

INTERVIEW WITH CHARLES HOFFMANN
Former Acting Chairman Department of Economics, Assistant Provost

October 16, 1987

Charles Hoffmann: I have four areas mapped out here to talk about. One of them would be the Department of Economics, because, if you recall, when I came I had a mission to get a chairperson and also to get the curriculum going and things of that sort.

Dr. Hartzell: When did you come?

Charles Hoffmann: 1963. There were two people in the department at that time, Marvin Kristein and Eliyahu Kanovsky and I was the third one. And then I was here, I chaired the department for two years in an acting capacity, and then I was lucky enough to get Bob Lekachman to come. He came the same time that John Toll came. And, of course I was also recruiting until, 1963 to 1965 I was recruiting mostly junior people, so that I could cover the department in terms of its mission, in terms of the changes that were made. Is that something that you would want?

Dr. Hartzell: Yes, that's good.

Charles Hoffmann: Okay.

Dr. Hartzell: See, this is the kind of thing. Now, let's see, you're the only person thus far that I've interviewed in the Department of Economics.

Charles Hoffmann: Yeah, but remember my role on the campus, in the beginning was in the department but then I had these other, they may be useful too. So a second area that I have is administration, and that is not only on campus but also SUNY-wide, things that I was involved in or in an administrative as well as in a professional capacity. As a matter of fact I just recently refreshed my memory, I have some clippings. There was a front page *New York Times* story on our opening up a library exchange with the teaching libraries that goes back to 1972 and 1973. And as a matter of fact in 1973 I went to China and I brought some of the first books that were being exchanged. So that's just an interesting thing, and I also, there was also an exchange with Fudan University; I don't

know if you know about that, the best university in China I think. And it's a university with which C. N. Yang had contacts through his father, and he came from not far from there. On the SUNY-wide thing we had a China Committee, which I chaired and which was instrumental with the help of Frank Yang in getting the Chancellor to China.

Dr. Hartzell: I figured somebody was involved in that; those are the interesting things to talk about, definitely.

Charles Hoffmann: So that's a second area, and that's a very extensive area. Now there were two other things that may be of importance, and one is faculty development, the program under the American Historical Association auspices. There were different routes, let's say, for faculty development. That was one route, and we had our internal development here without any financing from outside. And then another area which is related to faculty development was the Federated Learning Communities, which I was involved in. So those are the areas that I've mapped out to talk about.

Dr. Hartzell: All right, start with the first one today and go as far as you want to go, as much as you've got time.

Charles Hoffmann: I have an hour or so. You're going to feel free to interrupt me.

Dr. Hartzell: I will, yes. The only person in history that I've interviewed is Semmel thus far.

Charles Hoffmann: I'm going to see him, so I'll get some pointers from him. Let me ask you one question. You know I've forgotten the name of the building that we started in, was it

Dr. Hartzell: We started in the Humanities Building.

Charles Hoffmann: That's it, the Humanities. I didn't remember that; I knew that the English Department had much of the space there when I came.

Dr. Hartzell: My office was there for some time until we moved to the Library.

Charles Hoffmann: Okay, shall I just start then.

Dr. Hartzell: Do you want to talk about, first of all, the library.

Charles Hoffmann: No, I want to talk about the department first.

Dr. Hartzell: The department, all right, talk about the department first.

Charles Hoffmann: Let's see, I would take it up to the early years of the department beyond the point where Bob Lekachman came in 1965, because it was then that we began to develop a strategy, which may or may not have been continued, but it was interesting that we did discuss it, and that there was a general consensus on it. It's an interesting notion, so I will start with 1963. Should I just start talking then because you've got it taped.

Dr. Hartzell: I've got it going.

Charles Hoffmann: Everything is going.

Dr. Hartzell: Yeah.

Charles Hoffmann: All right, now, my first contact with Stony Brook was less than a year after you started here, and it was in the spring of 1963 that I was brought in as a candidate for the Department of Economics and for the chairmanship in an acting role.

Dr. Hartzell: This was Stan Ross.

Charles Hoffmann: Right, he was the Dean and you were the Chief Academic Officer, the president.

Dr. Hartzell: Well, I was the president without the title.

Charles Hoffmann: Right, and I even remember the interview I had with you. We talked about China. At that time, of course, China was, in many people's minds, but very little was known about it, and since it was my research area it was something that was interesting to discuss.

Dr. Hartzell: I had some family that was involved in China, my great-uncle was.

Charles Hoffmann: I was offered the position in the spring of 1963, and I must say that I was very excited. So excited that I started to come out right away, even though I wasn't on the payroll, but it was the summer, and we had the problems of relocating and we had identified a house but we weren't going to be getting into it until late in September. But in the meantime I came in the summer and started to work on plans for the next academic year. And there was one explicit mission that I had, and that was to search for an

economist with a national reputation and who would be a good person to head up a new department in a new university. And there were some difficulties because at that time most people in academia didn't know what Stony Brook was, where it was; they knew nothing about it, so that you had to overcome a kind of psychological obstacle. But I figured that there must be some people like myself who were interested in, who were venturesome, and who were interested in getting into a new university at the beginning and contributing in ways that were undefined as well as those that were clear cut. And it took a lot of doing and I did get a number of people to come; I don't remember all of them, but I do remember a couple who came, and I was lucky enough to be able to interest Robert Lekachman, who was at Columbia University Barnard College, and whom I had known as a graduate student and who had combined a very sharp economic mind with a love for writing, which wasn't always a combination that economists have. And we were fortunate enough to get him to come, and he came in 1965 at the same time that John Toll started his tenure here. Now to get back to the very beginning, in addition to looking for a chairperson, I had to recruit people because we were expanding the student body. If I'm not wrong on this, it seems to me that when I came to Stony Brook, this is before the 1963 academic year started, the student body was under a thousand, not many under a thousand

Dr. Hartzell: I think you are right, yes.

Charles Hoffmann: And with the new class in 1963 it just went over that thousand mark. And so with the expansion, which was a planned expansion, we needed more faculty members. I was the third one in the department, and we were constantly recruiting. There were two things that we seemed to be doing throughout the academic year and that was working on the budget and recruiting. Recruiting was a perennial operation, which was something that not all universities were lucky enough to have as a quality, but since we were expanding, it meant that we were recruiting people every year. It also meant that we kept our fingers crossed that mistakes that were made could often be overcome by the new personnel that came in. At any rate I remember spending

considerable time recruiting and getting some young, well-qualified people. But there too in the recruiting there was a problem of the name of Stony Brook not being known and therefore we were constantly explaining, sketching the mission of the University.

Dr. Hartzell: Where did you do your recruiting? How far outside New York State did you go?

Charles Hoffmann: Well, we went all over the country because if I would be going to the national meetings of the American Economic Association, and I would also be using the contacts we had in the universities we came from. By we I mean the members of our faculty, as well as colleagues in other departments. So that one person sticks out in mind in that was a young economist who was Korean in his background, and he didn't get his Ph. D. from any of the universities in the metropolitan area, that was one thing that we were trying to avoid, not absolutely, but we were trying to get a catholicity of approaches and backgrounds.

Dr. Hartzell: A well-balanced pool from which to

Charles Hoffmann: That's right, so that the first people that we did recruit were from outside the metropolitan area and even some of them were outside this region. As a matter of fact two of the young people I remember very well were James Corneille and Edward Van Roy. Edward Van Roy was born in the Netherlands, but he became an American citizen. He and Corneille came from the University of Texas, and they were very bright and they were very much interested in being at a place like Stony Brook, so we did get people from all over the country, and we did begin to build the department. Though it wasn't until Robert Lekachman came that we were able to look for more senior people. And there too we got people like Egon Neuberger who came from the universities outside the New York metropolitan area, and then we started to recruit people from the University of Indiana; when Ed Ames came his contacts were there. And so over time we still maintained a balance as to where people came from, but obviously people who had contacts with particular universities would use those contacts.

Dr. Hartzell: Where did Neuberger come from:

Charles Hoffmann: I don't remember; I think he got his Ph. D. from Harvard, but I'm not certain, my memory may be a little off there. We started contacting people at Yale and at other of the Ivy League universities as well as elsewhere. At any rate, by 1965 when Robert Lekachman came, we had a small cadre of junior faculty who gave promise of successful scholarly development because of research and writing and also who had some commitment to teaching. That was my background, you see, I came from a college, and I had been teaching at this college -- Queens College, which incidentally is celebrating its 50th anniversary this year -- where there was a very strong emphasis on teaching, even though we had outstanding faculty in terms of research and publication. And I know that I was inspired by the teachers I had who were excellent and who were also first-rate scholars, so that

Dr. Hartzell: Who was your president at Queens?

Charles Hoffmann: Paul Clapper, he deserves a lot of the credit. He was the first president of Queens, and he therefore as an educator, he got his training at Teachers College and had been at City College and was the first president of Queens College, which was set up in 1937. I guess that would be 20 years before this institution was set up. 1957 as I recall was the year that you opened up in Oyster Bay. Well, Clapper was an impressive person. Of course he was very fortunate; he was hiring faculty in a depression decade and so he got first-rate people, who also had a commitment to teaching and that's been a continuing tradition at that institution, and some of it carried over here; not just through me but through other people who came from Queens College to teach at Stony Brook in different departments -- in the language department, in English and so forth and so on. At any rate we were trying to emulate the best departments in terms of professional training, but also not forgetting that teaching was important. Now, one of the things that I felt was very important was to get up a curriculum that would be basic that all economics majors would take and that would prepare them to be economists, whether they went on to advanced degrees or not. In other words to acquire economic analysis to the problems of the world. It is interesting that in the contemporary world

people are economists without even knowing it in a sense, because there are so many problems that call for economic analysis because we are constantly making decisions with scarce means, scarce means but unlimited wants and needs, and so whether we are talking about time, whether we are talking about money, whether we are talking about work, these analytic techniques are appropriate. At any rate back in 1963 with that in mind I developed a curriculum which would certainly not controversial in any way but which I think included the basic elements of an economic education. At that time remember mathematical economics was just starting. There were three things that were important for me in a basic curriculum: one, economic theory or analysis; two, economic history, sort of the application of theory to the real world; and three, the measurement factor, in other words, statistics, of course, as we went on mathematics and econometrics. So that those were the basic elements of the required courses that economics majors at Stony Brook would have to take in order to fulfill the major. And there was no problem, it was just that we got the curriculum through so that the students who were there and were attracted to economics would be able to have a respectable education in this very important discipline.

There was something else that was important to me, I don't know how it fared, but it is important to understand what its context was, and that is the Economic Research Bureau, which if you recall was set up, I don't know whether it was 1964, somewhere around there, because it had to go through the whole process, and you had to approve it and then it had to go to Albany. The rationale for that was that no matter how theoretical a department is, it ought to have an arm that could be used in empirical studies. Whether those studies were historical or contemporary in terms of business, or in terms of taxation, whatever it might be, they should have that arm through which: one, the faculty themselves could engage in empirical research; two, the community could commission empirical research that was important to them that some faculty member was interested in. In other words it wouldn't be something that was imposed on us, and so the Bureau was set up and I'm glad to see that it still exists because I have a soft spot in my heart for

that because I think that as important as theory is, in order for theory to be tightened it needs to stand the test of application, being out in the light and then when the empiricists don't agree with the theory, then we have to recast the theory in a more understanding way.

