

INTERVIEW WITH ARNOLD FEINGOLD
PROFESSOR DEPARTMENT OF PHYSICS (RETIRED)
FIRST DEAN OF THE GRADUATE SCHOOL
NOVEMBER 28, 1988

Dr. Hartzell: I want to start off, Arnie, with the questions on the second page, but if you want, let's see what, that goes fairly fast.

Dr. Feingold: All right, I came to Stony Brook in the fall of '60; how old was I? I was 39.

Dr. Hartzell: From what institution?

Dr. Feingold: I came from University of Utah, where I was an Associate Professor of Physics with tenure. And I came mainly for two reasons: one main one was my family comes from New York, I was born and raised in Brooklyn, and my family lived in New York, so there was a strong tie to the East. And Leonard Eisenbud, who was the Chairman of the Physics Department at that time at Stony Brook was an old friend of mine whom I knew very well. We had both got our Ph. D.'s from Princeton though we did not really overlap there, but after I left Princeton my first faculty position was at the University of Pennsylvania in '50. And Leonard was at the Bartow Foundation and he had sort of, not an official position at University of Pennsylvania, but a sort of visiting position, he taught some of the graduate courses in the evening. And, so we resumed our relationship there, I had just known him slightly at Princeton, got to know him quite well and I highly respected him as a physicist, so when he asked me to come to Stony Brook and told me the vision of the university, I was strongly attracted.

Dr. Hartzell: How? What was it, as you understood it then?

Dr. Feingold: Well, the, what was it, the Heald Report had just come out at that time and he quoted to me extensively from the Heald Report that it was the intention, obviously of the Heald Commission and of the State, that the State should establish four universities and their vision was that these should be on a par with the best universities in the nation, public universities in the nation. And Leonard's view was that he saw no reason with Rockefeller's support

Dr. Hartzell: Rockefeller was Governor then.

Dr. Feingold: Right, Rockefeller was Governor at that time, and he strongly supported the Heald Report and he saw no reason why Stony Brook could not become the 'Berkeley of the East,' I think was the phrase that was bandied about at that time. Well, it takes a long time to build a Berkeley or comparable institution.

Dr. Hartzell: Yes, it did in California.

Dr. Feingold: Yes, it surely did. But still the promise was there, so that was a very strong attraction, to build a full university with graduate programs and all. I had been teaching graduate courses ever since I left Princeton, so I was strongly involved with graduate training from the day I arrived at Pennsylvania. I should say after I was at Pennsylvania for five years as an Instructor and Assistant Professor, I did not get tenure at Pennsylvania, so I went to Illinois after five years and I was visiting assistant professor there for two years, and then I went to Utah in '57 as an Associate Professor in Physics. I was there till '60. One of the other reasons why we did really want to leave Utah, our kids were, our second child was born in Salt Lake City, and we did not relish the thought of having them go through the Utah school system, there was a strong Mormon pressure on the children which was unbearable. Well, the University had none of that, the University was very fine, the University was very broad visioned and no sectarian viewpoint whatsoever. But the atmosphere for the children was a problem, so.

Though I must say we made many very fine lasting friendships with people at the University, a great deal was spent for the administrators at the University and one of the main reasons I went there I guess was because, who was the Dean of the Graduate School there at that time, very brilliant chemist, I can't remember his name. Even though he was a Mormon, he clearly was a very, very distinguished chemist and well liked, and I knew one of the professors in the department very well before, which is why I went there. So, academically and intellectually the University of Utah was very fine, but the community did raise some questions, particularly as the far as the education of our children. So, those three things that I knew Eisenbud well, I had great confidence in him intellectually as a physicist, I believed him about the goals of the institution and my ties with New York and so on. So I accepted a position.

Dr. Hartzell: Did anybody else interview you besides Eisenbud? Did Olsen interview you?

Dr. Feingold: I'm trying to remember that, I'm not sure.

Dr. Hartzell: Was Lee there at the time you came, or did he come after?

Dr. Feingold: Well, Lee came later.

Dr. Hartzell: Lee came later, all right.

Dr. Feingold: Olsen was in charge. I may have had a very short meeting with somebody who came through, but I really can't remember; my main tie was with Leonard Eisenbud.

Dr. Hartzell: Okay, and the year was?

Dr. Feingold: It was 1960, I came in August, I guess, of 1960 or July, during the summer to get ready for the fall semester. At that time the school was very small, of course, it was just the Long Island Center for -- what was it called?

