

BOOK 35

R O L F W E I L

ROOSEVELT UNIVERSITY ARCHIVES

MEMOIRS OF ROLF WEIL

Tape Recorded by Elizabeth Balanoff

August-September, 1981

Oral History Project

I, Rolf Weil, hereby direct that the interview recorded August - September 1981, at Roosevelt University
Date Location
by Elizabeth Balanoff by the Roosevelt University Oral History Project in Labor History be handled in the following manner:

USE BY RESEARCHERS.

Open

Closed Pending Instructions

Closed. until _____

Permission needed to cite or quote

No Xerox copies may be made of these interviews

Elizabeth Balanoff
Director, Oral History Project

x Rolf Weil
Signature of interviewee

INTERVIEW WITH ROLF WEIL
by Elizabeth Balanoff

August 19, 1981
September 10, 1981
September 22, 1981

Total time - 4 hours

Corrected for errors and necessary updating in early 1989

'TABLE OF CONTENTS

	page
Early life in Germany	1
Youth in Chicago .	5
College Years	16
Early Teaching Experience	28
Beginning Years at Roosevelt University	29
Early Faculty Caucuses	33
Roosevelt Faculty Senate	36
Racial Policies at Roosevelt University	41
Purchase of the Auditorium Building	44
Racial Discrimination in American Colleges	46
Merger with Chicago Musical College	47
Curriculum Disputes in the 1950s	49
Students of the 1950s	51
Red Scare at Roosevelt	54
Restoration of the Auditorium Theatre	56
President Sparling's Retirement	61
President Pitcheil	66
Early Years of Weil Presidency	73
War Protests at Roosevelt University	81
Lynd Controversy	83
Black Studies Controversy	93
Bachelor of General Studies Program	98
Herman Crown Center	99
Future Prospects of Roosevelt University	102

Interview with Rolf Weil
by Elizabeth Balanoff
August 19, 1981

B. I'd really like to begin with the early part of your life and have you tell me where you were born and something about your family and your early experiences in life before you came here.

W. Well, I was born in 1921, which was a very good vintage year along the Rhine Valley, and I was actually born at the edge of the Black Forest in a town known as Pforzheim. It was a good vintage year as far as the wine was concerned but it was the middle of the post World War I German inflation so I guess I was born into crisis and survived a number of them. My family moved when I was a very small child to Stuttgart, which is now the capital of the state of Wurttemberg-Baden. My parents, grandparents and great grandparents all came from that same area of Southwest Germany, I got all my elementary education in Stuttgart, then went on to the Gymnasium and got a very traditional humanistic education, learning Latin and Greek. Everything went along very nicely until 1933. I remember very well at age 12 the day that President Hindenberg decided, after several governments had fallen, the government of Bruening and the governments of Van Papen and Schleicher, that he would ask Hitler to be chancellor and form a cabinet. I remember on that very night disorders in the street. I remember people being thrown into police vans and all that sort of thing.

B. Let me ask you, before you get into this hot political period of your life, a little more about your-early life. Were you an only child?

W. An only child.

B. What did your father do?

W. My father was the manager of a Singer Sewing Machine store in Stuttgart. That I guess is relevant in a sense that when Hitler did come to power, Singer became a subject of attack very shortly thereafter on the grounds that it was a foreign company. Of course there began early in the Hitler administration an effort to get Germans to buy German goods made by German workers for the German home.

B. You were in trouble on that score then, among others.

w. Well, of course, the real problem was that we were Jewish and the combination of a Jew working for what they they considered a foreign concern posed some very major problems. That created the reason for our leaving in '36. I don't mean to bore you with this but the background is interesting. My father's boss in Germany was a man by the name of Lensch, who was the leader for the state of Wurttemberg-Baden of the Stahlhelm, which was the right wing Junker type military officer organization. This group, which was also affiliated with the Deutsch Nationale Party, the German Nationalist Party, was allied in 1933 with Hitler in terms of making up

a Parliamentary majority. However, they despised Hitler, they looked down on him. They didn't like his plebian background and some of the socialist ideas that he had, but they had an alliance of convenience which didn't last very long. They thought they could control Hitler and it turned out the other way around, he controlled them. So almost a year after Hitler came to power, efforts began to get rid of these people. In each major German city there was a Nazi newspaper and in Stuttgart there was one very much like the famous Stumer. The one in Stuttgart was called Flammenzeichen, The Sign of the Flame. And one day they had in great big fat letters on the front page a headline which said, "Kapitan und Leutnant" (captain and lieutenant) and the bottom line was that they described this man Lensch, who headed the Nationalist Party, as the captain but they asked rhetorically who was his lieutenant? His lieutenant was a full-blooded Jew by the name of Heinrich Weil.

The way multi-national corporations operate is easily illustrated by the fact that my father was promptly called to Berlin and, although financially Singer was tied to the United States, they told him that after all, "We've got this big investment in Germany and we have told everybody that we manufacture our machines in Germany," which they did, and "We simply can't keep you under these circumstances because the future of the company is in jeopardy, but the European headquarters in Paris will try to make arrangements to move you

somewhere else." So they offered him the job as manager in Budapest. He wisely decided that that was no improvement so he didn't go here. Then they offered him Ankara and he decided that he wasn't ready to go to Turkey. They then offered him Jaffa. Jaffa was an Arab city which is now part of Tel Aviv and my father decided that he would try that, so in the spring of '36 he went there.

Until that time our thought still was that we would stay in Germany. In fact in '35 my parents sent me to a pensionat in Lausanne and the idea was that they were going to eventually send me to college in Lausanne. My parents were going to stay in Germany but then things deteriorated and so my father in the spring of '36 went to Jaffa. At that time there were Jewish-Arab disorders and he saw two Jews get shot right in front of the store; where upon he came back to Germany and --

B. Did your family stay in Germany while he was away?

W. We stayed there. He went to Palestine to explore the situation and we were going to follow him. Had it not been for that coincidence of history, that these Arab-Jewish disorders took place, we probably would have emigrated to Israel. It also was fortunate that we knew that we could get a visa to go to the United States. My grandfather's brothers had seen him suffer in the German Army for four years as a conscript in the 1860's and they decided they weren't going to serve in the German Army, so they were, I guess, in the finest tradition

of many American immigrants, draft evaders and came to the United States. Their presence in the United States enabled us to get an affidavit so after my father came back we, of course, applied for a visa for the USA, My father got it in August and he again went first. Our American relatives were very careful people. They said you come first and see if you can make some money and then send for the family to come over. In December '36 my mother and I arrived.

B. Your father had to leave the Singer Company, I suppose.

w. Yes and no. The interesting story is that whereas Singer Europe was going to find a job for him, they told him in the United States there was serious unemployment. In Europe he could get another assignment because he could speak German and French. He spoke a little English but not very much. In the United States, they said, there is terrible unemployment, they have the worst depression ever and there's just no way that they could give you a managerial job. When my father came to this country he stopped off in New York at the Singer headquarters and they were terribly apologetic. I think there were some feelings of guilt, they knew about the whole German situation. As a result and for a fairly long time, I think it was about a year, they sent us a check each week of twenty-five dollars, which in those days made it possible for us to live. So that you understand what twenty-five dollars would buy in those days let me tell you that we paid fifty dollars

a month rent for a nice five room apartment in Hyde Park.

The additional misfortune that hit us at that time was that because of the terrible excitement that pre-dated our leaving Germany my father developed a hyper-thyroid condition which is very frequently connected with high blood pressure and other symptoms. The first thing that happened when my mother and I arrived in Chicago about the first or second of January was that my father had to have surgery at Michael Reese hospital. We left Germany in December '36 and we stopped off in New York. One of the things that I remember so well was that we had friends that met us at the pier. These were childhood friends of my mother who were born in that same little town in which my mother grew up. The gentleman was the uncle of the wife of one of our present faculty members at Roosevelt and we all remembered him as a very nice person. He kept telling us that we ought really not stay two days with him in New York but that one day was enough. He was not Jewish and we thought, my G-d, has he become anti-Semitic? Well, what he didn't tell us was that he had been called to tell us, that we should rush to Chicago as fast as possible because my father would have to have emergency surgery. So the whole atmosphere was a very depressing one.

And I remember not only were we depressed by the New York situation but we arrived in Chicago at the old Englewood Station on the South Side. By the time we left Germany you could take practically no money. You could still take personal

property and you could buy your ticket over there. So we arrived first class pullman and literally we stepped out of that train and from bourgeois existence to utter poverty. I remember my mother cried when she saw that railroad station because in Europe even the smallest cities had a nice railroad station. And she said, "My God, this is the Chicago railroad station!" Well, we didn't know that there was a better one downtown. Because our relatives lived in Hyde Park, they said the place to get off is Englewood. We thought we had left civilization.

All the new experiences -- we saw for the first time black people. I remember my mother in the morning when we were having breakfast on the train, she said, "I didn't sleep all night because I always saw a black face peeking into my compartment." The only black face that she had ever seen was when there was once an anthropological exhibit, I guess, at a local museum in Stuttgart and they had some Africans where the women had put boards in their lower lips so they would protrude. I remember them pouring a bottle of beer into that mouth extension and then drinking it. In any case the new experiences just were overwhelming and depressing.

B. How old were you then?

W. I was fifteen.

B. Did you know English?

W. Practically none,. You see the Gymnasium insisted that you study nine years of Latin, six years of Greek and three years of English, but I hadn't reached that point in my education where English was required. I had some French and I spent a summer in Lausanne so I knew French and I had some language ability because of the other languages I had learned. I had taken some private English lessons before we left but I knew very little.

In February 1937 the beginning of the spring term, an American cousin took me out to Hyde Park High School and I will never forget that experience. I had to see the Assistant Principal, a man by the name of Smalley. He was a very educated man because he, himself, examined me in Greek, because there was nobody else at the school who'd studied Greek. He examined me so that he could determine that I knew some Greek and he arranged for tests in Latin, French, German, mathematics and so on. Then he added up all the credits and he said, "Well, you've got enough credits to graduate from Hyde Park High School. I remember I got to meet that first day all the really great teachers that were out at Hyde Park at that time. I met Miss Shoesmith, for whom a school is now named and who was one of the truly great educators. Well, to make a long story short I had enough credits to graduate except I didn't have any English and I didn't have any American History and I didn't have Civics. These were required for graduation, so

they said, "Well, we'll just have to double up on these courses. We'll work that out for you," which they did.

Then something happened which, to me, was most bewildering. They said we'll send you to a "division room." The division teacher was a French teacher by the name of Margaret Johnson. She must have been near retirement age at that time. To me she seemed like eighty. I went to this room and there were all these people sitting there and she was walking around handing out slips of paper. I thought, my G-d, what kind of school is this? Only later did I find out that the division room is a place to which you went once a day and she was handing out tardy slips and all that sort of thing. The word "division" bothered me and I got my little dictionary out. I knew what division was, it was an arithmetic operation, but there was no arithmetic going on. All of a sudden a bell rang and everybody ran off in every direction and I just sat there. I had a piece of paper in my hand from the Principal's office and Miss Johnson came up to me and said, "You'd better hurry or you will be tardy. "Tardy" wasn't in my vocabulary so I looked it up in my pocket dictionary and she got very annoyed. I had to use the dictionary, you know, to look up tardy. She pulled this piece of paper out of my hand and she said, "You're supposed to be in room 242 and that's on the west side of the building," And I looked at her and said, "How do I know where the West is if I do not see the sun?" At this point she thought that I was absolutely stark raving mad. But, you know, it's only

Americans who, inside a building, talk about east and west. It's unheard of in Europe and so my comment was perfectly logical.

B. It makes sense to me.

W. Well, it didn't to her. Then, of course, this was a senior division so the students in the division were all about seventeen. They were all looking forward to graduation and there were proms coming up and all that sort of thing. Here I was, aged fifteen, out of a boy's school, never having been in a class with a woman and I was still wearing short pants. I guess they looked at me as if I were a mascot, just like in a fire department where they have the dogs on the ladder, you know, I felt just completely like a fish out of water. I remember one of the girls during the first week at Hyde Park was trying to be nice and she came and stroked my hair and I got a heat wave of embarrassment. When they noticed that I would blush, they'd keep doing this and I died a thousand deaths. The adjustment was unbelievable because when you went to a German school at that time at age fifteen, number one, you didn't look at a girl. If you did everybody would make fun of you. The time you began to relate to girls was at age eighteen when they took the girls from the girls Gymnasium and the boys Gymnasium and gave them dancing lessons. So I remember our relatives told my parents, "You've got to do something for this kid. First of all, you've got to get him long pants or

he's going to be the laughing stock of Hyde Park." So we went out and sold our Zeiss binoculars for fifty dollars and got me a wardrobe. Then somebody else arranged for me to take dancing lessons and I really didn't care for that at all.

Then there was the whole problem-of these people graduating and I still had to double up on English. It was just a terrible, terrible, adjustment problem. I was just beginning to develop facial hair and a French teacher asked me to stay after class because she knew I was one of these poor refugees and she wanted to be very nice. She said,- "My husband has a brand new safety razor. Could I bring that to you? I think you ought to start shaving." Well, all of these experiences were overwhelming.

B. It sounds hard.

W. It was really, really difficult. Fortunately there were two or three teachers at Hyde Park that really motivated me, really were constructive and really helped me, really set me on the path. And the outstanding one, it might interest you, was a historian for whom I developed a great love. If I had to pick one person who really helped me and got me started in this country, it was Walter Hipple. Walter Hipple, believe it or not, had been a student of Woodrow Wilson at Princeton and he taught American history at Hyde Park High School, He was also a person who got in trouble with the then administration of the Chicago public schools, with McKay and Johnson, and had

all kinds of trouble during the McCarthy era. I got into Hipple's history class. You know the funniest thing of all is here I was, not knowing a lot of English, getting "S"'s (like "All's) in English, not knowing a lot of American History but getting "S"'s in History. There were some funny incidents. For example, in the history class we were talking about colonial history and he asked the class on what river is Philadelphia located and everybody started guessing in that class. I could, of course, easily eliminate the ones that were the wrong guesses and the only thing I knew about American rivers beside the Mississippi was that I had read, in German, James Fennimore Cooper's Leatherstocking Tales, all five sections of it. Of course I pronounced all the names in German and I came up with "The Delavara."

B. But you had the right river.

W. Well Hipple, who taught me American History and Civics, was the person I would see every time I had a problem. He was just a lovely man. He said, "Well, what are you going to do when you graduate from Hyde Park?" And I said, "I really don't know. I'd like to go to college but I don't know how in the world I could afford it." And he said, "Oh you ought to go to the University of Chicago." I thought, well, that's a lovely dream. He said, "They have scholarships. Why don't you prepare for a scholarship examination?" I said, "How does that work?" He said, "Well, they give it in three subjects." So with his help I decided I was going to take it in History, in German and in French. The summer before that exam I took

H.G. Wells's Outline of History -- I still have that book at home I took it and I want you to know that I took notes on every page of that huge book and memorized them -- dates and people -- it was just a tremendous amount of work. The German, I thought would be relatively easy and I worked very hard on French. The top French teacher out there at the time was a Miss Roberts who was terrific. I think I'd have had a pretty good chance but lo and behold I had the bad luck that this was the year in which the University of Chicago decided to change their scholarship examinations and instead of giving it in three subjects, they announced, after I had done all that work, that they would give a comprehensive achievement test, And of course I was sunk, they included English literature and science, etc.

B. You weren't prepared.

W. The only one who understood my heartbreak about that was Hipple. I don't know whether today this would work, but Hipple and I think two or three other teachers in Hyde Park High School wrote letters to the University of Chicago about me. One day I got a phone call from a Miss Wickham, who was at that time the Director of Admissions. She was sort of a forbidding looking woman, rather scary, but somehow or other I guess I made a halfway decent impression on her. I was graduating in February of '39 and she said, "We can get you into a mid-year class and we can get you a one semester scholarship." And that's how I got started at the University of Chicago with some student aid. A similar situation happened when I got my Bachelor's Degree. I went out looking for a job.

B. Now, wait a minute before we get you all through college. What had become of your parents? Did your father --

W. Well, my father had surgery and it went well, He was sick for awhile and he eventually went to work for Singer as a salesman and then later on he left Singer and he -- Let me put it this way, my father was not made for American business. He struggled very hard, he supported his family till the day he died. But my father was much too ethical and "soft-sell" an individual to be very successful.