So those were important elements in the curricular development of the department. Later on, of course, when we had more senior people and the department developed and there was a considerable number of majors, we went on to strengthen the curriculum by requiring mathematics, econometrics, and we recruited people who were proficient in those areas. Now, when Bob Lekachman came and started to recruit people who were a little more senior, the question arose where was the department going, what is its objective in terms of its role in the economic scene in higher education. And we discussed that a lot, and it was discussed also in our interviews with people, and we came up with a kind of economic answer, which related other objectives of this University to the role that economics plays in the world. We decided that we should be strong in our comparative advantage, that is in areas that would be related to the development of the University. First of all, of course, it was clear an absolute essential was that we have a very strong, firm founding in economic theory and analysis, not matter what your specialization is, that would have to be the bedrock on which it was built. We felt that we would have a comparative advantage in certain areas of public policy, and they would be medicine, medical economics, the economics of medicine, and the economics of education. These were fields, they weren't, they've been with us a long time, but the development of the economics of these fields was in its infancy. There were well-known economists who studied medicine, that is the economics of medicine, but there were no departments that were focused in that direction. So that basically we agreed, there was a consensus at the beginning, I don't know how it turned out, although I know that there are people here who are in those fields, we agreed and the incoming recruits agreed that this was the direction to go. That we weren't going to compete with Harvard in terms of their bet, but we were going to develop in these areas that we were going to be more exposed to by the

nature of this institution as it developed. And so we have now several economists who are known over the country and even in other parts of the world for the work that they do the economics of education and the economics of medicine and health care in a broader concept which was consistent with the kind of Health Sciences Center we evolved at Stony Brook.

Dr. Hartzell: Did you give any emphasis to the economics of the Island, its light industry, and the economics of the marine based?

Charles Hoffmann: Well, that's something some of which developed, the industry, the Island and the planning and the development of the Island, as a matter of fact, early on, I don't know how early on, there was contact with Lee Koppelman, and when Dieter Zschock took over as head of the Research Bureau that was something that we developed, and we also had conferences and meetings with members of the business community. I remember a contact with the Long Island Association, but I don't remember any of the details. But certainly we were open to and sensitive to the developments that were going on on Long Island. Now sometimes you see there would be members of a department who are not interested in this, and that's okay, so long as the department itself does not hide from the world that it's really a part of, whether it denies it or not. It was our hope that there would be continuing contact, and I understand now that you are going to have an industrial park developing east of the campus.

Dr. Hartzell: Yes, I think Jack Marburger is interested in the relations with industry here, and we have a chap who used to be at Grumman -- I forget his name -- but at any rate, he is our liaison man with industrial research projects. I think we are moving in that direction.

Charles Hoffmann: Now the department developed certainly along some of the lines that I've sketched, but I should point out now that my role in it changed because in 1965 when John Toll came and when Bob Lekachman became chairman of the department, I was invited to join the administration as Bentley Glass's assistant, which seemed to me to be an exciting thing, not that I wanted to give up being an economist, but I was still

excited by the idea of being involved in the development of a first-rate new university. So I went over to Bentley's office, and since Bentley was not here full-time in the beginning, I was very busy there, but I still maintained close contact with the department through the chairman, and I continued to do my research on China, which I don't think I mentioned before except once, and to publish and also to teach. While I didn't teach full-time, I did continue to teach. And I must say that was because I love teaching, and I still teach even though I am retired.

Dr. Hartzell: What was your area of specialty in teaching?

Charles Hoffmann: Well, when I got my Ph. D. I was in economic history and industrial organization and labor institutions. My doctoral dissertation was on the depression, the economic history of the depression, which meant using business cycle theory as well as economic history, and it was the depression of the '90's, as a matter of fact some of my waggish friends have suggested that I ought to revise it now that the 1990's are coming up. The title was *The Depression of the Nineties*. It was after I finished my doctoral dissertation that I was sort of taking it easy and trying to decide which direction I was going to go in, that was back in 1954 or thereabouts. And I was playing with the idea of refocusing my concentration toward economic systems, comparative economic systems, and I was even thinking about studying the Soviet economy and I even started studying Russian, but I decided that I wasn't that much interested, and I switched rather to the Chinese economy because I felt, even though at that time it was not fashionable, that the Chinese would go a different way than the Russians, which they didn't do right away, but they did and of course they are continuing to do that now. So that in 1955 I started studying Chinese, and I started doing research on China. I've been with it ever since. And, I don't know if I indicated to you this earlier, I've been to China a number of times and the last two times in 1983 and 1987 I taught at a key university in Beijing, and I have considerable gratification to find now that my former students are among, because there are so few economically trained people in China, they are among those who are involved in the reforms that are going on and

they are, some of them are working in the United States, but most of them are working in high offices in China, and I get to see them when I go back, or I get to see or talk with them when they come to the United States.

Dr. Hartzell: That must be very gratifying to you to see them and your influence on them reflected in what's going on. I hope the reform movement continues and isn't set back.

Charles Hoffmann: So long as political stability can be maintained I would expect the reform will go on. Some of the people there who are trained incidentally, who studied with me, studied only with me their economics. These are all people who had to study in English because their English is the second language. There's a joke in China and that is English is the first language people learn beyond their own language. If they can't make it, then they study Russian, that's probably an exaggeration. At any rate, the young people in China are very strongly motivated and think, they are optimistic about what can happen to them and what can happen to their country.

Dr. Hartzell: There's a newness about it in some ways. What about the quality of students that came to you that you found in the University?

Charles Hoffmann: The quality of students improved over time. You know faculty members always complain about the quality of students, but I've been through that a long time, and I just know that the students at Stony Brook were good students, they became better, and of course once we got a full program with graduate program added to it, we were able to command excellent students from the whole market.

Dr. Hartzell: When the graduate program begin?

Charles Hoffmann: Well, I don't remember the exact year, but I would say it must have been somewhere in the maybe the beginning seventies, but I don't have a firm recollection. But we were preparing for it I remember over a considerable period of time. And of course, you see, the graduate program was an essential if we were going to be able to recruit first-rate faculty. We had to have a timetable on that, and they got pushed, I'm sure, as rapidly as possible because most of the best people will not go to a school

unless there is a graduate program. The graduate students also started to change; they became more international once we were underway.

Dr. Hartzell: Is that background or interest or both?

Charles Hoffmann: No, by background. Interest developed along those lines. We started to get a good number of Chinese students, they would come from Taiwan and from Hong Kong and eventually we got some from the mainland. And the interesting thing there was that the Chinese students were very good in math, whether they were male or female. And ironically when I was in China the first time, I was amazed to find out that economics majors not only didn't study math, they didn't even study statistics. That's been changed, now they do study both. The University of International Business and Economics in Beijing where I had been has a more advanced curriculum for students because it specializes in economics of and things of that sort. Anyway, to get back to my role in the department, as I said I became Bentley Glass's assistant, that was 1965 and that continued to 1968. Then I was asked by John Toll and Bentley Glass to become acting provost of social and behavioral sciences because they were attempting to set up a provostial system for the different divisions. It didn't get through at that time, but I was acting provost for a couple of years, including one year when I was on sabbatical leave. And then when I came back, that would have been, I went on sabbatical leave in 1969, I came back in 1970

Dr. Hartzell: The same year that I went on sabbatical.

Charles Hoffmann: And then when I came back I was asked to become assistant academic vice president, which I did. Bentley Glass was in his last year or two in that position, because of the mandate

Dr. Hartzell: He and I are the same age to the day.

Charles Hoffmann: That's right and I'm exactly 15 years younger than the two of you.

Dr. Hartzell: Is that right?

Charles Hoffmann: January is the month that we were born in, all of us.

Dr. Hartzell: January 17th is mine.

Charles Hoffmann: You were born a week, not after I was, but in date a week later, I'm January 10th. So I'm still supposedly young. I understand that Bentley is still around here.

Dr. Hartzell: Yes, he is. He hasn't moved.

Charles Hoffmann: Anyway that was my, then I was assistant academic vice president until 1974, and that meant that when Sidney Gelber became Academic Vice President, I was his assistant vice president, one of his assistant vice presidents. Then in 1974 I returned to my department, but actually I got involved with the faculty development program that was financed partially by the American Historical Association, and Bill Taylor was the director of that. And then when Bill Taylor went on leave, I was the director for one year.

Dr. Hartzell: What did that do, what was its function?

Charles Hoffmann: Its function was to involve faculty in a variety of activities that aided them in their continuing development. And so we had a variety of activities, such things as team teaching, the use of video, workshops, joint operations with Farmingdale campus as well as with some community college faculty, so that there was a sharing of problems, teaching problems as well as curriculum problems. And this went on for a number of years. It was at the same time that the Federated Learning Communities was gestating. Much of that went back to this, what should I, I'm searching for a word. We did have a, I don't know if it was a ten year or a twenty year period in which we did a study of the University under Sid Gelber, and one of the themes that came out of the study was that there were some students where there was a mismatch between, these were undergraduate students, between their expectations for Stony Brook and the reality. And so it was felt that there ought to be alternative programs that would take care of students of this sort.

Dr. Hartzell: Did you call this institutional studies?

Charles Hoffmann: Yes, it was. As a matter of fact, what's his name

Dr. Hartzell: Ray Maniuszko is

Charles Hoffmann: Yeah, but then the fellow who came from Stanford, I know his name well, but I'm blocking it out, a short fellow with glasses who shared a room with the former president of the Albany campus, who came here after he left Albany.

Dr. Hartzell: Oh, you mean Joe Katz.

Charles Hoffmann: That's right. Joe Katz is the one and with him was later on

Dr. Hartzell: Louis Benezet.

Charles Hoffmann: That's right, Louis Benezet. So a lot of this was going on as we were soul searching, so to speak, in this study that was commissioned by Sid Gelber; I think it came just before the Middle States Association evaluated us, did its periodic evaluation; and they were very much impressed with this study because the study, you know, it wasn't just a laudatory study; it identified some very important problems in undergraduate education and especially on a campus that was trying to develop as a University Center. There were often tensions between the undergraduate interests and the graduate interests.

Dr. Hartzell: I think we still have that.

Charles Hoffmann: Well, you are always going to have tension. The question is how those tensions get resolved. And of course the temper of the times is the fact that you don't have as many undergraduates coming in to higher education proportionally as you used to means that at least some attention has to be given. So that we get back 1974 to 1976 I was involved in the AHA faculty development program. When I wasn't directing it, I was working with Bill Taylor and spending some of my time, which was released from my department for that. But I continued always to play a role in the Economics Department.

