

INTERVIEWEE: ARNOLD BINDER
Professor of Social Ecology

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

DATE: April 21, 1989

FINAL
DRAFT

SM: All right, Arnie. This is an interview with Professor Arnold Binder, Professor of Social Ecology. It is Friday, April 21, 1989. And, first of all, Arnie, who recruited you for UCI?

AB: Of all people, it was Julian Feldman. Julian and I both had been consultants to something called the System Development Corporation. Are you familiar with that, SDC?

SM: Yes.

AB: And Julian had started as a consultant to that, coming from Berkeley. I gather that he was a faculty member there, I assume.

SM: That's correct.

AB: And I was at Indiana University and they'd bring me out every summer and then sometimes during the year. Now, I say this as an aside. You don't care about this about the UCI history, but with the consulting fees I got from them, plus their per diem, my salary for the summer was higher than my full academic year salary at Indiana University. (laughter) So, I went out every summer, of course, and I'd be in the research directory so I could actually do original research, too. And that's where Julian was a consultant, too, to SDC over the years, and I got to know him fairly well.

Now, the first time he asked me if I happened to be interested in coming here, I said, "No, I'm fairly happy." Just a year before that, I did have an offer from UCLA. Remember, those were the old days when you got a call and they'd offer you. You didn't have to go through the hassle that you do now. But I had turned down UCLA. But my life had changed. I mean, that was the preliminary to a divorce and so forth, and I was ready for something new. So, with Julian, we were at a meeting--Sam, I exaggerate not--in the men's room meeting in Niagara Falls. (laughter) And Julian said, "Arnie, are you interested in coming out to UCI?" and Julian had been very close to Jim March, of course. They had been working together. And, at that time, I said, "Julian, I am." And that's when it started and it led to here. Again, I exaggerate not, three months . . . Do you know a guy named Bill McGuire? Does that name mean anything to you? He was head of the Academic Senate at UC San Diego and then he became Chancellor there.

SM: Not McGuire, you mean . . .

AB: McGill, McGill. I'm sorry, McGill. It was McGill.

SM: Right, (inaudible)

AB: Right, and what he . . . Three months after I accepted here, he happened to see me at some other meetings, and a guy--another chap who you wouldn't know--Norman Anderson, and happened to be saying, "Arnie, we're starting to process you for a possible offer from UC San Diego." He said, "You

can stop it now. I've already accepted Irvine." But just think, if I'd just been delayed.

SM: Yes, that's interesting. Bill McGill . . . I came across this--it's not confidential--I came across this in Personnel and we sent up Bill McGill. We processed him. Of course, we had to give an equal (inaudible). In those days, it had to be equal, and San Diego or UCI, and he chose San Diego.

AB: Isn't that interesting.

SM: Yes, then he went to . . .

AB: He was at Columbia before that.

SM: Yes, he went to Columbia. He passed us up, went to UC San Diego, was head of the department, and then became head of the Academic Senate.

AB: That's what I say, he was Chair of the Academic Senate.

SM: And he did such a good job as head of the Academic Senate, he became Chancellor.

AB: Right. I saw Bill on an airplane, oh, golly, about eight years ago after . . . He went back, you know, he became president of Columbia after that.

SM: I know.

AB: And I said, "Bill, why the heck would you do that?" and he said, "You know, having spent all those years in New York, how could you resist being head of Columbia?" I don't know how happy it was for him or not.

SM: I don't think it was.

AB: But your saying that is an interesting reversal. Of course, I didn't have both of them back-to-back. I had chosen Irvine before they had processed that.

SM: And the second question, what did you know about the program? In other words, Julian Feldman had clued you into the whole thing?

AB: Yes, and my areas were mathematics, statistics methodology, and psychology, and I knew that this was highly quantitatively oriented and it would be very appropriate for me. Of course, that's why they were interested in me, why they were interested in McGill because McGill was a quantitative psychologist, too. So, interesting enough, so was Dick Atkinson. Did you know that? Dick Atkinson was a mathematical psychologist . . . the current Chancellor at UC San Diego.

SM: Yes, that's . . . Here he is. I'm going down there this weekend. Dick Atkinson, he's John Galbraith, who was Chancellor from 1964 to 1968, who is a very famous historian in my field, (inaudible), he was then . . . He did a tremendous work for the library. He said to all the scientists, "Look, you're getting these very large grants." This was a wonderful . . . you know, 1964 to 1969. Everybody was getting them.

AB: Yes.

SM: He said, "I'm going to take X amount of money from your

grant and buy books for our library." Well, they didn't like it, but they . . .

AB: Of course, they would not.

SM: And on the other (inaudible) shot up way ahead of us, and so there on Sunday they're dedicating a room in Revell College, which is a library, to the . . . called the Galbraith Hall, and I'm going there.

AB: Oh, yes. So, you'll see Dick there.

SM: So, I'll see him. I (inaudible) realize you'll say hello to him.

AB: His wife's name is Rita, Dick and Rita. Oh, yes.

SM: Were you here when that incredible lady from Harvard accused him of fathering a, or wanted . . . did she father a child or . . . He insisted she should father a child.

AB: I know much more about it than I can actually say, Sam. I know that well and much more.

SM: Okay. Well, now, what about the program? You knew the program from (inaudible).

AB: I knew it was quantitative-oriented, orientation, and, of course, I had contact with Julian.

SM: And did you come . . . Were you set up with a research cluster?

