

**Transcription of Oral History Interview with
CHARLES ADRIAN**

July 2, 1998

The following oral history interview is being conducted on Thursday, July 2, 1998, at the home of Charles R. Adrian, Professor Emeritus of Political Science. Professor Adrian joined the Riverside faculty July 1, 1966, and retired on June 30, 1988.

My name is Jan Erickson. I work in Chancellor Raymond L. Orbach's office. He is the eighth chief administrative officer of the Riverside campus.

Erickson: Professor Adrian, would you begin, please, by telling us where you were born and a little about your family?

Adrian: I was born in Portland, Oregon, in 1922. I came from an undistinguished family. I am the first one of my family to go to college, in fact. My parents were a little bit unusual, I suppose. They were divorced when I was very young, and so I never really knew my father. My mother pretty much supported me and my sister.

Erickson: How did she do that?

Adrian: She was an office manager. She just was a secretary and became an office manager. Most of the time it was the motor division of the Rock Island Railroad. So it was a difficult kind of job, but she was laid off for only two weeks in the entire great depression when so many people had no money.

Erickson: So that was good.

Adrian: But otherwise there is not very much to report about my family. I have a sister who is a registered nurse. We have two children.

Erickson: Let me go back just a second if you don't mind. What do you remember about the depression?

Adrian: Oh, some things. I have always been curious about everything. And I suppose I read beyond my years from the very beginning. I can remember certain things, but as a young child, you see I was seven when the depression started, and it never did end until World War II began, but I remember little glimpses of things.

For example, after her divorce, my mother moved back to where my family came from in Davenport, Iowa. I can remember there the bank closing in Davenport, and the confusion that resulted. I really didn't understand. Let me say, I did understand what happened, but I didn't understand the implications of it.

And I remember, of course, if you had a job through the depression, you were pretty well off. If you didn't, of course, you were in a lot of trouble. And there were a lot of people who were pretty poor throughout that period.

My family was basically poor, though not entirely. It was kind of divided. My grandfather, when he died in 1940 ... I remember had an estate of something over \$50,000, which isn't very much now but would be worth half a million by the purchasing power of today. So he was pretty well off, but he was also a skinflint, that's how he got to be well off. And he really didn't give my mother anything but sympathy, I would say.

I don't think he ever gave any financial support, but he and just about everybody else in the family seemed to think I should go to college. Here's a family who has never given any thought to college, and suddenly everybody thinks I should go to college.

Adrian: But I can't really tell, and I never found out what triggered that. I asked my mother one time, and she said, "We always thought you should." It was not a satisfactory answer, of course, but I guess it was more or less true. Certainly in my case it never occurred to me I wouldn't, and mother scraped together the money for me until I came back. I spent three years in the Air Force, and when I came back I had the so-called GI Bill. And that financed the rest of it all the way through the Ph.D. So that was about the story of it.

Erickson: Where did you decide to go to school?

Adrian: I don't know. If I thought too much about it, and I really didn't know. I always had a lot of interests, and I really didn't know what I wanted to study. But I ended up going to a very nice small liberal arts college. I went to Cornell College in Iowa. I think it represents in a way my notion of what a good higher education is, for it was the first one I was exposed to, but none that I have experienced since have convinced me they are better. There would no doubt be other schools of that type that would be better, but not that many. I had excellent undergraduate education, and I still think so today.

Erickson: So you got your undergraduate degree from Cornell, and then where did you go?

Adrian: That was another interesting thing. For one thing, I did not know very much about choosing schools and so forth. Most people go to graduate school, for that matter undergraduate school, without really knowing what they are doing. So I finally looked at several possibilities. I almost went to Columbia in New York, but finally I decided to go to the University of Minnesota, largely because William Anderson was there. Anderson, at that time, was the prime scholar in the field of American politics and also of urban politics. Those were my interests. I can't say why they were particularly. I had other interests too, but that is what I settled on eventually. Before I went to the Air Force, I thought I was probably going to major in music. I was interested in musicology and music history, and I've always been interested in that.

Adrian: Shortly before I went into the Air Force, I talked to one of my music professors and I told him about this, and he said he thought I should look for something else. I told him I thought of going to Columbia and also for that purpose, because Columbia probably turned out the best people in musicology and music history at that time. He said, "You don't want to go there, because Columbia turns them out on an assembly line." And he said that there are no jobs either. He was quite forceful about it, and I am sure he was right at the time, but of course the war changed everything. And there would have been jobs after the war, but he couldn't have known that. I think he probably gave me good advice actually. I didn't like it too much at the time.

Erickson: Did you play an instrument?

Adrian: Oh yes. Mostly I've played the wind instruments, clarinet, saxophone. I've played some flute and oboe. I was never a star player. I never thought of becoming a professional performer. My interest was always in the intellectual side of music, always. But then I gave that up. I've never been sorry that I did because I've been able to continue my interest in music ever since, well since I was a small child, of course.