Now in 1976 I went on sabbatical leave, but before I left I also had contact with the faculty Federated Learning Communities program that was emerging. It had not started yet, it started in 1976. Pat Hill was the one who helped to bring it to fruition and became its first director. And so at the same time as I was involved in the AHA program, we had the articulated with the emerging Federated Learning Communities, and we shared notes

and thoughts with Pat Hill. Before I left on sabbatical, Pat Hill asked me if, when I came back, I would be willing be the first one after him to work in his program, the FLC. I said, well, I would consider it, and we corresponded. And as a matter of fact I started to do some of the spadework when I was on sabbatical, in addition to my own research on China, I did move around and spoke to some people at Sonoma State University that were involved in parallel activities. When I came back in 1977, I took on the role, which is a full-time role, of Master Learner was the name. It always chokes in my throat because it is a little pretentious. At any rate the reality was much more real than the pretension of the title. And ours was the second group. If you recall this is a program in which a group of students, maybe between thirty and forty students would sign up to take a minor in an area which had a theme to it; it was interdisciplinary or, if you want to avoid controversy, transdisciplinary. Although part of our mission was to try to develop a concept of interdisciplinary teaching and learning, now the focus of our group was 'Cities, the Utopias and Environments.' And the students took in that program six courses in six different disciplines: one was in theater arts, one was in art history, one was in psychology, one was in philosophy, one was in -- gee, I'm not remembering all of them -- one was in history, and then there was one other, it was a biology course, it was called 'Ecology and Evolution.' Now as Master Learner I had to take all those courses and exams and write the papers and all. That was terrific for me, I mean it was a re-education, and I was gratified I still could do well in science, and I enjoyed it all very much. But not only was I to take all the courses, but I was to do a critique of each of the faculty members at the end of the course, and it was a long critique. I don't remember how many pages, it might have been something like 20 pages. It was a confidential report. In all cases, except one, however, the report was made open. The one person did not want the report be made open, and I refused to give the report away to the person because it was still my report, but I honored the confidentiality of it; it's in my files somewhere. These reports were supposed to be useful to the faculty members, and I must say that I got an eye-opener on the way some, remember committed colleagues, these are

committed colleagues because, after all, you know, a person who is not committed to teaching and to even looking with some critical eye at their own teaching, they wouldn't be in the program. Now, in addition to the six courses, and remember this was over a period of a couple of years, but the six courses were taken three each semester. In addition to the six courses there were three seminars. There was a faculty seminar, and I was a member of it -- the six faculty members plus the master learner -- plus I think Pat Hill was there too. Then we had a joint seminar, the students and the faculty. And then there was a student seminar of which I was member. I was a member of all three seminars. So I must say I was very busy, but it was exciting. You see one of the things that we did, the students, and I considered myself a student in this context, the students met at odd periods informally. We had a hangout, and we used to meet there. My role, you see, was a very interesting one, I was to interpret the faculty to the students and the students to the faculty, as well as to assist in any way in the educational process to try to explain why was it that in one discipline you got certain principles which seem to be in conflict with principles in another discipline; we would wrestle with that problem. And I must say it was one of the most exciting experiences I ever had. I had early on some commitment to interdisciplinary or at least to multi-disciplinary learning when I was an undergraduate, because I had been exposed to some of that at Queens College seminars that cut across disciplines, so this

[end of side 1 -- interruption in taping of interview]

finish up on the Federated Learning Community, which has gone on, and I understand is still in operation, is that right?

Dr. Hartzell: I think somebody has taken it over.

Charles Hoffmann: Jim McKenna was director for a while, I don't know if he still is.

Dr. Hartzell: I don't know, I haven't heard much about it, but I wouldn't necessarily. Pat Hill went to Green-something.

Charles Hoffmann: He went to Evergreen State. And I've had some contact with him, but I haven't seen him.

Dr. Hartzell: Is he still the Provost there?

Charles Hoffmann: I think so. I recently got a communication from him. He sent me an updated bibliography with some of the material I was involved in. But I think one of the greatest things that came out of my experience, I shouldn't say my experience, the thing I saw was that there were students who were saved and who became outstanding, went on; as a matter of fact I bump into one of them in Berkeley every now and then because he is a planner there. And when he came into FLC, he was about to drop out of college. We had a close relationship, and he had close relations with the faculty, that was one of the things he wanted. But he also was able to find his way. He moved on from FLC to work with Len Krasner and went abroad to England, spent a year in England, after which he came back and went to graduate school.

Dr. Hartzell: It's getting close to the end of this particular tape.

Charles Hoffmann: Well, then let me just finish, after that I was in the department full-time, that was 1977 to 1978. Then 1978 to 1979 was my last year at Stony Brook in the department. So I retired, I was eligible for retirement so I retired in the summer of 1979. But I retired to take another position. I was offered deanship of social sciences at my alma mater, Queens College. And though I had hankering, we wanted to go to California, we had a home in California that had been built where we intended to retire, and we were eager to go there, but I was excited by the opportunity of going back to Queens in a role that I was fully prepared for now. I spent three years there, with very exciting years; I would have liked to have stayed longer but I had someone pulling on me to go west, and so I retired from Queens in 1982, and since then I've been a research associate at the Center for Chinese Studies at the University of California in Berkeley where I pop in every now and then and keep up with my research and publication on China.

Dr. Hartzell: You keep active and you look well., that's good.

Charles Hoffmann: So let's make that number one; now I think that what I should do then is when I go home I'll do another one and send it to you, is that all right?

Dr. Hartzell: Fine, all right, that's good.

Charles Hoffmann: And anything that I didn't have in my outline, which I think is appropriate, I'll tag on.

Dr. Hartzell: All right. You've done

Charles Hoffmann: Well, I've done really the first three actually, although I didn't go into much detail on the faculty development, the American Historical Association. That's something you can get from Bill, who has documents too. Now, let me speak to you about documents, and there is something else I just thought of. What kinds of documents do you want, because I left most of the stuff here, but I come across every now and again some things, like I had some stuff with me.

Dr. Hartzell: I would say reports on the curriculum of the faculty, any reports on the graduate students, anything that you have that reflects the role of the faculty or the character of faculty life, faculty-students relations. This I'm not getting as much on that yet.

Charles Hoffmann: Uh, huh. Let me just say, here I have a folder, some of this stuff you may have already, for example, I think this is in the clipping service of one of our, so there is no point in making copies of that. All those clippings relate to China and some of the things that I worked on.

Dr. Hartzell: That's the kind of thing that would be good.

Charles Hoffmann: Here's something you must have, someone must have in the files, whether you've got it or not, I don't know, here's something else from the Library.

Dr. Hartzell: I'm not sure that we would have these. Look at the dates, this is back in 1973, it's probably before

Charles Hoffmann: Can I see that a second because I wonder if I have a duplicate here, no I guess not.

Dr. Hartzell: These are 1972 and 1973 dates.

Charles Hoffmann: Do you want to make copies of all of that?

Dr. Hartzell: I think so.

Charles Hoffmann: Then let me leave the folder with you but I want it back.

Dr. Hartzell: Sure, thanks.

Charles Hoffmann: Here's a, and I'll look at some of the other stuff I have, but now let me go on to another question which is a little more ticklish. Where will it be when you finish, after you've done it, after you've done the Xeroxing, are you going to leave it in the office here or what?

Dr. Hartzell: No,

Charles Hoffmann: If you leave it someplace, I could probably pick it up.

Dr. Hartzell: What I'm doing, everything that I'm doing goes to the archives, and we call our archives special collections and that's Evert Volkersz, second floor.

Charles Hoffmann: Okay, so should I go there and get it?

Dr. Hartzell: I think that's a place I can leave it there.

Charles Hoffmann: When is that going to be there roughly so I know when to look for it?

Dr. Hartzell: Roughly?

Charles Hoffmann: Yeah,

Dr. Hartzell: Certainly by Tuesday.

Charles Hoffmann: Okay.

Dr. Hartzell: My telephone here if you

Charles Hoffmann: I have your telephone, I've called, but usually I've gotten you at home. Now I want to talk about something else, and this is a little more ticklish. I want to talk about controversy.

Dr. Hartzell: Yeah, all right, just a sec.

Charles Hoffmann: No, you can stop it. I want to talk between the two of us.

[end of tape 1]

Charles Hoffmann: in 1987 when I was in Karl Hartzell's office at the State University of New York at Stony Brook I did one tape for the archives covering the period 1963 through the academic year ending in 1979. That tape, tape number 1,

covered broadly three subjects and focused mainly on academic processes in the Department of Economics starting in 1963 when I was Acting Chairman and in the Federated Learning Communities which developed in the 1970's and also faculty development under an American Historical Association grant. The tape I am about to make is being made at the beginning of 1988 and I hope to complete and send it to Karl Hartzell by the end of February or sometime in March. This tape, tape number 2, is covering the area of administration as seen through my eyes in various administrative positions starting in 1965 and ending in the middle seventies. I leave out my administrative role as Chair, Acting Chair of the Department of Economics from 1963 to 1965 since I have already covered that in the earlier academic focus. In 1965 John S. Toll became President of the State University of New York at Stony Brook. He arrived, if I'm not mistaken, early in the beginning of the academic year but probably in the summer. I had had contact with him in the period when he was President-elect. And as a matter of fact we had discussed Bob Lekachman's coming to the Economics Department as Chair. So that at the end of 1965 academic year I was relinquishing my chairmanship as Bob Lekachman came on in September of 1965.

Before Bob Lekachman's arrival, I was called in by President Toll, along with other administrators, to see if I would be willing to be either an assistant to a new graduate dean or an assistant to a new academic vice president, who already had been selected, H. Bentley Glass, a renowned geneticist, and in a sense a kind of international academic statesman. After serious consideration of the offer, I decided to become Bentley Glass's assistant. This was a challenge in several ways, since I had heard Bentley Glass, I knew about him from the AAAS and also from AAUP, in which organizations he had played a role of leadership. The thought of working closely with him was exciting to me since I knew what his academic and political positions were, and he struck me as being a person of integrity and high value. The Office of the Academic Vice President had just been established, and therefore it was being built from scratch, locating at first in the old library building. Old, of course, is silly because Stony Brook

was very new, but old in the sense that it became the core of a larger, newer building. The area assigned to the Academic Vice President was close to where President Toll had set up his offices. Since Bentley Glass, while technically Academic Vice President, was finishing up a number of responsibilities and commitments that he had elsewhere, his presence during the first academic year was sporadic. I was charged, therefore, with setting up the office in a physical sense and also hiring some staff members, though he and I worked together in deciding which of the various candidates would be his secretary. Given the chore of setting up this office the first two years were very busy ones, and there was considerable excitement in the sense of defining what had to be done and then trying to implement it. I stayed in that position from 1965 until 1967. The specific chores that were assigned to me came up as problems arose, but clearly I started out as a kind of office manager and also a handler of Dr. Glass's correspondence while he was away especially. In addition the various academic activities that reported to Dr. Glass would send their reports and make contact through me. This included not just the academic departments, but organized research, the library and other related academic affairs. A major responsibility for the office in any university is academic and professional recruitment, personnel policy, in those areas. At Stony Brook, however, this was an overridingly important function since it was a new university, and in 1965 had a relatively small faculty but plans to grow swiftly. The result was that the office, as well as most departments, were constantly in the process of recruitment, finding new people, sifting them out and then eventually putting their appointments through the personnel policy process that we were evolving. In taking on the responsibility as first Academic Vice President of SUNY at Stony Brook, Dr. Glass had a clear mandate to develop in its various forms schools, departments, divisions, a multi-versity of the first quality. In order to achieve this, academic standards in various areas had to be set at a very high level. Certainly Dr. Glass was the right kind of person to do that, since he came himself after having spent years at institutions of high quality and having committed himself to the search for excellence in all areas, he had therefore the ideal qualifications. In order to

carry this out at the point of 1965 there were a lot of housekeeping details that had to be taken care of, but his main efforts were to be focused on recruiting a faculty and researchers of the highest quality as the University expanded into an institution that would cover a wide range of activities running all the way from the School of Engineering to a major health sciences center. In all of this, Bentley Glass played a key role in terms of his contacts, in terms of the kind of leadership he could give, in terms of the attractiveness of himself as a leader, and in terms of the worldwide reputation that he had, and the worldwide institutions and academies to which he had contributed or had been honored.

