

INTERVIEWEE: Professor Roger W. Russell
Academic Vice Chancellor 1967-72

INTERVIEWER: Samuel C. McCulloch
Emeritus Professor of History
UCI Historian

DATE: May 30, 1989

SM: This is an interview with Professor Roger Russell, who was
our Academic Vice Chancellor from 19 . . . Was it 1967?

RR: Nineteen sixty-seven, right.

SM: Nineteen sixty-seven, and to nineteen seventy-three?

RR: I left in 1972.

SM: Nineteen seventy-two. I'll change it. And it's in my
office on May 30, 1989.

Now, the first question, Roger, is what did you know
about the UCI Academic Plan before you were interviewed for
the post vacated by Jack Peltason?

RR: Well, Sam, I didn't know anything in very great detail.
What I really knew was from two different sources. One, in
terms of people talking about the new venture at Irvine.
This was a fairly general group and none of them really
well-versed. The other was a long interview with Dan
Aldrich--in the airport it was, come to think of it--in the
airport at Indianapolis, when he was in between trips some
way or another. And he talked for about two hours about the
nature of the plan. And that was all I knew before I came
here. As a matter of fact, after we got through talking and
I thought it over--and Irvine was kind enough to make an
offer--I decided I really didn't want to take it. So, you

will find in the records a letter from me, from Indiana University where I was Dean of Advanced Studies in those days, saying that I appreciated the invitation but I thought I'd stay at Indiana.

✓ SM: Well, let me know, Roger, this is fascinating. Why did you change your mind? My first memory of you was at a party, when you were out here, that Arnie Binder gave at his house, in which you . . . we hoped you were going to accept. And, so, did you think it over enough to come out for an interview, or what?

✓ RR: Well, Arnie Binder had been one of my favorite faculty members at Indiana University when I was head of the Department of Psychology there. And he was also Chairman of the search committee here, as you'll remember. So, Arnie got on the phone and, I think, Dan also did. I gather the committee had quite a talk with Dan after my letter arrived. And then Arnie said to me, "Well, at least you and Kay can come out. You'll enjoy a visit to California." So, I said, "All right. You're my good friend. I'll come out." So, that's when, I guess, we met you at that party.

✓ One of the big factors in my decision--initial decision--that, as nice as Irvine was, I wouldn't be interested, is that Dan had said it would be impossible for me, as Academic Vice Chancellor, to do any teaching or any research. Well, that wasn't on for several reasons. One, that I was doing some very interesting research at the

time--interesting from my point of view. But what was more important, I didn't see how I could keep my fingers on the pulse of a growing institution while I was sitting in a posh Vice Chancellor's office. ~~So, that~~ unless I had contacts with students, as well as with staff, I could lose contact very quickly.

SM: ~~Well~~, I don't think the offices are very posh. (inaudible) your memory of your office. Dan's was kind of posh.

RR: ~~Well~~, it was high in the air, you know. It was on the top of the Library.

SM: Oh, yes, that is true. Right, that's right. ~~Well~~, so what you're saying is that they agreed to let you set up your laboratory. You used to have it over in the North Campus, didn't you?

RR: Yes. The first lab was, I think, at the corner of Jamboree and what is now Campus.

SM: That's right.

RR: Do we still have those buildings?

SM: Yes, yes. Oh, yes. In fact, they expanded them a little.

RR: Yes.

SM: Oh, yes.

RR: ~~Well~~, it was first set up there, but very quickly we moved to Biological Sciences, to Steinhaus Hall.

SM: I was talking to Grover Stephens and he was saying that with the opening of Bio Sci II they would really be able to get

Sam?

each department together in either one of the buildings-- Steinhaus Hall or the new Bio Sci II.

Now, was your research lab ready for you on arrival? Did you have to bring materials or what? That's the second question.

✓ RR: Yes. Well, I brought some materials, I remember, but what I had in mind wasn't all that complex anyway. So, I got some help from there and then I had a sizeable research grant. It was two hundred and some thousand from the National Institute of Health, which was sizeable in those days, and I brought some of that along with me, as I recall. Anyway, it worked out so that I could get started fairly early. Of course, there was an awful lot to learn about the campus here at Irvine and the community in which we were growing.

SM: Well, that moves me in, Roger, to the next question: What were the main problems you faced when you arrived, both inside and outside the university?

✓ RR: Well, all right. Let's take them in the reverse order.

SM: Okay.

RR: Orange County, I knew before I came, was perhaps the second most conservative county in the United States, second to Indianapolis in those days.

SM: Oh, I know.

RR: The John Birch Society had been founded in Indianapolis and it was very active here and there were a number of people who were not the easiest people for the university to deal

✓ with, particularly since any university is at a cutting edge of social thought. And there were times when conservative developments that were powerful in the community didn't agree with the general program, what they saw Irvine as doing. I can remember on one occasion, for example, a person--we won't name names, I guess--who was very powerful in those days, a member of the state legislature, who I invited to lunch because he was speaking publicly so unfavorably about the campus. I never got an answer, except that he told the reporters he would be seen dead in that cesspool at the University of California, Irvine. So, we had some of those kinds of problems.

✓ Another occasion which I well remember ~~that~~ reflects some of the attitudes of at least some members of the community--they happened to be ones who were quite outspoken in those days. It was ^{at} ~~on~~ an occasion when the difficulties were on at Berkeley and I was being asked by service clubs around Orange County to speak about the university and its development. On this particular occasion, every time . . . I can't remember what service group it was ^{it} but every time, Sam, I would make some favorable remark about the university, a voice at the back of the room would say, just loud enough so everybody could hear it, "Bullshit." (laughter)

SM: Oh, no.

✓ RR: Can you imagine talking to a group under those circumstances? Well, ~~it~~ ^{the talking} worked. It worked very well ^{and} we had some of those problems, but I think that the Irvine campus had fewer difficulties than any of the other campuses, with possibly the exception of Santa Cruz.

SM: Oh, Santa Cruz, no. They had some very serious ones. Remember they spat on Ronald Reagan when he was governor and he came to the Regents meeting? That's when they decided no more Regents meetings on campuses. They'd only meet at the Extension Center in Berkeley and I've forgotten where in Los Angeles, some club downtown.

RR: I know. I was at most of those meetings, yes.

SM: (inaudible) we got our (inaudible). Of course, you would go, from time to time, representing Dan when he was away, and you were in on what the other Chancellors talked about and what problems they had.

