a whole bunch of us who were fighting for these same things. We needed to get in the research orientation, but we wanted to make it clear that it wasn't just a man's job but women should come in and do research too. They shouldn't be excluded, and they shouldn't be pushed into the teaching roles, or the secretarial roles, or that sort of thing. We could get an equal start. We were succeeding slowly. We didn't fail completely, but we were only moving towards a doctorate. By that time, you see, we had different notions of what was going on, so anthropology and sociology became separate.

All sorts of things were splitting off, and we were having a different orientation to what a campus should be like. Women's studies, for example, after I left, became almost homed in the sociology department because of, this would be a natural—sociology would be a natural place for all women's studies, particularly one that has been emphasizing the proper place of women. I could see where other departments would be saying, Well thank—who got what. Think about that.

But the whole campus was growing. This is the thing we have to understand. This isn't just a thing that was happening in one department or this department, but it was a struggle that was going on in every department, and it made this an exciting place to be. It was really a fantastic experience to be here and to be a part of it to watch it grow. But it was also disappointing in seeing how—. Well, I think something happened when the computer world took over.

We've almost become robotized. There was a recent article in the paper where some sociologist was complaining because the students weren't able to write well. Well I made that complaint when I was teacher here, when I was on the faculty here. I disliked—as a statistician and the kind of person I am, I disliked what I called the forced answer test. I didn't like the computerized way of analyzing things because to me that was undoing the purpose of being a student. I wanted students to be creative. Things should come from the student. So in every course, even in statistics—in statistics, when I taught, they had to do two things. They had to rewrite the lecture notes as their own version of a statistics book, like whether it was filmmaking or sociologic humor. I used to say, "Give me a noun and I'll give you a sociology of it" because I wanted—whatever end, the sociology would be basically the same.

I wanted students to get in themselves and think out, and then I would write on it. My note many times [was] badly written. I also had a pattern on certain grades. You know, I gave it [and] you can either accept the grade I gave you, or you could rewrite it and try for a better grade. But, I left that to the student because if a student was satisfied with getting a C in a course, I'm not going to force them and say, "Okay, you've got to work for an A or a B, or whatever." If they were satisfied, okay, it's not my back they're on but someone else's. I had a lot of students who would then take me up on that and rewrite. Some of them, when I said, "This is badly written," thought I was talking about penmanship, and they would pen it very carefully [the next time].

Of course printing takes time, and if you scribbled sometimes it is hard to read, but at least you can get it done faster. I was trying to point out [that] good writing has a beginning. It has a thrust. It's going somewhere, and you can see it going and then it has a conclusion. Now the commentary film is supposed to be the same: a beginning, a development, and a conclusion. This was the thrust that I was trying to get people to get involved in so that when they were on their own, they could think. They could structure and come to a conclusion. That's what I thought the university experience was supposed to be all about.

YG: What were some of your major initiatives as chairperson of the sociology department?

RF: I tried to work with individual faculty members. I didn't think that a chairman was supposed to come down and say, This is what we're going to do. I wanted it to come from the faculty, so I would work with the individual faculty members. I was trying to get them stimulated, and see the thing was [that] they would. They'd respond. They had their ideas. They wanted to do things and felt held back, and what they needed was someone to encourage them and someone to help them develop their own things. They could be put down [and told] who cares about that, or [they could be told] try it. If you only get three or four students we know it was dumb, but just suppose you can get 10 or 12, so we can get 15, so we can get 50.

I didn't have a thing that I wanted to impose on our department; I wanted it to come from them. The source of any control I had was I would be the real key in the recruiting. It was in the recruiting that you were able to develop, and then when you were recruiting you could promise people they'll support you in this, and you can see what they were interested in. That was the way we did it. See, that would depend on what the candidate had, not what I had, not I was looking for. I was simply looking for bright people who had an idea, who wanted to have a chance. So the way the department responded was in the recruiting. I still recommend that. I'd say that's the best way a department can proceed because if the world is changing then you can change as the world is changing, and you aren't either going to focus it, or hold them back, or whatever.

YG: How did USF differ from some of the other institutions that you had previously worked at? What were some major differences about the University of South Florida?

RF: I think it's that we were growing. Philosophically, I think your blessing is your curse and your curse is your blessing; they're just flip sides of the same coin. Whatever is the good thing about someplace can also be its bad. The very good thing about a place like Minnesota is power and so on; that can also be restraint. It's a funny tension between both sides. The very things that make things happen at a place like Minnesota could also constrain, could also hold back. Here it was the other. Here we also had to learn in a way that you can't quite imagine. We know that the

off campus politics is going to have an impact. The more active you as [a] faculty member are, particularly if you're in an administrative or a committee leadership position where you're going to be dealing with some off-campus people, you'll encounter it more.