AB: I brought my research with me. I had a major grant from what is now the National Institute of Health, the old Public Health Service. And I brought my . . . They let me . . .

Not only did I transfer the grant here, which was substantial, but they . . .

SM: Oh, it was considerable.

AB: . . . the grant here, plus all my equipment from Indiana University.

SM: Wow.

AB: That was all part of the deal, that Indiana did release it. Apparently that's part of the agreement when they were federal grantees, see, of the major, principle So, I brought it here and set up a full lab here, a fully automated lab. So, essentially I set up my own research cluster.

SM: Oh, that's fascinating.

AB: Yes.

SM: That's fascinating.

AB: At that time, and now, you know, they give big amounts of money for setting up your laboratory. I brought mine with me. All they did was give me the room.

SM: Yes, and you set it up.

AB: And I set it up, yes.

SM: Did you have anyone join you later?

AB: Faculty members. I had a whole bunch of students who had (inaudible).

SM: You had your regular students?

AB: Yes.

SM: Now what about . . . I'm fascinated with your program in Social Ecology. I'm one of it's cheerers, cheerleaders, and I never quite understood why Jim wouldn't have helped you set it up within his school. That's (inaudible).

AB: Well, at the beginning he was. Let me give you a little background you probably don't know. Being statistical, quantitative, methodological, I could work in a number of areas in the behavioral sciences because the methodology was the same; and while at SDC, and I was a consultant there for about ten years, you know, maybe even more than that, but at least ten years and the . . . (tape is turned off)

See, I was speaking about this consulting at SDC. Well, this had nothing to do with SDC, but I happened to be at a meeting of the American Psychological Association, had gone through the displays, and I passed something on accident prevention of the Public Health Service. A guy looks at my tag and he said, "Arnold Binder! I know your work in this methodological analysis and I want people like you to be doing research in accident prevention. Why don't you prepare a grant?" I remember that so well. Well, of course, you don't know how serious when you take that, but eventually I did write a grant proposal and was funded, and I had the funding not come to the university but to me at SDC because they had certain kinds of laboratory equipment that I could use there. So, I got a \$100,000 grant, which was a lot in those days.

SM: Oh, yes.

AB: Oh, that's \$100,000 in, God, was it? What year was this? Nineteen sixty-seven, so it was a lot of money then. And I worked on accident prevention. Remember, I was a quantitative psychologist. I was an experimental psychologist. That's what my other big grant was.

And then something else came along. Somebody approached me and said, "Would you be interested in doing some of the methodological analysis in biometeorology?" Well, I didn't even know what biometeorology was, so they had me read it and I prepared a proposal in that area, which got a small grant.

So, I had funding in accident prevention and biometeorology, and I was a faculty member here at that time. I came here in 1966, but still doing the consulting at SDC. And it occurred to me, now here's . . . these are applied areas that are strongly interdisciplinary, accident prevention and biometeorology, but we don't have an educational program at UCI appropriate for that.

I don't know if you have gotten this from other people, but at that time, you know, Jim would not tolerate any sub-units. But, eventually, we formed interdisciplinary sub-units and I was the head of the sub-unit called the Program of Mathematical Models in the Behavioral Sciences. Has that come out anywhere?

SM: No, not yet, not yet.

AB: Or, our short name was the Formal Models Program. That is, all the more mathematically oriented people in the School of Social Sciences were presumably together. You can call that the . . . We got a note in our boxes, typical Jim March style, one day dissolving us all. So, we're out of business. That Jim! (laughter)

But nevertheless while we had those, I said, "Jim, why not get an applied program that would be very interdisciplinary, and we would have . . . I'd have the opportunity for getting Ph.D. students who work in applied areas, because I like what I'm doing in biometeorology, I like what I'm doing in accident prevention." Although my laboratory in pure experimental psychology was still going on, so I had those two sides. Jim's response at first was warm endorsement. He said, "Arnie, that's the kind of thing that would fit in very well. Let's form another program," like program in Formal Models or Mathematical Models Program, "and call it Applied Behavioral Sciences." So, I had Jim's endorsement.

I don't remember when, but say two or three weeks later, he changed his mind. He didn't want it. I think he attributed some gamesmanship to me. Sam, I don't know exactly. As much as I object to Jim in terms of him as an administrator and some of his nutty ideas, he's a very nice man and he really wouldn't deliberately hurt anybody. He did that, nevertheless. So, I don't attribute it to any

evil or any mischievousness, but some reason convinced him that he should not be endorsing it. So, Roger Russell, of course, was the Vice Chancellor and, Roger Russell being an old friend--as you know, in my case--so, I approached Roger and Roger said, "Yes, that sounds like a good idea." That was typical wishy-washy Roger. I never got anywhere with him.

But the initial idea occurred in 1968 to have a program that was going to be strongly interdisciplinary and not be ashamed to work on community problems in the applied behavioral social sciences. So, for some reason, you'll probably get . . . Dan may not remember this--Dan Aldrich . . . Dan called a meeting of key people--that he considered key people on the campus--I don't remember if Sam was there. You may have been there, but we were sitting around, you know, on the fifth floor of the Library Building and that big table, we were all sitting around.

SM: (inaudible)

AB: And you may have been there at a different meeting time or whatever.

SM: Yes.

AB: And he said, "What's going on on this campus that's exciting, that I should know about?" At that time, I said, "Look, Dan, this idea has occurred to me and it's an applied orientation with strong interdisciplinarity and Jim has rejected it. Roger says he's interested but nothing has

ever happened." So, Dan's response orally at that time was, "Why don't I ever hear about that thing?" The next I had heard, that Roger called me to his office because he got a note from Dan . . .

