



Julius Jahn  
February, 1992

## BIOGRAPHICAL SUMMARY

### Julius Jahn:

Julius was born in 1914 in Marshalltown, Iowa. He was raised in Faribault and St. Paul, Minnesota. His father, a minister for the United Church of Christ, had difficulty providing for their family. As the youngest of seven children, Julius grew up poor and learned early to pitch in and work.

He graduated from high school in 1934 during the Depression. Because he could not find work, he went to college. He won a scholarship to the University of Chicago, but after one year there he transferred to the University of Minnesota. To help meet expenses, he worked as a research assistant through a program by the N.Y.A. (Nat'l Youth Administration).

His major was Sociology, and he minored in Psychology. Due to economic conditions, he remained in college until eventually, he was working toward a PH.D. At the same time, he was research assistant to the chairman of the Sociology Dept. He directed a research project there for the W.P.A. (Works Progress Admin.) which he was able to submit as his PH.D. dissertation.

When WWII began winding up, Julius took part in protests against going to war. When he had to register for the Draft, he also registered as a Conscientious Objector. The university chairman advised him not to file for C.O. status, and when Julius acted against his advice, the chairman neglected taking action to approve his dissertation.

In 1942, just before he was drafted, he married Elsa Dahlgren, a social worker from Tacoma who he met when they both were in graduate school.

He was classified as a 1-AO, which is enlistment in the military without requirement to fight or carry arms. The only backlash he suffered from the military for his non-combat status was that he remained in the lowest ranks, and never promoted higher than corporal.

He worked in the Medical Corps, counseling patients in psychiatric wards. Many of the men were suffering as a result of their treatment in the military, as well as from emotional conflicts over having to fight and kill other human beings. These soldiers had been required to follow orders, not to think. But those who could not turn off their thinking sometimes ended up with mental illnesses.

In the Medical Corps, Julius met other 1-AO's. One was a member of the Religious Society of Friends. He went with him to visit other C.O.'s at a nearby work camp, and it was there that, for the first time, he attended a Friends Meeting.

He does not regret his life in the military. When he had only a few months left to serve, his wife had moved back to Tacoma with their two small children, and she contracted polio. When he was notified of her illness, he was immediately granted an early discharge to allow him to join her.

While his wife was recovering in the hospital, Julius looked for work and got an assistant professorship at the University of Washington in Seattle, where he was also able to complete his PH.D. Part of his work there included a study on Seattle's minority groups. The work was paid for by the City of Seattle, but he was also able to use it for his dissertation.

It eventually became obvious to him that he would not receive tenure at the University of Washington, due to an unpopular stand he took with regard to the "science" of Sociology. The chairman of the department was promoting another professor there who had written a book called, Can Science Save Us? They proposed that science (including the science of Sociology) could provide the solution to all the world's problems. When the chairman asked Julius for his opinion on the subject, he answered honestly that he believed the ideas idealistic and unrealistic.

After leaving the University of Washington, he taught briefly at Washington State University, then left the academic world for a time and went to work for a social agency in New York City. But while they were living in Seattle, he and his family had joined the University Friends Meeting where they were instrumental in establishing a youth program.

In New York they became members of the Flushing Friends Meeting. It is the second oldest Meeting in the United States, founded in 1686 and built from ships' timbers. It is famous for the "Flushing Remonstrance," a statement made by the Friends that "religious freedom" must mean freedom for all religious groups. This occurred after a group of Jewish refugees had been refused entry to New York Harbor.

Around 1958, while Julius and his family were members of the Flushing Friends, there was a discussion there on the subject of loyalty oaths. A guest speaker was seeking their support to protest a loyalty oath that was required of all public employees in the state of California. His son, listening from the back of the room, stood and announced that he, too, was

required to sign a loyalty oath before he could graduate from high school in New York City. In the end, his son took a stand against that demand, the American Civil Liberties Union became involved, and the schools finally abandoned their loyalty oath.

Due to his wife's ill health, they moved from New York and Julius joined the faculty at the University of Pennsylvania, where he remained from 1960 until his retirement in 1980. He found that to be a Quaker in Philadelphia was like being a Catholic in Rome. It is the center of Quakerdom in the United States. However, there is a wide range of Quakers there, from extremely conservative to very radical.

After his retirement, he and his wife returned to the Puget Sound. Before pin-pointing their new location, they decided to visit some Friends Meetings. They felt at home when they found the Tacoma Friends Meeting, and purchased a house nearby. Julius, now a widower, is still active in, among other social concerns, counseling Conscientious Objectors in the Tacoma area.

## INTERVIEW QUESTIONS

Could you tell me a little about your background before you became a member of the Society of Friends? Where were you born and raised? What was your family background?...religious background? Did you know of or associate with Friends who impressed or influenced you? When did you become a Friend, and how has that decision changed or directed your life?

When did you become a Conscientious Objector? How would things have been different for you if you had been a Friend when you took this action? Would it have been less difficult?

How did you first become involved in counseling and working with other Conscientious Objectors?

What do you feel is the prevailing public attitude in the community of Tacoma toward pacifism? (tolerant? intolerant?)

Does the presence of two large military installations in Tacoma's backyard make it any more or less difficult to become a C.O. in this area? How would you characterize the relationship between the Friends and neighboring military personnel (either personally or officially)?

How long have you lived in Tacoma, and how did you come to be a member of this particular group of Friends? Did you have acquaintances there, or did you seek them out on your own?

How does the Tacoma Friends Meeting differ from the other Friends churches in the area? Is there much interaction between your group and the others?

Have there been other areas of social activism besides your work with C.O.'s that you, or the Tacoma Meeting as a whole, have been involved in or concerned about?

Has the Tacoma community (religious and secular) been receptive to the Society of Friends? Have you personally, or the Tacoma Friends Meeting as a group, ever met with discrimination because of your beliefs, actions, or commitments?

Observing that there are only three Friends churches in Tacoma, would you consider this unusual for a community of this size compared to the numbers of Friends in other parts of the country? Why or why not?

What is your vision of the future for the Tacoma Friends Meeting? What do you see as its role in the religious and secular life of Tacoma's extended community? What is its relationship to other religious and civic groups?

PLEASE NOTE: Some of these questions are probably more pertinent than others. You might want to highlight those which you feel are most important and upon which you have most to contribute.

SYNOPSIS OF JULIUS JAHN INTERVIEW

<u>Tape #1, Side 1:</u>	<u>Page No.</u>
001 - Personal history, family & religious background	1
125 - Granted scholarship to Chicago University; job as research assistant under National Youth Administration	3
156 - Transferred to University of Minnesota	4
255 - Registered for the Draft; subject to discrimination from university for C.O. status	6
414 - Military service as a Conscientious Objector	11
453 - Worked with soldiers in psychiatric wards	13
542 - Became acquainted with C.O. from The Religious Society of Friends; attended Friends Meeting at a work camp	16
610 - Wife contracted polio; received early discharge from Army	18
646 - Completed PH.D. at University of Washington; appointed asst. professor in research; disagreement with chairman	20
713 - Became a member of the University Friends Meeting	22
 <u>Tape #1, Side 2:</u>	
001 - Disillusioned with the world of academia	23
035 - Family life was top priority	23
140 - Joined the Flushing Friends Meeting in New York City; worked with the youth group there	25
236 - Son refused to sign Loyalty Oath to graduate from high school in New York City	28
326 - Moved to Philadelphia; joined faculty at University of Pennsylvania	29
337 - Found great diversity among Philadelphia Friends	30
394 - Moved back to Tacoma; became member of Tacoma Friends Meeting	31

470 - Comparisons between Tacoma Friends Meeting & the other Friends Churches in Tacoma	33
494 - Involvement in Draft counseling service	33
505 - Dr. David Fletcher (& other military personnel) filed for C.O. status	34
541 - Black Army officer falsely accused of rape	34
633 - Advantages and disadvantages in military service	37
648 - Military service and conflicts of conscience; dealing with the problem of violence	38
736 - The Women's Internat'l League for Peace & Freedom works for peace on daily basis; coalition with F.O.R. (Fellowship Of Reconciliation)	39

Tape #2, Side 1:

001 - Friends emphasize crisis prevention	40
125 - Most civilian jobs are linked into the military system (We are <u>all</u> "in the military")	40
152 - Inter-personal violence is the real issue for today; solutions to personal problems demand communal support	41
265 - The Religious Society of Friends flourished during periods of persecution	44
290 - Conclusion; The Tacoma Friends Meeting as a model of community	45



**My name is Juanita Hembrow, and I am speaking with Mr. Julius Jahn in his home at Tacoma, Washington. Mr. Jahn, could you tell me a little bit about your background, where you were born?**

Well, starting from that early of age, that's quite a long time ago, 1914, Marshalltown, Iowa...famous only, not for my birth, but for the Maytag Company [laughs]. But I left there when I was about a year and half of age, and my family moved to Minnesota -- to Faribault, Minnesota, a little in the southern part of Minnesota. I lived there till I was nine, and then we moved to St. Paul, Minnesota where I lived until 1942. Up there I was drafted into the military, WWII,...so I'll kind of fill in that period first.

