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Scott Hubbart: Interview with Dr. Martin Juel on October 16, 1985, in the Juel home. Interviewer, Scott Hubbart. All right, Dr. Juel. You said you came here in 1950.

Martin O. Juel: That’s right.

Hubbart: What was your original position here?

Juel: My original position was health coordinator. Dr. Flowers, who was president at the time, got this idea from a program that was sponsored by the Kellogg Foundation. The idea that he had was to create a position where the individual that he hired would be in charge of all the health services and all the relationships between the health services and the athletic department, in the way of injuries and so on, and also the physical education department. I was fortunate enough to be selected for the job. I guess it was kind of a miracle that I ever came here because my major professor at the University of Minnesota and Dr. Flowers were bosom buddies, and when this position was created, the first guy he went to see was my major professor at the University of Minnesota. My major professor said, “I have just the guy for you.” Since I’d already been in Texas for eight years before I went back for my doctor’s degree, I was hired. Without any questions asked. I lacked dissertation when I came here, that was all, and I finished it four years later. That’s how I came here, and that was my job.

Hubbart: What generally, I know this could go into books, but what was the university like when you first came here?

Juel: Well, it was strictly a teachers college and the enrollment, if I’m not mistaken, was around 1,800 in a long term. If you’ll recall in 1950, that was right around the Korean War. A lot of men were, obviously, involved in the military. In the summertime, there was a larger enrollment than in the fall. The reason for that was all these teachers were coming back for complete certification, which they didn’t have and were required to have under the Gilmer-Akin Bill, which was passed just a few years before I came. So, we had scads of teachers that were teaching, coming back for certification. That’s the way it was. It was strictly a teachers college. It was a—many people called it a “poor man’s college” because it didn’t cost a lot to go. There wasn’t a lot of excitement, a lot of other things to spend money on. It was just a quiet little operation and, I might add, very pleasant.
Hubbart: If I’m correct, your next position was dean of students?

Juel: That’s correct. That came about in 1954. The person, who was, at that time, director of personnel, that was the title, was not rehired for professional reasons. The president came to me and asked me, he said, “Would you be willing to take the job of dean of students?” At that time he had just created that position. He had revamped the whole personnel department and created the concept of a dean of students. There were three other people that worked with me: the dean of women, dean of men and the director of student activities, all of which were part of the personnel department. At the time I was very flattered, obviously, because the guy that I had roomed with, officed with, was the one who had made the recommendation to the president. Dean Speck, who was a very wonderful old gentleman. I’ll tell you, I think my life was changed for the better as a result of my experience with him. But anyway, yeah, I took over the job. My first job, however, was a chairman of the personnel committee; that was in ’54. Then in 1955, that’s when the official title of dean of students was created, and that’s when I started my work.

Hubbart: Were these two essentially the same job?

Juel: Same job.

Hubbart: What did the job entail?

Juel: Well, I was responsible for everything except the academics. I mean everything; the health service, the student activity program, housing, all the disciplinary functions of the university, the food service, everything. All responsible to my office. It was an extensive thing, I’ll tell you.

Hubbart: How many dorms were there at that time?

Juel: Well, when I came, I’m trying to think, there was—there weren’t very many. There was Sayers Hall, which is no longer in existence. That’s where the Education Building is now. That was a girl’s dorm. There were a number of wooden cooperatives. You couldn’t believe—they were scattered all over the hills, which are now below the two co-ops we have now, Burleson and Hornsby. Wooden buildings that had maybe sixteen to eighteen girls. Then there were some boy’s dorms down where Laurel Hall and Retama Hall are now. They were old wooden buildings that housed boys, but Speck Hall and Harris Hall were the two men’s dorms that were there at the time. Speck Hall was completed my first year, Harris Hall was already there. The girl’s dorm had Beretta, Sayers, Brogdon, and Commons—were also completed and the infirmary—were completed during my first year here, that’s all.

Hubbart: Were students required to live in the dorm at the time?

Juel: Yes, as long as there were vacancies, that’s right. The reason for that was very simple. The State of Texas will not allow Southwest Texas, or any other school, to buy dormitories with state funds. So, Southwest Texas took these on itself with the understanding that they would be kept full by the people who sold the bonds to us. That’s the way it was, and there was no question
about it. There were very few cars, and most of the kids lived in the dorm. Unless they commuted from home, which was not too many.

**Hubbart:** You said that one of your functions was as disciplinarian. Did you have a lot of discipline problems back then? I’m talking about the fifties right now.

**Juel:** Not a lot. We had some, sure, and I sent kids home. That was one of the worst parts of my job, but I usually did that when it was the last resort. I was mightily involved in the life of kids. I did not stay in my office; I went wandering around seeing what was going on. When a kid got in trouble with the police, I was down there. I took many a kid home who had been picked up, put him to bed and stuff like that. When kids were killed, I was at the morgue, and I was the one that notified their parents. I had a terrific relationship with students, and I wouldn’t take for the years I had as dean of students, not at all.

