

final

INTERVIEWEE: MURRAY KRIEGER
Former Director of the Critical Theory Program

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

DATE: July 2, 1990

SM: This is an interview with Professor Murray Krieger, Director of the Critical Theory Program, on July 2, 1990 in HOB-360. And the first question, Murray, is what persuaded you to come to UC Irvine?

MK: Before I answer, I would like to correct the title you gave me. I am no longer Director of the Critical Theory Program. And as a matter of fact, perhaps I can take a moment to clarify the several kinds of Critical Theory things we have running around here.

SM: Do that.

MK: Originally, there was a Literary Theory Program, which I began in the very beginning of the days of Department of English when you were Dean.

SM: And Hazard [Adams] was Chair.

MK: And Hazard was Chair. That is, in effect, what he brought me out here to do. And that Literary Theory Program continues within the English Department. And then quite a few years later, there was a schoolwide attempt to create a Literary Theory Program. That rapidly changed its name to Critical Theory because people not in the literature disciplines, especially someone in your area, in your discipline,

final

complained that it should be given a name that was less prejudicial against the non-literary disciplines of humanistic disciplines.

SM: Yes.

MK: And so it was called Critical Theory. The Critical Theory Program then was developed within the School of Humanities, while there is a kind of mini-Literary Theory Program still going on, on its own in the English Department. That Critical Theory Program in the school applied to the Graduate Division to get funds to create a, then called, FRP, Focused Research Program. I think they're now FRUs. And as a kind of seed money toward developing an ORU. And some years later, oh, only about three or four years ago, that became an ORU and has the name that it now bears, the Critical Theory Institute.

By that period of time, I was planning to take over the University of California Humanities Research Institute that you asked about, that you will be asking me about later.

SM: Yes, right, right.

MK: And so I turned the directorship of the Critical Theory Institute . . . That was turned over to David Carroll.

SM: In the French Department.

MK: In the French Department. There was a good deal of pressure to take it out of English and Comp Lit, where Hazard and I and Frank Lentricchia and others had sort of kept it going all those years. And so David Carroll became Director of the

Critical Theory Institute and had a three-year directorship, at the end of which time it still moved farther from English. There was pressure to get it outside Literature. And the current Director of the Critical Theory Institute is Mark Poster of your department. And so my title now is nothing but University Professor of English.

SM: Very interesting. Very interesting.

MK: There still is a literarily based Theory program in the Department of English and Comp Lit, which is separate from the schoolwide program.

SM: I've got you. I understand. Yes, I understand.

MK: Which does give an additional concentration certificate to the Ph.D., when he or she earns the Ph.D.. It will be a Ph.D. in History or English or French or Comp Lit or whatever, with a concentration in Critical Theory. And that's a separate degree and curricular situation.

SM: Very good. I understand. Now, tell me, Murray . . .

MK: But that doesn't answer the question you asked me.

SM: No, that's right.

MK: I'll get to that.

SM: Yes, right. I'd just like to clarify now when you became University Professor. I remember Hazard Adams was the Academic Vice Chancellor.

MK: That's correct.

SM: I know all of us were delighted that we should have a University Professor in the School of Humanities. What year was that? In 1974?

MK: Yes, it was the spring of 1974, and finally became effective July 1, 1974. And at that time, I was the only non-retired University Professor in the Humanities. And except for Berkeley and UCLA, the only active university . . .

SM: Lynn White.

MK: Pardon?

SM: Lynn White was at UCLA.

MK: But he was retired by then.

SM: Oh, had he?

MK: Yes, he was retired by then. And Joe Miles was retired at Berkeley. And Uri^{ly}, Harold Ur^{ly}, who was in Physics, was retired at San Diego. So I was the only . . . It was important for Irvine because this was the first . . . I was the only active University Professor not at one of the two, not at either UCLA or Berkeley.

SM: That's right. At what point was Smelger made a University Professor in Sociology?

MK: Yes, he was made University Professor . . .

SM: After you?

MK: No, he had been made just before. He was already sitting there.

SM: Very good.

MK: But he and I now are the two senior non-retired University Professors.

SM: Yes, I know Neil quite well.

MK: I know him very well, too.

SM: A wonderful man. Well, he was connected with the EAP, and he was two years in England as the Director, and I was Coordinator here for ten years and I kept in touch with everything there. Then I went myself as Director to Australia.

MK: Well, Neil was a good friend of this campus.

SM: Yes, he was.

MK: Both in getting us the ORU in Critical Theory, and in helping to get through the final stages of the HRI, the Humanities Research Institute at the university.

SM: That's good news.

MK: Because he was the head of the Senate. And when the CCGA was dragging its feet, ^{and the other} ~~in all of its~~ committees and so on, he really got . . . I was on the phone to him and he was, as I say, as the Chair of the Senate, really got things moving for us.

SM: Very good. That's interesting to know. Now back to the question. What were the chief reasons for your coming to UCI?

MK: I've already, without meaning to, given you a lot of the notions, and you ^{should} ~~will~~ know more than anyone else. You ask me the question, though you really know the answer.

SM: Oh, yes.

MK: You were the Dean who first interviewed me when Hazard brought me out to talk about coming.

SM: Yes, I was excited.

MK: And the reason was obvious now. Hazard and I had known one another through each other's work before this. I had tried very hard to bring Hazard to Illinois when I was there, and again to Iowa when I was there, knowing that Hazard and I, I thought, could work very well together doing the work in Literary Theory that both of us felt was being underemphasized in the curricula of departments of English around the country. And both of us felt, I think, the mission of trying to make this a center of the way in which English departments were developing.

That is, English departments were developing completely in terms of the chronological periods, one after the other. That was very important, and remains important to this day, but at the same time, we felt there ought to be some place in which English departments would have a . . . some place where students and faculty would consider some of the generic questions about the nature of literature and its creation and its reception. And I went from one Big Ten university to another, bringing Literary Theory with me. When I got my Ph.D., I remember the head of the ^{English Department} program calling me and saying, "Now, how shall we sell you? What's your period?"

And I said, "I want to be sold as someone in criticism." And he said, "No, we want to have a chance to give you a job. We don't want you unemployed. We can't do that." (chuckling)

But, actually, he did, and I did catch on and did get a job, and I became a kind of traveling priest for theoretical interests within Departments of Literature. Each of the Big Ten universities that hired me had me . . . allowed me to do this, but never allowed me to replicate my kind. I could do it, I was treated very well, but no one was interested in building a program. Hazard talked with me about . . .

SM: A program.

MK: . . . my coming out and creating a literature department which had Theory very much as one of its central concerns. And that was . . .

SM: That you could be succeeded by someone.

MK: That's right. And that was the attraction, a new university which, presumably, could make it new, and the innovative character of all the philosophy going on around UCI, you know, everywhere.

SM: Yes. It's really exciting, and it's continued to this day. I interviewed the new Dean of the School of Fine Arts last week, and he is very interested in interdisciplinary work.

MK: Yes.

SM: Not only with the Humanities, but with other schools, and he's going to make an . . . He's got a lot of powers of leadership, that fellow.

MK: Good. That's good.

SM: I'm very pleased after that interview I had.

MK: So he's caught the spirit.

SM: Yes, he's got it.