Dr. Hartzell: Teachers of Science and Mathematics, right. But I was assured that was strictly temporary and that the mission would change and lead to a full university and that they were hiring with that in mind, to recruit faculty for what would become a major university. At that time, I'm not quite sure, I think the faculty, if my recollection is right, numbered about 35 altogether. I think that included all those that came with me, which was the full number at that time. So, I think I was the only one who came to the Physics Department that particular year, including myself I think there were 7, 7 in faculty. Most of them are still here.

Dr. Hartzell: Let's see, Cliff Swarz.

Dr. Feingold: Cliff Swarz, Herb Muether, Leonard Eisenbud was the Chairman. Now, Herb Muether I had known, he was a fellow graduate student at Princeton. Leonard, since he got his degree at Princeton, mainly recruited from his old acquaintances and that included a lot of Princetonians.

Dr. Hartzell: That's what Olsen did.

Dr. Feingold: Yeah, well, right, it's the natural thing to do. So there was Herb Muether, Cliff Swarz, Dick Mould -- who was a fresh Ph. D. from Yale. Everyone else had had experience, I think he made a bad mistake in coming to Stony Brook because he was a fresh Ph. D. from Yale, he was student of Margineau's, so philosophy of physics. But coming to a school which was not a university at the time meant that he was not exposed to, what shall we say, the research activities and the wealth of opportunities that are the in the university in a big department. Everyone else had been at, somewhere else and knew what a university was. Dick, in a sense, I think that hurt his career and I think that's why he's never been promoted to a full professor and I think it will never be because he got out of research. He loved the teaching, which is fine, if that's what you want to do. And

I think that's why he came; he must have been told a different story than I was, because he threw himself almost totally into teaching. But once the became to be a university there was a large emphasis on research and he just wasn't there; it's unfortunate. There's Dave Fox who came from Berkeley; and Jim Raz, I guess Jim Raz came the same time I did, he unfortunately died five years later.

Dr. Hartzell: I remember

Dr. Feingold: Yeah, he was a very bright, young, enthusiastic theoretical physicist in nuclear physics, so he and I hit it off well because that was my area too, and we got some joint research grants almost immediately. So that was nice. So I found that stimulating for my own research.

Dr. Hartzell: Your own research was in

Dr. Feingold: Was in theoretical nuclear physics at that time. We got an NSF grant, I think, the following year. There were seven people there: Eisenbud, Fox, Muether, Swarz, Mould, Raz, myself, am I missing somebody? And it's interesting that, in retrospect, none of them left; Raz died, Eisenbud finally retired, I finally retired, the others are still active. So they liked the department; it is a close department in the sense that we got along very well with each so that was very nice, not true of some of the other departments at that time. Anyway, I came with high hopes that the school would become a big university and I think everybody in the Physics Department certainly shared that view. The other people I met, of course, since it started as school for training teachers in science, the big departments, there was a departmental structured then and there was also a kind of a divisional structure, but the vast majority of the faculty were in the sciences then -- chemistry, biology, physics and mathematics. The humanities and social sciences were essentially what you would call service areas at that time, though

they had some good people there, I guess. I think the most distinguished person, I shouldn't make this comment, was Nelson.

Dr. Hartzell: Ben Nelson in Sociology.

Dr. Feingold: In Sociology and I must say I enjoyed the atmosphere there very much that first year; there is something about a small school that is very attractive, if it's growing. It's small enough so you know everybody; we used to eat in the cafeteria, which was the old stables. Do you remember that? And it was marvelous because we'd share a table with the biologists, the chemists, the mathematicians, occasionally a few humanities and social science people; and so you would get to know what everybody was doing. Of course I understand in the later years it's very hard to keep a catholic interest in the whole university when you have large departments; it's probably the main price you pay.

Dr. Hartzell: The separate structures, the large structures tend to condition association.

Dr. Feingold: Well, one could have close relations only with a limited number of people, and if you have a large department, it tends to be limited to that department.

Dr. Hartzell: Yes, well, we're making an effort now to reestablish the luncheon area.

Dr. Feingold: Well, a good faculty club would be very nice.

Dr. Hartzell: Right, okay, what were your impressions of Stony Brook when you first came: of the campus, the people, the leadership, the spirit -- that's number 8.

Dr. Feingold: Of course, the campus was beautiful, no question about it. I much regretted the move here, and I think everybody then did. It was just such a

beautiful grounds, it was a vision of what academia should be. But, of course, we had no say in that.