I decided though that I should major in political science. I think that was a mistake, but I didn't know it at the time. I didn't know it until much later. I was always interested in history, and I was always interested in political matters. And I don't know, excepting a course or two I took as an undergraduate led me to thinking I would most like to major in political science.

But if I had to do it all over again, I would have majored in history, or perhaps in something entirely different. I also had an interest in physics, too. I took a number of courses in physics. So I had a little trouble in zeroing in on something. I still have wide interests and I probably made a mistake, because political science did ... of course at that time I wasn't

Adrian: in a position to judge it. But after I was, I had hopes for it, but in fact the field has never developed as I was hoping it would.

And it has kind of died on the vine, excepting, of course, in the university all fields are bureaucratized, and under a basic rule of bureaucracy, they never die. And so I ended up with a political science major at the University of Minnesota. I liked the graduate program there, and I liked the people. I have no regrets about that. It's just the subject matter that I think is wrong or inadequate, because it still has never really gotten off the ground as a field. Perhaps that's to be expected. I don't know myself. I have had some ideas as to the direction it could go, but I'm not sure that any of them can escape the various traps that the field falls into always.

Erickson: You talked about the Air Force. How does that fit into this education pattern?

Adrian: I was interested in the Air Force. A lot of young men were in those days, of course. You had to choose something, unless you were 4F. And I was interested in becoming a pilot because that was kind of interesting and glamorous in those days. I passed my first physical examination, and a little later on, I flunked the physical examination, because I have a weak muscle in my right eye. It causes the eye to wander. And while I have no trouble under ordinary circumstances, the physician said I might have trouble keeping my eyes focused under inadequate oxygen conditions.

And you know the planes in World War II were not pressurized. They were not pressurized, and it would not have worked anyway. Even to this day you pressurize the suit. You don't pressurize the whole cabin, because one bullet would depressurize it.

So I was grounded, and then I went into another mini career which I have always been interested in ever since, too. When I was grounded, I had to choose something to go into, and they kind of pushed me into choosing three or four areas where they needed people. And one of them strangely enough was in the

Adrian: weather service of the Air Force. I picked that one of the choices I had and that was extremely interesting. For one thing, they required you to have a higher IQ than you did to become an officer. They wanted you to be able to learn a lot of things fast. And it was very interesting. What it meant was that automatically I had to work with people who were fairly bright and interesting people, and so I was glad about that and kind of rewarded, because there was always something interesting to talk about or to do.

And the world itself was interesting. I was in three years, almost two of them in the South Pacific, and when I finished that, I went back and finished up my undergraduate courses. I didn't have my degree yet.

Erickson: Oh I see, so this was much earlier. I had the wrong chronology there.

Adrian: No, I went to college and entered Cornell in the fall of 1940. And in the fall of 1942, we were under the expectation that we would either volunteer or we would go into one of the Reserve programs. The Reserve programs were reserved only until they found a place for you, until there was room for you. So that lasted only from October of '42 to February of '43, and then I was called up.

So you see, I was a full year short and a little more, of my degree. I had to go back and finish that up, and then I went to graduate school. What I did in graduate school was to plan to finish as quickly as I could because I thought the best jobs would be available at the front end, and that if you finished late in the program, late in the time span, that you would have trouble finding jobs.

And so I finished up and went into graduate work in 1947 in the spring and took my first job in the fall of 1949. I didn't quite have my Ph.D. yet. I did it very fast by going through the summers and everything. But I also did it by not spending any time on any unnecessary things. In those days, you still had to

Adrian: pass two language examinations, and there were a lot of rules that had to be met along the way.

And then I took my first job and got the Ph.D. in less than a year. Technically it was awarded in 1950. And then a couple of years later I had a chance for a Ford Foundation Fellowship, and I applied for study at the University of Copenhagen.

I spent an academic year at the University of Copenhagen. I was interested in it, primarily because in those days—remember this was 50 years ago—the drift of Scandinavia was much the drift I thought this country was moving in as far as governmental, social programs were concerned. And also I was of Scandinavian decent, my ancestors were Danes. And it was a worthwhile thing. I wouldn't say I wasted the time. I learned a lot of things and relearned Danish, some of which I had learned from my grandfather.

You have no need for Danish, you know. It's like learning whatever they speak on Mars or something. In those days there were only four million Danes. There are about five million today. All the Danes speak English, working class people don't, but everybody else speaks usually good English. So I had to fight with them because they wanted to speak English. It was so much easier than my struggling through the Danish.