MK: But there was a spirit of UCI that was there from the first day I came to look for the . . . And when you say, "Why did I come?" That was what brought me. Joan, my wife, always said, "Wherever you go, I always feel that you are the nail that goes into one of these self-sealing tires."

SM: (laughter)

MK: "You would seem to make a leak, but it seals and keeps going on its merry way. What you want to do is get to a place where you can really make a difference." And I did feel I could make a difference here.

SM: I love that. That's a nice way to put it. Well, I was very excited. The only thing I've been sad about is we couldn't get Rosalie Colie.

MK: Oh, gosh.

SM: Who was a person I admire enormously.

MK: Yes, and you and I worked very hard on that, because she was . . . We still have her picture hanging in our bedroom, you know. She was a very close friend.

SM: Well, you're lucky, because I knew her very well but not that well, and I was really counting on what she could do. If you recall, I went down and listened to a talk she gave in the . . . now the Howard Babb Room.

MK: That's right.

SM: And she did very well. And I still think about her a lot. And my thinking was changed when you said you didn't think she committed suicide. You thought she got trapped underneath that boat.

MK: Yes.

SM: That could be. I mean, I thought about it a lot.

MK: Yes, I know, I know.

SM: Ah, yes.

MK: But none of that would have happened, had it worked out here.

SM: No, I guess, I think, if she could have come . . .

MK: And it was one of the difficulties of being a young university, and indicates something--if you're writing the history--about . . .

SM: I am.

MK: I know you are. . . . about the difficulties of the young university in some of the older, more scholarly areas.

SM: Yes.

MK: She was very concerned about having a medieval collection that would permit her to do the kinds of things she wanted to do with medieval symbolism. As you know, she was close to the

K/S Warberg, people like Gombrich, was very . . . and for her, her materials were very important. I remember when she was out here, we sent her to the Huntington to see whether she could do a class out there, a show and tell class, as she put it.

SM: Yes.

MK: And she talked to Jim Thorpe about that at that time. And things could have been done. But when Toronto made her an offer at that time, with such resources in this area, she simply felt that the kind of students she would get would be one who was more oriented toward the library and one with whom she could work that way. And so it was partly our newness and her concern about the resources we might have for the . . .

SM: For the students, for the students she might get.

MK: For the scholar, and the extent to which students were interested in scholarly things, would come to a university that didn't itself have these library resources.

SM: Yes. Well, that was very sad for me.

MK: Yes.

SM: Now were your expectations satisfied? Well, really, you've answered that. You were successful, you did get the program going, and it's now still going. As you say, you're not involved, but there it is, a smaller program . . .

MK: I am involved. I'm ~~(inaudible)~~ in the Institute.

SM: Yes, of course, but not as an administrator. There it is in the department. Then there's this Critical Theory Program, which goes out side the department, even outside the school. And, incidentally, I think . . . I presume you're getting better students as we get along. We're finding we're getting better students, graduate students. We're really getting some very good students.

MK: Oh, yes. Well, our success has been so remarkable and, in some ways, is attributed to the support the university has given to the program, but, in some ways, also, is a matter of serendipity. That is, we could not have known, I could not have known that Theory--for better and for worse--would catch on as much as it has in these years. In the years since we came. Suddenly, it's the hottest subject around. And Irvine had a head start on everybody else because Hazard and I were doing Theory here before any other place was. And so, as Theory became more important, Irvine's position became more visible.

I remember thinking perhaps how foolish it was and how idealistic--utopian perhaps--to think you could come to a new university and really create a distinguished place in a short amount of time. But now it is commonly said everywhere that for graduate students in Literature Irvine is one of the places they automatically think of.

SM: Oh, yes, that's right.

MK: And we've got them now from the best places.

SM: Yes, yes, I've heard that and I'm delighted.

MK: I've just come from around the world. Wherever I've gone, they all . . . I have someone from Turkey, from Bogazici University in Istanbul, the best university in Turkey, a senior professor who is taking her sabbatical to sit in the Critical Theory Institute.

SM: How do you spell that name? We'd like this for the record.

MK: B-O-G-A-Z-I-C-I.

SM: I-C-I?

MK: Yes. But the G is pronounced . . . ^{also} has a Ch on it, and it's pronounced like a Y.

SM: Right.

MK: And she has applied. We have a post doc almost every year. We've had them from Yugoslavia, from Switzerland, from Israel, from Turkey, from China; post docs coming simply to be around where some of the big names in Theory are. And, of course, as you know, a few years ago we built the program to the point where some very highly visible names were suddenly willing to come and join us. And as a result of that, we got a lot of hype. That's good and bad. I mean, as you know, the academic profession has too much of that to suit me, but it is a fact of life.

SM: Yes. (chuckling)

MK: But if you have people whose names are widely known, suddenly things happen.

SM: Oh, yes, yes.

MK: And that's, of course, why the graduate students have begun to come from the places they're coming from.

SM: I think that's marvelous.

MK: So it was a dream. What if we made a university and it really worked, and it really was able to take its place among the leaders within a short amount of time, within a single career? Because I came here at forty-three--I'm now sixty-six--and, between those years, it's really happened. Before I retire, I've lived long enough here to see this kind of distinction (inaudible). That's lucky. So were my expectations satisfied or fulfilled? Way beyond what I realistically might have expected.

SM: Great. Well, I'll tell you Murray, those of us who were here at the beginning, the administrators, I felt . . . I remember telling my chairmen, "I personally will live and die on the record I make in the appointments that go through while I am Dean." And there were ninety-eight to one hundred appointments when I retired. And I killed myself. I used to work with the chairmen and I gave the great chairmen a lot of credit. But we would press and press to get them to come, and then when they would come, to make them happy, and this goes for some of the younger people. And I'm as interested in your

handling--that is, your, the departments handling--of Frank Lentricchia. And I felt that . . . Their decision was to move him ahead, to get him going. And, you see, what a success it all was, you know.

MK: Well, of course, he did leave us, but he felt he had to. He was at the point of becoming, of reaching the highest level of distinction, and, rightly or wrongly--I think perhaps wrongly--felt that there was a whole generation of people--people of my generation--who, while we were here, would make him seem always like second in line.

SM: Yes, that's right.

MK: And he wanted to go to a place where he could be first in line. And he went to Duke, and, I must say, has helped create Duke as the other major newly established program.

SM: Well, I think the other very important person we lost was Wright, the poet, who went to Virginia.

MK: Chuck Wright, yes.

SM: Chuck. And I felt he was . . . And I think, in a way, he was sort of bound to the South. I think he (inaudible).

MK: As a matter of his own personal roots. I saw him not long ago in Charlottesville when I lectured there.

SM: How is he?

MK: He's fine, and winning more prizes. As a matter of fact, he came to Bellagio two months ago, just the day I left, so I

never saw him there. But he is one of our most distinguished poets.

SM: Yes.

MK: And there it was a matter of his simply never feeling he wanted . . . For him, California, wonderful as it is, is a rootless place, and he had roots and felt he would write better as a poet.

SM: Yes, that's right, that's right.

MK: Close to his roots.

SM: But I felt that . . .

MK: We did everything we could, though.

SM: We did, yes, and you people did. And I feel that ^I~~my~~ stand and fall on the appointments made.

MK: But you're right. We're luckier than we expected to be. We thought we'd make the appointments, we'd start the programs, and sometime long after our demise exciting things might finally become visible.