Dr. Hartzell: Well, it couldn't

Dr. Feingold: Not under the restrictions that were imposed, the land was too small really and the grounds had to be preserved, so, but it was unfortunate, it would have been much better if they had just expanded the area there somewhat. And being closer to New York would have been a tremendous help. We recruited after that like other people who were just outside of New York City, but, and it is true you can get to New York, in those days in an hour if you went at the right time of the day. But 60 miles is a good deal different than 30 miles. And that was one of the main attractions we had trying to get back when we were in New York City because of cultural and intellectual opportunities. The people, as I said, most of the people I was thrown in with as soon as I came had the same vision of the institution that I had, that I had been told by Leonard. One of our most precious documents was the Heald Report.

Dr. Hartzell: Did you throw that out?

Dr. Feingold: I'm afraid so. I hope you have a copy of it. It must be in the file.

Dr. Hartzell: Yes, we do; we could use a couple more.

Dr. Feingold: Everyone in Chemistry and in Physics surely shared that same view of a major university, all of the big state universities, so that's my background as Pennsylvania is a quasi-state university. I think we tried it, but it is a fundamental state, and it ran as a state university, and then I was at Illinois, which is a big state university, Utah, a little smaller, but still as far the state was concerned, a big university. And my graduate work was at Pennsylvania, which is a big university, at least as far as graduate work goes, and I did my

undergraduate work at Brooklyn College, which is a big public university; so I was completely, what shall I say, public university oriented.

Dr. Hartzell: Was Harry Gideons at Brooklyn College when you were there?

Dr. Feingold: Yes, he came in while I was an undergraduate there, the latter part, after the storming late thirties; I didn't like him, he was much too conservative for me, as he was for most of the other graduates; but I did get to appreciate him. But, it still became clear after I had been there a very short while that there were people at the campus who didn't share my view of what the institution would become. There was this argument about how to organize the undergraduate curriculum *a la* the University of Chicago Undergraduate School 100 books program. they kept bringing up Annapolis, not Annapolis but St. John's.

Dr. Hartzell: St. John's at Annapolis.

Dr. Feingold: Yes, as their ideal of an undergraduate institution; there were people particularly, we had long discussions with people in the Biology Department who felt quite differently. Erk clearly had different views, he was the Chairman of the Biology Department.

Dr. Hartzell: What were Erk's views?

Dr. Feingold: I'm not so sure I ever discussed them with him at great detail but with the people in the Biology Department who shared them, and from reminiscences and from talks with people in the Physics Department who were there earlier, who came in '57, '58. There was a feeling that any faculty member could teach any undergraduate course, because after all undergraduate courses had a low level, one would think that a faculty member would have knowledge of the rudiments of every subject that we studied the first two years, say, of undergraduate instruction. So, the curriculum was organized around broad subjects rather than around disciplines. This was just going out when I came, but

they thought of course the “I” was the focus of the semester’s course, and after all the “I” involves physics, optics

Dr. Hartzell: This is biology?

Dr. Feingold: No, this is general, so in teaching the “I” you would teach biology, physics, chemistry, all of the sciences involved, and that any faculty member in the sciences could do that, teach the optics, teach the chemistry, teach the biology. My background was from the schools where the faculty were organized into disciplines and not a broad basis where any faculty member felt he could teach any course, I would resist teaching a freshman course in chemistry, for example, a freshman course in biology, just, not that I hadn’t had courses at that level, but I didn’t have the advanced information, which I felt was essential if one wanted to really teach the elements of a subject properly, one has to know a great deal more than the elements. So, there was that argument and that went by the wayside fairly fast used to participate in that, at least when I came in and we insisted that we have the more conventional structure. So, there was this division, I guess, between what you might call the conventional structure, which we in the Physics Department felt strongly about, as on the subject matter that the students learn to be in the individual disciplines, as opposed to a sort of overall mix that the people from Chicago felt was preferable. And that kept coming up. In fact, also, it quickly became evident about what the goals of the institution should be. It was clear that a sizable portion of the faculty did not appear to speak state university concept *a la* midwestern states, and their vision was more of a small undergraduate college really.

Dr. Hartzell: A liberal arts college.

Dr. Feingold: An elite liberal arts college.

Dr. Hartzell: And that became evident in the early planning of the buildings, the library, the size of the library.

