

INTERVIEW WITH FRANCIS BONNER
FORMER CHAIRMAN, DEPARTMENT OF CHEMISTRY

November 1 and 8, 1988

Dr. Hartzell: Former Chairman Department of Chemistry, November 1, 1988, in my office. So, go ahead.

Dr. Bonner: I'm Francis Bonner; I'm in the Department of Chemistry, Professor of Chemistry. I came to Stony Brook in, I came to the University in 1958; it was then, of course, Oyster Bay and I was 36 years old at the time, which makes me now 66.

Dr. Hartzell: 66.

Dr. Bonner: I came to Stony Brook from an industrial position. I was working for the Arthur D. Little Company in Cambridge, Massachusetts, and had been working in industry for a period of about three years; prior to that I had been in an academic position at Brooklyn College in the City University of New York.

Dr. Hartzell: Let me see how this, okay.

Dr. Bonner: I had been at Brooklyn College and had spent one year as a Visiting Assistant Professor at Harvard before that. The first thing that was primarily responsible for my coming to Stony Brook was Leonard Olsen. The way it came was that I had been an early member of the Chemistry Department at Brookhaven National Laboratory and had left there in 1948 to pursue an academic career. When Leonard Olsen, the then Dean of the College at Oyster Bay, was recruiting he went to Brookhaven Laboratory and one of the questions that he asked at Brookhaven was for recommendations concerning someone to come and build a new chemistry department. He happened to speak to Gerhard Friedlander, who was a very dear friend of mine from back in the earliest days of Brookhaven and Gerhard dropped my name, and the next thing was that Leonard Olsen wrote to me, was interested in me, for one reason that he was interested in me was that I had recently published a book, a textbook called "Principles of Physical Science," which was a text which I wrote jointly with Melba Phillips, then of the University of Chicago,

which was a presentation of the fundamentals of the physical sciences for non-science students. It was, the person that interviewed me primarily for the position was Leonard Olsen. Then, of course, I came down to Oyster Bay and I met most of the then faculty members, which was then a very small group of people, after all; and my understanding of the purposes behind the creation of Stony Brook was that Stony Brook was to become a full-scale university. It was made quite clear to me that the public mission at the time of being a small college for preparation of high school, science and mathematics teachers was really a cover for an effort to build something much more substantial and much bigger; and when I came it was with the full-scale assumption that our mission was to build toward a development of graduate programs and to form an active research oriented university. So those were the factors that were important in my decision; it seemed to me to be a unique opportunity was being asked to come and build a department, was a unique opportunity to build a new chemistry department from scratch. There was just one faculty member in chemistry there prior to my coming, that was Perry Gordon, who subsequently went to Brookhaven Lab. So, it was a unique opportunity to build a unique department, which as I understood it was to be a full-scale graduate department and went to work on the design of the then new Chemistry Building immediately, worked with the architects. And one thing I will always remember is that because of the blind of this being a small scale teacher preparation college, it was necessary to use euphemisms for the designation of research laboratories, so that the design of the building was full of preparation rooms and much imaginative language to actually design research laboratories directly into the building which was under design at the time.

Dr. Hartzell: Just a minute; you had the classrooms on one side of the corridor and the labs on the other side?

Dr. Bonner: Yes, we did.

Dr. Hartzell: You worked that way; and I think Physics did too.

Dr. Bonner: Yes.

Dr. Hartzell: Okay, right.

Dr. Bonner: So, let's see on the suggested checklist here there is a portion 'what was the vision being transformed into reality?' Well, that was the vision that I came with, was the vision of a new university, with an opportunity to build a new chemistry department, a graduate Ph. D. granting chemistry department in a state that did not have a well developed state university by any means and was long overdue and a state with substantial resources, so that it certainly looked like something, it looked like a very unique opportunity.

Dr. Hartzell: Was Rockefeller Governor then or was Harriman still Governor?

Dr. Bonner: Rockefeller was Governor.

Dr. Hartzell: He was Governor then.

Dr. Bonner: 1958, yes. I guess he was elected in the fall of 1957, I think his term had just begun in 1958, because, well, I'm not sure. I may be wrong about who was Governor, because my recollection is now that it was Rockefeller who came to break ground in Stony Brook, but that was not until 1960.

Dr. Hartzell: Were you at the groundbreaking?

Dr. Bonner: I was at the groundbreaking.

Dr. Hartzell: Do you remember Rockefeller's speech?

Dr. Bonner: Yes, he said that here I am inaugurating a Harriman project, so I think that's right; I think when I came in 1958 Harriman was Governor because he said that during the election campaign, Harriman had, he had accused Harriman of going around cutting ribbons on -- who was Governor before Harriman?

Dr. Hartzell: Dewey was.

Dr. Bonner: Cutting ribbons on Dewey projects, yeah, so here he was about to inaugurate a Harriman project, so that settles the issue. He was very charming, there were many schoolchildren let out for the day to see the Governor, and he had a good repartee going with them, and then he got a land mover and proceeded to desecrate the land. It was amazing how they, in order to build a few small buildings, they had to actually deforest such a big region. It was the way things were done in those days.

Dr. Hartzell: Right. There are pictures of Rockefeller and I think Leland Hayworth at a luncheon at the Three Village Inn at that time, so I think in some way Brookhaven was involved, and I'd like to find out more about that.

Dr. Bonner: I see; well, I don't know about that. Of course, George Collins was a member of the Council, George Collins was then Chairman of the Accelerator Department at Brookhaven. I had many long conversations with George during the time when I was considering coming; it took me quite a while to make my decision. I had a good job in Cambridge; I was enjoying industrial research, it was a big change for me and the economic future up there appeared very bright. So, it was quite a while before I made my decision. Then I should insert in here that after I had made my decision and accepted the appointment, that there were some things that happened that gave me very cold feet and I actually wrote a letter to Leonard Olsen withdrawing from the, withdrawing my acceptance of the appointment. What it was that was giving me cold feet was, although I had this understanding that I was to be given a mandate to build a Chemistry Department, one of the first things that happened, I think, was I got an inquiry from Dean Olsen suggesting that it would be appropriate for me to teach a mathematics course when I came. So, of course, I didn't feel that would be appropriate at all, either for the students or for me and this led me to examine in more detail than I had previously what the spirit was and what the practices were and I found that there was a large, there was a very substantial proportion of the Oyster Bay faculty that held this ideal, which apparently came from the University of Chicago program that teachers should be renaissance teachers and be able to fill in wherever needed, that there was a positive virtue in that and that was one of the first inklings that I had that I might be up against an unusual situation. One of the people I discussed this with at greatest length, and who played a very big role in persuading me to rescind my withdrawal was Cliff Swarz, and there were many discussions with Cliff Swarz and with George Collins at that time. Cliff Swarz was quite convinced that, although there were these problems and they bothered him as much as they did me, that this was something that was really going to work and that I should

come. So, I came in that spirit, understanding that there might be some internal debates about the direction of the institution, if we were going to have an institution that was so focused on undergraduate education that everybody had to be a renaissance person teaching courses of all varieties, it was going to be difficult to develop an appropriate graduate program with the essential research component to go with it. I took on that challenge understanding that there might be some clouds over it, at least that there was going to be some clarification that was going to have to come.

Dr. Hartzell: Did Dean Olsen actually talk to you in terms of graduate work?

Dr. Bonner: My recollection is yes.

Dr. Hartzell: I see, because that's one, when I came in 1962 there was no question but that Chemistry and Physics were already headed for graduate work.

Dr. Bonner: That's correct, yes.

Dr. Hartzell: And Biology was the first department that Dave Fox and I decided that we ought to have outside people come in and check quality of the faculty and the program and the facilities before we applied to Albany to go into graduate work. The assumption was the permission had already been given to Chemistry and Physics when I got there in 1962, but not to Biology.

Dr. Bonner: That's correct. I should say at this time that I'll take credit for something else that a very good thing for the University, and that is that, after I had made my decision to come to Stony Brook, I received a telephone call from Leonard Eisenbud, who was a friend of mine going back to Oak Ridge days, Oak Ridge National Laboratory before I went to Brookhaven over time, and Len and Leonard Eisenbud called me up and said he's heard this rumor that I was going to go to some unknown college on Long Island, he was then at the Bartow Research Foundation in Philadelphia, Swarthmore, Pennsylvania, and what could I tell him about it. I told him about it and he said well he'd really like to consider the possibility of being included and so I put him in touch with Leonard Olsen and the upshot of that was that Leonard Eisenbud arrived the same time I

did, so that was a contact for me that brought Leonard here. There was another thing that happened

Dr. Hartzell: This was 1958.

Dr. Bonner: What's that?

Dr. Hartzell: This was 1958?

Dr. Bonner: It was 1958, yes. And there was someone else named Joe Silverman whom I had known at Brookhaven, he was a student of Vic Dodson, a doctoral student of Vic Dodson from Columbia, who did his research at Brookhaven and he was

Dr. Hartzell: Vic Dodson was Chairman of Chemistry at Brookhaven.

Dr. Bonner: And Joe was then working for an industrial concern, I guess he was part owner of an industrial concern on the Island here, and he heard about this and he was interested. And the upshot of that was that Joe was recruited also, Joe came as an Associate Professor, I came as Full Professor and so we started in Fall of 1958 with a three man Chemistry Department, Barry Gordon and Joe Silverman. Just to say what happened to Joe, at the end of one year, Joe Silverman had an offer from the University of Maryland and, actually the Chemical Engineering Department, so there was some tension in him between applied science and basic science, and he had concluded by that time that this experiment, that the State University of New York was not going to work.

Dr. Hartzell: So, he went to Maryland.