B. He was really not happy in American business?

W. No, his life was very,very rough and tough. In Europe, you know, he'd been all settled and it was very rough on him.

B. How'd your mother adjust?

W. My mother did pretty well. I'll tell you how we lived rather decently actually. We had a five room apartment, two bedrooms. We spent more than we'should have, probably,for rent and there were enough single people who came over who could rent a room. So we always had one or two roomers and they would pay maybe eight or nine or ten dollars a week. The result was that we really didn't have much rent to pay. As I look back on these depression years of '36 through '39 particularly, we never had much money but we really ate well. I slept in the sun parlor, my parents had one bedroom and the other bedroom was always rented. For awhile a cousin of mine who had also come over also stayed with us. And you know there was no such thing as

air-conditioning. In summer we went out on the back porch or sat on the steps in front of the house. I have very fond memories of going out to the racks on the "point" at 55th and the Lake.

B. That was really a lovely neighborhood -- Hyde Park.

W. Oh, it was very lovely. In fact I described all this in great detail recently. There was a panel discussion on this German Jewish immigration of the '30s into Hyde Park and the Jewish Historical Society published the comments including my own. Curt Melnick is the current president, of this society and I gave one of the papers; On Fifty-third Street between Drexel and, the Lake in the years between '36 and '40 you could get along just as well speaking German as English.

B. Really, there were so many refugees there?

W. Oh yes, they were concentrated there, absolutely concentrated there and even many of the stores were owned by German refugees.

B. So you really had a community there.

W. Oh, there was a real community- spirit there. We started a youth group and there were services, Jewish religious services in German at the Sinai Temple which was then at Forty-sixth and South Parkway. We used to walk there to save money. I look at my kids and other kids today and by comparison they are spoiled. We lived on Fifty-fourth and Woodlawn and Hyde Park High School was on Sixty-second and Stoney and I don't think I ever took public transportation, no matter whether it rained

or snowed. The fare was seven cents and I didn't have the seven cents.

In order to make some money I had all kinds of jobs. One of the first ones was to buy eggs from a distant relative who had a farm and they'd bring in eggs and I would sell them for five cents more than I paid for them.

B. Where'd you sell them--in a store or door to door?

W. Door to door, to people I knew. I'll never forget once in delivering eggs on Sixty-second and St. Lawrence, which is quite a long distance and I was walking, it started raining and I had the eggs in a brown bag. I didn't realize it but the bag got softer and softer and finally the eggs started dropping out one at a time. I had my hand underneath but I lost all my profit for the day. Later, when I was going to the University of Chicago I looked for a job every summer.

B. You must have been quite young when you started there.

W. Yes, I was seventeen, I guess. I graduated when I was twenty and a half from Chicago.

B. With your Bachelor's Degree?

W. I got my Bachelor's in June of '42 and I was born in October of '21 so I was just twenty and a half.

B. What was your major?

W. Well, I went to the College and finished the College and then the question was what department was I going to go.

Naturally the department I wanted to go into was history and somebody gave me some good advice. The fellow who did advise me at that time was Greg Lewis who lived in Hyde Park and was on the faculty and is retired now. He said, "Do your parents have any money?" I said, "No." And he said, "Well, if you want to starve to death you can major in history." He said, "Unless you get a doctorate there's no chance at all. Besides, you 're Jewish aren't you?" I said, "Yes." He said, "Well, most universities don't hire Jews," which was true at that time.

B. Just like that -- quite open about it.

W. He was very open, that was unusual. He was a very honest guy, very straight about it. It wasn't that he discriminated, he was really telling me what was true. He said, "Look, if you don't think you can go beyond a Bachelor's Degree and if, you're interested in the social sciences, the thing to do is to major in economics. The government is starting all kinds of agencies and when they don't know whom to hire they hire an economist.

So I went into economics and I had, of course, a wonderful experience studying with some of the really very very fine people. I studied with Paul Douglas and Jacob Viner and Henry Simons and Oscar Lange who had fled Poland. That's another interesting story.

Then while I was going to college I was doing everything you can imagine to make money. I always had a summer job. During the school year I had as many as twenty private students

to teach them English. Of course I had just learned English myself. These students were all German refugees, newer than me. I taught them English and citizenship lessons. Among my students was Oscar Lange's wife. There was also a Nobel prize winner, James Franck. I had sort of reputation for doing a pretty good job at that, so I had about fifteen lessons that I gave during the week. This is all while I was studying for my degree. On Saturdays I worked at a haberdashery store at Lake Park and Fifty-third Street, Faust's. I sold ties and took care of the stock and swept the floor and whatever needed doing.

In the first summer while I was an undergraduate at Chicago I worked as a locker room attendant at the Idlewild Country Club in 1939. There I learned all sorts of things, I became rather disillusioned. I'd had, a very sheltered childhood and I was exposed to all sorts of things. For example, I had a grandmother who was a rather religious woman. She had told me that violence was something for non-Jews. Jews aren't violent. And alcoholism, only Gentiles get drunk, Jews don't do that. Well, I got out to Idlewild Country Club and I found that they beat each other up over non-payment or a bet. In the golf club I found not only Jewish men but Jewish women getting drunk. It was really a lesson in what it's all about.

I also was lucky I didn't get fired the first day I was out there. It was before the end of the term and there was a Sunday when they had a big formal dinner party. All the college

students that they were hiring for the summer were supposed to help out and I was supposed to work as a bus boy in, the dining room. I had never carried a tray in my life and they put some rocks on a tray and then took me to the back and taught me. I don't think I learned very well but during the dinner I was supposed to pour water. Of course, my eyesight had never been all that good and whether it was the heavy pitcher or whether it was my eyesight or whether it was my nervousness or a combination

B. You missed?

W. Not only did I miss but this was a formal dinner party and Mrs. Nathan Goldblatt, who was a gorgeous women, was at the table where I was pouring the water and I poured an ice cube down her décolletage and she screamed bloody murder. Well, I was sure I was going to get fired right that minute and I saw the manager heading my way. At that very moment there was a terrible noise and another one of the novices had gone in through the out door and dropped a whole platter of steaks on the floor, so that diverted the attention from the ice cube to the costly steaks and that guy got fired and I succeeded in hiding. The rest of the evening I was always somewhere behind, a pillar whenever the manager came my way.

B. He never found out who did it?

W. I don't know whether he did or didn't. Probably he just forgot and other things diverted him. The second college summer I worked at the Goldblatt's warehouse. The third

summer I was studying at Chicago I had the best job of the three years and that was as a Fuller brush man going door to door. I worked in different neighborhoods in Chicago and I learned more about these neighborhoods than you can imagine. For example, one of my territories was from Fifty-first to Fifty-fifth, from Kedzie to Central Park. It was a Bohemian neighborhood and they all lived in almost identical houses. They were an octagon front bungalow with a high English basement and you could always tell whether the children were the bread-winners or the parents by who lived upstairs and who lived downstairs. When the kids just got married they'd live in the basement and the parents would live upstairs. When the parents retired the parents lived in the basement. The houses were as clean as could be. Everyone had a cyclone fence and everyone had a sign, "Beware of Dog," whether they had one or not. And they were never in the front room. The furniture was overstuffed upholstered furniture, always covered with drop cloths. That was their good room and I was told by the sales manager, "In that neighborhood always go in through the back and ignore the sign about the dogs. Go to the back door, they usually don't lock the back door and very often they're in the basement. If there is a bell, ring it but if there isn't or it doesn't work just open the door and call in and somebody will come up from downstairs."

The first day in that neighborhood I did that and a huge dog came up and he just managed to get out part way and in a

reflex action I started to shut the door, I thought for sure if I let go he's going to bite me. This woman came swearing at me and I said, "Pull the dog back." She did and I picked up my little sample case. I remembered the Biblical story about Lot and his wife, you know, if you turn around, etc. I didn't look back, I ran all the way to Fifty-first street where I caught the bus.

When I graduated in economics in '42, I went out to look for a job. I thought I had a good chance of getting a job with Sears Roebuck and Co. out on Homen Avenue. The reason I thought I had a good chance is because they asked me to come back for a second interview. On the way back from that interview I came up to the fourth floor of the Social Science building and Simeon Leland, who was then Chairman of the Department and later became Dean at Northwestern, asked me to come to his office. I went to his office and he said, "What would it take to keep you in school?" I said, "Oh gee, mighty little." Almost immediately he said, "We have a grant from the National Bureau of Economic Research and the Social Science Research Council which asked the Cowles Commission to do a study on price controls and rationing. We could give you a job for thirty hours and it would pay a hundred and fifty dollars a month and of course you could get a couple of courses free." I Well, I didn't go back to Sears Roebuck, I grabbed that.

The other thing that I did to finish my education was through one of the helping agencies of the New Deal, the NYA

which promoted work-study opportunities. One of the important things to get on NYA was getting my citizenship. I had another complication which is hard to believe, but the American government classified me as an enemy alien.

B: A German Jew was still an enemy alien?

W. Some were so classified and some were not and nobody knew why. We had to turn over our shortwave radio which we had brought along. It wasn't as bad as the Japanese experience, but it was very hard to get that changed. I remember Paul Douglas wrote a letter for me to an organization which later changed its name. It was called the Immigrant's Protective League and with their help I finally got out of the enemy alien class.

B. I had no idea that any German Jews were classed as enemy aliens. And you weren't eligible for NYA until you got out of that class?

W. Yes. Well, I became an American citizen in '44. I got on NYA before I was a citizen but without being an enemy alien,

B. Did they ever try to draft you?

W. Yes, yes and I was dying to get drafted. I was three times 1A and then every time it came to the eye examination and I would get reclassified 4F. This, in fact, happened when I was already a graduate student at the University of Chicago.

B. Weren't there other places that needed you?

W. There were many things they could have used me for and I pleaded and begged and couldn't get in. The eye doctor that they sent me to, this Army doctor, as he examined my eyes, he said, "Did you ever learn how to read?"

B. They were that bad?

W. Well, you see, without glasses my eyesight is 20/400, which is very little and with glasses it's 20/100.

B. So you had serious eye problems even as a child.

W. Oh yes, however, using modern terminology, I was always "mainstreamed," which was probably the best thing in the world. I learned how to read very differently from all other kids. I never could read individual letters, I could only see the whole constellation of the word. I learned how to read that way. I mean, nobody taught it to me that way, but that's the way I learned. And the result is that I'm a very fast reader. I don't look at individual letters, I can look over a page.

Anyway you can see that the 1930 s, which was the formative period of my life, had a great influence on me because here I grew up in pre-Nazi Germany with almost all non-Jewish children, All my friends were non--Jewish, My parents weren't very religious. All of a sudden you're being labelled a Jew; all of a sudden terrible things happen to you. You go with your class to a swimming pool and a sign all of a sudden appears, "Jews are not permitted to pollute the water." And the class went off.

One of the things Hitler introduced which was very popular, and I must admit I was very envious that I couldn't be part of

it because they did such wonderful things, they had something called the Landschulheim. Basically it was like going camping out in the country and getting your education there. It was a marvelous idea! Of course it was used for political indoctrination. To a kid that isn't what was meaningful, the idea of going away for four weeks and being educated sounded wonderful. The day before they were going I was already packed. I got a note saying Jews are not permitted to go along and so then I was transferred to another school. In the other school the kids didn't know me. I was looked at as one of those dirty Jews that's been brought in. It was very, very difficult.

B. I'm sure, it was a different kind of trauma. People who were very much identified with the Jewish community had a different experience from yours.

W. Oh, very, very. When I left Germany in '36, in this whole Gymnasium there were only three Jewish kids. What most people, I think, can't comprehend is how even within a relatively short period of time the screw got tightened. For example, I was able to stay in my school until we emigrated because I was in a preferred category. What was a preferred category? Well they initially had categories of Jews. A Jew who was not born in Germany and couldn't prove German ancestry was in trouble right from the beginning. We could trace our ancestry back to the seventeenth century in Germany so that was an advantage for a little while. Then the next step was that Jewish children whose parents did not serve in the army couldn't stay

in German schools. Well, fortunately my father had served in the German army, then one thought maybe that would protect you, Then they said that you had to prove not only that your father served in the German army but that he had front line service. Fortunately my father was for four years in a ditch outside the Belgian city of Ypres, so that enabled me to stay to the end. Of course, eventually everybody, got caught, everybody ended up having to leave or be destroyed,

B. And they went beyond Jews, too.

W. They did, right from the beginning. In fact the first people they took were Communists and Social Democrats unless they changed. And, of course, a lot, of Communists became Nazis. Let's face it, it was very very easy to change from being a Communist to being a Nazi.

B. How did they do that just change their allegiance?

W. Just change from a red shirt to a brown shirt, One of the most disillusioning things. In fact the people who had a much worse problem with this kind of opportunistic change of allegiance, a much harder time than the Communists were the Socialists. The Socialists seem to get in terrible trouble when the Communists take over and they seem to get in terrible trouble when the right takes over, it doesn't make any difference. I guess I shouldn't take too much more time on that.

When I did graduate work at Chicago, of course, I never could do it full time. I worked first for the Cowles Commission for Research in Economics on a grant from the National Bureau

of Economics and the Social Science Research Council. I did that for two years. During that time I finished up my course work and got ready to take my prelims. Then I took a job with the State of Illinois in the Department of Revenue and worked for the property tax division, which was the old Illinois Tax Commission. I was always fortunate in finding people to work for who went places and that helped a great deal. So Simeon Leland, who was Chairman of the Economics Department, later became Dean of Northwestern, under whom I did most of my work in public finance, Simeon Leland had been Tax Commissioner, so through him I got the job at the Department of Revenue. Then the man who was also on the Tax Commission, a man by the name of George Mitchell, became a member of the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System and I did some work under him. So one thing led to another and I enjoyed my work at the Department of Revenue.

I was the first one to set the multipliers that you read about now. When the Butler Laws were enacted in Illinois, which was in 1945, I was the first one to have to calculate the multipliers. I tried to do it as accurately as possible and I had some help from some very fine statisticians and an excellent supervisor over there. I remember after we calculated, we went into the Director's office. The Director of Revenue of the State of Illinois is obviously a cabinet officer, and our data came back with red pencil lines through some of our numbers. I was naive enough to ask what mistakes I had made,

only to find out that he had used judgement, which proves that it was perfectly silly to be so accurate.

Be that as it may, while I was doing this I decided that I wanted to teach part time and through the University of Chicago I got a job teaching in East Chicago, Indiana. I taught at 3901 Indianapolis Boulevard.

B. Was that St. Joseph's or Calumet College?

W. That was Calumet Center. It was right across from Roosevelt High School and I used to take the South Shore train out and walk along U.S. 41, which is Indianapolis Boulevard. It was just at the end of the war and classes were large. I just loved that teaching. Coming in on the train from East Chicago, I would come in on the train with two fellows that also taught at Indiana: Otto Wirth taught German and Lionel Ruby taught philosophy. All of us lived in Hyde Park. Otto Wirth told me that there was a new school that was starting and was an out-growth of the YMCA College, that he had signed up to teach there and that he was going to introduce a new concept, Culture Studies, because one shouldn't just teach a language one should teach a culture. Well, I sort of liked that idea and I said I think I'd like to get involved with that. He said, "Well, if I ever hear that they need somebody in your field, I'll let you know."

Nothing happened on that at the time but I finished my-Ph.D. prelims and most of the course work and I was sort of

looking around for a teaching job even though I didn't have my Ph.D. as yet. At that point I knew I was going to get it. I went to the University of Chicago Office of Vocational Guidance and Placement, as it was called then. The head of it at that time was a man by the name of Woellner and I asked him to send me notices of vacancies. I don't think most of the people believe this today but most of the vacancy notices I got would say, "Baptist preferred," "Protestant Required", or "This is a church related institution." It was just absolutely unbelievable, so the idea of a Roosevelt where there was no discrimination really appealed to me.