**Hubbart:** I was going to ask, in light of that—you said picking up students from the police. Were the relations pretty good back then between the town and the university?

**Juel:** I could tell you some stories about the relationship between the town and the county—the sheriff and our school. Never, while I was dean of students, was one of our students ever brought to trial or anything like that, unless they first contacted me. The sheriff, Jack Gary, who was a fantastic sheriff; there’s no telling how many kids we kept out of the hoosegow because never did he fail to contact me. The local city police, the same way. The district attorney—whenever our kids were involved, I was involved. If I thought that a student deserved it, I told him that. If I thought there was a good kid that needed some help, you bet I told them. I appeared before the grand jury many, many times defending our kids. I had an interesting comment made by a retired professor today at a funeral I just came to. We were standing outside and he said—Mr. Martine, you’ve heard of Floyd Martine?

**Hubbart:** Yes, sir.

**Juel:** Okay. He and I were at the funeral, and he was my dean of men at the time. He said, “When you guys quit, morality at the university just quit too.” That’s being, probably, over generous, but I was glad that—I hope I’m remembered as being one who cared about the behavior of kids. Today, they just turn them over to the cops and (unintelligible)—but I—that’s not the way it was when I was there. When I got to that point, where the only thing I was doing was disciplining kids, then I said, “Phooey on that,” and that’s when I quit.

**Hubbart:** What sort of things would they be picked up for back then, was drinking a—

**Juel:** It was a problem. See, they’d go out to the county line, went out to the county line, and they’d come in, and the police came.

I can remember the one case of two veterans who came back and were very much undisciplined. The freedom that they had from being out of the service was too much. They were in the library
just tearing up the place, you know. The first time they came, and I put them on probation. I said, “Next time boys, it’s gonna be it.” Well, it wasn’t about (laughs) two weeks later, they’re at it again. The president interceded for them this time, and I said, “Fine, if that’s what you want, that’s good.” I said, “The next time they do it, they’re going home.” By golly, here it was again, and so I sent both of them home. They were madder than hops. They talked about the defending the country and all that stuff. I said, “That’s all good.”

The interesting thing about it, about six or seven years later, I was sitting at this table at Christmas Day with my family, and I got a phone call from one of them. He told me who he was and said, “Do you remember me?” I said, “Yeah, I remember you. I had to send you home and you were pretty mad about it.” He said, “Yeah, I was at the time, but you know what? That was the best thing that ever happened to me.” “Right now,” he said, “I’m on my way back to the seminary.” He was studying to be a minister, and since that time I’ve had other contacts with him. He has a very responsible position with the governor’s office in the state of Florida, and he asked me for a recommendation. Could I speak for him? I said, “Sure I can.” I did, and he got this good job. That’s the kind of stuff I can remember are highlights, in my opinion, of my job as dean of students, you bet.

Hubbart: While we’re on the subject, because you were dean of students when the county and/or town voted to go—to drop the dry laws—

Juel: I can’t tell you. I quit the dean of students’ office in 1967. I could tell you a lot of stories about that. I can remember when alcohol was first allowed to be served at university functions. I fought that until I could hardly stand it, and I don’t mind telling anybody that because I knew it was going to happen. At first, it started out like if they had punch just one portion of that could be alcohol and the rest of it would be something else. We had even a formula, this is what the University of Texas had, the same thing. Well, obviously, that went down the drain, of course, and there were more violations then you could shake a stick at.

I was also involved with the coming of fraternities and sororities, which I also fought. Until I thought, Well if they want it, okay, under certain conditions. So, we had a year’s study of the whole fraternity and sorority system, the pros and cons. We had a big committee of which I was chairman. At the end of this time, the committee voted to let them come on under certain conditions. Well, the groups that came on had a very rigorous test from our institution. You will do this or you will do that. They said, We will, we will. The first three sororities we had were Chi Omega, Alpha Delta Phi, and Alpha Xi Delta. The—did I say? —No, I should have said Delta Zeta, I think that was their Alpha Xi Delta. They were offspring of literary clubs that had existed before they came on campus. Then the boys, Pi Kappa Alpha, Sigma Nu, I think, and I can’t think of what the third one—but those were the first two boy’s fraternities. They all agreed their representatives, national representatives, met with our committee, and I’m sure they don’t have that anymore. That’s the way it was when we started out. It was back in 1957–58.
Hubbart: Why were you against them coming on campus?