Dr. Bonner: At the end of one year Joe went to Maryland. So, the first year was a time of planning, there was a lot to be done on the building, there was a man named Mike Golicki who worked with me, with whom I worked. He was an architectural engineer with Voorhees, Walker, Smith, Smith and Haynes -- that was the original architectural firm -- and worked with him on the building design. That was a very crucially important matter and Mike Golicki was really quite wonderful because

Dr. Hartzell: How do you spell his name?

Dr. Bonner: I think G O L I C K I. Because every time I would say we need, for example, we need to store a distilled water system in the building, he would put that in

and then take it to Elwin Stevens, who was then the principal person that the campus had to deal with in the Department of Public Works, there was no State University Construction Fund at the time. Elwin Stevens would 'x' that out and then Mike Golicki would come back to me and I'd get him to put it back in, and Mike Golicki did a really fine job of protecting our interests and seeing to it that the scientific people on campus were being appropriately, that needs were going to be appropriately, and he himself had some knock down, drag out fights with Stevens over things like, because Stevens was used to dealing with small college situations. He knew better. If I said we needed a distilled water system in the building, Elwin Stevens knew better, it was that kind of thing.

Dr. Hartzell: He was in the University Architect's office, or State Architect's office?

Dr. Bonner: The Department of Public Works, he was with, DPW was the agency that built, that took care of all State construction, and it was a very difficult agency to deal with. I mean that was certainly a great contribution of Rockefeller's to create the SUCF. Now the Stony Brook campus; of course, the Oyster Bay campus was just lovely, it was really beautiful; but you know that, Karl, it was a beautiful place to live, wasn't it? So, it was, those first two years, the years in Oyster Bay, the first two years in particular developed into a strange kind of nightmare really, because here we were in these beautiful surroundings and within the course of those two years -- '58 to '60 -- the tension between those members, of whom I was a strong advocate, who believed that the mission of the University was to develop a University, and there was reason for this in, I guess the Heald Report, it was by that time in existence; and the Heald Report had a very clear recommendation on that. So there was tension between that point of view and the point of view of the others identified with the Chicago college, a substantial number of people, including Leonard Olsen himself, who had come from Chicago College, wanted to build a new Hutchins program on Long Island.

Dr. Hartzell: He came from Albany

Dr. Bonner: He came from Albany

Dr. Hartzell: But his basis was Chicago.

Dr. Bonner: His education, his orientation on higher education was Chicago College. And then Alan Austill was the Dean of Students and kind of a number two henchman for administration of Olsen, and his orientation was similar from St. John's in Maryland. I think Alan Austill had come from there.

Dr. Hartzell: I'm not sure. I've got it on tape.

Dr. Bonner: But this did develop into a major kind of a battle and it was at the end of my first year there in 1959 that Leonard Olsen, in a very real way, threw down the gauntlet on this issue because there were three men from Columbia -- Ralph Bowen, who was Professor of History; Martin Fleisher, Assistant Professor of Political Science; and Emanuel Chill, who was Assistant Professor of History. They were, those three had all come from the, from Columbia, they were all closely identified with Columbia western civilization program and their educational orientation, and they had been there long enough they had been there by this time now two years, so it was hard for them, nobody came with tenure. I came with a three year appointment myself as Full Professor. And Ralph Bowen had been there as a Full Professor, but he did not have tenure. So, at the end of two years, it was time to give them notice about whether they would be re-appointed or not, and so late in the summer of 1959 Leonard Olsen informed them that they would not be re-appointed and they were going to be denied tenure; and this seemed very clearly to be a drawing of lines between the Columbia orientation and the Chicago orientation, I hate to put it in such black and white terms, but that's really the way it emerged, that's the way it appeared because they were all, Ralph Bowen was an established person and that was, and Bowen and Fleisher and Chill were both very smart, there was no clear reason to deny them, at least re-appoint them, and then perhaps tenure, but there was no reason to deny at least re-appointment for an additional term. It was impossible to interpret, it was impossible for me to interpret it in any way other than it was related to the conflict that had developed. Prior to, just prior to this announcement,

Leonard Olsen called me and he also called Leonard Eisenbud and informed us that we were both being recommended for tenure appointments as of the fall of 1959, and, so that So those are the events surrounding that situation, events and the persons and the experiences are the ones that really stand out in my mind from the Oyster Bay days and; however, in that first year I recruited four faculty members, who, all of whom became quite prominent on this campus; my first efforts at recruitment and the first appointment I succeeded in making was Fausto Ramirez, who was already at that time very well known in Organic Chemistry, I brought him from Illinois Institute of Technology; and I recruited Bill Lenoble, who has gone on to become a very important organic chemist in this country; and Ted Goldfarb, 24 years old, just completing his Ph. D. with George Clementell at Berkeley, and we signed him on as well. Then, in the summer when Joe Silverman decided to go to Maryland, there was a vacancy and it actually was Fausto who thought about Sei Sujishi, who we moved from MIT; and in a burst of last minute activity, we managed to recruit Sei Sujishi.

Dr. Hartzell: Was he in Organic Chemistry?

Dr. Bonner: Inorganic. So we hired on inorganic, one physical and two organic chemists that first year, so that gave us a very solid department and Fausto's appointment was particularly important in the development of research activity, he came with a couple of post-docs with active research grants, and we were over there in those prefabricated Butler building laboratories but we were able to get research space in operation and get research going.

Dr. Hartzell: He was very proud that one of his publications was the first to be produced by Stony Brook.

Dr. Bonner: He was absolutely right, he had every right to be proud of that. He was an outstanding person in the field of phosphorous chemistry.

Dr. Bonner: Organo phosphorous chemistry, he was quite preeminent, enormous publication record, and it was the appointment of Fausto, the appointment of Fausto was in many ways the making of the department, it was, because he was sufficiently well

known to give, so that it gave out the information of what we were doing in this unknown, that we were actually serious about building a research oriented larger Department of Chemistry, so the fact that we had made that appointment made a big difference in subsequent recruitment. For example, Bill Lenoble, I think Bill's, Bill applied to us after it was known, it became known that Fausto was coming and that was a very important event.

Dr. Hartzell: Was he from Illinois?

Dr. Bonner: Bill came here from, yes, he was teaching in a small Catholic college in Illinois, but he got his Ph. D. in Chicago and he had been a post-doc at Purdue, and then he had gone to industry at Romanhaus in Philadelphia and he decided industry was not for him, that he wanted to do, wanted an academic job and he had gone to a small college for a one-year appointment and decided to look somewhere else. So, I think those are most of the questions on the suggested checklist. I should say something about my own research activities; I was so busy with the administrative aspect of things that it was not possible for me to set up my own laboratory right away and get things moving in Oyster Bay, as Fausto was able to and then Bill and others, Ed Kossauer, who came in 1961, and so on.

Dr. Hartzell: Where did Kossauer come from?

Dr. Bonner: University of Wisconsin.

Dr. Hartzell: I see.

Dr. Bonner: But I was very fortunate in having close personal ties at Brookhaven, personalized professional ties at Brookhaven, and I was invited immediately upon arrival to become a research collaborator at Brookhaven and thus my association with Brookhaven made a big difference, as it did to the University in general, it made a big difference to a lot of people. So, for a number of years I did my research, I took, I set aside a minimum of one day a week to go to spend a full day at Brookhaven, and I worked in collaboration with Oliver Shaeffer at Brookhaven.

Dr. Hartzell: Did you, is that right?

Dr. Bonner: Yes, I guess I would have to say that have to take some credit for the subsequent recruitment of Oliver Shaeffer to Stony Brook, and as you know, he made a big difference certainly in the development of a fine Earth and Space Science Department.

Dr. Hartzell: He certainly did. I knew him when I was at Brookhaven.

Dr. Bonner: I'm sure you did. Well, Oliver and I arrived at Brookhaven actually on the same day in 1947.

Dr. Hartzell: Is that right.

Dr. Bonner: Yes, and we lived near each other and had carpooled from Medford.

Dr. Hartzell: I arrived in September 1st, 1947.

Dr. Bonner: Right around when we did.

Dr. Hartzell: I was with Sam Gaudsmith and Lou Stern.

Dr. Bonner: Brookhaven reminiscences come in here too.

Dr. Hartzell: One of the first things I did when I came was to bring Oren Phyte, Maurice Goldhaber to bring some of the top people for cocktails at Sunwood to meet you people. I don't know whether you remember that, that was one of the first things I did, bring the top people together.

Dr. Bonner: That was 1962?

Dr. Hartzell: Yes, the fall of 1962.

Dr. Bonner: I don't remember that occasion, it's conceivable that I was, I remember that for much of that summer I was in South America with Dick Morris, and we were talking about Dick Morris the other night. 1962, yes, it may be that I was out of the country when that occasion took place. I should tell at this, I should tell a little story about Ward Melville, you mention Ward Melville.

Dr. Hartzell: All right, good.

Dr. Bonner: I, of course, was well aware of his relation to Stony Brook as our official sugar daddy, and when I was, when we were house hunting, we agreed to come

because in January, and then we went through this uncertain time and along about March, I guess it was, maybe even a little bit later

Dr. Hartzell: 1959?

Dr. Bonner: 1958, this is, we were seriously house hunting and this was difficult to do, we had three little kids and it was difficult to do at long distance from Lexington, Mass, where we were living at the time, but at one point we found a house in Greenlawn, which was halfway between Stony Brook and Oyster Bay, which is how we had decided to play it. We found a place that we really liked, we really wanted, but we were put over a barrel by the owner, who required us to get a mortgage commitment in 48 hours or something like that, something quite difficult to do. And in racking my brains about this, I thought about the person was friendly to the University, who surely had outstanding connections to banks in the area, and I called from Washington, I called Leonard Olsen and told him that I was in this situation, and asked him whether he thought it at all possible that Ward Melville might help us out; and he said he thought so, and within the specified time period we had a commitment from one of the major banks on Long Island. Then I subsequently found out what had happened, what happened was that Ward Melville went to Greenlawn in person, himself, and inspected the house that we were proposing to buy; and then called the Security National Bank and told them to make a mortgage commitment to us.