That was something I remember as being worthwhile and kind of fun. But otherwise it was a year in which we traveled quite a bit in Europe, got to know the three Scandinavian countries well. We spent Christmas with the widow of my wife's brother. She had since remarried. We spent a few weeks in England with a very wealthy family, which was an interesting experience. But at the end of the time I went back and pretty much followed my academic career.

Erickson: Now at what point did you meet Audrey?

Adrian: I suppose I am kind of unusual in the sense that I have only had one wife, and she has only had one husband. We've been married for 52-plus years. Her father was a Professor of

Adrian: Physics at Cornell. That wasn't what got me interested in physics, however, I was already interested in it. And we met there and were married right after the war in April of '46. And we've been married ever since.

We have two children. Nelson, our boy, is a personnel officer for non-academic personnel of the Los Angeles School District. He has done well, but our daughter is the one who has really done well. They both went to UC Irvine. They didn't want to go here, because they wanted to be away from home, and they didn't want to go back to Cornell because it seemed impossibly far away to them. They both were kind of homebodies, and yet they wanted the independence of going away.

Kristin was a very fine student. She made Phi Beta Kappa. She got interested kind of early in law, and we talked about majors and so forth. I told her if she took the courses I recommended that law school expected her to have, she could major in just about anything she wanted to. And she majored in art history, so she also got a fairly broad education. My son majored in Psychology and he has a Ph.D. in applied psychology, in industrial psychology.

Kris then went to law school. She became a junior, and then a senior, partner in a large San Francisco law firm. And then she decided because she was a woman, she couldn't ... well, she said the lawyers who do the best and who get the most recognition and make the most money are what the lawyers call "rain makers," the guys who can bring in clients who will bring them a lot of money.

(chuckle)

Erickson: Sure.

Adrian: And she didn't think that a woman could serve effectively as a rain maker. Some people argued she could, but Kris has always been somebody ... she won't accept doing second best.

(laughter)

Adrian: So she decided she couldn't be a rain maker because she couldn't be a first-rate rain maker. That's really what it amounted to. And then she decided she would leave her firm, which was quite a decision 'cause it's a first-rate firm in San Francisco. But she felt she just wasn't going to get where she wanted to be. In time—it didn't take very long actually, she was never unemployed—she became a vice president of the Nestlé Corporation, and that's what she is now.

Erickson: That's a wonderful job.

Adrian: Yes. Terribly busy, but she loves it. I wish I could say the same for myself, but she has loved the law from her first course, and she loves her work.

Our son has never been quite so sure that he loves the work. He does it, and he does it well, but it's sort of work, you know. Work is ideal when you don't think of it as being work. And that's really the way Kris looks at it.

So we just have the two children, and they each have two children themselves, so we have four grandchildren. They are scattered all around here.

Erickson: Oh, sure. I see their pictures.

Adrian: They are older than that now. Those are from a few years ago.

Erickson: Cute pictures.

Adrian: But our oldest grandchild is only 10 years old, because we had our children a little bit late, and each of our children had theirs a little bit late. Again, because of the amount of education. They both got advanced degrees and so forth. So that's the family, I guess.

Erickson: Well, let's see. We had you back in Minnesota for all of your education years.

Adrian: Yes, the graduate programs.

Erickson: So how did you get to UCR?

Adrian: Well, that was a long wandering, really. Of course, when you get a Ph.D. and are ready to go out and find a job, if you are wise and professionally committed, you take whatever the best job is you can find. You know, they always say Berkeley has so much trouble because nobody wants to go more than 40 miles from Berkeley, and that's impossible. It is also not wise. But in my case, I simply took the best job I could find. Already the best jobs were gone by that time. Because, you see there were other people who ...

Erickson: So you were right.

Adrian: Yes, I was right. But you see there were other people who already had their B.A.s when they came back from the war. There were some who even had some graduate work, so the pipeline was already pretty filled. I found a job. The best I found at that time was Wayne University in Detroit, now Wayne State University.

At that time, the university was under the control of the Detroit Board of Education. It was subsequently taken over by the state because of the high cost of maintaining the university. Wayne State is a school, it is a full university, and it has just about every college you can imagine.

But it was in many ways a school that was primarily aimed at taking care of the lower income people of Detroit. If you had a higher income and were smart enough, you could go to the University of Michigan or Michigan State, you didn't go to Wayne State. That wasn't what I objected to about Wayne State.

What I objected to about it was the fact that because it had come out of the Detroit Board of Education, it had a kind of a lock-stepped assembly line approach to advancement, which

Adrian: meant that you probably weren't going to get advanced ahead of your time in service. It was a seniority type of thing. I felt I could beat that kind of a system, so I started looking around for another job. When I came back from the fellowship in Europe, I was (pause) ... let me think. It's so long ago, and I have to think to get the sequence right. (chuckle)

Erickson: Sure.

