

Oral History Transcript

John Broesamle Suddenly a Giant: A History of CSUN Collection

Interviewee James Cleary = JC

Interviewed by John Broesamle = JB

Interview conducted on June 6, 1990 at an unspecified location

Transcribed by: Amazon Captioning Service

Edited by: Adam Dennett

Time: 02:16:36

Biographical Note:

James Cleary began his service as President of Valley State College in 1969 in the midst of great social upheaval on campus that led to the development of multiple ethnic studies programs. During his 23 years as president, Cleary oversaw the campus' designation as California State University, Northridge, accompanied by a remarkable surge in student enrollment that over the following decades forced unprecedented expansion.

Interview Transcription

Tape 1, Side A

JB: There, we're on tape. You're on your graduate work and your masters were taken at Marquette and your PHD Wisconsin?

JC: Yes.

JB: And then you became assistant chancellor at Wisconsin, and then vice chancellor for academic affairs. What were your responsibilities in those two positions at Wisconsin?

JC: Well the, let me lead into the appointment at each of those levels. I had the great fortune to have been nominated by Fred Harrington who was then president of the University of Wisconsin system. To a program that served really as the prototype to the president of American Council on Education program of luring classroom professors into administrative positions, and it was sponsored by the Philips Foundation of New York City. A modest program to the extent there were only twelve national awards each year and you had to be nominated by your home institution and I was quite fortunate to receive Fred Harrington's nomination and I was also very fortunate in having UCLA respond affirmatively to a request to allow me to do my administrative fellowship, as they were called, the Philips fellowships at UCLA. And so I had kind of a preview of a California setting before coming out here in 1969 by way of spending the academic year of 1963-64 at UCLA working as kind of a special assistant to then Chancellor Franklin Murphy. But in fact, I worked far more closely with Chuck Young the current Chancellor, who at that time had just been appointed vice chancellor for administrative affairs at UCLA. And spent the first semester of that academic year basically getting to know or

understand UCLA but also the entire University of California system as well as what was then called the California State College system. And drafting a revision of the academic master plan for UCLA which ultimately went through the faculty governance channels and ultimately was approved by the board of regents at the end of that academic year; and then spent the second semester visiting a number of institutions in all three segments, UC, CSU or then CSC, and the private sector and in that latter category I visited, had in depth visits at Stanford and Occidental and USC, particularly those three. And it was during that Spring semester that Bob Clodius who happens to be now President of the land grant association a [inaudible] in Washington then, but serving as Vice President for academic affairs of the entire system came out and talked to me and said that, for the first time, the University of Wisconsin system was going to look at the concept of, and implement the concept of, a chancellorship of the Madison campus that would be separate from central administration. Harrington had served in both capacities, Chancellor and President of the system. And I was informed that Bob Fleming who was then director of the labor relations institute at the University of Illinois had been appointed chancellor and that Fred and Bob Clodius and a person by the name of Ed Young who was Dean of the College Letters and Science but had moved on to become President of the University of Maine, returned later to become President of the University of Wisconsin system, had recommended me for the position of Assistant Vice Chancellor - Academic Affairs, the assistant simply meant that there was still some uncertainty as to the what would ultimately become the structure of, the administrative structure of the University of Wisconsin Chancellor Office, Madison campus. And I served in that capacity only one semester and then was promoted to Academic Affairs Vice Chancellor and it was interesting that Bob Atwell was recruited from the Bureau of the Budget in Washington to become Vice Chancellor for Administrative Affairs and Bob Fleming had brought up from the University of Illinois, Barbra Newell to serve as his special assistant and the four of us really organized the first Chancellor's office for the Madison campus. It's also interesting to see that Bob had gone on after three or four years there, I think he left in '68, to the presidency of the University of Michigan. Bob Atwell, or Barbra Newell went with him but ultimately became president of Wellesley University, and became in fact the first woman in the United States to head up a major higher educational system, Florida State University system. Atwell stayed on after I left, but the year I had left he came out to become president of Pitzer College out here in Claremont and is now president of the American Council on Education. Fleming left Michigan after 12 or 13 years of very distinguished service, went to, in his retirement or semi-retirement to head up the Public Broadcast System and then resigned from that and returned to Michigan, and I believe he is still teaching law on a part-time basis. He is a Michigan FERPer as he would be called in our system. So in answer of the question, there really was not much difference between what I did for one semester as the system Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs and what I did as Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs. It followed the usual pattern that I was responsible for faculty affairs to assure that the RPT process operated in compliance with the faculty constitution, met with the deans regularly, was responsible for the academic part of the budget, recruited administrators. I did have an unusual appointment over the responsibility in that of all

