

CLARA PAYNE GROVE  
Fifth Interview

Interviewed by:  
Sam Schrager

Oral History Project  
Latah County Museum Society

I. Index

II. Transcript

# I. Index

## CLARA PAYNE GROVE

Moscow, Troy; b. 1879

newspaper editor, cook, nurse.

2 hours

minute	page	
Side A		
00	1	Tale of naming of Moscow - "Moe's cow." Father a politician first.
03	1	North Dakota's governor reduced taxes. People who don't vote should be fined. Dislike of Ford.
05	2	A Communist's dedication. A minister's warning about the Russians at the turn of the century.
08	3	Christianity had greater influence in the U.S. in the early days. Crime was much rarer. A man uncovered as a bigamist when he applied for a Civil War pension; the second wife abandoned. County aid was available on a case-by-case basis.
16	6	Remarriage was a good prospect in the pioneer West. Her family could live on little. Fathers had a right to the sons' wages. The family didn't have a lock on their door. Hard times - tramps and businessmen came to their home for food, and all were fed. A man who wanted coffee; one who lost his money on a "picture machine." University girls went despite lack of money
31	11	Rarity of "shotgun marriages."
Side B		
00	11	Unexpected pregnancies at the university. A boy and his girlfriend were forced to leave the university. Eighth graders caught fooling around were almost sent to reform school. A suicide over pregnancy as a result of ostracism. If married, such a person might eventually be accepted. And improper washerwoman. The difference in social attitude towards morality.
12	15	Importance of worship in church. A minister's reaction to the congregation's tardiness at prayer meetings.
15	16	She accepts legal separation, not divorce. Witnessing divorce proceedings as a girl; the husband had made shoes out of cowhide. The Scriptural prohibition against divorce - it was permitted only for adultery.

Clara Payne Grove

	minute	page	
Side B (continued)			Marriage is done for a legitimate baby, which is no reason to marry. Decline of morality causes societies to fall.
	27	19	Individual wealth is part of the design to weaken us. Greece refused our aid because the money weakened them. People had "nearly enough" to get along with. A dime made a child rich.
Side C			
	00	20	No separation between young and old age groups. Work for young people at home that they don't do. Need for age groups to share their views. Picnics for the whole community. Old people should stay with their children at home. Rarity of trees in South Dakota.
	08	23	There was perhaps no less discord in marriage then than now, but the atmosphere was much calmer. Marriage was a duty; couples kept their differences to themselves. If a woman couldn't get along with her husband, why could she get along with another? People accepted hardship. Differences shouldn't be put on a professional plane.
	17	26	Neely's bus service in Moscow.
	18	26	Women with families stayed at home. Women now must put their husbands through college, but the influences of doing so are not good. Low requirements for teaching.
	23	28	Working was natural to her. Owning the Troy paper. She always felt herself, whatever her job was, but never felt inferior. She and her daughter scraped through college; her daughter's \$15 loan. Older people lose their sense of smell.
Side D			
	01	30	Marriage is a business; people must work hard to realise the best from it. The weight of divorce on children. Grounds for separation. Marriage ceremonies should preclude divorce.
	09	33	Success of marriages for stability rather than love. Reasons for "business marriages." Discouraging a homesteader from marrying a rich woman. A woman who got slovenly after marriage, spending her clothes money on turkeys; her husband drank to hide his unhappiness. Unhappiness and conformity lead to drinking. Childhood alcoholism.

with Sam Schragger

May 11, 1976

## II. Transcript

FIFTH INTERVIEW

GROVE, CLARA PAYNE

This conversation with CLARA GROVE took place at her home in Moscow, Idaho, on May 11, 1976. Interviewer: SAM SCHRAGER.

CLARA GROVE: Someone would come and ask where John Smith lives, and they would say, "Well, right over there on the other side of the creek. Do you see that cow staked out there? That's Moe's cow. And he stakes it out there day, and you go past Moe's cow, and then you'll go past the first log house, and the second log house that you come to is John Smith." But that's the way people were directed in that day by Moe's cow. So they called it Moscow. Now, whether there is any truth in that, I don't know. But, anyway, I'm sure you'll be helpful by remembering about a boy. And the other thing I wanted to tell; now, do you think just gently and friendly without any fists, we could talk politics a little bit? (Chuckles)

SS: Sure, if you want to.

CG: Well, it's not that I'm so greenhorn about politics. My father was a politician first, and if there was any time left, he'd be a father, but he was a politician first always. And, I grew up <sup>C<sup>N</sup></sup> politics, and until just the last very few years, I have been very active in politics, but my mind doesn't carry anything over. I get something and it deserts me, and I would like a little bit of information. Now, what is it? Four elections we have coming on? I think it is.

SS: In the Primaries?

CG: Well, Primary or something, and I don't know how we have four or what they're about.

SS: You know the way I understand what it is-- (Machine shut off)

CG: -- he was so known or that the people so much wanted him or anything, but he was elected on the slogan, "The way to reduce taxes, is to spend less money." They elected him governor and it is said that

North Dakota never had so prosperous a time as while he was governor. And, he reduced taxes. Well, I think that any man who can grasp the situation in this country to the extent that he can reduce throwing<sup>our</sup> money away, should be in the White House regardless of politics or anything else. But, I just haven't known anything about any of these men. And I think that voting is such an obligation that since people are becoming so negligent about it, so refusing to vote, that if nothing else, there should be a cash or jail fine for one mentally and physically capable of voting and not vot<sup>ing</sup><sub>ing</sub>; I think they should be compelled to vote, and vote as they please. I don't know how it would come out, but in my idea that's the fair way to do it. So, I am glad to hear anything about these men.

SS: There~~is~~ one more thing I could say about--

CG: -- going to progress, now, that's certain. And the way that the rural has been and is being administered, is death to our country, if it keeps on. To me, anybody<sup>anybody</sup>, you, me or anybody else would be better than Ford. I wouldn't care who it was. They couldn't be any worse.

SS: Why do you feel that way?

CG: Well, so far as any religious belief is concerned, I think that's all hooey. I think it's assumed for effect. It may not be. It may be better than what I have in that line, but it doesn't impress me as being sincere. --(sounds as though the recorder shuts off intermittently) Asked for a donation of money and so this A said, "Are you hungry?" And, B said, "Yes, I'm hungry." He said, "Well, I'll gladly take you to a meal.<sup>says, here's A counter</sup> Come on in and I'll get you a meal." The man said, "No, I don't want a meal, I want money." And A said, "Well, if you're hungry, why do you want money instead of food?" He said, "Because I'm a Communist. If I can get a dollar, I'll buy one



loaf of yesterday's bread and get along with that and give the rest of the money to the Communist party." I have seen a man do stunts just like that, so I know something about the Communist Party. And they work so slowly, so methodically. I'm going to be ninety-seven now in just a couple of days, and way back when I was in my early twenties a minister of the gospel, who was touring and speaking in schoolhouses or where ever he could get a group, say, "And what is to prevent the Russians coming across that very narrow gulf of water between Russia and the United States and taking over <sup>the</sup> United States?" He said, "What's to prevent that?" Well, I'm ninety-seven now, and that's when I was in my early twenties that that man saw that. No one else that I ever heard of had heard of such a thing at that time. Well, they haven't necessarily come across that strait, <sup>they</sup> mostly come by air, with our money. In my opinion, they're getting very close to the place where they'll say, "Take down your flag."