Juel: Well, in the first place, the fraternities and sororities, the conception, the national conception of these things did not fit our campus at all. We didn’t have those kinds of kids. They didn’t have that kind of money. They didn’t have that kind of interest. These organizations came about and asked if I would allow them to use Greek names. For example, the Jeffersonian Literary Society, which later became the Sigma Nu [fraternity], that was started way back in Lyndon Johnson’s day, and it was originally a debating society. Well, they called themselves the “Jeffersonians.” Then they finally said, Hey, we don’t want to be called that anymore, we want a Greek name. So they got Greek names, that was a forerunner of it, and I saw what was coming at the time. That’s when the committee was set up to decide whether they should come on or not. So all these organizations changed their name, and the ones that were socially-oriented changed their name, and that was the beginning of it. Yeah, we had problems. I was hung in effigy by one of them because I disciplined them for violating every rule and regulation in the book.

Hubbart: That was in ’61.

Juel: That’s right, something like that. But that same group came and apologized about two weeks later and said yeah, they had done it. That didn’t bug me, really; I think the thing that made me decide more than anything that I didn’t want to be dean of students anymore was one night I got a phone call from one of the two night watchmen. That’s all we had, [they] drove around in a pick-up. One of them called me, said, “Dr. Juel, you better come down here, I think they’re going to have a panty raid.” Well, we weren’t interested in anything like that because they were disruptive. They were all up in the corner where Arnold Hall is now, you know where that is?

Hubbart: Yes, sir.

Juel: Okay. There must have been six–seven hundred boys all ready to get after it. I came up, and I walked down in the area right down below them so I could talk at them. I said, “Boys, don’t make me do something that I don’t want to do. But if you don’t believe what I’m talking about, just try me.” I stood and shook like, you know, and by golly they grumbled a little bit, broke up, and went home. I came home, and I told my wife, I said, “That’s it.” I said, “I’m not about to put up with this, and I don’t want to. That’s not the way my life is.” The next day I had a resignation in on the president’s desk. Asked to be transferred at the end of that school year to teaching, which is what happened. Well, you know, but I felt good when I got home because if they hadn’t some respect, they would have said “phooey on ya” and run over me. But they broke it up, and it’s like I’ve told many people; it’s always been my philosophy to quit when you’re ahead, and I felt that I was ahead, so I quit.

Hubbart: Do you think there was some appreciable difference between the students in the fifties and sixties?
**Juel:** Oh yeah, I think there’s a very definite difference. One of them, and I think this was the case more than anything, is that students were more concerned about the academics. They weren’t interested in confrontation, and they weren’t interested in criticizing—they weren’t concerned about what’s going on in the world like they are now. That all changed, of course, with the Vietnam War. Then you began to see confrontation and began to see little cliques of students wanting to get a public forum to criticize the university about this or that or about something else.

It started out with a guy by the name of John Schroeder, and he was vice president of the student body at the time. He got permission to “stump speak,” what they called it, and so-and-so or somebody else would get up and lambast the business office or the cafeteria or the students or whatever, with always the matter of getting their grievances out. In fact, this is what led ultimately to the big case involving Mr. Martine after I left. Do you remember?

**Hubbart:** No.

**Juel:** Well, you never did hear about the “Infamous Ten” I guess. Well, this was during the Vietnam War, it was after I quit, it was 1968–9, someplace in there. They wanted to have these anti-war rallies stuff, and they wanted to have them right out in the open where everybody could hear them and so on. Mr. Martine, with the consent of the other administrators up there, said “We’d be happy for you to have them. But you have them in Evans Hall, Evans Auditorium, so you don’t disrupt classes.” Well, this group of ten decided that they were going to have it wherever they wanted. There were a bunch of them. So they congregated right underneath the old Evans Academic Center, right there where the horses are. So Martine came down, and he said, “All right boys, I’m going to give you three minutes to get out of here and go into Evans Auditorium, or you’re out of school.” They paid no attention to him so Martine kicked all ten out of school. It was a very famous thing that got national publicity. The courts upheld the university across the board. That was the end of it. But this all—see, that was all after I left. The problem with drugs was not even in existence at the time, none of that. It all happened after I left, thank goodness. That would have been—