SM: A yellow paper, yes.

AB: Yes, and it said, "I want you . . ." and this I'm distorting a little because I don't remember exactly. I shouldn't say distorting, but it may be there's some distortion in this. Essentially, "I want you to do something." This I'm not, because the second sentence is, "This is one of the reasons I came to UCI." See, he was talking about the land grant institution where the institution is oriented to work on community problems. So, Dan's endorsement moved it from stagnation of an idea in my mind . . .

SM: Thank you. This is all . . . See, I have talked to Jim March, but it's way back in 1971 or something.

AB: Oh, yes.

SM: And he wasn't about . . . He didn't want to talk about Social Ecology. I'd like to go up and see him again. See, I'm reinterviewing. I interviewed twenty-eight people in 1974.

AB: Oh, my.

SM: From Clark Kerr on down through Dean McHenry who was Dean of Campus Planning, to Dan, to the Vice Chancellors, to the Chairs, and I mean all the key people, including like the young . . . What's his name? Not (inaudible) who was . . .

I can see his face. Who started out the computer work. He went up to Oregon.

AB: Oh, yes, a very short name.

SM: That's right. Well, no matter, I'll think of it in a minute. Anyhow, I think I might reinterview Jim March. I don't know. He likes to play games.

AB: Jim does. He does like to play games. That's part of his style.

SM: And I'll ask him, and the question, he'll play a game with the question and it thoroughly annoys me.

AB: He may not want to say why he didn't support it at that time.

SM: Yes.

AB: But your later question . . .

SM: Well, I'll tell you my interpretation of his reason. I figured that he didn't want somebody with really as good a . . . Fear, really is one. He didn't like anyone who really challenged him and who was as good as he was intellectually. Secondly, he did not appreciate or want to understand interdisciplinary work. When I set up . . . Two examples, I wanted to set up Latin American Studies.

AB: Yes.

SM: And I wanted to use the social scientists and the economists and the great Lou Hanke was here with us and he worked like a dog and they got . . . mentioned it in Spanish and I think Henry Cord Meyer and myself worked some on

History side, and we had a really good Latin American Studies.

AB: Yes.

SM: He turned it down. Now, secondly, or thirdly, I was really wanting to get Linguistics off the ground. I didn't want the Linguistics to be attached to each department, which I regret to say is now happening. They're all going to (inaudible) that's where you get all sorts of fights and god knows, you know. Washington Seattle blew up the Spanish Department over the Linguists there. There were other departments around the country. Linguists are difficult to get along with, and so I wanted it separately. And he's got some good ones, you know, as you know, over there.

AB: Sure.

SM: And so, I went to him and I said, "Gee, Jim, let's put up a new discipline. Let's have a real good Linguistics program. In fact, if you and I together, if you want to get a big name chairman, a really big shot that will . . . so we won't have any damn, petty fights and things, where this man can watch the whole thing and be so respected that we'll get the Linguistics program off the ground." He didn't want it and didn't do it. I went ahead and set up my linguists for our Linguistic program and I made them a separate program.

AB: Oh, yes.

SB: As you know, Mary Key and all those other people.

AB: Sure.

SM: So, anyhow, that's my theory.

AB: And the university is paying a price for not having gone in that direction.

SM: Oh, I agree. And I said to Roger, "Here's your chance. Let's pull in some big name in Linguistics." And, well, that's my feeling about Jim and I, obviously, it's been my theory because I haven't talked about it to you. I'm talking about it to you now and I haven't talked about them to others, except, you see, you put up a really interesting program which Dan really liked. And I know that because I wrote a letter when Governor Brown turned down our [Social Ecology Building.] Did you ever see the letter I wrote as Chair of the Academic Senate?

AB: No.

SM: Oh, yes. Ellen Greenberger said she read a part of it to her department--you might have been away--and I said something to the effect that this is a great program and I quoted Dan, you know, he (inaudible).

AB: Oh, yes.

SM: And I said we need that building and I said it's . . . So, I was really strong, so I did get a sort of a sub-secretary or something giving me an answer. But, nevertheless, it's such a successful program.

AB: But, really, as I say, Dan is the critical one. But, in answer to your later question, would it have been in Social Sciences? Of course, that was my . . . I had no thoughts,

no plans. I didn't even know how to go about getting a separate program. My intent was to make it a department eventually in Social Sciences.

SM: (inaudible)

AB: And that was . . . and I had no other thoughts. It was Roger who initially suggested that. But, typical Roger, he didn't do anything about it. But when Dan sent him that note and Dan said something like, "This is the reason I came to this campus," that was strong. Things started moving. Now, then I had to get it approved by . . . Graduate Council, of course, turned it down.

SM: Did they?

AB: Oh, yes. Oh, their typical . . . They didn't turn it down. Turned down my proposal and said I'd have to modify it in this way and then, remember, we had the Program on Interdisciplinary Studies, or something.

SM: That's right. That's right.

AB: It was a Senate committee. It had to go through that committee. But I had a very friendly chair of that one, and, while they . . . of course, they had me rewrite it. The critical issue that I almost withdrew it came over this.