ROTC programs reported to me and also for whatever reason, ended up as the CEO for the entire intercollegiate athletics program at Wisconsin. And in my term of three and a half years in that position, Wisconsin reached the questionable stage of having the longest losing season in the history of the intercollegiate athletics in the country. I think the football team went 3 and a half years with a something like 28, or 3 and 28 season, or record. In addition to that, of course, this was in the middle '60s a lot of my time was taken up in working with the, very carefully with the Dean of Students who at the time was Joe Coffman who later, interestingly, went on to become the President of Rhode Island State College. Left that institution and returned to Wisconsin and ultimately became Executive Vice President of the entire system, so it was rather interesting that that cad ray had organized the first Chancellor's Office of Wisconsin, moved out in different directions and exciting times. But a good deal of that time was spent in dealing with the student unrests and after Fleming, Bob Fleming left Michigan, a very distinguished and very liberal professor of sociology became chancellor, Bill Sewell was his name. And it was during my term that I had that very tragic but yet very educational experience of being called upon by the Chancellor to preside at what I believe, in probably higher education with the longest faculty meeting in the context, or in the aftermath of the Dow riot of October 17, 1968. I just returned from the University of Wisconsin where I received recently the Distinguished Alumnus of the Year award. And in my speech my response opened by way of saying the last time I stood on the stage of the Wisconsin Union Theater was the time of presiding over that faculty meeting. And as the parliamentarian oversaw that it was interesting to see that in a meeting that lasted, started in one day at one in the afternoon and ran until about one in the morning, and then a meeting, we recessed. I met with the Executive Community of the faculty from about one thirty until seven a.m.; the faculty reconvened at eight a.m. and carried on the second day until I believe about four or five in the afternoon. But in that total period of time we had disposed from a parliamentary perspective of three hundred and forty-four motions from all classes main, subsidiary, privileged, and incidental. The other interesting aspect was that the theater capacity is about 1,400, every seat was taken and we had an additional 500 hundred faculty at the Wisconsin Center, about a block away tied in by a way of a two way remote television setup. And parliamentary it was quite an experience to be sure that the ratio was fair in turns of recognizing two speakers from the theater over and against one from the Wisconsin Center to keep that balance in the debate and various resolutions. Had it, it's served a very good purpose and I, as I have pointed out in those remarks to weeks ago. It was probably a university in it's most tragic moment, but also in it's greatest moment, in that through those deliberations, which resulted in a lot of ventilation of hard pent-up feelings because in that Dow riot the police and ultimately the National Guard had been called in, approximately six hundred students ended up in the University Hospital and about as many police and security officers at the day end of the break out of the riot early in the morning, about mid-morning. That the university really pulled together, the faculty did, irrespective of the strong feeling on either side of the issue of the universities involvement in Dow, contracts and difference of opinion in regard to the use or call of for

outside police forces, which call was mandated by faculty policy under the circumstances that we were confronted with.

(00:14:48)

JB: The faculty called in?