**Hubbart:** Was that a problem, drugs on campus?

**Juel:** Not while I was there. Not while I was dean of students. Now you’ve got, you bet, but who cares, you know? One of the things that I think has caused all this is the fact that the eighteen-year-olds are now adults. That has changed the whole attitude of the university toward the student. I can’t tell you to do anything, you’re over eighteen. You have to violate something that is so significant before they can do anything to you now. Look at what goes on in the dormitory. They’ve got beer and other stuff in the dorm; that was unheard of in my day. Why? Because an eighteen-year-old was still an eighteen-year-old. I can remember a case, Scott, that you’d be interested in. One of our boys, eighteen-year-old kid, got picked up for drinking. He had falsified his driver’s license; he was supposed to be twenty-one. Falsified his driver’s license and he was
out here at Beebeck’s, which is by the county line between here and Seguin. The Liquor Control Board picked him up. They took him to Geronimo, you know where that is, and they fined him $75. At the same time, it was automatic disciplinary probation, that was the rule. So I wrote a letter to his father and told him what I had done and why I had done it. The father got the letter. He called me, he said, “I am madder than hops. I want to come up and talk to you.” I said, “Come ahead.” So the next day, he comes up and talks to me and you know what he said to me? He said, “I sent my kid up here for you to take care of.” See, that was the attitude. “But you didn’t do your job.” He was blaming us for what his kid had done. This wasn’t a common conception, that parents blamed the university. But, they turned them over to us; they expected us to take care of them. That’s the way it was when I was there, and when it got different, when nobody cared about the kids anymore, they just let them do their own thing, got their own way, [and] that’s when I said phooey. I still feel that the university has a function in helping kids grow up. It isn’t just a matter of going to college and all that other stuff. You can’t tell me, and nobody can tell me, that an eighteen-year-old is an adult. Physically, you bet, but socially, emotionally and all the rest of those things, they haven’t had adult experiences, there’s no way. I felt that way, and, of course, when freshmen came up here, we did everything we could to see to it that they made it.

**Hubbart:** I had seen an article in the University Star, I’m not sure if that’s what it was called back then. It was in the early sixties where you had a big meeting with the freshmen. The topics you were assailing them about, things like the cafeteria, not cleaning up in the cafeteria, causing a lot of trouble in there. Remember that?

**Juel:** I can also remember having long arguments with the student senate over the relative merits of five-day week. See, we went to noon on Saturday when I first came here. Quit at twelve, six days. They didn’t want that, they wanted five-day week. I said to them, I said, “Okay, now, if five-day weeks come, about three things are going to happen. Number one, the extracurricular program is going to go down the drain. Number two, athletic participation is going to be almost unbelievably nothing. Number three, there will be nothing going on this campus at all. You’re going to have night classes and all that other stuff to come.” All three of those have happened, and man, they’ve happened. Whether the kids care about it or not, I don’t know. But to me, that was a major factor, and you know, you can’t have any social activities on that campus anymore. They don’t have any. They go down to Jeremiah’s Wooden Nickel or down to Cheatham Street Warehouse, that’s where it is. Nothing on the campus anymore to speak of.

**Hubbart:** It used to be a lot more prevalent on campus?

**Juel:** Oh gosh, we had stuff going on. We had things like Tommy Dorsey’s Orchestra, if you can believe that, coming and playing for our kids. We had the Ink Spots. We had Jimmy Dorsey. We had Lee Morgan. We had all the popular big-name bands coming. Can you imagine paying them $1,500 to come? That was the extent of it, and they put on a concert in Evans Auditorium and played for an hour, all their good music. Kids would go in, cost them a dollar a piece. If they
wanted to go down and dance afterwards from 9:00 [p.m.]–12:00 [a.m.], which was what we usually did, it would cost them another $1.50 apiece. We had stuff going on all the time. The APO organization, which I was sponsor of, they had things planned and going on all the time.

But now, you don’t have anything. To me, one of the things that’s happened, Scott, is that you don’t have the deep-seated loyalty to the institution that you used to have. They could care less; I mean it’s like going to work, and when they get through: am I proud that I graduated Southwest Texas? It doesn’t make much difference.

Hubbart: Were you there when they started allowing people to live off-campus?

Juel: No, I did not fight it because we couldn’t handle them all, we had to. The interesting thing about that, when all these apartments were built, the original builders of the apartments promised that they would obey university regulations. John Stokes, you remember him? Big contractor, he built half the buildings on campus. He built Balcones Apartments. I remember him coming in my office and I said, “Now John, if we allow students to live in your building, what cooperation are you going to have?” “Oh,” he said, “Don’t worry about it, we’ll cooperate 100%, whatever you say.” All of them were the same way. This great big high-rise that is now College Inn was first built by a private enterprise. Jay Levine was the guy whose name it was, and he came into my office, same story: Oh yeah, no problem, we’ll follow dormitory regulations and all that stuff.

Hubbart: They said they would follow dormitory regulations?

Juel: That was the original thing, yes. Particularly girls. Oh, yeah. Oh, they weren’t that tough. But, you know, the parents in those days were still concerned, particularly about the girls. They wanted regulation, period. But when the kids became eighteen, the regulations went down the drain. They sure did.

Hubbart: Another thing I noticed about that one meeting you had, that just sort of stands out in my mind, is you also declared a certain bar off-limits.

Juel: That’s right.

Hubbart: Did that work doing that?

Juel: As far as I know, yes. That was over at Hunter, if I’m not mistaken.

Hubbart: Yes, that’s right.

Juel: We had had nothing but trouble. We had had kids coming in from there; there were fights out there and everything else. I just said that’s it, no more.