SM: Yes.

MK: But we're like Moses who lived to see what he was . . .

SM: What was completed, yes. That's great. Now, three, you've answered the third question, Murray.

MK: Yes.

SM: How well is the program in Critical Theory and Literary Criticism going?

MK: I will add one thing, though.

SM: Yes?

MK: That what I'm happy about here, worried sometimes, but happy about, is that we still do have very strong basic programs in the Literatures. That is, what concerns me more now than it did before is almost the too great success that Theory has had. Before, I mean, I wanted to have Theory to have its place recognized within the curricula, within programs, and within the work of students. What concerned me after awhile was the unhappiness of some of our literature colleagues around the country, that there's so much theory around, no one ever bothers to read the literature anymore. There's so much Theory ⁱⁿ ~~and~~ History around that no one bothers to be historians anymore. I think some of the charges perhaps are too strong, but I think at the same time there is that danger in America.

SM: Yes.

MK: In American academies like everything else. In America, when something gets hot, everybody goes for it.

SM: Oh, yes. I know it. (chuckling)

MK: It's like a detective story on TV. If one is successful, you suddenly have a whole season of nothing but copies of the first. Well, Theory took on so strongly that you do have almost too much of it being done now, I would say. And a program like Duke's has been transformed almost totally into that. We have a program here, but I'm happy, and I must say I fight continually to keep some balance so that we still have

what I call standard literature programs being done very well, and I'm very concerned to try and maintain that balance. We do have good literature students coming out. I just saw Bob Montgomery, talking about some of the people we're sending out with the job market this year. And we both said, "Gee, these are pretty orthodox English students. I hope some of them can make it in the new market, which is looking only for these more exotic areas."

SM: Just quickly, is Bob going away this summer? Do you know?

MK: I don't know.

SM: Well, the reason I ask is this. Carl Hartman . . .

MK: I know Carl.

SM: Came from . . . Of course, you know him very well. We have tried to have him over about once every three weeks. He comes over on his machine, and he came in and I was telling him how upset I was at this Senate committee's report on the library and the librarian. Absolutely wrong, how they (inaudible).

MK: I haven't seen the report. In effect, what does it say?

SM: Well, I'll tell you off the tape.

MK: Okay.

SM: I'll talk to Bob because I want to ask his advice on something. He's going to be Chair of the library senate committee next year.

MK: Oh, good.

SM: So I'll talk to you later.

MK: We'll talk of that off the record.

SM: Yes. Now are the students in your program doing well? You've answered that.

MK: Yes.

SM: They're doing extremely well.

MK: And we're placing them well.

SM: And you're satisfied with their abilities.

MK: Yes.

SM: And we're very pleased with some of the new students that are coming in, the history graduate students, and I'm pleased to tell you, Murray . . . I only teach one course a year because I'm retired, I just teach one, and I am finding the students a little better than they were. And I think the core course is one reason. They write better. And one time, oh, as much as eight years ago, I said, "How many of you have been in the Humanities core course?" Well, up went more than half the hands. And I said, "That's the reason they're writing better."

MK: Well, I think that's something we can never stop thanking two people for.

SM: Well, Hazard is one.

MK: One is Hazard, but the other is one who we're not likely to think about in this connection, and that's Howard Schneiderman.

SM: Yes, that's right.

MK: It was Howard, who as Dean of Bio Sci said . . .

SM: Yes, yes.

MK: You know, he's an old Boston Latin school person in Harvard, a Harvard undergraduate, who knows more classical languages than I do, and Howard said, "Every Bio Sci student is going to have to have some humanities."

SM: Yes, he told me that . . .

MK: It was with the support of those students we're able to man that course.

SM: And he told me that the result was that he definitely found his students had better success in getting into medical school.

MK: Yes.

SM: Because of the fact that they could write, you know, think, reason and so on. Well, question five, please tell me ^{at} ~~in~~ some length how the Humanities Research Institute was located? Now I was down in Australia for two years and it happened when I was away.

MK: I remember. Yes. I was sitting in Konstanz, West Germany on a Humboldt (inaudible), that's a research prize, which a few humanists each year are given by the Federal Republic of Germany. I was sitting there doing my work when the phone rang, and it was Bill Lillyman on the phone. I said phone and it reminded you your phone was connected.

SM: I'll disconnect it.

MK: Yes, because he interrupted me. And he told me about the fact that the president had announced this Humanities Research Initiative, which would have a number of major parts to it, but the centerpiece of it was to be a university-wide Humanities Research Institute, and that all the campuses were invited to apply for it. And Bill said the automatic expectation was that one of the two big campuses would get it, Berkeley or UCLA. But he felt that Irvine had a good chance to get it, if I would permit them in the application to actually specify the fact that, if it were placed at Irvine, I would agree to become the founding Director. And he felt the reason was I was then the only University Professor in Humanities.

And that being the case, since it was to be a university-wide institute, and technically I was sort of on the President's own faculty, as University Professor, that they might make an argument that the University Professor should be the first director, since normally anyone else would be responsible exclusively to his or her own campus. Whereas a University Professor might be expected to have university-wide benefits in his mind, and, further, I'd been on every campus, I taught on every campus as a University Professor, for a long or short period, and that with that experience and the friends I had on several campuses, it might just be a good argument for Irvine.

SM: A very good argument, I think. (chuckling)

MK: Because both UCLA and Berkeley, you see, were offering to put many more resources on the table than we can afford to. UCLA was promising a building for the HRI, and we weren't, obviously, in a position to do that. Jack Peltason could say, "We'll try to raise money for a building." That's all he could say. (chuckling) Anyway, I was persuaded . . .

SM: Are they trying to raise money for a building?

MK: Well, when I left the directorship, I was told that it was somewhere at a fairly high priority in the twenty-fifth year fund raising. Where it is, how it is, it's for my successor director to be concerned with.

SM: Yes.

MK: Since I left before the priorities were set. Jack promised me it would have a high priority. I don't know. They did proceed, as you know, to give us excellent space in the Administration Building, so we really can't complain.

SM: Oh, no, I love the space. I've been there.

MK: I know, I know that, of course. But in any case, we did not seem to have the resources at hand that the others did have. In any case, the application was prepared. I guess Irvine was the only one that named who the Director would be if they got it, and it was submitted. The President had appointed a committee of members, one member each from each of the campuses.

SM: Who was our member?

MK: Our member originally was Bill Lillyman. And, of course, we had a real advantage. He was the only upper administrator who took the time to be a member of that committee.

SM: (chuckling) I think that's super.

MK: Well, what happened was the committee wrote around, sent the proposals out to twenty-five or thirty people around the country, some from the UC system, but a good number from all around the country. I don't know who those people were. And those people reviewed the proposals and wrote their . . .

SM: Recommendations.

MK: Their recommendations on that basis. On the basis of what they received, that committee decided that they would nominate, as final candidates, one major campus and one younger campus, one senior campus, one ^{junior} ~~younger~~ campus. I should say that a proposal was submitted by five of the campuses, Berkeley, UCLA, of course, Irvine, San Diego and . . .

SM: Santa Barbara?

MK: And Santa Barbara. And then Santa Barbara. No, I'm sorry, San Diego did not submit one. Roy Pierce, for some reason or other, couldn't get his act together. It was Santa Cruz and Santa Barbara.