Dr. Hartzell: Very good.

Dr. Bonner: I thought that was nice of him. And then I should add a footnote, and that is after when we went to the closing, we did get charged an appraiser's fee.

Dr. Hartzell: Well, he was, he had a soft spot for individuals, Ward did, very definitely. He was a humanitarian, in that sense. One to one individual. He and I became, I think, quite close.

Dr. Bonner: Well,

Dr. Hartzell: Do you want to get into the Lee situation at all or?

Dr. Bonner: Sure, I'll get into the John Lee situation next. Chemistry Department was flourishing with those first appointments, we were doing very well. Then, in 1960 two junior level appointments were made, and that was, one was Arthur Leffley and the other was Robert Schneider. Leffley left a few years later, our Bob Schneider is still here, as you know. Is that Art Leffley's father? "Value of Cooperative Inquiry" by Ray Leffley, was he at Columbia; Peoria, Illinois. That's right, I remember Art Leffley came from, there's a university in Peoria, he was a graduate of that institution. And in 1961 Ed Kossauer came. And it was in 1961 that John Lee was appointed; and this came about in the, as a byproduct of the conflict and tension that was building on the Oyster Bay campus. One feature of it was that the, there was a mandate, a public mandate by that time for the University to build a program in engineering, and there was at that time only one very junior faculty member in engineering. We had by 1961, we had all four classes -- freshman, sophomore, and junior and senior classes -- because the bunch of kids who came in 1957 were senior by that time, so we had, not in the winter of 1961, we had juniors -- freshmen, sophomores and juniors -- and freshmen were coming in with the promise that there was going to be an engineering program. But Leonard Olsen wasn't doing anything about it; and there was only a man named Dick Glasheen, you remember Dick?

Dr. Hartzell: Vaguely, yes.

Dr. Bonner: Dick Glasheen was the one engineer and so some of us got to be extremely concerned about this problem if they have public mandate to build an engineering school, why aren't we doing something about recruiting engineering faculty. So, what happened was that John Lee came as a candidate for the position of Dean of Engineering, and Leonard Olsen recommended to SUNY Central that he be appointed, and I don't recall now who it was attributed to, but I was told at the time that Leonard Olsen, that somebody in SUNY Central turned it around on Olsen, and said, well, if he's that good, if John Lee is that good, then why just Dean of Engineering, why don't we consider him as a President. Did you ever hear anything like that story?

Dr. Hartzell: I've heard something like that, but whether that came from anyone here at Stony Brook, in other words, that story or whether it came from Larry Murray, it could very well have come from Larry Murray.

Dr. Bonner: It seemed to us that somebody in Albany was trying to solve the conflict problem here by putting, by going over Leonard Olsen's head. And this was a way of doing it, was to bring somebody in over him; and John Lee, who, as it turns out, was the sacrificial party for that, because it is certainly clear that it was a surprise to Olsen that this happened. And that it was a very, the appointment of John Lee and the way he, himself, handled the situation was very polarizing. The appointment itself polarized the faculty, if there was any polarization needed; but it carried polarization about as far as it could. If I recall John came in about January 1961, and I was one of the people that he consulted with rather closely, regularly and Sidney Gelber, of course, was another; and Sidney

Dr. Hartzell: Sidney was Chairman of Philosophy?

Dr. Bonner: I don't think he was Chairman of anything. There was, we had departments only in the sciences; that was something that I think Leonard Olsen would prefer not to have done, but he couldn't fight the sciences, he couldn't stamp it out. But there was still a divisional structure and the maximum person was still a divisional chairman; but in the humanities and social sciences, there were no departments, so Sidney was there as Professor of Philosophy, I guess.

Dr. Hartzell: I think so.

Dr. Bonner: Or the title might have been Professor of Humanities, that's the way things were being done. The deliberate effort to de-emphasize discipline and departmental structure, and I think that many, probably Leonard Olsen brought many of the particularly Chicago colleagues, deplored this departmentalization that was happening in the sciences. So Sidney was appointed Dean. John Lee decided he needed a Dean of Arts & Science to come to grips with the situation, and he appointed Sidney Gelber Dean of Arts & Science.

Dr. Hartzell: What was Leonard Olsen's position after Lee came?

Dr. Bonner: That's a good question. I really don't recall what he was told. He might have, I think he may have been called Dean of Faculty, but I'm not sure, but he was number two. And he had a following that considered this inappropriate and he himself considered it inappropriate and it was a very rugged time. It was a very rugged time, and then some moves were made. The appointment of Les Tack and the denial of tenure to Robert Smolker, these were lightning rod events that increased the polarization, and of course, then we started having this campaign in the newspapers, well, typically Newsday.

Dr. Hartzell: Yeah, Smolker was from Chicago?

Dr. Bonner: Smolker was from Chicago, yes, I'm quite sure. I think that, that wasn't the basis on which the, certainly not because he was from Chicago, I mean, that drew the denial of tenure, but in terms of the, but by this time the graduate program development objectives of the institution were openly articulated and was, by John Lee, and was not an underground thing anymore at all, and I think the judgment about Bob Smolker was that he didn't have very strong research credentials and that it was necessary for the Biology Department to build its research capabilities, that we were going to fulfill the mission that was now being articulated. And by this time, we in the Chemistry Department had developed a Ph. D. program on paper and were pushing hard for its approval, so that we could begin recruitment for the Fall of 1962, which is what we were shooting for.

Dr. Hartzell: When did you get your approval?

Dr. Bonner: We got our approval in, not, we got our approval after John Lee was fired, and it came in a meeting with Tom Hamilton, the President from Albany. What happened was we had our Ph. D., ours and Physics, and if I recall correctly, one or two engineering programs -- mechanical and electrical perhaps -- those programs were developed on paper, we had processed them, attempted to process them through proper channels to try to get SUNY Central and then you need State Education Department

approval, so that we could go ahead and begin recruitment in the Winter of 1961-62. Then John Lee was fired and a cloud came over the future. We, then morale went down to the bottom; mine certainly did, I didn't know what we were doing there and what this department, that had been recruited by me for purposes of developing a certain kind of an institution, was now in question. We didn't know whether it was going to be a graduate and research oriented university or not; it looked very much as though it would not be, in view of this public repudiation and humiliation of John Lee, who had been articulating that objective publicly and strongly.

Dr. Hartzell: Do you know why he was fired? Why do you think he was fired?

Dr. Bonner: Well, insubordination for one thing.

Dr. Hartzell: As far as the Central Office?

Dr. Bonner: As far as the Central Office was concerned. No, are you going to tell me why you

Dr. Hartzell: No, I'm listening, I'm not saying.

Dr. Bonner: How did it look to you and the people

Dr. Bonner: Well, it looked to me as though he was fired because there were forces in SUNY Central that were (a) really opposed to the idea of the development of a full-scale university. They were the objectives that he was articulating and he was articulating in consonance with the Heald Report.

Dr. Hartzell: Sure.

Dr. Bonner: But I would say it looked as though there was a combination of that opposition, which could have been channeled, should have, its origin could have been the private university lobby in the State of New York, but it was also a kind of personal situation of Len Olsen that was, he had backers in Albany that we knew not of, one of whom was Larry Murray, I think; am I wrong about that?

Dr. Hartzell: That I don't know, that I don't remember that particular point.

Dr. Bonner: The actual firing came after John Lee decided to go on the offensive, when the opposition was gathering force against him and he decided, he held a press

conference and leveled certain specific allegations against SUNY Central, really, that SUNY Central was not living up to its public commitments and the slow pace of development of the engineering college was one and he cited a litany of things that were inconsistent between what SUNY Central was doing and what public policy appeared to be. So, he was fired very, very publicly, and I felt that that was a, at least the public part of it, was a reaction to his counterattack.

Dr. Hartzell: The whole case brought attention focused on Stony Brook and what the State was going to do about Stony Brook.

Dr. Bonner: That's right.

Dr. Hartzell: It was in the New York Times.

Dr. Bonner: What happened, I was going to say how, you asked how did the Chemistry Department There was this steady stream of articles in the, mostly in Newsday, Newsday was very biased against, I felt there must have been college lobby, get work on Newsday because it was a poisonous kind of thing that was going on, the kind of things that were being written in Newsday about the situation at Oyster Bay and trying to make it, the objective seemed to make it look like such a rat's nest that it was impossible to solve, you might as well abandon it, give up and go somewhere else. Along about December, the John Lee firing took place in October, I was in South America when it happened. John Lee firing took place in October and along about December, Fred Hechinger, who was then the Education Editor of The New York Times, started trying to put together a background piece about all this, and in the course of doing that, he called me. As I'm home and the phone rings and "Is this Francis Bonner?" Yes. "This is Fred Hechinger," and just want to have a little background discussion about, and I spoke very candidly and very freely with him. And in the course of the conversation I said that the only way we are going, we're facing a situation in which we have to know whether we are going to be a graduate research institution or not, and it's really quite urgent, because if we are going to continue along that route, we have to get our Ph. D. programs in place and graduate student recruitment beginning this winter in order to

bring our first students in the fall, that's the crucial issue. And he said, "may I quote you, may I attribute that comment to you?" And I thought about it and I said "Yes." And so, buried in the Christmas Sunday New York Times, page 147, was this long piece by Fred Hechinger analyzing the problems of Oyster Bay and the question marks that are hanging over and it included this quotation from me, attributed to me.

Dr. Hartzell: Do you have a copy of this?

Dr. Bonner: I probably do, yeah.

Dr. Hartzell: We ought to have that in archives.

Dr. Bonner: That's true, I'll try to find it and see if I can. And it was after that article appeared in The New York Times that Tom Hamilton came to Oyster Bay and met with the faculty and said kind words about the Ph. D. program in Chemistry and the next thing we knew the Chemistry and the Physics Ph. D. programs were approved; we got our brochures out, we started recruiting for the fall of 1962, so that was an interesting.