In 1945 I started my job search. Rind you I didn't have to look for a job because I had one, but I wanted to go into teaching. I didn't want to be a civil servant. I went to the American Economic Association meeting at Christmas. It was in Cleveland and I went by train and I found a lead to the University of Denver, which I didn't know if it was going to work out or not. I was on the train going back and I was sitting in the coach grading papers for my course out at Indiana and a tall man came by and he looked over my shoulder. He said, "Do you mind if I sit down next to you?" And I said, "No." He said, "It looks to me as if you're grading economics papers." I said, "Yes," and he said, "Well, my name is Walter Weisskopf and I teach economics at Roosevelt and I'm very lazy. I don't like to make up exams, could I borrow some of yours?" So Falter Weisskopf got into a conversation with me. I gave him some samples of my exams and he said, "Would you

be interested in teaching part time at Roosevelt?" And I said, "Well, I would be interested in teaching full. time but I'm not really interested in part time because I'm very happy out at Indiana and I see no reason for changing," He said, "We're just starting out and don't really have any money, I doubt if we have any full time slots." Well, I bet you it wasn't more than two months that elapsed, it was February or March of '46 when Walter called up and said, "We're really looking for somebody for this fall, would you be interested in coming to Roosevelt?" And I said, "Yes, I would." He set up an appointment for me to see Wayne Leys, our dean, and Wayne Leys and I just hit it off perfectly almost immediately. We had just a wonderful conversation. Then I was sent to see Jim Sparling. He was on vacation and Leys had practically made the agreement with me. When I got to, see Jim Sparling he looked at me and said, "Well, I, understand that you're sort of a fait accompli," Well, to make a long story short I got hired and that's how I came to Roosevelt and started over at 231 South Wells Street.

B. Oh, you were in the first building.

W. In the first building.

B. You were really in on the ground floor, then.

W Oh yes, I was hired within a few months after the school started. At that time I was delighted, (A) to get a teaching job which I wanted, and (B) at an institution which didn't discriminate, which at that time meant a great deal, especially

given my background and all that. And I will say that the Economics Department at that time was a very good department, We had some very good people, both full-time and part-time. So I was just thrilled and I can really tell you, in conclusion today, that all my ambitions at that time were fulfilled. I never wanted to do anything but teach and I was just absolutely delighted. I have to just backtrack for one minute and say that at that time when I was negotiating for a teaching job I also got married. I got married in 1945. I actually wanted to marry Leni even earlier. We'd dated for about three years.

B. Where did you meet her?

W, I met her as a child. She's also from Stuttgart and then we met again by pure chance in Chicago on 53rd Street, of course. My mother said, "No decent boy would get married before he's twenty-four," so I waited until three days after that, We've been married for thirty-six years no.

Well, if you want to continue this let's make it another day.

September 10, 1982

B. Last time we got you to Roosevelt, I believe. You travelled on the train and you met Mr. Weiskopf and you had just joined the faculty of Roosevelt University. Do you want to pick up where we left off?

W. I started in the fall of 1946. The university had been founded in April of '45 so I really started in the second academic year. We were located at 231 South Wells which was an old office building. It has since been torn down and was located where the Federal Reserve Bank Annex is located now. When the school started on Wells Street the average age of our students was probably in the late 20s which is not too unlike what it is today. I remember at the time being younger than at least half my students. This was 1946 so I was twenty-five years old when I started teaching.

At the time there were, I guess, four or five people teaching in the Economics Department. The chairman was Walter Weiskopf, who has since retired and lives in Menlo Park near Palo Alto and occasionally teaches a course at Stanford. Walter Weiskopf gave a social science dimension to the Economics Department because he was as much a psychologist as he was an economist. In fact at a time when it was not as common as it became later he challenged some of the fundamental theoretical assumptions of economics. He challenged the assumption of both

conservative lives and as I indicated before, their radicalism was of a very mild variety. One of the leaders in the group, Wayne Leys, was an editor of Christian Century and in the minds of some people an editor of Christian was down right radical. I think it's sort of interesting to see how in a relatively short time the labels change. Well, these people were very, very concerned about the fact that being a liberal institution in the sense of providing equal educational opportunity and being a very democratic institution in the sense of participation of the faculty in decision making, that this would lead to the infiltration of the institution by an ultra-left wing element that would then manipulate the institution to accomplish their objectives and that's how the conservative and the liberal caucuses were developed.

There were some very interesting ideological discussions with a theoretical foundation and I regret that today faculty politics is so darn mundane and concentration on bread and butter issues. I don't think it would be possible in today's faculty to have the kind of papers-submitted that were submitted in the early days on such subjects as whether we should have the faculty organization or senate structure, whether we should have proportional representation or not have proportional representation. In fact we had a faculty publication, and I think copies of it are in the archives, called Issues, and some of the papers that were submitted to Issues were really superb papers. There was great disagreement on many

issues, both pedagogic and political, but it was really on a very high plane.

The lines weren't always clear cut. The original structure was that everybody belonged to the faculty, tenured or non-tenured, administrators or non-administrators, full-time or part-time. This was early in the history of the university. we all change over time and wear different hats and in those days I was one of the faculty who was in opposition to the administration's position in favor of the senate structure and I wanted to keep the comprehensive faculty concept. But the administration felt very strongly that we should move to a senate structure and some faculty felt that they did not want a situation where part-timers would be brought in to vote the "right way" on crucial matters, and they also felt more comfortable if the senate would consist of "old-timers" and the people they had confidence in. The theory was that if you had a senate structure where each department would vote for representatives to the senate, that then the most senior people that they could trust would be elected. They turned out to be totally wrong because as time went on, it was very obvious to me, fewer and fewer of the well established scholarly types wanted to be in the senate. So that didn't work out and, in fact, there were others who argued that the bringing in of part-timers was often the activity of the administration not of the faculty. Well, times change and circumstances

change but, be that as it may, the reason for going to the senate structure of governance, I think, was that the administration felt that that would give the university a more stable and a more conservative tinge than it otherwise would have.

The other big issue dealt with the question of proportional representation. I might say I've changed my mind on that. I was very much for proportional representation. You know that, with the exception of election to the Board of Trustees, according to the Faculty Constitution of Roosevelt University, all elections, unless otherwise specified, are by proportional representation. The debate which ensued involved really some superb speeches by people like Frank McCulloch, who was then Director of the Labor Education Division and was a lawyer by training. I remember his speech very well and I remember a superb speech by Seigfried Marck. Interestingly enough, Seigfried Marck, who had been a Social Democrat representative in the German or Prussian Parliament during the Weimar Republic, came out violently against proportional representation in spite of the fact that he considered himself certainly very liberal in all other respects. He kept referring to the fact that the rise of Hitler could be almost totally explained, as he saw it, through the existence of the system of proportional representation, because until 1932 the Nazis never had a majority in any parliament and if you would have had election by districts, certainly they would have had some representation but they would never have been in a controlling position and able to govern. It was because of proportional

representation which spawned a plethora of parties that coalition governments became essential as they were in France at the time. The result was, of course, that the German left wing, behaving the way that I think the left wing has behaved in Europe typically, fractured off into innumerable ideological divisions. You try to get a hundred Social Democrats to think alike and it's very, very difficult. They immediately split into ideological factions. So what happened is that government after government, coalition after coalition would fall until they finally got a coalition with a strong man who simply corrupted the whole system. That was the end of it. Well, I don't want to go into German history but that was debated at great length.

Now that got into this whole question of what is the difference between a state and a university. Well, I have come to the conclusion that when you have a large deliberative body, such as a faculty senate of the size that we have -- (There are faculty senates at other institutions that are made up of twenty senior faculty or something like that and that's different.) many people, who get up and make speeches at senate meetings, whether it's faculty members or administrators, imagine themselves as Disraelis and Gladstones. That may be a form of megalomania but I suppose we're all guilty of it to some extent. You know, you've got front benchers and back benchers and there's some danger in political posturing. There's danger in this because I think that the concept of

democratic governance in education has to be very different from the concept of democratic governance in a nation. Proportional representation in a national setting, with some modification, of course, provides protection for minorities but also spawns many parties. The latter problem I think nations have learned to tackle as a result of the experience of the 1930s. The new German constitution, for example, preserves, I think, what is good in proportional representation but also eliminates the bad by simply saying that if you can't get five percent of the votes you don't get parliamentary representation, so as to eliminate the very teeny tiny factions that could be terribly divisive and could prevent effective government. Of course the best example of a survivor of this whole kind of system, and that's sort of ironic, is in Israel where you've got this ridiculous situation of a very tiny proportion of that population that is ultra religious simply using its power position in coalition situations to accomplish its objective. They'll go with either of the major parties provided they give them power out of all proportion to their numbers. So those are the problems. Well, that was the early days of Roosevelt University.

B. How long did it take them to iron this issue out? Did the total faculty decide?

w. The total faculty met and I don't remember the exact vote but I think it was rather close. The whole debate went on for

a couple of years as I recall. And, of course, after that the issue continued to fester. I would say that that was the big issue of the time. It was the issue of faculty structure versus senate structure and that has to be seen as an issue that really went to the question of conservatism versus liberalism.

B. What did the conservative caucus stand for exactly?

W. The conservative caucus wanted to make sure that the image of the university was not going to be the "little red school house" image. They were essentially in favor of non-discrimination, but otherwise relatively conservative in their views and life style.

I think one would have to say that about the administration, starting with President Sparling, but particularly about more active politicians who at the time were Wayne Leys, the Dean of Faculties; Joe Creanza, the Dean of the Music School; and Lowell Huelster, the Vice President for Business and Finance. I have to say these were all people who at that early time I disagreed with and later on found myself in considerably more agreement with.

They were very able people but they were extremely sensitive to the fact that it was very difficult for Roosevelt University to get financial support in the community and that was based primarily on totally unfounded rumors and reports that went around.

B. Do you think it was because the racial issue was involved?

W. Oh yes, I have no doubt. The reason the institution was referred to very frequently as a "red" institution or communist institution was not because people had any evidence of that,

and one of the unfortunate things is that it did result in a bit of a witch hunt which later on became very open through the Broyles investigation and still later the McCarren Committee and all that sort of thing. But that was much later. The fact that we were called "radical" and "red" was purely because these were code words. I don't know if there were any members of the Communist Party on the faculty, but I don't know of a single one. That doesn't mean that there weren't one or two or three "fellow travelers," there may have been. But this was really a faculty very typical of faculties of any institution. But the fact that we were founded on this principle of non-discrimination and that Jim Sparling, although I think right in principle, had a tendency to state his position openly and strongly and in a scolding manner and not always in a very diplomatic fashion, resulted in an antagonism that lasted until the day of his retirement. I think he had every right to take the positions he took and I would say that probably on most of them he was basically right, but sometimes you can take a position without scolding other people;

There were issues of racial discrimination, I am sure, at the old YMCA College. There was a request from the YMCA Board to get an exact count on minority students which Sparling refused to provide. I think he was probably right that their intent was to have either an actual quota or a quasi-quota, but he went

around saying that that was what they were going to do and, of course, you couldn't prove that this was what they were going to do. So they said well this is all a conspiracy and it's a lie and that there was no intention to discriminate via quotas but we of the Board have a right to know the facts. I read as much as I could in terms of documents and memoranda and the thesis of Lelon who wrote a Ph.D. dissertation at the University of Chicago on the founding of Roosevelt College and I can't find any clear evidence that, in fact, they would have set up a quota. But, nevertheless, they very well might have.

The real reason, I think, why there was a revolt against the YMCA College Board was the same reason why there was a aborted revolt just before World War II started. In the thirties there was an aborted revolt at the YMCA College which resulted in the dean, Millard Everett, being fired. He later became the Chairman of our Philosophy Department. Everett had been dean of the old YMCA college and he was one of the leaders of the revolt. Why did they revolt? They revolted because the YMCA had diverted funds from education to other YMCA purposes. They actually made money on the educational program and diverted it to other YMCA activities and this the faculty was obviously very upset about. They were working for extremely low salaries, their working conditions were really very poor and they were extremely productive scholars. The YMCA faculty that came over was in every respect, whether you want to measure it by degrees or publications, really

a superb faculty. I guess the division was between those who certainly wanted to be independent but didn't want their neighbors to think that they were a bunch of wild-eyed revolutionaries, and those who don't mind being unfairly called "wild-eyed revolutionaries", and that's how the division took place within the early faculty. So when I talk about a conservative caucus and a liberal caucus what you're really talking about is people who were all really basically main stream New Dealers.

B. They must have represented the poles among liberals.

W. And that's a sort of interesting phenomenon. I guess the pendulum swung from one extreme, you see the original idea was that there shouldn't be a public Board. The original idea was that this was going to be a college that was going to be run by the faculty and they were going to have an all-faculty Board. They were going to hire a president and deans and that was going to be it. Then the faculty leadership thought the better of it because they decided, well my goodness, if it was going to be an all-faculty Board how in the world were they going to raise any money. Then they decided on making sure that there would always be faculty representation on the Board. But that had to be explained pretty much in terms of the original conflict with the YMCA Board, which was an intrusive Board. That is how, then, this came about. Now there was also, besides the race issue there were some labor issues. You may recall the incident involving Sewall Avery.

B. At Montgomery Ward.

W. Where Mr. Sparling sided with the strikers and, of course, that meant that in the business community he was persona non grata, particularly because he was hired by the YMCA Board on the recommendation of Mr. Stanley Harris.

B. The Harris Bank?

W. The Harris Bank and old Stanley Harris had recommended the hiring of Jim Sparling because he was a "lifelong Republican" and a very "decent Christian gentleman" who had taught swimming to Harris's children and had married this very lovely lady who had been the "au pair" girl for Mr. Stanley Harris's children. In fact, Jim Sparling's daughter, Mary Ann, used to go to bed at night praying for Mommy, Daddy and Uncle Stanley. They were that close. You know, Jim Sparling had been dean of students at Hiram College and had views compatible with the YMCA movement.

Well, getting back to Roosevelt, the other big issue in the early years was the purchase of the Auditorium Building. In 1946 the university became aware of the fact that the Auditorium Building was available. It had been a servicemen's center throughout the war; before that it had been a hotel, office building and opera house, and it was in terrible shape but it had a marvelous location. On that subject I think the administration was very much divided. It wasn't clear if they should or should not buy it, I think, at the time. It was to Mr. Sparling's credit and I think to a large extent to Joe Creanza's, who was his major ally

in this, that they had the guts. And it took a lot of guts and a lot of courage to buy this building which had a huge back debt on it in the form of back taxes that had never been paid. They could buy, I think it was 80% of the building; the other 20% was owned by a syndicate, maybe even the syndicate, but the representative for the group that owned it was a man by the name of Abraham Teitelbaum, who also at that time owned the Fine Arts Building including the heating plant. So they first acquired the main part of the building but couldn't afford to pay the outrageous price that Teitelbaum wanted for the crucial other part. In fact, we moved into this building in '47 still not owning the north part of the building. I well remember moving over here in '47. In fact I took several trips to try to pick out the best office for the Economics Department, which at that time was Room 718 which has now been converted into classrooms. When we moved over, there was on each floor of the Michigan Avenue side of the building at the north end of the corridor, chicken wire which the Teitelbaum group put on every floor. So the students did something which was a terrific stunt; they decided to have a chicken wire dance. In those days Life Magazine was a weekly publication and one of the features was "Life Goes to a Party" and Life Magazine came and the heading in Life was "Life Goes to a Chicken Wire Party." Well, eventually a deal was made with Mr. Teitelbaum in 1947 and then the next problem was how to get rid of all the back taxes. A deal was made with the city or

county and approved by the court system which involved a forgiveness of the back taxes in exchange for the university's willingness to permit the city to arcade the building in order to continue the Eisenhower Expressway, the Congress Parkway, and connect out to the Outer Drive. As you know, the arcading involved all buildings between Michigan Avenue and State Street both on the north and south sides of the street. But that is how we cleared the title on the building. Of course, I wasn't involved in this at all. I was a young assistant professor struggling to finish my doctorate at the time. When we first moved in I remember faculty members sweeping the floors. I may still have a picture at home of my wife and the Sparlings' daughter sweeping the stairs between the first and second floor.