SM: Yes.

MK: Hayden White submitted one for Santa Cruz.

SM: Yes.

MK: So there were three small campuses, Santa Barbara, Santa Cruz and Irvine, and two of the large campuses. Well, we won the small campus competition and UCLA won the big campus competition, so it was UCLA and Irvine going head to head.

SM: Oh, my, I didn't know this.

MK: And Dave Schetter was telling me . . .

SM: Who is that?

MK: Dave Schetter. He's over in the Graduate Research and Graduate Studies Office.

SM: How do you spell that?

MK: S-C-H-E-T-T-E-R. He ^{was} a very important person, because after we got it he was an enormous help in setting things up. He helped write the proposal and so on. But Dave continually met with Graduate Research people from other campuses. And the people at UCLA said, "Why don't you people just pull out and make it easy on yourselves." I mean, "You have no chance."

SM: UCLA said that to us?

MK: UCLA said that to us.

SM: (laughter) Oh, wow.

MK: And the committee then met again, with the members from those two campuses dropped off, and read the proposals again, read the statements by the other people, made their own statements. And the result of it all, we won.

SM: Gee, that's terrific.

MK: And I must say, UCLA was furious. But in such open ways. I mean, there were people there who were very, very angry with me. As you know, they tried to recruit me many times and it never quite worked.

SM: Yes, I know, I know. I'm so glad they didn't. (chuckling)

MK: Shortly after the announcement was made, I went around to the different campuses to try to involve them, and was successful, eventually, in overcoming the initial anger. And Berkeley was unpleasant about it, but they had lost out to UCLA. They weren't even in the finals.

SM: I know, yes.

MK: But my UCLA friends were really very miffed. I remember . . . I must tell this story for the record.

SM: Oh, good, good.

MK: And that is I went up to see UCLA and I called Herb Morris, whom I never had met until that point, who is Dean of Humanities there. I asked him if he would assemble as many of his faculty as he could or would for me to speak with them about involving themselves in the activities of this university-wide institute at UCI. And instantly, went around, and the first sentence I spoke everywhere was, "I accepted the directorship not as a professor at Irvine. I accepted the directorship as University Professor. It's your institute. It's located at Irvine, but help me make it a university-wide operation."

SM: Yes, very, very wise, very wise.

MK: This is what David Gardiner wants and this is what I want. I appeared with David Gardiner before the Regents in September of 1987 to present the Institute to the Regents, and made this kind of speech.

SM: I can remember, Murray, writing to you [from Australia] sometime in June or July, saying you must be the director. You must be the director.

MK: That's right.

SM: And I wanted you to have a five-year term.

MK: I know. Well, I did have an understanding with Gardiner that I would get it to the point where he and I agreed that it had attained such quick visibility, that it was recognized as the leading institute in the country, if not in the world, that we had programs afoot that were sufficiently launched and grounded that I could safely step aside and give it to a younger person.

SM: Well, back to UCLA, though.

MK: Yes, I want to finish that story.

SM: Yes.

MK: Herb arranged for the faculty . . .

SM: You met these faculty. (chuckling)

MK: I got up there and Herb introduced me as follows: "I had a dream, and I dreamed it many times, of this beautiful woman that I wanted to marry. And I dreamed it and I dreamed it,

and, all of a sudden, one day the phone rang and my younger brother whom I never thought about said, 'I just married her.' But, more than that, I want you to invite all your friends so I can tell you about it. Here is Murray Krieger." (laughter)

SM: Absolutely marvelous.

MK: And Herb was.

SM: Well, that's good.

MK: Herb became chair of the board of governors, the first board of governors of the Institute. And I must say he was a marvelous chair who cooperated in every way and helped bring UCLA aboard. And all the campuses have been deeply involved. We've had conferences on every campus. We've had members of the faculty on every campus deeply involved in our activities, so that there is no question at all that I was able to get over. And that was one of my big problems, the political difficulties of Irvine's getting . . . daring to take this.

SM: Yes, right. Well, you're satisfied then, Murray, that it's a university-wide institute, really.

MK: Oh, yes.

SM: And we're running it here (inaudible).

MK: Gardiner is satisfied, which is the most important. I have a collection of letters that he wrote me as we accomplished one after another of our goals. In the first year, I started, through a series of conferences, a Consortium of Humanities Centers and Institutes, with its headquarters in Irvine. And

every major institute in this country and around the world is now affiliated in this Consortium of Humanities Centers and Institutes, CHCI. The actual president of it is Ralph Cohen of the University of Virginia. I wanted it to be bi-coastal. The headquarters are here, and we have now over eighty members in the Consortium. I have published a book. Our institute published a book, A Directory of Consortium of Humanities Centers and Institutes.

SM: Well, now, Murray, I realize I've . . .

MK: Including, by the way, one in Canberra.

SM: Yes.

MK: Ian Donaldson's Australian Humanities Center.

SM: I know who he is. Look here, Murray, I realize I'm retired and I don't hear as much as I used to, but I'm not aware of all these little details you've given me. Is our faculty aware of all this?

MK: Well, they should be. I can speak of my directorship, and I think it's true of my successor. We put out newsletters and . . .

SM: Well, I'm thinking of this board of directors you have, you just mentioned.

MK: You mean, the board of governors?

SM: Governors.

MK: Yes, yes.

SM: And that's something I wasn't aware of.

^ MK: Well, the board of governors have five members in the University of California, four members from around the country. And the first board of governors had on it Edward Levyⁱ, the then president of the American Academy of Arts and Sciences, former president of the University of Chicago, former secretary of . . . I'm sorry, attorney general under Ford, or was it Carter?

SM: Carter.

MK: Carter, I guess.

SM: I think so.

MK: Yes. And Nathan Scott, a very distinguished black scholar from Virginia.

SM: Yes, I know him.

MK: (inaudible) religion and literature.

SM: I know his name.

^ MK: The very brilliant Classicist from Harvard who is . . . I'm showing my age. The name just suddenly . . . just around the corner. ^ Emily Vermeule.

SM: Well, I'm already there. Murray, you're much younger than I am.

^ MK: And O. B. Harbison^d, the former Director of the Folger Library.

SM: I know him.

MK: And a very distinguished (inaudible).

SM: He was out here last year.

MK: Well, he was in the Institute. That's why he was here.

SM: Yes, (inaudible).

MK: He was a resident member of the institute.

SM: He came and I spoke to them.

MK: You spoke to that group, I know.

SM: He was there . . . And who is my friend who is up at Berkeley Law School?

MK: Oh, you mean, Harry Scheiber.

SM: Harry Scheiber.

MK: He's the one who invited you down.

SM: Yes.

MK: He was helping me run that group (inaudible).

SM: And he was interested in institutional history, UCI as an institute. ^{isn} Say, you'd be interested . . . Very quickly I'll put this in the record that UC Berkeley had a seminar running for the Institute of Higher Education and Research, and they are going to write a history of Berkeley, and they were running a seminar of six meetings in the year. Well, I was in the hospital and getting better for two of them, but I attended four others. They paid my way up, too. And I persuaded them, frankly, that they really oughtn't to be doing just Berkeley. They ought to do the whole University of California, if they wanted to do a proper job. I'm doing Irvine, I told them. Anyhow . . .

MK: I like Irvine doing their own, in a way, rather than it being done from the perspective of the whole university, where we will get a minor role.