Dr. Hartzell: Well, you had to call a spade a spade. By that time Rockefeller was Governor.

Dr. Bonner: By that time, he certainly was, he was Governor. I think he must have been elected in 1959 and took office in 1960, I think that was the Rockefeller situation. So that was the message that told us that the mission, the direction that we thought the institution was going to develop was still in place, it's sound. One other thing that happened, and I don't know how I ever got such chutzpah, but after John Lee was fired, my morale couldn't have been lower and I felt great responsibility for all these good people that I had recruited into this situation, which was going, for all I knew, to just fall apart, and I didn't know where to turn for advice. And at one point I picked up the telephone and tried to get, to see if I could speak to Commissioner James Allen, Commissioner of Education of the State of New York.

Dr. Hartzell: Did you know him?

Dr. Bonner: No, I had never met him, I knew, however, that he had been on the campus. Well, actually it is conceivable that I met him when he was on the campus, I

can't recall actually. But, if I had met him, it was just very peripheral. I placed the call and got through to his secretary, told her who I was and she went off the phone for a few minutes and came back and asked when I would like to come. I was invited to come up and visit the Commissioner. And, so I thought this was a great gesture on his part and a great opportunity for the campus, for me and the campus, and at the last minute I asked Arnie Feingold if he would just drive right up with me, we were going to drive up to Albany, and he did. And then when I got into the Commissioner's office, I told him that I had a colleague and he was quickly invited in. So, Arnie and I together had a probably, spent probably an hour with Commissioner Allen and told him what we thought, told how the situation felt from where we were. Arnie had

Dr. Hartzell: This was in November or December of 1961?

Dr. Bonner: I'd say it was November.

Dr. Hartzell: November 1961.

Dr. Bonner: I'd say it was November 1961. I'd say, I'm sure it was before that article, that Fred Hechinger article appeared in The New York Times.

Dr. Hartzell: What questions did Allen ask you?

Dr. Bonner: He didn't really probe. We told him that we, I told him on the telephone that we had what I thought was a situation of some desperation, we had many good people with potential, the nucleus of an excellent institution, but that in the existing atmosphere and uncertainty and tension and polarization, that it was unlikely to hold together very long, and I'd like to seek his advice about it. So, that was how I set up the framework for the discussion, and he just invited us to talk about what we felt, and I said we want you to know how it feels inside that institution. We spoke very candidly; Arnie Feingold had been Dean of the Graduate School very briefly -- that's another story -- he had been Dean of the Graduate School very briefly, and in the course of being Dean of the Graduate School, he had been in Albany quite a number of times with John Lee and with some other battles that John Lee had been fighting directly in SUNY Central, so he had more information than I did from that point of view, that part of it. So, he listened to

us, asked us some questions and he advised us to hang in, you know, and told us about, a little bit about the politics of the situation; and he commented particularly about -- who was the Chairman of the Board of Trustees at that time?

Dr. Hartzell: Frank Moore.

Dr. Bonner: Frank Moore, he commented particularly about Frank Moore; he said that Frank Moore is so political that whenever anything, any decision of this kind comes along, once you try to get into it, you find that Frank Moore has touched base with everybody, every political figure up and down the State and you're boxed in. So, he gave us the clear impression that he was, had deep interest in solving this problem, and what this nucleus of excellence that we were describing to him, this nucleus of potential that we felt existed down here; he wanted it preserved. So, he wanted us to know that he was active in the situation and at political level, political as well as intellectual level. And I think it was fairly clear that he had the ear of the Governor. So there was a lot of reassurance for us in that.

Dr. Hartzell: Did he bring at all the Regents, the position of the Regents, or didn't they have a position, or was he speaking for the Regents?

Dr. Bonner: I'd say he was really speaking for the Regents. He was a very respected, highly regarded, very judicious, careful, with imaginative and skillful commission; he really was a first-class Commissioner; and I think we owe a lot to him. I think that behind the scenes, my guess is that James Allen had a lot, an awful lot to do with straightening out this situation; and the fact that he did have the ear of the Governor was very important. And, as you know, the Governor effectively apologized to John Lee for what had happened to him, and took care of him, to Rockefeller Brothers Fund. The situation of Arnie Feingold being Dean of the Graduate School was an interesting one, because John Lee decided to make some appointment, some administrative appointments at a time when he was very, when his relationship with SUNY Central was very shaky. Along about, I don't know, March, probably April, I think, maybe later than that, maybe even May 1961, he decided to move swiftly and make some appointments, and he asked

Sidney Gelber to be Dean of the College of Arts and Science; and he discussed with, he was very concerned about getting a Graduate School organization started, because this was, this was the key to consolidation of the mission of the University, so he wanted formal recognition even if there were no graduate programs, that it was planned to build quickly, build graduate programs quickly, so he wanted a, to establish a Graduate School as a

Dr. Hartzell: Infrastructure?

Dr. Bonner: Graduate School infrastructure right away and after, I forget whether it was after or simultaneous, he asked me to whether he could appoint me first Dean of the Graduate School; and I gave him my consent and was willing to serve, and he took the appointments to, I forget whether that went up at the same time as the appointment of Sidney Gelber, I have a feeling it may have come up at a different time, but then there was Sidney, he proposed Sidney Gelber's appointment, and that was approved and Sidney then became Dean of Arts and Science. Then, at a later time he requested approval of my appointment as Dean of the Graduate School, and it was refused. It wasn't refused in a very direct way, it said that, they came back with a statement that they would approve the appointment of Leonard Eisenbud. And it was interesting because Leonard because Leonard and I were then friends when he came and continued to be friends, and we're friends throughout that whole crisis, but he saw differently, and he saw the turmoil and conflict in a somewhat different way, and when things became very polarized and became whether you support John Lee or you support Leonard Olsen is what it came down to, Leonard was supporting Leonard Olsen for reasons best known to himself. And so that was interesting, they didn't comment on me, they just said they would approve the appointment of Leonard Olsen.

Dr. Hartzell: Well, was Leonard Eisenbud appointed or how did Arnie Feingold get it?

Dr. Bonner: Well, that was not accepted by John Lee, that proposal. And, so I backed out of the picture, I didn't try to get John to insist on appointing me, it was fine

with me, and I guess we came, Sidney and I came up with the idea of supporting Arnie and that brought to Albany and they approved it, so Arnie was the first Dean of the Graduate School. And then he resigned in a very, when Tom Hamilton came down after the massacre -- the firing of John Lee -- Tom Hamilton got Sidney Gelber in his office and suggested to him it would be appropriate if he were to step down and Sidney graciously stepped down; he was respectively fired from the deanship. And Tom Hamilton then got Arnie Feingold in his office and asked him to continue as Dean of the Graduate School, and in the course of that conversation Arnie learned that Tom had asked Sidney to step aside and Arnie was very irate that he would take such an action without consulting the Dean of the Graduate School, and very loudly and vocally and angrily resigned. I think that shook up Tom Hamilton quite a bit. And then I guess we didn't have a Dean of the Graduate School until Dave Fox was appointed.

Dr. Hartzell: You didn't have a Dean of the Graduate School when I was there, when I first came.

Dr. Bonner: There was none?

Dr. Hartzell: No, that was, that line was vacant.

Dr. Bonner: That was after David served, it was just vacant?

Dr. Hartzell: I think it was vacant, because as I understand it we looked at John Toll first as Dean of the Graduate School.

Dr. Bonner: Yes, that's true.

Dr. Hartzell: I was concerned that we did not have a Dean of the Graduate School and were supposed to go into graduate work, and I felt that the Dean of the Graduate School should be appointed and have a say in what was going on, we needed a leader at that level right at the beginning.

Dr. Bonner: You came in 1962, right?

Dr. Hartzell: September 1962.

Dr. Bonner: September 1962, which is just after we moved out here, so I guess that's right, Arnie Feingold resigned and that position was never filled, but then you asked Dave Fox to do it.

Dr. Hartzell: I don't remember, frankly I think probably that was vacant until John Toll came.

Dr. Bonner: Really, I can't believe, I doubt that, I mean we really had a graduate school going. September 1962 we had a

Dr. Hartzell: You had a chairman of a graduate committee, I think that was Dave Fox, but I'll ask Dave Fox, he'll probably remember better than I, but that's what I did about it. You see, one of the difficulties that I was under was that I never knew from one moment to the next when I would be going back to Albany. See, I had been appointed in the Albany office as Executive Dean there and was immediately on detail to Stony Brook. I was to go back as soon as they found a president. And I didn't feel that I could make very many moves, or should make many moves as a kind of fill-in until somebody was appointed.

Dr. Bonner: Then you inherited the worst of the polarization and you had to deal with a very ugly situation in the mathematics department, the considered campaign of Spike Martin to get Les Peck. That was unfortunate; that was really very unfortunate. And I was blamed by those mathematicians for the Les Peck predicament, because; and the way that happened was that Sidney, as Dean of Arts and Science, Sidney was looking, in the short time that he was in office, he was looking for someone, he was looking to solve the Mathematics Department problem, which was, it was a very severe problem, I mean there was no question about that, and he wanted a consultant and he spoke to me about it, and I had worked at Arthur D. Little, had done some work that had involved some very sophisticated mathematics and had been helped by Les Peck, who was an employee of Arthur D. Little, so I was very impressed with him, as a mathematician, the work that he had done with me and I suggested his name as a consultant. And, Sidney brought him in as a consultant and then Sidney, I think, a little too hastily, because he

offered him a job in a rather hasty manner; so it was the way the appointment was made and then Les Peck had some, had an 'Achilles heel' or two that made him vulnerable; that was a very bad situation. I was very sorry about it.

Dr. Hartzell: He was gone when I came; and Harry

Dr. Bonner: Harry Porter handled that.