✓ RR: ~~Oh~~, yes, I went quite often because Dan had all sorts of commitments. You may remember that for awhile, several months--maybe six--I was, in fact, Acting Chancellor. So, I did meet with the Regents quite often and there are some interesting experiences I could tell ~~there~~, too, but I'd better let you lead this conversation.

SM: ~~Well~~, you can tell me at the end of it. What about the problems you faced inside the university?

RR: ~~All right~~, that's what I was just going to say. You asked me about outside and inside. And, I guess, to summarize, my

view is still that we had relatively few difficulties with a community which was traditionally ultra-conservative. It has changed since then. ~~All right~~ . . .

(telephone rings and tape is turned off)

SM: All right, so it's ultra-conservative, and the inside, the problems of the university inside.

RR: Yes, well, I think I would like to go back a couple of steps, to give you a bit of background. I had had a good bit of administrative experience under a number of different circumstances, ranging all the way from the Army situation, ~~of course. But, after the Army,~~ to ^{run} a section of a department at the University of Pittsburgh.

(audio problems with tape)

SM: Okay, okay.

RR: Let's see (inaudible).

SM: (inaudible)

RR: ~~Well,~~ I was mentioning some of the background, my background in administration, because that, I think, is important to my discussing the situation internally at UCI when I came here. I had had experience, as I started to say, all the way from the military situation where you had to be the macho leader or everyone would be dead, to running a small section of a department at the University of Pittsburgh, and then being head of a department at University College, London. I'd gone from there to be the executive officer of a large national organization of 75,000 members, and also the

✓ ^{secretary} secretary-general of an international organization of three times that size. Then I went to be Chairman of a department at ^{University of} Indiana ^{and} became Dean of Advanced Studies at ^{there} Indiana, before coming here. Well, all of that had helped me, I think, to develop what was very important / from my point of view, a concept of management that I can describe to you briefly. All of this was helped a bit when I was in Washington by seminars I took at . . . attended at Brookings Institute, where we had discussions with top-notch people from General Motors, General Electric, Dupont, ~~where~~ ^{there} there was a good bit of discussion of models of management.

✓ And the model that seemed to me to be most significant, and I thought we had a good chance of implementing here at Irvine, went along the following lines, with certain basic principles. The success of any organization depends upon what the organization as a whole produces, not what any single individual produces. Therefore, it's important to get everyone involved.

Secondly, there are people in any organization, particularly in a university, who know a whole lot more than a president of the university knows about that individual's own specialty.

✓ So, one of the basic principles in a good management model, as I saw it, was that responsibility was delegated as far down the channels as possible, as close as possible to where the action took place. In other words, to the

individuals who knew most about that particular aspect of the organization's activities. If responsibility is pushed down there, then authority to carry it out has to go with it or it's not possible to hold an individual accountable who doesn't have the authority to carry out the responsibilities [that] she or he has been assigned.

And so, this kind of model was one that I had visions of being able to develop, or I thought was in the process of being developed at UCI. It didn't really develop that way. We had it to some extent but not completely. Those were in the early days. Then I think that everyone--you included, as the first Dean of Humanities--were really, in a sense, struggling for a model that would encourage our development as rapidly as possible. The fact that Irvine is achieving so much nowadays indicates that, even though maybe we struggled a bit in those days, we came out very well.

SM: We developed a good base. And if we didn't, we all knew, Roger, if we didn't have a strong base of very strong appointments, we never were going to make it in the . . . as you look forward ten, twenty years. And what's happened then, we are looking at our twenty-fifth anniversary coming up, that we really built a good . . . made a good foundation. Even Jim March . . . Of course, his model or organization, I swear, was to create chaos. Well, often it was so . . . it is still difficult. And they're going . . . The decision that I made at the beginning, which was to

develop departments, with graduate work and everything. So, now they're struggling and they are finally having, one after another, departments. They've got . . .

RR: I know. As you know, I was on a committee that was set up to examine the School of Social Sciences earlier.

SM: Oh, really?

RR: Yes. And that's another story.

SM: When was that? What date was that?

RR: Last year.

SM: I see. Oh, how interesting!

RR: ~~But, anyway,~~ we can talk about that later. But to sort of continue to develop an answer to the question you asked me about internal problems . . . All right. So, one problem, I think, was associated with ~~a~~ somewhat of a state of indecision as to what our administrative model should be. There were times when Dan would stand up, as you know, at the Academic Senate and say, "I make the decisions around here." All right. Now, that isn't really what Dan was thinking, as I knew Dan in personal conversations with him. At the same time, he wasn't quite willing to go as far as I would like to go. So, we had some significant difference of opinion about the administration.

~~All right,~~ so I think I'll leave the administrative side of things there. But you asked for problems generally. There were problems of getting good appointments, as you've mentioned earlier. They're absolutely essential to a great

university. You have to have great people. But you can also get into difficulties by just having great people without some kind of organization. May I mention . . .

SM: Yes, San Diego did that.

RR: I was just going to say that Bill McGill had been a very good friend of mine since he was a graduate student at Brown. ~~And~~ I remember a Regents meeting in Los Angeles when he called me up and said, "Let's have breakfast together." ~~And~~ at breakfast he said, "I'm going to announce my resignation as Chancellor at San Diego today." And I said, "Why?" "I've accepted the presidency at Columbia." I said, "Bill, are you out of your cotton-picking mind?" Columbia was having all sorts of problems overtly in those days.

SM: (laughter) Yes.

RR: Well, he said, "I'll tell you, there are two main reasons: more money and less trouble." ~~And that really . . .~~ The second of those really set me back because we hadn't heard of any difficulty at San Diego in those days. But the big difficulty internally was, as I think everyone discovered later, the appointment of a lot of great people who were individualists. And Bill was finding it very difficult to put together a coherent organization. I think that's probably still a problem down there.

In any event, to get away from the management side of things and to get to some of the specific problems, I had started to say something about the importance of appointing

individuals, really top-notch individuals, and we set about, certainly, to do that. I think that Jack's been particularly successful in the last few years on that score, but I don't think we ought to for a moment forget that some of those early appointments were also terrific.

SM: Yes.

RR: I remember very clearly incidents with people like Fred Reines. Fred was a particular joy to me. He would come back from one of those research sessions of his ~~and~~ two miles, or was it three miles, down in a gold mine in South Africa, looking for neutrinos.