Hubbart: And they would do that? They would stay away from it?

Juel: They would stay away from it.
Hubbart: Another thing, you were talking about athletics. You know there’s a big move in the high schools right now on athletics, and it may move into college. Was this a big athletic school back then?

Juel: Well, when I was there, we won a national championship in basketball. We took third two other years. Football, we won the Lone Star Conference a couple of times. It wasn’t like it is now; oh, no. Because we didn’t have half the scholarships or anything like that. There was nothing like that. The athletes lived in what we called Bobcat Hall when they first came here. That’s down where the Music Building is now. There were two wooden buildings, they were rat-holes, but that’s where they lived. I was also chairman of the eligibility requirements for NAIA [National Association of Intercollegiate Athletics] nationally for a couple of years. So, I was mightily involved in it. Athletics was important, but it wasn’t like it is today.

Hubbart: You also said that you were—I’m sorry, my mind is slipping—You said you were chairman of health when you first came here, health and—

Juel: No, I was not. I was responsible for all the health services. There was no health stuff. One of my jobs when I first came here was to create a master’s degree in health and physical education, which I did. That went along until we got a master’s in health education, which I was able to get separate and apart from physical education. Then I became, after I left the dean of students, I served part-time [in] the education department and part-time as head of health education department, which Dr. Calabeek now has, he took my place. I stayed there until 1973, and in ’73, I became Chairman of the Department of Education, and then I had to give up work in health education. I was involved in writing state curriculum in health education and everything else in the early seventies. So, like I said, I’ve had all kinds of different experiences.

Hubbart: Was physical education a requirement?

Juel: Yep, two years.

Hubbart: Ever since you were here?

Juel: Always, it’s always been that requirement, yeah. Today, I think, we do not nearly have the physical education department we had. We had people that were more concerned about athletics, and physical education was just an afterthought. The whole conception of anybody majoring in physical education, he was automatically going to be a coach. Well, that doesn’t persist anymore, thank goodness, because what they do in physical education today is superior, far and away, to what we used to do. Today, they are concerned about lifetime sports and stuff like that. Giving kids [the] opportunities to do things, learn skills and sports they’ll be able to participate in long after they leave here. Which I think is the way it ought to be.

Hubbart: I know I’m jumping back and forth here—

Juel: Help yourself.
Hubbart: I’m sort of interested in the sixties, because that was such a transitional time in the world.

Juel: Sure was.

Hubbart: I guess what I really want to know is what sort of an impact it had. Just sort of a general attitude. For instance, say with the advent of rock and roll, the Beatles, did things start to change then?

Juel: Yeah, but it was slow on our campus. Yeah, ultimately, but I really think it was slow. Again, because of the kind of kid we had. You know, most of them came from small towns. We had a radius of 125 miles from where we got nearly all our kids. That’s small towns, agricultural towns. Well, they weren’t into all that stuff. They sooner or later got into it, no question about it, but nothing like today. Then the Beatles came; then, of course, you had them start talking about dress codes and all that stuff. You know hair styles and all this. We didn’t have anything like that. We didn’t have any problems like that. There were some. Girls had some regulations about lengths of skirts and stuff like this, but that was the extent of it. I think deans of women would roll over in their graves if they could see the way kids come to school today. Right or wrong.

I know my own personal self, my job was training teachers. When they came into my class and were improperly attired, I said get out. I said, “You come back here when you’re ready. You’re going to be a teacher. Teachers are going to be required to look better than you are, and you’re going to start practicing right now.” We had them kicked out of observations in the public schools because they didn’t care how they looked and stuff like that. We had it; oh, yeah, we had it. But it was slow, and it was no big deal. The biggest thing I think of the sixties was the speaking out about national things. Which of course up to that point people called it apathy. Maybe it was, but they were content to let things go and just rock along. But when the sixties came, particularly the latter part of it when the Vietnam War broke out and our boys wouldn’t go up, that’s when we began to see the change that came about.

Hubbart: Did that bother you?

Juel: Did it bother me? The only thing that bothered me about it was some of the demands they made. Not the causes they were espousing, heck, no, because I said, “Fine, go right ahead. But understand these conditions because you’re not going to disrupt classes or anything like this.”

Hubbart: What sort of demands would they make?

Juel: Well, they wanted to have their thing at this time in this place.

Hubbart: No changing.

Juel: Of course, you know, our contention was, and still should be, that the prime function of the university is instruction. If they’re outside this window doing all this yelling and so forth, we told
them, “You can do it here or here where you won’t disrupt classes.” “Well, you don’t tell us to do anything,” some of them said. So, that’s the way it started. No, I was not opposed to that, not at all. Never have been. But I was opposed to some of the requests that they made. I told them what I thought of it, and the answer was no.