**When were you drafted?**

June of 1942.

My father, until we moved to Minnesota, was a minister in what is now part of the United Church of Christ, but he was in a little country ministry. He had little country churches. In fact, he had three of them. His total income was five hundred dollars a year, plus the parsonage, plus what the members would supply (vegetables and things...).

Well, he left it partly for economic reasons, but also... because he really did not exactly believe any longer in the traditional orthodox Christianity, and had been converted to something called the Social Gospel which believed that Christianity should be practiced, not preached. But this didn't go over too well with the people in charge, so he got delegated to these little out-of-the-way places.

But then eventually -- I was the seventh child actually, so with seven children, \$500 a year (plus this was in WWI, which

had a lot of inflation), he started to go into business -- real estate, mostly farm real estate. He did very well in it until -- I mean he actually accumulated quite a bit of acreage and money. But then after WWI there was a depression in about 1923 where he lost his assets...

But he was active in different kinds of things, even after he left the ministry he was involved in helping [to get] a hospital built, and he was always very active in doing things for people. So he had a social conscience, but he was a very poor provider as far as being able to provide for his own family.

And therefore, I grew up in a family that had seven kids and very little income until the older children began to work. In fact, we all worked at something or other. We survived because everybody in the family worked or did something, and so we never were like on welfare, but everybody had to pitch in. So from as early as I can remember, I would carry paper routes, or I would...work on farms in the summer.

And the main thing I remember of this is that I was probably the only one of the children who never had too much hostility towards [our father] because of his lack of providing for the family. I didn't know that there was a time that he was, you know, able to provide for the family and so forth.

**You hadn't known any different.**

No, and I didn't know...that the father was supposed to provide for everything. I mean, I just assumed everybody pitched in.

Plus, he had a few (should I say) inconsistencies, apart from being almost more concerned with what happened in the world than what happened with his own family. He wasn't an abusive father, but he was very authoritarian, and for the older

children...he was very authoritarian with them. But [since] I was the youngest (the seventh), I kind of escaped that because I profited by the olders' experience. I was smaller and I got sort of out of the way so, only rarely did I ever get exposed to his authoritarian tendencies. But I could see what happened, I mean, I was observant.

But the other thing is probably, within the family, I'm the only one who ever got to go beyond high school. Partly that was economic. In those days when you got out of high school you got a job. And all the others got jobs, and then they got a car, and then they got married. Whereas, when I graduated in 1934, there was a depression going on. If I could have, I would have got a job, but I couldn't get a job. So I got part-time jobs in working farms and in parks and things.

But I had done very well in high school (grade wise), so I went back to the high school and talked to an advisor who had said I should go to college. I said, "I guess I will go to college after all because there's no jobs out there." So she said, "Well, just by coincidence, there's information about a scholarship at the University of Chicago. Would you be interested in going there?" and I said [I would be]. So I applied for it and got a scholarship to the University of Chicago.

After spending about three years -- I graduated when I was seventeen, and when I was about nineteen, I went back to college. I started at the University of Chicago, and after about one year there, although again I did all right grade wise, all I had was a scholarship...to support myself. I worked for my board, and I paid about \$15 a month for a room. I had what is called a National Youth Administration job to be an assistant to somebody in the university who had a project for \$30 -- first it was \$15 and then it was \$30 a month.

**That was assisting a professor, or -- ?**

Well, the first one I assisted actually was a graduate student, and then gradually...I worked my way up to professors and so forth. But as an N.Y.A. student, you'd get like at first \$15 and then \$30.

Well, I just could not do it in Chicago, so after a year I decided, "What the heck, I'll go to the University of Minnesota." Because, although I didn't get a scholarship, the tuition at Minnesota was \$30 a quarter...so it was \$120 [a year]. At Chicago the tuition a year was \$300, but all the expenses... I transferred to the University of Minnesota anyway because, economically, I just couldn't make it at Chicago... I could live at home in St. Paul, and I took the street car and went to Minneapolis [laughs]. And I also was an N.Y.A....plus I worked in the parks during the summer, or on a farm. So I could make it all right in Minnesota.

At Minnesota you'd get credit for high grades, so I actually got through college in about three years (undergraduate), and I started taking graduate courses even before I was a graduate student. And, I got to -- instead of being an N.Y.A. student, I became a research assistant, and then every once in a while, I'd stop and look for a job, like when I got my Master's degree. I checked in the jobs, and there were no jobs. I took Civil Service exams and passed with high ratings, but with -- I majored in Sociology, incidentally --

**I was going to ask you that [laughing].**

-- and minored in Psychology. But as a way to earn a living in those days with a Bachelor's degree -- I also took a lot of statistics courses, and I assisted people in statistics. I learned how to do all the statistical stuff you could do,

so I took statistical exams and I got up...where I could have got a Civil Service job, but a beginning salary with a Bachelor's degree would be about \$1600, \$1700 a year at the Federal level, and then in the rural areas in North Dakota or in the state places it would be even less than that and way out in the sticks.

My faculty advisor advised me, "Well, why don't you go on and get a Master's degree and then you [can] get more money, plus you can earn that much money as a research assistant or a teaching assistant." So I stayed on, and at a certain point then I got a Master's degree (or the equivalent) and then I thought, "Well, I'll look for a job." So there still weren't any jobs. And then they said, "Well, you ought to go into teaching." ...so then I was going on for a PH.D. (laughs).

I was very successful as a graduate student because I got to be half-time, and assisted even the chairman of the department. I was his research assistant and the W.P.A. (Works Progress Administration) wanted some research on the W.P.A. ...I directed the project for half-time salary, plus I could use it for my PH.D., and everything was going along great till 1941... I finished the project [and] I was writing it up for a PH.D. Everything [was] finished, except the dissertation had to be approved by the committee (and I had a French exam too, as I remember, that I hadn't taken).

And along came the draft for -- well, it wasn't WWII yet. The draft happened a couple of years before we got into it... So I got a draft number.

**How old were you by that time?**

Oh, I was around twenty-eight...I was going on twenty-eight years of age.

**They drafted people at 28?**

Oh, well, sure...everybody was in the draft until about forty years of age. I mean, you had to register for the draft. And for registration there were -- later on they would do it year by year, but [in] the original first draft, which I was in, everybody between 18, and say 40, had to register. And then they began to exempt people for different reasons.

Well, when I registered I get this form and I fill it out, and it tells about, you know, what your interests are. I had been part of the peace movement before WWII. There was a big anti-war movement --

**This was when you were a college student?**

Oh, yeah. We had a strike against R.O.T.C. We got rid of the R.O.T.C. in Minnesota. There were demonstrations and protests all the way, every step of the way that Roosevelt was taking us into the war, and I was part of it. I mean, I wasn't a leader, but I was in there with the inner, you know, there was always an inner caucus group. The graduate students in sociology and social work there [and] activist groups that we were involved in [were] organizing things and having skits and agitating and what not. And in the classes we would be speaking up and making sure -- The faculty were reluctant to even mention the problems (laughs).

Thinking of academic freedom, one of the curious things is [that] the illusion of academic freedom in peace time is great. But actually before WWII the faculties, except for a few, didn't speak up once in classes against whatever was going on. They kept their mouths shut. But as students we would, as I say -- In sociology (in social work in particular), it's relevant to bring in current issues. So we would keep insisting on discussing this in class, and some of the people would [be afraid] to do that because it would affect their grades. But

here I was assistant to the chairman, and I knew his personal opinion, and the fact that [he supported the war].

Most of the faculty personally would be critical [of the war], but they wouldn't be publicly expressing their views. So I got a little disillusioned about the belief that, you know, scientists are objective. And even the physical scientists and the mathematicians who had before been all for pure research -- they were all busily finding ways in which they could make a buck out of war related interests. So I was beginning to be disillusioned about the idea that the scientists and the academic people were going to somehow stop [the war].