If you're withdrawn and not involved in that stuff, you may not notice and you may complain about it, but you'd be vague about your complaints. You wouldn't know really what's going on. One of the real differences is the different political structure. The politics of Minnesota were relatively very different from the politics of Wisconsin. But these were very different political structures than here in Florida, particularly now under Governor Bush. We have an altogether different kind of political structure. I don't know whether I should say I'm glad I'm not chairman now with this administration because I certainly would oppose a lot of the ways he has gone about trying to dominate, trying to push controls on. But see, that's part of the whole scheme of things. If the faculty member isn't alerted to that and tuned into that, [you] know they're a little shell, and they can be anywhere and they aren't really making much difference. I think the real difference is how the external politics of Florida differs from politics of the other states.

YG: In those early days, was the community supportive of the University of South Florida? The larger community?

RF: Yeah. See, Tampa was also growing. The urban world was changing, and the South was changing; the South was changing very dramatically. Now they're writing things in the paper as though it is a recent thing, but that isn't really quite the case. There was a lot of change going on then. There was some—of course, there were forces to hold things back. Forces to keep things as they were, there always is. So, it was racist. It was—but Tampa itself was changing. Temple Terrace, just a little thing where I live now, was changing. It became really an adaptation of the campus. All that was changing, and so they were welcoming this. This was fantastic. Even now I think the City of Tampa has to acknowledge that the major economic force in Tampa is the University of South Florida. What happens at the University of South Florida controls Tampa really. Not in the sense it's mechanical and does this and that, but if there is a big negative thing, say in the medical program, wham, that would happen and that would really kill things in Tampa too.

There's a balance that has to be worked out, and both sides have to do these peculiar thing. They have to maintain their own integrity, and yet they have to mesh and work with [each other]. Meshing and working with [each other] means you make compromises. This is always the difficulty. After the compromise is made you can say, Uh oh, this guy was doing it for himself, not—and sometimes that's true. This is an experience. This is really what makes life amazing, particularly if your intellectual activity involves looking at people as people. I can see an astronomer, that's not his business; he doesn't worry about that. A mathematician is worrying about number theory, what does he care about that? But, if you are people oriented and you're disciplined, this is exciting.

YG: Why were students in the '70s interested in sociology at USF? What attracted them to sociology at the University of South Florida?

RF: I think it's the same thing that attracts them almost anywhere. We do tend to recruit people who have a certain value concerns. I think you have to have a feeling about what's —could be and usually is—emotional, and stupid, and wrong in the factual sense of wrongness. That there is something wrong. I remember even in—and this was true here, but I remember it happened in the '60s and '70s. I had a student, and he got involved in this student activity, you know the anti-war and all that sort of stuff. He was wearing—I think he was wearing a leather jacket or something, and he had it all the time. He'd been in one of these street-based things. So I commented to him about that one time and he said [that] oh, he just had to rebel. He had to throw it away. And so, they threw away all of his clothes. I said, "Oh, you just changed one uniform for another."

He said, "Oh my god, that's true." That student, that guy, came back (inaudible). That turned him around again, so he was freed from both sides. That was a lucky fit. I don't know what popped in my head to say that you changed one uniform for another, but it's relevant here, you see. To answer your question, we tend to get sociology—and the social science disciplines in general tend to get people who, for whatever reason, are concerned about the world they live in. So they bring that with them. Now I don't like to say a liberal conservative because that's—I'm conservative in way that I want to conserve freedom of speech; I'm liberal in—you know I think that's silly. I used to tell my students, "I am ahead of center, not to the right or the left." The geography of that or the geometry of that is really what's silly because there are now some students who are really radically—would be labeled conservative.

But see, they have concerns; they have concerns about society. They have a concern. They're the kind of people—it's the, I suppose the activist people who tend to get involved in the social sciences. That's always been the case, but the question is, what is it that's activating the young people? The women's movement activated a generation, and they came in and they mostly came to the social sciences. You don't see many women activists who went into mathematics. What motivates people? They're going to go to where their questions are going to be answered. If they find some area that will enable them to be themselves, then they're going to go there, everywhere. That's always been the case. I suppose it was the case in the '30s and '20s.

YG: In terms of how the department changed, certainly you came in the mid '70s, and by the time you retired in 1993, I'm certain that there were major changes that happened in the sociology department here at the university. Can you talk a little bit about that?

RF: Well one of the things—and it's—. Yeah, I can talk a little, very little about it. Mainly because, at that time you see—. Theoretically we were told we were to retire at age 65. I was

retired at 73, so I was already breaking the rules. But, I was still involved with students. Many of my students, particularly graduate students at that time, were women. I had one woman who was handicapped, physically handicapped and had emotional problems. I don't know how to put this. You tried to help her, but at the same time it was time consuming because of her problems it takes more time. But, then on the other hand, I was involved with another student who was an artist.

