

**INTERVIEW WITH WILLIAM MORAN
FORMER ASSISTANT TO THE PRESIDENT
PRESIDENT OF UNIVERSITY OF NORTH CAROLINA, GREENSBORO**

May 1, 1987

Dr. Hartzell: All right, Bill, I guess we're ready to go.

Dr. Moran: Do you want to follow this checklist that we have here?

Dr. Hartzell: Let's follow it, yes, I think you can but you can digress as much as you wish.

Dr. Moran: Do you want to enter in as I'm going along and ask for clarification or so on? Would you like to get questions read out?

Dr. Hartzell: I think that's important.

Dr. Moran: The first question is, name, department rank or position. The name is William Moran. And if the reference is to the department or position there at Stony Brook, is that it, yeah, I came to Stony Brook in 1966 to work as an Assistant to John Toll. I'd finished graduate work at the University of Michigan in the Business School there and had done the MBA at Harvard before that. In any event I joined John in 1966, had the tail end of a dissertation to write, and I finished that up about December of '66. The work I did varied a good deal, although a lot of it had from the beginning to do with planning, particularly that portion of planning that was influenced by formulas and budget models.

Dr. Hartzell: Your work at Michigan was in a program for training of college and university administrators, if I remember correctly.

Dr. Moran: No, there was a touch of that, there was a Center for that in Ann Arbor and I had done a little bit of work over there, but chiefly my work was in the Business School and it concentrated in organizational behavior, theory of formal organizations and so on, there was some managerial economics, the usual sort of thing that goes into a business degree. But my interest and my dissertation had to do with control patterns in large organizations, and in particular the control pattern at some public universities that I

had looked at, which I had thought were quite interesting, the subject was quite interesting. So I came with that previous work in business at Harvard and then in business at Michigan, but the theoretical interest was in the structural formal organization, how they worked, what constituted a healthy one and so on. So I came to work for John doing general kinds of things and found myself working on the application of formulas as they would determine the resources of the University: the faculty, operating resources, and above all, the capital requirements of the University. Alec Pond came into the Executive Vice Presidency quite soon after that, and Alec, of course, had been helping John for a long time with exactly those kinds of things. I can remember meeting with Alec in the dining room there shortly after I came on, and I told him what I was doing, what I was planning to do. I had no idea at the time that I was talking to him that he knew twenty times more about the very thing that I was working on than I did. Some time went by before I realized with whom I had been talking to. But in any event, he came on into the Executive Vice Presidency job and what I was doing then tied me in directly with Alec, which was a pleasure and a privilege. And I worked really with Alec from that point on, on some of the same things because Alec was working on them. And I picked a kind of specialty within that of Director of Long Range Planning, and I had a staff working for me. And I also for a year or two really was kind of Director of the Budget under Alec. So my duties covered quite a lot, both the operating resources, the capital resources and to some degree I was drawn into the negotiations with the senior staff at SUNY Central, with whom Alec and John and some others were dealing.

Dr. Hartzell: Before you get into that, how was it that you came to Stony Brook, who brought you here?

Dr. Moran: I think I was recommended by some folks at Michigan to John, and how the first interview was set up, I'm really not very sure. But I knew that it was a developing, burgeoning operation. That interested me a great deal. I met with John, and we hit it off. He was then and he still is a lovely man. I liked what I saw very much, so it was done really about that quickly. I was getting out of Michigan with a Ph. D., and I

needed a job, and this is exactly what I wanted to do, exactly that sort of thing that John was offering me. So it was a lovely fit and I liked everybody that was there, including yourself. So that's where I came from and it was with the things in mind that I actually did do that I came. I came there as I said in '66. I had gotten out of Princeton in '54, had had three years in the Navy, and then Harvard Business School, and then I worked for a consulting firm for a couple of years in New York, went back to Harvard, worked at the Graduate Business School there for a while, then got the Ph. D. So in '66 I was about 34, had had some quite interesting experience but was really just starting out in what was my chosen field, which was university administration. So as I look back on it now, it was sort of a tardy entrance into the field, but I've been doing a lot of other things, and was satisfied, by the time I got there, I was also satisfied that that's where I wanted to be more than anything else. So I was 34 when I got there, been married two or three years and was just starting with my own family. Next question, from what institution or which position did you come? Well, from the University of Michigan, but no particular position there. I went out there to do the Ph. D., and called a little bit upon the Center for the Study of Higher Education there, but wasn't functionally connected with that.