JC: No, but Bill Sewell called them in. But the reason why I ended up as presiding officer, he called upon me to preside so that he could sit behind me and look at the faculty to quote him, squarely in the eyes in discussing and debating the feasibility or the wisdom of that decision. When he was simply, in his words, trying to follow faculty policy, it was a very, very tense moment in the history of the institution. But out of that came an institution that realized that it was pointless to allow disruption of the educational process to occur at any cost and resulted really in the reunification of the entire faculty and the student body as well. But it was a very scary time because the faculty who had attended that meeting had to, students formed a gauntlet had to walk into that theater down through a gauntlet of students on either side, jeering some cheering. It was a not pleasant situation to say the least. In many respects it seemed to become the basics for my involvement in that situation for interest of the institution when search and screen community came out, unbeknownst to me, to ask me if I had interest in coming to this institution. A community that incidentally spent three days on campus checking me out, so to speak, in a number of different quarters before they came in to see me at eleven o'clock on Friday or Thursday afternoon.

JB: Again, what were the days of the dow affair?

JC: October 18, 1968. October 17, 1968.

JB: '68. Alright. You're appointed of...

JC: Oh wait, now you got me confused here. I think it was October 18, 1967. That's when it occurred.

JB: You were appointed president of San Fernando Valley State College in June 1969. You had time at UCLA, you looked at the CSC system as well as the UC system, what impelled you to come to Valley State at that point, what drew you here?

JC: Well several things in that year I spent at UCLA, given the fact San Fernando Valley State College, as what it was called in that time, was geographically close to UCLA was one of the first institutions that I visited after I have concluded my work at UCLA. And I found the institution, though I had not any inkling that I would eventually or fate would eventually bring me here. That the people I had met out here, Ralph Prater as a matter of fact, I spent several hours with interviewing as your interviewing me about the start of the institution and so on. And many others that the institution seemed to have the same kind of

intellectual and professional environment that I knew existed at Wisconsin. So I found this institution by virtue of the makeup of the faculty, and in many respects, even the students, very comparable to the faculty, and general education environment to the inverse of Wisconsin; and then secondly, I knew as many people across the country knew, that this institution was a troubled institution having had a very serious and tragic moment in terms of the November 4, 1968 arrangement or incident. And the second compelling reason was that I thought perhaps I might for my past experience in having served in the capacity of the mediator between the students and the administration and the university and the faculty, to provide some assistance to the institution.

(00:19:47)

JB: What were your first priorities when you arrived?

JC: The first priority was to reestablish a sane, peaceful, educational environment, in working towards that objective, to try to bring the faculty together as a united community, the students as well, and really to get on with the business of the institution and the mission of the institution. The second priority, and it kind of relates to the first, was that I learned that many, many people believed that our library now called the Oviatt library, was lost in the legislative process in Sacramento as a punitive measure taken by some legislators in response to the November 4 incident and succeeding incidents of protests and demonstrations. And so it became important to address what appeared to be, a very poor rapport between the institution and the immediate community, to restore that to normalcy as well as restoring the creditability of the institution within the system of CSC and the legislature; and that task did not take too long, within six months the library was back on track in Sacramento and funded so we were able to open the Oviatt in '73, so it was I think it was about two years in construction. So it was probably a year, at least a year, in restoring those relationships.

JB: It had been encoring another way.

JC: Oh yes, but that's, yes it was scheduled for funding, and the institution had lost its funding in the spring of '69, in the budget deliberations in Sacramento, in the spring of '69.

JB: So your goals, initially, was to bring the students together, the faculty together, the campus community together.

JC: Yes.

JB: And restore the credibility of the institution.

JC: Yes.

JB: And Sacramento also.

JC: And in the community, right, yes.

JB: Daunting priorities indeed.

JC: Pardon?

JB: Daunting priorities indeed. So Much is subsumed within that.

JC: Well it, I don't know what your next question is. Is it on the same [inaudible]?

JB: No, I wanted to stay with this just a bit longer. Did you develop an overall strategy for coping with student demonstrations?