Now, you might . . . God, so much should have been pulled for what some of this you can use.(??) Why is it Social Ecology succeeded whereas a lot of these other programs that came about in the late sixties or early seventies did not? And I think one of the critical factors

is I'm a deep-down, traditional academic. I did not want to go in kooky directions. So, if they're going to do field study, they had to write reports. They had to use the . . . They had to show--which they do to this day--had to show how they're using the academic knowledge that we consider important in their field placement, whatever it happened to be.

Now, I believe that was critical for two reasons. One, we had a very strong academic orientation from the first and I think other people respected me. See, I wasn't one of the kooks who was doing this, but I can handle mathematical problems as much as the best. So, I had that going for me, in terms of survival for this, and a lot did not. Well, now, I'll tell you this one incident later on, because I want to finish the absolute launching of it, in terms of the committees.

Nobody was ornery. Remember, there was sort of a kindly group here, but they're typical academics. They want to be satisfied. And one--this was the critical thing that I had to overcome because I would not accept--they, like typical academics, they wanted to make sure . . . They wanted all appointments to come through some established department. They did not want this interdisciplinary . . . No, I shouldn't say . . . not interdisciplinary. It's the inter-something-or-other committee, remember? Intercurricular or something committee. There were three of

us: Computer Science and Comparative Culture and Social Ecology were under it.

SM: Inter-Programs.

AB: Something like that. Well, you'll find that, whatever it is.

SM: Well, I've got it here, see, it was in the catalogue.

AB: Sure. And it was quite an active committee. They wanted all appointments to be made in an established department or school and I wouldn't accept that. I wanted full status, the equivalent of any, and if I hadn't won that, we would not have Social Ecology.

SM: You would have lost it, yes.

AB: I would not go ahead. Because then we would not have control of our own fate. There would be other ones. Can you imagine where I had to have all my faculty members appointed within Social Sciences to come here or approved by Social Sciences to come. I couldn't do it. So that eventually--I don't remember who it was--I think Jonas may have been an . . . He's a very kindly individual.

SM: Who?

AB: Jonas.

SM: Oh, Jonas. Was he [Schultz] Graduate Dean or what?

AB: No, this is before he was Graduate Dean, but I think he was on the Graduate Council, I think, in terms of . . .

SM: Oh, (inaudible), yes.

AB: Yes. Well, nevertheless, I did win that, that we could be a fully independent unit reporting to the--like you did as Dean of Humanities--reporting to the Vice Chancellor, which was the ideal for me, and at that time, well, I sat, as you know, on the Dean's Council with everybody else. But that was, to me, nonnegotiable. If they wouldn't allow that, I didn't feel we could make it. But that really was critical. I have no idea what Dan was doing behind the scenes because my interactions with him were minimum at this time. Certainly, every time I'd see Dan he'd give me the kind of emotional support that was helpful, but whatever he did was behind the scenes, if he did anything. Remember, this was the Senate part of it and he wouldn't have much to do with that. But how he was handling Roger and so forth, I don't know.

SM: (inaudible) and that (inaudible).

AB: And Roger would not move without that push. Despite being a friend and so forth, Roger just, as you know, didn't take chances on anything. Eventually, we did get approved by . . . and then, at that time, this was 1969--the idea occurred to me in 1968--it was late 1969, that it was going to the meeting of the Senate. Remember, we didn't have representative assembly then. It was everybody who wanted to could come.

SM: Oh, yes.

AB: So, what I did, it was a, you know, small group. I called every one of my friends to make sure that I'd have a majority. Something like, and you'll have the exact number, but as I recall, something like fifty-two or fifty-four came. I must have invited thirty-five of them to the . . . You know, I couldn't take a chance of it being approved that they voted (inaudible).

SM: Yes.

AB: It was . . . So, it went to the Senate with the name, the Program in ~~Applied Behavioral--Applied and Life Sciences--~~ that's right. And if it were in Social Sciences, it was going to be Applied Behavioral Sciences. When I was looking for it to be a separate program, I went into the Senate as the Program in Applied Life Sciences. It was approved unanimously by that, but Keith Justice got up, not in an unfriendly way, and objected to the name.

SM: He might have been the Chair of the interdisciplinary group.

AB: Keith could have been. I don't know.

SM: He was for a time.

AB: But what he said . . . Sam, this was not unfriendly. He said, "To Biological Sciences, Applied Life Sciences means Applied Biological Sciences, and, Arnie, that's not what you mean." So, the committee--not the committee, the whole Senate--approved it with the stipulation that I'd have to come up with an acceptable name within two weeks.

SM: Oh, my gosh.

AB: And so I had . . . At that time, I was the only faculty member, of course, involved in it. So, I met with all the students and a couple of other people who were interested. Arthur Boughey was one who drifted in with us.

SM: Yes, (inaudible).

AB: And he came to some of the meetings and perhaps somebody else. I don't remember. What name shall it be? And at one of those meetings, Social Ecology. Why not Social Ecology? And everybody said, "Yes! That's a good choice." And we submitted that and that was approved. But that came after approval because we . . .

SM: See, this is all good history for me. If you ever written it up?

AB: Never have. Sam, I've been planning to do it so many times, of doing this, but never have.

SM: I keep telling the people I interview now it's time you wrote it up . . .

AB: Yes, Sam, I've wanted to do it so many times because, you know, we are of international fame now.

SM: And, of course, I'll have it in because I think it was a very important and interesting program, one of the most important and interesting programs. I'll have you know I get many students from Ecology over to my History courses.

AB: Oh, yes.

SM: And they invariably are good, good students.

AB: Oh, yes.