But...when I filled out this form I just checked things off one at a time, and because I was in research, I believed in being truthful. That is, when you report, there's no sense in trying to deceive anybody, so I filled it out honestly in terms of my background, interests, and so forth. And you keep filling it out, and like an income tax [form] which -- There is a certain form that governments use, which I think is pretty good. They don't start out, "Are you a conscientious objector?" you know.

**No, they put that on last?**

...just one at a time you check, [and] if you do it honestly, out pops at the bottom what your status is. And it turned out, the way I had filled it out, I was qualified for a 1-AO, Conscientious Objector to be subject to the draft in the military, but not to have to bear arms, and also not to be in combat. (You don't have to bear arms to be in combat. There are other ways of being in combat.)

I decided, "Well, if that's the way it is"...but before I think I finally submitted it, I had to have some letters in support of it. And I had to get a letter from the minister

of the church I belonged to, and from a couple of other people. And when I went to the minister, he had never expressed himself against the war either, so I was kind of curious about whether I should do it. But when I talked to him, he really supported me in it, but he said, "This is an individual choice. The church is not taking a position, but now that you've [made] the choice he said, more or less, "I admire you for it."

**And this was at the United Church of Christ?**

It was part of it. A number of churches came together, and this was a church called the Evangelical Synod of North America, which was a German related church,...but it was not a peace church. ...this was the biggest church in Prussia, but it was was not too well known, and it's confused with other evangelical churches.

However, [the minister] supported this as an individual decision, but he wouldn't -- Even in his letter he said, "Although we're not a peace church, and this is not the stand of the church, we support this as a matter of [individual] conscience."

Well, then I went to the chairman who I had been a research assistant for, and asked him for [a letter]... He [said], "I advise you not to do this" (not register as a Conscientious Objector). He said, "I'll send a letter, but I would advise you not to do it."

**Why was that?**

Well, that's what I said. "Why not? Here's the form."

"Well," he said, "There's two reasons. First of all, you do not have to. Even if you...don't register [as a Conscientious Objector], you can avoid having combat. You don't have to -- "



**...take a stand?.**

And he kind of leaned back and said, "Well in WWI, I did not register as a Conscientious Objector, but I got into the Red Cross. And now there are things like the Red Cross, and there's research, and then there's -- The government is wanting people to come to Washington as research statisticians and what not. You can get a non-combat job with deferment, but if you register for this --"

I said, "But what's wrong with registering?"

"Well first of all," he said, "if you register, they will not accept you for those kinds of positions. You're almost sure to be drafted, see, you won't get exemption, you'll get drafted. And then after you're drafted, you'll be in the military. The other is -- We'll just assume the war's going to be over pretty soon. And assuming that [you] come out of it, this will ruin your career... Nobody who has got the reputation of being a Conscientious Objector is going to get very far after this war."

**So then what did you do?**

Well, I said, "Here, I've filled it out. What should I change?"

Well, he was a little embarrassed, you know. Because here after he and I, [having been] trained in honesty and accuracy -- that I should go back and erase or submit something different, or that I should put that the reason I don't want to do this is that I want to get a job after [the war]. This would require me to be deceitful, and he didn't quite --

He said, "Well, think about it."

And I said, "Well, I've filled it out. Will you send a letter, or not? ...fate has overtaken me, and I have a deferment

till the end of the year."

The odd thing was, my dissertation was on his desk waiting to be approved... I did go up before the Draft Board, and they did accept my status as a Conscientious Objector. I was drafted at the end of the year. But my professor, the chairman, proved to me that he was right, that my career would be [damaged]. And he started right then to prove it. Instead of accepting my dissertation, he let it sit on his desk... No committee got together to approve it. It was all finished, sitting on his desk, and he didn't act on it... But, he had joined the war effort already, and he had already judged that I was...not any longer a good research assistant to have around, or a person to get a PH.D. from [his department].

**Were you aware of his feelings about the war at the time?**

Not that way, no. I didn't know that he had been -- I think he was concerned that Minnesota -- He wanted to make sure that every one of their PH.D.'s was somehow an honest, dependable type of person who could get a job, and they wouldn't have to worry about it. To have somebody come up with any kind of Conscientious Objector type [image] -- he couldn't accept that. Not out of personal conviction, but his sense of what's right and proper. And he himself was involved already in some war related research and stuff.

And the other sad thing was that, it wasn't just him that -- One by one, many of the students and the faculty who had been in the anti-war movement joined the war effort. On the one hand, what I would call the conservatives, joined it because they would get jobs in Washington. Some of the most radical joined it because they were, in some way, supporters of the Soviet Union. And I wouldn't even say they were necessarily Communists, but there was a lot of support for the Soviet

Union..., and when the Soviet Union was attacked, a lot of them switched over from being against the war. And the next thing I knew, one of my friends who had been against it comes in [wearing] an officer's uniform. He enlisted as an officer just over a month from [graduation].

And I'm trying to think -- I don't think it ended up that I knew anybody else, personally, who ended up as a Conscientious Objector of any kind, [who had taken] the stand that I did before I got into the military. So this was something that I arrived at simply by filling out a form, obviously [laughs].

**Little did you know where it would lead.**

I knew that my career was going to be [changed]... Before that, I was sort of set for a certain kind of a standard career in sociology because I was making a lot of progress in that. In fact, I had been doing most of [the chairman's] research, for which he was getting all of the credit. But I was more concerned -- In fact, I got married. I met a social worker, and we got married just before I got drafted.

**What year was that?**

1942, to Elsa Dahlgren. And I don't know if I should anticipate -- She was born in Tacoma [laughs], which has some reason why we're back in Tacoma.

Well, the WWII period itself -- I was really surprised because, contrary to [the university chairman's] warning, in three and a half years, once I was actually officially recorded as a Conscientious Objector and I was consistent at it, I had absolutely no trouble...in the military. And in a sense it saved me... The fact that I was a Conscientious Objector protected me all during the war.

Only two people actually had any personal animosity towards me because of this. And they were because -- They were both officers, but they were kind of nutty. Most of them said, "Gee, I wish I'd known about this (laughs). It would [have made] life easier."

And as a result of being a Conscientious Objector, I gradually worked my way into being in the Medical Corps and in counseling in psychiatric wards... I really learned a lot in the jobs I did. I sort of enjoyed [them] basically, and I benefited the people I worked with. The only price I paid was [that] I stayed a PFC for about two and a half years. For one year I got promoted to a corporal. So I ended up as a corporal, or T-5 (which is the equivalent of a corporal). So the only price I paid was staying in the lowest possible rank.

**And how many years were you in?**

Three and a half. And occasionally somebody would say, "Well, why aren't you an officer?" I was practically a PH.D., and I was doing things where the people working with me were officers, and they were at least sergeants.

And [I] said, "Well, I'm registered as a Conscientious Objector."

"Oh. All you have to do then is -- well, you can change." If I dropped that, I could become an officer. I thought I'd rather stay the way I am. Therefore, being out in the open --

And of course, the other problem was being separated. Most of the time I was separated from my wife, but eventually we had about a year together in Florida. It's strange that that experience -- I look back now almost with a certain amount of nostalgia. Where a lot of people look back in horror to WWII experience, I look back [and see] that it saved me from [becoming] the typical academician that many of the people that

I was with [became]. I would have been doomed to become the kind of academic persons they were.

However, the ones who suffered were [those] like my wife. There were a lot of people that suffered. The men I worked with suffered really (because I worked in psychiatric wards a lot). The people who suffered often were...victims because [they were] those who could not resolve the conflict between this being the "Holy War" and the fact that it was a horrible war, and [that] what they were expected to do was horrible.

**So those were the people that you dealt with a lot in the psychiatric wards...? It came from their military experience, the problems did?**

Well, eventually there's going to have to be a true story of WWII, because WWII still is a part of the mythology (maybe like the Civil War) that it's kind of the Holy War, that it's the only good war. In fact, one of the odd things now yet, a lot of people who have become anti-war recently still say that if they had been in WWII, they would have probably been for WWII. Because the myth is that that was the good war, and that myth most people still believe. Whereas, anybody who was in it -- They know different.