Hubbart: This is hypothetical. You know, there is a group starting up now, the Southwest Texas Alliance I think they’re called, and it’s a gay rights group on campus. Suppose that had tried to start in the sixties?

Juel: I would have said no, definitely. I would have said no. If I hadn’t have said no, I would have had problems with the Board of Regents and everybody else. Because the attitudes of the whole administration toward anything like that would have been never, never. Of course, at that time, homosexuality was behind closet, as you well know.

Hubbart: It was starting to come out at that time.

Juel: Barely, just barely.

Hubbart: Only in San Francisco.

Juel: Yeah, but you see, again, our school, you look at the background of our kids. Now, it’s not true today, but it was then. So, I should have said no at that time. The Board of Regents would have definitely said no. If I had said yes, I would have been up in front of them quicker than you can shake a stick.

Hubbart: So what I would glean is, things obviously changed in the sixties with the eighteen—they moved the majority to eighteen and all that and the drinking. Was there a problem with the town? If you took all of those and put them together, was there any big problem, or did the town kind of always, in a way, depend on the university?

Juel: The town has always depended on the university, the merchants. A lot of the people who were not involved in business here never got that close to the university. There were a lot of attempts. I know that Dr. Flowers made many attempts, so did Dr. McCrocklin, to try to bring the two factions closer together. But there’s always a question about voting. There’s always a question about disturbance and all this other stuff. You don’t get this many kids together in one place and not have problems. Well, we had them.

Of course, San Marcos wasn’t as big as it is now either and wasn’t as diverse an operation. Yeah, we had problems, you bet. The merchants, obviously, were happy to have the students. When the students went home for Christmas, they felt it. But the people who were not involved in business here, for whatever reason, were not that happy about it. So we had, I suspect that you have that today. I’m sure you do.
We just lost one of our most wonderful friends who was killed because apparently a couple of students ran a stop light and plowed into him. You know, that kind of thing doesn’t help the students and their relationships with the town at all. But that’s what happened.

**Hubbart:** Would they not have cars back in the fifties?

**Juel:** Oh yeah, they had cars, but nothing like this. See, they lived on campus, there was no reason. Now, they go home, and the campus is expanded. They can’t drive to class half the time so—

**Hubbart:** They can’t drive period.

**Juel:** Yeah, well, but this was not any big deal. Parking was no big problem, but you know, not like—

**Hubbart:** Well, anyway, so you left the dean of students in ’67.

**Juel:** In ’67.

**Hubbart:** What did you do after that?

**Juel:** I taught in the Department of Education.

**Hubbart:** Obviously, there is just a very appreciable difference since House Bill 72 came into effect. Would you say that in requirements between back when you started teaching and now?

**Juel:** For who?

**Hubbart:** For the—to get certified to become a teacher.

**Juel:** Well, Southwest Texas always had some kind of a program to allow into the teacher education program those students who could do it. We had a lot of screening devices that we ourselves had that kept kids—for example, they didn’t make a C average on their education courses, they were out. Or if they didn’t do some other things, this just couldn’t continue or they couldn’t get in. Well, now they’re getting, it’s the same thing really. But House Bill 72, I just talked to a class in the legislative process, Mr. Fowler’s class last Monday, and my opinion about House Bill 72. Of course, it’s mixed, no question about. There are a lot of things that I think about the bill are excellent, for instance, the no-pass no-play. Philosophically, that’s beautiful, but now what happens, for example, when you lose so many kids because they can’t follow that and those that can do it are deprived of playing or doing whatever because the program can’t exist, they lost too many people?

**Hubbart:** Now, you’re an old coach too, aren’t you?

**Juel:** I’m an old coach, you bet.
Hubbart: Is that the coach talking?

Juel: Well, in a way it is, in a way it is. I also have another feeling about that. I think philosophically that’s the way it ought to be, but I think if they’d have made this change slower. You see, they did two things. Number one, sixty was passing, they now made it seventy. Okay, you could fail one course, now you can’t fail any. If they’d have done that more gradually, no problem because I believe that’s right. I believe a kid, his first job is to pass. But now, let’s look at another thing. How many kids, for example, are not that sharp, and how many kids are schooled past the day that they could legally drop out because of athletics or music or whatever it is? All right, they flunk out, drop out of school. Running around on the streets. I’d rather have them in school where I could work with them and help them rather than having them out in the street doing, in many cases, mischief. So, there are two sides to that.

I think, ultimately, yeah, extra-curricular activities, in my opinion, is a privilege. You earn the right to participate. I believe that with all my heart. But I think they should have done that slower because everybody is not that good, period. I think the emphasis on reading, writing and arithmetic is excellent. Except, again, there are a lot of kids who are not, they don’t have that bent. The vocational aspects for them have been good, but that stuff, I’m afraid, is going to be downgraded or has been downgraded, and I think that’s sad. When you get into the inner-city, not in a town like San Marcos, but you get into the inner-city like Houston and so on and so forth, I think it’s going to be a problem. I really do, and I think that the legislature will have to reconsider some of these things when they meet again in maybe two years or four years. But, it’s interesting.