Dr. Hartzell: Yes,

Dr. Bonner: Harry Porter got him to resign, forced him.

Dr. Hartzell: I thought Harry was doing a good job; he and I got along very well, two historians. And, Harry was kind of amused, would talk to me in a kind of a bemused way about various individuals and the situation there.

Dr. Bonner: Yes, he tended to be a little too detached, I'm afraid. That's the way I felt. I have to tell you an amusing story about Harry. Of course, we all got, especially department chairmen, got to know Harry very well. We, in the summer of 1962, before you came, were getting ready to move into these new buildings, and there was a capital equipment budget that comes along with them. So, we had to draw up a capital equipment request in the Chemistry Department, so I got my colleagues all together, and we worked on this very hard, and we drew up specifications, and we included the electromagnetic resonancy program and a very broad range of spectroscopic equipment and in general wanted to get set to get started with this excellent research facility as we could. And, when we added it all and put it together, the bill for equipping that building came to one and quarter million dollars. And this was DPW construction, one and quarter million, there had never been anything been in SUNY at that magnitude and Harry Porter was extremely dubious about it. But the day came when it had to be defended, the request had to be defended to the Bureau of the Budget, so I was asked to come up and flew to Albany. Harry Porter met me at the airport. It was kind of amazing to think about that, isn't it? So, Harry Porter met me at the airport, personally it was very nice of him, and we went some place and had a cup of coffee and a muffin. And, in the course of, so before the appointment, which I think was 11 a. m., Harry Porter was quite clearly

trying to make it, preparing me for a letdown. I shouldn't get my hopes too high that we were going to get anything like that million and quarter bucks. And he told me about this terrible budget examiner that we would have to deal with, and said if it's so-and-so Roberts, forget it, it's going to be terrible. So we got over to the State Capitol Building. So the hearing is me and Harry Porter and this guy comes in, and it is Roberts. So we start talking about the equipment, and Harry Porter starts making some comments about well, we can really cut this and we could cut that, and Roberts kind of laughed and said I have dealt with Dr. Bonner before, I have great respect for him, I'll accept his opinion, and we went through this budget hearing, and then went back to Thurlow Terrace, and sat there with Milton Lewis. Remember Milton Lewis?

Dr. Hartzell: Vaguely.

Dr. Bonner: So, I sat there, and about an hour after lunch, Milton Lewis got a telephone call and the entire request had been approved, there wasn't anything that had been eliminated. And Harry Porter was just utterly flabbergasted. I mean they were both very pleased, but I think Harry was really trying to do his best to support it, but his way of supporting it was to show willingness to be flexible and compromise. And it was interesting that this guy just stopped that and said, well, we want to do this right, and they approved the whole thing. And Milton Lewis said there had never been anything of that magnitude approved in SUNY before that day. It seems like peanuts now but it was a great day in our Department.

Dr. Hartzell: The Bureau of the Budget, Division of the Budget now, is the right arm of the Governor, and Rockefeller was Governor, and he may have gotten, Roberts may have gotten his signals clearly from the Governor.

Dr. Bonner: Could be.

Dr. Hartzell: Get with on with the job of building the institution.

Dr. Bonner: It may have gone back to the Fred Hechinger piece in The New York Times, who knows? [end of Tape 1]

Dr. Hartzell: Interview with Francis Bonner, by himself, November 8, 1988. All right, Francis, I'm interested to get thethe Chemistry Department and the evolution of Stony Brook on its new campus. In other words, stay away from Oyster Bay, and tell us as much as you can about the evolution of the Department of Chemistry.

Dr. Bonner: All right, but let's touch bases Oyster Bay just briefly, what we were talking about last time was the clearing of the atmosphere that had to take place, that in my view was the very significant, crucial role that John Lee played in the history of this institution. I really think that a very important event, that he was very publicly fired and set off into oblivion, but the fact of the matter is that, as a result of that, the issues did get sorted out, both in Oyster Bay and in Albany and a clear institutional direction was decided. So, that by Christmastime, with Tom Hamilton's having come down, hand deliver the approvals of Ph. D. programs in both Chemistry and Physics, I think in Mechanical and Electrical Engineering as well. We knew at that time that the mandate for the institution was the development of a university, a research oriented university with graduate programs at Ph. D. level consistent with the recommendations of the Heald Report. So, from then on we knew how to pursue our planning and immediately began recruitment efforts for graduate students to come coincidental with the move into the new buildings on the Stony Brook campus, which was the far along under construction and scheduled to be completed by the early summer of 1960, that's where we are now, 1960. So, we had restoration of morale, as it were. I mean the whole thing could have just as easily fallen apart at that point, but we had this, by this time this very good nucleus of people in Chemistry. We had Fausto Ramirez, Bill Lenoble, Sei Sujishi, Ted Goldfarb -- who had come in 1958 -- I think Hammer in 1959, around there, Bob Schneider and Art Lesley in 1960, and Ed Kossauer had joined us in 1961. So recruitment of graduate students was our first priority; we had received approval for what was at that time a very substantial equipment request, which gave us good flexibility in recruiting new people, would put us in a position to be able to make major instrumental commitments, which had been rather on a shaky side before that. The recruitment of faculty in 1962 had been

substantially compromised by the publicity surrounding the events in what I'm referring to as the clearing of the atmosphere, so we did not do very well in 1962. We were turned down by a number of very excellent people that we had made an effort to hire. One of them, by the way, was Ben Chu; he was then a post-doc at Cornell with Peter Dubuy, and we made a very serious effort to get him to come to Stony Brook in the class of 1962; he turned us down and went to the University of Kansas, but it wasn't many years later that we started getting signals from Kansas that Ben was ready to move East and we recruited him in 1968. He came to Stony Brook as a Full Professor, as a matter of fact. So, that's how things went. We started with a, and when we moved onto the campus in 1962, it was a mess; the campus was still, buildings were still under construction, it was hard to get into the buildings, it was hard to walk around in the mud, but there was lots of determination and excitement and we got moved in. It was a big job, we had accumulated by this time quite a bit of research equipment. We had active grant support research, a number of programs already in motion by that time in Oyster Bay. Fausto Ramirez and Ed Kossauer were the leading figures, but by no means the only. The move took place in late summer. Our new incoming class, our first incoming class of Ph. D. students to the best of my recollection, was about 13 that we recruited that year. We began our first graduate course instruction and in due course got settled down in the then new Chemistry Building, which is now officially designated Old Chemistry. The building was turning out, was working rather well, we had good research space. I told you last time about the minor deceptions that we pulled in the architectural, with the architect's knowledge and assistance. We had many spaces labeled "Preparation Rooms" which were full-phased research laboratories, so that the Department began to blossom in its own facility. It was a major event for us to be able to expand from the very constricted prefabricated laboratory quarters we had been occupying in Oyster Bay to this, at that time, seemingly very spacious and luxurious building. We enjoyed that very much. And continued to work very hard, everybody was working overtime for sure. It was just a big job to get everything moving, teach the new courses. We had an incoming

class that was the largest yet, that was another feature of this whole period. Every fall we had more freshman than we had had the previous fall and very percentage of incoming freshmen have always taken freshman chemistry so we were always in a position of having to tool up for a larger number of students than we had had the year before. This placed quite a bit of hard work and excitement on all of us. The next recruitment season, 1962-63, we succeeded in recruiting both John Alexander and Paul Lauterbur, and these were, in both cases, I think, really major coups for the University. John Alexander was by that time a very leading figure in the field of nuclear chemistry, nuclear reaction studies, this was, being able to recruit him put us on the map in a very solid position for sure in that field.

Dr. Hartzell: Where did he come from?

Dr. Bonner: He came to us from Berkeley. He was, got his Ph. D. at MIT and had been a post-doc at Berkeley and then a regular staff at the Lawrence Berkeley Laboratory. So we were pleased to be able to recruit him, because our relationship with Brookhaven was crucially important in that regard. And that's been a very important appointment for us. The other one was Paul Lauterbur, who was recruited that same year, from Mellon Institute. That was before there was a Carnegie Mellon, he was in the Mellon Institute and was known at that time, he'd had an interesting career because he had only recently earned a Ph. D. but had already, was already known as the father of Carbon 13 nuclear magnetic resonance spectroscopy. Anybody who knows the literature of that field knows the first papers ever, first Carbon 13 were those of Lauterbur done at the Mellon Institute, where he had developed professionally while being a graduate student at night, so he had taken a long time to earn a Ph. D. at the University of Pittsburgh. So, we were very fortunate to be able to recruit him and our equipment, our ability to buy expensive equipment was an important part of that, because we would make a major commitment to a major nuclear magnetic resonance facility for Paul. And, of course, Paul went on from there to become the father of nuclear magnetic resonance imaging

with his work in the early 1970's in imaging; and it's just a damn shame that the University somehow allowed the University of Illinois to steal him away from us.

Dr. Hartzell: When did you have your international conference of crystallographers?

Dr. Bonner: That conference took place in 1969.

Dr. Hartzell: Oh, that late.