But if you don't resolve that [conflict] in some way, then you can have a hundred different kinds of problems. And, if you're the victim -- like the ordinary soldier was victimized by the way they were treated -- The treatment of the enlisted men by officers was the kind of treatment that inevitably will either educate you to become a fighting man (or doing whatever you're told) or, in rebelling, some end up in the hospital and lay in bed and can't get up, or they develop different kinds of physical symptoms in the hospital. Some take off and get arrested, and men are brought back and court marshaled. Some will shoot in the wrong direction. They will shoot towards

the officer rather than towards the enemy. Some just -- Well, they go into the orange groves and hang themselves.

A lot of the so-called mental illnesses -- You can just see how mental illness can grow out of how you're treated. You don't have to go back to the genes or what your mother did or your father did. If a person is treated in a certain way, they will develop so-called psychiatric symptoms. And I used to take the histories of men, and it was just obvious that there was nothing wrong with them except the way they were treated.

However, when I worked in a psychiatric unit, the psychiatrist insisted that there must have been something in your background. "Was it what you mother did?" or "Was it what your father did?" or "Was it something in your past that somehow made you so that you're not qualified to be a soldier?"

They would never want to document that the conditions [were] due to their treatment in the military -- for two reasons. One is that the person would then be eligible for compensation, service connected. The other is their own, call it, complicity. That if the training process involves treatment which ends up with psychiatric disorders, [then] it's not God or Nature that does it. It's the military itself [that] inevitably produces this because of the way they operate.

And a person who is an officer cannot be disloyal to his organization and say, "We're producing this" -- anymore than universities, when somebody jumps out of a window, can say, "We must have done something" (laughs). Because any organization cannot take the blame for what happens to some people.

**Do you think that had anything to do with changing the way things are done in the military now? I mean, haven't there been a lot of changes? Are they a little softer now, or more humane?**

Well first of all, WWII, [although] it was very popular on one hand, [it] still required a draft. If it was so popular,

you wouldn't have had a draft. There's illusions [about] the draft. Also, they over-drafted, see. I think they maybe drafted up to three or four million, and they only needed maybe a million and a half or something. So the problem was that everybody was drafted, but then [would] get exemptions, see. And low and behold, the exemptions went to people who had some connections... Whereas, the ones who got [drafted] were the ones who didn't know how to avoid the consequences of just being drafted.

**Sounds like the same thing that happened with Viet Nam, pretty much.**

Well, the military learned something, but then they do something else. The other thing is that they really emphasize in WWII the noble cause (Hitler, and the Nazis, and saving the Jews, and all of that). So this was like a holy war, which I never heard that much [of] when I was in the military. But when I went home the civilians believed it. But once you're in [the military], that is not the approach at all. They don't justify a holy war or unholy war. Here's your job, you follow orders, do what you're told, don't raise questions, that's it. ...a lot of people really believed the propaganda, or even the Pearl Harbor situation, that we were attacked unknowingly, an unprovoked attack. So the mythology of WWII is something [that] eventually, I hope, will be discovered. But I did not believe it.

On the other hand, I survived, but not because I was sort of being anti-war or pro-war. But once I was classified as a Conscientious Objector, I did those things which I was willing and able to do. [I] didn't run into any particular difficulties ...and I can say that I got a certain benefit out of it. But if I hadn't been a Conscientious Objector, I'd have probably been dead. In fact, I know I would have been dead because of

some of the things I was lined up to do. I would've been dropped someplace on a radar thing behind lines...[where] everybody's wiped out. Particularly up in Alaska. There was a radar unit that was sent up there, and if I hadn't been a Conscientious Objector, I would've been sent... So I survived, physically, and mentally, and what not -- and wiser [laughs].

Well, the other thing is, I did meet for the first time in my life...other 1-AO's. There were a group of us who discovered each other because we were assigned to the Medical Corps. Somehow we learned about each other as 1-AO's, and we became close friends and enjoyed each other's company. And instead of going for drunks and other things in town, we did things that were mutually enjoyable.

Plus I met for the first time a Friend, a member of the Society of Friends, who invited me to go to my first Friends Meeting in Florida. I was near Tampa at that time, and this [Meeting] was over in St. Petersburg...so I began to go to a Friends Meeting every once in a while.

**Was that the first time that you had any --**

I'd never met a Friend, until in the Army. Plus, there was a Conscientious Objector Camp for those who were not inducted into the Army... It was near Tampa, out in the woods, and their job was to build privies in rural areas. And we went to visit them once, this Friend and I. We went to visit them on a Sunday, and I went to my first Friends Meeting...with them on the shore of a lake. And it was a lot of fun and beautiful, but -- You've heard of "messages"? (\*see footnote)

**Yes, uh huh.**

---

\* a spiritual insight; a leading from the Divine Spirit.



The messages that came were gripes and complaints about what they had to put up with. Here they were sitting in a beautiful spot, and here we were kind of envying them, [thinking], "Wouldn't it have been great if we had registered for this camp life instead of military life?" And they had gripes and complaints which made us say, "Well, our life in the military [isn't] quite as bad as theirs." And their two greatest complaints, one was that -- Well, in the military, you direct your gripes and complaints against the officers. You know, the people "up there." Whereas, at this camp, their director would also [have been] a Conscientious Objector. I think it was run by the American Friends Service Committee [under] a person who was also a Conscientious Objector. And here they're complaining about some person who is also a Conscientious Objector... Just imagine having to criticize fellow Conscientious Objectors, [especially if] the Conscientious Objector next to you is kind of a sloppy guy. You know --irritating and what not.

The other [thing] is that in Florida they were subject to racial problems. They would go into town [and] they would mingle with the blacks, intentionally. And they would be threatened, their lives would be threatened. Their director charges, "You can't do that, because our project here is to do the privies in Public Health. If you do that, they won't let us come in." But [the men] said, "It's more important that we help the [dissenters] than to get the privies built" (laughs). Well, living in the woods there in Florida...it's kind of scenic, but...our living conditions on the post were much better than theirs in the woods there.

So, in a sense, visiting with them -- It is strange that up to the present time, most of the discussion of the Conscientious Objector's life in WWII is based on those who ...were not 1-AO's, but [on those who] either worked in camps

or...went to jail. And what happened to the 1-AO's has not yet been [told]. There were more 1-AO's than anything else, but they kind of got lost in history. A lot of people didn't even know there was such a thing as 1-AO's. And my personal experience was that -- I have no regrets about it. Personally, it was the best choice for me, and it stayed the best choice.

**Well, after that first impression of the Friends, how did you find your way back to them?**

Well now, for my last assignment as the war went over, I was assigned to Separation Counseling. That is, men were being separated from the service, and I was getting my brief training as a separation specialist. I was in a camp out in Indiana...separating soldiers. This was in '46, and my wife was [in Tacoma].

There was something called a "point system" that depended on how many years and what you did. You could be scheduled for separation as a certain priority, and I knew what my points were and so forth, and that I'd be scheduled maybe for six or eight months more of service. And my wife, in order to wait for my being separated (we had two children by that time), she moved back to Tacoma. She had been working as a social worker back in St. Paul as a child welfare worker, and then --

**That's where you met?**

Well, we met in the graduate school, and then she graduated and got to be a social worker when we were married.

She had decided to await my discharge by going back to stay with her mother in Tacoma...say, in the early spring or summer of 1946. And then, it must have been around November, I get word from the Red Cross that she had polio. She'd got polio in Tacoma, and was in the hospital in serious condition,

and that I could apply for a leave to go and see her. Well, by that time I knew about things and so forth, so I said, "I've got to leave. It would be kind of silly to go way out there and then come back, and I only have -- " (I had a certain number of months to serve). "I'll apply for early discharge."

So I went to talk to the people above me to get their approval, and I have the letter from the Red Cross (and the fact that I was a Conscientious Objector is still known, you know, they all know that.) But my God, instead of getting any resistance they said, "Why don't you go right away?"

I said, "When?"

"Well, you'll have to wait till maybe Monday." So they insisted on what I call "expediting." Well, everybody I dealt with were willing to expedite it so that everything went through in about two days, including getting the separation, getting the money to travel, and finally, the last thing was turning [in] all of my military equipment (clothing and what not). And when I went to the supply place to turn it in -- and most of these people I knew casually. I said, "I'm turning it in," but they said, "No, you can turn it in, but you've got to take a new issue." ...but some of it wasn't that old, and they insisted I replace it with new... So they out-fitted me with a complete new overcoat, raincoat, jeans, everything.