Dr. Feingold: Well, I don't know whether that controlled it. It was just that you couldn't get permission to build buildings much larger to accommodate a student body very much larger than the present one, you know, you can make enrollment plans for the future, but they won't accept anything beyond the next three or four years, even though the buildings plan to last for twenty or thirty years or more, so that was a serious problem. But the main problem was this philosophy of a liberal arts, essentially undergraduate college versus a discipline oriented, research oriented, graduate oriented large state institution. And it was clear that many of the faculty had been recruited on the basis of its being a liberal arts college, which I found astounding because I had been told exactly the opposite. This was, it was clear the people in Biology had mainly been recruited on the idea that it would be a liberal arts college. Erk was giving his people a different story than Eisenbud and Bonner were giving their people, and that was most unfortunate. You had people come to an institution who come for reasons what the goals of the institution are and then find that that's not shared by the administration or by other faculty members, who are at a different start. That was very, very unfortunate, and that was the real crux of the difficulties.

Dr. Hartzell: So essentially it was an ideological split over the nature of the curriculum and the nature of the institution.

Dr. Feingold: Oh, yes.

Dr. Hartzell: Well, now, let's see, you say Lee had not arrived when you

Dr. Feingold: No, Lee came, Lee was hired in, at the end of '60, either the winter of '60, in December or January, at that time, and I don't know when he officially took over, whether it was in January's semester or whether it was

officially in July; I think it was actually in July but I may be mistaken about that. But he did give a speech in the early spring to the faculty and he just quoted the Heald Report, which is what he had been told was the mission of the University, and I would say half the present faculty at that time were astounded, that was not what they had been told. He had no conception that a large portion of the faculty had a different vision of the institution and felt that they had been sold down the river. He was never informed about this, which was very unfortunate. Now, of course, what he said I wholeheartedly supported him because that was the vision that I had come to the institution with me. And when the faculty heard that we had already had strong debates at faculty meetings about how the curriculum should be organized and what the goals of the institution were, but that speech of his, that really caused things to crystallize into two opposing camps, and he was completely I felt the people in Albany had, well, he was guilty in part too; one shouldn't take a job like that without talking with many of the faculty before accepting it. You shouldn't talk just to people that hire you, but I felt the people in Albany had let him down.

Dr. Hartzell: Now are the people in Albany, what individuals come to mind?

Dr. Feingold: Well, I wouldn't know; Hamilton, of course, was the Chancellor or the President or whatever they called it.

Dr. Hartzell: They called him President then.

Dr. Feingold: President, I guess, yeah. And Hamilton and Porter I guess would be his right hand man, and they essentially would be the people, at least to my knowledge, who were running the State University of New York. Now, Porter's background, of course, was small college, so that's excusable in a way.

Dr. Hartzell: President of Fredonia, he had been President of Fredonia and his field was history.

Dr. Feingold: Yeah, but Hamilton should have known better.

Dr. Hartzell: He came from Michigan State.

Dr. Feingold: Michigan State, right. And he should have known better, he came from a big midwestern university. Well, maybe he got sandtracked too by the fact that he came from a big state university, that's the way he envisioned the institution should be, too, till he learned otherwise, but it's true that the other people outside of Hamilton were all teachers college, small liberal arts college background.

Dr. Hartzell: Reuben Freuden, does that mean anything to you? Carlson, does that mean anything to you?

Dr. Feingold: No.

Dr. Hartzell: I think he was the predecessor of Hamilton.

Dr. Feingold: Oh, but anyway, Lee clearly came with the vision that it would be exactly what the Heald Commission said it would be, a major university center *a la* big midwestern

Dr. Hartzell: Was that the view of the Central Administration in Albany?

Dr. Feingold: That's what Lee was told, that was clear, that's what the Heald Report said. I don't think that was, it may have been Hamilton's vision, I have no idea, it clearly was not Porter's vision. Well, the vision accentuated with the very first things that Lee did, he was following what he felt was the mission of the school: to build it into a major university. He did not like the Chicago structure for the undergraduate school, he did not like the divisional structure, he felt that to get academic excellence one had to have strong individual in authorities, so one of the first things he did was abolish the divisional structure. Now, divisions were run by people who were committed to the liberal arts structure, that was Bill Lister, who was divisional chief for the physical sciences and mathematics; Erk, I think

Erk, whether Erk had a divisional title or not I am not sure. It's hard for me to see Biology being a separate division by itself, but maybe it was. And, who was in charge of Humanities and Social Sciences, was it Williams or Zyskind or one of those people.

Dr. Hartzell: Zyskind was in Philosophy, what about

Dr. Feingold: Yes, Zyskind was in Philosophy, Sternfeld was also Philosophy, Williams I guess it was.

Dr. Hartzell: George Willams?

Dr. Feingold: No, no, he's a biologist.

Dr. Hartzell: Williams was in Political Science.