Dr. Bonner: Yes, that was a great event. Also it was a very nerve-wracking event for those of us who had the major responsibility, because at that time we were, of course, there was still construction going on all over the place, and we were, it wouldn't have been possible without the Lecture Center, but the Lecture Center was, completion of the Lecture Center had been delayed, so it was nip and tuck whether we were going to have the plenary opening session with Linus Pauling as the principal speaker in the Lecture Center or not. But there was a lot of cooperation from the contractors and I guess by that time the State University Construction Fund. And everything was in place just barely at the last minute, but it was a big and glorious opening plenary session in the big L100 Lecture Hall; it was the first event to take place in L100. So, I could go on about recruitment in the 1960's, it was John Alexander and Paul Lauterbur coming; that was a very major event. And we recruited, we got as the decade of the '60's went on, we seemed to get more lines to fill each year. We would run exhausting recruitment seasons. There was one year in which we made seven appointments of, and the, as I've already mentioned Ben Chu; Harold Freidman came in 1965, that was a very major coup for the Department and the University; Jerry Whitten about 1967, I think; and numerous young people came as junior starting Assistant Professors who've made very outstanding reputations, among them Phil Johnson, Dave Hanson, Bill Fowler and others. I'm not going to try to touch on everybody. And, so by, it's very interesting, I find it very interesting to note that by the end of the '70's, well, I remained in the Chair for 12 years, so I was the Chairman, I had one year off for good behavior in 1964-65, I had an NSF senior post-doctoral fellowship and went to Paris for a full year. Sei Sujishi reluctantly

agreed to be acting Chairman for that one year, so I was Chairman from '58 to 1970, I stepped down in 1970 and I just recently had occasion to do an inventory on the present faculty, this is now 18 years later and the faculty of the Department of Chemistry still consists of more than 50% people that were hired during my chairmanship before 1970, which shows that we had a good retention ratio.

Dr. Hartzell: The Department is well rounded in the areas, what are the major areas in the Department, would you say?

Dr. Bonner: Well, the Department is extremely strong in chemical physics, spectroscopy, multi-photon ionization spectroscopy is a method that Bill Johnson actually invented, it was his contribution to chemical physics here at Stony Brook, it's become a very major method of spectroscopy. So we are very strong in the general areas of physical chemistry and chemical physics. In theoretical chemistry we have a very great strength in statistical mechanics, it's where Harold Freidman has made very major contributions. George Stell has been at the University for a long time, always affiliated with the Chemistry Department, but his major appointment was in the Mechanical Engineering Department, he just a few years ago became a full-time member of the Chemistry Department, I guess maybe he's severed his connections with the Engineering College, and he's a very major

Dr. Hartzell: How do you spell his name?

Dr. Bonner: S T E L L. He's a very major figure in statistics, so we have very great strength there. Our other theoreticians are Jerry Whitten -- who is now making major contributions to quantum mechanical applications to surfaces -- and Dick Porter who has always, his field has been theoretical aspects of chemical kinetics, very fundamental. In organic chemistry we had very outstanding strength with Fausto Ramirez and Ed Kossauer, those guys, unfortunately, didn't get along with each other very well or with others in many ways and organic chemistry did not flourish as it should have with fine scientists, as excellent scientists as they were at the top, but we did not flourish as well as we should have. Bill Lenoble, of course, his career has been

developed, he came here determined to play a major role in applications of high pressure to the kinetics of organic chemistry and he has become one of the leading figures internationally in that field and he is an Associate of one of the major journals, a very major career has developed here. Ed Kossauer left us a number of years ago for Israel, he went to University of Tel Aviv. And in recent years we have developed this very great strength in organic chemistry, it's really very strong with some of the more recent appointments that have been made. Fausto retired coming on three years ago. It was unfortunate, he was in very poor condition, having had very serious problem.

Dr. Hartzell: I interviewed him before he had his stroke.

Dr. Bonner: Inorganic chemistry is another area in which we've had substantial strength, not the most outstanding but very good people.

Dr. Hartzell: What about the context of the Department in the university-wide structure, faculty life, quality of students, that sort of thing, that is the institution as an association of scholars.

Dr. Bonner: Well, Stony Brook has always suffered from a kind of compartmentalization I deplore. Since we came, well, not since we came to Stony Brook, we started out at Oyster Bay, of course, with everybody on top of everybody else. And aside from the effects of polarization, which were very severe, in Oyster Bay and which pursued us to a certain extent here at Stony Brook as well, we had very good communications and it was, when the place was smaller you felt that you knew just about everybody and that was good. Physics and Chemistry were all mixed up with each other, very close relations among Physics and Chemistry. We came out here and got into separate buildings, didn't, well, we had faculty dining room facilities for a long time and that was a place where people got to know each other and came together, but went out a number years ago. Remember, we had a faculty dining room? You were over there in H Quad. That was good, but that went out and

Dr. Hartzell: Well, they moved over to the Union, for a while there was a separate room for faculty persons, in the Student Union, you remember that?

Dr. Bonner: Yes, and then I guess in the late '60's that became too elitist; you had to open it up for students.

Dr. Hartzell: And then they tried the dining room on the second floor of the new Chemistry Building.

Dr. Bonner: And that worked very well, but then it folded. It wasn't economically viable. I think it was sabotaged by the food service people. Yes, they put up the End of the Bridge Restaurant in the Union Building, and that became, was put in position of being a direct competitor, and the Commons, what was called the Senior Commons collapsed. That was really very unfortunate so faculty at this University tend to be brown baggers. I do more brown bagging than anything else actually myself. And so the faculty, the various component parts of the faculty don't know each other as well as they should. That's unfortunate. So, it's, I think, within departments I think there's a high degree of collegiality, not all departments, but certainly in our department it is. Student body, through the, coming through the late '60's and into the '70's, I felt that we had a very high average quality student body. In more recent years that's gone down seriously.

Dr. Hartzell: Do you have any idea why?

Dr. Bonner: Apparently, we, in order to maintain enrollments, with declining applications we've had to, the Admissions Office has had to go down to a lower standard of admissions.

Dr. Hartzell: We don't have a very large Admissions staff, so we don't really do much effective recruiting.

Dr. Bonner: I think our Admissions has been very seriously deficient for many years. It's an old story. I don't know why that problem wasn't faced head-on a long time ago. It's been a very serious problem. We had the famous drug raid of 1968 that plagued us for many years, and still plagues us. I think we developed a reputation, a certain reputation that has hung on among high school guidance counselors. Long Island students are counseled to go elsewhere routinely. And I don't think our Admissions Office has been very ineffective in countering that.

Dr. Hartzell: What about graduate students?

Dr. Bonner: Graduate student recruitment has been very tough, and it's become increasingly difficult to recruit domestic students because they are getting to be less and less of them, and so that it becomes the best foreign students, there's even a very severe competition among the best graduate schools for them. We have had consistently each year, we have had some very good graduate students. We have many of our Ph. D.'s out there in very good positions and we're very proud of them; they make very fine contributions. We're up to the level, in Chemistry, we're up to the level of recruitment that we like. It's of the order of 30 to 35 new students each year. And with the quality level among foreign students very high and very satisfactory. The numbers, I think the numbers of domestic students is probably hanging around something like 50%, but I'm not sure that the quality level among the domestic students is holding up as well as it should.

Dr. Hartzell: What about the kind of support the Department has received from the administration and from Albany itself? Have you had any connections with people in Albany?

Dr. Bonner: Well, I was for 12 years a member of the Board of Directors of the Research Foundation.

Dr. Hartzell: Of the Research Foundation in Albany? This is Mort Grant's operation?

Dr. Bonner: Well, it was a long time ago. I was appointed to the Board of Directors of the Research Foundation in 1976 as a representative of faculty principal investigators. I was appointed to a three year term, and with one thing or another, I wound up, I tried to get out, I thought it was appropriate for me to get off after three terms, they twisted my arm and wound up serving four terms on that Board. Actually, it was a very satisfying for me because one of the things that concerned me a lot, we're going way back to Oyster Bay now, when we first started to get research grants, I was concerned about where does the overhead, every faculty member who gets a grant, of

course, realizes that a very high percentage of the funding that comes from the federal agency goes into the overhead. And we were working through this remote agency that none of us knew anything about, the Research Foundation of State University of New York. Funding was all carried through that agency, the funds were paid to them and we weren't seeing any of that indirect cost at all.

Dr. Hartzell: We were probably contributing a large proportion.

Dr. Bonner: It became a large proportion, it was a drop in the bucket in the earliest years, but then it kept growing and it became to be very substantial indeed. We're now the biggest, our contribution to the overhead, total overhead earnings is the biggest of any campus. But there was very little of it coming back to campus. What was coming back in the early '60's was, all the way through the '60's was what was called 'OR5.' That was strictly to compensate the campus for the administrative costs on the local campus, the cost to the local campus in administering the grant, so that was there for Grants Management, personnel and strictly administrative costs and none of that was going back for principal investigators, who were bringing in the money and felt that it was riding on their backs, you could see it in many ways. And it was still, basically it was still like that in 1976 when I became a member of the Board.

Dr. Hartzell: Were you able to change it a little bit?

Dr. Bonner: It's changed enormously every time that I've been on the Board, and I'm given a lot of credit for that, not so much in Stony Brook, but in Albany. Cliff Wharton's chancellorship made a big difference, he allowed that to happen in ways that I don't think his predecessors would have; because the Chancellors like Ernie Boyer and Sam Gould before that come into office as Chancellor and find that they effectively have no discretionary funds whatsoever, they have no flexible funding that they can work with, that's the way the New York State budget process works; so they did have, through the Research Foundation, what was money coming in outside the State treasury, which they could

Dr. Hartzell: Lay their hands on.

Dr. Bonner: Lay their hands on, and, of course, were reluctant to give that up. One thing that changed it was that Controller Levitt was, he was Controller of the State of New York for many years, and he had a consistent campaign over many years to get that money redirected into the treasury, where it would have State spending controls on the money, and that would, of course, have been bad for everybody. So bit by bit we were able to get the funding directed back to campuses; it is now at quite a high percent. I can't say that I am satisfied with about half of what happens on the local campus; in recent years it has been less and less of it coming back to departments, where there should be a high percentage going to the departments that generate it, in my view. And that has been cutting off in recent years in ways that I regret and deplore. So I just went off that Board, the farewell celebration for me was last March in Albany. Of course, I did get to know a lot of people in the Central Administration through my membership on that Board.

Dr. Hartzell: Who are some of the people in Central Administration perhaps now and previously contributed to the growth of Stony Brook, other than the Chancellor?

Dr. Bonner: I don't know but have you planned to interview Wharton?