SM: Neutrinos.

RR: And he would burst into my office, shut the door, go to my secretaries and say, "Cancel all his appointments!" And they'd get him a blackboard to tell me what had excited him during that last visit. Well, that was tremendous. I still think Fred ought to have a Nobel prize for what he did, you know? In any event . . .

SM: Yes, well, I was sad that . . . You know, the last one, [they] gave it to the person who had been working on neutrinos.

RR: Yes.

SM: (inaudible) and somebody . . . I think Fred said it to me. I said I was sorry that this guy was not him. And he said, well, he'd have to learn to live with disappointment.

RR: Yes. Well, I was expressing my personal view. Sherry Roland was another one, of course, in Chemistry. But they were all over the place. In Biology, we have some really top-notch people. It would be difficult to find a person better than Jim McGaugh in his field. Internationally today, he's as close to number one as you can get.

SM: Yes.

RR: And it shows up with his being elected a Fellow of the National Academy of Sciences recently.

SM: Yes, and that's exciting, Roger, because he's done his work here. We can say he's one of ours.

✓ RR: ~~Well~~, you know, that story is an interesting one, too, if you don't mind some personal anecdotes.

SM: Oh, no, no, no. That's what we want. You know, Jack said at the last one . . . He said, "Sam," he said, "find out what they don't have on the record. See if you can't find some stories or something that they don't have in the record." I said, "I'll try." (laughter)

✓ RR: ~~Well~~, you're not having much difficulty in getting me to come out and say what you want me to.

SM: No, I want to, but I have difficulty with some of them. They don't have them. Go ahead.

✓ RR: ~~Well~~, let me go ahead with Jim, then. I remember Jim very well because I was attending a scientific meeting out here on the West Coast when I was in Washington and Jim came up to me. He had just recently got his doctorate from

Berkeley. I was a member of a National Institute of Health committee and he asked me, "How do you go about getting a research grant?" And I sat down with him for some time and talked to him about it. Well, you know, Jim got that grant and he's had them ever since, and he's used them to . . . really, with great finesse. And I think we should be very pleased with Jim as one of our products.

Well, in Humanities, the same way. It had been very difficult--leaving you and me out of the discussion at the moment. It would be very difficult to have found a person better than Hazard Adams in his particular field.

SM: And Murray Krieger.

RR: And Murray Krieger. Those two also were very interested in administrative matters, as you probably very well know, but I don't know that story in any detail. But one could go the rounds and point out really outstanding people.

So, I think we started off with some good people and they have since developed to a point where they're not only good but they're great.

Now, there were other problems that were tied, in part, to organization, other than management. And that was the way in which the school had been put together in the first instance. I mean, the university, the campus, had been put together in the first instance. I happen to think that as long as it's small that model is a good one. That's the one that was set up at my university in Australia [Flinders

✓ University, Adelaide] and still holds, ^{and} ~~it's~~ ^{action} very good as long as you're small. But when you get too big, beyond a certain threshold point, I think it's difficult for it to function as it's intended to. But, in any event, we went ahead with that organization, but with problems. Let me mention a couple that still are here.

✓ When the whole matter of affirmative ^{action} came up, there was great pressure on campuses all over this country to set up Black Studies programs. Here's a fast reaction to pressures from the black community. And that's what happened to most of the campuses of the University of California. But we sat down--and I think you were involved in this as much as I was--we sat down and said, "Well, look, let's think longer.

✓ Let's think in a ~~more~~ broader sense about this whole matter of affirmative action." Not only are the blacks involved, but there are those we, in those days, called Chicanos and Orientals and a number of other minority groups that need ^{ed} attention as well. So, instead of setting up a Black Studies Program, we set up a Program in Comparative Cultures. I'll say a bit more about that in a moment, but that still existed after the Black Studies programs in most other campuses in the United States had disappeared, because the concept was a good one. There's a difference in a concept and its execution sometimes.

SM: Oh, yes, I know.

RR: But the concept was a good one and our capability of setting up programs on sort of a trial basis, before they became either schools or parts of schools, made it possible for us to do that for Comparative Cultures.

Another example was one that was very near and dear to the heart of Arnie Binder and, indeed, to me. That was the Program in Social Ecology. Arnie and I got together and spent quite a bit of time setting up a program, of which Jim March would have nothing to do. He didn't want it anywhere near the School of Social Science, as he saw it. So, the possibility of setting up a special program as a trial basis, to see whether it was going to work or not, made it possible for us to develop the Program in Social Ecology, which, I think you'll agree, is one of the real successes--unique successes--on this campus.

SM: No question about it. No question about it.

RR: And it had a big advantage, Sam, a tremendous advantage, from my point of view. Our relations with the community, as I said earlier, were in some difficulties at the time. Well, when this program was set up, one of the basic principles was that students in it had to get into community agencies. The first year, there was great skepticism on the part of social agencies, the police, the fire department, and so on, whether they should let any of those students from Irvine in. After one year, they began to include money for fellowship support in their budgets.

SM: Wonderful.

RR: And it really was a tremendous concept from the very beginning.

SM: I agree. I was elected Chair of the Academic Senate from 1978 to 1980 and, at that point, we were told no more buildings. Anybody above the 15,000 goes to Riverside, which was silly, because they'd go to Cal State Fullerton or Long Beach, which are very good and are not so far away. But I wrote to Governor Brown when they blue-penciled the Social Ecology Building, and next year it was put in. It was the only building we expected to get. It went right ahead. Have you been in the building?

RR: Yes.

SM: Very handsome. Very handsome.

RR: Yes.

SM: And Dan himself has an office space. Social Ecology was something he said he'd come to UCI . . . come to be Chancellor, but to have a program like this. (inaudible)

✓ RR: ~~Well~~, that's interesting you'd say that because it was developed as part of our academic program.

✓ SM: ~~Well~~, that's good. I'm glad to hear that.

RR: And we had good support from him, too. But it really began with Arnie Binder and, I think that Arnie would say, too, with me being involved in it from the beginning.

SM: Yes, indeed. I had a good interview with Arnie about a month ago. I had it on tape because I'm really interested.

I'm having Ellen Greenberger to my office on Friday, who was the second Chair of the Program in Social Ecology.