I will say this, there was a great spirit at the institution at the time in spite of the fact that there were ideological divisions. Everybody was agreed that we needed an institution that didn't discriminate against faculty or students on the basis of race or creed. And I might say in some ways I think this was even a stronger feeling on the faculty side than on the student side, because it is true that in those days --I don't even want to talk about black faculty members because there weren't all that many and we could get the cream of the crop at the time, such as Lorenzo Turner in English and Chandler in Chemistry and St. Clair Drake in Sociology and Anthropology. But it was also true that Jewish faculty were discriminated against at many institutions. We could get, indeed, the best Jewish minds in the country practically because they had a hard time finding

jobs. I remember, when I looked for a job, getting notices from the University of Chicago's Office of Vocational Guidance and Placement headed by a man named Woellner. I remember the notices that came through and they just passed them on the way they came through, and college after college, some of them the best known old liberal arts colleges in the country would say, "This is a Christian institution," or "Presbyterians preferred," and various and sundry other code words which, of course, immediately meant that if you were Jewish you didn't even bother to apply because your chances of employment were just about negligible. Of course, there were always institutions like the University of Chicago and Harvard and, if you were a Nobel prize winner, you could have been a Hottentot and they would have hired you, but the typical American institutions simply didn't do this, so Roosevelt could indeed get a superb faculty because of this non-discrimination policy. Well, those were then the big issues of the early years: the question of the acquisition of this building, which was debated, and the question of whether we should substitute a senate for the faculty and the question of proportional representation versus a simple majority rule.

Then came the big question in 1954 or thereabouts, in the early fifties, of whether we ought to go into graduate work. That wasn't really all that divisive, but then there came one in which there was real bitterness and that was the merger with the Chicago Musical College. It was very much opposed by the Dean of Faculties. This was a very bitter fight. You see, we

had a music school and Chicago Musical College, which was a very old institution, founded back in the 1860's or '70's by Florenz Ziegfeld, the elder, so it was an almost hundred year old institution at the time, an institution which was headed by a man who was much beloved and had a wonderful reputation in music, Rudolph Ganz, but an institution which was losing so much money that it was on the verge of going under. It was a conservatory with a very heavy emphasis on applied music. The Dean of Faculies, Wayne Leys and the Comptroller, Lowell Huelster, very much opposed it on the grounds that if you made a losing unit larger you'd just lose more. With hindsight I would say that from the point of view of giving prestige to the university, the prestige of the Chicago Musical College was a very good addition. There is no question at all that from a financial point of view music has always been, is, and always will be, if it's any good, a losing proposition. In fact the better you make the music school the more money you have to lose. You have to ask yourself the question, does music contribute enough prestige to the institution to justify the expense, and my answer to that is yes, it does. I think that our music school is, indeed, the unit that has probably, if not the best, one of the best reputations of any of our departments or divisions in the country at large. Now I will also say that some of the really great people that were associated with music at the time have unfortunately passed away. Three names come to mind almost immediately that have not really been replaced with people that I would consider their equivalents.

One is Rudolph Ganz, another one was Mollie Margolis and another one was Morris Gomberg. These were among the greatest music teachers in the country and had, indeed, national and international reputations. I don't mean to belittle the very fine faculty we've got now but these former faculty simply had long established reputations. So this was a very, very great thing for Roosevelt! Well, these were the issues of the fifties.

In the early fifties there was, of course, also the Korean War which had broken out in 1950 and we went into a period of declining enrollment with its financial implications for a tuition driven budget.

B. Did the G. I. Bill help very much in the early days of Roosevelt?

W. The World War II G. I. Bill was the only way this institution could be supported in the beginning.

B. -Was it running out by the fifties?

W. It was slowly phasing out because many of the veterans already had some credits from before the war, but even many of those who just started in 1945 or 1946 graduated by 1950 or soon thereafter. Although many of our students worked full-time and went to school part-time or went to school full-time for two years and then started to work and went to school part-time, the early fifties saw the end of the World War II G.I. as a factor in enrollment. The enrollment pattern, then, was such that in fact a number of departments were over staffed. They had more full-time faculty than they could use. One of these departments was Political Science and that led

to some Political Science people teaching History and there were some Political Science professors teaching economics which also caused some problems.

There were also some curriculum disputes in the early years. When we started out we had a course called Social Science, which was an integration of the various social sciences, sort of a freshman survey course, and there was quite a bit of in-fighting on that. I will admit that we economists felt that any social scientists, other than economists, were totally incompetent in our area. I assume the political scientists might have felt the same way about the economists.

B. What did you do, just get rid of the course?

W. Yes, we got rid of the course. And then the science people tried to get rid of the Physical Science course but they never completely succeeded in that. Professor Morris Goran, for many years, was a remnant of that period. He built the Physical Science course and did a superb job. He was an excellent scholar but was never fully recognized by the other scientists. For one thing, his Ph.D. was in Science Education or some such thing. His course consisted of lectures and demonstrations and pure scientists believe that there is no such thing as a science course without a laboratory component. There was also the question of the role of Culture Studies versus pure Language teaching. Otto Wirth was a strong supporter of the Culture Studies program. For some students a foreign language is important, for others it should be a culture study, and one should be the substitute for the other, that was the Wirth position.

There was the question of what to do with transfer students. In those days transfer students were not as high a proportion as they are now and there were many, including myself, who advocated a comprehensive examination for admission to the upper division of the university, I must also say that in those days we were really the most important, I think, commuter institution, something that, from my point of view anyway, unfortunately changed. That's from the point of view of a Roosevelt University administrator; from the point of view of society, maybe it's a good thing that more upper division channels have emerged. Roosevelt University used to get a very high proportion of Jewish students, very bright, very capable students because we were the only non-sectarian four-year institution that they could go to in Chicago that didn't charge very high tuition and made it possible to work while going to school. So what you had at Roosevelt was a lot of unpolished diamonds; if you will, and some of these people have gone on and I could give you many illustrations of some of the superb students we had in those days. I remember in the late forties people like Don Jacobs, who is now Dean of the Graduate School of Management at Northwestern, or a fellow by the name of Burton Gould in Economics. There were several students, by the way, in History who went on and became really very outstanding scholars. And the same was true of some of the faculty members. In fact, the man who is now President of the University of Cincinnati, which is after all a major institution, was a faculty member. in the History Department. That was Winkler.

And so we attracted not only a superb faculty but some really excellent students. They were not the type that would go to Northwestern: they were not the type you'd find in Ivy League institutions. But at least to my way of thinking I preferred them very much because these were people who used the language of the people. They weren't hesitant to ask the embarrassing questions. They didn't take everything the professor said at face value. You had a very active student body. We also had, back in the late forties and early fifties, I thought, a rather mature type of political student activity. You had a spectrum ranging from the American Veterans Committee to a branch of the American Legion and you had a Trotskyite Club and you had all these various organizations and there was really very active and mature participation. All of this started going, in my opinion, downhill by the mid-fifties.

B. What was the cause of that?

W. Well, I don't think anything was going wrong. It was simply that the veterans who had that maturity were gone. And then what happened is the state institutions began to grow and that really changed things in the sixties when you took the old Teacher's College North and South (which were both mediocre colleges), gave them a great infusion of money and made them into state universities. In addition to Chicago State and Northeastern, the University of Illinois started at Navy Pier and, I think it was in the sixties, built the Circle, well you got into a situation where even though we were trying very hard to be a low tuition institution, there

was just no way that we could compete on a tuition basis with these heavily subsidized institutions. The interesting thing is that we have finally gotten, by the time the eighties have come around, to the point where we basically can compete effectively at least for the economically poor. We can enroll students who get really a free ride by state and federal subsidies, and those who are on tuition reimbursement plans from corporations and a handful, and I mean really a tiny handful of people who are sufficiently affluent that they can go to the institution of their choice. But the middle class student in Chicago doesn't have freedom of choice. If they did have freedom of choice, I think we'd have many more students and we could be much more selective in whom we would admit. As a result many students who would rather be here, or certainly would have rather been here the way this institution was, ended up over at the University of Illinois at the Circle.. That has been particularly true of our old Jewish constituency. The interesting thing is, and this is where I think a real perversion of public policy and public service occurs, when Roosevelt, a private institution, ends up having a greater proportion of black students than the University of Illinois. If you recognize that poor black people from the South Side and the West Side of Chicago pay sales tax so that the children of doctors and lawyers and accountants and university presidents can go to a heavily subsidized institution in Urbana-Champaign. You end up with something that's really ironic. Indeed that is

what has happened.

Let us now move to the sixties and in the sixties, aside from the facts which I've already mentioned, we're now getting into the whole period of the Viet Nam War. You get into the period of student discontent.

B. Wait a minute. Before you get to the sixties, did you want to say anything more about the Broyles Committee?

W. That was in the fifties.

B. At one point you said you might say more about that later. Did that contribute to Roosevelt's reputation for being super-radical?

W. Oh, I think it was the other way around. I think the reputation -- remember that people like Broyles and McCarran and McCarthy were always looking for something that they could focus their attention on and it was a political tool for their objectives. They went to institutions where they thought they would find supporting evidence for their efforts. Just like at a later time some government people came; that was in the sixties after I was already president, to count the number of minority students here because it would look good for their statistics. They knew that they were coming here for that purpose because they could demonstrate that there were institutions that didn't discriminate.

Broyles picked on the University of Chicago and Roosevelt and they named specific people. I think that there were some very unfortunate things that happened. I, for one, although I

consider myself as anti-communist in my feelings as anyone, have never been able to support the maligning of individuals that went on in that period. I remember having signed a petition against the McCarran investigation and the Broyles investigations because I considered them then, as I do consider them now, just plain witch hunts that went out of their way to make accusations and didn't really care much whether they were right or wrong. If you accuse enough people I guess you're right sometimes. I think that there was within the academic establishment a group of people, and it is my impression that they were predominantly former communists or Trotskyites or whatever, who were perfectly willing as an act of revenge if nothing else, to name names and places. You know on the broader scene there was the Whitaker Chambers-Alger Hiss business. We had some of that right here. In fact, a letter was written by one of our own faculty members listing all the faculty members at Roosevelt who had signed this petition against Broyles and McCarran. My name was on the list, which I resented very much. It was done by a person who was ideologically much to the left of me.

Of course, one of the things over the years that I have learned and that has been a great distress to me, I have found that there is an awful lot of hypocrisy and hypocrisy is just as prevalent among intellectuals, maybe more prevalent, than among others. I have been very disillusioned over the years with the group that is sometimes described as "liberals",

the group that I used to consider myself a member of. And I discovered that many people will stand for civil liberties if it's on an issue where they are in the minority that's being discriminated against but will take the very opposite position when they are in the majority. I've seen this happen not only at Roosevelt University and in educational organizations, but as you probably have observed, too, you find it in labor unions. There are many people who will preach great liberalism when they're on a soap box and deal with national issues. Let it be in their own little organization and, by golly, they're going to be absolute dictators and they will trample on the rights of the minority whenever it suits them. I'm afraid -- this is sort of an introduction to the period of the sixties which produced probably the most traumatic experiences of my life.

A discussion of the late fifties and early sixties would certainly not be complete without my telling you about a very bitter fight that resulted in the resignation of Leo Lerner as Chairman of the Board of Trustees, along with several other trustees and administrators of the university. The issue was the restoration of the Auditorium Theatre here. The question was not really whether the theatre ought to be restored or not so much as it was a question of under whose auspices and with whose resources it should be done. There were those who said the university shouldn't have anything to do with the restoration of the theatre because it would divert energy and resources from the main mission of the institution. The people who strongly opposed the restoration included the Vice

President for Development, Wells Burnette, the Dean of Faculties, at that time Wayne Leys, both of whom resigned over this issue. The Chairman of the Board, Leo Lerner, resigned as did a trustee by the name of Stapleton, an engineer at Inland Steel, and Morris Hirsch whose family put up the money for the restoration of the Sullivan Room on the second floor.

There were a number of other people who were opposed to the restoration efforts but who did not resign, including the later Board Chairman, Jerome Stone, and Max Robert Schroyer. The question was: should the President of Roosevelt University be involved in running the theatre? There was no question in my mind that Jim Sparling wanted to run it. This was all part of his personality which was a combination of idealism and stubbornness, and it's really the combination which you need to bring off something that maybe otherwise would have never come off. I give Jim full credit for having started Roosevelt University; most people thought that it was an insane venture; On the other hand, he very stubbornly believed some things which I suppose many people, including myself, would say were foolish. For example, he believed that if the theatre were restored, some of the finest professors in the country, I can hear him say it, would give lectures in the theatre and it would be packed to hear them. I submit to you there isn't a professor in the United States today that could give a lecture and fill that theatre. Now, of course, since then television has come in

and that has made academic use of the theatre even more problematic. It is very difficult to fill that large 4,000 seat theatre for cultural events. But he wanted it restored and one issue was whether the president of the university should be involved in this effort. A second issue was whether university resources should be involved. Should one raise money for this purpose and would that, then, take money away from academic purposes?

Well, a compromise was worked out and the compromise was that the Roosevelt University Board would set up an Auditorium Theatre Council which would be a creature of the Board of Trustees but not responsible to the president, but responsible directly to the Board. This was considered as an insane concept by Leo Lerner. When people like Harland Allen and Phil Klutznick and quite a few faculty members -- I think the faculty was divided -- supported this compromise, we got the resignations mentioned previously. Mrs. Spachner became Chairman of the Auditorium Theatre Council. The Council was authorized to raise money for the restoration and to operate the theatre under the jurisdiction of the Roosevelt University Board. No fund raising for operations was contemplated.

There were many battles over the years. There was a period of time when the Auditorium Theatre Council was eager to emphasize separateness from the university. They would never

use the name "Roosevelt" in any context. You must remember that the word "Roosevelt" in the early days was also a major handicap. If people thought that you were in any way connected with Franklin D. Roosevelt that already was a problem in the forties and in the fifties. Today this isn't true anymore.

There were periods of great strain between the Auditorium and the University and only in very recent years has the conflict been reduced. It's become more friendly. In fact the bylaws got changed so that now the Chairman of the Board of Roosevelt University and the President are ex officio members of the Executive Board of the Auditorium Theatre.

There were all sorts of rumors which were partly right and largely false. There was a rumor to the effect that there was a proposal to gut the theatre and build a parking garage inside the Auditorium Theatre as a way of financing the university. I think that concept was once facetiously stated by John Golay, a former Dean of Faculties. I am sure that he said it after he had a couple of drinks and didn't really mean that, but that was one of the rumors.

Another rumor, which I'm sure Jim Sparling totally believed is that there was a group of people, including Leo Lerner and Arnold Marement, who were trying to "steal" the theatre because at one time they had proposed a concept of an independent organization that would lease the theatre from the university and give the university a certain amount of money each year. As I look

back on it now, that would have been a marvelous solution because, as it turned out, we get nothing. Of course, I don't think we would have been able to work out the lease arrangement anyway.

I just came from a meeting today of the Auditorium Theatre Council at noon and one member of the Council said that the university should get a lot of credit for helping in the restoration; and Jerry Stone said, "Yes, we ought to get a lot of credit because we don't get any cash." Mr. Stone is a marvelous punster. Well, that's the Leo Lerner resignation story. It's rather sad because Leo Lerner was a very good Board Chairman and he had a lot of friends. And they left the university en masse, really. We lost a lot of friends.

I made efforts to get Leo's son, who became-the publisher of the Lerner papers, to go on the Board of Roosevelt. I got a "No" the first time around. The reason I wanted him to come on the Board was partly at least in memory of his father who had made much major contributions. To this, his comment was, "I'm trying very, very hard to escape that aspect of my life and establish my own identity." Unfortunately, Louis Lerner passed away before we could ask him again.

B. Let me ask you, did it hurt the fund raising of the university very much when these people left?

W. Yes, I think for a period of time it hurt. I certainly know that one man, Mr. Hirsch, whose family gave the money for the Sullivan Room restoration wouldn't give another dime. And I tried, after I became president, but he just wouldn't. There was no of getting him back. I don't think the incident was really terribly destructive but it did set us back for a bit.

B. Do you want to talk next about the student upheavals of the sixties?

W. Well, let's first get some other dates in here. In 1959 Karland Allen took over as Board Chairman. Harland Allen had supported the auditorium Theatre concept and in February, 1960 the Auditorium Theatre Council was, in fact, established. Then in the early sixties a number of things took place. The Division of Continuing Education was established, although at that time it was purely a non-credit division, In 1962 the building next door to us on Wabash Avenue, the Favor Ruhl Building was purchased with the idea of eventually building a Student Union and dormitory. Then in 1963 the next really important event in the history of the university took place and that was the succession from the first president. You will see that on this subject different people will give you different version I suspect.