So I've got two bags packed full of military uniforms and things which [I wondered], "How in the world am I going to use all that stuff?" Well, eventually I did. I dyed it, [and] for twenty or thirty years, I had military [clothing]. Particularly the wool -- wonderful wool that is. And I had a car which I got the gas [for], and coupons and permits to stop and get gas.

So I got an early discharge in November and drove out. I stopped in St. Paul and I drove all the way out to Tacoma. [I] ended up crossing the bridge with twenty-five cents in my

pocket [laughs].

And [my wife] was in the hospital with polio, and in isolation for about three weeks yet. She came out of it with paralysis of one leg, which took about six years to really correct, mostly, although she did use crutches when she needed them.

But then I, with the two kids, stayed with her mother in Tacoma. I looked around and lined up possible jobs... I applied for a job at the University of Washington and got an instructor, assistant professor appointment. Half-time at first, and then full-time. And then I finished my PH.D. there at the University of Washington.

**Did you use the same dissertation, or were you able to submit it?**

Well, I could have. But, for various reasons, I wanted to sort of get Minnesota out of my system. And the University of Washington had a very liberal chairman at the time who -- I had let him know that I was a Conscientious Objector. Instead of [it] being a handicap, he was happy because he himself was against the war, not as a Conscientious Objector, but he was against the war. I'm trying to think of his position... In some way he was affiliated with what was called "America First" -- not to be entangled with foreign wars. So he wasn't a Conscientious Objector but he was against the war... He was just even happy to know that I was against the war too.

But he was mostly interested in the fact that I had been a researcher, and he wanted to build up the research department. So I got to be the person in charge of the statistics and research courses there. He wanted it first on a part-time basis, and then I used (for a PH.D.) a research study I did for...the City of Seattle...[concerning] the problem of the returning [minority groups].

Well, after the war there was the so-called problem...of the blacks coming in, and the Japanese and others coming back -- and there was a certain amount of concern. They wanted to prevent turmoil. So my study was a study of minority groups in Seattle. I did it for them, got paid for it, and I could use it for a PH.D.

We moved to Seattle to live for a few years till I finished my PH.D., and then I was coming up for tenure. And, without getting into all the complications, I realized that I would never get tenure at the University of Washington, for a number of reasons.

[It was] partly that, although the chairman and I were very compatible in general, he had committed himself to a person that he brought there to be in charge of a research project which he asked me to evaluate. And I was critical of it because it was a bunch of nonsense. He asked my personal opinion about it, and I gave it to him. But he had already committed himself to this...

-- being honest again.

[laughs]

It wasn't on pacifism in this case. I don't know if you know anything about sociology, [but] the issue is that sociology was emerging as a science, and he was one of the guys that said sociology should become a science. He even wrote a book called Can Science Save Us?, in which he really pushed, "Science is wonderful and it will save us," and so forth. And the person that he chose to be the medium of this was -- He wasn't exactly completely incompetent, but he could not separate between the dream and reality. So he kind of dreamed up the science, and he even wrote a book which was a great big dream, but there's no substance to it...

**And that was the name of the book? Can Science Save Us?**

Well, his book was Can Science Save Us?, and the other book was called Dimensions of Sociology. But it's like, here's the person who wants to have a science, and the other person who -- you ever hear of "The Emperor's New Clothes"? -- who puts on a big act and sells this guy on it, and they became buddies. He asked my opinion and I said, "There's nothing to it." I didn't say it quite this bluntly. I just pointed out that you can't have a science by just saying you want it to be a science, and having formulas. You have to actually do the research which accumulates the evidence which you can justify as a science.

Well again, this was an odd thing because some of my friends there, who also were critical, shut up and they stayed on. And I suppose, in some ways, this was the second time where being honest -- In science, at least...you've got to be honest...

I could see that I would never get tenure so I applied for other jobs, and I ended up at another job, temporarily, at Washington State [University]. But I ended up leaving the academic world for a while, and going to New York City to work in a social agency as a researcher in community service.

**And when was that?**

That was about 1954...

Well, now another thing I should [mention]. While at the University of Washington, I did join the Society of Friends, I'd have to say that, which was 1948. I was asked to join the University [Friends] Meeting.

**Oh, there was a [Friends] Meeting at the university?**

Right. Just right off campus. And it was in an old house, more ramshackle even than the one we have here.

(turned cassette here)

I was going to be a sociologist. I was going to be a researcher. I was going to contribute to the development of the science of Sociology. I was going to be connected with the universities and so forth. It was all laid out. And in many ways, what's happened to me was [that] hardly anything turned out the way I anticipated, see.

And from one point of view, a person could say, "Isn't that too bad?" Our youthful (whatever you'd call it), our ideals, our dreams, our visions, the frustration of not being able to fulfill all of those -- I can look back and say, "Thank God I did not carry out, or wasn't able to do what my so-called vision at that age was." Because what happened to me wasn't exactly my choosing, but I was confronted with things where I had to make a choice...and if I had stayed consistent with what I was thinking of at nineteen to twenty-one, I would have been in a completely different place. I would be very frustrated because I would have accomplished all of my so-called dreams, and -- "so what?" Because I've seen what's happened to most of the people who stayed in the academic rut. It's just "much to-do about nothing" basically, because this academic Sociology just went down a road where there's nothing ever accomplished by it except pretense of [being a] science.

So, in many ways, my life probably was affected most by what I would call "family." Getting married and having five children, and having to adjust to many so-called difficulties and so forth, probably my major occupation was family responsibilities. That probably was central, more than the job or anything else, more than friends and so forth. And it

just could be, partly, I owe some of this to my father, not because he was a model of what he should have done. My older brothers and sisters criticized him, but I said, "My God, in spite of his profession and his good intentions, he was a failure as a father. Why?"

The reason was, he didn't work at it. He didn't put the time and effort into it. My mother was the one who was responsible for the actual dealing with family issues and, therefore, I realized that no matter what your intentions are, if you don't work at it, if you don't take responsibility (even like doing the dishes or what not), then you only give the impression of being noble and so forth... So, if anything, I would say that I have some sense of accomplishment [because] I was able to maintain and develop a family life under various stresses and strains. That was always my first [concern].

With respect to the Society of Friends, in the early days, like at the [University] Friends Meeting, we would come to the Meeting with a lot of expectations, but there would be no children there. We had three children, and...we discovered that there was a group that...had a separate meeting called The Little Family Meeting. They would go with their families to a separate place, but my wife and I insisted on staying there [at the University Friends Meeting] with our children. Gradually, because we stayed...the First Day School was built up, and the families with children would stay. We got involved with the Family Life Cooperative System which was actually started by a Friend in Seattle and, therefore, family life became sort of the center of our connection with the Friends... We would have to put the time and effort into making it happen. And my wife was mostly the one who did it, but I usually took the boys [laughs]. There usually was, during the summer, a Friends Family Camp that combined camp with a peace issue which we



would go to... And then there were like the Quarterly Meetings and the Yearly Meetings which...would give you more families and children to be able to appreciate in larger numbers.

But the Friends I think, for us, was largely a place of people who were congenial and not just fighting the battles of peace, but actually they demonstrated it in their family life [with] some commitment to raising their children and taking care of them, and not just being for peace in the abstract. And again, there you would have the example of some people so active in the so-called peace movement that they would neglect their families.

The peace aspect of the Society of Friends, I never needed because I already had my commitment. However, I think that to be a part of a group, you don't have to constantly argue a position. Just practice it, [that] is the important thing. If you're in a debating society, you win your point, and then that's it. But in the Society of Friends, you don't argue about it, you just do something about it. I mean, if you're for peace, do something. And it doesn't have to be fighting against war. You can always find something [where] you can use your talents in a way that is helpful to others.

Well, what else happened? We made some good friends in Seattle, but then when we took off for New York...we found a meeting called the Flushing Friends Meeting which is the second oldest in the United States... It was founded in 1686. And it's famous for what they called the Flushing Remonstrance, which is the first statement by Friends that religious freedom should not be just for Friends, but for all groups. [It] was particularly with reference to a group of Jewish refugees from -- I think they came from Brazil. They tried to land in New York when the Dutch were still there, and they at first were refused entry, but the Friends came out with a letter to support their being admitted. They had a statement that religious

freedom should extend to everybody and not just [to] the Friends themselves. Up to that time the Friends had been mostly defending the right of Friends to be Friends.

[The Flushing Friends Meeting House] was like a great big barn which was built from ship's timbers, and when we first got there, there was like a pride of keeping it like a museum. ...so as a museum, on a nice day it would be okay, but it was heated by little wood stoves about this big, one at each end, and when it got cold you just couldn't be in it.