Dr. Feingold: Political Science, I think he was, I may be wrong, but I think he was in charge of the Social Sciences, but anyway those people, along with -- Olsen clearly wanted it to be a liberal arts college. And, of course, was very upset when they brought in Lee. He clearly was disappointed that he wasn't selected as the, what did they call it then in those, the Chief Executive Officer, there was no title of President.

Dr. Hartzell: Chief Administrative Officer, yeah.

Dr. Feingold: Chief Administrative Office, but, anyway, he was clearly disappointed. His vision of the school was clearly completely contrary to that of Lee and that may have been the main source of the rancor between the two. The ousted division chiefs, of course, for many reasons, felt they had been unfairly treated. So that led to a great deal of turmoil. Fundamentally, it was this question of what the goals of the institution would be: was it going to be a university *a la* Illinois, Berkeley, Wisconsin, which is what we in the physical sciences felt

Dr. Hartzell: Those were the models for a state university at the time and they were highly respectable models.

Dr. Feingold: Yeah, and of course, one can say that's conventional and a new institution has the opportunity to be unconventional and innovative, so one can see that perhaps one should change, but it's a good time for change, if one wants to change from the customary schools when a place is growing. But I think the real reason was, I say, this question between the liberal art school and a graduate oriented institution.

Dr. Hartzell: A big institution.

Dr. Feingold: Though I think they would say it was more on the basis of educational philosophy, after all. Undergraduate at Chicago is just part of a full university.

Dr. Hartzell: Now, as I understand it you, there was some occasion, who appointed you Dean of the Graduate School?

Dr. Feingold: Well, that happened in the summer. I'm vague whether Lee was officially President at that time or not, I don't know whether the term had started in January or July, anyway, but he felt that since the mission of the institution had now changed from an undergraduate institution to that of a full university that it was very important to organize the school *a la* a typical state university because the eastern state universities were not the models that we were following, they were small institutions.

Dr. Hartzell: Cornell was not

Dr. Feingold: No, Cornell was not a state university, it was a private institution.

Dr. Hartzell: Yes, that's right, it's private but it has the contract colleges.

Dr. Feingold: Yeah, oh well, yeah, Cornell is a semi-state institution, as the University of Pennsylvania is in that sense. It's supported by its contract colleges, just as the University of Pennsylvania is supported by its Medical School. But

actually Pennsylvania got money from the state for its undergraduate program, because they had some arrangement where they had to admit so many students from each district in Philadelphia; so they did get state support that way. Cornell just got it through its contract colleges. Of course, we wanted, we felt, at least those in the physical sciences felt that it should become a big university of the stature

Dr. Hartzell: Big Ten.

Dr. Feingold: Better than the Big Ten. After all New York State at that time was the wealthiest state in the Union, at the time; it isn't any longer perhaps, but it was at the time. We had strong reservations about four state universities but of course that's up to each center to vie to see which one can become the first, the crown jewel. And we felt we had a head start over the other centers because we essentially were starting from scratch so had no large built-in faculty semi-mediocre undistinguished faculty. We had a chance to build. Albany again, teachers college before and again, so it had trouble developing because we had an easier time, except, of course, for this core of faculty who had come in with different music. So what Lee did, he thought he had the whole faculty behind him.

Dr. Hartzell: He did?

Dr. Feingold: He did, nobody told him otherwise. So he immediately went ahead as sign it was to become a university, he got approval for the Engineering College so he brought Tom Irvine and Bill Snyder

Dr. Hartzell: Bob Schneider?

Dr. Feingold: No, Bill Snyder, he left after left, a firm who were associated with North Carolina.

Dr. Hartzell: Raleigh.

Dr. Feingold: And Snyder and Irvine were clearly top engineers with international reputations, so that was the model that Lee was trying [end of Side 1]

It's not clear how far along we are, whether even we have reached the firing of Lee.

Dr. Hartzell: Let's go ahead with that.

Dr. Feingold: All right, let me just be brief about it. The decision on Smolker not to give him tenure, I believe the firing of Austill because of some possibly improper financial arrangements with the students and also the feeling that he was instigating the students against the administration. Finally and shortly thereafter, let me say, and shortly thereafter there were student demonstrations, there were articles in the newspaper about the campus, which we felt did not really portray the situation properly, we consulted about it, finally out of the blue came the announcement that Lee had been fired and that Hamilton was now the Acting Executive Officer. We were all stunned by that, Sidney Gelber, myself, Tom Irvine had not been contacted by the administration at all in this matter; we felt we should have. Hamilton came down shortly thereafter to talk to us about it; he was, we told him our view that that had been improper action, that the faculty were not all against Lee, because that was the impression he had, that all the faculty and the student body together were all opposed; in fact, he thought he even would have our support that the firing of Lee was a good decision. He was greatly taken aback to learn that we were very upset by that action. We had a long discussion about how to proceed from there on; it was clear that the firing of Lee was an act that could not be reversed. had consulted with the faculty, with us; we got, we insisted on guarantees that he would consult with us in the future before taking actions as the Chief Executive Officer on important matters, I particularly