She worked among the homeless, and she drew pictures of the homeless. I directed her master's thesis and that wasn't finished until December 1996, two years after I had retired. But you see, to answer your question, when you get to be about 70 or so, you're starting to get signals. Somewhere I learned that, and maybe because my oldest brother was a politician that I learned it from him. It's better to leave a year early than a year too late. If you stay that extra year or two where you goof and you make dumb [mistakes], then you ruin yourself and you ruin everything you've done. So there comes a time when you have to be asking yourself, is it time to go? Now when that happens you are pulling out of the fight in the department, and there are changes going on.

You can see, also having gone through it yourself, that the people who are now in power would like to be able to replace you. Now sometimes if they are good and can work it right, and if your salary is commensurate, they can get two for the price of one. I'm going to leave and they get two in place so that there will be evident change there. Now, I've been recruiting women and women leaders, they've come in. Now I'm sure that they didn't understand me and what I've done and the fight I've made for women's rights, and that was not of concern. That wasn't an issue because they had their job. They had to do just like I had to do, and so there was a change going on. It was very clear to me that intellectually active women were finding a home in sociology, and intellectually and morally I couldn't oppose that.

That in a way was what I thought, and see it was happening. They needed it, and whatever mistakes they're going to make—I had made mistakes—the next generation will be there to correct them. So there were changes going on, but it wasn't changes that I was, in a sense, looking at, directing, and saying, Okay this is where we're going. I was leaving it to them. You see, if I had connected myself to that, then I couldn't leave. This I think is very important to understand. If you get involved in that stuff, you either will then leave angered, disappointed, frustrated, or something, but it will be negative. That's not the way you say your farewell, at least it shouldn't be.

YG: Two more questions. In your nearly 20 years of service to the University of South Florida, what are you most proud of here at the university?

RF: I think of the students. I got a lot of reaction from the students. Here is a letter when Betty Castor was president that's dated March 8, 1995. I had been retired now for over two years now,

and a student wrote her a letter commending me for what I had done, how I had helped her. You see, when you get things from students like that—. The student advisory magazine gave me a plaque that's outstanding teacher. When you get recognition from students, when you give your career to students and say, You're what it's all about, and then they say, Yeah, thank you. What more could you ask for? I just couldn't ask for anything better. But, the administration from time to time would recognize that. I was granted emeritus status.

I understand that in some places emeritus has become almost automatic. If you get retired, they call it emeritus, but it used to be for the distinguished faculty. But, then the whole world changed to people are supposed to feel good about themselves. Grade school kids are supposed to feel good. They're flunking out, but they're supposed to feel good about themselves. A professor that should have been fired 20 years ago, you hear they've given them emeritus and that sort of stuff. That happens, but there's also some genuine signs that the administration appreciates it.

YG: My final question to you, and this is something that I've asked all of my interviewees. If you could leave something on tape, either to future faculty and students or to your colleagues and your students that you've had over the years, what would you want to say to them about how the University of South Florida influenced you? What would you want to say about the university and your experiences at the University of South Florida?

RF: The first thing I would remind them is that all of this stuff we read about science and scholarship being ethically neutral is wrong. Academic freedom is based on intellectual honesty. You cannot lie about your data; you cannot lie about your procedure and tests. The first commitment you have to make is—and this has to be virtually a religious commitment, deeply felt responsibility—you have to commit yourself to intellectual honesty. If you're not honest, and you don't demand your students to be honest, and if you don't demand your administrators to be honest, this is the thing I would say—now, in my experience here, my efforts to be intellectually honest, see I was able to use humor as a way in which I could be honest—sometimes you can't be brutally honest.

That's going to undo you, so you have to use what devices are available. But, if you have this understanding of humor and really sincerely believe that you can joke about the serious providing you are then as serious about the jokes. If you have that and are committed to honesty—now see, my experience here—well it's been—. I think I experienced it more here than at the other campuses. I think it's generally true, but I really found it true here. I hope they can maintain that, that this is a campus where intellectual honesty and humor can coexist. In fact, they would coexist. I'd like to see some faculty pay attention to this [and] pick up the idea of the Follies, come back and have it again. But be sure, if they do, that it isn't just faculty [that] it's faculty and staff. Anyone that participates in making this thing work should be able to participate and express themselves through song, or humor, or dance, or whatever they do. It's been a great ride.

But, I also think that we should understand the role that the faculty women's club made on this campus. As the role of women changed on the campus, and you get the male who is now on campus, there must be some way to involve them so that it's like a family affair. That's what it was before. If they lost the feeling that the family is involved then they've lost an awful lot. If the university can say, Well we're not like Wal-Mart. We're not like General Motors. We're a university. We are people oriented. It's the whole person, and the whole person includes his family or her family. If they can feel that, believe that, and act that out, then I think this is going to continue to be a great place.

YG: Dr. Francis, I want to thank you very much for your interview.

RF: Well, I'm glad to be here.

***End of Interview***