And again, at first there were no children there, so gradually we built up a First Day School, but [at our] First Day School in the winter time, you'd come, like on Christmas Day, and -- freezing, ice! (laughs), and no heat!

**First Day School -- is that like Sunday School?**

Yes, except the term -- Friends use terms which mean different things, and when you say like "Sunday School," I would say "anti-" Sunday School. I was brought up in Sunday School, so I would never tolerate my children or anybody else being subjected to Sunday School. However, if you have children in the meeting, something needs to be done to provide for [them]... The parents bring children, and they get involved in developing something. And they don't just turn it over to the Sunday School teacher or Meeting... It's up to the families themselves to do it, which we always did.

And for various reasons...only rarely would there ever be any discussion of religious issues or Bible or anything else. Only when somebody would say, "Well, why don't we teach our kids something about the Bible?"

I'd say, "Well I'm not going to do it. Elsa's not going to do it. Do you know somebody who is willing to do it? Are you willing to do it? If you do it, then it may happen."

Well, we often had to draft people, and they would last for a few months, and then the kids would stop coming, and they'd say, "Where are the kids?" So then I'd say, "Well, if you want kids, that's something else."

So my wife and I put on the kinds of programs [where] parents and the children would come, and they themselves would decide what to do. I often would end up with the boys between the ages of say eight to twelve or thirteen, who didn't want to do anything but to take off. So I would usually end up taking them someplace...where they could engage in different interesting things. And then [members] would say, "Why, they're not getting any religious education," and I'd say, "What they're getting is, first of all, they actually want to come, and then they bring their friends or their relatives (cousins and what not)...and we'd have discussions.

For example, once one of the [boys who] was not a Friend ...brought a cousin in a Marine uniform...and people asked about the Marines and why he joined and so forth. Well next there was a discussion, "When I grow up, am I going to be a Marine. or am I going to be in the Air Force, or am I going to be this, or am I going to be that?" ...it's kind of shocking to think that in a Friends Meeting, these young boys are thinking that way! Well, instead of being shocked...somebody said, "Well, I'm going to be a Conscientious Objector like my father."

"What's that?"

So then, you know, they'd bring up their points of view. ...out of that group, probably about half of them eventually did end up becoming Conscientious Objectors.

More or less quietly, but my oldest son did it in a way that was unexpected too. Because, apart from whatever influence I had on him, there was once a meeting for adults which he actually voluntarily came in to listen to, [where] a speaker from California...was talking [about] the Loyalty Oath.

In California there was actually a state law that every public employee had to sign a loyalty oath, and the Friends Service Committee was organizing a protest against the California law. So [the speaker] had come to the meeting there to discuss and to get people to protest. And my son is sitting in the back listening to this, and in the discussion he said, "What about the loyalty oath here in New York?"

"Loyalty oath? What loyalty oath?"

He said, "Well, I'm graduating from high school, and I've been given a form which, in order to graduate, I have to sign..." Nobody had ever heard of it... On his own then,...not only had he decided that loyalty oaths were bad in general, but that he would not sign this...for graduation from high school. Not only did he say that he wouldn't sign it, but he actually wrote into the space where he was supposed to sign, "I refuse to sign." He wrote it in so nobody could put in his signature... That sort of hit the fan, and it led to a great big to-do in New York City involving the American Civil Liberties Union and what not.

**What year was that?**

That was about 1958.

But now see, the loyalty oath doesn't seem to have any connection with Conscientious Objectors against war, and a lot of people said, "Well I'm not going to worry about that because I'm not going to be drafted," and so forth. But what this illustrates is that everybody gets exposed to something, and here in high school, ever since 1919,...I think in the whole state of New York...but at least in New York City, you would have to sign a loyalty oath...in order to graduate from high school...

Well, in the kind of uproar that emerged, some of the reporters checked into it because there was one reporter who

[said], "It can't be true, because I graduated, and I never signed it." Well, he checks back, and if it was left blank, then somebody would write in the signature...the student's name. Or if he signed it, he didn't know what he was signing...

So as a result of my son just saying "No" to this, it came out [into] the open. He got the support of the Civil Liberties Union, and the case in about a year or so...didn't affect him, but [the loyalty oath] was eliminated... Instead of going to a city university, he went to Antioch University which welcomed him, more or less, because of the stand...(plus he had very good grades). So...in some ways, taking this stand opened the door to a college which otherwise might not have been interested in somebody else from New York...

Well, the other thing I think we discovered in New York... within the Meeting, we sort of got involved in what you might call Ministry in Oversight, which is being concerned with the people in the Meeting. And I was surprised that it's not only in the military that you run into people who really need personal help... At every Friends Meeting...there were people who really were in serious difficulties with their families and their friends. We had to really try to do something, not only about the world's problems and the family problems, but to help the people in the Meeting to survive in New York, and to be concerned with each other personally...

Well, then New York was getting a little too heavy for various [reasons], plus my wife developed a couple of medical problems for which living in New York was too much of a strain. So I went to the University of Pennsylvania in 1960, and stayed there for [twenty years on the faculty]...

But while there, I discovered that being [a Quaker] in Philadelphia is like being a Catholic in Rome. Instead of being a...handicap, it's a big advantage to be a Friend. That's the center of Quakerdom in the United States. The only question

is, "Which Meeting do you go to?" There's so many Meetings, and to find the right one takes a little time...

It's amazing how many different kinds of Friends there are. They range from very conservative reactionary to very radical, from what I would call Orthodox Christians to Humanists, Buddhists, Jewish, all kinds of theological positions, poor and wealthy -- very wealthy Friends there.

One part of this is, to some extent, I had to get used to conforming. That is, even to [adapt] to Friend's ways, you have to learn to conform. I mean, if you're rebelling against everything [laughs], you're doomed. But once you're conformed to the more traditional ways of Friends doing things -- For example, I have trouble [because] I might laugh too loud. I mean, I see the humor of things too much.

In Philadelphia, you have to learn to smile, but not to smile too much... Just imagine laughing out loud in a meeting or something... There's a great [deal of] reservation based on British habits and customs. The British tend to be very reserved, and I think the Friends in Philadelphia take that on. But also, there's not as much activism as you'd think with all that many Friends [there] because, in many ways, the conservative Friends still dominate. So the activist groups tend to be in the Service Committee and in something called a Special Meeting for Social Concerns.

But within the Friends,...whatever you want to do, you'll find there are those who are compatible. But...why separate yourself from conservatives, or from orthodox people or from Buddhists...? It's important to learn how to be friendly and to somehow live with this great variety. And that's what I learned in Philadelphia, because here [in Washington] we tend to only form little groups where all of us are sort of like-minded or, you know, not too incompatible. Within Friends, there's this wide spectrum of people, and I think if you ask what

holds them together, in Philadelphia it partly is the tradition. They've come [from] ten, twelve generations of Friends.

But then I do think there is...a way of reacting to people that is more respectful, and not coming on too hard or ignoring them, being concerned about people... There is always some cause that they're concerned with. Apart from their families, most Friends have some cause that they're concerned with personally.

**You were in Philadelphia for eight years?**

Twenty. Twenty years.

**Oh, twenty years.**

1960 to 1980.

Well, now let's come to how we got to Tacoma. I retired in 1980. And then finally we had a choice [of where to live based upon] "place" and not because of the job or other considerations... Some of our children had already come back out to Seattle...

**How many are sons, and how many are daughters?**

I have two daughters and three sons. At the time that I retired, one daughter was in Alaska, but she had been by way of Seattle. She got her nursing degree at the University of Washington. One son and one daughter were living in Seattle, and one was in Virginia.

But we had then visited [here]. I'd gone here for my degree. [Coming] back to the Puget Sound was almost inevitable. The only question was "where?" And at first my wife Elsa said, "Any place but Tacoma." And I said, "That's strange," because

Tacoma is her home town. Well, she said she [had] intentionally left Tacoma and went to the University of Minnesota to get away ... "why go back there?" Her mother had died before this... and she had no particular interest in going back to live in Tacoma at all. But we decided we at least would be on the Puget Sound someplace...

So we came out...and we looked and looked... Finally we decided, "Well, let's attend some [Quaker] Meetings".... So we came to a Meeting in Tacoma (I think it was between 1980 and '81). It was in the [Tacoma Friends] Meeting House, and when we came, there was just about three, or four, or five people there. I think Leonard Holden was there in particular, I remember...