SS: I'd like to ask you something. You just said a little while ago that when you mentioned one religion; you mentioned that the Communists said that if Christians had been as strong in their Christianity they could have had one religion and one faith. Now, I'm wondering: In the early days, was Christianity more that way? Within the towns and the communities, was it more one faith than it is now?

CG: Well, at that time, I think Christianity depended on church membership as much as it does now, but, I do think that the nation, as a whole, or at least any part of it in which I was, and I circulated around quite a little, that any part of it lived nearer to the concept as given us in the scripture than they have through the years since. That gradually, from the time I was a child til right now, we have gradually drifted away from the scripture to man-made rules

only. And that the Communists have dominated the world more than any other concept of what they are after.

SS: When you say, living closer to the scripture then-- what do you mean by that? How did that make people live then?

CG: Well, we didn't have rape and murder and burglary as the common diet. There was so little of it, that it was almost unknown. We never had prisons that were over full in the town where I lived for some years in early life before I was a teenager and a little while afterwards. And there were times when there was nobody in our jail. And there were times that there would be one or two or possibly three for a little while. But a jail was just, well, something you had because it was part of the city setup; not that you really needed it for anything of that kind. And as for rape, it was practically unknown. And as for murder, there were so few that you scarcely knew the word. And as for burglary, there was very little of it. Very little. The moral of the people was much higher than it is now. And as for people living together unmarried; in our town-- my father worked on the railroad-- and in that way I knew some railroad families that I wouldn't have known otherwise-- One of them was a family named Cooper and Mr. Cooper was much older than his wife and they had two boys and a baby girl. At the time that this Mr. Cooper applied for his Civil War pension--well, he hadn't thought that they were going to look up his record all his life before they'd grant a pension-- which of course they do-- and they found at that time that he had a wife living in the East. Well, they wrote to him that since he had a wife in the East who was living, and he claimed a wife here, that no pension would be granted. To him, that was absolutely penitentiary. No way 'round. The judge wouldn't judge anything else and they would-

n't fail to pick him up. And he read his letter and he just simply got out of town. Nobody knew where he went or just exactly when. Well, there was this young wife with-- the older boy was, I think about eleven, something like that, and then a younger boy and the baby girl. Well, there she was and there was no welfare at that time; there she was without any support at all. Well, I don't know how she got along. I do know that the older boy was working on a ranch and broke his arm and had to be taken home with a broken arm. But to get a doctor to set it probably wouldn't take more than five dollars all told. And there was no hospital; he would be at home, of course. So that it wasn't like it is now, at all. But that was punishable, that was penitentiary, and this man knew that immediately he would be picked up and he would be judged, and he would be put in the penitentiary. And they never heard of him again in the town.

SS: You talk about his wife, his young wife, it makes me wonder-- with no welfare what a woman who had been abandoned by a husband or had no husband but children, her husband, say, even had died, what she could-- What her situation was. Was she in dire straits?

CG: Apparently not.

SS: I don't mean just her, but kind of in general, when women found themselves in this kind of situation.

CG: Well, there was county aid. That was entirely a personal individual matter. I presume that she applied for county aid, in which the County Commissioners would take her circumstance and judge her circumstance on her circumstance and make their decision as to what county aid <sup>she</sup> would get. It had no relation to anything former or coming, it was at the moment, that if someone wanted county aid then the County Commissioners ruled on that case as they saw it. And, I suppose she

got county aid. I don't know how much. It wouldn't be any great sum, but they owned their home. And, of course, she would own it now. And, well, I suppose that thirty-five dollars a month would have been sufficient to keep them. It probably would have been.

SS: What kind of prospects would a woman in that kind of situation-- not only her, but when that would happen to people-- what kind of prospects would they have? If you had children and in a world, where I take it it wasn't so easy to make a living, very difficult, would she have to try to remarry? Or would women be able to go it on their own successfully?

CG: It is very probable in this case that she would remarry. Now, I do not know about her following this event. But, for one thing, I was too young at the time to have any object in pursuing it.

SS: I'm really thinking in general, not just for this particular case. I'm wondering how society took care of people who were in---

CG: Remarriage was very probably for any one in that situation. Very probable. Because, the country was new enough that there was no shortage of men, and there would be, say, a farmer who would be so glad to have a housekeeper that he would gladly marry her with her children in order to have a housekeeper, rather than do his own cooking after he'd worked in the field all day. So that marriage was very probable for any such woman. And this woman was still quite young. Her husband had been much older than she was. But that was the only case of that that I knew of, <sup>there</sup> and that was because they were railroad people-- my father was, and I had known the family before this happened, is how I knew about it.

SS: Were railroad people more-- people that were just working on the railroad, were they more likely to move around from place to place?

- CG: No. No, they were not rail men. The roundhouse, it was a division point, and there was a two-stall roundhouse where the engines were cleaned and serviced. And these were settlers in the town. They might be there all their lives, working in the roundhouse or on the section, one or the other.
- SS: Would they be likely to hold a little land outside of town as well, or were they towns people?
- CG: They were just people, just like the rest of them.
- SS: And they wouldn't be farming as well?
- CG: No. No, they weren't trying to do anything else. My father-- well finally there were seven children, but the seventh one came ten years-- eleven years gap between the one above and the last one. And at this time there were six children, although the oldest one was mostly away on his own <sup>affairs</sup> at this time. But, anyway, there were the five of us there and Father and Mother, and we paid the enormous sum of eight dollars a month for a three bedroom house, a good house, in a good location. We paid eight dollars a month out of that forty. Well, there was thirty-two dollars for food and clothing and school and anything else that might come up. We got along. And at times, each of the older brothers worked for some time in the roundhouse. Father's work was solely in the roundhouse.
- SS: Were they expected to contribute their wages to the family?
- CG: No, they were not expected to, any more than anyone else would be. That is, you mean to his own family?
- SS: Yes. Your brothers, before they were married, when they worked out, did they bring back their earnings to help your father and mother out?
- CG: They did or did not, as they chose. But there was law on the books that the father could collect the wages and if he wanted the wages

and did not collect it from the boy, it might be that whoever paid it would have to pay it to the father again, because he was entitled until the boy was twenty-one to the wages. But, usually, he did not collect it. And, I remember a boy that I played around with while I was teaching saying that his dad gave him his time til he would be twenty-one. Well, that was a gift from the father. He gave over his right to the son's wages. But that was done frequently, that the father would make the son a present of whatever he earned til he was twenty-one.

SS: Would this be decided by the father's own attitude, or would it be more like a natural situation?

CG: It would be more his own mental idea of whether he or the boy should have it. And each one had his own idea. The law was very clear on the matter, so there was no trouble there. It was quite a different time than it is now.