Soon after his arrival he reviewed with me personnel policy procedures and standards at Stony Brook. I was in a good position to help him at that time since I was a member of the University Personnel Policy Committee, in effect a promotion and tenure committee, and remained a member over a period of four years from 1964 to 1968, being its chairman from 1966 to 1968. Dr. Glass was very much concerned that the personnel policy standards and procedures conformed wherever possible within the constitution of the SUNY system in conforming to AAUP standards. This is something that involved such things as notifying people of appointment, reappointment, non-appointment, and so forth and so on, as well as the whole question of tenure and other areas relating to personnel policy. With the very large and expanding numbers of faculty appointment, reappointments, non-appointments and so forth, it was very important to set forth clearly, as soon as possible, the procedures that were to be followed. And this Dr. Glass did with dispatch and with a clear-cut understanding of the critical issues, an understanding from his long experience as an academic, but also from his commitment to AAUP standards. It is fair to say that he carried out this responsibility with great acumen, and that over the years there were relatively few incidents in which people could claim that their rights were not protected. There were a few occasions in which questions of academic freedom were raised. Dr. Glass always responded in those situations in a manner consistent with the values and standards of the AAUP.

As a footnote remember that he remained Academic Vice President through 1971. At that time I think he was 65, and the SUNY regulations mandated that administrators end their tenure as such when they were 65. He then moved back full-time to the Biology Department. I worked closely with him from 1965 to 1967. I went back to my department 1967 to 1968. I returned as Acting Provost for the Social and Behavioral Sciences 1968 to 1969. I was on sabbatical 1969 to 1970. I came back as Assistant Academic Vice President under Dr. Glass in 1970. I stayed in that in that position in 1971 when the next Academic Vice President, Sidney Gelber, took office, remaining with him until 1974.

The Office of the Academic Vice President grew over time; its organizational structure including more and more academic people. It grew along with other aspects of the administration at Stony Brook. For example, toward the end of the 1960's when Stanley Ross, who was the Dean of Arts and Sciences, left there was a reorganization in which a vice presidency was established, a Vice President for Liberal Studies, under the Academic Vice President and taking over the functions of the Dean of Arts and Sciences. The Dean of Engineering, of course, continued at that same level over the College of Engineering. In the Office of the Academic Vice President itself the various functions over which the Vice President presided included such activities as all academic departments, organized research, organized activities, the Library, personnel policies and so forth and so on. In the beginning when Dr. Glass took on these responsibilities and I was his assistant, the office was small. There were a few staff members but it was relatively small. Over time it grew, and at the point where toward the very end of Dr. Glass's tenure in 1971, when assistant vice presidencies were set up, I was one of those and there were at least two others, I can't remember the names of the people but one was a black woman biologist who took over some of these functions and there was at least one other person.

The functions at that point which I was responsible for included the Library and organized research, among other things; the other things included, as it had before, the

handling of personnel, both faculty and professional, technical. The problems of a rapidly growing library, whose holdings had to be enriched, so that graduate programs that were being spun off would have adequate research bases. These growing problems were not only related to the size of the library, its holdings, but also to personnel; and there had been a succession of directors with not too much satisfaction. At some point in the period when I was in the Office of the Academic Vice President toward the end, we were confronted with the need to conduct a search for a new director and dean. The search committee was an excellent committee set up with the intention of making a thorough search conforming with affirmative action values and principles and with the hope that we would recruit a first-rate person. It was a search that took considerable time, and we were pleased that in the end we were able to appoint John Brewster Smith as dean and director; and I think, although I haven't been at Stony Brook for a long time, not involved in its activities, I think that he has turned out to be a very good dean and director. One of the positive fallouts of his appointment and the process by which he was recruited was that affirmative action in the library was given a very strong boost. And as a matter of fact one of the people who was considered for the directorship, a black woman librarian, later was appointed as Dean Smith's associate director or some such relationship. And in addition Dean Smith was very positive in his efforts to raise the level of recruitment of minorities. The result was that some of the intern programs and other programs had the fruit of uncovering and hiring first-rate minority people.

In 1971 when Sidney Gelber became the Academic Vice President, the office was fairly well developed. In addition to the assistant vice presidents, there were several assistants to the vice president, so that there was a staff as well as secretarial help to give full blown support to all of the activities that were essential to carry out the responsibilities of that important office. During the process of the office's development and administrative changes in other parts of the University, an effort was made in the late 1960's, I think it was 1968 to be exact, to set up under the Vice President for Liberal Studies, provosts for the different divisions of the College of Arts and Sciences, let's say.

And I played a small role in that, being appointed Acting Provost for the Social and Behavioral Sciences, but there was opposition to this tier of administration in Albany, so that the efforts in that year, 1968 and 1969, to establish this structure were not successful. Ultimately, as we know, that structure was implemented and what were first provosts have now been renamed deans.

To summarize, during the six years of Bentley Glass's tenure as Academic Vice President, the Office grew from nothing to a quite sizable group with its hands on all of the major academic activities. Bentley Glass, himself, was a very sincere and honest administrator, who often knew or didn't know that the President was making decisions that he, Bentley Glass, should be making, but for the most part Bentley Glass never stepped over the jurisdictional lines of his office. He tried to maintain a very evenhanded administrative role. He was very good in adhering to the values of academic freedom. In all of those six years only once did I see evidence of his veering from that to some extent, under pressure from President Toll, and that incidentally involved me and the Chairman of the Economics Department. It was in the late 1960's during the period of considerable student unrest. The Department was taking action in some way to involve students in the departmental governance process. I say governance, I mean student presence on some committees. The President reacted very negatively to that, and Bentley Glass went along to some extent with the President putting pressure on me as an economist administrator and the Chairman of the Department, Bob Lekachman, to reverse this action. I don't remember exactly how it was resolved, but I know that both Bob and I resisted very strongly. So, aside from that, Bentley Glass, whenever there was an issue that in any way seemed to involve academic freedom, he came down hard on the side of academic freedom. And there are some other cases in my mind that I remember: one of a radical faculty member who was up for tenure and who was not in the good graces, naturally, of the President, and despite the President's indication of his inclination, Bentley Glass stuck to the principles of evaluation on the basis of performance and the usual canons that are employed in evaluating faculty who come up for tenure.

Another aspect of Bentley Glass's administration was that he made decisions, he didn't shy away from making decisions. That, ordinarily, is taken for granted, but since in the period after Bentley Glass retired from the vice presidency, the next Academic Vice President, Sidney Gelber, a very nice person, had a major problem in making decisions. That problem, of course, was complicated by the fact that the President was always trying to make decisions that were strictly speaking in the purview of the Academic Vice President. And while I don't know the complete extent to which Sidney resisted, if at all, those pressures, I do know that just in terms of making decisions in Sidney Gelber's period, that is while I was in the office, which means until 1974, from 1971 to 1974, there were difficulties in his making decisions. Sometimes he gave the impression of having made a decision to those who wanted a decision, but in reality oftentimes that was not so. As a matter of fact it took me some time to get to sense whether Sidney Gelber had made a decision and which way his decision was made. To put it facetiously, if I were sitting in with him when a chairman of a department or some other person in charge of an academic activity came in for support for a particular activity, financial and/or moral support, I would determine which way the decision went by looking at Sidney Gelber's notetaking. If he jotted down a few notes and seemed to be saying yes, I would usually infer that he was really negative. In other words, the extent to which he took notes on the particular issue at hand was often an indicator as to whether it was going to be positive or negative. Obviously, this is an exaggeration, but it gets across the notion of the indecisiveness and the fact that people never knew for sure, never being a strong word, whether they had gotten the decision -- positive, negative or maybe. In Sidney Gelber's tenure there was another complicating factor, and that is that the position of Vice President for Liberal Studies, which had been established in the late sixties after Stanley Ross left the deanship of arts and sciences, that position, while it was clearly under the Academic Vice President, was one in which the Vice President for Liberal Studies, depending on his personality and inclination, could also make end runs and often did; and there were two such Vice Presidents that I remember, Kalish being

one, and the other one was, what's his name from the Philosophy Department, they often made decisions to fill a vacuum or to pursue their own particular bent.

A final word on the Library. John B. Smith, who came as Dean and Director of the Libraries probably in 1973, but in any event, a memo of April 3rd, 1974, which was shortly after he came set forth a program for action on the Library, which covered public relations relationship between the library and the community, that is, personnel resources, collection resources, technical services and public services. In this regard, we had at that point a plan for action for the library to expand quantitatively and also qualitatively to become at last a full blown academic library for undergraduate and graduate activities. Whether that promise was fulfilled, and I suspect it was, I don't know myself because I left the office in 1974, just as that program was being put into process.

In addition to my regular duties under the Academic Vice President, I was also charged with chairing the Affirmative Action Committee. This was the committee made up of faculty members which had the responsibility of implementing University policy on affirmative action, and that involved reviewing specific cases in which affirmative action was an issue. The purview of the committee extended not only to faculty members, but to all non-teaching professors. As the affirmative action program evolved, a university-wide, campus-wide structure also evolved. There was an overarching committee for the entire campus, and then there were committees under it which were responsible for different aspects of personnel recruitment and promotion and things of that sort. The committee which I chaired was the faculty and non-teaching professional group. There was one that covered administrative personnel and so forth and so on. Each one of the committees had representatives on the umbrella committee so that there was communication that way and there was also informal communication among the committees. Not only did the affirmative action committee serve as an oversight committee, but it also had an educational function informally. So that over time department chairpersons became more aware of the problems of affirmative action, the guidelines and so forth and so on. The faculty committee had at least ten to fifteen

members, I don't remember the exact number. Among them we had a good representation from among women, some minority and faculty members from different parts of the University. We also were fortunate to have some outstanding faculty members that lent greater respectability and solidity to the committee. We were pleased to have the Nobel Laureate, C. N. Yang, on the committee for at least a couple of years. An important contribution that the committee made was to provide departments with different sources of qualified personnel, minorities, women and so forth, so that they could take an active role in seeking out people from among these groups who would meet the regular qualifications for faculty and professional appointments. The routine reviewing of appointments was an important process, because through it we got to know what the personnel policies of different departments were. We were able to sometimes put some pressure on a department to be more active in its search for minorities and women, and over time a culture of affirmative action developed. The more controversial elements in our operation were not many, and they came later on in my tenure on that committee when the committee was presented with complaints of discrimination, let's say. One in particular that I remember was a complain that came from one department in which a female full professor, who claimed to be underpaid in terms of her age and experience and professorial rank and publications and so forth and so on. This kind of involvement of the committee led to conflict with some members of the administration, the President in particular, and ultimately there was a suit filed by this individual person. And beyond that, there was a class action suit filed by women faculty members and joined by other women on campus, a suit that ultimately went to the Federal District Court where the women lost. I personally was involved in that after I left Stony Brook actually when I was called on by the women and their attorneys to testify as to the operation of the Affirmative Action Committee and the policies that were set forth and how they were implemented.

Paralleling my involvement in affirmative action was an involvement in some of the issues that arose during the sixties with student protests. One in particular was of

some significance, and that was the whole area of minority students and Black Studies. And in the spring of 1968 I was approached by the Academic Vice President and the President -- I should point out that, if I didn't make this clear earlier, that I stayed working with the Academic Vice President through academic year 1967, and then I took a year back in my department. So it was at the end of that year, when I was fully in my department, that Bentley Glass and John Toll asked me if I would take on some special assignment during the summer and then starting in the fall become acting provost of the social and behavioral sciences. The special assignment had to do with the problems of student contention, student agitation, student demands for a variety of things, and among them was the black student demand for a black studies program. During the summer of 1967, therefore, I had an important role in trying to come up with a solution to the problem, trying to help shape a program that would meet the academic standards that the University set for its programs. It was quite a summer because there were confrontations of all sorts, and we were able, I think successfully, to minimize the dislocations, to dissipate somewhat the anger and hostility and demanding nature of protests and of student pressure to come up with a program. It also meant dealing with people in the black community, in the larger black community off-campus, as well as with various leaders and other members of the black community on-campus, student leaders, black personnel in admissions and in other parts of the campus organization. Ultimately, of course, a black studies program, I think it received another name, Africana Studies or something like that, but in any event, the efforts of this period in 1967 were not without positive results later on.