And I think the second time we went to the Meeting, we... just drove around and happened to come down this street, and... some people were pounding in a "For Sale" sign... The price was right...and so we decided to buy the house. And once we decided to buy, we realized that all the reasons [my wife] had previously for being negative about Tacoma were no longer present. But the advantages, finally, were that we had a Meeting there which is actually in walking distance if we wanted to walk.

**Were you only interested in [an] "Unprogrammed" Meeting?**

Yes.

And then, once you're in Tacoma, you can go almost any place very quickly. Traffic is not too bad. You can have public transportation. You can walk to almost anything. So you have all the advantages of a suburban area without having to be so far removed. So, from the point of having a place to live, Tacoma has been very satisfactory.

The Meeting when we first came was down to a very few



people. But over the years it's built up in numbers, and gradually the meeting house, from really being a wreck, is now livable [laughs].

The only occasion that we've had anything to do with the other Friends Churches (they're the "Programmed" Meetings)... From time to time we went over [to Olympic View Friends Church] for programs [\*see footnote]. I think once some women [from there] came to visit us. But in general...there have been minimal contacts...although every once [in awhile] there is a program where people come together, particularly through...the Friends World Committee [for Consultation]...

The difference is that the membership of those [Programmed] Meetings tend to be drawn to the ministers...and they have relatively few of the interests...that we're interested in. In many ways, not having a minister probably is one of of the symbols of Unprogrammed Friends. That's very important. Just having a minister is very difficult to accept, though it doesn't bother me that much. But for a lot of Friends, they just can't tolerate having ministers.

Well then, in 1985 things were going along fairly smoothly and what not, except getting the meeting house built up, and I think it must have been [when] the Granada war came along -- I'm trying to remember which came first because there were three things happening.

In Seattle there was a draft counseling program that was operating. There's something called the Committee for Conscientious Objectors which is located (at least the Western offices) in San Francisco. They would give us pamphlets and leaflets on the C.O. situation. Milton Andrews from the Hillside Church has sort of been the center of keeping contacts with [that] organization.

---

\* Incorrectly referred to as Sound View.

But one time, in walked [Dr. David Fletcher] and began attending our Meeting. When I got acquainted with him after a little while, he turned out to be a captain in the Army at Fort Lewis (he was in charge of the Public Health unit). And he just attended and sort of took part in things, and actually became quite active. I think he even became our treasurer.

But then he applied for Conscientious Objector status...and he asked [us] for a letter in support of his position, which we gave him... He kept pursuing this and...[the Army] didn't act upon it... We attended the hearing down at the Fort, supporting him, and nothing would happen. So it turned out that, in some ways, he was too valuable [for the Army] to let him go, and his commanding officer just wouldn't process him... It would take appeals to get it up [to higher levels of authority]. Finally when it did get to Washington D.C., I think it was turned down. It was either turned down or they didn't act upon it. So he actually then went to court (in Federal Court). And again, we supported him in his court action, and the court ruling essentially [was] that the court could not interfere with the process. He still had to pursue it through so-called channels to the end.

Well, while he's waiting and doing his own thing, then other people would hear about that from him, [and] he brings [them] to the Meeting. So three, or four, or five different people, before he even got out -- one of the enlisted men got out before him because [the Army] was not interested in keeping him... And some of the cases were not even completely C.O. cases.

One was an officer who was, I think, falsely accused of rape in Korea. He was black and...they wanted to get rid of him, but by court marshal. He wanted to get out himself, but he was fighting the rape [charge]... Without getting a certain amount of support to fight it, he would've been like in deep

trouble with the law (having committed rape).

But his story which he gave to us -- and we more or less -- all we had to do is get it [written] down and make sure he submitted it because, win or lose, it's important to have it on the record because then he can always appeal -- that he had been the supply officer (and what was he? He was a major). And a supply officer in South Korea has a lot of assets that he's in control of. And he discovered that there were a group of people involved in drug dealing and stuff (and also stealing and what not). And once he had discovered it, they wanted to get him into it too, and he refused to become a part of it. But because he refused, then they set him up with a woman who then hollered rape.

Now the question is, "Who do you believe?" But I mean, once he has his story out, eventually it is up to somebody else [to decide]. But the main thing we could help him with is helping him make sure that he got the story out...which is also true incidentally -- Whatever it is, if you get involved with the military, you can't come between the person and the military. You have to support the person who has to learn how to confront the situation with your help, but if they can't confront it with help, there's nothing you can do about it. So basically, every time we got involved with anybody, we were there to give support and encouragement and other things, but we never became the lawyer or the advocate.

But our main activity with the Conscientious Objectors, apart from counseling them, is that we'd welcome them into the Meeting, and they would be at least attenders, and eventually they would join (some of them). But fighting their case was not the main [concern]. The most important thing is that you're part of a group of people who you want to be with...

I think we did have one person who did use us in the sense of getting [our] support, and then as soon as he won the case,

he sort of took off... He did not exactly take advantage of us, but it made his case easier...because once he became a member and had the support of the Friends, he got out [of the military].

The crisis in Granada provoked most of these cases, including this captain... He refused to go to Granada and carry a weapon and be part of the Granada invasion.

And then I think, in some ways, it's not sad, but it's a commentary on the peace movement, that once the crisis dies down, there's a long period of quietude. Then when another crisis comes along, suddenly peace becomes an issue. But the Conscientious Objector issue has never been the main issue in recent years because there is no draft.

**You still have to register.**

Well, there's a registering issue, but see, even here, if they put everybody in jail who would not register, then there would be a big issue. But they have not really been going out and doing anything to non-registrants. A few they pick out, who actually do public protests. And they will not give loans to some people, which is just as well [laughs]. You take a loan out, and you're indentured for life, so that's not a big penalty.

**I know it affects student loans.**

I know, student loans. But I mean, that's just as well. People are lucky that they don't go and take out loans beyond their capability to pay [back].

But I think the real -- First of all, "to register or not" is often an issue, and again in our counseling the big issue is not to do what other people think you should do, or even what your parents think you should do, but if you know

enough about what registering and not registering means --

The other [important thing] is, I think, to help people [realize] that being "against" something [should not be] your life. I mean, some people are too concerned about orienting their life [around] protest. And they have to be helped to see, "Get your life around something positive." If you're involved in something positive, that you're for, then these things come along and you deal with them. But unfortunately, some people in the peace movement become so preoccupied with being against this and against that, that it becomes somewhat self-destructive (and also for their families)...

**This crisis with Granada -- did some of these things repeat themselves when we had the Gulf Crisis?**

No, we didn't get any upsurge of -- Now the reason for this I think is, it began to be clear when we went to Fort Lewis and would have these hearings. One hearing officer said, "What's the problem? We don't have a draft. We have voluntary enlistment. Everyone in there is voluntary. They knew what they were getting into. How come, suddenly, they decide they're Conscientious Objectors?"

And it is true that, when you look at the inducements to get into the military, you say, "What's the problem?" For a lot of young men and many young women, it's a wonderful opportunity. However, once you're in [laughs] --

**As long as there isn't a war!**

No, even without the war, see... Apart from war, there are situations where the consequences could be life or death. [But] very few people confront that in the military, very few [military] people are in a situation where it's life and death, and that's even rare. Persons who are in active combat, it's

in and out. And those are usually picked people who are trained so that they even enjoy it. I mean, they begin to be combat happy... There are some people who like to smash and be smashed and what not. If they don't have the military, they jump out of places.

But the biggest thing in the military is, there are a lot of inducements, but once you get in, you have lost your ability to make private, personal decisions... It's no longer what you want or what you think is right, but you have to give over to somebody else the decisions about what to do and what not to do...

The way you succeed in the military is to...do what you are told, the way you're told... Be obedient, and do even things you don't think you should do... You have to follow orders, and then under stress and strain. And most people in our country are not too equipped [for] being subjected to this discipline. And their reaction to that is often what creates -- on the one hand, having all these rewards and wonderful things, but the price you pay is giving up your autonomy.

For some people -- Let's say a person is sitting back in some place, and he never sees combat, but he is putting the bombs into a plane, and not only bombs, but maybe atomic things or poisonous gas or phosphorus shells, and then he sees things which shows the consequences of that. Some people have a conscience [laughs]. [They realize] that they don't have to be directly involved in it, but if you're a part of it --

So, some people deal with that by not thinking about it. They just do their job, don't worry about who else is doing what. You have to close your conscience, don't think about it. That's somebody else's concern. Well, many psychiatric disorders grow out of this dilemma, this conflict... [A brief discussion follows here regarding differences between military violence and domestic violence or societal violence.]