Dr. Hartzell: Was Algill Henderson

Dr. Moran: Algill Henderson was running that at that time, and he was a first-rate figure. He had put that Center together, it's still the best in the country, largely because he put it together, I think. He was there and taught one course that I took over there, and we thought very well of each other.

Dr. Hartzell: You knew that it was his function as Associate Commissioner for Higher Education that was taken over by the Board of Trustees in '48 under Dewey.

Dr. Moran: I had some dim understanding of that.

Dr. Hartzell: He was Associate Commissioner for Higher Education in '48 when the legislation was put through, took all the operating functions away from him, placed him under a separate Board of Trustees with its own executive officer.

Dr. Moran: I didn't recollect that, Karl, it's very interesting. Well, he was a remarkable figure, and I just brushed up against him in Michigan really in the last stages of his career there as an administrator. He had put that Center together, and it has prospered ever since. So I came from Michigan from a kind of traditional Ph. D. in business but with some exposure to Algill. Indeed, it made have been Algill who made the connection for me, I honestly don't remember how I got there, but it might have been. Who was primarily responsible for my coming to Stony Brook? I suppose John, although all the people who met with me then, including yourself, I think Sheldon Ackley, there probably were some others too who made the decision. The next question has to do with who interviewed me for that position, and I recall it was you, Sheldon and John. I came because it really looked like if it wasn't the only game in town, it was certainly going to be one of the most interesting games in town, thinking of town as the United States. It was clear that everyone at Stony Brook, and I thought those at SUNY Central, were aiming very, very high. I thought that the aim was to produce the best in a research university that could be found. There were some other models for that, of course, Ann Arbor where I came from, Berkeley and so on. I don't know that anybody was aiming at a duplication of that, but as far as the quality, everybody that I talked to at Stony Brook had that in mind. And I liked that, and it had a good deal to do with my going. Still there was a personal angle to it too, Barbara's parents and my own were in the East. Barbara's on Long Island and mine in Westchester County, and that had some bearing on it. But chiefly it was the professional excitement of the thing that did it. So, it was the vision really that I thought the Stony Brook people had that excited me, and the scale and the predictable dynamic of the thing. I mean I was looking to learn and it was very clear that a whole lot was going to happen there in a short space of time; and it did. And I could not have been in a better place to pick up an awful lot about how good university's function, what they need in the way of resources, and how even the governance system can be put together. That was a special problem at Stony Brook, but I learned a lot about that. We might talk about that again at a later point. But every aspect of what's

important in a university was exposed in those five years, and more than exposed was the operational significance, and I was conscious of that. I would just say this too, I don't suppose I was confident that it was all going to be brought off. I knew what everybody had in mind. I wasn't experienced enough really to know how difficult the roadblocks were. I didn't know much about that, but I knew what the aims were. As to the impressions of Stony Brook, the campus, the leadership, the people, the spirit; they were obviously very positive, when I decided to come. After I had been there a while, of course, I had a deeper understanding within a year or so of what was actually there. In large part it correlated with what I thought I saw, although it was different in some respects. It was a much more fractious place internally. And what you might call the political or managerial side of the thing of bringing off the vision there looked to me after a year or so much more difficult, much more time consuming than I might have imagined originally.

Dr. Hartzell: Can you be specific and define the word 'fractious.' You talking about the campus or you talking about Johnny?