SS: I'm fascinated by what it was like then. (Chuckles)

CG: Well, it was like this; probably you didn't even have a lock on your door. You didn't need it. In the hot weather, <sup>with that family on his hands</sup> we slept with the door open all night. We didn't need a lock, nobody was coming in if he had no business to. And, there came a time, after a while, that hard times struck the country. We didn't call it a recession, or anything of that sort, it was hard times. And we knew what that meant. There would be a string of men walking the rails and ties, and our house was right by the railroad, and they would come to the kitchen door and ask for something to eat, and some of them asked if they might do some work for something to eat. And some of them after they had eaten would ask if they could do any work. And some of them didn't say anything about any work. And Mother fed ev-

ery one of them that came and asked. And, we didn't just hand 'em out something, she brought them in and set them at the table; fixed 'em a meal. And someone said to me, "Uh-huh, your mother's going to be killed at that some day. You'll find it out, too." <sup>Well, you know, tell a child that.</sup> So, I run and told Mother, and Mother said, "There is no man that's as dangerous as a hungry man." Well, none of them was ever in any way impolite or anything. He was merely grateful and expressed his thankfulness for his food. And, some of them were hobos. We knew the difference between a hobo and a businessman when we saw them coming. But, there were some of them were hobos. And some of them were simply businessmen in their business clothes, just as they had sat in their offices until there was no way to sit there any longer. And there was nothing to do; nothing to be had, and they would venture forth and see if there was any place that there was something. And, there was another time of hard times after that, and it was a little bit different. I was in Des Moines, Iowa for a while at that time in an apartment there for a few days, and a man came to the door, he was a nicely dressed businessman, and he asked me if he could have something to eat. Well, a woman alone doesn't usually have very much to eat right around, but anyway, I got something and gave it to him. And he said, "Do you have any coffee?" I said, "No, I don't," I said, "I never drink it, and I don't have any in the house." But he wanted a cup of coffee so badly. But he evidently had been a prosperous businessman, and business just was failing all over the country; and there they were. And, at one time, oh, it was years later, I was living in a cabin on a farm where other people lived, and the other people were gone, and a man came to the door one day and wanted something to eat. Well, he was sort of a strange acting,

but, I always remembered what Mother said about a hungry man being the dangerous one, so I told him, Yes," I'd get home something to eat. And he sat there shoveling it down with his knife and fork as fast as he could eat, and now and then he'd say, "A picture machine." Well, at that time <sup>the</sup> a picture machine was very new. It wasn't developed at all, as it has been later; and I presumed that he had cast his money into a picture venture ~~that~~ had failed, and that it had turned his mind a little. But he ate his meal still muttering to himself about a picture machine and he left. I was glad he left, because it was very apparent that his mind wasn't right and I was alone on the whole farm. And later yet, in '27, when I came to Moscow there were hard times. Did you realize that?

SS: I heard about that.

CG: 1927. Well, now, unless they have so much money, a certain amount of money, they can't go to University, they think. At that time they went and took a chance. I was on the campus one day; every girl that I saw on the campus either had a hole in the heel of her stocking or she had her stocking pulled down into her shoe to cover the hole! Every girl that I met! (Chuckles) That's the way they went then! <sup>well</sup> Now, if she can't have two or three formals, she just ain't a going, that's all!! Which is quite different.

SS: I would like to ask you a little bit about, more, about marriage in those days. Since we've talked about it, I've read some things about it and I'm very interested in understanding better the differences in opinion now and then people had. Now, one thing is, I have the idea that there was a lot of-- more stress on marriage then, of getting married than there is nowadays. That when girls grew up, they just about had to get married if they were going to have a place in their communities. That's the idea I get. Is that true, do you think?



Were there many women who didn't marry?

CG: It used to be that there would be one "shotgun marriage" in one place in a long time, before there would ever be another. Or, perhaps you wouldn't be there long enough that you would ever hear of another. They were very uncommon. And, And, as for in the University-- see my daughter was in '27 to '31, four years there-- and the Dean of Women was gone on a trip to the South, and there--(End Tape A)

"I don't have any trouble at all with my girls in that way. I'm strict with them, and I don't have any such trouble." And, after being gone a couple of weeks she came back and one of the women who had been taking her place as Dean rushed over and she said, "Oh, Dean French, there are five girls here who are pregnant!" Dean French had supposed there were none! But, in the whole University, there were these five. And later, when I was cooking on the campus, and that would be after '31, be after '33, to be exact, while I was cooking on the campus there were four boys in the kitchen with me as ~~common~~ and one of them was a great favorite with me. A six-footer, a handsome youngster, and jovial and just full of pleasantries, and I liked him so much. I was very fond of him. And at the place where he lodged, he had an upstairs room, and the stairway went up, oh, sort of semiprivately to those who were on the second floor, and the woman with whom he lodged got the impression that a girl was coming in by night, into this boy's room. So, she waited until finally, she knew that a girl had been up there for the night. She went up to the room and she picked up the evidence that the girl had been there. She hadn't quite taken all her clothes away with her. Well, she picked up the garment and took it to the Dean of Men. The Dean of Men called this boy in and explained to him that this was the Uni-

versity and these things were not tolerated, and that if he and the girl, both, would just quietly withdraw, without any furor, without saying anything to anybody, just leave, that they would be allowed to leave in that way. Well, when-- I'm not going to say his real name, I'm going to call him Joe--Joe didn't come for his work one noon, and I said to his cousin, who also was in the crew, "Where is Joe?" "Oh, he's around somewhere." I said, "Stop it, I want to know where Joe is. Now you tell me where Joe is." He said, "He's in his room." Well, I went over to his room as soon as my noon work was done up, which wasn't long, and Joe's father-- I never can forget how he looked-- he sat there with his hands hanging between his knees and his head hanging. Just the picture of despair. And Joe the most wretched looking youngster you would ever think of seeing, was busy packing his trunk. And I said to the Father, "I just had to come over and see Joe. I think a lot of that boy. And his father said, "We think a lot of him, too." He was taking the boy and the girl back to the Father's home, since they had no place else to go. Well, they were married after they got back there. But here was his university career interrupted. He couldn't get a degree.

SS: Did he ever go back?

CG: No. He wouldn't be allowed to. No, the condition was that he was gone, with the girl. And he had never supposed that such an interruption could happen to him, of course. But, anyway, that is the way that thing was then. Well, think what it is now, when they're encouraged.

SS: Do you know of young women, when you were growing up, who did not marry by choice? Who decided they didn't want to be married? I know of men who are bachelors, but, I'm not familiar around here with any

more than one woman who decided she didn't want to get married.