SM: I'm very happy to have a Social Ecology student come. Some cynics say, oh, they're all Humanities majors who didn't want to take the foreign language requirements. (laughter) But I think it goes much beyond that.

AB: Oh, yes, especially we have such . . . I mean, we have such . . . like our Betty Olson's students are quite laboratory, biologically oriented. They're closer to Biology than they are to any Social Sciences now, in terms of that.

SM: Yes. Now, then, as the founding Director--this is question six--how did you make the necessary decisions for staffing and courses? You really have said that once you got the full line of appointment, that solved the staffing. And the courses, of course, you must have had a committee or something.

AB: Oh, I had to in order to get it through the committees. I had to make proposals. That is, the committees . . . I have . . . It's interesting when you say "write this up," I have a lot of these documents of my proposals to these committees and the areas we would cover in the proposed courses are in many of these.

SM: Well, may I ask a favor, Arnie? Could you send me a xerox of, say, one or two of those?

AB: Sam, that'll be no problem at all.

SM: Because I really would like to, you know, as I write it, I like to look at these raw data.

AB: Some of these would even been in my own handwriting, prepared for the committees, but that's no problem. I can get that to you.

SM: Well, now, moving forward into the early seventies, what do you consider your major successes?

AB: Oh, you mean in the seventies?

SM: In the seventies, when you were Chair, when you were Director.

AB: Well, a major success was when Hazard Adams took over as Vice Chancellor. Hazard Adams being a very cool individual and very difficult to warm up to, and I had interacted with Hazard on many committees and mostly I guess we disagreed more than we agreed. I think that's not an unfair statement. But something that I didn't know at the time that I reconstructed afterwards was of significance. Do you remember the--well, you couldn't miss it, you were Dean at the time--the Schapiro thing?

SM: Oh, yes. (inaudible)

AB: Well, he went to the Welfare Committee, Privilege and Tenure

SM: Privilege and Tenure Committee.

AB: And guess who was Chair of P and T?

SM: Who?

AB: Arnie, on the Schapiro Case. So, now, I didn't know all this, but I was Chair of the Schapiro Case and I knew the sensitivity of it. So, I invited an attorney from Los

Angeles and I said--Cree something or other--and he came down and I said, "It's very important for you to make sure this is handled right so that we can minimize appeals," and what I did is I said, "I think this could drag out for months and I don't want it to. So, it's my ruling that we'll continue the hearing until it's terminated." So, we started at two in the afternoon and finished at two or three a.m. We had dinner brought in for it and then I stayed up after that, wrote my report, and, of course, then submitted it to the other members of the committee, and had it approved. And I gather that was so effective it got rid of him and no appeals in the process, and I really think, and, Sam, I didn't have any idea that that lingered--the effectiveness with which that was handled--in Hazard's mind. And he had a positive attitude. I didn't have any idea. That was reconstructed afterwards, mind you . . .

SM: I'll tell you why that's interesting and I'll tell you why I think you're probably right. The reason is that I remember talking to you not long before you were sending up, going to send up some work to Hazard Adams on all your Social Ecology. And you said, "Sam, I don't know why they made him Vice Chancellor."

AB: I did say that.

SM: Yes, you said, "Why have they made him Vice Chancellor? I've had so many arguments with him and I just don't think

he has the right temperament and he doesn't have the right .
. . and no compassion," and on, and on, and on.

AB: Sam, it's . . . those are my feelings.

SM: And then what happened, he approved all the things you wanted. (laughter)

AB: Everything. We doubled our faculty in his first year of assignments.

SM: Yes.

AB: You got something like twenty-three new FTE to the campus. He gave eleven of them. That brought us from eleven to twenty-two in one year. Now, when he took over, and I have no idea what else happened, but he said, "Arnie, I want to understand Social Ecology. Let's have lunch." We had lunch and he said, "I want to know more about it," and we had lunch again. And then shortly after that they assigned the FTE. We got the eleven and then I thought about it afterwards. I said, "I'm not usually that charming." Then I thought back to the P and T, that he may have had a very favorable . . . since that time.

SM: Yes, he has a very accurate and long memory.

AB: Oh, yes. Well, in thinking back of the P and T, it really was handled very sensitive . . . I did . . .

SM: Oh, sensitive, oh, my!

AB: And, yet, as you know, it died down after that. Schapiro felt he had a good hearing and our report carried. So, nevertheless, that was the greatest success when Hazard, who

I thought was much to traditional to tolerate Social Ecology, accepted us as perhaps . . . acknowledged us as perhaps the most important development on the campus in getting us the bulk of the FTE. That is, over Humanities, over Social Sciences, we got eleven of about twenty-three in that first year. That moved us from . . .

SM: But it was the students, too, and the very interesting public relations work that was done by Social Ecology. And my memory is I would go over there, give out a description of my courses to your advisors. They're very good advisors over in Social Ecology.

AB: Oh, yes.

SM: There's a graduate advisor still there and she's got a Spanish name. A Spanish name . . . Cindy? No, well . . .

AB: No.

SM: Well, she's there because I talk with them sometimes.

AB: Our Graduate Advisor is Kay Helwig now.

SM: No, that's not . . . Yes, okay, I know who she is. No, this is somebody else. Anyhow, I think she said you had 400 majors back in about 1978, could that be right?

AB: We probably had more than that.

SM: Well, maybe it was 400 freshman. It was an incredible amount.

AB: Yes, we have about 1300.