(00:23:30)

JC: Yes. Having come from the academic discipline of communication, speech communication, and other forms of communication, the obvious key was talking. And getting people to talk rather than to fight and argue. The first task was really of one establishing a presidential office that would become known for its openness and to encourage discussion of all the issues that led to the November 4 incident. And be willing to meet with students, to meet with faculty, to hear both sides and try to explain the importance of re-tracking the institution that, in this kind of situation, the institution experienced no one was really a winner, and everyone a loser to the extent that the students simply were not receiving a traditional normal scholarly experience, or educational experience. The faculty had been detracted to the point that I suspect during that period, and you probably know better than I, since you came about that time, you were here before that time, you went through the incident. Detracted from their professional objectives and scholarly tasks of researching and writing and carrying on with teaching under normal civil circumstances. And I must say that I don't really attribute anything to myself or very little. I attribute more to the commitment of the faculty in carrying on with the business of education. And attribute to a wariness that had apparently developed with personal friendships that were broken up among the faculty, among students, etc. People were simply tired of that kind of setting and so, as soon as people knew that it was going to be open and that dialog there would not be anything to fear in terms of retribution or any special autocratic activities, people were anxious to get back together and get with on with the institution and with commitment of the desire to do that, I think, was a major factor in the institutions getting back on course. But I, as I started to say, I was amazed that from my perception began to occur within six months and within 12 months, I felt that the institution was fully back on course and the only thing left that made it difficult was that there were some felonious charges still pending against some of our students. And those charges went through litigation and during that first year there are many people who had been involved in various situations that had to make depositions and those depositions

brought back memories and very severe feelings on one side or the other. But once those trials were over, the mending was almost a complete process.

JB: Did you open your office to the aggrieved or to those who felt they were aggrieved, students and faculty would come in and talk? Did you know?

JC: Yes I came in to the office at I think was eight a.m. Monday morning June 15, was my first day in office. And several things surprised me, number one, the office of the president was in a windowless closet because the president's office had been burnt out. My first meeting within 25 or 30 minutes was a group of black students, the representatives of the BSU. With whom I had spent about two and a half hours listening, not talking, but listening to their concerns but more importantly there expectations. And as soon as they left, without notice, a group of about six or seven faculty came in to indicate what they perceived to be the position of the entire faculty. And then right after that group another group came in presenting what they perceived to be the faculty position from their perspective and of course the two came from conflicting camps at the same time. But that probably was the most educational moment in terms of becoming acquainted with the institution that I have ever had; and then in a relatively short time, in a matter of one day. But I remember Dean Scofflan was one of the first, I think he was the spokesperson of a group, the first group of faculty that came in right after the leadership of BSU left.

(00:30:39)

JB: In General, what did you feel were tolerable and intolerable forms of protest, on the campus? Was there any clear definition of that or merely the legal definition?

JC: Well in my mind I personally believed then, believe now that all forms of protest are legitimate. I'd hate ever to give the impression that protests need to be looked at by virtue.

Tape 1, Side B

JB: And again we were talking.

JC: Yes I.

JB: About forms of...

JC: Yes, I never cared to look at the concept protest immediately cast it into a legal or illegal dichotomy. I think putting aside the concept of protest; the question had to do with what's tolerable and what's intolerable. And I think what's intolerable is of course violence, physical violence and destruction. Again problems are not solved by burning down buildings. But messages are made very clear through the form of protest and

demonstrations and I applauded the students in the protest and demonstrations and in which I was personally involved and that was almost every day for the first 2 or 3 or 4 months of the fall semester of '69. And I had not so much to do about, interestingly enough, about the about the racial issues that were so fundamental to the 1968 episode. Believe it or not, apparently from many conversations I spent most of my time meeting with student groups, student individuals, students who came out to the house. And I think that, that the intense feelings on the racial issues diminished to the point or level of people wanting and expecting solutions to that problem and had some reason to feel there was a way to address those issues. The protests, believe it or not, had to do more with obviously the social issues of the day, national social issues of the day, the Vietnam situation, but also many of them having to do with the disposition of faculty promotion, retention, and tenure decisions that were made favorably or unfavorably. Protest over obviously popular instructors who were not promoted or did not receive tenure. The students at that time were very much interested in the faculty personnel process and the outcome. And you must remember at that time they really had as they now have, any opportunity for student input, formally and procedurally. We have now student evaluations, we didn't have those before. And, but there were demonstrations over many of them were over personnel actions taken by faculty committees or ultimately by myself, because I, given the thoroughness of their own internal faculty RPT process, never overturned any of those decisions. Although I may have had questions but I have to respect the role of the faculty in determining personal policy and actions.