Dr. Moran: Yes, I am talking about the campus. It seemed to me after a year and beyond that point that it was not an academic community that was at peace with itself. Indeed, it was hardly an academic community in the sociological sense of that term. In one sense it was obviously, but, and I've thought a lot about this since, but I had a sense of it at the time. Good universities become good normally over a long period of time. They are quite complicated organizations, logistically, programmatically, structurally, very complicated. And because they are complicated, it is just intrinsically and was intrinsically difficult to put them together rapidly. And one of the consequences of that, of being unable to come together overcoming that problem, one of the consequences was that the kind of understandings which pervade an established university about how things will be done, how fastly an administration would relate to one another, how work orders will be put through, how the programs will be initiated, how they will be evaluated, all these things had to be learned rather rapidly there. And it is very difficult to learn that

rapidly. Indeed, impossible to learn it rapidly without strain, and there was a lot of strain. And that's what I'm talking about when I say fractious. I think the signs of the strain of bringing together so many people so rapidly and trying to get those people familiar with one another, trusting of one another proved to be very difficult to do in a short period of time.

Dr. Hartzell: Did you know Myron Doucette?

Dr. Moran: Very well, I did. It's funny you should mention him. Why do you bring him up?

Dr. Hartzell: Because I hired him, and he was Assistant to the President for Science Planning and Equipment. He just came in, he was a walk-on, and he retired from and he was just the man we needed.

Dr. Moran: Yes, lovely man. I was there when he died, and I felt that one because I thought he was a very high quality person. I did know him and I counted it a privilege to have known him and I think about him now and again. So that was my impression of the campus. The people I thought were of professionally a very high quality, though they were not all at ease with one another. Individually it was a very high quality. The leadership is a part of this question, and that's really a very interesting one. John Toll was the leader, and he was, and is, an extraordinary figure. He had not been there long when I got there. I'm not sure, when did you come?

Dr. Hartzell: '65.

Dr. Moran: '65. So he had gotten there only about a year before I did, but he was clearly in charge when I got there. I found in John a person of extraordinary mental energy, astonishingly retentive memory. Formidable man in an argument. With more energy, mental and physical, than anyone I had ever seen before. And a kind of tenacity and boldness that I thought were extraordinary. He had as well something that I thought was in its own way even rarer than the things I have just mentioned, I found him to be an immensely civil person, courteous, thoughtful and above all, modest. So he struck me then and seems to me now an extraordinary figure, who was certainly going to

accomplish great things somewhere, if there was any justice in the world at all. And he had set out, I think and thought at that time, to do that at Stony Brook. So I liked what I saw in the way of leadership there. Now, leadership is to some degree, Karl, a cultural phenomenon, in that it, when it's most successful, is custom fit to circumstance. The same person is not the proper leader everywhere. It's a very circumstantial kind of thing, but certainly the basic skills and talents that, some of which I have been talking about here, John had all of the things that a young campus needed going for it. He was, he did have his foot to the floorboard, he was driving it forward; it wasn't just happening to it, he was doing it, he was pressing it forward, and so was Alec. Largely conscious of the risks of the high speed, but he had his reasons. I think we talked about those. But he knew what he was doing anyway, and he was doing it very consciously. He liked to work with a certain degree of crisis in the air, partly because he enjoyed that and partly, I think, because he could keep those around him at a pitch that occasionally would approximate his own energy and intensity level. Maybe it was partly chemistry to some people would be harmful for reasons that have a lot to do with genes and such things. But he did work that way. That didn't trouble me very much; I relished it; but I think it did grind some people down. It did drain the energy out of some, and it did short some tempers occasionally; and it made him a tough guy to deal with, for others to deal with.

Dr. Hartzell: a defect in terms of balance between the effort directed in the direction of the sciences, social sciences, humanities, can you say anything about his evenhandedness or his competence in pushing in all three directions?

Dr. Moran: It was clear to me that he was aiming at a high level of quality in all directions, but he knew more about what that was in some directions than in others. And, in addition, I think he had more of a spiritual or intellectual sympathy with the scientists perhaps than with the social scientists and the arts and letters people. But he wanted high quality in all areas. He simply knew more about it one area than another; there's nothing unusual about that, we're all that way. The next question, number 9, asks about what events or persons or experiences stand out in my mind. Of course, I have been touching

on some of those obliquely. The sense of urgency, and more than a sense of urgency, the real presence of urgency, tremendously important decisions were being made.