SM: Well, I'll be working on the . . . Yes, I'll go to the archives and get all these figures, so it's no worry, but

you were doing extremely well. Number eight on the list there, did you have any failures? Some things didn't . . .

AB: Oh, there were many failures. One of the big failures was a kind of failure I had in Social Sciences. My bias is that you need smaller clusters than a school, and that's what Jim was always opposing. He was opposed to departments, to programs. As I say, he dissolved the programs. And I think, frankly, it can only work best in smaller groups. I don't believe in it. And it took, in my opinion, that's why he is making Social Sciences now, getting departmentalized. Sam, I was for that in the sixties and when we were having programs . . . You knew Bill Sharp? Do you remember Bill Sharp?

SM: Yes, oh, yes.

AB: He was an outstanding economist. Well, he was in my program, the Formal Models Program, being a mathematical person.

SM: I remember that.

AB: And Bill said to me, "Arnie, I don't think economists could survive, except in the Department of Economics, due to the nature of that." And I was convinced of that. So, I wanted a Department of Economics. Jim would not tolerate it. And I feel that was one of the failures, that I couldn't swing it. And you can imagine being in faculty meetings and everybody there telling what Social Ecology really is and I'd say, "How could they tell me what Social Ecology is?"

(inaudible) They all know what Social Ecology is." And I said, "My intent at the beginning was not to have this broad group." It was to have smaller departments.

SM: Yes.

AB: For the first time, we're moving in that direction. I feel we would have been much more successful if we did it before. I always consider that one of my failures. That's one.

Another that I couldn't . . . They have to interpret interdisciplinary and broad-ranging to include Social Ecology as a big entity. And I said it was a convenient rubric under which we operate, but there's nothing sacred about it. We can break up into smaller groups and, I think, be effective and have more commitment from faculty members.

The other was, being a psychologist, when I was recruiting, I had a tendency to recruit psychologists because I knew them best. Carol Whalen is the first. I knew Carol only through Dick Whalen. I was a visiting professor at UCLA, when I was at Indiana, a couple of years before that, and I met Dick there. So, when Dick was here I, of course, interacted with Dick and he was married to Carol, so I got to know her. So, when an opening came forth, I said, "Carol, are you interested?" because she had good credentials from UCLA. And the second one I hired was Pamela Rayger, another psychologist. The reason that I don't . . . I consider that ~~was~~ ^{was} a failure is I think that biased us, because we have too many psychologists on

the faculty, and I think my initial biasing may have done that. So, now I'm the leading advocate for not hiring psychologists.

SM: It's interesting that your successor, Ellen Greenberger, is a psychologist.

AB: Oh, yes, we have . . .

SM: In other words, the first two Directors were . . .

AB: Well, actually, Arthur Boughey . . .

SM: Arthur Boughey . . .

AB: Arthur Boughey succeeded me, but then he only lasted a short while. He was interim and he was not appointed as a regular Director. The first full Director, indeed, was Ellen.

SM: I more or less think of him as a botanist. He's marvelous and knows every damn tree and shrub and flower in this whole area. A very interesting guy.

AB: Oh, yes. Oh, yes.

SM: I like him a lot.

AB: But, Sam, that's what bias did and I think it's unfortunate for us that we're so dominated by psychologists.

SM: Anything else you feel you . . .

AB: Any other failures?

SM: Yes.

AB: Probably. Well, nothing that occurs to me. I'm sure there are others, though.

SM: Now, many of us, myself included, consider this a major success, this program. And then I was absolutely dumbfounded when you resigned.

AB: Well, here's the sequence of that. At that time, I was the only administrator and I spoke to people in the Vice Chancellor's office--that was Roger's. No, it was Hazard at that time. And they said the only way you can get the administrative help is if you become a school. Not really the case, but people may not even believe that now, but that's really what happened. Phyllis who . . . Remember Phyllis?

SM: You mean, Phyllis Beck. Phyllis Beck?

AB: Yes, who was Phyllis . . .

SM: She was on the budget. She ran the budget.

AB: Yes. And said to me that the only way I could get--like I wanted an associate director because we'd gotten very large. I handled it all myself, the entire . . . I didn't have any assistants, associates. I think it was not accurate information, but that was given to me. So, I approached Dan and I said, "Dan, it's very important for us to become a school because I need that kind of support." It was not the glory of being a school or the . . . and I sat on the Dean's Council and I had all that going for me, but I need the support. And I honestly believe that's the only way I could get it. I don't think it's right now, but nevertheless that's the information I had. And Dan said, "Well, not

quite ready yet." So, then I said, "Look, Dan, if we don't do it, I am going to leave." So, I sent a letter of resignation to Dan . . .

SM: But Jim McGaugh was there at that point?

AB: No, he was not. He came . . . It was a transition point. This was in . . . I was going to Ireland that year, it was in 1974.

SM: That's right. That's right, it was in the paper, yes.

AB: I was going to Ireland.

SM: ... University.

AB: And so Dan essentially said, "Arnie, it's not a good time for you to resign. Even though you may not be able to get the school, but I'd like you to wait a few years until you really make it." That is, Social Ecology is more stable. So, he said . . .

SM: Well, it wasn't unstable, was it?

AB: Well, his reasoning is benign. He really did not want . . . So, he said, essentially, withdraw your resignation and hold it for a few years and then come back.

SM: Yes.

AB: Because what he was saying is he needed that administrative strength or the movement by a founder, whatever his reasons. Dan, you can talk to Dan and see what he has to say.