SM: Well, that's why I was anxious to have it. And they were rather chagrined. They started only with Berkeley. Then they were told by Bill Baker, "If you want money . . ." They'll want money to run their seminar next year and get speakers in and so on. And he said, "I'm sorry," Bill said, "you've got to think wider than just Berkeley." (chuckling)

MK: That's right. Berkeley never thinks wider than Berkeley.

SM: They never did. So they were (inaudible) felt a little parochial. As a result, they're going to do the nine campuses. Now, I'm doing my work and I gave them a talk of about two hours on what I had done and what I'm going to do. And they're interested. I think we're . . . There's a Gene Lee, Eugene Lee, in Poli Sci.

MK: I know Gene. He's the head of the Institute of Government.

SM: That's right. Well, Gene came to most all of these seminar sessions, and he told me to congratulate Jack for appointing a UCI Historian.

MK: Sure.

SM: He was really very supportive.

MK: In fact, they waited too long.

SM: He was very supportive of what Jack had done and so on. But you'd be interested in the seminar. And, as a result, I also

went to . . . I share your good opinion of Gardiner. We had a session, really, discussion the whole future of higher education, and they got people in from Japan--who could use our junior college system, apparently--and from Germany and everywhere, and Gardiner was very forceful.

MK: He's very good, yes.

SM: He's very good. And he was low-key, but he was forceful. So I said to him afterward. I was walking out. He remembered me, I was surprised. "How did you like Australia?" blah, blah, blah, you know, and, "How did things go down there in Education Abroad?" And he was very concerned about Prop[osition] 111.

MK: Oh, of course he was.

SM: He gave a little pitch. And I said . . . And then Clark Kerr, in the dinner session, told us all about the Master Plan, all the intricacies and problems. And, oh, did they have difficulties. They felt they failed. They thought they'd have to go before the legislature and say, "We failed, we can't get your Master Plan." And at the last minute, the idea of bringing in the private institutions made all the difference.

MK: I see.

SM: Well, anyhow, Clark Kerr was good, and I said . . .

MK: He's terrific. He doesn't age a bit. Oh, he's incredible.

SM: Yes, and I'm a good friend of his and I like him. Anyhow, I said to David Gardiner, (chuckling) I said, "You're an historian, David." You know, he did this Oath Controversy book. "Now you've got to see that all these things are properly tape recorded." He said, "Well, I hope that was tape recorded tonight." And I said, "Don't worry, it was."
(laughter)

MK: Back to your question, by the way.

SM: Yes.

~ MK: So I have spoken ^{about} to the Consortium, which gave the Institute tremendous visibility around the country with other centers. We became sort of the center of centers, and that's commendable to happen so quickly. Because Humanities Centers and Institutes are mushrooming everywhere, and I felt that they needed some leadership and tried to provide it. At the same time, I led the Institute into a number of international affiliations. We have formal affiliations with the Soviet Academy of Sciences. I just came back from Moscow, as you know, as part of our home-and-home conferences that we have. We had the Soviets over here last year.

SM: Yes, right.

MK: And we just went over there.

SM: Yes.

MK: We have a formal affiliation with the Chinese Academy of Social Sciences, CASS, and we were supposed to go over there

last October but Tienamen Square intervened. But we now do have hopes of perhaps being able to have the first group of Chinese scholars over here, Chinese scholars who are not politically complicitous with the government, and it looks as if they may be able to come over here next year for a meeting.

SM: That's exciting.

MK: Yes, very much. I don't know what's going to happen to it, ^{also} we had a formal association with the Central Institute for Literary History in East Berlin.

SM: Good.

MK: Yes, and we had a number of Eastern European scholars over just before everything changed over there, from East Germany, Hungary, Poland, Czechoslovakia. And they were over here in a major conference with American scholars on the various kinds of histories being written in the east and the west.

SM: Well, that's wonderful.

MK: So I did try to launch these international initiatives. And it was on the basis of those kinds of conferences being planned internationally, on the basis of the meetings we had of the Consortium leaders, that I was able to come to Gardiner with those, plus three years of programs laid out for conferences and for resident research groups involving distinguished people from around the country. And I was able to say to David, "I think we are launched, I think we're secure. I think I've done everything I promised to do. I did

it faster than you wanted me to, but I've done it." And he said, "You couldn't do it too fast for me."

SM: No, that's true. I can hear him say that.

MK: Although he did try, of course, to persuade me to stay on longer, and we agreed that I had fulfilled my part of the commitment.

SM: Well, that's very nice. I still wish you had stayed on. And I will say, Murray, now, I'm the moderator of the UCI Forum, and you spoke on it a couple of years ago.

MK: On the Institute.

SM: Now I want you to talk on the Institute.

MK: I did, for Henry.

SM: That's right, but a lot of things have happened.

MK: But I think for there you should get the current Director. It would look as if I was sort of stealing the march on Mark Rose, who is . . . Have you met him?

SM: Yes.

MK: And as the current Director, it seems it would be inappropriate for me to, as the founding Director, to come in and speak about the Institute.

SM: Right.

MK: And I've tried to keep ^{out of it.} . . . You know, the one thing, you can't give something away and keep it, too.

SM: No, no, no, but I want you, the person (inaudible) to tell us what we have done, as much as what we are going to do. All

right, I'll call him up and try to get him for the fall. Now, do you think the Institute is fulfilling expectations? Obviously that's answered.

MK: I cannot speak for the last year, that is.

SM: I understand.

MK: I turned it over to Mark in October.

SM: Right.

MK: On October 1, 1989, and began my sabbatical. And he and I agreed . . . Well, I insisted that I would not be looking over his shoulder.

SM: Of course.

MK: Because he's much younger than I, he's at a different level, in terms of recognition and so on. He's a very good younger scholar and has considerable distinction, but he felt, I'm sure . . . I didn't want him to feel, shall I say, that people would be looking to see whether he was fulfilling my shoes and so on. So I try to stay as far away as I can and give him as free a hand as I can.

SM: Oh, yes.

MK: He has on a number of occasions thanked me for not coming into the office very often. (chuckling) Although I will say he has repeatedly called me to ask me various questions and so on, but I've tried to stay off his feet. So I can't tell you too much about the progress of the Institute for the last year. He can.

SM: Okay, I will get him to talk and I'll talk to you, too. You know what I said to Hazard when I retired as Dean, I said, "Hazard, I'm not going to look over your shoulder."

MK: Same thing.

SM: I'll never come into your office. If you want to contact me, call me and I'll be delighted to give any help you wish, but otherwise . . .

MK: I must have heard that conversation because I repeated those words to Mark Rose last year.

SM: (laughter) Yes, right. Well, I think Hazard did a great job as Dean. Now, how is your research going? I would like just a little bit of . . . Tell me what you're doing. What's your next book going to be called?

MK: As a matter of fact, it was for that reason that I had to give up the directorship. I mean, I felt . . . You and I, Sam, will go on forever. We both know we're immortal. (laughter) But I am aware of Father Time, and I did feel I knew what my menu, what was still on my agenda, and I had an unfinished book that I started working on in 1967.