But I do think that those of us not in the military -- (I think this is probably one of the biggest problems), is that we should be more concerned -- The military have their problem, and we have to say, "We will not be a part of that." But how do we deal with the violence which occurs in our own lives and with people around us where we're involved in it. Because in our daily lives, that for us -- It's our problem.

Once we say we're opposed to the military and war, how do we deal with the kind of violence that confronts us? We can't just say, "We're not going to be a part of it." We are exposed to it, and are in it. How do we deal [with it]?

Although I think that to say that the military doesn't contribute to [violence] -- I think that the military is a symptom. Let's say that in international relationships, dealing with those problems through war and violence is the same approach as dealing in other situations with counter-violence to violence. In other words, they are analogous and, therefore, to deal with violence is not just to be against it (like against wife beating or strikes and everything)...but then beyond that, what can you contribute to preventing it. That's the constant struggle...

**What are some of the activities that people from the Tacoma [Friends] Meeting have done along those terms?**

Well right now, we still have on reserve this counseling group. We're connected with Milton Andrews, and there are a couple of us who, if necessary, we are on call to deal with individual situations. But lately it's been just a standby operation.

But then, the Meeting House is a place where the Women's International League for Peace and Freedom meets monthly, and that goes back to WWI (Jane Adams) where they have consistently been saying that, to have peace, you have to work for peace and freedom all the time. It's a small group, but they have

been very active and they keep meeting and having programs... They were actively involved in [protesting] the Gulf War situation...

At Milton Andrew's church (he's the minister at the Hillside Church), the Fellowship of Reconciliation meets there once a month, and they have programs dealing with whatever issues are coming on. And when the Gulf War was actually active, our Meeting, and most of the churches, and the Women's League, and F.O.R., all came together in a coalition that sort of organized and spearheaded all the things that happened... The Women's International League and F.O.R. is going have a joint meeting next month. It's hard to say exactly what the main issue is now. I think the main issue is how to deal with conflict resolution wherever it occurs in our lives.

(end of cassette #1, continuing on cassette #2)

And for our Meeting -- I think the issue in our Meeting is that the Friends do not want to just be there when the crisis happens... We're just a part of the crisis reaction, but we have not been exactly the leaders in it. I think the...kind of leadership Friends have to provide is...[asking], "What can you find in between crises which are reasons to work together?" ...the fact that we're entering into economic stress and strain, I think we have to begin to say, "What can we do?" rather than just wait for the government to deal with [it]...

Another [thing] is, everyone of us, every person who is working for a living in any way -- you don't have to be in the military. But what you're doing, either at the present, or potentially, is in some way hooked into military applications. In some way you're tied in with the military. You just can't say, "I'm going to get completely out of having anything to do with the military." And I think we have to learn that people



who are in the military, whether they're in it or out, at Boeing's or whatever -- They are not somebody to be shunned because they're in it. They're people who, whoever they are, can be helped to move in some direction to survive, and [yet] not to be as much a part of it as they would otherwise be ordered to do...

But I think the Society of Friends has to somehow welcome in and be receptive of people who are trying to move from being completely into something, to be questioning it -- to be concerned with organizing their lives in such a way that they can see that they're moving in the right direction. And the concern about economics is one thing, war's another. But I think what I would call inter-personal violence probably is the real issue these days.

### **Inter-personal violence?**

Yes. That is, one person reacting to other people...whether they're relatives, husbands, wives, people on the job. Not the person far away. But there's a person that we are confronting within our lives. The real issue is, "How do we confront and deal with the conflicts we have with real, live people?" And if there's anybody in this world who doesn't have some person-a living, breathing person in their lives with whom they are in a conflict situation -- Even Jesus Christ himself was in that situation and didn't resolve it.

And I think it also makes one a little more appreciative -- If it is so hard for us to deal with these (what I'd call) relatively minor things, just imagine the problem for those who are caught up in the military, or in the political, or the economic [conflicts]. So I think we have to start doing things in areas that we know in some sense can be dealt with. Something can be done. Then the question is, "Well why don't people do

more?" So many people tackle these big issues, right? But they don't confront these --

**more personal?**

I'm trying to think what -- First of all, it's real -- like even when I was in the military, I had to confront real people, see. That's where I had to learn. Apart from being a Conscientious Objector and being against war, I had to learn how to deal with real live people. That was a hard thing for me to do...

I do think there's a little confusion between -- "Violence," to [my way of thinking], has to require blood, injury, and physical and mental suffering. I mean, just to argue is not violence, or to disagree, or even to shout, or even cry (you know?). Things that have to be limiting is anything that involves drawing blood, or breaking arms -- you know, physical violence or psychological torture (being destructive psychologically). Once those things are dealt with, we have to learn to live with arguments, differences, unhappiness and some of these other things, because some people confuse, you know, violence as almost anything. You don't even speak, or you can't even say an unkind word or say, "I don't agree with you."

**Or raise you voice.**

Right -- or raise your voice, right.

But I do think that it does require -- You can't leave the people out who are involved. That is, you can't say there's the peace makers out there doing it, or psychiatrists are doing it, or the doctors are doing it. The very people who are in some way involved in this hostility have to be involved in working

it through.

And then the last part is...for some strange reason, we often wait until the crisis or the conflict before we react. What you have to do is -- If the situation happens, and it some way gets resolved, you have to then begin working on avoiding it again the next time...

The important thing I think for a Society of Friends is that -- If you develop a community within which people are more aware of and responsive to each other all of the time, [then] those who can help others more quickly, are able to provide for others some guidance and some encouragement just gradually, daily, you know -- in a way which gradually overcomes the situation rather than having to say, "Well, let's wait for the crisis."

**It sounds like the new thinking in terms of medicine, you know. Thinking in terms of wellness instead of just curing illness. Do you think that would be kind of an analogy?**

Well, that's one of the odd things, is that I'm involved [as a consumer representative] in the Group Health of Puget Sound on this issue, and come to think of it...there is an analogy there. Friends probably should also be concerned with applying this to health, explicitly... Group Health is involved in this, but the Friends have not been that concerned with dealing with that issue. But it is the same principle...

**Well, I've had you talking here for an awful long time I think.**

There was one thing in this -- I think the interview questions would really be a good thing for the discussion group in one of the Meetings for Learning...because these are really good questions for the Meeting.

And the other [thing] would be that -- Leonard Holden has been asked to (and I think he's done quite a bit) to be sort of the historian. So he would have a lot of the records about the Friends.

And he himself, also, come to think of it -- You mentioned, "Did I have any trouble in Tacoma as a Conscientious Objector?" I never personally did, whatsoever. But he did.

**Hmmm. Well, I'm going to be talking with him tomorrow, so --**

And he was here during the time when, to be a Conscientious Objector was serious, see. He was working in the Public School System. I think this would be -- The public schools are more patriotic than universities or social agencies, because they're concerned with how you might be influencing the young people.

Now your last question -- I think there is something curious which I still haven't figured out, and that is -- The Society of Friends actually flourished in England and the United States during a period of persecution... When there was religious persecution, any religion which was not the state religion was persecuted, including the Friends... Many other groups were destroyed, but because of the non-violent position of Friends, the Friends survived and attracted other people. However, the numbers of Friends tend to decline as more and more freedom is achieved, see. Once you achieve freedom, then people take it for granted.

**So the fact that this part of the country was settled later, and long after religious persecution --**

When people were struggling for religious freedom, the Friends flourished. But...the Friends have declined in numbers, historically, the more you got religious freedom....

[Closing segment of the interview]:

Our interview concluded with a brief discussion on the need to form communities, and how the Society of Friends might serve as a model of community. It is not necessary for everyone to become a member of the Society of Friends, but he believes that everyone should be a part of some community.

The reasons for particular individual's attraction to the Society of Friends tend to be diverse, but he feels that many of the people who have come to the Tacoma Friends Meeting came there because they were dissatisfied with their previous religious affiliations, and were trying to find a religious community that was more compatible with them. Their Meeting has experienced a large turnover in membership and attendance because many people were not quite sure what they were looking for.

He also notes that the largest Friends Meetings are located near universities, and said this is because, "On every campus there are a group of people who, intellectually and academically, are bright and able, and they somehow have not given up on their [religion]."