And, for instance, my personal feeling of it--I've always supported this Social Ecology--was that Arnie is a very good scholar. He's respected around this campus as a good scholar and not as a, you know, a fellow with wild ideas. So, when he put this forward, we said, "That's good. Arnie's going to run it and therefore it's going to have standards," and so on. So, I think the fact that Arnie was such a good academician, you know, as a scholar and a teacher, made just . . . The thing flew from the very beginning.

✓ RR: ~~Well~~, it had some birth problems, I must say, because there was no money for it, of course, in the budget. It didn't exist in the budget initially.

SM: Yes, (inaudible) money and . . .

RR: Oh, they found it. I found it.

SM: Had you?

RR: And I'll tell you some circumstances there, if you like.

SM: Yes.

RR: We had a bit of money, something . . . \$40,000 or \$50,000 or something--some small amount that could be allocated. We had free rein to allocate and all of that went to get that program to begin, to start it.

~~Well~~, I was Acting Chancellor when Dan was away and Arnie felt that he wasn't getting enough support. So, he

got his students to cable Dan. He got them to come into the Chancellor's Office--my office at that time--and he talked to the newspapers about how this great . . . this program of great potential wasn't funded adequately. And I can remember there were a couple of Oriental students. There was one very young fellow who started out being extremely sarcastic and so on. I told him, "Look, if you're going to talk this way, the meeting is ended." So, the other people got him to stop.

They were all very serious and very realistic. And I explained the situation to them. I was behind that program from the beginning. I helped to set it up. When March wouldn't let it go into a school, to be a department or a school program, I found another way to do it, okay, administratively. And, so, there at the very beginning there were some efforts made to put pressure on. ~~But as soon as we had a . . .~~ And, by the way, that had occurred before we'd even got our budget for the next year, and that budget had a line item for the development of the program.

So, one could tell a lot of stories of this kind but, generally speaking, these are the sorts of things you can expect in any organization, whether it's a university or industrial organization or some kind of social agency. And we had fewer of these to worry about, just as we had fewer difficulties with students. Now, that was very clear, and if that's an item on your list . . .

SM: Yes, it is.

RR: . . . why don't we talk about it now.

SM: This is how I stated it. It was, "Between 1969 and 1973, you were faced with continuous student agitation. How did you manage to keep things under control?" Because I remember the flag going up and down and your demonstrations outside your . . . sitting down outside your office, and your talking to them. It was a . . . The fact that you kept talking, I think, was something.

✓ RR: Well, ^{the} that's part of ~~that~~ model of administration that I talked to you about earlier. But I think there are two points I'd like to make here. One is, I think that the word "constantly" is not appropriate in your question. And, secondly, you have mentioned a couple of instances that I (inaudible). I don't think you can mention very many more. But let's get back to those.

✓ SM: Well, you've got Kent, Brannan, and Shapiro.

✓ RR: Well, we'll come to them later. They're faculty.

SM: Yes, okay.

RR: Okay. You mentioned the flag yo-yoing up and down on the flagpole. That was a very interesting incident and it shows how it's possible, despite the best of intentions--as Dan had at the time--to be snookered by people who are only interested in achieving their goals. They don't care about the truth. I had this happen to me at Indiana when ~~we were~~ . . . I was debating with some students in a public meeting

and one of the students got up and made atrocious statements. You know, anybody who had looked into the matter couldn't possibly help but recognize that they were falsehoods. I accused him of this and he very blandly said, "Oh, yes, I make them up as I go along just to emphasize my point." All right.

In a sense, that had sort of happened to Dan the night before the flag incident occurred. Dan had pressure from students, and I think a student in History, as I remember, was . . .

SM: Yes, probably Craig Harlan.

RR: . . . was the leader in it.

SM: Craig Harlan.

RR: I don't remember his name. And they came in furious because they said two students had been killed by the police at Berkeley. ~~And~~ they said the least we can do is to put the flag at half-mast. And, so, Dan agreed. But then he had to catch a plane to go to a meeting in Washington.

Well, later that night, I learned, first of all, that no students had been killed at Berkeley. Secondly, one person had, in fact, died. He had been drunk and fallen off a balcony and impaled himself on a picket fence or something while he was watching the demonstration. So, I was really unhappy about this and I called up one of the leaders I knew, a girl, and said, "Look, I want to see all of you people in my office at eight o'clock tomorrow morning."

And, when I did, I found out it was really so, that they had been shooting a complete line to Dan, and that really made me indignant. I said, "You realize you have lied to the Chancellor. He has taken action, assuming that you are telling the truth, and you've been lying to him. That flag must not be at half-mast today and, in addition to that, I want you when the Chancellor gets home, gets back here, to apologize to him for your behavior."

And most of the students, with one or two exceptions, were really chagrined because they had taken it for truth from whoever these people were, the leaders. And, so, what they did was say to me, "Well, how can we get in touch with the Chancellor in Washington by telephone?" I gave them a number. They called him up and apologized. Okay, okay.

Now, this is the kind of situation that we had at Irvine. Nevertheless, the few . . . small group of students who had started the whole thing with misrepresentation in the first place, went out and started to pull the flag down to half-mast. Well, then the ^{other} students . ^{and} the campus officers, who were very few and didn't have much authority anyway, started putting it back again. And, in addition to that, it got into the news. So, a squad from the Veterans of Foreign Wars marched onto campus saying that they were going to defend the flag of the United States, for which they had given their lives.

SM: No kidding!

RR: Yes.

SM: Oh, god!

✓ RR: ~~And~~, so, what happened was there was a bit of yo-yoing but not much. And that was a small incident. As a matter of fact, I had the leader of the VFW in to talk with [me] and we talked about the whole thing and I think we have some friends in the community as a result of it. But that's an incident that was, you know, really very small.

Now, another one involved the occupation of this building, the Humanities Building. And that interested me because . . .

SM: That was the Shannon . . . I mean Kent, Brannan, and Shapiro. That was over that and they occupied the . . . I was Dean and they occupied the Writing Center for about three days.

*Identify?
my wife
"your wife"* RR: Yes. But, if you remember, it was over a weekend and, on top of that, I know that Kay and, I think, Sally and some other wives were involved in bringing over blankets and cookies and coffee for those people who were sitting in.

SM: Yes.

RR: Oh, Sam, you know, you can't help but win under those circumstances. They were out by Monday.

SM: That's right.

RR: So, I really feel that we've had little difficulty. There are a couple of other incidents I remember.

SM: Well, let's hear them.

✓ RR: Well, one happened after . . . the day after the death of Martin Luther King.

SM: I was in New York then.