It was a book I projected a long time ago. I wrote an article which is one of the most influential individual articles I've ever written, been cited more perhaps than any other article of mine. And I knew there was the germ of a book in that article that was published in 1967. And in the meantime, I've published six or seven other books. This has

always been on the back burner because I know it's a toughie. I never struggled with a book as I have this one. And, finally, I knew once I cleared away the Institute, I would get the time off to focus finally on this book. And I will say that my month in Bellagio in April, from April to May, allowed me to finish the first draft.

SM: Well, that's great news. What's the title?

MK: The title of the book is . . . It may sound a little cryptic, it's actually a Greek word that I've borrowed. The word is Ekphrasis, E-K-P-H-R-A-S-I-S.

SM: What does it mean?

MK: And the subtitle is The Illusion of a Natural Sign. Ekphrasis is that genre of literature in which poems seek to imitate or describe works of the plastic arts. Keats' Ode on a Grecian Urn is the most obvious example you can think of a poem which . . .

SM: Oh, yes.

MK: Or Homer's description of the shield of Achilles.

SM: Yes.

MK: Where a poet uses words to describe a visual image. And that leads, for me, to the large question of the relation between poetry and visual arts, between the language of criticism used in describing poems, or conceiving of the languages of poems, and the languages of criticism used to describe pictures, which you might think of as a natural sign. That is, where

the image resembles the reality. A picture of a horse looks more like a horse than the word cheval or horse does.

SM: So at Bellagio you got the first draft done?

MK: In Bellagio I finished the first draft. I'm fairly close, and I have hopes for, if not by the end of the summer, shortly thereafter. It will be my eleventh originally authored book and my fifteenth book altogether, of books altogether.

SM: Very good, great.

MK: But this one has been really a thorn in my side. I've traced the whole history. I begin with Plato and do the whole history of criticism dealing with an attempt to describe poems as trying to give us visual images, and poems as trying to give us verbal images. And what do we mean by a verbal image?

(End of Side 1)

MK: Well, while you were changing the tape, we started talking about . . . You asked me what I could suggest to you as
UCI
Historian.

SM: Yes, right, right.

MK: And I said keep on doing what you're doing. And then I said how wonderful that you would have Hazard Adams to interview again.

SM: Yes.

MK: Because he's coming back to join us. And I said it's as if the history of UCI is coming right back to be the present. Because bringing Hazard back is bringing back our history.

SM: Yes, I'm just so happy and delighted.

MK: He's coming back, of course, for one quarter.

SM: For one quarter.

MK: Each year.

SM: Yes, each year. It's a wonderful arrangement and I heard all about it. In fact, I talked to Ed Schell about it, and apparently Tien messed up the appointment and held it up too long and couldn't get Hazard and Hazard got mad.

MK: And you know who straightened it out, don't you?

SM: Who?

MK: You're talking to him.

SM: Oh, you're terrific. That's good.

MK: Maybe I shouldn't say this on tape. (chuckling) I got to Jack Peltason in a Regents' meeting and said, "I've just come back from Seattle, and if something isn't done about Hazard Adams' appointment, he's pulling out. He is so offended." And I said, "It's such an embarrassment to us because he was encouraged to speak to his own administration to see whether he could be freed for a quarter to come here. And it was only with some persuasion on his part that he got them to say he could come. And after all that, it looks as if the whole thing is going to fall through, simply because nothing is happening."

SM: That's right.

MK: Three days later, I had a phone call from the Executive Vice Chancellor, saying that things were now off his desk and they were moving.

SM: Very good. Well, my God, he stands to blame there, I'm sorry to say. But I'll tell you why I'm going to do Hazard, and although it will be . . . Probably I can have someone transcribe it. My budget is sixty-five [interviews] and I'm actually going to do sixty-seven. But Hazard will be down, and the reason I'm doing it is this: You had a very smart, or the Institute did last year, had a very smart assistant or associate professor of Philosophy from Berkeley. Her name was Lisa.

MK: Lisa Lloyd, she's coming. She's so good, we're bringing her back next year.

SM: Yes, she was . . .

MK: She's going to be here next year, I guess.

SM: That's wonderful. You can tell her I got this idea from her. She listened to my presentation (inaudible) institution.

MK: She was in the group you addressed.

SM: ^{on} ~~of~~ what you do for an institution like a university, I mean. And I talked about what Alan Nevins . . . I started with Alan Nevins and his history of Standard Oil. How does he handle it? Is he objective? Am I objective? But she said, "Have you thought of this?" She said, "Have you interviewed some people who have left UCI, either as a failure or as a

success?" So I thought about that and I said, "Well, I'm going to start thinking about that."

MK: Good.

SM: So Hazard is going to be my success.

MK: Of course, he now is . . . He still has left us.

SM: Yes, but he can say to himself . . .

MK: Why did I leave?

SM: Now why did I leave? What is Irvine doing now that is not doing up in Washington?

MK: That's right.

SM: And what has Irvine meant to me? That's what she had in mind. Now I'm not going to do someone who is total. You take a guy like George Kent who's a total failure, and I don't see any use interviewing him.

MK: You don't want to get someone who is angry.

SM: I don't want to get someone who's angry. But I could get someone who didn't make the tenure, though recommended by department, has gone off and made a success somewhere.

MK: Oh, yes, oh, yes.

SM: What did Irvine mean to you? Well, you're going to get a different story.

MK: That's right. (inaudible)

SM: So, anyhow, I am doing Hazard. I'm doing Hazard when he comes down.

MK: I should mention one other thing about Hazard. This does remind me of one of the small things that happened at UCI, and it probably belongs in the history, that enabled us, at least in my area, to make some of the leaps forward that we've made academically. And that is--what seemed like almost an accident when it happened--the hiring of the part-time, permanent part-time professor. In 1975, Wolfgang Iser, who is probably the most distinguished literary critic in Germany.

SM: How do you spell his last name?

MK: I-S-E-R.

SM: Oh, I remember him. Oh, yes, yes, yes.

MK: Wolfgang Iser, who was, as I say, perhaps the most distinguished critic in Germany, in West Germany, was invited by Bill Lillyman to be visiting professor one quarter, because Bill had become Dean and he had a soft money vacancy in his department for the courses he wasn't teaching, and used that money to bring different visiting professors different years. And in 1975, he brought Wolfgang Iser. Well, Iser, who was doing very exciting work in reception theory, he was really the founder of reception theory and is worldwide in his reputation for this and has many, many students all over the world. Wolfgang became very close to many of us in the Department of English and Comp Lit.

SM: Oh, really?

MK: During the time he was here. And by the time he left, we had decided--he had decided, we had decided--that we would make him an offer and he said he would want to come. He had a very close friend who had left Konstanz--he was at the University of Konstanz in West Germany--who left Konstanz to go to Harvard. And he thought that he now would do much the same thing with Irvine. What he didn't know was that Harvard, as a private university, was able to do all kinds of extravagant things to make up for the retirement that these people would use. Apparently, Germany was anxious to prevent the brain drain. The drain of professors to this country.

SM: Ah ha!

MK: Professors of that caliber had contracts that gave them a 90 percent retirement. That is, if they retired at retirement age they get 90 percent of their final academic salary. Pretty damn good.

SM: Yes.