Dr. Hartzell:

Dr. Moran: Yeah, that's right, and that pervaded Stony Brook, I think, saturated the place. It was partly John Toll, but it was John Toll responding to the right signals from the State of New York and SUNY. John and Alec, of course, both felt correctly that at any time the situation could change in some important fashion and the resources which were needed to do what they wanted might be turned off. That was another reason for the accelerator being hard against the floorboard. There were a whole lot of reasons but that sense of pressure and urgency and the need to accomplish a lot fast is certainly the outstanding impression that I am left with as I look back. The struggle with Central Administration, of course, was another feature of my years there, which I was very conscious of, which had something to do, although I was mostly working with John and Alec, who were the contacts, there was a great sense of money and great programmatic issues at stake. John, of course, had an answer on all questions, and was urging that answer on everyone in sight and putting, in his own way, great pressure upon the key figures at the staff level worked for Gould in Central Administration.

Dr. Hartzell: Remember who they were?

Dr. Moran: Yes, I'm trying to remember now the name of a very fine gentleman who was in charge of planning up there, died of a heart attack at too young an age.

Dr. Hartzell: Was it David Price?

Dr. Moran: Price was there, but it was chiefly, started with an L, a sort of scholarly-looking fellow with glasses in charge of long range planning and basically it was he who was negotiating with Stony Brook these formulas which produced such important financial results.

Dr. Hartzell: Langford.

Dr. Moran: No, it wasn't Langford. I'll have that for you, Karl, I'll give it to you. He was a very good man, and he was put under pressure by everybody and by John to do what we felt was needed at Stony Brook.

Dr. Hartzell: Did you deal with Axelrod or Adinolfi?

Dr. Moran: Yes, yes, both. Axelrod was, I thought, the stereotypical state budget bureaucrat, a person with some intelligence, affable but bristly and not especially sympathetic to what was being tried, suspicious

Dr. Hartzell: Of what?

Dr. Moran: Suspicious of being taken to the cleaners. Adinolfi, of course, was running the Construction Fund and was important figure and John would deal directly with him. But in any event the relationship of the leadership of Stony Brook with Central Administration in SUNY was a very stressful one; it wasn't full of trust. Although the people at both ends thought well of each other, but they had slightly different things in mind, slightly different responsibilities, and so their views were not easily reconciled.

Dr. Hartzell: How many in the Central Office do you remember as being university-trained individuals?

Dr. Moran: There were some. The Provost, who was key for a while, was an historian, you probably remember him.

Dr. Hartzell: Harry Porter.

Dr. Moran: No, Porter was there, but I think the one who came after him who went to Queens College, I think he did the Jefferson papers, uh, well, in any event, I've forgotten the name now, red haired fellow, anyway, it wasn't the Jefferson papers, it was after he left Stony Brook, he finished that up, but he was a real academic person. The others there, I guess I wouldn't call them remarkable academic figures in the sense that this Provost was, but they were not fools and they were not ignorant of what was at stake. But, you know, in a sense, Karl, the events were overwhelming people, and what they knew about academic standards or about how universities function, it was almost irrelevant because things were moving so fast.

Dr. Hartzell: Who is the chap who had been President at Delaware, came up, or Dean of Delaware, Dearing.

Dr. Moran: I did not know him.

[end of side 1]

about the mechanics of doing what they were doing, suspicious of Stony Brook, suspicious of John, not challenging his character, but suspicious that they might be taken to the cleaners, and never as helpful as they might have been.

Dr. Hartzell: Their responsibility was not the immediate one of having to build the institution, they were somewhat removed from that.