RR: Yes, well, that news came over the radio and the next morning I called a meeting in the plaza near the Library for . . . I've forgotten what time it was. I've still got the short speech that I wrote. And then several other people spoke as well. But, you know, the effect of that on the student body was . . . I couldn't walk down the campus without being hugged by someone for the next few days. And a similar sort of thing happened . . . It was giving them an opportunity to express their emotions and this, of course, was not looked at favorably by some members of the community. This is why we were called a cesspool. By the way, the person who called us a cesspool was a person who later on was found to have three illegitimate children.

SM: Oh, Schmitz.

RR: I wasn't going to mention names. And the kind of character that he was, it seems to me to have come out pretty clearly later on.

Anyway, another incident that is along these same lines was when Dan called a meeting of everybody--an open meeting--in Steinhaus Hall, I think it was--in a big lecture room, anyway--for a Sunday. I don't know whether you remember it or not. [Science Lecture Hall]

SM: Yes.

RR: I think it was a Sunday. . . . to talk about the events that were happening in Cambodia. You remember Nixon had approved . . .

SM: I was in Australia on my Fulbright.

RR: Yes. Well, Nixon had approved actions in Cambodia and everyone was horribly upset about that. And, so, to take the steam off and give people a chance to talk, we had a public meeting in which Dan spoke. I remember I spoke. And what I did, really, was to read a telegram that Kay and I had sent to Nixon the day before, decrying the attack on Cambodia. Well, other people spoke. After that meeting was over, Ralph Gerard wouldn't speak to me for several days. But, generally speaking, people really reflected the spirit of the whole population of this country in those days, which was: let's stop this futile business.

SM: Yes.

RR: You know, it's interesting. I had been a member of the Army Scientific Advisory Panel for about ten years.

SM: What's that called again?

RR: The Army Scientific Advisory Panel, through the Department of the Army--that's the top. And they had been advised by their intelligence experts that Vietnam type of operation had not ^{to} end. There wasn't a chance of winning it. If you drove every North Vietnamese into North Vietnam, you'd still have to have troops--as indeed we do. We have 45,000 troops along the border to keep them from coming back in. So, in

new any event, Sam, that's what . . . I'm sorry. I'm talking about Korea now, aren't I? Not Vietnam, but Korea. *So,* the basic point I want to make is that it would seem to me that we were using some really good tactics in those days of communicating, of not standing up like macho administrators and beating our chests and saying, "We make the decisions around here!" But saying, "Look, these decisions are going to affect you people as well as us. Our success as administrators is going to depend upon how well you people do in your individual jobs, so let's make this a mutual enterprise."

SM: Very good. Can you think of any other incidents?

RR: *Well,* you're talking about internal. Well, there are a lot of internal . . .

SM: No, I'm thinking mostly of the students.

RR: Students . . .

SM: Because there's no question in my mind that from time to time the press did not help us. Example, before I left for Australia on my sabbatical in January 1970, there was a--I think it was in December--it was Mao Tse-tung's birthday, if I remember. So, the students decided they were going to have a demonstration, that they were going to put the flag up, you know, (inaudible). So, out come the press, and there weren't more than fifty students. There could be more than fifty students there and they photographed it in such an angle, clever photograph, as though there were really a

very large group of students. There weren't. And they made some speeches and then they dispersed. The impression you got, you know, in the L. A. Times, Orange County section, that there was a big demonstration on Mao Tse-tung's birthday and the students spoke, blah, blah, blah, you see. The press definitely, as I said, gave an exaggerated picture.

✓ RR: Well, this happens all the time, because it's happening today.

SM: Doesn't it? Yes, I know.

RR: If one looks at the beginning of problems, serious problems, overt problems at Berkeley, one realizes that it started with seven people, as I remember, with . . . Oh, what was the name of that chap who was there in those days. But with four-letter words, parading up and down before, I'll say, Sather Gate.

SM: And Mario Savio.

RR: Mario Savio. At noontime or so, and getting the press there, taking pictures of all these students who were apparently involved in this parade. They were all sitting there eating their lunch. And it was just another example of, in fact, what can happen. By the way, what happened to Mario Savio? He wears striped suits, as I understand it. He was elected a member of the council of the city of Berkeley. ✓ Well, at least interesting things happen once you begin to mature.

SM: He's very traditional. He's joined the establishment. That's pretty good. Well, these are . . . If you can think of any as we talk, I'd like to hear them. But I would like your memories of Kent, Brandon, and Shapiro, because you played an important part in arranging . . . Kent and Brandon and Shapiro were dismissed, but Kent was kept but you arranged a changeover to Comparative Cultures.

RR: Yes.

SM: Well, sadly, you know what happened to him?

RR: No, what?

SM: Well, he was a brilliant teacher at the time.

RR: Yes, he was.

SM: He never did a lick of research though.

RR: No.

SM: Not a lick. And we couldn't . . . We in the History Department . . .

RR: That was his problem.

SM: So, he never did and he never did and he never did. But then his teaching began to go off. And last year . . . Well, he's had periods of drinking and things. His wife was a delightful person, a Chinese . . . named Minnie, left him. And, anyhow, last year--just six months ago--he was missing classes. Some students came to the paper, and one student was quoted as saying, "I thought he was a great scholar and was working on his book." This is in the New University [our student paper]. So, he was suspended

without pay. And they did it without pay because they figured he would have to resign to get a very considerable pension that he'd worked up over the years. And I met him. Apparently, he stopped drinking. I met him at the South Coast Plaza and he seemed to be in good spirits. But it's a sad story to be (inaudible).

RR: Yes. Well, I think that people generally felt that he had some considerable ability but he wasn't putting it to work. Now, there are other problems in regard to Shapiro. I don't remember then, ^{them} really. What was his story?

SM: Well, Brannan was a simple . . . I'll watch this [the tape]. We're going to have to turn it over. Brandon was a simple, acting assistant professor. You must finish your degree and get it in two years or you will not be continued. He didn't finish. He had his two years. He spent a lot of time with students, but the English Department felt all along that his Ph.D. thesis, his dissertation was a very interesting, promising one, if he would only get it finished. Well, he did eventually get it finished. I don't know where he's teaching. But he did write a very fine dissertation. I believe it's turned into a very successful book and he's--wherever he is--he's doing well.

RR: Well, I'm glad.

SM: Yes. Now, Shapiro I have no idea what's happened. I think he's not in the academic world. He really was a case.