CG: Well, I wouldn't know about that. But, I would say, that contact without marriage was very seldom. Very seldom. I do know, in high school-- no, it wasn't high school, it was eighth grade-- there was a family from far East moved into the town and they had a boy in the eighth grade-- well, I don't know that being from the East had anything to do with it, but he was from the East-- and he taught everything he knew to the boys and girls in the eighth grade. And I went to school one morning as usual and there was something in the air that you could nearly cut it with a knife; I didn't know what was wrong. And one of the girls ran to me and she said, "Oh, Clara, they're going to send Idy and me to the reform school." Well, one of them was the daughter of a keeper of the upperclass hotel in town, and the other was the daughter of the furniture dealer, who was also the undertaker of the town. They had influence enough that they kept their daughters from being sent to the reform school. But, it was only because they were considered important men in the town that their daughters were not sent to the reform school. I never heard that they were going to send the boys. I suppose they would have, but it was the girls that I heard about. That was high school. But that was the one case of that, that I knew of through school there. And later years, it was after I had left there, but I had a sister in that country, and she said that the winter was so terrible that no one would attempt a burial. It was just too terrible weather, too much snow, to attempt a burial. But there was a young woman, not a young girl, but a mature young woman, who committed suicide because she was pregnant. And <sup>that</sup> they couldn't bury her; didn't bury her til spring. And that was the only case of suicide that I ever

heard of in that place. And, it was the only case that came out into the open about pregnancy without marriage. Of course, there may have been more, I don't know. That was the only one that ever came in the open.

SS: It was really a very terrible sin to-- for that to happen to a person. I mean, for her to commit suicide, she must have been terribly distraut.

CG: Well, she would be, because she was cast out like dirt. She would have no standing whatever in the town. She couldn't face it, so she just killed herself.

SS: If you got married when something like that happened, would it be alright? Would the town forgive a "shotgun wedding"?

CG: Well, I don't know whether she had parents or not. I didn't know much about it, except <sup>at</sup> just these bare facts. But, if they had given her a wedding, if she had married, I presume that after years enough perhaps she would have been accepted. But I think it would have taken a good many years. There was one woman I knew who had a laundry. At that time, a washerwoman had a different connotation than the words would imply, and this washerwoman took in all the night work she could get and I never knew of her making any attempt to make any friends or to attend anything. As nearly as I know, she was always <sup>at</sup> home, just by herself. Not trying to be anybody. While there were those women, they were not to the fore, like they are now. Like this woman, they just simply stayed at home, <sup>and</sup> stooped over the washboard. No, times were different then. The moral values received attention in a way that they don't now. And, instead of any such thing being looked upon just with a snicker, it was looked upon, well, like a morass of flames. It wasn't tolerated at all. And, as far as the

church was concerned, quite generally, I think, people attended church. More generally, perhaps, than they mostly do now. And the church was-- made itself more obvious as a place of worship. They might have occasionally some festivity and the church building usually consisted of one room. Some of them had one small anteroom that had been built on later. But, a good many churches consisted of just one room. And at Christmas there <sup>would</sup> <sup>be a</sup> Christmas celebration, in almost any church. I don't know if it was all of them, but I know that in some of them they'd have a Christmas celebration, especially for children. And, there was the Sunday morning service at eleven, and Wednesday there would be at seven or seven-thirty or eight, as suited the congregation, a prayer meeting for an hour. And, in the evening at seven, seven-thirty or eight there would be the evening church service for those who could not attend in the morning. So, there were the two formal services every Sunday and the midweek hour of prayer. I remember distinctly our pastor; people were coming later and later and later to prayer meeting, and he had urged 'em to be on time. And, finally at one prayer meeting he said, "On Wednesday evening there will be the usual prayer meeting at eight o'clock and it will close at nine." Well, lo and behold, some of them went in about half an hour later and when the next half hour was up, he pronounced the benediction and walked out! Well, after that, they got there. (Chuckles) I think that occasions of tact like that are too rare. It seems to me that there are so many places that a side effect of that type will do the job. I noticed it so much in the Dear Abbey column in the Idahoan. That for a while her only plea was, "Give him an ultimatum or get a divorce." She came out with that time after time. Now, I don't see that. I don't believe in divorce

for one thing. It is certain, that at times, there must be a legal separation. Well, in a legal separation, neither party can marry as long as the other one lives. And in a divorce, they can have the judge read the verdict and pronounce the marriage ceremony at the same time, if they want to. But, anyway, there was-- well, I can't remember back there in my childhood days, that I ever heard of such a thing as a divorce. Yes, I did! Yes, I did! A grade school teacher, the eighth grade,-- and nosy little kid that I was, I went to the hearing, which made it awfully hard for her. I've thought about it since, how hard I made that for her, because she had to witness for her mother, and her mother divorced her father. But, oh, she must have been thirty-five or so at the time.

SS: The teacher?

CG: The teacher. The daughter must have been at least thirty-five at the time. Or thirty, at the very least. But, anyway, they were divorced. And, I've wondered and wondered and wondered about that. And, of course, I made up my mind what ought to be-- I knew. Any kid would. I knew, that that woman didn't deserve a divorce. That she'd <sup>been alright</sup> just wanted a divorce, but she shouldn't have it. I remember distinctly that the husband on the stand said that there was one winter that times were so hard that it was almost impossible to get by, and that his daughter wanted a pair of shoes that would cost fifteen dollars. Well, that was incredible to me. I didn't think that a pair of shoes could cost fifteen. He said she wanted them so badly that he got them for her and it took the last cent he had, and he had to have shoes so he could get out to do the chores in the snow and that he had a cowhide and he made himself a pair of moccasins, and wore those all winter. And, I thought, well, now if a man could

do that, he can't be so bad. (Chuckles) But, anyway, she was granted the divorce. And that is the only divorce that I remember of through those years of childhood.

SS: I must ask you; considering nowadays, divorce is so common and so commonly accepted, you have a strong conviction that divorce is wrong, and I think perhaps you might even feel that it shouldn't be permitted-- I'm wondering, why people felt in the early days that divorce was wrong, and shouldn't be permitted.

CG: Well, they were following the scripture on that; that there was one cause for divorce and no more.

SS: What was the one cause?

CG: Unfaithfulness. If either one is sexually astray the other one is entitled to a divorce as though that one had never been married. But, other than that, divorce is forbidden. But now, it seems as though if John says, "I wish you'd learn to make coffee." And Mary says, "It's none of your business, I'm going to get a divorce." That's all it takes. They don't seem to have to have any reason. Well, so many of them as they married, they married with the idea as soon as the child has a legal name, I'll have a divorce. But if the marriage ceremony contained the information that if you complete this marriage, you can never obtain a divorce, there'd be quite a number of them I think would have sense enough not to complete the marriage ceremony, and leave themselves free. I argue all the time that pregnancy without marriage is no reason for marriage. That there must be the real reason in addition to that, or, I say, that neither the father, the mother, nor any parents nor any person excepting the doctor and the nurse who are oathbound and witness that they will never divulge anything about the birth, they should be the only ones who