I think the thing I resent about it more than anything is that the teachers, the school, is getting all the blame for the failures. I no more believe that than the man in the moon. I’ve been teaching for forty-three years, and there’s no way you can tell me that the full blame, all the reforms are necessary; are the fault of the schools. If you can show me parents that are 100% in cooperation with the schools and make their kids conform to academic requirements and so on, then I’d say, yeah, the schools are to blame. But, that’s what happened.

Hubbart: Do you think that was something that, the schools getting blamed, is something that has come up recently, or was it always like that?

Juel: No, uh-uh. I think there are a lot of reasons why this has happened. Number one, I think that this has been a much more permissive generation. I think parents have had a different outlook, attitude toward their kids, and they’re giving their kids much more leeway. Much more responsibility and many of them are not able to handle it. Also, there are many, many working parents, both of them now, so that the kids don’t have all the contacts with their parents that they used to have. Now, that’s something that can’t be helped, but it’s still a fact. Look at the discipline in the schools. Go in the inner-city, that’s total lack of respect. Well, where do you get this? You can’t pass legislative laws to discipline kids, they can only do the mechanics, but you
can’t create respect. You can’t create motivation. You can’t create any of those things, that all comes from within the person. You can’t motivate that, and you cannot legislate that, and that’s what I have against it. A lot of things needed to be done, no argument about that. But the merit system, the career ladder concept in there—down. All that’s done is torn up a bunch of people. Here in San Marcos, for example, they didn’t have enough money to reward all the people that should have been rewarded. Who gets it? Why didn’t I get it? Why did you get it? And so on and so forth. People have tried to make that decision, their name is mud. That’s not the way you create morale in the public schools, but that’s what happened. So, I have some real problems, no question about it. Again, I’ll admit some reform was necessary, no question about it. But I don’t agree with all of it.

Hubbart: As chairman of the education department, did you try to deal with the reform as you saw it in your curriculum?

Juel: Sure.

Hubbart: What sort of things would you deal with?

Juel: Well, for example, our screening program was one thing I insisted upon. Another thing, we worked very closely with the English department in identifying those kids that could not write and making them take remedial work before they could get their certification. We were tough on student teaching. Whether they could cut the mustard or not. We instructed the student teaching supervisors to be real careful, and if they can’t do it, then don’t let them through. Southwest Texas, Scott, has always had good teachers. We have been known throughout the whole United States for our, the quality of our student teachers and for our teachers. We put out more teachers every year than the University of Texas, and they’re good ones. When you get an employment rate of 95% nearly every year, somebody’s doing something right. That’s I think—

Hubbart: Of course, this was predominately a teachers college for years.

Juel: Sure.

Hubbart: Did that change while you were here?

Juel: Yes, it changed while I was here, and it was something that tore up the president, Dr. Flowers, more than anything I know of. He was proud of the fact that it was a teachers college, proud of it.

Hubbart: Why do you think that changed?

Juel: Well, pressure. Pressures from within. There were a lot of people, for example, in [the] liberal arts field who felt that while they were teaching English and this stuff and they had all their graduates going into teaching that the institution ought to have a broader scope than that. Well, the first step was to knock off the teachers. Then it became Southwest Texas State College,
and that was about 1957 or ’58, someplace in there. Then it became a university. Well, every institution in the state is a university, almost. A lot of them in violation of the true concept of the—there’s not been that much change, except we have created colleges, the School of Education, the School of Business. They were departments under the college organization, but now they’re colleges or schools, which qualifies them to become a full-fledged university, and that’s just a matter of terminology.

Hubbart: Well, you know the saying “those who can do, those who can’t teach.” Did you notice any of that when the school started shifting away from education? Did you notice maybe that the students who weren’t as adept academically try to get into education?

Juel: No, I did not notice that so much. However, did we have pressure from the other world, you bet. There was a lot of anti-education publicity from some of the departments on our campus. Kids would tell us that we were being ridiculed and stuff like that. You know, Mickey Mouse kind of junk. That used to make me madder than hops. I would, every chance I got as chairman and as a professor, I would try to point out that education teaching is more than telling, it’s a whole lot more than telling. If you think for one minute that you can stand up in front of a class and dish it out and then say “you got it?” —that that’s teaching, well I’ll eat your shirt. There’s a whole lot more to it than that.

Hubbart: There was that big move in the sixties, here I go back to the sixties, for relevance in the classroom, teaching relevant things. Was that a problem here, with the relevance?