Dr. Moran: That's right, and this point deserves a comment. It is easy for folks in jobs like that to begin to think that the system that they are working with is the critical thing. And it isn't, except insofar as it supports the creation of what is the critical thing, a first-rate university campus, one at a time. It's easy to imagine that it is the larger thing, that federation, if you will, that's important, and that has a life somehow independent of these campuses, whereas the fact is that it's the other way around, or often seen the other way around. Now it isn't entirely their fault that they see it that way, we'll talk about that. But there is a distortion of view. All that counts in the last analysis, all that was going to count, and all that did count, and all that counts now is the quality of the instruction, research and public service at the campus level. That's the payoff.

Dr. Hartzell: The system doesn't do the teaching and doesn't do the research.

Dr. Moran: That's right, and it's very tough to keep that in perspective in jobs like that, very, very tough. Even for the best academically who come into them, and why that happens is another story we might get to, but that tension was there. The difference in perspective; John's responsibilities were clear to him and ours were clear to us, and we had a lot of trouble in making our own vision clear to the people with whom we were dealing.

Dr. Hartzell: How successful do you think you were?

Dr. Moran: I think we did the best we could. We mounted the best case and tried to understand, of course, what had to be done and mounted the best case for it that we knew how. We did not lack for energy, or will, or ability, or endurance. But we were moving very fast, and it was clear that we were working with things that had very long range implications. On the whole, I think we did pretty well within the circumstances that surrounded us. I'm not satisfied with what has happened, but I think the team that was there that you started and which you worked with thereafter was first-rate.

Dr. Hartzell: Did you find support from Elwin Stevens in construction, in building?

Dr. Moran: Yes and no. He was a technically competent person, and we needed his help because we were doing an awful lot in the way of planning and building. And he wanted to do first-rate work, that's important, he wanted to do first-rate work. But he was often difficult to deal with, mercurial, abrasive, tough to deal with, and he probably still is, but technically very good. Now there are some more questions here about my expectations, but I'd like to follow any questions that you may have that might bear directly upon the central questions. You ask me whether my activities were confined to the Stony Brook campus. Yes, although I was working with those who, Alec and John, of course, always were working the countryside and working Albany and I was back and forth a good deal and had a pretty clear idea of those relationships and how they worked well, how they worked badly, so I would be there but I was not a principal, I was a staff figure.

Dr. Hartzell: Joe Diana was there when you were there.

Dr. Moran: Joe Diana came after I was there; he came from the University of Michigan, and brought some real talent there, and he came into an area of great difficulty which he tried to repair and I'd say that only went indifferently well for a variety of reasons.

Dr. Hartzell: Remember Cliff Decker?

Dr. Moran: Yes, I do. I had a good impression of him, I think he left eventually and I think it was not altogether a happy separation.

Dr. Hartzell: No, he attributed it to Joe Diana being instructed, trying to get something on John Toll.

Dr. Moran: Well, there were funny relationships there between Joe Diana and Kettler in Central and John. I don't attribute mischievous motives to anybody there, but it was not a healthy arrangement. And the reason I think that it wasn't structurally was that Kettler was concerned about the management of financial affairs at Stony Brook, because things were moving very rapidly, and the financial management system was changing and new kinds of talents were required, some of the staff that had been brought forward from the old days were good people but seemed to be technicians and not managers and what was required was changing from the technician to being a manager, so there were problems there. And Joe Diana, I'll tell you a story about that too, Joe Diana came in. John, actually, had tried to put me into that financial vice presidency, did you know that?

Dr. Hartzell: No, I didn't.

Dr. Moran: Yeah, I had been running the budget for some time, and I would have been interested in doing it, but Kettler stopped in on that, and I think that's where Diana came into the picture. I think that's right. In any event, John sensed that something more was required in the area of financial management and had in mind putting me into that, and did try to do it, was stopped by Kettler because I had no experience having done that somewhere else, I imagine that's why. And then when he began to assert himself, when Kettler did, the assertion took the form of having a very heavy hand in the placement of the new man, who was Diana. And it was my impression that after Joe Diana came, he maintained a connection with Kettler that produced a divided reporting responsibility, in effect it was a poisonous design, and it had poisonous consequences. Yes, I remember Joe Diana.