MK: And he was . . . He's close to my age. He wasn't even then at an age when he would build up enough retirement here. Well, Harvard had made arrangements to buy up much of the retirement of ^J~~Yuri Streeter~~^{iedt}, who was the very distinguished person they hired from Konstanz. And Wolfgang didn't know anything about that when he was here. So when he went back to Konstanz, he didn't realize that he couldn't take his retirement with him. Germany had a rule that if you didn't

stay to retirement, you'd lose it all. And so he wrote back saying, "I'm sorry, I said I would accept the job, but obviously I can't accept the job and lose all this retirement." And it was a very sad letter and we were sad, he was sad. This looked like the first major appointment after me, and that was quite a few years earlier, and we were anxious to build that reputation in Literary Theory. What could we do? And everybody felt sad and unhappy.

It was just about that time that I had begun teaching at UCLA in the spring quarter as part of my University Professor's arrangement. As University Professor, you may remember, from 1973 to 1982 I taught fall and winter quarter at Irvine and spring quarter at UCLA.

SM: Right, I remember well.

MK: And in 1982, our program was flourishing so much, I couldn't any longer afford the luxury of being away, so I cut out the UCLA portion, and from then on I've been here full-time. But I got the idea that why couldn't we use the money every year that I wasn't using up and bring Iser on as a one-third appointment here. Well, that had never been done here. No one knew quite how to handle it.

SM: They want to take it away, Murray, as what they call--what's the word--budget . . .

MK: Salary savings.

SM: Salary saving. That's where your money goes . . .

MK: But this was a permanent arrangement. And I got to Carl Hartman and Carl and I got to Jim McGaugh. Or was it Jim McGaugh yet in 1973? Well, whoever it was. But what I remember was that finally it was arranged, that we would have the soft money to bring Wolfgang Iser, and we could bring him as visiting professor each year. That didn't satisfy me. I was worried because I knew once Iser started visiting this country another university would snap him up on a full-time appointment. That is, a full-time appointment even on a one-third basis.

SM: Right, right.

MK: So what I insisted on was that he be given an FTE, a .33 FTE, hard money, budget money, that I be budgeted as a two-thirds professor at Irvine, since UCLA paid back every year one-third of my appointment, and that that one-third appointment money we got back from UCLA would be . . . Since I'd be a .67 professor at Irvine, he would become a .33 professor at Irvine. There was a world of difference, I insisted, between having this person come on soft money from year to year, with each year a new contract, and having this professor committed to be a UC professor of English, able to take graduate students with obligations and so on, if he was willing to do it, on a .33 FTE.

SM: What happened?

MK: I got it through.

SM: Great.

MK: I got it through and Iser came, and immediately that brought a lot of notice to us. But beyond that, when in 1980 . . . When was it? In 1984 or something like that, when I discovered I had a good chance to bring Hillis Miller here as Distinguished Professor from Yale, which really would be a blockbuster appointment, and it turned out to be a blockbuster appointment, in terms of the kinds of students we started getting almost from then on. Hillis said he would come, yes, but he had this arrangement . . . had for many years an arrangement with Jacques Derrida, the distinguished French philosopher. Derrida had been coming to Hopkins.

SM: D-E-R . . .

MK: D-E-R-R-I-D-A.

SM: That's right. He's come up in a former interview I had. I've forgotten with whom.

MK: Oh. So Hillis had gotten Derrida to come to Hopkins. When Hillis went to Yale, he got Derrida a part-time appointment at Yale. And I flew to Paris to talk to Derrida about a similar kind of appointment here. Now the Iser model had been created, so the notion was: let's do it again. It had worked so well with Iser, let's get another .33 FTE appointment. And the Iser model was there, and so Derrida came to be appointment the same way, and Miller would not have come if Derrida hadn't come after him. But it was hardly a

consolation. I mean, Derrida is so distinguished in his own right. We have people coming from all over the country to hear his lectures when he's here.

SM: Well, how long did Derrida come to us? Oh, excuse me, did Iser come to us?

MK: He's still coming.

SM: That's good. I met him (inaudible).

MK: Not only is he still coming, but he's retiring from Konstanz at sixty-five, year after this, and is then going to start coming here two quarters.

SM: Oh, wonderful. That's good news. I met him at Bill's. Bill had the dinner for him once and we were there. Say, tell me something . . .

MK: I want to just add one other thing to this.

SM: Yes.

MK: Because at the same time then, it turns out that this other very distinguished French philosopher, Jean-France Lyotard . . .

SM: How do you spell Lyotard?

MK: L-Y-O-T-A-R-D. Probably the leading philosopher of Post-Modernism. He has a book called The Post-Modern ^{Condition} Tradition, which is translated in ^{to} every language and is sort of the standard work. We found out Lyotard would be willing to come for a quarter. So we did it again! And I said why not do a whole year?

SM: Yes.

MK: Lyotard in the fall, Iser in the winter and Derrida in the spring. And so we now have three . . . And that's one of the best inventions I had since I came here.

SM: Well, you know, way at the beginning, Murray, I told all four chairmen that they could have a visiting professor once a year. Why don't you get a really good person that will shake everybody up, the students, the faculty, and really be great. Or have a literary figure. So Hazard chose X. J. Kennedy for that [first year].

MK: I know, he started with writers. He felt the writing program needed it.

SM: Right, he did, so he chose X. J. Kennedy. Well, then, all of a sudden, it was a hard FTE that I had, a 1.0 FTE. The administration wiped it out because the guy had gone home.

MK: Yes.

SM: I said, "That's ridiculous! We've got to work it out, Hazard, so this is a permanent FTE." And then, you know, he had them all the way down through Galway Kinnell, you know.

MK: Of course. But this is the reason why I wanted that locked in as an FTE figure and they could never take it away, it was an FTE.

SM: Well, we had to lock it in, though. They had an FTE, which they took, because the man had left.

MK: It was vacated. It was vacated.

SM: Terminated, he had vacated it.

MK: But, of course, these one-third FTEs would never be vacated.

SM: Yes, you're right. I know the whole. I know what you're doing. It's very good.

MK: But once that model was created, we got Iser, then we got Derrida, then we got Lyotard.

SM: That's great.

MK: And now Hazard is under the same model.

SM: Oh, wonderful. That's great.

MK: And Hazard once again is a .33 FTE coming every year. It's the same model again.

SM: Oh, that's wonderful.

MK: And, by the way, it did occur to me, one thing that's not been mentioned here. I don't know if you want us to talk about it. It may take too much time, but we've not talked at all When we spoke about the growth of Critical Theory at Irvine, we never mentioned the School of Criticism and Theory, which is really the linchpin that got Irvine's distinction in Critical Theory on the national and international map.

SM: The School of . . . ?

MK: Of Criticism and Theory.

SM: Now are you speaking, then, of the one that's the most recent one?

MK: No, I'm speaking No, I speak now of something different.

SM: Oh.

MK: No, I'm speaking of an international institute that I started in the middle seventies. But it's a good story again. I got a tremendous offer from Johns Hopkins.

SM: Well do I remember that.

MK: Which I came within an inch of taking. And at one point, Dan Aldrich brought me into his office and said, "Why do you want to go to Johns Hopkins? We'll match anything they give you." And I said, "Well, to tell you the truth, there is that eastern establishment in the Humanities. In the sciences, wherever you have brilliant scientists, you can build a great department overnight. But in Humanities, it's a conservative discipline, and the eastern private institutions, Yale, Harvard, Columbia, Princeton, Hopkins, Cornell and so on, these eastern private institutions seem to have a stranglehold on it, and it's a little network they have out there.