insisted that I could not continue on as Dean in the Graduate School unless I was consulted on all matters that had strong pertinence with regard to the graduate program. He agreed that, of course, would be done. And the upshot was that Gelber, Irvine and myself, we agreed to continue to serve. A short while thereafter that we learned, at least I learned that he had fired Sidney as Dean. I felt this had violated our understanding that he would consult with me and I had no recourse but to resign, and I did write him a letter to that effect, that I was resigning because he hadn't consulted me, I felt that was most unprofessional.

Dr. Hartzell: Did you talk to Dr. Allen before this?

Dr. Feingold: I think that discussion with Allen, I think that had happened well before that because, it must have happened before that, because we surely didn't go up, Sidney was along with us up in Albany. I don't remember whether Lee was with us unfortunately, but Sidney surely was. So the conversation in Albany with Allen must have happened before Sidney was fired; whether it happened before Lee was fired, I just can't recall. Francis Bonner would be the best person to ask about that or Sidney. So, I resigned by letter to him, but I told him that was between himself and myself and I didn't feel it was proper for me to explain to the faculty my disagreements with him as to his actions as President. I felt that was his job to be president, but I was resigning on the grounds of non-consultation. He came down to Oyster Bay shortly thereafter to explain to the faculty why he had fired Sidney and to justify it. I vaguely recall, I was so upset about it that I am not even sure I can recall just what he said. In retrospect I would say that it was to bring harmony to the campus, that he felt it was clear that Sidney was a divisive force and to restore some harmony he had to remove him. And he said then, he said it was unfortunate that I did not, that I felt I had to resign because I did not concur in decisions. At that point I felt I had to make it clear exactly what

had happened, and I got up and made a short speech that the reason I resigned was because he hadn't consulted me about the matter. Of course, in addition, I felt it had been an improper move on his part, and I would have told him so if he had asked me, but he hadn't. I think that ended with his announcement that Porter would be taking over the day to day operation. My resignation, I have no idea when this occurred, it clearly occurred before I stepped down because I put some deadline on my letter of resignation to give him a little time to get a successor for himself. I think it was technically, I think I officially stepped down at the end of the year, December '61.

Dr. Hartzell: '61.

Dr. Feingold: So, I was really Acting Dean technically, I think, only from September to December, though I think the appointment was from July. Now, Dave Fox, I believe, was appointed the Acting Dean after I stepped down and in fact I think it was probably the only choice they could have made because I think he was the only other faculty member who had had some graduate experience. I'm not sure he had graduate students, but anyway he made a fine Dean, and I was pleased at least that we had gotten the graduate program started and had agreed on ground rules for writing proposals and collecting vita, both publications and teaching experience of the members, what the program would be, a list of courses that would be offered in the program.

Dr. Hartzell: You said your proposal for graduate work was well received.

Dr. Feingold: Yes, we sent up the chemistry one, and I don't know whether I got any word that it was well received or not, whether that was just after the fact that I learned from Dave Fox that everything went smoothly on that. I am not sure the chemistry program was approved before I stepped down, I don't think it was. But that was the first one we sent up, shortly followed by the Physics Department.

We weren't happy, I must confess, that our programs were the programs that would make a big deal in the East, but we feel they were at least better than many programs being offered by respectable institutions at the time and that was sufficient for us to get State approval; that was the premise, as long as it was better than well recognized programs, then we felt that was adequate to ask State to recognize them as such. And so that went along fine, and Dave Fox pursued that. I would talk with the Physics Department and work on finishing touches for the physics program.

Dr. Hartzell: Were you surprised that Lee was fired?

Dr. Feingold: Well, we were very upset that nobody in Albany was talking to us and Lee couldn't seem to be able to get any response from Albany. I think he tried to go to them and explain the situation. They clearly, we did, I think we had a strong suspicion to believe that actually we were told that somebody from Central Administration had come down to the area and had talked to some faculty members in Oyster Bay, but they didn't talk to us -- their guys in the administration. We had heard those rumors, so we were very upset by that. We were upset by what we felt was the biased newspaper reporting, which we felt had been inspired by some dissident faculty, we suspected Markman had something to do with that.