Dr. Hartzell: Did Boyer come in before you left? You left in what year?

Dr. Moran: I left in 1971, and yes, Boyer had arrived on the scene, and I had seen him at work a few times in Albany. I don't recall his being on campus, although I

suppose he was, but I did see him at work in Albany. But he must have come on just before I

Dr. Hartzell: Why did you leave?

Dr. Moran: Well, I wanted to leave, I felt it was time to go. I simply wanted to do more, that is I wanted additional responsibilities of some kind, I really wasn't too concerned what kind it was, maybe in the area of financial management of the campus, That would have suited me. When Kettler put that stop on things, and I saw John's hand checked in that way, I pretty well concluded that I had reached the limit of what I was going to do there. Though I did stay on for a while after that, but professionally it was just time to do something else. And then, of course, the opportunity to be the Chancellor out at the University of Michigan, that came out of the blue, and it was something probably that would have drawn me anyway, but I concluded after Kettler seemed to be exercising that control, I thought John's autonomy, his freedom to move, was badly checked at that point. While I had a better impression than ever of John and Alec, I still admire those two persons unqualifiedly, I thought the time had come to break away. And soon thereafter the opportunity came, and I left.

Dr. Hartzell: Did you have any feel for the quality of the faculty and the quality of the students?

Dr. Moran: Yes, I thought the faculty were better than the students, although the students were getting good. They were fairly good while I was there and beginning to get very good. The faculty leadership, the ones that were being brought in and put into the departmental chairmanships, the distinguished professorships and so on, were being filled by remarkably able people, but, and it's not a very serious but, they were tough people to live with -- prima donnas, impatient with the crudeness of Stony Brook, and it was crude, facilities, operating procedures, it was pretty raucous and wild place. And so the people coming in were very high quality academically, but they didn't fit together all that well. They were not awfully tolerant of one another and certainly not very tolerant of the administration. The faculty administrative connections there were pretty rough, I

thought. And all of that roughness was amplified and aggravated by the Vietnam problem and the failure of governance understanding, to which I alluded earlier. So there were all kinds of things boiling around in there that made relationships between faculty and faculty, between faculty and administration, and between faculty and administration and students rough, and it was rough.

Dr. Hartzell: Remember the drug bust?

Dr. Moran: I do. It was a very destructive development that the campus didn't recover from for a long time. It damaged John's leadership there because it was done without his knowing about it. It frightened the campus in that it suggested that external powers were hostile to the campus and to its development, which wasn't altogether inaccurate. That the community was still at odds with the University, and this raid

Dr. Hartzell: Not all of the community.

Dr. Moran: Oh, of course not, but this raid that took place, the way in which that was done, I thought, reflected an infection in the community, a degree of puzzlement and concern, some degree of hostility, to the emergence of this giant in their midst. And, you know, there were a lot of ways that the arresting of people involved with drugs could have been handled. The melodrama of that thing was gratuitous.

Dr. Hartzell: Did you see the program with the face of a knight on horseback which was handed out to the TV and newspaper people.

Dr. Moran: No.

Dr. Hartzell: It was a production. I think part of it stemmed from the need of the Republicans to recoup themselves over a scandal, I think, the sewer system scandal. In other words, it was not simply the University, internally the Republican party.

Dr. Moran: There were probably a whole lot of things going on there. And this community grumpiness about some of the developments in Stony Brook was, I am sure, only one strain in the whole thing. I don't pretend to understand all that is going on there, but I do know that the arrival of 50 or 80 police cars and all of that marching about

and the collecting of people in the middle of the night, people who could easily have simply an indictment with a subpoena, that was gratuitous, it was crude and it hurt.

Dr. Hartzell: It did a lot to damage the image, the public image, of the University for a while. And by contrast it was news because of the favorable publicity that Stony Brook had had prior to that.