JB: Apart from RPT were there any areas where you felt students had a case where they were right as student demonstrators? And where did they go wrong?

(00:04:53)

JC: Where did...

JB: They were arguing about social issues of the time, as you point out, race and the war, did you find yourself in agreement with them at all?

JC: Oh yes I was fully sensitive and sympathetic with their issues as I am today on some of the current burning issues. I think if there's any disagreement, or where I personally perceived that where they may have gone wrong was to attack the problem in a way that simply would not be productive. As I have said earlier, you don't effect change by burning down buildings or stopping the educational process or disruption an educational institution. 80% of the community, LA community, could care less whether we shut down a day or two classes, the only people who suffer are the students and faculty and many administrators who then have to put aside all their administrative work and let it pile up until they get back to it. The interesting phenomenon of the student revolutions of the '60s and early '70s; I think the students generally came out of that experience, coming to that realization you don't get change, you don't effect change by closing down administration building or disrupting teaching. You get, you

affect change by getting involved in the process itself, and I think one of best examples is the instances of the real student leader of that Dow riot at the University of Wisconsin, ultimately, only about 4 years later became the mayor of the city and stayed the mayor of the city for 15 or 18 years, and he was a very distinguished mayor and things changed.

JB: Who was he?

JC: I'm sorry I can't...

JB: It might be Tom Hayden up in California.

JC: Well yes, well the same thing happened up in Berkeley. I think one of the student leaders became mayor of Berkeley, if I'm not mistaken. That wasn't Tom Hayden.

JB: No.

JC: But Hayden in turn also got into the process and now he's a very distinguished assemblyman.

JB: It could be called the Tom Hayden syndrome.

JC: That's right, and that was a good lesson to learn. And as we now return since I've firmly believe that it's all cyclical and the pendulum moved extremely to one extreme in the 60's and 70's and then through the middle and late and early 80's moved to the other extreme of indifference, no activism, which cost, I think, educational institutions the price of being or ceasing to be intellectually lively places in which to learn. And now it's starting to swing back, but as it swings back so far there hasn't been the violence that one normally associated with the activities student activism of the '60s and '70s. And while those protests or demonstrations are beginning to become more and more frequent, at the same time there is civility, good humor and willingness to get involved in the process. So you see the leaders now becoming more involved in student government, student government becoming more articulate, important in the decision making process or policy setting process of an institution. So if we do move further to, as I am sure we will do and see it all about us, to the point of activism that will be very comparable to what we experienced in the '60s and '70s, it appears that it will be done in a more effective way in terms of getting or achieving, affecting change. And the media are assisting a good deal. The media are paying more and more attention to every kind of demonstration on Wilshire Boulevard. And any demonstration over the quality of food or the dress code in high school, as a matter of fact high schools are now becoming as popular for the journalist and the news reporters as places of action and newsworthy events as institutions of higher learning. And those students in high school will be soon our students and another, it's happening now and I suspect the student

attitudinal profile will be far different from 4 years from now than what it is now, if not sooner, 3 year, 3, 4, 5 years.

(00:10:47)

JB: I think you're right. I'd like to make a rather a long leap, to a very different sort of question, it's one that I put to Ralph Prator, and I would like to ask you the same question. How would you describe your own style of presidential governance? Are their ways in which you would characterize it? What your approach is, your philosophy presidential governance?