SM: I will.

AB: And bring up that he had my resignation and that, and very important, that he talked me out of it. And so I went to

Ireland and that's where it stood. So, in Ireland, I didn't know what I was going to do to force the resignation. But it was not in effect at that time because he asked me to hold it, but I didn't know what to do. I went to Ireland about the end of September of 1974, with a Fulbright appointment, so, you know, I was going to teach and do research at University College in Dublin.

And McGaugh had been appointed as Vice Chancellor, and I guess he took over whenever it does . . . September or October of that year, of 1974, and I considered McGaugh a friend of mine and interacted with him warmly. So, here I was in Ireland. I had turned in my resignation but it wasn't effective at that time because Dan asked me to withdraw it. And in January I got a letter saying I'd been fired.

SM: Fired?

AB: Well, the nice way that Carl Hartman does it, that the Vice Chancellor has decided to terminate your appointment as I said to myself, "How could the son-of-a-bitch do that while I'm in Ireland?" And it's so stupid. Gil Geis had been standing in for me as Director. It was so stupid. If he wants to get rid of me, why doesn't he ^{let me} come back for a year so he can get stability in the . . . Well, you can ask McGaugh why he did that.

SM: I will.

AB: But that's . . .

SM: And I will ask Dan Aldrich his memories.

AB: I think Dan is embarrassed by all this. I think he is genuinely embarrassed by it. I think McGaugh, if he had to do it over again, he wouldn't, because of the rebellion he got on campus and the harassment he got. But, Sam, it's a matter of utter indecency. I had done all this.

SM: Yes.

AB: And maybe McGaugh didn't like what I did, but he could have done it so much more readily, saying . . .

SM: I can't see that because, as a psychobiologist, he'd have a lot of sympathy, would he not?

AB: You'll have to get that from McGaugh. I have no idea. I have never been warm to McGaugh since. I have had . . . I can tell you confidentially, but not with that on, of some . . . (tape is turned off)

I'll be interested to see what you say in your history and how frank you're going to be in this.

SM: Well, I'm going to be . . . How frank will I be in this history?

AB: Incidentally, that letter should be available in the files for you to get.

SM: I will be quite frank. I think you . . . I want to do a good job and what does a good job mean? You can't cloud over important decisions. You want to know why they were made.

AB: Right. Why didn't they give me a chance to save face? And it would have been, Sam, look, I've reconsidered your resignation. I think we'll accept it. They had my resignation, that's true. He could have implemented it at any time. But, for the sake of the program, give me a year to look for somebody else.

SM: Give you a year, yes.

AB: So, instead, he got Arthur Boughey, and Arthur Boughey was the biggest pain that he ever encountered. There was a constant clash between Arthur and McGaugh. Well, that's the story there.

SM: I'm disappointed to hear it.

AB: I did resign, incidentally. That's true. But Dan asked me to hold it off.

SM: Yes.

AB: And then I got a letter of termination.

SM: And it should have been . . . A year should have gone by, at least. All right, number ten, then. [Did you play a part in appointing Ellen Greenberger as your successor?]

AB: No, I did not.

SM: Was there a search committee? Because I'm interested that they chose a psychologist, and a very good one, too.

AB: I had nothing to do with the choice of Ellen. And, Sam, I actually don't remember when it happened, because it may have . . . Let me give you a little personal anecdote to go with that. I was so embarrassed in coming back here, when I

was gone, a couple of friends put me in as a write-in candidate for the Committee on Academic Personnel, and I was elected, as you know.

SM: Oh, yes.

AB: I'm not exaggerating. I was so embarrassed that I'd walk up the back steps so I wouldn't pass people, my old friends, because it was so embarrassing to me. Can you imagine, after what I had done, to not even be treated with a modicum of decency and not a chance to save face.

SM: Yes.

AB: Okay, McGaugh wanted me out? That's his right. But he could have given a lot of ways of doing it, rather than be dramatic. Now, I have a hypothesis why he did it that way.

SM: What's your hypothesis?

AB: Remember the person he was replacing, the guy he disliked so much, Roger Russell, because he was too wishy-washy and he wanted to show strength. Other people be damned, I'm going to show strength. So, he did that. He did it to Creel Froman, too. Creel Froman was terminated.

SM: As Dean.

AB: As Dean.

SM: Yes, I think that he always wanted to be decisive and he would get into trouble for it, too. Such small things, we were working on a bookstore--and a proper bookstore--that, really, the faculty could be proud of. We're talking about 1979. And Jim apologized. He said, (inaudible). He just

not
"bookstore"

didn't feel we should be worrying about bookstores. He wasn't going to give us any help.

AB: How is it progressing? [Number 11, How is the Program progressing now?] Well, I had nothing to do with Ellen Greenberger's appointment, so I don't even know who was on the committee. But I somewhat withdrawn during that period of time. That was when Arthur Boughey was Director and I was not active. I did become active in the CAP, and I also became Chair of CAP, and I had to interact with McGaugh, too, but we did it in a very business fashion, business-like fashion, and it worked out well.

SM: Yes. Say, one quick question which I can find out, (inaudible), when you took care of the Schapiro Case, did Hazard sit in on most of it?

AB: No. He came in for testimony as somebody . . .

SM: Yes.

AB: He was one of the people who came in and spoke. And, no, he didn't sit in through it. We couldn't allow that. Remember, we had an attorney who had rules, but he came in and we asked him questions and then Schapiro came in.

SM: Okay.