Juel: I don’t think so. I’ll tell you why, because Southwest Texas has always been what I would call a teacher education program that was practical. In fact, when I was teaching and when I was chairman, I had kids who would transfer from other schools. They would have been in the departments of education at other schools, and one of the things that they said when they came, almost to a man, I would ask them, “What’s the difference between our program and theirs?” Almost every one of them said, You tell it like it is. When you tell it like it is, that means you’re conversant with what’s going on in the public schools and you’re teaching teachers to meet what’s in the public schools as far as you can. No ivory tower stuff.

Hubbart: Was that always the policy?

Juel: As far as I know. As long as I can remember. Dr. Flowers, of course, was extremely anxious to get the kids out in the schools. Long before other schools did this, our kids were getting out and observing what was going on. We’re even moving farther in that direction now, but it’s becoming more difficult because if we were to keep up with all the requirements that are now being made, it’s going to be hard to find places for kids to do all this. San Marcos is going to have to be extremely generous with their facilities if we’re going to do all the things we had to do. Unbelievable.
Juel: That was my job, which I think I was really happy with. Because I believe with all my heart that you teach kids first and then you teach them something. That’s the way I operate. So, I felt that the first course that we offered kids involved understanding the child they’d be working with and then you go from there. That was our philosophy pretty much; at least it was while I was chairman. It always was while I was teaching. So, that’s the way I believe.

Hubbart: Did you notice, not so much grades, you know, the SAT scores took this nosedive, and now they’re coming back up. Was that a problem, say, in the seventies?

Juel: If it was, nobody paid any attention to it. What we were concerned about was where our kids placed, were they getting jobs. We figured that the proof of the pudding is in the eating. When you get it like I say, 90–95% of your kids getting placed, somebody said you’re doing something right. Every accreditation visit we ever had we got top rankings. Test scores weren’t that significant, we didn’t worry that much about them, and I’m not sure we should today. I really don’t feel that paper and pencil tests are that significant.

Hubbart: Are you talking about things like the PPST [Pre-Professional Skills Test]?

Juel: I’m thinking about this. I’m thinking about a lot of things.

Hubbart: Teacher competency tests?

Juel: I have some real reservations about that. I read a letter to the editor in the Austin paper the other day, and this was a lady, who was not a teacher, but she had seen a copy of the test that’s going to be administered in March to all the teachers. She said it’s an insult to the profession. Number one, it’s so easy that it doesn’t measure the depths of knowledge that a professional ought to be able to demonstrate. It’s so easy. What in the world, she said, it’s an insult to the profession. There are other ways of keeping people; if the administrators cannot evaluate the competency of a teacher, paper and pencil tests are not going to do it. I don’t care how much I know, if I can’t communicate my knowledge to my students and if I can’t get my students to learn what I have to communicate to them, what good is my knowledge? It’s not worth a flip. That’s why I resent measuring teaching on the basis of this kind of stuff. I really resent it. If I want to keep people up to date, I’ll make them go back to school every so often for a couple of sessions in summer, something like that. I could do it this way, but this competency test—Now, do I believe in it for kids just coming out of school, you bet. As long as the test measures not only their basic skills but also their knowledge of the competency they’re going to need in order to be successful teachers. If they measure that too, and I think it does, I’m for it, you bet. I don’t have any objection at that level, but later on I have a lot of objection.

Hubbart: When you mention the screening process that you had, how would the education department turn out a good teacher? Not that they could just know that this would be a good teacher, but—
Juel: No. Well, obviously the staff members that we selected. We tried to select people who cared about kids, first of all, and who were knowledgeable about what their skills were. We put them out in the schools early and let them see what was going on, and we related what we were doing in the class to what’s going on. Then when they got out to student teach, we tried to put them with the best public school supervisors. Then our people who were out there were expert classroom teachers who knew what they were doing. They weren’t a bunch of people who had never been in a public school classroom before. By the time they got through then, they’d been exposed to the best we had to offer.

Again, I say, the proof of the pudding is in the eating. We were sure with accreditation reports and all these other things that we were doing the kind of a job that the public schools wanted us to do. That’s how we did it. If you look at the Department of Education, the turnover has been relatively small. We have people up there who are dedicated for what they are. They’re interested, they love Southwest Texas, they love what they’re doing, and that’s good, that’s good, you betcha.

Hubbart: If I want to just play a little word association.

Juel: All right.

Hubbart: If I asked you what the biggest difference between 1950 and 1981 when you retired, am I correct? The biggest difference in the students, what would you say?

Juel: I would say they’re concerned with what’s going on in the world, that would be my biggest concern. Of course, in 1950, when I first came here, was the Korean War, and they were concerned then. But after the fifties, when the war was over, the latter part of the fifties, a lot of people use the word apathy, and maybe that was what it was. But they were content to just rock along and worry about their own problems. Getting the job done and stuff like this.

End of interview