B. I've really heard very little except that everybody thought it was a disaster. The replacement was a disaster.

W. Oh, the replacement was a disaster, but the event leading up to it.

B. I don't know anything really about what happened.

W. Well, Jim Sparling, as he got older, and he was then in his late sixties I guess, you could check that date, I'm not sure: Although his personality didn't change all that much he

became somewhat more irritable than he used to be, somewhat more set in his ways. On several occasions when he made a proposal to the Board and they didn't immediately "buy it", he would make a statement, and you could just see his chest expand as he spoke. He would say, "You gentlemen better remember you're not going to have this president to kick around forever." Or, "I'm not going to be here very long," things of that sort. I suspect most good politicians would never make this kind of statement.

I was an elected faculty representative on the Board and I so well remember an incident which Jim believed was all planned and that there was collusion of some sort. I don't really believe this, I think on that subject he was "paranoid." What happened is that one day Mr. Sparling said at a Board meeting, "Well, I'm not going to stay in this job much longer." I don't think he meant it but he had said it one time too many. Harland Allen was sitting in the chair (and I don't think there was any great love lost between them but I think they were in many ways very similar people) at the time. Harland Allen came out of South Dakota Wesleyan, didn't smoke, didn't drink and had strong and Puritan feelings. Harland Allen said, "Jim, do you really mean that?" Now that's the worst thing ever to have asked Jim Sparling because if you asked Jim Sparling do you really mean that, he had no alternative but to say, of course. You see, he was not the type of person to hesitate. You know maybe that's both a strength and a weakness. If you asked me

do I really mean this or that, chances are I'll say well, yes, I mean it, but I'll sort of hedge and contemplate. Well, Jim couldn't do that so he said, "Of course I mean it." And Harland Allen said, "Well, in that case I think it would be in order to have a motion for the establishment of a committee to start looking for a successor." Well, Jim couldn't bring himself to say well, I really didn't mean it. And lo and behold within a few minutes the motion was passed and Lyle Spencer was appointed on the spot, by the chairman, to be chairman of a committee to be formed.

B. I don't think I ever heard that at all, how he left.

W. The way he left is that he, himself, said he wanted to retire. But he said it in a context where I am convinced -- if you asked him years later, even then he would have said, yes I meant it. I am just as certain as can be that he didn't really mean it. What he hoped, I think, is that somebody would say, oh, we can't do without you, please stay on. And that didn't happen. So what happened then is that a committee was set up by Lyle Spencer. Now Lyle Spencer had been a Board member throughout most of the history of the university. Most of the time he had not been very active. By that time he'd already become a very wealthy man. He was really interested in Roosevelt and he was, I think, an individual who really was concerned about inner city education. He was concerned with education generally. He had high standards. He was quite an intellectual. He was a tough cookie, however, and he was not just an idealist in the Jim

Sparling sense. I'm not saying that he didn't have ideals but he was a very pragmatic and scholarly individual who had all but his Ph.D. dissertation in Sociology from the University of Chicago. Well, the committee consisted mainly of Board members from Roosevelt, including a couple of faculty members, of which I was one. And it had a number of leading citizens from the community from outside the university, including Professor Hauser from the University of Chicago. It was a good committee and they went to work to look for a successor. I was elected secretary of the committee. The job of secretary of the committee was literally what secretaries normally do. I kept the files, I cleared via telephone meeting times, etc.

I almost resigned from this committee because of what happened one day when I got a call from Jim Sparling. I felt a certain loyalty to Jim because I was hired by Jim and I got my-deanship while Jim was president. I was in a real conflict of interest situation because the activities of the committee were, after all, if not secret at least confidential. Jim called me and he wanted me to give him a sort of blow-by-blow account of what was going on. I remember very well sitting in Jim's office, then half the saize that it is now. Jim would never have an office like this and I would never have built a big office like this either.

B. Mr. Pitchell's contribution?

W. That was hig greatest contribution, and I'm delighted

because I would never have had the guts to spend the money to rebuild the office. But anyway, Jim called me up and he wanted to know all of these things and I said, "Jim, you're putting me in a very difficult situation. If you think it is a bad thing for me to be on that committee, I'll be very glad to resign as secretary of the committee. I certainly didn't look for that job. I would be very happy to talk to the chairman and ask him to keep you informed as to what is going on. I think it would be quite appropriate if he did that, but I think it would be very inappropriate for me."

Well, Jim was glaring at me. He was very angry. And although today I think Jim and I are good friends, I think at that time he really believed that I was part of this "conspiracy" with Harland Allen and Lyle Spencer and I can assure you nothing could be further from the truth. I knew absolutely nothing about it. I was just an ordinary faculty member and they really wouldn't even have confided -in me at the time. Jim said, "No, I don't want you to do that." I did talk to Lyle Spencer and he said, "Okay, I know what you're asking me. You're asking me to keep Jim's paranoia under control and I'll do that." So I think Lyle did periodically meet with Jim. But it was a very difficult period because Jim, on the one hand, recognized that he was getting older. He was in his late sixties," he recognized that retirement was something that was inevitable somewhere along the line but he somehow thought that it would never come in this fashion. So I think he was a very bitter man at the time.

Then a number of people were brought in and the job was offered to two other candidates before it was offered to Pitchell. Neither of the others took it. One of them, Werner Baum, later became President of the University of Rhode Island and still later Chancellor of the University of Wisconsin, Milwaukee. And the other one, Rhoten Smith, at that time was Dean at Temple University. He later became President of Northern Illinois and still later Vice Chancellor at the University of Pittsburgh. The third choice was Robert Pitchell.

In view of the fact that I was secretary I was certainly privy to all the official correspondence. I can tell you that ever since that presidential search I have not trusted letters of recommendation. Pitchell received magnificent letters and the two main references that supported him were Senator Birch Bayh- Pitchell had been administrative assistant to Birch Bayh and the second was the then President of Indiana University, Herman Wells. Superb recommendations! Lyle Spencer told us later that he found out Herman Wells hardly knew him, but that one of his administrative assistants had written a letter and had talked to Wells about Pitchell and that Wells had signed this letter, based on his assistant's judgment.

Pitchell came here like a whirlwind and I guess he made not just one mistake or two or three. He made every mistake that you can make when you move into a new job. He came in with two assistants from the outside. He should have taken somebody from the institution to advise him at least in the

beginning. Before he ever set foot on this place he had instructions out. He took the manual, the faculty manual of Indiana University, and put somebody to work to change "Indiana" to "Roosevelt" which resulted in such ridiculous things as: "Any travel outside the corporate limits of Chicago requires permission of the President's Office." It was a silly mistake but it was foolish to have done that sort of thing and resulted in much ridicule.

He devoted most of his time during the first months to amenities, both personal and official. For example, he objected to the fact that there was only a single door to the president's office. He had the wall knocked out and double doors built. There were no double doors before; all the doors were the same.

The crisis was complicated by the fact that during the last two years of President Sparling's tenure we ran big deficits. One of the things that happened in the Budget Committee was that there were certain faculty members on the Budget Committee (one of them was Professor Bernard Greenberg of the Biology Department who influenced Mr. Sparling through flattery. I can remember some of the old Budget Committee meetings where I've been on both sides, administration and faculty (by election). Of course, the elected faculty members bargain primarily for higher salaries. It's basically a non-union bargaining committee and the technique which Greenberg had found to be most effective of all with Jim was that he would say, "But listen, Jim, if we

all work with you we know that you can raise the money." And this appealed to Jim's vanity, it invariably worked. But what they would do is simply write up the fund raising expectations even though it was impossible to make the goal. So Jim Sparling ran for two years into large deficits and then Pitchell came in and he ran the largest of three successive deficits. So finances for three years were very bad. There was something like an \$850,000.00 accumulated deficit by the beginning of 1965. Moreover, Roosevelt University had neither a substantial endowment or significant reserves .

Pitchell rebuilt his office completely and that was not cheap. He got the university to buy him an apartment, a magnificent apartment in Hyde Park at 4950 Chicago Beach Drive. He had our physical plant staff out there completely remodeling their kitchen. He built himself a bedroom that became the laughing stock of all of us because he decided that he had to have bed that was raised at least one foot off the ground and covered by one of those blue canopies, you know, like royalty.

The man developed "megalomania." It was just obvious to everyone. He used Mary Sonoda as a baby sitter and demoted her because Mary had some loyalty to Jim Sparling and maybe did occasionally say things she shouldn't have said for her own good. There was another lady in the president's office with the name of Jerry Trammell, a black lady, very competent, as competent as Mary. They were both very competent people. He

promoted her over Mary and then he rewarded her in special ways because of her loyalty to him. He bought this Mrs. Trammell the most gorgeous watch necklace, which he bought with university money.

He engaged in a lot of financial improprieties and after about four months on the premises the deans decided that we just weren't going to go on like that. We were prepared to "lay our jobs on the line." We went through channels, i. e. through the president, and we requested a meeting with the Board of Trustees after we had tried many times to get him to be reasonable. For example, with regard to salary increases, he rode roughshod over recommendations from departments. He had his own rating scale which was done mainly by his own assistant, a fellow by the name of Kraus. The ratings depended essentially on who his friends and his enemies were and the favoritism got pretty bad. But I will have to say to you that I think all of us deans might have lost our jobs and I think the Board probably would have supported Pitchell anyway if it hadn't been for the financial mismanagement. That's what gets presidents into trouble more than anything else. The fact that the deficit was growing like mad, that he wasn't putting in financial controls and that he, among other things, borrowed money from the Board chairman and had trouble repaying it because he had to have more money in order to live in the style that he thought a president ought to live in, that brought about his downfall. He would also make expense requests to the Controller, and the Controller, Melvin

Tract reluctantly and under duress went along with many of the early improprieties.

Finally, the Controller was beginning to get worried about what might happen and at one point said he couldn't do this or that and at that point Pitchell fired him on the spot. Tracht later became Vice President and Controller of IIT and had a fine reputation. Among the things Pitchell did in order to raise cash for himself was the sale of his private automobile to the university and he set the price himself. In order to save sales tax he would make personal purchases through the university, things of that sort. And that was really, in the end, his downfall. The fact that he was dictatorial and not attuned to the Roosevelt University frugality and mystique didn't matter to the Board, but by the middle of the year, by the summer of 1964 I think the Board had pretty much decided they had to get rid of him.

They didn't want to create an immediate crisis and, they didn't want a scandal, so they did a peculiar thing which anybody other than Pitchell would have taken as an indication that he should resign. They called him in and they told him that he should devote his time exclusively to fund raising and that the Administrative Council should elect a chairman and this Administrative Council, under its chairman, should run the internal affairs of the university and that Pitchell should inform the Council of anything he wanted to do and the Council

in turn, should inform him of their actions and if, the two would agree, then the appropriate action would be taken and if they didn't agree the matter would be passed on to the Board. Well, on the face of it, that couldn't work. I was selected Chairman of the Council and had the impossible liaison responsibility.

B. Did he agree to that?

W. Reluctantly. The alternative was to resign and that he didn't want to do even though he had been administratively emasculated. At that point things were really going downhill. For example, he had been hired with all of us believing that he was a non-practicing Catholic married to a Jewish woman. But when things started falling apart, Miss Sonoda tells me that he had a priest in his office once a week for reassurance and for help. When things got very bad he had himself hospitalized at Michael Reese Hospital and one could only see him by special appointment.

Finally, the Board decided that this was an untenable situation and on the 30th of December, 1964 Lyle Spencer called and asked me to come to his office. He said, "Look, we can't go on this way. We're going to have to get a new president and I have to have an interim solution. I'm going to ask Pitchell to resign and I want you to serve as acting president provided that we have a clear understanding that you will not seek the presidency. We will have a new search and look for a new president." They they searched for Pitchell to tell him they

wanted him to resign and they couldn't find him. He was on a retreat somewhere in Arizona. So on December 31 there was a special Board meeting at the Mid-America Club which was located in the Prudential Building at that time and the press was called in. Lyle Spencer announced that I would be serving as acting-- president and a new Search Committee would be appointed to search for a president. That was on New Year's Eve 1964 and I remember going to a New Year's Eve party that night and I remember turning on the news and seeing the press conference on the tube.

The year and a half that followed was really a very difficult period because I also had a deanship responsibility in the institution. I had appointed Dick Thain acting dean for the period of my acting presidency and I had hoped that they would make a quick search and get the thing over with and so did Dick Thain. One of the unfortunate things was that after about nine months Thain arrived at the conclusion that: . A. I would not be the president, and B. They would drag this thing out, and so he quit and went to the University of Chicago where he has been Associate Dean of Students in the School of Business for years now. He was a very good man. I saw this sort of thing happening: Everybody was "acting," I couldn't appoint anybody on a permanent basis and there was really no progress but a "holding action." They weren't really looking actively for a president.

Then one day I heard there was a meeting of the Search

Committee. Bob Runo, a political science professor, was on the Search Committee and somebody quoted Bob Runo as having made a statement at the committee that went something like this, "Well, shucks, why should we bother looking for a president? Things are going along pretty well and when we find somebody that's better than Weil, then we'll just replace him at that time."

I decided I'm not going to stay on on that basis. So I communicated with the Chairman of the Board and I said, "I'd like to have a deadline set for the selection of a president; I have no intention of staying on as acting president forever and I would like at an early date to return to my deanship." Well, at that point they decided to interview, I think, two more people. One of these persons became president of one of the New York State universities later and he had been, I think, head of the Peace Corps at one time. Another candidate they considered was Philip Mullenbach who was and still is on our Board. Finally, they decided that they would ask me to serve as president and when we continue the story you must remind me to tell you about the lecture I got from Lyle Spencer about not starting the job with a chip on my shoulder. I'll have to tell you that because it's a revealing story.

W. The fifth Chairman of the Board of Roosevelt University was Lyle Spencer. Just for the record the first chairman was Edwin Embree, who headed the Rosenwald Fund, then Harold Ickes, then Leo Lerner, then Harland Allen, and the fifth one was

Lyle Spencer. Lyle Spencer was a very interesting and somewhat complex individual. He was both an intellectual, in the truest sense of the word. He was well read in the literature of the social sciences and psychology. He had worked on his Ph.D. in Sociology and simply by an accident of circumstance, I think, he had got into business and, of course, became an extremely wealthy business man who headed Science Research Associates, a company that was primarily interested in testing, and testing became the fad of the land after World War II. He had developed his interest in testing primarily through his war time service when he was in the Air Corps and worked primarily with the Menningers. They were at that time testing pilots to see if they were the type that would crack up under the stress of battle. Of course, SRA took some of the techniques they learned during the war and after World War II everyone knows educational testing boomed. There was a test for everything. Lyle Spencer eventually sold his business to IBM, became a board member of IBM and the second largest stockholder of IBM. In the all too short period that he was a Board Chairman of Roosevelt, he became a major contributor to the institution both in terms of money and in terms of influence that he had on the administration and the direction of Roosevelt University.

He was a very strong type of individual and he was a man who could be very congenial but you also knew darn well that he was as hard as a rock, that you'd better not cross him. In

fact, if he "wrote you off", you were totally cut off and I know some people who were in that position. Lyle asked me to serve as acting president in December 1964 (You recall that he had been Chairman of the Selection Committee that picked Pitchell and he felt very guilty about having made the wrong choice) with the understanding that I would not seek the presidency. He also said, however, "I want you as acting president to behave exactly as you would if you were president." And he said, "Always remember that I have just a few rules that I tell all my executives in my company and that I want you to abide by. No. 1. Don't ever let me get caught by surprise. No. 2. If a major decision has to be made, I want to know what alternative policies you are considering. Tell me which policy you intend to pursue and then make it come out right." Those were my instructions.

B.. Sounds hard.

w. I may say that I later added two others, one of my own and one that came from another trustee. The third one-is: "Don't make any promises you can't keep", violation of which rule, is one of the easiest ways to get into trouble. The fourth one came from Charlie Davison, a former Roosevelt University trustee who used to be with Peat, Marwick and Mitchell, and his rule was: "Remember you get paid to take all the s-h-i-t." Those are four principles of management which actually are fairly valid.