should know whether the child was dead or alive; perfect or imperfect. Male or female, or any detail of any kind concerning it. And it should immediately go to the parents that have already been arranged to take it. The adoption should be arranged before the birth. I know a case in which the adoption was several months before the birth, and the ones who took the child for all these months beforehand, took this girl into their home and kept her and sent her to the hospital and paid for it, and immediately at birth took the baby. That's the way it ought to be done. Although, I do see, <sup>that</sup> in many cases, the adoptive parents can't take the girl and have her live with them as this couple did. ~~But~~ they were well to do people and had a house sufficient to do so, there was no reason why they couldn't, if they wanted to, but they felt that this was their baby; which it was. And they felt that the mother was receiving the care to produce a good baby. And I thought it was just about as sensible a thing as I ever heard of. That was perhaps twenty-five years ago; quite a while ago, I know. It was South Idaho, when I was down there. But, we have gone so far with all manner: "Thou shalt not." is what we try to do, instead of adhering to any of the old tenents as to what is proper. And, did you ever hear of a nation that was taken captive that hadn't gone morally wrong before? What about Rome? Men lying in their perfumed baths. Women walking the streets looking for what they were ~~l~~isting for? Children neglected. So Rome was taken. Well, what are we doing? The same thing. And yet, some people don't see how close this nation is to annihilation. How close it is to being taken over completely. We have, according to all that a person can hear, a large number of senators and representatives who are Communist. And a Communist ~~turns~~ are being called every so often. I heard Paul Har-



vey just a few days ago say-- he mentioned the sum of twenty thousand and the sum of twenty-four thousand and I don't know which of these two sums he used, but it was one of them, say, even that it was twenty thousand, that the postal department has just spent for a deluxe edition of a book praising the Postmaster General. And you pay thirteen cents for a stamp! He added. Well, there we are. That's what's doing.

SS: Do you think that the country was better off without the wealth that we have now? Do you think that being closer to the bone, or, you know, having less surplus, less money to throw around was better?

CG: I think that the fact that we have so much money was calculated as a help to losing the country. The fact that we are throwing our money away; the fact that we are giving cash and armaments to our enemies is defeating us, so that those who are back of the defeat say, "Well, I didn't do it. Your leaders did that!" I remember, perhaps you don't, I don't remember how many years ago, it's quite a number; the first money that we gave to a foreign country went to Greece. I think Greece has a president, I think that's their ruler, but whoever their ruler is, refused the money. He said he didn't want it. That is the way it was reported. But it was forced on the country anyway. And later there was an article in the paper saying that an interview with the ruler of Greece, the ruler of Greece had said, "It is true that we have much more money per capita than we had before." He said, "Before, we had twenty-eight dollars per capita, which is a small sum, and now we have a larger sum, but we're in a much worse condition now than we were before we had this gift."

SS: Well, let's talk about the average person in America when you were growing up. He didn't have much money. I imagine he had just about

enough to get along on.

CG: We had nearly enough to get along, but we got along anyway. No, there's no use saying we had enough to get along. (Chuckles) No, there's no use saying we had enough to get along with; we didn't. We had nearly enough, and we got by. And, it sort of strengthens your backbone, after you do it that way.

SS: So, it's better to have not enough than to have too much?

CG: It is. It is. When I was a child; if a child had a nickle, it had money. If it had a dime, I'll tell you, it was rich. It could get two candies with a dime. At least two. And if it had a nickle it could get at least one, maybe more, because there were penny candies. And it wasn't so often that a child did have a nickle or a dime, but when they did, they were just up in the clouds. Well, now, - they don't seem to think much of a dollar. Dad'd give them another one, or maybe a five dollar. And it's ruinous to the morale. It's true, there are some children who have to work for every penny they get. And they're allowed to save that money for college or whatever. But that is not the general rule, that's the exception. And, when I was young- (End tape B)

We had to have a lot of preparation for young people. There was no such thing as young people and people and all that. And when they got on in years, they were not the elderly, they were old people. Right out, pointblank. And there was no-- for going to church, for going to a social, for going anywhere, there wasn't the marked distinction into age groups there is now. It is true, there were some things that were for youth and there were some things for adults, not in general, like now, and made an effort to find something that would employ the time of the <sup>young</sup> people. What do you want to take their time

for, when they have to sweep the floor and wash the windows and the clothes; take care of the younger ones and a few more things like that? But, I remember the woman when I was in <sup>Melvin</sup> Alsager's office, I was there for four very instructive years, and a woman came in one day when Melvin was out and she was talking with me. And she said, "If only there was anything in this town for young people to do, but there isn't anything for young people to do." Dad can come home so tired he can hardly get his coat off and he can run the lawn mower. Mother can have all <sup>kinds</sup> things on her hands - but if the floor gets swept, Mother sweeps it. There's just as many things for young people to do as there ever were; <sup>only</sup> they're not doing them. And, it's true that modern conveniences have taken some of the labor and stoop <sup>work</sup> out of it. But, even so, with the modern labor, it's Dad and Mother that are doing it so young people can go to their roost, wherever it is, and be with the young people. Well, it's alright to be with your compatriots to a certain extent, but I don't care which age group it is if they separate <sup>off</sup> by themselves, they get a quirk in their brain that they <sup>don't want,</sup> shouldn't have. You can take the young people, the children, the adults, the old people, they do not keep the bread <sup>the</sup> of thought that they would have if they are with the other groups. <sup>That</sup> Have other ideas. And it's beneficial to all of them. I don't know just why we got the idea, that old people cannot be cared for in the homes of the children or relatives, or whatever. I don't know where we got that idea. Do you? But, anyway--

- SS: Perhaps, it has to do with this private tendency, where people of each family cut themselves off from the others.
- CG: Cut it up into as many divisions as you can. Which is sort of fatal.
- SS: I think some of what you are saying about the age groups, maybe that's

a substitute for the way that the community would do things together and would care about-- not just the family-- but from some of what you've said before, but it was the whole community that was looking out for the others, and doing things together. Is that so?

CG: Well, we did then, much more than we do now. We had picnics that took in everybody from the baby in arms to anybody who could get or be taken there. Just the whole community. Everybody. And they were not divided up at the picnics; they were not divided up for age groups. It's true, that in the apartment age that we have now, it would be more impossible for the adult children to keep the old parents with them, than it was when people lived in houses. If you lived in a house, even if it was only one room, well, in the summertime you had some ground that you could all get on. And, it was possible, more possible, <sup>then</sup> than it is now to keep the old people. Unless that is what did it, I don't know what it would be unless it's the restlessness of the age.

SS: What were these picnics like?

CG: Oh, we all took our lunches and went down to the river or out where there were a few trees or to the top of a hill or some appointed place and we visited around of a morning and then we had this <sup>noon</sup> meal, everybody contributing and eating. And then we visited some more and then we went home. And, perhaps, they had a game of horse shoes; that was quite popular. And, there might be some kind of a ballgame or it might be that the various children would take their balls and they just played ball. Well, occasionally, about the grade school group would get to playing Farmer-in-the Dell or something of that kind. Skip-to-My-Lou, or something or other. But mostly it was just a matter of being together without any work to do for the day.

And, we had such good times. And, rivers and trees and hilltops were not very common. They were scarce. We were, I think, about eight miles from the Gem River, and there were trees along that.

SS: Where?

CG: Redfield, South Dakota. I remember one little girl, and that was at Redfield, it was when I was just a small child, we were all out on the playgrounds and this little girl said, "I Saw a tree that was that big!" And she put her hands like that.

SS: The palms are almost touching each other.