✓ RR: Well, I can tell you a bit about that, too, because it had some interesting aspects.

SM: Yes, well, let's hear it.

RR: There were problems with Shapiro the other two didn't have, at least we didn't know that they had at those times. I think Shapiro was--well, at least it was alleged that he had had--oh, how should we put it? Had certain kinds of relations with students, as well as outside the class as well as in. But I don't know that. That I could not vouch for and that I paid no attention to, really.

He was also not doing his scholarly activity and he was very outspoken about his concerns. About that time, the students had asked if we could have on campus Carl Rogers from San Diego, who was in psychotherapy. Now, I've known Carl since World War II and when he was at Ohio State . . .

SM: I've read his book. I've read his book.

RR: And his client-centered therapy. But by the time he came to us, he was pushing what he called Gestalt therapy. Anyway, we had him up because he's a good, and a very nice person.

SM: Yes.

RR: So, we had him up and he gave some demonstrations and some talks here. As a result of that, the suggestion was made why don't we have a Gestalt session here in which we get the Chancellor and Shapiro together to see if we can't, if they can't understand each other better? And Dan, in good

spirit, agreed. So, we had a session. It went all night long. I was there.

SM: All night long!

RR: Oh, yes. In those sessions you're supposed to stay and then people speak freely. I've forgotten who was the leader. I think maybe Carl Rogers sent someone up from San Diego who was experienced at it. Anyway, I was accused of being a listener and not really participating, which I guess was right. But it was an interesting session which didn't really come to much, except it gave Shapiro a chance to express his position. And Dan had a lot of control over himself. There were times when I think he could have exploded if he had wanted to. In any event, the next day, at noontime or so, it was abandoned because no one seemed to be getting anywhere. But it was interesting that we got Dan to agree to do something like this, which I think gives us some idea of the kind of person and the kind of interest Dan had, basically.

SM: Oh, yes.

RR: Dan, I think, is basically a very nice person. Then I disagreed considerably on models of management, but . . .

(End of Side 1)

RR: . . . retired. But let's not talk about him [Ralph Gerard] unless we're going to do it later. Where were we?

SM: Did you have a (inaudible). Did they have a Festschrift published?

RR: For me?

SM: For Ralph.

RR: It was never published, but I wrote ²the paper.

(tape is turned off)

SM: Now, let's go on with Shapiro. Anything more that you can remember, except that Gestalt . . . Incidentally, Carl Rogers taught at San Francisco State when I was Dean. In fact, we invited him for a summer session, which was very successful and a good enrollment.

RR: Yes.

SM: Okay. Now, going on. After you finished with Shapiro . . . Then, I'm interested in how well your Committee on Privilege and Tenure worked. That Arnie told me--I mean, in the interview--he was Chairman of it, and they had a lawyer. I guess you knew Shapiro had a lawyer. And they started a hearing and Hazard came in and gave testimony, and they decided they would go on and they wouldn't . . . they would have dinner and then they would continue. They continued the whole way through, to about twelve o'clock, and finished it and it's never been questioned. Shapiro accepted the decision, which was that he should not be continued at UCI.

✓ RR: ~~Well,~~ those are always unhappy situations and that's why it's so important to do a really top-notch job of selecting in the first place, isn't it?

✓ SM: ~~Well,~~ I will say that [as Dean] I questioned Hazard [on Shapiro's appointment]. I said you've got a risk here

because he showed his paranoia or even (inaudible) on his behalf that he was a brilliant man, and Hazard chose to take the risk. Of course, good administrators do take chances.

RR: Oh, sure.

SM: And he took that one that didn't work. He took others that did work out. Now, I do want hear from you, Roger, on how well did you think UCI planned for the future? In other words, you left at a time when we had our plans but we were being told we can't carry them out. You always made the five-year plans, remember? Five-year plans and we kept changing them . . .

✓ RR: ~~Well~~, there was a period when . . .

SM: My question is how well do you think we planned for the future?

✓ RR: ~~Well~~, I think our plans for the future were based upon the concept of a great university, which means a university that covers most of the areas of knowledge. Hopefully, better than [as] Emerson once commented to Thoreau that Harvard taught all the branches of knowledge, to which Thoreau replied, "Yes, all the branches and none of the roots."

SM: I love that.

RR: Well, I think that we were trying, in the days I was here, always to look at ourselves as potentially a university with all the capabilities of a Berkeley. This is one reason why we put so much effort into a school of medicine. We had, certainly, plans for a school of engineering, which we were

✓ successful in carrying through. Whereas, Santa Cruz ^{even} had hired a Dean of Engineering ^{but} had to discard it. In those days, we had thought of a school of law and, so, I think we were trying to be an overall university. That was not possible in those days because the projections for student enrollments were such, for the University of California as a whole, that ^{they} it didn't justify it. That's why, for example, Santa Cruz got its School of Engineering taken away from it. It wasn't perceived that there was enough, really, demand to justify it.

✓ even!!!
And now, what has happened quite clearly is a very sizeable shift, not only in the demography, but also in the cost of education. It is reaching a point where California parents cannot afford to send their children to Stanford, to USC, to other places they might have sent them in the past. They (inaudible) and the ^{Claremont} Chapman group and so on. And so, a greater burden has fallen upon the shoulders of the University of California, and I think will continue to do so.

This has led to the present proposal that the university develop three more campuses. It also means, of course, that Irvine will be taking a much larger total of the students than was projected when you started, and even when I was here. I think you were right in saying we had about a 15,000 [student population] limit, something like

that. Now, I don't know what it is officially, but it'll be 30,000 before you get through.

SM: Well, we did start out with 27,500. I asked Clark Kerr why that number and he said that there really was no rationale, they just picked it.

RR: I remember that.

SM: And in that's my interview with him which was made back in 1967. Well, anyhow, then when you were Vice Chancellor we were told you've got to cut it back. It was to be cut back at 15,000. Now, we're going back to the 27,500, which we'll reach in the year 2005, the fifth year of the twenty-first century. And that planning is going on right now.

RR: In my experience, Sam, university planning is a continuous process.

SM: Oh, yes.

RR: It's affected by a lot of variables. And the University of California is affected by the very favorable situation, financial situation, for students who come here, plus the outstanding level of its academic achievements. The University of California has made a tremendous reputation for its research, its contributions to society, not only in agriculture and industry, ~~industrial~~, but in humanitarian social areas, and it will, hopefully, continue to do so. It, hopefully, won't go the way that Maggie Thatcher has shifted the British universities and the Australian

universities are going at the moment. They are becoming essentially political institutions.