Another major area of my involvement in the period that I was at Stony Brook was in campus-wide activities. I was involved in a variety of campus-wide activities, either in my role as a faculty member or in my administrative role in the Office of the Academic Vice President or whatever other offices I was involved in. Among these campus-wide activities was the Faculty Senate. I was at one point, for at least a year or two, I don't remember the years, a faculty senator and participated in some of their activities. As a

matter of fact one of the things that happened while I was on the Faculty Senate was that the President, in the middle of the summer, abolished the Department of Education. This was without prior discussion and ironically enough, even though the department generated that very important item, student FTE's, and that was a criterion that was almost always used as a bottom line concept, despite that the department was abolished. That meant, incidentally, that people lost their jobs, even people who had tenure, some of them did lose their jobs. The Faculty Senate was up in arms about that, and there were efforts made to save some of the people, because we did have some excellent people in the Education Department, just as we had some who were not all that great, but that could be said about other departments too. I never subscribed to this knee-jerk anti-education departments on the grounds that they were qualitatively always very poor. We certainly needed some sort of academic umbrella department, program to take care of the very large number of students, maybe mostly secondary school teachers in training so to speak. At any rate, out of the erasing of the Education Department there emerged a program in social sciences and that was a program which combined certain of the Education Department functions in terms of certain teacher practice courses, certain, oh, I've forgotten the name now, the methodology courses in particular disciplines. It was an umbrella, this program, for East Asian Studies and the Chinese language, which, of course, was a strange sort of combination, but that's where it fell. I was involved in the faculty committee that was set up as an oversight over the social science program. I also had a heavy interest in an East Asian Studies program and in the Chinese language program, since those were areas of my research. There was another committee set up that also was a consequence of the end of the Education Department and that was, I can't remember it's exact name, but it was a kind of board set up to develop the standards for certification within the framework of our campus, and in that committee there were people from, some who had been in the Education Department and still were on campus, others who came from different parts of the campus. In any event here we were trying to improve as much as possible the quality of the offerings to meet state requirements in

new ways and to assure that those students who graduated from Stony Brook in teacher methods in subject areas would be eminently well qualified.

Early in my tenure at Stony Brook I was on another oversight committee, and it was a committee on the Computer Center. And that was an interesting period because universities were playing a kind of status game with computers, IBM this, IBM 360, in other words, just having the computer, having the hardware was the important thing. It became clear to us early on that whatever hardware we had was more than adequate in that there was no squabbling over time to get to the hardware because the demand for it was not all that great. On the other hand, the fact that we weren't under that pressure made it possible for us to focus more on questions of policy on the use of the computer, because obviously there would always be some people who would have legitimate reasons to use a computer, but who would not be funded through grants, that would be particularly true of people in the humanities and some people in the social sciences. It would be less true probably for people in the sciences, and so there had to be some criteria other than the price criterion to determine how people who had legitimate needs for computer time would get them. In the beginning there was considerable chaos, and it took a while for us to develop some criteria, and by that time I was off that committee.

Another area in which we had very high hopes was what was then called the Instructional Resources Center, and now I think it's called the Educational Communications Center. But whatever it was or is called, it's clear that developing the technology using the latest high tech methods, video and other media, was a very important aspect of improving the quality of our educational programs, getting faculty involved. Even where the faculty were not involved with students in these endeavors, they were significantly involved in developing for themselves techniques; the mere exposure to the various technologies available in the IRC was in itself a faculty development element. Many of the faculty, of course, used IRC directly in their course presentations; but some went but did not come up with satisfactory resolutions to the issues that they were dealing with. There were some continuing problems in the IRC of a

personnel nature, and that relates to who was the head of the Center. And I'm afraid that one would have to say there was some internal politics of a personal nature in that the person who was in charge for a long time, and who may have been very capable, certainly had excellent credentials as a scientist, however, the things didn't work out too well, and at that time the IRC was one of the centers that reported to me in the Academic Vice Presidents Office. This was, I think, after Bentley Glass retired from that position, and I was working with Sidney Gelber on the IRC. There were difficulties. I didn't have too much difficulty getting along with the Director, however, there were things that were happening at the Center which made me very uncomfortable. And eventually I think it was the considered judgment of the Academic Vice President and myself that there would have to be changes. Among the items which caused, resulted rather in a lowering of staff morale in that Center was something that I found just incredible, and that is that the Director required that all mail that came to staff on campus was to be available to him to open. And his rationalization for this was that he didn't want people writing off campus in unauthorized ways for materials and so forth and so on. I can understand the problem, but my commitments to first amendment rights, to decency and to the consideration of one's colleagues, fellow workers left me quite unhappy with the situation. But this was only one, I won't say minor, it was only one of a number of behaviors and patterns which affected morale in that Center in a negative way. The personal politics that was involved was that the Director of the Center was a friend of and also a fellow physicist of both the President and Executive Vice President, and ultimately, despite the difficulties and the hurts that might result, changes were made.

Now, let's move on to SUNY-wide activities in the period 1963 to 1979. Over the course of that span of time I visited all of the university campuses, plus other campuses such as New Paltz and Plattsburgh and whatever the name of the unit was at Syracuse, Brockport, Old Westbury, and in addition community colleges. We had close contact with Nassau and Suffolk for both administrative and academic purposes. SUNY-wide activities included a variety of things. I was involved with the upper administrative

offices on budget hearings in Albany, and of course there were a variety of other administrative matters that had to be taken care of in Albany. In addition, there were SUNY-wide operations, such as equal opportunity or affirmative action conferences, workshops and so forth and so on. On the academic side I was involved in Asian studies conferences, meetings, seminars and in addition, I also gave lectures at various campuses on a variety of topics, usually it was on my own research, but it would move on to other areas. I remember one SUNY-wide committee that I was on that had to do with women's studies, which was a new approach, and which called for coordination from different parts of the university system. I was also involved in search committees. And while I don't remember the variety of them, there weren't that many, there was a handful. One, of course, that stands out is the one on finding an affirmative action or equal opportunity office for the entire system. That was a very important committee, it was involved over a considerable period of time and it made a national search for top notch candidates. As a matter of fact, as I recall there were all kinds of complications. We had some excellent candidates from all over the country, and the committee made its recommendations in order of preference, and it turned out on the first go-around that the top people did not accept the offer for a variety of reasons. Then what happened ultimately was a person who was picked from among the original list of candidates who came from within the system, but there was some controversy from within the committee as to whether or not that person had in effect been on a list of those to be hired. At the time the list of, let's say, three or four top people was set forth, it was never expected that all of them would be gone through without an appointment made. As a matter of fact some of us thought of that in advance and we claim that we made the point that if those four or five were exhausted that the administration ought not to appoint anyone below that number but should reactivate the search. That was not followed out, and some people who had been on the committee were very unhappy at that outcome.

The university-wide committee that I was most involved in in terms of length of time, energy and so forth and so on was the University Committee on China, which I

chaired, and which had representatives from, let's see, New Paltz, Buffalo, Albany, Plattsburgh and at least two or three other campuses, as well as myself from Stony Brook. This was a committee that had both administrative and academic functions. Administratively the central administration in Albany expected that we would coordinate activities on China and help in establishing contact with China and exchanges and so forth and so on. The committee was set up early in the seventies, actually I think it was before Nixon went to China, but I may be mistaken in that regard. In any event, in addition to these administrative inter-university China-SUNY relations as being a focus of the committee, there was an academic focus that all of us were very much interested in, and that developing a curriculum for an introductory course on China. Every member of the committee was a China person, that is, he or she was involved in research and teaching of Chinese society, its history or in my case the economy, in other cases it may have been the literature and so forth and so on. We started working on the curriculum and then came up with the idea of developing the introductory course on videotape, which for all of us was a completely new experience, and while I am not ready to say that the quality of what we did was technically all that great, it was a learning experience. It was a faculty development experience, which carried on over the years. And we would have special meetings at different campuses. One early summer I remember we met at Plattsburgh on Lake Champlain; I even remember that on the weekend we went off to Montreal to see the ballet. The Bolshoi was visiting and there was a guy named Barishnykov who was there who was electrifying in his dancing, and then a few days after that we learned the he had defected so that we had a special seat at a very historical event. At any rate the two foci of the China Committee, one: to try to develop exchanges and relationships with China; and two: to try to have an accepted, agreed upon introductory course to study of China. Those two foci kept us together and developed our friendships over time. As a matter of fact at least two or three of the members of that committee became friends and met one another in China at a future time when at least two of us were teaching there. A third one was also teaching but he left before I arrived.

One of the outcomes of the committee's activities in trying to set up relations was its success, with the help of Professor C. N. Yang of the Physics Department at Stony Brook, to get an invitation for the Chancellor -- I can't remember the Chancellor's name, but he became U. S. Commissioner of Education under President Jimmy Carter and now he's the head of the Carnegie Institution on Education, he was succeeded by Clifford Wharton; his name is Ernest Boyer. The original notion was that if we could arrange for an invitation to the Chancellor, he would go and make contacts and see about setting up exchanges, or at least setting the stage so that later contacts would more likely be successful. The original idea was that some members, or at least a representative from the SUNY China Committee, would go with him, but for some reason that never came to be. At any rate, first contacts were made after our success in getting an invitation for the Chancellor. Over time, of course, once

[end of dialogue -- end of tape 2]

Charles Hoffmann: in 1987 when I was in Karl Hartzell's office at the State University of New York at Stony Brook I did one tape for the archives covering the period 1963 through the academic year ending in 1979. That tape, tape number 1, covered broadly three subjects and focused mainly on academic process that I, Charles Hoffmann, have been taping for the Stony Brook archives. The period covered here is the period of my stay at Stony Brook, 1963 to 1979, when I took early retirement. Tape number 1, which was taped on October 16, 1987, at Stony Brook in Karl Hartzell's office covered my academic activities. Basically there were three main headings there: the Department of Economics, which I came to in 1963 and was acting chair then until Bob Lekachman was recruited in 1965; the second area covered was the Federated Learning Communities, a program that still operates at Stony Brook and started in the mid to late seventies, and I was the first faculty participant after Pat Hill, who was a director of the Program, the term that was used was Master Learner; and the third aspect of academic activities was faculty development, both under the American Historical Association grants and other local activities. That completed tape number 1. Tape number 2, which

was taped at the beginning of 1988, and for which this tape number 3, which is being taped in February 1988 is a continuation. At the end of tape number 3 I was still talking about the China committee, in particular its thrust to develop on video an introductory course on China, and it was successful in creating several modules for that course. I know that I used one or two of them in my course on China. How it was used by the others I'm not certain. At any rate, the end of tape 2 completed the discussion on that committee and on the Chancellor's visit to China arranged through the committee.