Dr. Hartzell: You suspected who?

Dr. Feingold: The mathematicians had something to do with that. I shouldn't say that, I have no basis for that. But it was clear that there were people, I least we felt, there were people in Albany, people on the campus who were talking to people in Albany but the people in Albany refused to talk to us. So, it was clear that the situation was Upstate and that may have been why we went up to Albany to talk to Allen about it, because we couldn't get any satisfaction at central headquarters. So, the firing of Lee, while it certainly came as a shock, was not a

completely unexpected shock. The premonitions were ominous, premonitions that went before it.

Dr. Hartzell: I think Rockefeller thought well of Lee and was surprised that Hamilton had

Dr. Feingold: I wouldn't be surprised, Lee had an incredibly fine background, but he did have one failing: he was, his previous position was dean of an engineering school. Engineering schools are fine; in some places they are, what shall I say, as diverse as academia is, but in many institutions they are a very closely knit group, and it was clear that was the situation in North Carolina. So, he had no idea that faculty members could have such diverse views of how an institution should be, what its goals should be, how it should be structured. He clearly had not faced such a situation before, not familiar with such a situation.

Dr. Hartzell: We talked a little bit about the views of the Central Office, of what the four university centers should be like.

Dr. Feingold: Right, well, yes, we always had feelings that it would be a rocky road ahead because of basic political problems facing the institution, the fact that the Legislature could not be partial to one area of the State *vis a vis* other areas so they were in effect committed to this four institutions, this seemed to place a very large burden on the State. It was not clear they could live up to make four first-rate institutions. And, secondly, the opposition of the private universities, which are very powerful in the State -- Columbia and Cornell, NYU, Rochester, Syracuse and others. New York was blessed with many fine first-class private institutions, really first-class, some of them at the top of the list in the country. Columbia surely was at the top, one of the three or four schools in the country at that time; and Cornell was not far behind. So, it was clear that there would be strong institutional pressure against the development of State competitors,

especially for them. We did feel we had advantage over the other three centers, that we were starting fresh, so we didn't have a large group of faculty of different expectations and abilities and that we were near a major metropolitan area, which would make it easier for us to attract first-class faculty. And we were also not far from Brookhaven, which we had excellent relations with and we hoped to build on that. So, we had some strengths. And the fact that Long Island itself was a large population region which didn't have a major institution. So, of course, we can't have it both ways, say you're part of metropolitan New York and then say you're not because of the competition. So, we did feel, and we did have, we felt we had Rockefeller's commitment. He clearly wanted to leave a monument that he had built: a major institution. And, of course, at that time not long after World War II, the GI Bill and all, there was a much more general sense of State commitment to higher education than before. So, in that sense we felt a real good start for us. And, I feel the firing of Lee was most unfortunate; it was probably inevitable in view of the fact that he was not aware of and did not make himself aware of the dissension at the institution. One could blame it on the fact that Albany sold him a bill of goods and then it up and had their own private contacts with the institution, which they didn't make him aware of and didn't let him know when they heard critical remarks against him, call him on the carpet and have it out with him; but instead proceeded to figure to fire him. But he knew there was trouble and he probably should have done more to figure out the extent of the trouble and how to stop it. The Smolker firing was, as I said, you have that on the first tape, it was unfortunate because we could have, as I said before. One can easily tolerate 40 faculty members with different ideas of what the institution should be, if the institution is going to grow to several hundred in a few years; it's a small price to pay and people can still do very important and useful things for the institution.

People who may not be in the center of activities, so that was a bad mistake. I do regret I participated in that; I gave approval. But, that my only excuse is Sidney was ready; and I was only concerned about excellence. But I should have wanted

Dr. Hartzell: We also have the kind of context in which Stony Brook is growing up, a Central Administration which did not have within it people with experience.

Dr. Feingold: That was very frustrating. There was nobody we could talk to in the Central Administration, we felt as the same background of views of what a major institution should be like that we all had. We felt, I shouldn't we all had, because we all didn't have that view, but at least what the administration had, and what we felt was our mandate as laid down in the report to become. We felt the people in Central Administration did not have the background, could not appreciate what goes on at a first-class university and what is necessary in a first-class university. I shouldn't say a first-class university, because there are many kinds of first-class universities, but a first-class large State university, which is a beast of its own kind.

Dr. Hartzell: Well, Harry Porter could not see beyond the fact that they had made

Dr. Feingold: They made tremendous progress with the teachers colleges, unquestionably.