When Lyle asked me to come over to his office and to assume

the acting presidency, one of the things he said was, "Now I want you to belong to an appropriate club," and he said the University Club would be a suitable club for me to join. I said, "Well, Lyle, I just want you to know that I'm Jewish and from what I hear this may be a problem in getting a membership in the University Club." And he glared at me and said, "Now don't you start out with a chip on your shoulder. That's just utter nonsense." I said, "Well, fine. I don't want you to think for one moment that I have a chip on my shoulder. If you can get me a membership in the University Club, I'll be very happy to join." He said, "I'll take care of it."

Well, weeks and weeks passed and I didn't hear about it, so one day I went over to the office and I spoke to Marion Faldet, who is now a vice president of the Spencer Foundation, and I said, "Marion, what ever happened?" And she said, "Oh, it was just too much red tape and Lyle just decided it wasn't worth pursuing any further." And I said, "Well, that's all right with me." Of course, I had come to the conclusion myself that undoubtedly he ran into an obstacle and he just decided to give up.

A few years later Wendell Arnold, our Vice President for Development at Roosevelt University, came to me. (He had not been with the university at the time of the first University Club incident.) He said, "You know, I think it's wrong that every time we have a fund raising meeting we have to have it

at the Standard Club" (a Jewish club). "After all, we're not a Jewish university, we're non-sectarian. The university really ought to get you a membership in a non-sectarian club." I said, "Wendell, don't even talk to me about it. If anybody wants to get me a membership in some other club, it's all right with me, but I'm not going to lift a finger to accomplish it."

Well, he at that time then talked to a trustee by the name of Ed Peske, who was a vice president of Illinois Bell Telephone, and Brandel Works, who was a member of our faculty, and they were both members of the University Club. I will say that possibly because a few years had passed which changed attitudes a bit and possibly because Peske made up his mind that they were either going to take me or he was going to blast the University Club (That was before he retired from Illinois Bell). I got a call one day asking if I could come over and meet with the Membership Committee of then University Club.

The first statement that the Chairman of the Membership Committee made was, "By the way, we want you to know that this club has never discriminated." And I thought to myself that this was subtle evidence of discrimination. When someone tells you that they have never discriminated, you know that there are some guilt feelings in this regard. But, be that as it may, I looked over the list of the membership at that time and I didn't find a single name that sounded Jewish, which doesn't mean that that might not have been an ethnically Jewish person in the club.

I remember an incident which is just a part of my increasing skepticism about the liberal community which I alluded to, I think , in our previous session. After I was admitted to the club, I decided that I might as well swim in the club one day and I went swimming. When I was ready to get dressed, I heard in the shower room a voice that I knew and I will not identify the individual but I want you to know that it was a leading liberal in the community, a person who, if it had been a matter of voting on my admission, would have unquestionably voted for my admission, a New Deal liberal by any measure or standard you wish to use. So I decided to go over and say "hello" to this individual and at the top of his voice so that everybody in the locker room turned around, he said to me, meaning no harm, I'm sure, "Don't tell me they let you into this club!" To me that is just an indication of the deeply ingrained prejudices that exist in our society even among those who are great liberals. This was not Adlai Stevenson, I want you to know, but it could have very well fitted that kind of individual, that is, people who in their own personal thinking are very different from their public pronouncements.

Well, one of the tasks that was given to me by Lyle Spencer, and it was given to me explicitly and implicitly in many, many ways, was along the following lines: "No. 1. Roosevelt University exists to provide upward mobility opportunity." Those were Lyle's words exactly. "We've got a role to play to maintain the social stability in Chicago. The fact that Roosevelt

has attracted a lot of Black students, that's a good thing. Non-discrimination, that's the role you've got to play. You can provide the business community with the rationale why this is important to them. Businessmen give to institutions because they believe that what you do will, in fact, contribute to the stability of the community. You've got to change from what Jim Sparling has done, which has been going around scolding businessmen. You've got to stick by the basic principles of non-discrimination, providing upward mobility education, but you must convince the business community, (otherwise this institution will not survive) that what you do (A) will save them money, and (B) will save them trouble." And I must say I had no reservations, really, about doing that. In fact, I became -increasingly convinced that if you appeal to businessmen's self-interest you can accomplish the objectives of an institution like Roosevelt. Granted there were some people still in the business community who wouldn't even talk to me and who felt that Roosevelt was some ultra-radical institution, and there were people 'who still harbored basic racial and ethnic prejudices, but the overwhelming majority of the business leadership, even though in their social lives and in their private lives maybe wouldn't want to associate with Jews or Blacks or "do-gooders" or whatever they called them. I think they were able to understand that an institution like Roosevelt was an anchor at the south end of the Loop and helped in mitigating the increasing racial conflict

that was developing at that very time.

Remember, we're talking about the sixties and you've got the mixture of the remnants of the Civil Rights struggle, which had reached its peak in the fifties, and the new youth revolt and the problems that arose out of the Korean and Vietnamese War. So my major task in the sixties to which I had to give all the vigor at my disposal, was to try to convince people that Roosevelt University was not an institution which was agitating for the overthrow of the government (ridiculous as such perceptions were), that the faculty was dedicated primarily to teaching the truth as they saw it, that we had a great range of opinions, on campus and that although we had some faculty members whose views may have been left-wing, we were really very much like any other institution. And I have to say that I took pride in having changed the attitude of the corporate world vis-a-vis Roosevelt University. When I became president the university had very minimal-support from the business community. I think I succeeded in turning attitudes around without at any time or in any way compromising any of the principles that I fundamentally believed in: i. e., non-discrimination, the upward mobility role and the academic freedom concept.

B. Was this a very major part of your job -- to get money?

W. Oh yes, it always has been. One of the difficulties of being President of Roosevelt University is that you have a

terrific problem in time allocation, because on the one hand the institution has always been a shoestring operation financially, so you're hard pressed to raise money. And at the same time that you have financial problems, the very democratic structure of the university is very time-consuming. I'm sure that most of the faculty never really quite understand that. Certainly Jim Sparling, my predecessor, and I would have loved nothing better than to spend all of our time consulting with faculty members on every issue but you're just running out of time. And it's just absolutely impossible to do all the things you have to do and to do them well and also to have frequent meetings. It's a terrible problem and so what you have to have at Roosevelt to a very large extent is someone who performs some of that internal political function for you and that's a very, very difficult one. It's not easy.

Well, my terrible test, and in a way both the highlight and great tragedy of my presidential career, was the period from 1967-1969. At that time I was trying to put the university on a financially viable basis. Remember, when I came into this office there was an accumulated deficit of \$800,000. One of the first things I had to do after I became president was to go with Lyle Spencer to the American National Bank and literally plead to get the money that we needed to meet the payroll. It was that bad! We were just absolutely strapped. So here I was under the injunction to "turn things around."

The words Lyle used were, "I want to insure the fiscal integrity of the institution." Two of his favorite phrases were "upward mobility" and "fiscal integrity." I was trying very hard to accomplish that objective and by about 1967, in fact, I had gotten to the point where we had no accumulated deficit any more. And I might say we haven't had one since. I'm very proud of that. But along came the student unrest of the years 1967 to 1969.

B. Was this the first time you had student problems?

W. Yes, there were three years in particular. Oh, I guess there are always small problems in an institution but no major ones. But '67 and '69 were different. It started in '67 and in that year it was over the ranking issue. Now mind you the draft had started and the government instituted a policy which, from the very beginning, I considered totally insane myself, namely a policy of ranking students so that those who ranked low in terms of grades would get drafted and those that ranked very high would not get drafted. Thus we got into this foolish business of women saying, "Let's not get good grades, otherwise we force a man to die," and all that kind of stuff. The pressure began to build. Demands were made. This was the period when the practice of making the so-called non-negotiable demands started. One non-negotiable demand in 1967 was that we would cease ranking. Now the leadership was purely a left wing radical leadership which included a minority, but a very

clever minority, of people that were clearly communists of various shades. We had many meetings about this. I had, in fact, interceded in many, many ways.

B. Let me ask you something. It must be up to the administration of the university to make the ranking. Were the teachers --

W. Oh sure, the registrar's office did the ranking and I can tell you there wasn't a soul in the administration that liked the thing. Most university presidents didn't like it but the dilemma you were in was that most students wanted to be ranked because they wanted to stay out of the war if they could and they didn't want to be drafted. The hypocrisy of it all which turned me off, was the fact that we had many cases of students who would "sit in" because I wasn't willing to stop the ranking but then would at the same time go to the registrar's office and apply for ranking. In other words, what they wanted us to do was to become a political tool to accomplish their objectives, and in the process we would have destroyed the institution, as I see it, because we would have lost all the students who wanted to be ranked. Probably ninety percent of all the students were not politically involved. All they were interested in was staying out of the draft. And a small number that had a political agenda themselves were hypocrites, because they themselves would have been among those who would have left Roosevelt University if we had not ranked. Then they would have started the agitation at another institution. This

was just the beginning of the attempt on the part of people with various motivations, (some of them may have been idealists), others, I think, were simply political functionaries) to use the university as a political tool. My great disillusionment was that some of my best friends in the university on the faculty, and in those days I had just come out of the faculty and had a lot of good friends, when I found that some of them were supporting these things and didn't even want to understand the problems of an administration that was simply trying to let the institution survive, it was a very trying, very difficult thing and one that really was a blow to me psychologically.

This unrest became accentuated in the following year over an issue which, of course, you're well aware of because it centered on your department (History) which was the Staughton Lynd affair.

B. I remember that.

W. And the Staughton Lynd affair, the full story of which will probably not be told until Staughton Lynd is gone

B: I was hoping you might be able to tell

W. Well, I will tell you some of it because the papers are here and will be preserved. I realize that you'd like me to spill all the beans but I will tell you the essential parts.

B. Withing your own good judgment.

W. There was never any question about Staughton Lynd's credentials, but there was a little history about Staughton Lynd,

which I might say I might not have known had not something occurred which tipped me off from the very beginning. In fact, I have to tell you that I knew nothing about Staughton Lynd when the name first came up, and I wasn't fully aware of what was going on. The first experience I had was that George Watson, who was then Dean of Arts and Sciences, invited me to a meal at his house with Staughton Lynd. Staughton Lynd, as you may know, was a Quaker and so was George Watson. (So was Richard Nixon. Quakers come, I suppose, in all sizes and shapes.) I must say I find it very difficult to be sympathetic to some of the ambivalence which some Quakers (such as George Watson) seem to be particularly susceptible to. But George Watson just wanted me to meet this nice man whose wife was a graduate of Roosevelt and Staughton Lynd had worked in the library, and I thought that was very nice. We had a very pleasant conversation and all that. But then one day I received a visit from Dick Hooker and Jack Roth (both professors of history) and at that point they were very friendly and they thought I was going to be a pushover in this situation. What they said to me was that Staughton Lynd was going to apply for a position here and this poor man had been so mistreated at Yale and at Chicago State and the University of Chicago, and he needed a position in Chicago. They were going to recommend him and they wanted to warn me that if I turned the appointment down all hell would break loose. That is what got the thing started,

because if there is one thing that makes me immediately suspicious, it's if somebody says you'd better hire somebody or else ! Then I decided, well -- normally I just look at the credentials and with regard to most of the appointments here I feel I'm almost a rubber stamp. But that incident really bothered me. It deviated completely from all past patterns. No application for a position is ever handled that way normally. The department meets the person, so does the dean, and then the thing comes up and it's usually relatively routine. But here, you know, it was like a red flag. Somebody says this person is a candidate and if you don't hire him something's going to happen.

So I decided I better find out who this Staughton Lynd is and I started looking into it. And before long I found out that he didn't get tenure at Yale, that he'd gone to North Viet Nam and broadcast from North Viet Nam, anti-American propaganda, that he had applied at Chicago State and the then president, a fellow by the name of Milton Byrd, had given him a letter assuring him of an appointment on the recommendation of the History Department. Byrd was a new president and didn't know that he had to get approval from the Board in a state institution and then the Board reversed him and then Staughton Lynd sued them and they had to make an out of court settlement.

I found out that he had made an application at the University of Chicago for a position -- all before he applied

at Roosevelt University. At the University of Chicago there was a "sit-in" in Cobb Hall and he was reported to have gone out there and he told the students assembled there that the University of Chicago doesn't believe in academic freedom and, I'll prove it to you, because my-support of your sitting in and forcing this administration to take a position against the war will result in their not giving me an appointment." And, of course, it was a self-fulfilling prophecy. There was a professor at the University of Chicago who was also a Quaker and who initially supported Staughton Lynd and then said, "I don't support him anymore." so they turned him down. He tried Loyola and the University of Illinois and got turned down everywhere. Well, at that point I was beginning to wonder and I started checking more.

Then I found out there was a paper which was published at Columbia University about Staughton Lynd at Yale and which was, in fact, written by two members of the Yale History faculty. In this-paper they pointed out some of the very negative aspects about Staughton Lynd and how, in fact, one of his major interests was the use of a university for his political objectives rather than simply teaching. Then I decided to still further investigate the situation. I found out, obviously on a confidential basis, that he had very serious problems, that he'd been an adopted child and never got along with the senior Lynds. You know that he was an adopted child of the "Middletown" Lynds.

That's all irrelevant and hearsay. Each item by itself is irrelevant but the total combination made me decide, My God, I don't have to get myself into that kind of a situation, which I thought was simply doing my job as I saw it and it was very different from interfering with the academic freedom of a professor, something I have never done and never would do because I believe very strongly in academic freedom and I don't care whether a professor has ultra-radical ideas or not. That's irrelevant, but I think at the time of appointment I have a responsibility to make certain that the person is at least reasonably well adjusted to the academic environment, not somebody that goes around creating trouble.

I also found out that he had sued a school in North Carolina as I recall it. He seemed to have made a practice of suing. I decided I needed that like a hole in the head. In addition to that, by that time the whole business had gotten into the newspapers and, had I gone ahead with this appointment, there would have been real repercussions public relations wise. Well, I tried to reason with a lot of people and this is where my great disillusionment came in. But people like Dick Hooker and Jack Roth, who I thought would at least understand that there are some situations where to do what they wanted to do was simply going to be damaging to the institution, simply did not want to understand.

And lo and behold, almost overnight groups to defend Staughton Lynd appeared and I received a letter from a new

organization entitled Professors for Academic Freedom in Illinois and I would be visited by them. I'd get telegrams and I would first avoid seeing them. When I did see them, I faced a very nasty situation where people in this President's Office would be impolite, aggressive, and threatening. And I thought to myself, My G-d, these are people that always talked democracy and freedom and here if they don't agree with you, they will not give you the right to hold a different view and threaten you instead. They ranged from instantly created committees on "civil liberties", to established organizations such as the American Civil Liberties Union and the AAUP as a result of complaints by the partisans.

I spent endless hours making sure that these organizations wouldn't back the opposition but that they would come out on my side. In the end they did, but these things don't just happen. You have to have some friends-that will work-for you. In fact, when the AAUP sent in people I shared with them, on a confidential basis (and I have to say, to their credit and at that time I was becoming very suspicious of outside organizations because I'd felt betrayed by so many) the evidence I had and I said it's my responsibility to make faculty selections and I may be wrong at times but I'm going to do what I think is right and I'm not going to be threatened. I had literally an outline, day by day, of things that groups supporting Lynd were going to do if I didn't approve of Lynd's appointment. It was literally spelled out, all the escalation from day to

day. I just couldn't believe it.

B. Was this from the organizations or from the students?

W. From various organizations, from student groups. There was even a maniac rabbi, who was- Rabbi of Solel. Temple by the name of Arnie Wolf, a man who in my judgment has a serious psychological problem, and who came in here and started waving his finger in my face. And he said, "I wouldn't be here telling the students to go on with their sit-in if you weren't Jewish, but as a Jew you have a special responsibility." I said, "What's Judaism got to do with it?" And he said, "I would rather see Roosevelt University destroyed than Staughton Lynd not being appointed," which resulted in an editorial in the Chicago Tribune called "The Destroyers" because he made the statement over and over again. All the big guns were brought in here,

B. What about the Civil Liberties Union? Did you say they sent somebody?

W. No, the American Civil Liberties Union had a meeting on the Lynd case and there were several people who helped me a great deal who were then involved with the Civil Liberties Union. One was Mick Shufro. The other was a man by the name of Sam Sherwin, a University of Chicago graduate who is now in the real estate business in Evanston. All sorts of friends sort of developed within the community: there were people who, in fact, said this revolt at Roosevelt University is just

outrageous. Some of them threatened to resign from Temple Solel over the issue. I had a lot of support in the academic community. I got a lot of support from people at the University of Chicago who knew the whole story of what had happened out there. In fact, one of the University of Chicago professors and Nobel Laureate, George Stigler, came over here while the sit-in was going on and stepped over all the people who were sitting-in and brought me a bottle of champagne in the middle of all this. Of course, I got the unsolicited support from some of the people on the right wing politically in this thing and you know it created a terrible dilemma because on the one hand I was looking for whatever support I could get, but at the same time it's an unfortunate situation when the people you considered your friends betray you and sometimes you get friends that you hadn't really looked for.