I want to continue on this tape on the China outreach, focusing however on Stony Brook rather than on campus-wide efforts. The China outreach that was achieved on a SUNY-wide basis through the SUNY-wide China committee and through the efforts of its members was continued as relations with China developed and more and more individual campuses moved on to make their own arrangements. The China committee continued but it no longer had the thrust that it had before. Moving our focus then from the SUNY-wide China activities to the Stony Brook China activities, we see that C. N. Yang played, as one would expect, a significant role in the development of Stony Brook's relations with Chinese institutions, specifically and in a general way. I worked very closely with C. N. Yang, and when we did have visitors from the People's Republic of China on campus, the two of us were usually joint hosts, though it was Professor Yang's contacts with colleagues in physics and former colleagues or students in China that was the basis for our early contacts. C. N. Yang went to China very early on before President Nixon made his historic trip. I went shortly after Nixon's trip and by that time Professor Yang had been going to China when he felt like in terms of projects he had underway. Professor Yang was in China in July of 1973, the same time I was there, only there was a slight difference, he was given an audience with Chairman Mao Tse Tung, an audience that was publicized in the Chinese press, and of course it was also picked up in the United States press.

The first outreach to China from Stony Brook came on an initiative that I took with the Peking Library. As a result of contacts that I had through the SUNY-wide China

committee, I made contact with the State Education Department Library, and there had been some correspondence in which that Library found out that the Beijing Library, as well as other libraries, were interested in getting all of the works of Lewis Henry Morgan. Footnote on Morgan: Lewis Henry Morgan was a nineteenth century American businessman who lived in the Buffalo area, and who was a kind of amateur anthropologist ethnologist, and some of his writings were seen by Marxists as corroboration of a Marxist theory of cultural, social development and of the Marxist theory as it was interpreted in the context of primitive peoples and developing peoples. After my contact with the Library in Albany, through our Library at Stony Brook we made contact with Beijing Library and offered to try to get any of the works they wanted. They sent us a list and I was able with the help of a good friend, a historian friend who had access to all of Morgan's bibliographies, to get up a checklist and to succeed in identifying and acquiring many of these books. As a result the basis was set for an exchange, and it was agreed upon. And as a matter of interest, in my first trip to China in July 1973 I took the first books that were gifts from the Stony Brook Library to the Beijing Library. Incidentally, you will find that among the materials that I gave to Karl Hartzell that was Xeroxed are the letters, as well as news coverage items on this whole library exchange affair which I think ultimately was a front page story in *The New York Times*. We were very happy to start this exchange, and it broadened after the first sending of Morgan's works. Of course we put in requests for materials that we want, and I don't know what happened to continuing this exchange in the late seventies and after I left Stony Brook.

Another aspect of Stony Brook's China reach was hosting visitors from the People's Republic. And remember this was occurring in the early and middle 1970's, before there was complete normalization of relations with China, which was accomplished in the Carter administration. But before that we had had a number of distinguished visitors. Once again it was Professor Yang who had the contacts, and we used to get these visitors coming on their own projects but they came back to Stony

Brook over time. The most distinguished among these visitors was Jiao Pei Wen, who is still alive and is sort of the dean of Chinese scientists, he's a physicist who did his work at Cal Tech many, many decades ago. He must be in his eighties now; he still had a wonderful command of the English language. I had met Jiao Pei Wen in Beijing when I was there the first time and visited Beijing University and Ching Wa, the science and technology university. He was president of one of those universities, I think it was Beijing, but I am not certain. Of course he has held the highest science positions in the governmental structure, and to this day he is very active. He is a member of the Chinese People's Political Consultative Council, which is the non-Communist representative group of the various organizations and movements that were allied to the Communists when they took over the mainland of China. In addition to Jiao Pei Wen, one visitor we had a number of times was Chiang Wen Yiu, who also is a physicist. As a matter of fact, he and his wife were physics professors at, I think it was Indiana University, possibly Purdue, but I think it was Indiana, back in the late forties and early fifties. As a matter of fact, after the Communists took control in 1949, they tried to go back to China, but they had great difficulty because, if you recall, that was the McCarthy period, and the atmosphere was, to put it mildly, very restrictive, and so it was only after considerable difficulty that they were able to get back to China and to take an important role in the scientific development of the People's Republic. As a matter of fact, I saw Chiang Wen Yiu when I was in China the first time in 1973, and I think I may have seen him one other time. He became the director of the high energy physics institute in the northwest part of Beijing. I don't know whether he still is, he probably is retired by now, but it's possible that he's still active. Another Stony Brook faculty member who was involved in this was Sheldon Chang of the Electrical Engineering Department in the School of Engineering. He may have been a student of one of these visitors. Both he and C. N. Yang were undergraduates in China and left China in the forties before the revolution was successful. There were engineers who came to visit at Stony Brook, and here I'm talking about people who would visit for a day or so. I'll talk later about others. One of the

engineers who visited, and I've forgotten his name, was the one in charge of the design of the memorial building, the Mao memorial building in Tiananmen Square in Beijing, that was a building that designed and completed in less than a year, and so we had a chance to hear his comments on that whole process. So what I'm trying to depict is a flow, it wasn't steady in the sense of continuous, but we would have a flow of visitors from the People's Republic, many of them attracted to Stony Brook only because C. N. Yang was there, and they knew him either personally or by reputation. So this is what happened.

Now as the Academy of Sciences in the United States developed its contacts and set up a committee on scholarly communication with the People's Republic of China, which is still functioning these days and has an office in China in Beijing. As a matter of fact it was in the same compound I lived in when my wife and I were there early in 1987. The committee under the National Academy of Sciences worked very hard to develop protocols, procedures for exchange. And as a matter of fact the beginning flow of scholars and scientists from China was later in the seventies reversed in a flow of members of our faculty and others to China. The most prominent of these was the visit by John Toll and science colleagues under the auspices of the Committee on Scholarly Communication of the National Academy of Sciences. And with John Toll and his wife and spouses I guess of the other members of that delegation were other outstanding physicists, I don't remember their names, I remember one of them was the director of SLAC at Stanford, and there other people of that caliber. C. N. Yang and I spent much of one day giving orientation talks on China and responding to questions from members of the group who were at Stony Brook.

In addition, there were other members of our faculty who went to China in various roles. I don't remember all of them, but the flow grew as our contacts grew, and of course, as there was a formalization of exchanges. One of the early exchanges we had was from different institutions. Fudan University in Shanghai, is a university where C. N. Yang's father had been a professor of mathematics, and he had contacts there. So we had some people, one I remember was Goo Chow How, who was a professor in math and

physics at Fudan and who collaborated with C. N. Yang. I think they had one article that was published. He came over for a year. And along with him there were other people, not all from Fudan. I remember there was one professor of Engineering who taught in our Electrical Engineering Department and who brought his son and niece over and got them started as undergraduates in the Stony Brook program. They stayed on when he went back to China after his year or so was up. Actually I've had contact with him over the years. At the time he came to Stony Brook he came from the northeastern part of China, Manchuria, one of the technical colleges or universities there. He is now at a university in Tsiamen, which is in the southern part of China, a beautiful city. He was a dean there, I don't know if he still is. I went on several trips to China while I was still active at Stony Brook. I went in July of 1973 and in May of 1978. After I retired in 1979, I went back to China in 1983, where I was a faculty member at the Institute of International Economic Management in Beijing, and then again in 1987 where I was visiting professor at the University of International Business and Economics. In addition to these trips I carried on correspondence with some colleagues and developed programs contributing to the east Asian studies program at Stony Brook. Members of that program, like Professor Lee, also had a keen interest in China and did go to China at different points in time. Professor Lee went to Hong Kong frequently because his wife's family was there, but he also went on professional business.

One of the concrete outcomes of these contacts with China and the early exchanges, most of which were in one direction from China to Stony Brook, was eventually an agreement on a, a formal agreement on exchange program with Fudan University in Shanghai. Fudan University is one of the key universities in China. Key universities being those that are: one, financed by the central government; and two, universities with the highest standards in the country. I think I indicated earlier that Fudan was a university that C. N. Yang had considerable contact with, since his father had been a professor of mathematics there, he also had knowledge of the university, and he was held in high esteem, not just because of his being a Nobel Laureate. At any rate,

the contacts with Fudan led eventually to this agreement that I mentioned in which they sent students and faculty beginning in the sciences, and we sent some students, I don't know how many, but I remember that one of my graduate students in Asian Studies, Janet Ford, was there for at least a year, had a command of the language and pursued her studies as an Asian Studies history major. Our early contacts with Fudan faculty and officials were with a couple of vice presidents. One was sort of like an academic vice president, he was fairly old, and eventually he was retired. He had with him another vice president who was also an academic, she was a scientist, and if I'm not mistaken, she was a biologist. She came to the United States more than once, and I had contact with them at their first visit to Stony Brook, and I corresponded with her. She eventually was given an honorary degree by the City University of New York City College, and in recent years she became President of Fudan University; her name was Tsia Sida, and the last time I was in China, she was still president. Some of my contacts continued over the years, and one in particular we exchange Christmas cards every years, but I have not been to Fudan in my recent visits to China.

Among the contacts from China that were made were those by C. N. Yang in physics, and he invited a number of young physicists to spend time at the Institute of Theoretical Physics at Stony Brook, and even after I retired I occasionally visited and had a chance to speak to him about these visitors and what some of their qualities were, what some of the problems were. One of the problems that we had spoken about over the years was that they were very narrowly specialized; as he put it, undergraduates in physics didn't major in physics, they majored in optics or some such field of physics, so that when they graduated they were very narrowly trained. Fortunately for China the curricula are being modified considerably so that that kind of early narrow specialization is being superseded. This idiosyncratic development of Chinese scientists or scholars isn't just something that is characteristic and can be just viewed as an anomaly, it also makes it difficult for scholarly and scientific communication to occur, and it also makes it difficult for the individuals to learn as much when they come let's say to an institute and

have to interact with people from various areas. And even though they may be very adept at an aspect of their discipline, their ability to assimilate very much is limited.

This completes the section on my experiences in various aspects of administration in the period that I was at Stony Brook in 1963 through 1979. I will move on now to another section, probably the last section in my taping. The preceding two sections have focused on: one, academic developments that I experienced and was involved in; and two, administrative developments mainly on the Stony Brook campus, but also including inter-campus, university-wide activities. In these there has been a sense of the construction, the erection of buildings, programs and the developments thereby of a multi-versity.

Now in this last section I want to talk about more problematic issues to try to give the fabric of change, more controversial issues so that one gets a sense of the construction occurring in a very dynamic context in which there were crosscurrents, in which there were different groups and individuals trying to achieve ends, some of them related to the campus and the university' programs, others related to the campus but also to issues that transcended the campus, whether they were national political issues, or national regional movements, social, political and so forth. This intermixture of campus and trans-campus problems and issues obviously I am giving my view of what I saw happen and my interpretation of significance and my critical response to some of them. I don't expect that what I'm giving is the definitive view, but I am trying here to come up with issues and events and a process that will give a more realistic fabric to the development of Stony Brook as a multi-versity. It is hoped that this exercise will give a more realistic tone to the construction of a physical campus and of programs and of an intellectual atmosphere so that what we see is a picture that is real, not surreal and not romanticized or idealized.