AB: And not everybody was there during the whole session, only committee members and attorney.

SM: Well, now, the Program, are you happy with the Program?

AB: I'm delighted with the Program now. I'm delighted. We have

a Graduate Review going on right now, and I had dinner with the Review Committee (inaudible).

SM: The visiting team? Did a visiting team come out?

AB: A visiting team, yes. All outside distinguished people. And, Sam, they're delighted with it, in terms of the positive outlook that report is going to be. But, certainly, their oral comments are everything I could possibly expect.

SM: Yes. Have you had . . . You must have had at least one five-year review (inaudible).

AB: Oh, yes, we had one in 1982, was the last one.

SM: And that went well?

AB: Very positive, in terms of what we're . . . and that's the graduate level.

SM: Yes, and five to seven, this is the next one?

AB: This is the five, well, nominally, five years. And, Sam, I expect this to be a very positive report, in terms of our international recognition now as a center for this kind of study.

SM: Great. That's super. That's super.

AB: So, I am delighted. And I'm delighted what is happening with our new planning directions. You will learn more about that as you go along, but we're going to become an institute of planning here in some way.

SM: That's very good. Gee, Arnie, that's very exciting. I'm always pleased with your program. Now, twelve, I was down

in Australia when this happened, but Maddi, Sal Maddi was brought in and he made statements that I read in the UC items and so on, and then all of a sudden, he's gone.

AB: Well, it's a problem we have with the administrators who come from more tyrannical and less democratic, less senate-oriented, and the adjustment is very difficult for them. Our Vice Chancellor for Research, I assume, had similar problems. I don't remember his name. What's his name? The guy who was terminated as Vice Chancellor for Research.

SM: (inaudible) Yes, his name was Nass (inaudible).

AB: Lew, Lew, yes. Nosanow.

SM: Nosanow, that's right. I'm very happy with the new one, Paul Sypherd. (inaudible)

AB: I don't know him. I know the name.

SM: Well, let me tell you what my reaction is. I, as Chair of the Academic Senate, had to deal with the Medical School. It was so difficult, and the man that I felt was the best and the smartest and the best . . . with good judgment and cool and so on, was Paul Sypherd.

AB: Well, I'll be darned.

SM: And I put him on two very key committees, very sensitive committees. And everybody said he was great. Now, you'll be interested that only a week before last he sat right there and I interviewed him.

AB: Oh, yes.

SM: I had no idea that he was going to be the new Graduate Dean.

AB: Oh, yes.

SM: And . . . (tape is turned off)

Yes, I'll just repeat the question, in case I got lost there. That why is it that Sal Maddi, who had all sorts of training at Harvard and so forth, lasted so . . . I was down in Australia and he came and went by the time I got back.

AB: As I was saying, it's hard for somebody to adjust to a University of California system where we have . . . you pay special regard to the faculty because they . . . each faculty is a subcommittee of the Academic Senate and gets all its power through that, and you can't bypass faculty members. You can't bypass committees. And people who come from places like the University of Chicago, that's where Sal came from when he was teaching, is where administrators make decisions. And I've come from places like that. The readjustment is difficult, and I think that's the major source of Sal's difficulties.

SM: Is he happy now just as a teacher and scholar?

AB: We had a party for the visiting scholars last night and I spoke at length to Sal, and he's readjusting. It's probably going through the same syndrome that I went through of just being embarrassed by the whole state of affairs. But he's recovering, I think, nicely and getting down to it. He doesn't appear as often as I did, and I avoided people because I was embarrassed by it. Now, he's showing that

syndrome, but he's also showing coming out of it, so I expect it to happen in a couple of years.

SM: Was Ellen Greenberger at your thing? Her father has been terribly ill.

AB: Ellen said he's coming along nicely. He just . . . he had bypass surgery.

SM: Yes, he turned a corner, but he was on the critical list, very seriously ill, and they thought he'd had it.

AB: Oh, yes. No.

SM: I talked to her along about Wednesday.

AB: And I spoke to her last night. She was at the dinner with these people.

SM: Now, are you in agreement with the present thrust of the Program? Of course, the answer to that is yes.

AB: I am. And the big thrust now is to incorporate a whole new Planning Program, Applied Planning Program, where we're going to give master's degrees in Planning, plus doctorates, so it's going to be a new thrust. But that's in accord with my suggestions in 1968, in my original documents.

SM: Interesting.

AB: It is.

SM: Yes. Now how's your own research going?

AB: Oh, you'll see a bit about that.

SM: Yes, I've always been interested.

AB: What happened is, well, I'm taking on more of the role of a senior citizen. That is, writing a lot of chapters for

books, getting . . . I got invited for two more book chapters now, and I am doing that. It's a luxury that we as senior scholars can do, who don't have to worry about getting promoted, getting tenure and so forth. And, you know, they downgrade chapters of books, and I'm also writing books now which I . . . I started my first book twelve years ago--that recently--and all the others were articles. Experimental mathematical psychologists write articles, and I have the luxury of writing books now, which is fun, which I'm doing.

SM: That's wonderful. That's great.

AB: I have applied for a grant. I was turned down for a grant oh, about a half a year ago. Funds really are difficult, even for us these days, in the criminology area. And I'm supposed to hear on the twentieth, would you believe. Here it is the twenty-first, and I haven't heard whether I'm going to be funded or not for that. I'm enjoying a life very much as . . . because I have the luxury of doing what I want now.

END OF INTERVIEW