Then-there was this awful problem about what you do with students that don't want to leave the building. There was this whole issue about the sit-ins, that they wanted to stay all night. We finally decided that at a certain time each night we were going to clear the building and those who weren't going to leave were going to get arrested. Now we did that because I had evidence, and let me tell you that in spite of the fact that nowadays people talk about the "red squad" and the FBI's involvement, I can only tell you at that time I was sort of pleased that they did what they did because I used to get phone calls even in the middle of the night telling me

what was going to happen the next, day. And, of course, this was possible because they tapped phones and so forth. And I knew that people from as far as California were coming to help organize things at Roosevelt University. All that happened and the reason I know that they must have had inside information, either by infiltration or whatever, is because whatever they told me on the phone, in fact, did happen. One of the bits of information I got was that if they stay in the building during the night, they will barricade the doors downstairs and there will be no classes in the morning That was going -to shut -down the university. And frankly; I was convinced then and I'm convinced now that it would have destroyed the institution.

B. It seems that I recall they were allowed to stay all night one time with faculty supervision.

W. Yes, there was one time that we allowed them to stay all night, a small number under faculty supervision in a designated area. We wouldn't permit them to take over the fund raising area because the rumor was that they were going to destroy the files. There were a variety of people who got themselves arrested. There was one fellow who got arrested who I remember was constantly on his knees praying to G-d. And I spend endless hours trying to convince him to go home. You know, in a situation like this, you get a whole variety of people involved for a whole variety of reasons.

Well, I discovered that all the things I had been told about what the ultra-left wing will do were true. For example,

the people who got arrested were almost never the ring leaders. They always disappeared. They always organized things, they' always decided, they voted on who-was going to get arrested on a given night, but the key leaders always disappeared. One of the supposedly key leaders, to my great dismay, teaches part-time at Roosevelt, and as far as I'm concerned I have restrained myself over the years not to make an issue of it because it would just play into their hands.

Be that as it may, my concern was not whether people were for or against the Viet Nam War. I didn't care what positions people would take, but a fundamental principle was at the bottom of my position. We got out a statement, which is in the Archives and which you can check, called "Freedom of Expression", and it's a statement which I think is of fundamental significance and it's one that I hope Roosevelt University will always stand by. What it said, essentially, was that anybody can say anything, write anything, have a meeting on anything, represent any point of view, but no one has the right to impose their positions, their values on other people by force and say unless you do this or that we will shut down the institution. The freedom of the university is really the fundamental issue and it must always take precedence.

The interesting thing is that on the Staughton Lynd issue, and I'm only giving you the surface manifestations, I soon discovered that the student leadership and the outside leadership (and there were outsiders in it were not really terribly

interested in Staughton Lynd. They were much more interested in using the University for their political objectives. I tried to negotiate an agreement to stop the sit-in. And you know all sorts of other things came up -- freedom, participatory democracy, educational reform and all sorts of glittering generalities. Well, we worked out a compromise and the students voted to accept it. And that's when Rabbi Wolf and others came in and told the students it would be better for Roosevelt University to be destroyed than for them to give up on Staughton Lynd. But they were perfectly willing to "sell Staughton Lynd down the river." That was obvious. Well, in the final analysis we had no agreement. It just fizzled out.

B. What happened? Spring came?

W. Spring came to an end and it just fizzled out. It was a very, very traumatic experience, only possibly exceeded by the one that followed it. It was personally very, very difficult for me and it went on for another year or two with the AAUP and the American Civil Liberties Union continuing investigations of the whole thing. Finally it got dropped, And, as I say, I had help from some faculty members here and from some people from the outside. It involved conversations with Brewster at Yale, who wasn't terribly helpful, and people at Chicago. Brewster -- a typical comment from Brewster was, "Well, he wasn't good enough for Yale, but he might be good enough for Roosevelt," or something like that, It endeared Brewster to me forever.

I must make a comment about George Watson. George Watson had recommended Staughton Lynd's appointment and he was in on it with the History Department from the beginning. "Otto Wirth recommended negatively and I made the negative decision. Then George Watson, in typical George Watson fashion which he tried to explain to me in terms of his Quakerism, he said that he had to act on the basis of his conscience and his conscience on the one hand dictated that he support Staughton Lynd because he was a pacifist and a person who believed in the same principles that he did. On the other hand, he felt that I was completely, within my right in denying the appointment. I remember saying one time to George Watson, "With friends like you I really don't need any enemies." In other words his conscience dictated that he should recommend Lynd. On the other hand, he considered it his responsibility to try to explain to the faculty and the AAUP and the Civil Liberties Union, which he did, that I was really right from an administration point of view. In his judgment I made the right decision for the wrong reasons. That was really obtuse as far as I was concerned.

1969 was the last of the three sit-ins and-the '69 one was the most threatening one physically. 1968 was probably the one that was hardest on me intellectually. But in '69 it was the Black Panthers that led the thing. It was over Black Studies and they disrupted classes. They disrupted classes taught by people like Ric Pasta because he, a white man was married to a black woman and they called that a "throw-back to slavery."

In the case of St. Clair Drake, the comment was he "talks black" but he "sleeps white." Drake was married to a white woman. Bob people, especially Pasca, had their classes disrupted. Whereas the first two sit-ins in 1967 and '68 were strictly "white" led and the blacks at that time stayed out of it, although there were constant attempts on the part of the left wing, especially in '68, with great mis-judgment by the way, to get blacks involved, the blacks stayed out of it. In '67 and '68 radical rhetoric also-kept talking about the down-trodden cafeteria employees and the down-trodden janitors. What the white radicals didn't realize is that they were all unionized and were doing pretty well. Our janitors aren't down-trodden at all. Things didn't come off at all, according to their plans, because they couldn't get the "workers" support to make this into a class struggle issue and a race issue. Much of the activity at Roosevelt University was of a "copy cat" nature and the rhetoric was not readily transferable from other institutions.

in 1967 and '68, to the credit of the black students they stayed out of it. Then in '69 it was over the Black Studies issue and I would say that ninety percent of our black students weren't involved and couldn't care less. But then I get again non-negotiable demands.

One day there were just a few of us in the President's Office. It was the end of the Administrative Council meeting and a few were in the office, including Otto Wirth, our Academic

Vice President; Larry Silverman, Vice President for Student Services; myself; and I think Dan Perlman, Assistant to the President. The protestors marched on my office and they posted guards at every door and they came in with a document of demands and then they were talking about who was going to "take care of which one of us." You know, there was sort of a veiled threat about killing us and it was a very, very scary incident. I wanted to go to the telephone to call for help, and at that point, as I was walking from my conference table to my telephone, one of the guys rushed over and tore the telephone right out of its socket, threw it against the wall, and there's still a scratch there which you can see where the telephone hit the panelling. Fortunately, somebody in one of the neighboring offices had noticed what was going on and had called the police. All of a sudden one of the guards at the door shouted in, "He's called the pigs, he's called-the pigs, and they ran away.

During that period I was informed that I was on the Panther's execution list and for a whole week I had police protection. When I would walk out of the building there would be a plain clothes policeman going with me over to the El and then I'd go home and then there was a police car in our alley, until I finally told them, for G-d's sake, stop this nonsense. I came to the conclusion that if somebody really wanted to kill me the only advantage of the police protection would be that there'd be an immediate police report. A lot of good it would do, but these were scary incidents. I had young children at the time. It was

really a scary business and the demands were so totally unreasonable and we gave in on some of them.

B. I was going to say I thought we got a Black Studies program. What were they asking beyond that?

W. Well, they were asking for a bigger Black Studies program and finally got down to "bread and butter" issues, got down to money. It was really a demand for a budget for a Black Studies program with the right to spend the money any way they wanted to. It bordered on extortion.

B. You mean the students would run the program more or-less?'

W. It was left very vague. We never gave in on it --

B. you mean it never got that far.

Well, what we did is we made up, as part of the compromise at that time, a very substantial budget. We insisted it be spent on curriculum, but-it had -a category in there for lecturers. Fortunately, we succeeded in finding people on the faculty who were relatively level headed and it all died down. Sarah Woods was a great help at the time and she was very sensible. But I think the demand was clearly for a "pay-off." The people who came in here and threatened to hurt us were expelled from the university and that again started a major upheaval with all kinds of calls. "How can you throw these people out of school?" we were asked. And I said, "Because they threatened to kill some of us." To which some of my dear liberal friends on this faculty said, "You don't understand the rhetoric. When they

say kill, they don't mean it." I said, "Thank you very much. You might not feel that way if somebody tells you they're going to kill you." 'You know, it's lovely to say that's only rhetoric and maybe it is and maybe it isn't but I think people ought to be careful not to say we will kill you.

Well, that was 1969 and as I say the years 1967 through '69 were an extremely tough period everywhere, but at Roosevelt it was a period when I think the very survival of the institution was at stake. Some people would say, "Oh, all he's trying to do is to play the role of the conservative or the reactionary," and in reality all I wanted to do was to keep this institution going, not to let it be used by people for what I thought was a totally destructive purpose. If we had surrendered to either the Black Panthers or to the Staughton Lynd group, I think we would have been labelled as an institution which in fact, was not going to serve academic freedom but was going to surrender to people of a particular ideology.

I could never understand why there wasn't really a groundswell of support for a position that was: yes, everybody has a right to say what they want; everybody has a right to be opposed to the Viet Nam War, to publish papers, to give lectures, to do anything, but nobody has a right to say that somebody who is of a different opinion cannot express it freely. We must recognize that a university should be non-political, except possibly in one situation, and that's been always my philosophy, namely, that if the main mission of the university

is threatened, such as if you had a Nazi type government that would not permit the faculty to teach the truth as they saw it, I think at that point a university has to fight. But at all other times the ideal university is one where you have every point of view represented. There is no such thing as totally objective teaching. Obviously, as a historian, you will understand history is viewed differently by different people and that's as it should be.

B. The best safeguard is to be sure you get a variety of people writing.

W. Anyway, I guess the thing that traumatized me more than anything else was that against my own will I was being cast in the role of some sort of a reactionary and that was very, very difficult.

Well, that ended that and then came, at the same time and in the seventies, the need to prepare for a whole change in the educational environment. The administration generally recognized that our days would be numbered with the coming of the University of Illinois into Chicago if we would continue to try to get primarily eighteen year olds. We had to go for the adult market and we made a strategic decision to enter the "adult" market and that was the origin of the Bachelor of General Studies program. Again, it wasn't an anti-Arts and Sciences movement at all, although some people interpreted it that way, but it was simply a way of trying to preserve the university and to package the curriculum differently. We

moved in that direction and we also developed the satellite campus concept. Many of the things we did were simply a way of making sure that the mission of the university was going to be a mission that could survive what was going to be a major demographic change in this community. And, of course, this trend continued into the eighties.

At the same time, during that period we had to go and do something about the Auditorium building. It was falling apart, the heating system was falling apart, the plumbing system was falling apart. So we went out and raised money and we spent millions of dollars in the seventies and the early eighties refurbishing the building and re-doing our whole heating system; putting air conditioning on the Michigan side of the building and remodeling it. We got the largest gifts in the history of the university from the Heller Foundation which added up to about three million dollars-in several installments. We started out with two million dollars which enabled us to build the ten-story Heller Center inside a light and air court. This made it possible to expand laboratories and the library.

The Crown Center, which at least as a marketing device has been a disappointment, was planned before I became president, but I was successful in getting the money that got it off the ground. The hope was that we would be able to recruit a great number of students from outside the Chicago area. We even spent a lot of time designing a priority scheme as to who could move into it based on a questionnaire that we'd sent to students

and we thought we'd have a long waiting list of students wanting to move into Crown Center. It never materialized. That is why I have great doubts about student opinion studies.

B. Don't we provide living space for students from other schools?

W. Yes, from other schools as well as Roosevelt. We fill it up but we could not have filled it up with our own students. It's become really now a student hotel, if you will, and it's probably more Roosevelt students than others. We've got students from Columbia College, from the Art Institute, from the Academy of Fine Arts., from the Harrington Institute and so on. It was built, of course, partly because we thought the dormitory would help the overall enrollment but also partly because we actually needed a student union. We needed more classroom space and the only way we could do that was by moving what was the cafeteria on the second floor of the Auditorium building, moving all of that over to Crown Center and thereby creating space in this building for classrooms and other facilities.

I would say, if you asked me what the major accomplishments have been in my period as president, I would say: number one, to establish the fiscal integrity of this institution; number two, we assured academic freedom with credibility; number three, we made major curriculum changes, especially in terms of moving into the adult area and the Bachelor of General Studies program was introduced; and number four, we developed Roosevelt University, Northwest.

B. How did you feel about --I remember we changed our curri-

culum requirements during that period of student unrest.

~~W. Yes, at that time I thought it was all right. If you want~~
my opinion with hindsight, I think it's something that we had to do. Pedagogically, educationally, I think it was a terrible mistake. Of course, we were forced almost by competition to make changes. We're not Harvard that can set the tone. I am absolutely convinced that giving into the demands of the students, namely, that they should have greater choice, really is educationally wrong. I think a faculty ought to know. Granted that there are many-ways to structure a curriculum, there is no one right way, but I do believe ideally that a Bachelor's Degree ought to mean that you're an educated person and I think, for example, the abandonment of a language requirement is really sad. I think that even from a purely practical point of view, when we had standard requirements it was much easier for planning. It was fiscally a much, much easier system, so my answer is we probably had no choice but I think it was a mistake.

Finally, I must say that some of the major accomplishments, such as the physical renovation of the Auditorium building, the building of Crown Center, the establishment of our satellite operations, etc., all of this had to go on at the same time that we went through some of these crises. Looking to the future, I would have to say, if all goes well, I hope to stay in this job another five years. 1986 or 1987 would, according to the old retirement rules, be my last year and I'm -- let me put it this way, if I maintain my sanity I will not stay beyond

that point. I may want to continue to teach a bit or something of that sort, but I'm afraid the decade ahead is going to be an extremely difficult decade. The college-age population is going to go down nationally, but it's going to be much more serious in Chicago. Not only will the overall population of Chicago go down, but the proportion of Chicago that is black and Latino will steadily rise and the facts are that in the black and Latino population the proportion that are college bound is simply less. This has nothing to do with discrimination; it's simply a fact of life that maybe in another generation it will change. In the Hispanic community, which is the most rapidly growing, college going is a very minor factor. So we're going to have to draw students either from the business community, where they get tuition reimbursement, or we have to depend on some of our suburban operations. What I'm afraid of is that the public institutions that are heavily subsidized are going to invade our turf. There was a time when they weren't interested in the adult student and we had them to ourselves, but everybody is going to invade that turf.

I would like to plan for the worst but at the same time be prepared to take advantage of any opportunities that come along. That, of course, applies to the crisis of last year when many faculty members felt terribly threatened by the document on reduction in force even though the Administration had the best of intentions. It ended up all right, but I discovered

that it doesn't matter how many people you confer with and consult, there will always be somebody who says we did not consult. The Torch was full of misstatements. Milt Greenberg, who wrote the document and, in fact, was almost totally responsible for it, had consulted at great length with the Executive Committee. And, of course, nobody was totally happy with that document. I'm not happy with that document. What we had to do was to go through motions over and over again, you know, going over the same ground, changing finally a few words here and there. The only reason we did that was that if we had not done it, we could have done all the things that the document says, except that then we would have been accused of not following due process. You prepare a document and you engage in consultation -- there were statements made, for example, that it's illegal. They were made in meetings. We had legal opinions on this, it is not illegal. As a matter of fact, by now, most institutions have such a document except that in most institutions the faculty never even heard of it.