And, quite frankly, if you are out there, you're where the establishment is and your books will get reviewed by more places. You're running up and down lecturing at all these places, you have interchange with all these people, and so on. I said I suppose it's basically a question of: Do I really, finally, after all these years, want to get back and go where the establishment is. And Dan said, "What if we bring the establishment here?" And I said, "Well, how would you do

that?" He said, "You invent the way and I'll let you do it."
That's just like Dan.

SM: (laughter) That's Dan. Oh, wonderful!

MK: And I came back with a proposal which Hazard and I worked out together. Of course, it didn't hurt that Hazard was also Vice Chancellor of Academic Affairs at this time. And our proposal was to start a summer program, run not by the university, but we would create a board of fellows made up of the ten most distinguished people we could get to join from anywhere. I had friends among the best people we could possibly get, from Northrop Frye on down. And this would be the board of fellows that would operate an independent summer program, funded to begin with by the NEH. I remember Hazard and I flew to Washington and got the NEH grant.

We would invite each summer sixty young, either ~~professors,~~ assistant professors or young associate professors, people within the last ten years of their degree, of their Ph.D., within ten years of having been awarded their Ph.Ds., young people in the profession, or very advanced graduate students. And we would have a program made up of six courses taught by six world-famous, highly visible fellows. And it worked. We got the money. NEH gave us a three-year grant, with decreasing amounts each year, with the university picking up increasing amounts, until it was all university by 1979. We planned it in 1975.

SM: Where did you have your meetings?

MK: Here.

SM: Right here?

MK: In the university. It was summer. We used the dormitories for the students. The faculty, we got faculty housing. The first year, as a matter of fact, Promontory Point was just being built. They gave us very cheap apartments at Promontory Point--never could get those again--for our faculty. We had the biggest . . . We had Frank Kermodé, a Regents Professor from Cambridge.

SM: How do you spell Kermodé?

MK: K-E-R-M-O-D-E.

SM: Excuse my ignorance, but do you spell Konstanz, C-O-N-S-T-A-N-C-E?

MK: No, that's the English ^{transliteration} alliteration. It actually is K-O-N-S-T-A-N-Z.

SM: That's right. That's how we once spelled it.

MK: That's right. Constance is . . . You know, we speak of Lake Constance, but it's the same lake.

SM: Yes, I know.

MK: They don't call it Lake Constance, by the way, they call it Bodensee, meaning "the sea on the floor."

SM: Yes.

MK: On the floor of Germany, because, as you know, it's surrounded by . . . It's at the very bottom of Germany.

SM: That's right.

MK: Anyway, we had the most incredible people willing to associate themselves with that school. We felt we could influence the next generation of teachers of literature by having this school, in which we would have theory and criticism infused into the English curriculum that way. Well, that group now is . . . They're the chairs of departments. We now have graduated from the School of Criticism and Theory--I mean, we've had people in the six-week summer session of the School of Criticism and Theory--over 750.

SM: Gee, I'm embarrassed. I did not know this.

^ MK: We had it at Irvine in 1976, 1977, 1978, 1979, under my direction. Hazard and I ^{were} ~~will~~ co-directors until Hazard left for Seattle. Then, in 1979, Jim McGaugh called me into his office and said, "Prop[osition] 13 just passed. I don't know that I can guarantee this money each year for the future." We had just gotten it back from the NEH and we had to fund it ourselves. We funded 1979, but he said, "With Prop 13, I don't know that I can guarantee it into the future. Can we wait and you come to me each year?" I said, "No, the people I get to teach, we have to have two years in advance or we won't get them."

SM: Yes, I remember. Oh, I remember that.

MK: And so then what happened was it moved. It moved from Irvine to Northwestern. Northwestern bought in a minute, as soon as they heard that Irvine couldn't . . .

SM: Yes, I recall that.

MK: Well, my senior fellows voted not to keep it at Irvine if we had to come each year and not know whether the money was there or not.

SM: Oh, no, no, no.

MK: Couldn't do it.

SM: They were right.

MK: So Northwestern bought it and they had it from . . . I brought it to Northwestern and I was Director at Northwestern in 1981, but I did . . .

SM: So you went to Evanston?

^
MK: For one summer only. I said I wouldn't spend more than one summer in Evanston. (chuckling) And ^{Geoffrey} Jeffrey Hartman took it over after 1981, and it was in Evanston for five years and then it moved to Dartmouth.

SM: Well, that's a nice place to spend a summer. Hanover is nice.

o
MK: It was my idea [that] I didn't want to seem as if Irvine lost it. I wanted it to seem as if it was moveable ^{or} feast. Five years in the far West, five years in the Midwest, five years in the East. I thought that would make it look better. Besides which, I felt the Midwest is not the best place for a summer program. So when Dartmouth made a bid for it, we

^
^ moved to Dartmouth. Just as I carried it to Northwestern for
one year and then gave it away, ^{Geoffrey} Jeffrey carried it one year
to Dartmouth. Now Michael Rittatterre, who ^{ff} you may remember, ^m
you tried to recruit him.

SM: Oh, I tried to get him, tried to get him.

MK: He's University Professor, by the way, as I am. He's a
University Professor at Columbia now. And he's director of
the school now.

SM: Did I ever tell you what happened? He turned us down and
everything. This was 1968, I think.

MK: I remember.

SM: And, anyhow, I went to New York. I was recruiting or
something and we were going to a history meeting, too. And
I saw in the paper, you know, a headline, "Three People Were
Mugged Outside of Columbia," where he lived. So I got on the
phone, and I said, "Look here, we're very disappointed you
can't come. But don't you think with all this danger . . .
you're not going to be in any danger here where we are." And
he said, "You know, I really want to come, but there is this
odd situation of my children. I'm divorced and I cannot . . .
. If I leave and go outside of the state of New York, I'll
lose the . . ."

MK: Custody.

SM: " . . . the custody of my children."

MK: The rights, the visiting rights. That's right, yes.

SM: So that's why we lost Ritt^{fe}caterre.

MK: I know. Well, he's a close friend, and he's become the successor to me at Dartmouth.

SM: They're doing it in New York, are they?

MK: It's still in Dartmouth. No, it's still in Dartmouth.

SM: Oh, I love Dartmouth.

MK: But, anyway, the visibility we earned. People still refer to it sometimes as the Irvine School, even though it's moved.

SM: Yes, that's nice, that's nice.

MK: And that gave us the visibility in Critical Theory. That is really what got us to the next point. And, you see, Hillis Miller was one of the teachers we had out here teaching. And that's he fell in love with us.

SM: Yes, yes.

MK: And that's why we got him later. We got a lot of bonuses out of that.

SM: Well, wonderful. Well, really, then, the last question is, Murray, have you any suggestions for me?

MK: Not beyond what you're doing. You're doing a great job (inaudible).

SM: I think the most valuable thing, really, honestly, Murray, are these interviews. I use, of course, quite a bit of them or a lot of them for my history. But they'll stand there in the record for years, you know.

MK: Oh, I see. You're keeping it separate from the data for the history.

SM: Now these interviews follows . . . Jack [Peltason] did a nice thing. I guess they know on tape what we're doing, so I'll accept this and thank you very much for one of the best interviews I've had, Murray.

END OF INTERVIEW