✓ SM: Well, that brings me to the next question, ^{when did} ~~which~~ you became Vice Chancellor of Flinders University in Adelaide, South Australia, about 1973?

RR: Nineteen seventy-two.

SM: Nineteen seventy-two. I'll correct it. This means, of course, that you were the president. And I'd like to know what differences there were in the way in which Flinders was administered, as against that of the University of California campuses in 1972.

RR: ~~Well,~~ I think that the best place to start there may be to raise the question as to why I went there in the first place.

SM: All right. Why did you go there in the first place?

✓ RR: I went to this new university in ~~the state~~ of South Australia because of its state of development and of its potential.

One of the biggest problems I had faced here was getting the school of medicine in--the California College of Medicine, it was called--in as a school of medicine at UCI. This decision, I guess, had been made by the state legislature, just as the decision to use Orange County Medical Center as our hospital. It was not, in my opinion, made in terms of the ease with which a top-notch medical center could be established. The problems associated with

CCM were, in a sense, personally horrendous. A lot of the staff at that California College of Medicine, who were top-notch teachers, had to be told--and you know who had to tell them, me--that they did not meet the standards of the University of California as faculty members. Therefore, they had to come in some kind of ancillary position, if they came at all. It was a very difficult situation, indeed--a lot more difficult than starting at scratch and setting up a new medical center.

It was complicated further by the fact that we had planned for a hospital on campus, a teaching hospital. And some very powerful members of the community, whose name again I don't see any point in mentioning, queered that dream for us, exploded that dream for us. They had, and I had a number of conversations with them in the evenings at their homes and elsewhere . . . They had . . .

SM: Now, these are who now? These are . . . ?

RR: People in the community. Powerful people in the community. What they really wanted was for us to give them a plot of land at a dollar a year, on which they would build a private hospital that they might let us use for teaching purposes if they wanted to. In those days, private hospitals were making money and they saw this as another way of making money. Well, when we just said, "That's not going to suit us at all," they then queered us from having a hospital here. And we were forced, as indeed were Davis and San

Diego at about the same time, to take on the community-- sorry--the county medical centers.

These are impossible organizations, unless the county or the state will provide adequate support, because they are the places to which the indigents go for treatment. ~~And~~ they're the people who can't pay and there isn't money to reimburse for the cost of services to them. So, they're in a very difficult position and I think they will be as long as that state of affairs continues to exist. But what also is bothersome is that such a population of patients is not the best population in which to do a good job of teaching.

So, there were really problems associated with bringing medicine onto the campus. The people who came also had to make significant adjustments because they were used to a particular administration, of being autonomous, and now they couldn't be. They had to report to some character called the Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs.

In any event, the reason I'm mentioning this is because, if you put this difficulty together with my own interest in a particular model of management, I saw a new university in Australia ^{as} ~~was~~ providing both opportunities. I went there. I could set up my own model. I could build my own medical center. A medical school didn't exist. I was given a flat piece of land and you have seen the medical center we built on it.

SM: Yes, I saw it, yes. Oh, yes, yes. It's very, very interesting.

important
RR: And it meant we could plan it for the twenty-first rather than the ~~twentieth~~ ^{nineteenth} century. So, these were the ~~really kinds~~ ^{kinds of opportunities} of ~~appeals~~ that appealed to me very much.

✓ SM: ~~Well,~~ that's the real . . . When you were there, Roger, the way an Australian university is administered . . . I take it you had a Council, did you? A professorial board? How was Flinders run?

RR: The Australian universities have as many different methods of administration as there are universities. Now, Flinders was a relatively small university. It's up to, oh, 10,000 or so now. But the way we organized it was to minimize the channels of communication. You know, in a channel of communication, every time you introduce another nodal point, you introduce an opportunity for noise getting into the circuit.

So, the way it was organized was from the faculty on up to the University Council, which was legally the authoritative body governing the university. The steps were these: The individual faculty members were all automatically members of their school boards. We were divided into schools, a School of Humanities, a School of Social Science, a School of Biological Science, and so on. So, every individual member was a member of the board.

Members of the board elected their chairman, or dean, ^{who were} (inaudible) elected. Okay?

SM: Yes.

RR: Now, communication then was very easy within the school because everyone had his opportunity, or her opportunity, to contribute to discussion of any issue ^{at} ~~within~~ the school board meetings.

The decision of the school then went through one layer, really, of committees. It consists of an academic committee, on which the dean or the chairman of every school, plus elected members, participated. A . . . what do we call it? A budget committee that was . . . Or it was called a Finance and Buildings Committee, which was chaired by an outstanding financial expert from the community.

SM: Oh, from the community?

RR: Oh, yes. But it had members or representatives. All the chairmen of the schools were members of that committee. And then there was a committee, essentially, on personnel that, again, consisted of the chairmen of all of the schools. So, if you look at it, in terms of structure, ^{communication went} from the individual staff member ^{to the} school board, ~~this layer of committees~~ directly to council. So that only, really only one step between the individual staff member and the ^{legally} authoritative body.

SM: Yes. Now, tell me, is the Council composed of

administrators and faculty and outside people and some alumni?

✓ RR: Yes. Okay, it consists of some people appointed by the state legislature as their representatives--that's a small number.
✓✓ member.

SM: Yes.

✓ RR: Some people elected by the faculty. Some people elected by the alumni. And then there were some ex officio like the Vice Chancellor who is, as you know, the president or the Chancellor in British-style universities.

SM: Yes, yes. Yes, right, right, right. That's a very interesting model. Of course, then, I was enormously impressed, Roger, with that hospital that you did. Now, of course, in 1974 it wasn't there. When I got there in 1980 and came over very briefly, there was this beautiful hospital. I saw it again in . . . Where was I, then? In 1986 and 1987, I was over at Flinders a couple of times. And you remember. You came in and helped me with the Education Abroad students to come from Flinders.

RR: Yes, yes.

SM: That hospital was a very, very busy hospital.

RR: Well, that was a real joy and it was worth leaving here to go. I went there at a less salary, by the way, than I was getting here.

SM: I didn't know that. Oh, I didn't know that.

RR: That's right. But it was the opportunity to try to put some concepts and ideas into effect that brought me there.