Dr. Hartzell: I had not simply because of his coming in fairly late, maybe I should.

Dr. Bonner: Yeah, he came in it must have been 1976, was it 1976 that he came?

Dr. Hartzell: I don't know.

Dr. Bonner: I guess it must, no, I know it was 1978.

Dr. Hartzell: He succeeded Ernie Boyer.

Dr. Bonner: When I went on the Board, it was Boyer. Then Boyer left, I think, in 1977 and Jim Kelly was Acting Chancellor for a year.

Dr. Hartzell: Then Wharton came in just about the same time that John Toll left.

Dr. Bonner: That's correct. Wharton came in in 1978. Well, in answer to your question about the growth of research, of course, you mentioned Mort Grant. Mort Grant was put on a side track in Research Foundation shortly after Wharton came; and there was a, the administrative organization changed around. So Mort Grant was, I guess, for a

while Executive Vice President. A man named Paul Silverman, who was there for just a relatively short time, was President of Research Foundation and when Silverman left, Mort Grant was respectively put on a golden parachute, side tracked rather cruelly, actually. Much as he was a source of much difficulty and much ill feeling between campuses and Stony Brook, he had a high handed way of handling things that did create a lot of ill feeling, especially here at Stony Brook. But even so, I don't think that the way he was treated by Wharton was humane. The person that succeeded him as Executive Vice President was John Buckhoff. And John Buckhoff has done a very excellent job in that position, and he has guided that Foundation through a major transition, in which responsibility and funding have been spun off to campuses in a very major way. And John Buckhoff has witnessed the growth of Stony Brook, I think he has good perspective on us, but he hasn't witnessed us from way back; but you might want to consider an interview with him.

Dr. Hartzell: Do you know anything about the reviews of the department, either by the Middle States people or by the national association of chemists

Dr. Bonner: The American Chemical Society?

Dr. Hartzell: The American Chemical Society, do you know how the department has been regarded?

Dr. Bonner: Well, the American Chemical Society has an accreditation program, they don't call it accreditation, but certification. And, so it was way back in the early days, I forget whether we were still in Oyster Bay or just recently moved to Stony Brook when we were ready for our first evaluation by the American Chemical Society, it's called the Committee on Professional Training. And they came, they sent their inspector, who was a Professor at MIT. And we got very

Dr. Hartzell: The inspector?

Dr. Bonner: No, his name was, it's funny

Dr. Hartzell: But he was from MIT?

Dr. Bonner: He was from MIT. Well, I'm getting so I don't remember lots of things. But that's funny, I knew the guy; and he was a very good person and did a very thorough inspection and gave us a very high recommendation. I did

Dr. Hartzell: Was it in writing, would the Department have a copy of it?

Dr. Bonner: It was in writing and the Department should have a copy of it, whether the Department can locate it or not, I really don't know.

Dr. Hartzell: About what year was that?

Dr. Bonner: Well, it would be the year 1961 or 1962. I did get criticized, well, I got criticized, I was Chairman and the Department got criticized. In that report, and it has happened subsequently also, because we don't have any faculty or programs that are explicitly called analytical chemistry. And it so happens that the Professor from MIT that inspected us that first time was a Professor of analytical chemistry at MIT; and this is something that was deliberate on my part in building the Department, and something that many people agree with very strongly, and particularly people that came here. It was a big attraction for Ben Chu. It was always my view that analytical chemistry, that we all have to be analytical chemists, and so we never, we haven't recruited people that called themselves analytical chemists. And if you look at the American Chemical Society Director of Graduate Research, which lists all the departments, faculty and their research programs one by one, you look at some of the major departments, like Harvard and Berkeley, you notice that that's the same way, that there aren't people that call themselves analytical chemists. I doesn't mean that they don't know how to do analytical chemistry, but in order to do any kind of chemistry you have to be analytical. So, we have had criticism for that. And there may be some ways because people, there is certainly a group that make a profession out of it, chemical analysis. I've had a couple of my own graduate students, who have, one of my Ph. D. students went to University of Georgia to be a post-doc with one of the major analytical chemists of the country, well qualified as an analytical chemist, he and another went,

working now for the U. S. Geological Survey, where their concern is water fall here on Long Island, essentially it's analytical.

Dr. Hartzell: Do you know anything about the reports that we got by the ten-year Middle States Association review.

Dr. Bonner: I don't

Dr. Hartzell: I think the first one was in 1963, or late 1962, and the leader was the chap from Rochester, had been Chairman of the review committee that did Bucknell the year before.

Dr. Bonner: Oh, so you were familiar. I don't recall ever having seen anything exclusive about Chemistry in those Middle Atlantic States reviews.

Dr. Hartzell: Any other international conferences besides crystallography?

Dr. Bonner: I certainly never, never wanted to take on another one after that. It was a very nerve-wracking thing and it was a question of what infrastructure, administrative infrastructure does Stony Brook have to field things like that; and we've never done very well. It's just been, there's a feeling about Stony Brook that, if anything can go wrong, it probably will. It's sometimes people call that 'Murphy's Law.' But it seems to be a regulation of Stony Brook. I always used to worry about the first person who was going to have surgery at University Hospital. I don't know who it was, but he seemed to have survived it very well.

Dr. Hartzell: The Hospital has done very well, there are more than 50 beds in operation. Okay. Do you have any feeling about the three years that I was in charge?

Dr. Bonner: Well, I have very warm feelings about those years. Speaking personally, it was the time when I felt that I couldn't have been supported better. I felt I was extremely well supported in my efforts and in what I was trying to do, and having a supportive administration behind me made it possible to bring off some of these, what I still consider, major coups, people like Alexander, Lauterbur, Freidman, Chu. Well, Chu was later, but certainly those -- Alexander, Lauterbur and Freidman -- were all recruited

during that period, between that period. And, I remember Charlie Cooper who was Business Officer under you, is that right?

Dr. Hartzell: Right.

Dr. Bonner: Charlie Cooper was so supportive, we couldn't have asked for better budgetary support than we got during that time. He had great confidence in me and what we were doing; and I really appreciated that. And I have always felt that I had your confidence.

Dr. Hartzell: You did.

Dr. Bonner: And Stan Ross was very supportive and very helpful.

Dr. Hartzell: Ed Price, did you know him at all?

Dr. Bonner: I never

Dr. Hartzell: Vice President for Personnel in Central Office.

Dr. Bonner: I think I must have met him, but he was never, he never loomed large in my horizon. The people that did give

Dr. Hartzell: He was very supportive.

Dr. Bonner: The people that loomed large in my horizon were, as I said in the last interview, Harry Porter; I had quite a lot of direct personal dealings with him, and Milton Lewis. Charlie Foster

Dr. Hartzell: Foster, I interviewed him.

Dr. Bonner: Did you get him on your interviews?

Dr. Hartzell: Yes, I did, but he's one of the first, I really probably should go back to him now that I know a bit more about what questions to ask. He's retired, of course. Milton Lewis, I don't know where he is.

Dr. Bonner: I have no idea.

Dr. Hartzell: Okay.

Dr. Bonner: Because at that time, another thing that happened when the air got cleared, I'm talking 1962 now, early 1962, we're going to move to the new campus and we're going to recruit graduate students and we're going to go full speed ahead. A major

event that happened then was the arrival of Alec Pond and that was, for one thing, I think I played a major part, major role in the recruitment

Dr. Hartzell: Did you?

Dr. Bonner: Of Alec Pond.

Dr. Hartzell: Tell me how.

Dr. Bonner: Well, Alec had to be persuaded that this place, that the thing was going to go. And that was tough, because, as I said, we were having no luck in recruiting people to the Chemistry Department in that year, because we had just been through this horrendous event, so it was a question of helping, getting people to see through all the smoke, that it was going to clear, the conviction that it was going to clear, and that we were going to, that we did have a major opportunity here. I think I spent a lot of time with Alec, because I think it was the early months of 1962 that he was considering it. Leonard Eisenbud had made it known that he did not wish to continue in the Chair of the Physics Department and he hadn't been the most vigorous chair, vigorous recruitment; he made some very appointments but it was a major event that Alec, with his drive and his determination and energy, was willing to come aboard.

Dr. Hartzell: He came the same time I did, and I remember a, the first meeting that I met the faculty was in the little anteroom which was my office, in Coe Hall. Were you at that meeting?

Dr. Bonner: I surely was, yeah.

Dr. Hartzell: I remember going out afterwards and

Dr. Bonner: The meeting of the committee

Dr. Hartzell: It was a committee of some kind.

Dr. Bonner: It was called the Faculty Consultative Committee.

Dr. Hartzell: Was it?

Dr. Bonner: I think so. This was something set up by Harry Porter.

Dr. Hartzell: Well, at any rate, Harry brought me in and introduced me, and I never knew whether you people knew anything about me at all, or whether you had had any hand in selecting me.

Dr. Bonner: We did not. We knew that you had recently been a Dean at Buffalo and that you were a historian with credentials from Harvard, and that's about what we knew. We were not consulted on the appointment; and I think the justification for that was, although we were the official faculty consultative committee, that you were and that Tom Hamilton was still the officially designated President of the campus. Harry Porter was acting for him, and you were being brought in to act for Harry Porter. Wasn't that the theory?

Dr. Hartzell: I actually joined the Central Office as Executive Dean on detail immediately downstate for one year, until they could find a President and I would go back to Albany, that was the original design.

Dr. Bonner: Well, that is the way I understood it at the time, and one of the things that the Faculty Consultative Committee was understood that was involved in was the presidential recruitment. And George Collins was the key figure on the Council in getting the presidential recruitment and there were

Dr. Hartzell: I knew George in my Brookhaven days. He and I had been final for the tennis at Brookhaven.