The 1960's, of course, are known for the protests against the Vietnam War, they are also known for the horrible assassinations that went on starting with the assassination of President Kennedy in 1963, later in that decade the assassinations of Robert Kennedy running for the presidency and Martin Luther King. These assassinations set a tone. One

thing that should not be forgotten is the numbness that was achieved, that was spread throughout the country by these assassinations, which set the stamp of violence that characterized much of the protests movement, some of the student movement, not just in the United States, but throughout the world. In France remember in 1968 there were student riots and violence. Of course this is a period in China of the cultural revolution. So the tone, the atmosphere, the emotional sensitivities of people, some of whom were not even aware of how they had been effected, all of these were important elements of the emotion tone of the decade. The 1970's, the early part of which marked the running down of the Vietnam War, the 1970's were a period of consolidation, assimilation of the changes that had come about in the 1960's. Looking more closely at the Stony Brook campus in the context of this period of tremendous upheaval and change within and outside the University, the Vietnam War, of course, was the focus and the detonator of many of the events and movements that we saw active on campus. In the early 1960's, as I recall, when I came to Stony Brook, remember that was 1963, I found myself in the beginning to be almost alone in my opposition to the Vietnam War. Colleagues of all stripes were supportive of the war and, as a matter of fact, the terminology was very interesting because they spoke of the possibility of another Munich if we did not fight the war. That changed, it didn't change swiftly, but it changed not at a very slow pace, so that by the middle and later years of the 1960's the attitudes and positions of faculty on campus more and more were against the war, perhaps this was another example of the impact of television, six o'clock news, the repeated portrayal of action against civilians and others in Vietnam. At any rate, this change was to some extent, I think, caused by what was going on on the campus itself, the students were more and more active in their protest against the war. Remember that many of them were in college to escape the draft, it was a quote "rich man's" unquote way of escaping the draft. They were under pressure, however, to maintain an acceptable performance level. That meant that many of them were shall be say looking for courses that would not be too demanding. I'm not suggesting that that's the only reason for the very strong student push to change

curriculum requirements to reduce the number of requirements and to allow for an expanding number of elective courses in those areas which traditionally had been required course areas, that is, the basic general education areas, social sciences, sciences, humanities. Now even if there were requirements in those areas, they were set up in a manner that students could elect. There was also a cutting back in the requirement of languages. There was a cutting back in the requirement of mathematics and so forth and so on. In any event this as we know today had a very significant impact on curricula throughout the United States.

At Stony Brook this change in curriculum meant changes, not just for students, but also for the financing and staffing of curricula in different departments. There was a shift, a reallocation of resources as the result now of consumers, the students having more of a say as to which courses were to have large enrollment. The achievement of these changes on the campus, as well as the achievement of changes in the official position on Vietnam were brought about by, on campus that is, by sit-ins, teach-ins. There, of course, were mass protest meetings on campus as well as co-joined protests in Washington and other parts of the country, and there was, of course, the famous march to the Pentagon. And there were individuals from Stony Brook student body and faculty who were ones who tried to penetrate the Pentagon in that very well known confrontation. One of my colleagues in the economics department, Michael Zweig, was among those at the Pentagon. At the end of the decade, in 1970 to be precise, we had the explosions that came about in consequence to the United States incursion in Cambodia. I was on sabbatical leave that year, but I did come back to Stony Brook in the spring of 1970, so I experienced the explosion both at Berkeley, where I was teaching a research seminar, and at Stony Brook. And of course the Kent State and other campus explosions added fuel to the fire of protest at the United States invasion of Cambodia, a non-participant in the Vietnam War.

The 1960's was also a period in which spin-offs from the student protests took other forms, most particularly black students were trying to get curriculum changes which

would enhance their position in terms of giving them courses they could deal with more readily, but also giving them courses which would reflect their higher sense of identity in terms of the role of blacks in the history and sociology and economics of the development of the United States. So, as indicated elsewhere, many of us, including myself, were involved in attempts to come to grips with the problems that these protests movements brought to the fore. And, of course, one way was in providing support for affirmative action in bringing more black and minority students and women onto the campus and also providing them with a curricula that were more reflective of their interests in the roles that their groups played in the development of this country and in the world's development.

It is in this context that I want to look now at important events that occurred in the sixties and into the seventies. One controversial area was the area of the quality of student life on campus, and this was the consequence of a number of forces at work. First, remember that in the sixties Stony Brook was very small, and at the outset each entering freshman class was as large, if not larger, than the rest of the student body. There was, therefore, not a stable situation into which new students came. And, of course, if anything, this exacerbated any sense of anomie that students had coming to college, getting adjusted, finding their role, deciding which directions they were going to go toward, and so forth. The situation of anomie, the situation of not having standards, not having a stable social and physical situation to come to was made worse by the fact that in those periods when students had leisure time, such as on the weekends or in the evening, time beyond their studying, there was almost nothing they could do on campus, except of course generating interaction with other students, but we did not have in the early years adequate athletic facilities. We had no student center; students lived in dorms, and they made do in the best way they could. It took years until we had the physical facilities. Incidentally, there was no ready substitute close by to campus because the Stony Brook area was not a very heavily populated area, and didn't have many social facilities. There were some bars, but there was very little. This meant that many students

went home on the weekends if they were living close enough to home, and there was a considerable number who could do that. But it meant that the social life of the campus was primitive, to put it mildly. Another element in the poor quality of life was that there was constant construction going on. Unfortunately, that construction disrupted the usual avenues of access, ingress and egress among the buildings, dorms, library, classrooms. Now, it was not set up in such a way as to take into account the needs of students and faculty and staff. Anyone who was walking around the campus was walking on an obstacle course, and oftentimes there was not sufficient care taken to assure that people would not get hurt. As a matter of fact, one terrible tragedy indicated the extent to which getting around campus made life more complicated. One night a small group of students was walking on campus and one of them either fell or slipped or was possibly pushed into an open manhole and was killed by scalding. This brought to the fore the problem of poor quality of life, just in terms of order of priority that did not place quality of life at a very high level. Quality of life and the high priority in the administration's plan for developing the campus were not logically or naturally in conflict, but the energies and focus that the top administration put on getting their strategic plan in operation and moving toward success apparently left them no energy or no interest in pursuing the very important end of quality of life.

The low place given to quality of life didn't just relate to the physical condition of the campus, the unavailability of student social facilities, but it related also to academic and other goals. For example, the very low priority given to the development of a performing arts center, given to support of facilities for students and faculty in other areas meant that facilities which would in their very nature bring the campus together, unify in a social, as well as in a physical and interactive way that would bring and make the campus more a unity, a community. These were not seen in their functional role. They were seen as part of a multi-versity, but we could get to them later, they could wait. Now this isn't just a fancy on my part, I know as a fact from a colleague who was not just a professor, but also had a political role on Long Island and in Albany that he was often

asked by the president of Stony Brook to push for certain things in Albany, and those would be things that would be consistent with the president's strategy and vision of the role of the University and the rate at which it would develop toward fulfillment of that role. And the president did not entreat him to push for let's say a performing arts center until very, very late in the construction game. The primary objective was to get science departments, starting with physics, set as swiftly as possible with the physical facilities necessary for a first-rate science center. And in doing that, it's interesting that, while the president never himself said this, but one of his close administrators saw physics in a reductionist sense, and that is that almost everything could be explained in physics and in physical terms. Toward that end, of course, there were certain numbers games that had to be played, and, well, let's be specific. The more science students and faculty one had, the more space, science space would be constructed. Now, when I say the more that one had, it wasn't just what one had in a particular year when you were asking for the science facilities, but also the projections as to what enrollments would be like down the road. Now, those projections were, to put it mildly, considerably exaggerated. The president's colleague who was working on these data had an expression, which I found sort of obscene, and that was 'massaging' the data. And, in effect, the projections of science graduate students versus social science and humanities graduate students were very far from the reality that came to be. And this wasn't just an error, it was rather a very carefully honed set of figures that were consistent with the notion of developing science departments of a certain size with certain facilities. In other words, the relationship between student and faculty FTE's and square footage in the different science areas could very easily be related to the enrollment projections that were offered to Albany as realistic views of the future number of science students in the various departments. So this was a strategic context in terms of which Stony Brook developed physically, and in terms of faculty recruitment.

One area which I was closely associated with because I was a member of the, I don't know if you would call it an oversight committee for the Computer Center, was that

we built up computer capability in a manner which I would as a social scientist characterize as conspicuous consumption. And at that time, of course, there was a status game that was being played among campuses in which there was effort to get the highest level of IBM. At that time I think IBM 360 was the in hardware. Computer hardware, of course, at this time and beyond that time changed very rapidly and the capacities were very great but growing larger. At the time we got the IBM 360 and started to put it into operation, it was clear that its capacity was way beyond what the demand for that capacity was. In the several years that I was on the committee, we never really had a problem of there not being enough time available for those who wanted the use of the computer; so that there was excess capacity. Of course, ultimately we had to develop criteria for the use of the computer, both in terms of making sure that there was an equitable distribution of what was available, but also the whole question of paying for the time. Making sure there was equity in terms of those who had grants for their research being costed for the use of computer time, at the same time as those who had legitimate demands on the computer but did not have research money being provided with time. And this, of course, is always a very difficult problem. But at the time I was on the committee it was not a problem because anyone who wanted to use the computer would have the time since the demand was much below the supply.

Earlier when I mentioned the problem of student anomie and the difficulty they had in living a reasonably normal life on campus, I should have mentioned one positive response to this, which dealt with an important aspect of student life, and that was the creative idea that was implemented of setting up a residential college program in which each dormitory would have assigned a faculty master. This program, which was announced by John Toll in his inauguration address, which I think was in the spring of 1966, aimed at setting up situations in each dorm where student life in its intellectual, social, recreational and other aspects would have a focus around a program. And the program was structured this way: there was a faculty master for each dorm, and he had a coordinator who handled the day-to-day activity of the program. The faculty master was

relieved of some of his other campus responsibilities. The program had courses that were given in the dorms, but also an array of other activities, which involved visiting lecturers, off-campus projects, off-campus recreational activity, and so forth and so on. So that there was a continuous set of options that students had within their own living environment in addition to whatever responsibilities and activities they were involved in on the campus itself in their academic and interpersonal activities. Whatever the difficulties encountered by this program later on, and one of the major ones was budgetary as the entire University was subject to budget restraints and cutbacks. Whatever those difficulties, and they were more than budgetary, the program was a very positive activity which certainly dealt with an important aspect of student life, and even if it is only viewed as transitional until the University's development had reached a point where there were numerous options that students had on campus to fill in their lives, the program certainly has to be seen as a very positive outcome to a difficult situation.

In the period when I was at Stony Brook one of the major issues that faced the campus as it faced the whole nation was the whole question of dealing with discrimination against minorities and women. And so, as other universities had, we had an affirmative action program and committees which I've alluded to earlier. There was an umbrella campus-wide committee and also there were committees for specific areas. I chaired for a number of years the committee that dealt with faculty and non-teaching professionals. There was another committee that dealt with administrative personnel and so forth. Now, in all of this there was considerable controversy, even though no one raised the question as to whether or not there should be an affirmative action program. There were mandates from Albany. There were mandates from the president at Stony Brook. In other words all of the rhetoric was as it should have been, and the mandates and the various memoranda relating to affirmative action principles and practices and so forth were very clear cut. However, the problems arose in the implementation and in the kind of support that was given to such programs. I realize that what I am about to say is probably controversial and certainly there would be people in the administration that

would question my judgments, but that's the way reality is, and I, as chair of this committee and involved even after I relinquished the chair, I had my perceptions of what went on, and I also had chapter and verse, which I won't go into here, supporting those contentions. Basically, I would say that the president and those close to him at Stony Brook was not against affirmative action, he just didn't want it in any way to interfere with his objectives for the campus. And he did not wish to provide resources beyond the minimum resources that came, much of it volunteer from faculty who were willing to participate and there was, of course, some cost involved in the paperwork that had to be carried out. My main criticism about the whole program was, as implied, that there was not the same kind of support given to this program as given to other legitimate programs on campus. One example, we in the affirmative action committee wanted very much to set up programs in which there would be support for minority students who were recruited from various high schools in the region; the kind of support which would make it possible for them to come to Stony Brook even before the academic year started and get some diagnostic as well as therapeutic processes going. Now, in order to do that fairly, and also to be sure that it was done responsibly at a high level of performance, it made sense to provide faculty, who were willing to give their time in the summer for these things, extra compensation. This is the way all other programs were operated; those faculty who contributed time during the period when they were free to carry out their research were reimbursed. This was not something that the administration was willing to do on an organized and widespread way.