CG: And another little girl said, "You never did, trees don't get that big." (Chuckles) Well, it's true, there were trees along the Gem River, but I don't remember that any of them had any size, like even these of mine. I don't remember they were that big. Might have been some, I don't know. But anyway, to go to the Gem River---

SS: --- marriages between husband and wife. And I'm wondering, in those days, if a woman was dissatisfied or wanted a divorce if she could get one-- would people think it's because she had inflated expectations to start with? Would that be the kind of reason?

CG: Well, I don't believe I would know <sup>answer to</sup> AN <sub>1</sub> that. I don't think of anything on which I would base an answer to it. But, at that time, there might have been, I don't know, there might have been just as much bickering between husband and wife as there is now. But, it didn't culminate in divorce, because that was something that wasn't done. In fact, it practically wasn't known about, more than just the word, was all a person knew about it. But I doubt if-- although the concord between husband and wife may have been less, or at least different, at that time because we were in a calmer atmosphere. At this present time, the atmosphere is rush and push and something different. It's

something all of the time. There are no calm places. And at that time, calmness was common. People knew it and practiced it because that's the way they were. This restlessness that we have now, we just didn't know.

SS: How would that affect the marriages? Do you think?

CG: Well, if the whole atmosphere was quieter, both husband and wife would be in this quiet atmosphere and they would be more settled and quiet, I think, than they can be now with all this push and rush. I think so much of that is detrimental.

SS: I have the idea about marriages from what I was reading, and what we've talked about and other things I have heard, that maybe in those days married couples put their duty before personal happiness. Does that seem to be a fair statement to make, or not?

CG: State it again, let me get it a little more--.

SS: They put duty, their duty to the marriage before happiness, even. Their own personal happiness wasn't as important as their duty. I have that idea somehow. Do you know what I mean?

CG: Well, I think that marriage was looked upon more as a duty than it is now. Well, it was common, it was the style, it was the fashion for people to be married and keep their marriage quiet from the notice of other people, if there was differing. That they were at least pretending that they were glad that they were married, when perhaps some of them were concealing something. But, it wasn't common for differences between the two to be spread abroad. It wasn't the style. Does that answer it?

SS: I think though that nowadays young married people would say, "Why should we suffer? If we don't get along with each other. Why should we give up our chance for happiness that we might find with someone

who is more compatible. That's what I think they would say today, but in those days, that isn't the way people thought.

CG: No, they didn't-- That attitude reminds <sup>me</sup> of <sup>the</sup> woman, -- it's been, well, it's more than fifty years ago, <sup>that recent,</sup> that a group of women were together, and discussing a divorce, which was not common; but there had been a divorce and they were discussing it because it was something so strange and so unusual. And, one woman capped the conversation by saying, "If I can't get along with the husband I have now, why should I think I could get along with any other one?" Well, that was quite a bit the attitude; that this one maybe isn't very good, but, another one might be worse!

SS: Do you think that that would be so? That it wouldn't matter very much between one person or another? I mean, I have the idea that there are such big differences in people; from one person to the next.

CG: <sup>The</sup> People were different. They took hardship in a different way, than people refuse it now. If hardship came, well, hardship, yes, and they just accepted it and lived with it more than people do now; much more. And, at that time, there was no such thing heard of as a married ~~ad~~ counselor. That makes a difference, I think. I think that perhaps, we would be better if we didn't try to put the differences between husband and wife on a professional plane. If we kept it so private, just the same as <sup>they</sup> wouldn't remove their clothes and go into public. They don't open their mind to the public. It isn't done. That is the way it used to be. ( You know, I would brew a cup of coffee if you would like to have it, would you?

SS: Okay.

CG: I'll put it to brew and let it brew and we can go on--

later

- CG: They had a route from the campus, south of here and then around to Sixth and I don't know where all they did go, but it was quite a route that would help a good many people. But I guess it didn't pay out.
- SS: Private bus?
- CG: Well, people more and more got cars and if they had a car they weren't going to bother with a bus. But there was quite a bit of travel on the bus when they had it. That was the Neely bus. Neely's had the taxi.
- SS: I'd like to ask you about working, and what you thought about it-- what's your attitude about working. When you were working back in the old days, when you were, say, teaching and that sort of thing. I know it wasn't so common, I mean it wasn't uncommon for women to work, but it wasn't too common, either, was it?
- CG: There was nothing like it is now. A woman who had a family, never thought of an office job or anything of that sort or in a store or so on. She stayed at home; took care of the family and the home. There was nothing like there is now about women working. And, my opinion is-- I have to admit that right now they are not saying to a person, "What can you do?" The employer says, "Where did you get your degree?" And the man must have a degree, and he cannot get it unless his wife puts him through. So, I can't help commending that, although I do feel that women working has a great deal to do with the unease of the country. That it promotes separation and all that kind of thing. It is not too uncommon that the wife has contact with other men and she isn't making coffee for them, she isn't ironing their shirts, she isn't listening to them tell what a hard day they had, and they look a little glorified when they're not! And sometimes, it just works wrong. So it's not a desirable situation. But what



else are you going to do with it? <sup>If the</sup> man has to have a degree and he can't get it otherwise. So, I condone that much of it. <sup>BUT</sup> As for this woman before this was ever necessary, and all the years afterward, I don't approve of it at all. Not a bit. I think that it should be motivated against.

SS: Well, when you were working, back in the early days, like when you were teaching, and that kind of thing; you did quite a bit of work.

CG: I taught before I married. I didn't teach <sup>any</sup> after I was married or work anywhere else. I was at home all the time after I was married. But, at that time, it was very common for a girl to teach until she was married. And the requirements for teaching-- I spoke to the greek letter school teachers one evening down at Johnny's, and one of the girls wanted to know what the requirements were for teaching. Well, if you had graduated from the eighth grade, or especially from high school, and you could answer the questions in the examinations that were given to you, you were qualified for teaching. That is all that was necessary. And as for the questions, they were no more difficult than the eighth grade questions for the eighth grade diploma. I remember distinctly one girl, this was in North Dakota, the question was, "If a room is twelve feet square and carpeting is one yard wide, how many yards of carpet will it take to cover the floor of this room, twelve feet square?" Well, can't most anybody figure that out? But there was one girl who said to me, "Well, they don't need to give me any question like that, that's just a catch question, and I didn't even try to answer it." She couldn't answer that. She was taking a teacher's examination! Well, I proposed that thing to this bunch of teachers-- ha, ha! they were quite puzzled! Well, they'd never heard of carpeting a room, and to have

that proposed to them. (Chuckles) You could see that they were puzzled at what could I mean. It was funny to me.

SS: Well, let me pursue this working a little further. When you came to Troy and you were working as a newspaper editor and then when you moved into town and worked here. Did you feel that it took a great deal of independence for you to be able to carry on; support yourself and your daughter?

CG: Well, I just took it as much a matter of course as I would to put my shoes on. I had no special feeling about it, only that I was always glad to have work. And, after I bought the paper I enjoyed the work so much. I think I told you how I bought it. (Chuckles) Well, I sold it the same way. Just a sudden impulse. A sudden chance. I just accepted both of them. We had planned that I would go on with the paper and we'd get a car and Ethel would drive in any driving weather and live in a hall the rest of the time. But, the equipment was badly worn, in fact they said that the press was the one that Mark Twain brought across the country with him. And Ethel said, "I know better, he never brought any such useless old thing as that." So I don't know whether it was or was not the one he brought. But it was such a huge, cumbersome thing that it makes a person wonder if he did bring it. Oh, it was practically as big as that alcove. Makes a person wonder if he did bring anything as hard to get across the plains as that would be.