SM: Yes, yes.

RR: Now, all of them didn't get into effect. We had some problems with the community. They would say to me, for example, when they were building the hospital, "Well, that isn't the way they do it at the Royal Adelaide Hospital." Well, the Royal Adelaide Hospital has been in existence since 18-something or other. And I finally got to the point of saying, "Yes, and that's why the Royal Adelaide Hospital is a nineteenth-century hospital."

SM: (laughter) That's right.

RR: And the people at the Royal Adelaide encouraged me to say that because they very much wanted to change.

SM: (inaudible)

✓ RR: So, we had representatives from the School of Medicine and the hospital at the University of Adelaide helping us and supporting us all the time. It was good. We didn't get everything we wanted, but we got a great deal of it.

One of the main reasons why we got off to a fast start was through an interesting contact that I had had earlier. When I was at University College, London, a professor of architecture had been involved in the re-design of all that devastate, bombed-out area around St. Paul's Cathedral in the central part of London.

→ Carry on

And he was interested in general design, architectural design, of utilitarian kinds of buildings, including hospitals. So, he'd been very clever. When computers came in, he got plans of hospitals from little places in the middle of Africa to big hospitals in New York City and had divided them down into the percent of the total space allocated for obstetrics and gynecology, medicine, surgery, psychiatry, and so on, and found, interestingly enough, that percentage-wise there was a relatively small variation.

SM: That's interesting.

RR: So, we got a firm which he had established in London, architectural firm, to advise us on the Flinders Hospital--Flinders Medical Center, it was called--and that meant that instead of spending two or three years, bringing in experts and arguing about how much space everybody should get, we could start right off, right off.

SM: Yes, wonderful. You'd be interested, Roger, in the new science library, which will go up where the credit union . . . on the spoke of the wheel between Bio Sci, or Steinhaus Hall, and the Medical School. And that science library, the architect is a man--I think it's Sterling--he's a very famous Englishman, and he's . . . If I can dig up the model, I will. I've got a picture of it. He's a very imaginative man. It's going to be a wonderful building. I'm just worried. I hope there'll be enough money involved.

You've probably noticed that the state all of a sudden found a surplus. Did you notice?

RR: Oh, I did. Being in Los Angeles, how could you help it? That was being counted on to solve the teachers' strike.

SM: Oh, that's right. That's right. Well, anyhow, that building will be wonderful when it's built. And it's an English architect.

But we can just wrap this up now, Roger. What impressions do you have, really, of UCI now and its future? And any words of advice to the historian, which is I?

✓ RR: ~~Well~~, I think that, you know, Sam, that the success of the campus here at the University of California, Irvine, has recently been just beautifully portrayed in ^a ~~this~~ special issue of the Los Angeles Times Orange County supplement, "UC Irvine, the Buzz-Word is Destiny."

SM: Yes, and I love it, you know.

RR: And that's a beautiful job for whoever did the PR ^{that} ~~on this~~.

✓ But what to me is beautiful about it is ^{that} it shows how the university is behaving in an innovative sort of way. A lot of the emphasis is on what happened earlier ~~on~~ that formed the foundation of the present development, ^{perhaps} perhaps not as much as I would like to see given to the future, and what the planning is now. And, also, I think that a great deal of credit for what is summarized in here belongs not only to Dan but to you and a lot of other people who were here at the beginning, maybe a bit of credit to me, too.

SM: Oh, yes, definitely, definitely.

RR: . . . that doesn't, of course, appear here in this kind of document.

SM: Yes, yes.

RR: But I would think that it would be very exciting to be on the faculty at the University of California, Irvine at the moment.

SM: I think it would be interesting, Roger, if you and I and the others had really forced the Regents to get us our faculty housing earlier. One of the great reasons for our breakthrough of getting these very outstanding people was their being able to build their house on the campus on land which they don't have to pay a nickel for, just like . . . It's just the Stanford plan--identical. And that's one thing which made . . . We got three Psychobiologists--some people who were very important and another to the medical school. And they would never have come if they hadn't been able to build their own house.

RR: Yes.

SM: The second thing that I think has made a big change is this breakthrough on the possibility of high tech offices and industry being built all around our campus, instead of like at Stanford [where] they're all at the south end, just off the campus--all the high tech people. I'm amazed at this new breakthrough. The Irvine Company permitted this. There was a clause, you know, which forbade us to build anything

like that, and they changed it about ten months ago. Or, maybe it was a year ago. And this fellow Bren has given us some money to have these Bren Fellow Professorships, all the high tech people coming in. Have you read about that?

RR: Yes. Well, I don't know very much about it, (inaudible) here.

SM: Well, it's all very exciting. It's all (inaudible). And I think those two things. But, you know, you and I wondered, too, when are we ever going to get our Town Center? When is it every going to be built? And it was put off and it was put off and it was put off. And I'll tell you one interesting thing. The last year I was Chair of the Academic Senate we had a meeting. I represented the faculty and we met with the Irvine Company. When are we going to get . . . What are the plans for the Town Center? And they came up with something pretty good. Jim McGaugh was Vice Chancellor during this period. And, at the end . . . half-way through, you could see it was so different (inaudible) at the beginning of the meeting (inaudible). And so, Roland Schinzinger, an engineer--he was representing the faculty in Engineering--he said to Periera. And he said, "Bill, what do you think of this new plan?" And Periera, you know, he sits regally for awhile, and then he sat up and (inaudible) he said, "It's so different from what we had originally thought that I will have to think about it."

Now, he wasn't putting on. He really wasn't putting us off.

He was really, you know, saying, "My god, what's going on?"

✓ RR: Well, I had heard the stories, even when I was here, that the Irvine Company, being rather a conservative group in itself, had decided that they didn't want to have the Town Center anywhere near a place where they had all those radical students tramping around. And, you know, if anyone had any sense and had bothered even to come to look here, they would have seen . . . As I used to tell these service organizations, "Look, where do our students come from? Ninety-five percent of them are from your homes. They went to your schools. They grew up in your churches. Now, don't tell me that we're responsible for their personalities."

SM: Yes. Now, one member of the Irvine Company told me . . . He said, "We were going to move our offices--our headquarters into the Town Center that weekend. And on Monday somebody burned down the Bank of America." No, they could never pin it on our students, but somebody did it.

RR: Yes.

SM: Well, that's right. Well, thank you very much, Roger. This has been a very productive session.

END OF INTERVIEW