There was also resistance on campus to affirmative action, even though people would mouth the principles of affirmative action. Let me give you one example: there was a program that was on research money, which then was switched to state money, university money, and there was a mandate that when new programs were set up, even if there was a link from an old funded program, that affirmative action principles be put into operation in terms of searching for minorities, women and so forth. Now, that led to some difficult situations. In this particular case there was a technician who had been with

the earlier program and who was very good and the people wanted to keep him on. And I spoke with the Provost in the case, and I understood the sense of doing that, and we came to an agreement, and that was that, okay, we would approve the continuation of this person in the position under state funds, but the Provost agreed that the next opening that was available for that kind of technician would be filled by the person whom we had found for the position that was going to be continued with the old technician. Well, when that opening appeared, the Provost, for his reasons, refused to honor the commitment that had been made. Generalization that this example relates to is that there were many leaders in departments in research programs and so forth who were not willing to take any chances, who were not willing to conform to the letter of the affirmative action program for a variety of reasons. It wasn't necessarily because they were discriminators, it's just that they did not want to in any way stretch their programs to conform to the affirmative action mandates.

When it came to discrimination against women, there, too, there were some problems. As I think I indicated before, there was a federal suit at some time in the early 1980's which the women at Stony Brook lost; it was a class action suit. There was also earlier on a suit by one faculty member who was close to retirement, a suit before the State Commission Against Discrimination. And our committee was involved in both of these in a number of ways. In both instances the grieving parties lost their case. In the case of the full professor close to retirement, the committee went over that very carefully, and it was our judgment that, given all of the qualifications of this person, the fact that her salary was considerably below the average of full professor in her department meant that either there was gender discrimination, or there might have been a good explanation; and we presented the administration with that situation. What is the explanation for her not having a salary that was within close range of the average. She had published; she had received some sort of an award for excellence in teaching; she was an active member of the department, and so forth and so on. So, basically, since she had met all of the requirements of the rank, why was she not getting a salary which was commensurate with

what professors in her department were getting. There was never any satisfactory explanation of this situation. This does not mean that it was not possible to implement the principles of affirmative action and non-discrimination. A lot of things were going on at the same time, and it was possible because you could not see the evidences of it that there was considerable success being achieved. I know in one instance there was a woman faculty member, who was a senior faculty member, and originally she had been in a program part-time and then she had been full-time. And I know that her salary was lower than it should have been in terms of her publications and her other credentials. And I personally intervened to get the salary up to what seemed to be a fair level, and I was successful. And I'm sure in other instances things of this sort were accomplished. So, I don't want to leave the impression that the whole program was a failure; it wasn't a failure, it's just that it might have been more swiftly achieving its objectives, and it might have been more effective in a broad sense if there was the kind of support from top administrative leaders that they gave for a lot of other programs.

Another issue during this period of some significance was the whole question of upgrading the Library. The Library building itself had been expanded so that it had capacity to contain all of the volumes that would be necessary for a major university research library. However, the history of the Library in the early years of the campus was one in which the leadership left much to be desired. Roscoe Rouse, who came to direct the Library early in the period I am talking about, stayed some years, but there was a general dissatisfaction with what was happening in the Library. After he left, until John Smith came, there was a gap in which other leaders were used, but the Library's progress, except in terms of its physical growth, was not at the rate that was necessary for a speedy development of a research library. Part of the problem was one of human resources, the librarians themselves felt that they were not given the stature that their qualities and performance warranted. The search for a new director of libraries was a very thorough one and followed affirmative action principles very effectively. The search itself unearthed some very good people, among whom were those that fit the affirmative action

bill, that is, women and minorities of stature and experience. Among the finalists was John Smith and a couple of other people, one of whom was a black woman librarian, who in the final round decided to turn the position down. Basically she did it because she did not feel comfortable in terms of the kind of experience that she had, but she did have excellent qualifications. As it turned out, John Smith became Director of Libraries, and he then wanted to fill the position of Associate Director and didn't have to go very far; he chose that woman who had been among the finalists. I don't know whether she still is at Stony Brook; but she did come on, and it seemed that she and he worked well together, at least in the early years while I was still there. At any rate, under the new director, the Library moved more rapidly in the direction mandated by the campus's mission, and the quality and status of the librarians was upgraded, they were given a faculty status. Moreover, the acquisitions program and the budget were strengthened so that the library could move ahead. And while I don't know whether the success that was commenced while I was still there has continued, I expect that the Library at this point is a research library that can be used with confidence.

One of the prominent and distressing aspects of student life during the 1960's was the drug culture. In that regard, Stony Brook was no different from other campuses. However, there was an event that occurred in that period which suggested just the opposite, and that is the drug bust at Stony Brook. The behavior of the Suffolk County police in this regard was unbelievable. Swooping down on the campus in the wee hours of the morning, and routing out students from their beds to arrest them seems pretty far out. There was not attempt, to my knowledge, on the part of the police to contact authorities on campus and to arrange an orderly arrest, it that's what was in mind. But this arrest in the wee hours of the morning, this complete confusing, upsetting, dislocating action also had counterparts in going into classrooms later in the day and pulling students out, instead of asking the authorities, campus authorities that is, to move in and to ask students to present themselves to the police authorities. At any rate, the traumatic impact of this bust was not easy to measure. It sort of set Stony Brook up as a

pariah. It's ludicrous nature was brought home to me very readily when I visited other campuses in other parts of the country. The same question was asked of me and that is, what so different at Stony Brook from our campus, why did this happen? That question remains unanswered, except in an obvious way that the police and the governmental authorities, if they were working together, must have seen that there's some political capital to gain out of this kind of swooping down on a campus and this disruption and dislocation. Needless to say, it had not very much impact on the continuing drug culture on campus, and I know that when one would walk into the dorms, one would immediately get the smell of the drugs, but that whole issue is another question. It was just a punctuation, a very exclamatory one, that was put to the life of the 1960's on the Stony Brook campus.

An interesting incident occurred in 1974 in which the administration suddenly showed muscle in trying to prevent some faculty members from soliciting funds for the defense of the Attica prisoners. The background on this is that the Attica event occurred I think in 1971 and in that prisoners as well as guards were, some of them were killed and others were injured in the shoot-out that took place; and over the years, until the trial came into being, funds were raised for the defense of these people. Now, in 1974 there was a letter circulated among faculty and staff -- I guess it was in September 1974 -- and signed by a number of faculty people stating the purpose for which money was being solicited and indicating the channels through which the money could be funneled. And there were six faculty members, a committee of a larger group, and among them was myself and people from other parts of social sciences, I think it was social sciences and humanities. Now, the administration came down on us saying that we had not gotten permission and that -- they wouldn't give us permission actually -- but saying that we had violated some kind of rule about permission. The interesting thing is that considerable number and different kinds of solicitations had gone on at the University; for example, there was a United Way, some of that was supported by letters -- I wonder what process of permission was gone through. There was also a solicitation when Hurricane Fifi hit;

there was also a solicitation that had to do with Honduras, help us help Honduras; and so forth and so on. So that when we were under fire for what we had attempted to do and were told that there was a policy in which we had to get permission, we pointed some of these things out, that such a policy which clearly could be used for political purposes was a way of preventing people from carrying out their first and fourteenth amendment rights. We also pointed out that even if there was such a policy, it was being invoked in a less than evenhanded way since there was a constant use of the mails by members of the community for personal, commercial and other purposes. And if there is such a rule and policy, then there ought to be explicit procedures and set forth in such a way that people would know in advance what their rights were and so forth and so on. But it appeared that there was selective enforcement in this instance. And this is the position we took, we had a strong suspicion that the reason that we were being limited in our right to solicit money had to do with the political content and of course the fact that the Governor of the state of New York, who had been involved in the Attica affair, and other political groups that supported that position would be unhappy if we exercised our rights in the way that we attempted to. This was one of a number of political positions and actions that the administration took that tended to irritate members of the staff and faculty and also was a kind of limiting of the spirit of freedom and exchange of different ideas and values that one expects in an academic environment.

Another issue which assumed large proportions and was a continuous one over the period that I'm covering was the issue of undergraduate education. Undergraduates felt, and some of the faculty did too, that undergraduates were in a sense being shortchanged in order to develop and provide adequately for graduate programs. Faculty attention, faculty input and so forth were claimed to be much greater for graduate programs, graduate curricula, research and so forth and so on. This was a not unusual statement to be made at universities where there was competition for time between undergraduate, graduate studies, between teaching and research, large class size for lower division undergraduate courses, inability of students to get to see faculty; these were some of the

indicators that students used to prop up their contentions. Assessing such charges is very difficult. From my own experience I know that the situation varied considerably. In my own department from the outset we did not have very large undergraduate courses. We tried to keep them down, but over time, of course, there was some erosion. On the other hand many of us made an extra effort to be available for undergraduate students. Personally, I had always had a strong commitment to undergraduate education, and I was careful when I was chair, or even in the period after that, to try to stimulate faculty to give major consideration to undergraduates. Of course that was easier to do if the graduate programs were going ahead relatively slowly; and this is another factor that would bring about different results in different departments. Those departments that were more advanced in terms of development were the ones where the conditions were riper for the kind of discrimination that undergraduate students were talking about, large classes in the sciences were not unusual. Incidentally, one personal experience is interesting here. When I was a Master Learner in the Federated Learning Communities, one of the courses I took was a science course in biology, it was an ecology course; and there the class was between 225 and 250, and I want to say that the professor in that course made sure that every student had an opportunity to ask questions, to be answered seriously, with care and so that once again the whole question arises as to what is meant, *size per se* is not necessarily a problem, it depends upon how it's used. Another important point here was that the professor gave the course himself, and he was a senior professor. So I suspect that as good or bad as the situation may actually have been, it varied considerably. My own assessment, which is not a scientific one, is that there was competition between graduate and undergraduate programs, and that this varied considerably but where it occurred in its worst forms undergraduate students were left with a sense of anomie, a sense of not being part of a organic whole, not being thought of as being important in the process of education of that particular department or program.

It's interesting to note that when enrollments became more and more important, when they were not climbing each year without any attention being given to recruitment,

there was a significant change in attitude and behavior. Each department set up special program to court students, to attract them to the department. This was done at the very first level before students even arrived at the University when recruitment was going on and special parties, shall we say, were held for potential undergraduate students. At a later stage in the process of a student's development other parties, receptions were held in which senior members of the department mingled with, interacted with and actually courted students to put down their chips on that department. this suggests that since student FTE was now much more important, that it was being given an attention which it had never had before. This concludes the third and last tape of this set.

[end of interview]