SS: When you talked about working there at Troy, and you would explain to me that some of the men didn't approve of a woman editor, didn't particularly like women in business, it gave me pause to think that perhaps, it wouldn't be so easy for a woman to be a business woman in a man's world, where men usually run the working situation, and I

thought maybe it wouldn't be so comfortable at times for a woman.

CG: Well, as far as a woman doing it; Troy, at that time, was quite largely people, a good many of whom themselves, were from the old country. That is, Norwegian and Swede. That was Troy. And in Norway and Sweden a woman does not bear title to property and own things and do things, like they do in other countries.

SS: But the women, I know, the women milk the cows and worked in the fields. They worked very hard.

CG: Yes. Yes, they did. But they had no title to <sup>that</sup> that cow <sub>^</sub> they milked. They didn't own the fields that they tended. The husband owned that. Or Dad, whichever. Because, when I was in <sup>Melvin</sup> <sub>^</sub> Alsager's office there was a man came in and he said to Melvin, "<sup>Now</sup> <sub>^</sub>It isn't proper that a woman own a title to a car. And my son's widow has his car, and she may have it, but I want the title transferred to me because a man should own the title. So, you get the title transferred to me." Well, Melvin didn't see that. (Chuckles) So she kept the car.

SS: Did you mind working, and work that you needed to do? You said, you didn't think much about it.

CG: I had no feeling of inferiority because of what the job was. I was myself, just the same as owner of the paper as I had been sticking the type for somebody else, or as I had been later scrubbing a floor or doing ironing or anything else. No, I never had the slightest feeling that that altered me in any way whatever. I was just as self-respecting at one as I was with another. The only thing I asked was that it was decent; that it was proper. I didn't care what the work was, if there was any pay attached to it so we could eat. We scraped through college in some way. At the very last, I said to my daughter, "Well, you'd better get a loan of fifteen dollars." Which she

did. And as soon as I recovered from a lot of illness and ~~gone~~ to work again, I repaid it. And the woman said, "Oh, dear, I'd hoped this would run for years yet so I would have the interest." Well, I wanted the interest, myself! (Chuckles) - I'm going to see about that percolator.

SS: Smells like it's brewing.

CG: Should be. You know, older people lose, along with other things, a sense of smell. That's common. It used to be that I could smell a thing miles across the plains, but now, I have very little sense of any fragrance or other than fragrance.

Side D

CG: I've never heard of a business that was likely to prosper if it wasn't worked at. I remember there used to be a man named Fred Fulton, who was an insurance man here in Moscow, and he was a prince of a man. He told me one time that the six children of the home had all gone back to the old home to be together, and one evening <sup>the</sup> six of them were sitting talking and one of them said, "Well, here we are, all six of us and five of us married, and happily married, and he spoke to one sister and said, <sup>But</sup> "You do seem to have in your marriage something that the rest of us missed. What is it, how do you do it?" And, she said, "I work hard for all the happiness I have." There you have it; marriage is a business, if you want what it can give you, you have to work for it. And, if youngsters were taught from the cradle up, that marriage is a business, <sup>and</sup> someday they'll go into business and they must prepare themselves to work at that business. Dear Abby last night had the question of a girl had to help her mother with the dishes and taking care of the younger ones ~~and~~ she just hated it, that she was going to be an actress or a clothes model, and she just hated that kind of thing, and her mother would always tell her that later

in life the practice would be useful to her, and she didn't think so. And Dear Abby replied: "That's what you think. You don't know what becomes of an actress and that clothes model in later life."

Well

^ There you have it! She was going to have her happiness without working for it at all.

SS: I think it's interesting that you say that it's the children, because I have the idea that the children are the ones that really suffer in a divorce. Because, I have the idea that these days, the parents don't really think about the children as much as they used to. I mean, they think of the children as little people that can take care of themselves.

This day, to quite an extent,

CG: ^ They don't think that it concerns the children. Right across the street here, ~~one~~ woman who lived there at one time, across the alley, said that every evening when school was out, a family of children ~~from~~ farther down the street stopped in at her place. Well, I couldn't blame her for feeling that she couldn't take ~~all~~ the annoyance of having the two families there at the same time, and yet, my sympathy was with the children, because they said, "Well, yes, but when we go home nobody's ever there. So we stay here." Well, you can't blame the children. They went home to an empty house and they were just little tads, like the third grade. They had no business being alone in a house.

SS: You think a divorce has to affect the children, and just about be for the worse for the kids? The children that are separated from the parents?

CG: Well, anything unusual, that is drastic and happens to a child, is very hard on the child. It's just as though you had <sup>a</sup> just start <sup>a</sup> willow tree, just a little thing, ~~about~~ as big as your finger, and you

expect<sup>ed</sup> it to bear a hundred pound weight, which a grown tree could bear without feeling it at all. <sup>It's</sup> Just the same thing for a little child to have grownup catastrophies thrust on it; and they do suffer. They suffer badly. Some of them tell about it; some of them just nurse it in secret, which is worse yet. So, to protect the children, I would cut off divorce. And, if absolutely necessary, and really proven, there could be occasionally, like if one parent goes insane, something like that, you know. Or if one parent is sent to the penitentiary, there might necessarily be a separation and there might not. It might be a case when the family should merely wait for the penitentiary sentence to be served and Dad come home.

SS: How do you feel about divorce when there are no children involved?

CG: I think divorce in any case is just not to be done, except for the Scriptural cause. There shouldn't be any other divorce at all. And, I have an idea that if part of the marriage ceremony states plainly that you cannot receive a divorce, you will be compelled to spend your lives together, that it would settle 'em down, "Well, if that's what I have to do, I'll get at it! And, I'll stay at it, if I have to." It would have that effect. But now, there's nothing in the marriage ceremony to say that they can't separate. Of course, it says about as long as both live, but they don't take it seriously like they would the real statement of the fact that you can't separate.

SS: Now, I'm afraid that if that were written into the marriage ceremony in this day and age a lot of people would just stop getting married altogether.

CG: There, you have the point. That's what it'd be for ! To stop a lot

of these marriages. And if they'd stop a lot of these marriages there couldn't be so many divorces. The person would just simply wait until they had some reason that was proper for marrying. And, for that matter, I don't think that love, or attraction or anything of that kind is the only thing for a happy marriage. I have seen business marriages that turn out very well. There is no rapture in them, that's true. But, they weren't looking for rapture. They were looking for stability, and they got it and they're happy with it. And they get along just the same as two business partners on the main street get along. <sup>BECAUSE</sup> It's necessary. I have seen business marriages that turned out well.

SS: When you say a business marriage, you mean that when the two partners decided to get married they did it for business purposes?