Dr. Bonner: Well, George was, I think George was very important; it was very important that he was in that spot. And there were, I do think that the Central Administration was determined to fill that presidency fast. Fortunately, there was enough strength on the Faculty Consultative Committee to slow them down because they were coming in with some, one candidate that I remember was the President of Fredonia. He was, I think he would very much have liked to get the job; he became the President of the State University Construction Fund. It's funny because his name doesn't come to mind. He was a chemist actually and he had, just didn't, I mean there is nothing personal against him but his institutional outlook was not one we were looking for, coming from a

small and relatively small undergraduate SUNY college campus, that wasn't what we were into. And there were other, there was one, the Dean from Georgetown, I think Georgetown University; there

Dr. Hartzell: Loren Easley?

Dr. Bonner: Loren Easley was something else. He was from Pennsylvania. I think that was one that we would all have welcomed.

Dr. Hartzell: You would have welcomed it but he turned it down.

Dr. Bonner: Yes, I'd forgotten that Loren Easley, but that's true, but Loren Easley. So, Alec, Alec Pond's participation and his ambition was, of course, a very important factor in slowing down the efforts from Albany in trying to get the presidential recruitment on the right track, the right track Of course, it was Alec that finally played a major role in bringing John Toll to the campus. At the time Alec gave me, I was in Paris when that appointment, when the appointment was finally consummated. Alec wrote to me with great joy and in that letter he said this is your triumph; he was giving me the credit for that and certainly I did have a great deal to do with it. It was Alec's determination and his connections that made it possible.

Dr. Hartzell: Originally I think that we had, he had come to the campus, which he considered for the Graduate Deanship initially.

Dr. Bonner: Yes, that's correct.

Dr. Hartzell: I remember that there were a number of names, his name finally came to the top for consideration for the presidency. And at one of the meetings of the Council, Judge Sullivan asked me what I thought about it, whether he'd make a good man. I said I thought he would. And he said, would you go down and see if he'd be interested.

Dr. Bonner: In the presidency?

Dr. Hartzell: Yes. And I said yes. So, I was not a candidate in my own mind at all, so I went down and stayed overnight with Johnny with Maryland and we talked about it and he asked me why I wasn't interested in the job, if I was interested. And I said, no

..... My interests were basically with the faculty and the curriculum and the students, not with the other kinds of administrative responsibilities, demands personnel. And we arranged for John to come up and be interviewed in Albany, which was, I think, after, I don't remember whether this was before Sam Gould was appointed or after, I think it was before Sam Gould was appointed. He came and stayed with us at Planting Fields.

Dr. Bonner: The Coe mansion, Coe Cottage it was called.

Dr. Hartzell: The Cottage. And I briefed him for about eight hours as to the situation in Albany and he made it. He took copious notes, very detailed in his questions. I could tell this was something that was viable.

Dr. Bonner: Right, and that was, much as friction had developed which I later, that really was the making of Stony Brook.

Dr. Hartzell: That really was.

Dr. Bonner: His drive, his hard work, his ambition.

Dr. Hartzell: I remember introducing him to the faculty as the right man in the right place.

Dr. Bonner: Yes, well, that was absolutely right.

Dr. Hartzell: Remember that meeting.

Dr. Bonner: Well, maybe not because I was in Paris; was that in

Dr. Hartzell: This was probably in spring of 1965 before he

Dr. Bonner: I think that's when I

Dr. Hartzell: Take over

Dr. Bonner: Well, I was in Paris until September. I came home September 1965. We came by boat, one could still do that, came home on the France with our three kids. Sei Sujishi came and met us at the boat, and I stepped off the boat and he handed me the keys to the washroom, didn't want to be Chairman any more. You're reminding me of those years, 1962 to 1965 in which you were, where we, many was in the faculty head,

we talked about it, about the concern for you, that you had, you were kept in this anonymous title of Chief Executive, what was it?

Dr. Hartzell: Acting Chief Administrative Officer.

Dr. Bonner: Acting Chief Administrative Officer; a suggestion was made to Albany on a number of occasions that you should be designated Acting President, nothing ever came back from SUNY Central about that. But it did put you in the position in which your movements were restricted, and this had some consequences, and I'm sure I don't need to tell you, that those parts of the University, you did not feel free to make major personnel moves, so those parts of the University that had strong leadership, had good leadership did well. I certainly feel that way about my own performance in the Chemistry Department with the support that I got. Other, where there wasn't, where the leadership was not as, I don't know what word to use, was not as qualified as they should have been, there were problems, and one of those was Biology. I think there accumulated at that time substantial problems in Biology. There was another problem in Mathematics, which came, which arrived from Oyster Bay, of course, there was this major polarization there and that was a situation that had to get straightened out by major new appointment, that was one of the things that Johnny Toll did take care very soon when he brought in Jim Simon, it made a major difference. You were very supportive, I remember, of Oliver Schaeffer. As I said in the last interview, Oliver Schaeffer, I collaborated on research with him and then in the early years at Stony Brook, he began to come over here and he was doing some teaching over here, on a part-time basis. And the germ of an idea of his coming over and developing, being the first person to develop an science approach began to germinate. And then I think it was your support that

Dr. Hartzell: Well, I knew him at Brookhaven.

Dr. Bonner: That assisted that situation a lot. He was a physical chemist just like me. He had taken his degree at Harvard in physical chemistry, came to Brookhaven and got interested in geochemical problems, just as Ray Davis, you remember. Ray Davis and I worked with the same research professor, Professor at Harvard and Yale. In fact, I

succeeded Ray Davis, the laboratory that I worked in as a graduate student, when I moved into it, had just been vacated by Ray Davis. Some people think we even did the same research problem. So, but Ray Davis became interested, when he got to Brookhaven, he became interested in cosmology, cosmological problems solar neutrino experience.

Dr. Hartzell: I remember he worked on that.

Dr. Bonner: Yes. So, that was one consequence, I think some of the softness in the Social Sciences that developed in those early years

Dr. Hartzell: Well, I think, in some way, I think my appointment of Stan was a good one.

Dr. Bonner: It was, there's no question.

Dr. Hartzell: I had liked the way he handled his research in the History Department. I thought he was looking for quality and could recognize it.

Dr. Bonner: He definitely was and he made some major moves. I mean with Bob Lekachman, for example. Unfortunately, we weren't able. No, Stan Ross made some very major moves. He couldn't do everything.

Dr. Hartzell: And I kept, I never knew from year to another when they would find a President, until Johnny would be looked at.

Dr. Bonner: And there was a sense that the appointment of Johnny was kind of, they did continue to bring in one candidate after another but the faculty committee responsible for consultation didn't want it. And time and after time we were put in this position of putting down appointments that were really inappropriate.

Dr. Hartzell: This was typical of the narrow view of the Central Administration of university quality, it was, it seemed to me that after and Rockefeller it was all downhill, partly because nobody in the Central Administration had the vision or the background of coming from a top flight university.

Dr. Bonner: Yes, that's right. And I had the feeling that whether Johnny Toll appointment did go over the top, that it was still against a certain reluctance in Central Administration.

Dr. Hartzell: You have mentioned this before, you have the view of looking at Stony Brook and the University Centers, where we have come from in New York State and looking at themselves with admiration, a big step forward, which it was, but the point of view was not comparative on a national basis. They never had that national point of view. At other institutions it's standard. I think Johnny certainly had that and a lot of the faculty have it because they had come from other institutions.

Dr. Bonner: Central Administration in my experience, long experience now, although when I went on the Board of the Research Foundation in 1976, but I was active in committees; from the early '60's there was a committee of the Research Foundation called at that time the Committee on Procedures. I represented Stony Brook in that for quite a few years and actually chaired the Committee in '69, '70, so I had long experience going up there. And my observation goes way back that there is a very strong tendency to view the mission of the University as undergraduate education, period. And that is, there is also a strong desire on the part of the Central Administration to look out from this centralized perch on a unified, something that's unified, they call this the OBU complex - - one big universe -- strong desire to look at it as one big university

Dr. Hartzell: That was Sam Gould's philosophy.

Dr. Bonner: That was Cliff Wharton's philosophy also. It didn't get dispersed.

Dr. Hartzell: A centralized

Dr. Bonner: So there's

Dr. Hartzell: It's quite different from California.

Dr. Bonner: Well, that's because we have two systems, actually really three systems in California, right. But here we have everything lumped into one, and I think that's been something that Stony Brook and Buffalo had a hard time bucking all along. When the new Chancellor was announced, I'd only wished it had been Steve Sample and

not the President of Buffalo College. But who knows, maybe it takes, this is a good Nixon to recognize China, maybe it will take the President of Buffalo College to recognize the need for differentiation between graduate university centers and the undergraduate colleges. What do you think?

Dr. Hartzell: Unlikely, I think it is unlikely.

Dr. Bonner: He probably has a, I've heard good things about him, Johnstone, have you?

Dr. Hartzell: I don't know.

Dr. Bonner: I was appalled by the institutional connection at first, but I have heard that he has a broader view than you would expect.

Dr. Hartzell: I think it was a mistake to hire from within the system.

Dr. Bonner: I was appalled, I couldn't believe that they did this. But I did hear one chilling detail, and that came to me from John Buckhoff, that the day that Mario Cuomo chastised Jerry Komisar, remember a year ago in his budget message, coming up a year ago, in his budget message, Cuomo criticized SUNY for not having proposed plans for cutting back. He asked all the State agencies to tell what they would have to do, what they would do if they had to cut back a certain percent and Jerry Komisar had written a letter essentially refusing to play the game. And Mario Cuomo criticized SUNY very publicly for that in his state of the State address, and John Buckhoff told me that immediately after that happened, four top candidates for Chancellorship dropped out. That's pretty chilling, isn't it?

Dr. Hartzell: Well, that's

Dr. Bonner: Well, I'm going to have to.

Dr. Hartzell: Good-bye, thanks very much for your time.

Dr. Bonner: Well, it's been very interesting; I really enjoyed it.