B. Most institutions have such documents?

W. Most institutions have been planning for reduction in staff and waiting with implementation until necessary. So what happens is that when you try to be democratic you pay a penalty for it. You're caught between a rock and a hard place. On the legal end of it the only Appeals Court decision along that line was in the Creighton University case. Creighton University abolished

a whole college and there were only tenured faculty members in it. The case went up on appeal from a lower court to the Appeals Court and the argument of the faculty in that college was that: "we've got tenure and Creighton is by no means bankrupt. They've got a substantial endowment, why don't they keep us?" And the court held that if an institution can prove that a particular division is a constant drain on it and they feel that other parts of the institution suffer, and as long as it isn't done in a discriminatory fashion (that is you abolish something you don't like and keep something you do like) then the burden of proof would be on those who say that it is discrimination. As long as due process is followed, hearings and the whole bit, that obviously this is something an institution must have the right to do in order to survive. Again, my statement at the time to the faculty was that I had no intention whatsoever of using this unless absolutely necessary but that we wanted to have it on the books. But, of course, people become -- and, of course, I understand that -- people become very scared because they think in terms of their livelihood. And yet, if you don't plan for this sort of thing when you are not in trouble, then you've got a real problem on your hands because what are you going to do in a crisis without a plan. Then you're going to have to take action when you really get into difficulty for which there is no plan, and that, I think is much worse than to have a plan.

I hope I didn't sound as if I was just griping and complaining, but I have grown up with this institution. After all, I started with a salary of \$3,000. a year as an assistant professor and I love this place, arid yet at times --

B. It's a hard job.

It's a very hard and frustrating experience. The only hope I really have is that when I do move out of this job, I'll be able to turn it over to somebody else in good shape. That's going to be very difficult.

B. Finding someone else to fill that role is not going to be easy either.

W. It's not going to be easy. Let me say this, there are many people who could do it, but whenever you search for a president you run a great risk, as we found out. I think at Roosevelt it is an advantage to have somebody from within, although you can argue against it. The main reason, I think, is that we are so different in terms of internal politics and our constitution that for somebody coming from the outside to adjust to this kind of an environment is extremely difficult. And I think that although to some extent Pitchell's problems related to his own personality, but to some extent also he found the responsibility. to so many different constituencies an extremely difficult thing. What you have to do at Roosevelt is you have to certainly listen to your faculty, which is probably your most important constituency. At the same time you've got to recognize that you've

got a Board and that you depend on that Board to a very large extent for financial support so you've got to make sure that your Board members feel good about the institution. And I recognize that if I complain to my Board, say about faculty politics, if I did that, I would be undercutting the very objectives, so you've got to be schizophrenic. You see, I've got to, on the one hand, say to the faculty you can't do this or we're going to have problems. And you have to do that in subtle ways.

I can't do it in the Senate either-. One of the greatest difficulties I have at Roosevelt is that we have a Senate the likes of which exist in no other institution that I know of. If I had a Senate which was relatively small, made up of senior faculty members where one could speak in relative confidence, (you never can speak in confidence to any-large group), but at least where you didn't have the Torch sitting there; it would be a very different kind of a situation. If I want to convey anything to the faculty that I think is important I have to talk to four or five faculty members that I know and hope that through the grapevine the word gets out, because the Senate is simply a forum where anything I say becomes public knowledge through the newspaper. That poses a particular problem. Well, I guess that covers most everything I wanted to say on this subject.

B. Some of the faculty were wondering if there was a kind of new policy afoot to get them to cooperate more with each other.

This last year, the orientation session that we had --

W. There is no new policy -

B. It wasn't a tactical change, a technique -change or something?

w. No.

B. It seemed to draw the faculty together more than normally.

W. Well, if so, I'm very pleased and very happy about it. I think one of the problems at a school like ours, and it's true of every urban institution, is that faculty come here to work, if you will, and after teaching their classes they go off in every conceivable direction, which has pros and cons, but you don't have the kind of closely knit faculty that you have in a small town or even in a suburban situation where faculty members are together all the time. I would hope certainly if we could strengthen the esprit-de corps of the faculty, I would very much like to see, for example, faculty to recognize that certainly your top administration is really a part of the faculty. To think that we have a different motivation, although we wear different hats in some respects, is perfectly silly. You talk about salaries, heaven knows that the administration's salaries are always tied to those of the faculty, and if anybody thinks that a dean doesn't want a salary increase, you know, they must be kidding. My salary is always tied to the faculty salary situation.

One of the concerns that the Board had, in connection with

votes of confidence, and I might point out this we haven't talked about, the Board members have recognized much more than faculty members the problem with the vote of confidence. And the problem is that some administrators will run scared even if they're reasonably certain of getting a vote of confidence, and as a result not do the job that a Board wants them to do. That is why some years ago (I've forgotten whether it was the last year of Lyle Spencer's chairmanship or the first year of Jerry Stone's, but they would always give me a three-year contract.

I know that we have lost some people because of the vote of confidence, the best example being Paul Olscamp, who in my opinion was an outstanding administrator. That doesn't mean that everything he did was right, and he had a tendency to be a little gruff and maybe too blunt at times. He was not diplomatic enough, but he had a vote of confidence -- he didn't do badly at all on the vote of confidence, but he had I would say something like 30%+ "No" votes. Here was this fellow who had a black belt in karate and a "tough type"- and yet he was in tears in his office. I mean he cried like a child. He said, "How can that many people vote 'No' on me even if they disagree with me. After all, all I was trying to do was to do my job and do it as best I could." And from that day on he looked for a job. He became president of Western Washington and now is president of Bowling Green University and was voted in Change Magazine as one of the fifty outstanding university

B. We really drove him away, then?

W. There's no doubt about it. Well, he might have left sooner or later anyway. He was obviously looking for advancement, but he left not for a presidency at the time, . I want you to know. He took a job as assistant to the president at Syracuse University simply to get out of here.

I know that he did some things that were not very diplomatic. There was a faculty member who complained about his salary increase and went to see him. And the way the faculty member ---told me the story, whether that's true or not, was that when he said, "Why didn't I get a bigger raise," Paul Olscamp said, "Because you didn't deserve it." Now that's, of course, a foolish thing to say even if you think it.

Interestingly enough, I could not get Milton Greenberg (Olscamp's successor) in my judgment, (and he would deny this), but I could not get him to take positions that would antagonize anybody six months before a vote of confidence, which means out of every three-year period you could be sure that there was a six-months period of inaction. He would very bluntly say to me, "Look, this isn't the time for me to stick my neck out."

That raised interesting questions. I don't advocate changing it for my tenure in office but it is a problem. You've got a situation where you have great limitations on administrative power, and I was certainly one who advocated such limitations myself when I was a faculty member, and I

don't believe that excessive power for administrators is a good thing. On the other hand, once you have the kind of limitations we have built into our system, I think (in the last two or three years things haven't been that bad, but there have been times when administrators felt that they were constantly being harrassed no matter what they did), it becomes impossible to be decisive in a timely manner. Administrators make mistakes, including myself. I could probably make a list of the mistakes I've made as a matter of fact, but you must give administrators some room for action.

I think what people ought to do is at least give you the benefit of the doubt. I think it's perfectly all right to criticize mistakes. I think we all learn from our mistakes and that's perfectly all right. I don't mind criticism, but I think that at the same time it ought to be done in a constructive fashion. I know some faculty members on the staff, who on the one hand are critical of the administration but who, I think, basically want this administration to succeed and are loyal to it. But then there have been other people, historically, over time at this institution who've simply been destructive. And I guess that's true at any institution.

B. I'm sure that is true.

W. Very often these are people that are self-destructive.

B. And they don't recognize what they're doing.

W. Except that we provide an outlet for their own frustrations and unhappiness and that sort of thing. And you know, as I

look back on some of these people, they, too, played a par-

was a thorn in my side.' His name was Dale Pontius, a political scientist with a Harvard doctorate, but who, as far as I'm concerned, was "crazy;" but you know he contributed to the flavor of the university. He was a courageous individualist critical of the U. S. at home and critical of the USSR on a trip to Russia. Or I think back to a Helmut Hirsch in the History Department who was also "nuts", in many..ways.'

B. I didn't know him.

W. Oh, Helmut Hirsch-was 'an expert on-modern European history, especially on the Revolution of 1848 and the role of Rosa Luxemburg in the 1920s. For him these were the highlights of history and he "lived" those periods. And at the same time that he considered himself a great socialist -but he was the most Germanic nationalist- I've 'ever met. When Kurt Schumacher came to speak at Roosevelt he was the leader of the Social Democratic Party in the late '40s and had been in a concentration camp throughout most of World War II Helmut Hirsch -- marched down from his office wearing boots Basque a Basque hat' and carried a black, red, and golden flag with the three arrows the symbol of the old Social Democratic Party, and he picked himself two blonde students-to march on either side of him with a bouquet of flowers and came up to Schumacher and said, "Welcome, you bringer of culture to this cultureless country."

B. Only at Roosevelt could that happen..

W. Well, he was also the one who once got up in the faculty senate and said he would like, for the record, to announce that one-quarter of the faculty were hypocrites. And he based it on the fact that -- this was in the early days of the university when we had invocations -- and he said he counted the number of people that bowed their heads during the invocation and called them all hypocrites.

When the secretary of the Senate, at that time, Chief Librarian Marjorie Keenleyside, after the October senate meeting wrote in the Minutes that Dr. Sparling gave an inspiring address, Helmut Hirsch got up and said that the secretary was out of order in using the adjective "inspiring", that whether an address is inspiring or not is a matter of judgment of each individual faculty member and they are perfectly capable of making the judgment of whether it was inspiring or not. Jim Sparling did, I think, a clever thing. He got up and said, "I move that the word 'inspiring' be stricken." That really did it. But Helmut made a real contribution, you know, in spite of all his crazy habits such as not permitting his son to speak English because German was the language of culture. So we had a lot characters here. I think that contributed to the uniqueness of the institution.

I mentioned earlier in your first tape about Siegfried Marck, who I think made an important contribution, as did Walter Weisskopf in his way. I don't know of any people now on the faculty that could match some of these people in terms

of being colorful, which is sort of a pity. At the time you may think that some are stark raving mad but they do set a tone of independent thinking. As I travel I around the country, and talk to alumni, the people they remember are the colorful ones. They talk about Helmut Hirsch; they talk about him with nostalgia. Another example is Hermann Bowersox, whom many students hated while they were in his class, yet more alumni praise him than almost anybody else because they say he changed their lives. And you know, of course, he was really cruel, absolutely cruel to students but he forced the best out of them. So those are among many pleasant reminiscences that I have. This growing up with Roosevelt was really a great experience. The only question I have which troubles me is, has Roosevelt played its role and is that all over?

B. Do you think it might be?

W. Well, I think we'll survive but that's a different story.

I for one, I want more than survival for the institution in order to remain enthusiastic.

B. When you say it's played its role, do you mean as a source of social mobility?

W. No, we will continue to be that. But Roosevelt met a very great need in Chicago when it was founded for certainly the first thirty years or so of its existence. There were no other institutions where people who either belonged to a minority group, racially, ethnically, politically or socially could feel comfortable.

B. You mean the country has caught up with us.

w. The country's caught up and so the question is how do you find a new uniqueness. I try very hard to find it. Oh, I find some rhetoric for speeches and so on, but I have some doubts.

B. Our students still tell us that we do things other places don't do.

w. I'd like to believe that.

B. I don't know if it's true or not but they seem to think it is.

w. I think it is to some extent. I think that there is because we're smaller, still large enough to specialize and to serve and still small enough to care. I think that element is there, its intangible.

B. Some of them say that they were able to develop themselves more here because we were, I suppose, less conformist.

w. And I have to believe that there's certainly an element of that, but I have my doubts sometimes. And that does worry me because I would like to be able to say that we are unique and that was really very easy to say --

B. If we aren't, there's not really much justification for a private institution.

w. That's right.

B. How do you think we should be unique in the future?

w. See, we don't have a constituency on a religious basis as do some of the Catholic institutions. Oh, I would love nothing

better than if we could be unique in terms of curriculum, and I've had ideas along that line. I've sort of given up on it, ~~to be perfectly honest with you because I find myself too frus-~~trated to fight for it.

B. What kind of changes

W. Well, if we could really go all out in terms of the undergraduate program, in terms of the freshman and sophomore years, the idea of providing an integrated, inter-disciplinary, humanistic education. When I threw that challenge out a couple of years ago to the chairpeople, I got something back that so turned me off I felt. I didn't want to go on. They all took the lazy man's way out. Take two courses from history and two courses from philosophy. That's not what I meant! Of course, I know that what I meant would mean an awful lot of hard work and dedication, and maybe it's too much to ask. It's too much to ask from a faculty that is maybe overworked. But to me an inter-disciplinary program means that you develop courses that would combine history and philosophy and literature. What I want is a Humanities Degree and maybe a Social Science Degree, and it would be a distinguishing feature, something so that I could say we've got an entirely different way of teaching an undergraduate. I know exactly how I could get cooperation -- if I had a million dollars to hand out. Literally, I mean that!

B. I think in some cases you'd really have to start with a new faculty. Some people are just so set in what they do that they do that they wouldn't want to do something different.

W. Why do you think we started the BGS program? Only for that reason. Only for that reason, because it was actually impossible to get people to deviate from their standard. And right now in the Business School we're moving exactly in the opposite direction. These are the disappointments.

When I was the Dean of the Business School, I came to the conclusion that there is no discipline called "Business" and that what you really need to do in the Business School is to apply basically the social sciences and the behavioral sciences and to some extent mathematics to study an institution, e., business enterprise. And my idea was that we would employ an awful lot of people from the social sciences and from the humanities and the natural sciences, bring them into the Business School and have them develop the application of the techniques from these fields to the study of the business enterprise and be indeed a unique business school.

Then along came, of course, this whole business of getting professional accreditation. There you run right up against the monopolistic practices of the American Assembly of Collegiate Schools of Business who think that if your Ph.D. isn't from a Business School it's second rate. Well, I think that's utter nonsense. The greatest teachers I've had in the Business School were people like -- going back to Wayne Leys and Lionel Ruby, who taught business ethics, to Dick Thain, trained in English, who contributed a great deal in his teaching, and it just seems

to me that what we're doing is that we're narrowing business education, specializing increasingly. My own concept of education, (I guess too many people don't know that.) is that I would much rather have people use the humanistic training-that they've had but also to be realistic enough to say I've got to apply that to the management of business enterprise. I think there's a lot to be said for truly educated people applying knowledge to the professions, but I find an awful lot of people, not only in the professional schools but also in Arts and Sciences who, in my opinion are not truly educated on a broad basis. If the attitude in a field like history (and it's not so true at Roosevelt as it is in some other institutions) is one of specialization on a country and a given century only, I am dismayed.

B. Or a decade sometimes.

W. To me that simply is not-what liberal education is all about.

B. Well, I think maybe one of the things that we do still provide in the fringe areas, at least, is that students who want on their own, to get the kind of education you're talking about can usually arrange to do it here.

W. That's right.

B. In a sense that's what some of them have said.

W. That's right and that is more true at Roosevelt than at most institutions.

B. But it takes some effort on their part. Still they can do it here.

W. What I'd really like -- and on several occasions I've really succeeded -- what I'd like a planning or a curriculum committee to do instead of spending too much time on the nitty gritty of a specific requirement is to search for uniqueness in curriculum and in educational philosophy which is terribly important. The great merit of Robert Maynard Hutchins was that he set a tone at Chicago at the time which created among young undergraduates, and I was one of them at the time, a real enthusiasm. It wasn't the only way to do it but it was a way of doing, it and everybody identified with it. You know, Harvard has its case study method. I don't think the case study method is all that great but it is a distinguishing feature and I'm afraid I don't know how in the world one could ever get at Roosevelt, university-wide agreement on educational philosophy.

B. It would be hard.

W. Very, very difficult. Now fortunately, and this is why I'm very proud of what they've done in the College of Continuing Education, at least in the BGS program they've got these integrating seminars and I think that's a good thing and it's developed an esprit de corps. They've got this BGS League and I've gone to a number of meetings. I'm rather proud of that.

B. We've gotten some excellent students from that BGS program.

W. And that's another thing. BGS has channeled its students into all the other areas.

B. Some interesting students. I think we're about out of tape.

W. And I'm out of time as well.

B. Thank you very much.