CG: They do it because the woman has no other way to support herself, and because the man has no other way to have the woman companionship <sup>10<sup>n</sup></sup> that he wants, and have <sup>to</sup> a housekeeper in his house. Both of them are situated where this is the thing that they can do to achieve what they need. And, so, I say, it's a business. <sup>I have seen it.</sup> There was a man over home who, well, he was doing the best he could as a bachelor, and he was accumulating property and money all the time and doing very well, but, still, when he came in at night, there was his empty cabin, there was the cold cookstove; if he wanted something to eat, he had to produce it. It just didn't suit him. There was the woman who <sup>had</sup>, she came into the area later after he'd been there years, and she had a boy, oh, I don't know, perhaps eight or so, something like that; whether he was a legal child or not, I never knew, and I doubt if anybody ever inquired. But, anyway, they were married. And they had a very good marriage. They married because she had no support and he had no housekeeper. And there was a splended young man who

worked on the ranch for us, and he was engaged to a girl back in Iowa; this was over in Montana, and his brother of the brother's wife were at the ranch one day while he was there, and the wife was telling me about Carl's girl that he was engaged to back in Iowa. And she said, "We think that Carl had mighty little to do with that, that the girl was the only one that figured in that much," ~~whether~~ they were engaged and she wasn't in favor of him marrying her at all, <sup>well</sup> I don't know a thing about the girl except what she said. And Carl went back while he was with us for part of the winter. He went back to Iowa to see her, and when he came back, he said to me, "Mrs. Grove, I'd like to know how you look at this." He said, "My girl has a big job of her own and she lives at home with her parents, who are very wealthy, and have a beautiful big home and she doesn't pay them anything, and on my claim<sup>u</sup>- he had filed land just shortly before- "And on my claim I have nothing but a one room shanty. I don't so much as have a horse that I can go eight miles to get my mail from the mail route." And, he said, "This girl insisted that we be married and she come back with me." <sup>He said,</sup> "Now, what do you think?" I said, "Well, Carl, first thing I want you to know is that all that advice is good for is to enable a person to see something on the other side that they haven't seen yet!" But, I said, "As far as this girl, situated as she is, coming to what you can offer her now; No, nothing. She shouldn't do it." They couldn't have been happy that way. I don't see how they could. But, anyway, it was only, oh, I'm sure not more than three or four months after that, til a new family came in- to the neighborhood, and they had a daughter who was sixteen years old. Very grown and mature for her age. Well, when Carl saw her he didn't ask Mrs. Grove nor anybody else what he should do. He mar-



ried her right now! (Chuckles) Well, I could a whooped for joy! And, for anything I know, they got along alright on his claim. The girl never had<sup>had</sup> anything, but a family that moved on West, and West and West; and she was used to the conditions. And I have an idea that she and Carl were pretty well used to each other.

SS: What do you think that rich young woman wanted to marry him and go to the homestead ~~life~~? Do you think she thought it was romantic, or something?

CG: I have only what I figured out for myself later; and that was, that she may have had an illegitimate child, or she may have been unattractive and had never had any other opportunity to marry, and as the sister-in-law said, they felt that Carl had little to do with the engagement. That the girl had made it. Whether she had an illegitimate child, that would be very possible under such urgency-- if I remember rightly she was a little older than Carl-- and this sixteen year old girl was a few years younger. Or, it may be that she just was so unattractive that men were not interested in her at all. That happens at times. And, what it was, I don't know.

SS: But, was it the fact that she was well-to-do that in itself, made you decide that it wouldn't be a good match at that time?

CG: She could live so luxuriously, and all her life had, and that she had all her own wage, and her living free, and then go here where a dollar was a lot of money and where he lived on the smallest amount of grocery that he could, and that kind of thing, it would be deathly to her, after living in luxury all her life. If, it had been a love match, but as nearly as I could make it out, there was no love, whatever between them. It was merely her insistence that they marry and Carl's determination that it wouldn't be best, and I was

sure he was right about that. No, I don't think that except with a monumental love for each other, she could have endured that. There are cases in which a woman can take on that and live with it, and be gloriously happy; but they're so rare. They just happen once in a lifetime. But Carl was a mighty good boy. We had another very good boy who married the school teacher, way off, quite a distance from us where he homesteaded. I met her, and I think they had two children at the time I met her. But, anyway, later I heard that she had gotten to looking so seedy, with never getting anything new or not keeping herself up, that Matt gave her a hundred dollars and he said, "Now, you go to town and fix yourself up with new clothes." Well, she went to town, alright enough, no question, she went to town-- she came home with a hundred turkey poults, from that hundred dollars! (Chuckles) Incredible as it seems, I had a Christmas card from Matt two years ago, and he was in a hospital at the time, I don't know anything more about them than that.

SS: Well, was she more practical than he was? Is that the moral of that story?

CG: I don't think it was practical altogether, I think it was just not laying the proposition out and selecting what she should out of it. Now, if she wanted to get ten or twenty poults, all right, but she had no right to spend that hundred dollars on turkey. And I can imagine how Matt would feel. He was such a splendid young man. And, I heard that he got to drinking very badly. Well, I suppose he was trying to hide his unhappiness; as though liquor would do it.

SS: I was going to ask you that, too. Do you think that that is often the reason why a man would start to drink? To hide his unhappiness? Or to escape from his frustrations, or disappointments in life?

CG: I think that his unhappiness and disappointment have befuddled his mind to a little extent. That it doesn't function as it should to lay the proposition out and work the whole thing <sup>out</sup> mathematically as to whether he does or doesn't do this, that, or the other. But I think he isn't quite as capable of doing that, but I do think that unhappiness, not only from marriage, but business or ill health or various things, they do start drinking, thinking it will stop that. And, I think that aside from that, quite a bit of it is that the bunch is drinking and he doesn't have grit enough -- lemonade for mine-- he doesn't have the grit to do it. I read of a Congressional party, the Congressmen were having a party, and one of them said, to another one, "As you see, I just have orange juice, ~~here~~ ." He said, "Some people think it's strange, but I never take anything more than a fruit juice." And the other one said, "Well, that's what I have, if you notice." He said, "I never drink anything else." So, it can be done. These were two men in the United States Congress. It can be done, even if the rest of the bunch has something else. But there aren't so many who have the grit to do it. Just the same as, well, on St. Patrick's Day, some people put on a green tie and others wouldn't think of being that conspicuous. And they're afraid of not getting in with the bunch if they don't do as the bunch does. <sup>with</sup> Never thinking that maybe some of the bunch would like to do something else, too. There are quite a number of reasons, and at the present time there are lots of children who are not more than ten years old who are confirmed alcoholics. I got that fact from a factual source, just recently. Isn't that something awful? A ten year old a chronic alcoholic! Well, I suppose, that a child starts drinking because Dad and Mother drink. Or, that he doesn't know any better. He has

no knowledge what the consequences can be. So, if other people are drinking it, well, so does he. The amount that is consumed-- it's stupenduous. The money spent on it is enough to run the nation entirely. That is, without throwing it to nations that don't want it, or are using it to fight us, or something of that kind.

END

Transcribed by Frances Rawlins, August 18, 1976