Dr. Hartzell: There was no national view. Johnny came in with a national view.

Dr. Feingold: Yeah, oh sure. Johnny was my kind of man. We had the same vision of what a first-class institution should be. It was very easy, we had a very simple rule, I had a very simple rule. In those day, they don't do it any more, but they used to put out these five year reviews of institutions and they would rate

them and you would get a ranking of what the faculty country-wide thought about which were the best institutions, in which areas, and they rated every university in each discipline -- first, second, third. Unfortunately, they stopped that because the schools rated low didn't like it. But that was marvelous. I just looked at that, picked out what were the schools that were rated most highly by the faculty who should know. This is faculty country-wide, it's not the faculty of the institution themselves, which always have a biased view of how they're doing; and try to emulate the ones that were ranked the highest, that was our goal. We wanted to be one of those. In some respects it's amazing that we've accomplished as much as we have. In some areas we already are at the top 20, let's be conservative and say the top 20. But it's unfortunate that

Dr. Hartzell: The last two Governors

Dr. Feingold: Right, the economic threat or whatever the reasons are, the attitude of the Legislatures or the Governors, or the economics of the situation, the school has essentially stopped growing in the last five years. Physics finally made it to the top 20; Music surely in the top dozen, I would say. Some of the biological areas are surely very good or were until recently. And English was very good, but probably not as good as it was. Psychology moved up to the top but unfortunately again; it's a matter of leadership to a large extent.

Dr. Hartzell: Leadership where?

Dr. Feingold: Well, in the early days in the first fifteen years, I would say, it was department chairmen almost completely. And that's why Physics and Psychology, possibly, Alec Pond and Harry Kalish were energetic people, knew what top quality was, went at it aggressively to get it, went up to Albany, fought the battles there and it was very easy for them to impress the people there, because as you say they didn't know what it was. So, if you had a good aggressive

chairman, he could go up to Albany and get whatever he wanted. And Kalish and Pond were able to do that. Mathematics was a disaster until they got a first-class chairman, and it was Simon, who was an excellent mathematician and had the savvy. He was just marvelous; he built that department in five years, you know, just himself. Of course, he had the support of the administration, in a sense, but it was the chairman that did those things. After Toll came in, of course Toll would try to do things, but you can't do anything if you don't have an aggressive chairman.

Dr. Hartzell: Yeah, that's right.

Dr. Feingold: You just can't.

Dr. Hartzell: It's up to you to get the aggressive chairman.

Dr. Feingold: I know Toll worried and worried about Mathematics, and we in Physics, of course, were very upset by a divisive Mathematics, what was the name, Backus was the really scholarly person.

Dr. Hartzell: He was from Oxford, but he was the one who wouldn't take it.

Dr. Feingold: He wouldn't take it. And it was a wise decision on his part, he would have gone to pieces by what was going on in the Mathematics Department.

Dr. Hartzell: Is he still here?

Dr. Feingold: I don't think so.

Dr. Hartzell: He was here for quite a while.

Dr. Feingold: I don't think so. Simon came in and now who was responsible for bringing Simon in, I don't know.

Dr. Hartzell: He did a good job. I'll find out.

Dr. Feingold: You never could get the Math Department to agree on anybody. Whenever one group in the Math Department would propose a good

mathematician, the other group would automatically oppose, they never could agree on anybody.

Dr. Hartzell: I'll find that out.

Dr. Feingold: Finally they got Simon and that was just overnight. So, it's up to the departments; I think that's true in every university; also administration can do something by putting the money in the departments that it feels it has confidence in. Here it's very hard to do anything because Albany exerts too much control. So, I don't know what the future is. My feeling is the University went far enough in its first fifteen years so no matter what happens in Albany, it will remain a respectable institution.

Dr. Hartzell: I think that's true. The Health Sciences

Dr. Feingold: The Health Sciences have some first-rate people there, international caliber people.

Dr. Hartzell: Right. I think Pellegrino is proud of what he started.

Dr. Feingold: Yes, oh yes. I think he is an operator in his own way but Ed is a very successful builder, he has to be. And Johnny Toll was too; and don't you regret that he didn't pay more attention to the way the campus looked, the living conditions of the students was a serious problem; but he felt the first thing was excellence. He did make important strides in that direction. So, I think there is a basis. I'm not gloomy about the future. I'm glad to be out of it at this time, to be honest about it. These are hard times for the university.

Dr. Hartzell: Well, thanks very much for coming over, Arnie.

Dr. Feingold: Well, I'm sorry I don't have any concrete to give you.