Dr. Moran: Yes, I don't know who was responsible for that, but that came at a critical time and it hurt. Of course, to some degree the factors that were present on campus were hurting the University too. That is, the Vietnam ferment and the distress there between components of the University because the place hadn't settled down yet. It was changing so rapidly. The institution was very vulnerable, and it took a lot of hits of different kinds, and that one was just the most melodramatic. But, you know, we were quite regularly in *The New York Times*, and some of it was favorable, but there was a kind of a lust in the media, I think, for problems and we had them.

Dr. Hartzell: Well, there's an aspect of the media which is almost feminine, it's the spirit.

Dr. Moran: Yes, We just had an experience like that down here. We made a decision to go into Division I athletics, and there was an editorial in the *Raleigh News and Observer* that said nothing original, you know, nothing penetrating, that's what you're talking about, the wringing of hands at a world that will not deal with what the editors think should be done and Stony Brook was getting It's an old story.

Dr. Hartzell: Well, we've come to the end of the questions.

Dr. Moran: I think everything in here we have spoken to. We didn't take the things in the precise order but we really covered them all, I think, unless there are any other things that you want to touch upon, Karl.

Dr. Hartzell: No, I think you have handled the internal operations, programming, getting capital equipment into the pipeline, the relativism within the system you and I

spoke about that, but maybe you didn't speak for the record here, and the upstate view of Long Island that seems People up there put a set of glasses and look at Long Island.

Dr. Moran: It's not unusual. You know in the State of Michigan, Wayne State University around Detroit, a very important university, has very little sympathy from the Legislature that comes from the middle and central part of Michigan; it's much like this. It's very tough to get a legislator, powerful legislator, who comes from another part of the state to look fondly on this thing that's eating up money and seems to him a long way from home; in fact it isn't. He has more interest, Senator Anderson had more of an interest in Stony Brook perhaps than he understood, because wherever he came, I don't know where it was, his children from that area were going to depend upon Stony Brook in some important way; but I don't think they see that too clearly. You haven't asked about what we were talking about earlier, how it has turned out. Let's talk about that for a minute. Because we spoke about the ambitions and the quality of people that were there and the resources and so on. I haven't a lot to tell you about how it turned out because I'm not there and I left in '71, that's 16 years ago.

Dr. Hartzell: That's about the end of the period that I'm supposed to be collecting data.

Dr. Moran: Oh, okay, that's right. Well, let me just say that I'm not satisfied with how it has turned out though what has been accomplished at Stony Brook is not trivial. But I think that it's best days are still ahead. They haven't been reached yet.

Dr. Hartzell: Thank so much.

Dr. Moran: Pleasure, pleasure, Karl.

Dr. Hartzell: You supplement very well some of the other interviews.

Dr. Moran: You're going to have an interesting portrait of the institution. You're going to know more about this, with these tapes, because you're the only one that hears them than anyone in the world about what really happened.

Dr. Hartzell: When the four of us, or five of us, were talking in my home to begin with, they were reminiscing very rapidly about Oyster Bay.

Dr. Moran: Which four or five of you?

Dr. Hartzell: Sidney Gelber, chairman of the Department of Philosophy and former Dean; Francis Bonner, chairman of the Department of Chemistry; Tom Irvine, Dean of Engineering; Cliff Swartz, one of the first people in Physics; and Francis' comment when we were talking about Oyster Bay said, if anybody were to write a story of Oyster Bay, nobody would believe it.

Dr. Moran: What did he mean by that?

Dr. Hartzell: Well, so many types of conflict, so many different kinds of people, so many jealousies, so many conflicts in philosophy of education, Chicago versus the Columbia people, bringing in who started as Dean someone who didn't have his Ph. D. who was a philosopher, winding up with a President who was an engineer; the philosophers and engineers were poles apart in their thinking. A divisional concept from Chicago, departmental concept from The elements of conflict were there.

Dr. Moran: Yes.

Dr. Hartzell: I came in when the faculty was split, students were anti-administration.

Dr. Moran: Literally so, or just sullenly so.

Dr. Hartzell: Oh, I don't know. I was a new face, I think that helped.

[end of tape and interview]