JC: Yes I, I think that, I can do that rather readily because it is a question I always raise it, if we were in a reversed situation and I was interviewing you for a administrative position, vice-presidency or deanship or whatever. The question I always ask is how would you describe your administrative style? Which gets at the same basic answer as your question does. There are certain characteristics, I think first of all, and you put it in the context of the presidency or the chief executive officer of a educational institution. The first thing that I've believe one has to highly value, is the fact that you are there really as a servant of the people supposedly or to preside over, you're to be a facilitator. You are to assist students in the best way you can to meet their individual educational goals and aspirations. The president or a chancellor is there to facilitate the function of a university professor, teaching and research and community service but primarily the prior of the first two. And to protect at the same time the academic integrity of the institution, particularly during times when change is inevitable in adapting to special and obvious societal needs. Changing, in our instance, changing demographic conditions of the state, the people we serve and to be the best possible spokesperson of both the faculty and the students and I have to include the administrators because they do from groundskeepers, to technicians of all sorts, to secretaries. To be the best possible spokesperson in the forums where the resources of the institution are at stake and that means the best possible spokesperson before the Chancellor's Office in the instance of our system and before the Board of Trustees and before the legislature and various offices of the executive branch and the Department of Finance and so on. In terms of style, I have always believed and something basically that Bob Fleming taught me and I consider it a great benefit that I derived from working with Bob Fleming who is chancellor at the time, that people will accept a decision normally if they feel they have been a part in the shaping or making of that decision. And to achieve that kind of feeling among people, faculty, students there has to be a very important element of consultation or willingness to consult as often as possible on every issue. And I know from my in-depth evaluations made by the Chancellor's Office over the years, which have been, and I say this very modestly, I hope that they have been very very kind and very very favorable, but one source of criticism is of myself has been that I consult too much. And if one has to err on the side of consultation I suspect it's far better to err on the side of over consulting than under consulting. And the price you pay is that it takes a little longer, sometimes too long. But, I don't mind that it requires at the same time

then patients in dealing with given problem and quite willing to be patient and wait it out. And sometimes if the institution is known to be a place where there is a good deal of openness, sometimes those problems get resolved without any involvement of the president or vice-president or the dean. And that probably is the best way to get at a solution, because you can be almost absolutely assured that whatever the outcome, everyone irrespective of which side the given issue one may be, will tend to accept it because they know it's evolved out of the pure discussion, pure dialog rather than being imposed by the administration fiat which is the worst possible thing to do. So openness, frankness, forthrightness, patience, willingness to be available, those are all, in my book, important characteristics of a good presidency.

(00:18:23)

JB: Shared Governance?

JC: Yes, no to be sure.

JB: As a Principle?

JC: Yes.

JB: Let me ask you about the faculty role ensure of your governess because they do play a large role in this. Looking back as far as 1969, would you say that the faculty role in governing the campus has grown or diminished or remained about the same?

JC: Could you be clearer on, what do you mean by role?

JB: Well...

JC: I know what I mean by role.

JB: We have a senate now and we had a senate then. And we have faculty opinion that is reflected in the senate and reflected outside the senate. And faculty come in and share views with you and they do that now and they did that then. You have ways of tapping faculty opinion and attitude. Through your conversation and through talking with your own executive group and with those in turn who have contacts in the general faculty. I guess to phrase the question a little differently, has faculty influenced on the ways, on the direction the campus takes and on what the campus does remained as it was then? Has it actually increased, has it diminished as you see it? Maybe that's not a meaningful question.

JC: Well I. Pardon?

JB: Maybe that's not a meaningful question.

JC: No, I think I understand the drift of it. I think that, well first of all let's set out some basic principles. One, of one I firmly believe that the faculty should have a prime, primary voice on all issues having to do with educational policy and personnel policy in regard to faculty peers, having to do with retention, promotion, tenure. And this is why over now 21 years, I take great pride in the fact that in regard to personnel matters, I have not overturned a single action, personnel action, by a personnel faculty committee. Where I have had some question, I made it a point of meeting with that personnel committee, and I have to say that honestly in 21 years I may have done that once or twice. But nonetheless, irrespective of the outcome with the request for reconsideration, after the request was made the decision was to stay with the original one, that's what I accepted. The only time that I did not give a clear reading was on one faculty personnel action, in which at the department level, school level, and the all university level, those three bodies voted differently, two in one direction, one in the other direction. And in each and every instance the difference was only one in the vote, in the actual vote. And I simply took arithmetically all those votes and gave them equal weight and went with the decision of what I could determine to be the majority of all those who did vote, all three levels. In regard to educational policy, prior to this year, I also take great pride in the fact that I remember, rejected the recommendation of the faculty senate, I think only one occasion I sent an issue back for reconsideration, quite frankly, about 10 or 11 years ago, and I can't even recall what the issue was but it was re-debated and the faculty senate changed its position. And this year I broke that record in one semester by having to reject two recommendations, one coming out of the educational resource committee that called for formulaic approach to the allocation of support positions, and the other in regard to ROTC. On both issues however, I was in support of, sympathetic with the motives for the recommendations that came forward and in support of what was being ultimately sought. In regard to the ERC recommendation I returned to that committee, the ERC, and indicated a full willingness to pursue that, the basic problem about

(00:25:05)

which we all exist, and to encourage that we sit down together to examine various alternatives. I felt I could not accept the recommendation after having had 20 years plus experience of fighting for opposing formulaic budget approaches. It destroys the flexibility of an institution. It makes it extremely difficult, if not impossible to deal with mandates imposed by the state government or by the Board of Trustees in regard to the use of positions that can be used for different purposes within certain guidelines. But you see the basic problem here is inadequate support for faculty at the departmental level. And I have talked enough and have talked enough with a number of faculty saying, who said that giving a department an additional support position does not guarantee that the faculty will benefit from it. I mean you give it to a school and it may stay in the school and the departments don't. Or you give it to a department chair and the department has to use the position to respond to the numerous requests, bureaucratic requests for responses to questionnaires and reports and so on, that the support is not

available for the faculty in order to prepare for exams, or prepare for research grants and the whole bit. And so I suggested to ERC and I said, I hope you understand that, and I hoped they understand, even now or with the new members coming on, that I agree with the problem and there may be some alternatives we can follow to address really what are the roots of the problem, inadequate individual faculty support for teaching and research. One alternative for example might be to establish a university wide or school wide pool of secretarial service, to which pool faculty member could go to have a grant proposal prepared or a manuscript prepared for submission to editorial board one sort or another. So I, even having taken that action of rejection doesn't mean the issue in my mind is finished and I want the dialog to continue and to continue until we get a satisfactory resolution And I hope ERC invites me back and they get to the point where they want to revisit that particular issue. And they seemed at the time of my meeting, four weeks ago, that they will extend that invitation. I don't want to impose myself but they know then I'm anxious to address the problem. In regard to ROTC thing I was kind of caught in a unfortunate, no-win situation in terms of the university community, or at least the vast majority of the university community. Because I have received a legal opinion from the Chancellor's Office that simple said, that you are running a very serious legal risk and a risk that the trustees ought to address rather than an individual campus. That was the basic context of the message of saying here are the problems, one two three four five. And I found myself, I guess a rather lonely position and frustrating position of supporting the effort to change or to really abolish the discriminatory policy of the Department of Defense, homosexuals serving in military ranks. And I, in one session before the last senate meeting spent time working with a rewrite the resolution that would in effect put us all together on a university-wide bases altogether on the issue of opposing the discriminatory policy of the military and in fact going further and setting out a course of action that would call upon the students, the faculty, myself, the chancellor, and the Board to Trustees to pursue a given course of action to secure that end. And as I recall we worked nearly two hours on that and at the last senate meeting it never came up, and I don't know what happened to it. And I'm pleased so see the original position was reaffirmed and the senate simply chose to go the governance route and message that position to the state wide...

[END OF TAPE 1B]