Adrian: I guess that I had some inquiries even before I came back, but anyway, I had a chance to go to Michigan State. So I came back to Wayne State. I didn't have any obligation to return there, because all they did was to give me a leave of absence for a year. (pause) I taught the summer session of the year we came back, which was '55 at

Erickson: At Michigan State?

Adrian: at Wayne State. And then that fall of '55, we went to Michigan State. I was at Michigan State for about six months or so when a member of the staff of Governor G. Mennen Williams of Michigan asked me if I would join the Governor's staff to fill in a vacancy that had developed. So I spent almost two years on the staff of the Governor of Michigan.

Erickson: That's good.

Adrian: Well, it was good administrative experience and political experience. It was a useful sort of thing. In fact, the Governor asked me to stay on for another year, and I said no, that I really had to think of my professional career first and that I would help him find a replacement, which I did.

Then I went back to Michigan State. That was in probably the fall of '57. And then almost immediately I became the director of an institute called The Institute for Community Development, which was a program that tried to parallel agriculture extension by taking academic knowledge and helping communities and cities to improve and solve some of their problems.

Adrian: We didn't help Detroit because it's so large and has every bureaucrat you can imagine. But for the smaller cities, we did quite a bit of work. I was the director of that program for maybe three years or four. I didn't look these things up.

Erickson: Oh, that's ok.

(laughter)

Adrian: I've got these records somewhere. But anyway, I then became the chairman of the department, because I spent half time in the institute and half the time in the department. I chaired the department for three or four years before I came to UCR.

Erickson: Who contacted you from UCR?

Adrian: (pause) The question here is why did you choose UCR?

(Dr. Adrian was looking at a list of possible questions which had been submitted to him prior to the interview).

I didn't. Really, UCR chose me. Sort of what happened was this. I had entered early-middle age. I had accomplished a lot ... all these things I said I have done, and I also published ... oh, I suppose fifty or sixty articles, several books. I had several very successful textbooks and research studies (doing one that became a book). And doing all these things, I thought that I had come to a kind of a dull spot. I had bogged down in middle age.

At about that time also, Audrey had always had a little trouble in the wintertime with depression. Nothing real serious, but it was always bothersome. She kind of hated the long, cloudy winters, you know.

Erickson: Um hmm.

Adrian: And so, in part, the decision to come to UCR was a non professional one. But partly, it was because I thought maybe a change in scenery would be good for me, and I thought probably there were things—prospective things—in California for me to become involved in. So when the opportunity came along, Audrey very much wanted me to take the job. It was harder for me to turn it down, because I had just two years earlier, turned down a professorship at the ... it was a combination between the Claremont Graduate School and Pomona College.

Erickson: That would have been nice, too.

Adrian: Yes, but I wasn't too satisfied with the state of the graduate school at that time. Also, I ran into a practical problem which I think they have pretty much solved. I was about thirty eight years old or so, and I would have been at the top of their salary bracket. That didn't make any sense to me, and I turned it down almost entirely for that reason, and Audrey was very unhappy about that. But I couldn't see it, it didn't make sense as a professional move. They have improved their salary schedules and solved some of their financial problems since then. But I couldn't stand around and wait for them to do that. (chuckle)

So the second time an offer from Southern California came up, and it was a little harder to turn down. I decided it was worth a try.

Erickson: Who was it that contacted you?

Adrian: Well, I think the first contact was by Ivan Hinderaker. Hinderaker had been in his last year of graduate studies when I began my graduate studies. So I knew him.

Erickson: At Minnesota.

Adrian: Yes. I knew him, not real well, but I knew him pretty well. So he asked me if I would be interested in coming out for an interview. I'd say that probably he was the contact.

Erickson: And then the interview process was much different from what it is today, right?

Adrian: Somewhat.

Erickson: Would you describe the interview process?

Adrian: Well, in the first place, of course, the department committee, which in those days and still is today largely ... the graduate committee of the department interviewed me, and I was also interviewed by the dean and I guess by the chancellor, because I was being interviewed for the possibility of becoming the department chair as well as professor.

The process internally, I assume, worked about the same as it did a year or two later in which the proposal went to the academic personnel committee from the department, which in those days was called the Budget Committee. The recommendation of that group plus the chancellor, usually the academic vice chancellor. I think that was it.

Erickson: What year was that?

Adrian: That was '66, and I've been here ever since.

Erickson: Was it appealing to come to the department as the chair?

Adrian: No, see I was chair at Michigan State. That was no big deal to me. If I said I felt anything about it, it was a kind of safe thing. I would have some say in anything that happened or potential changes and so forth. I felt I could handle the chairmanship because I had been chair before.

In fact, I had two administrative jobs, you see. I had been Director of the Institute before chairmanship. I thought it was more of a relief, I suppose, than any special accomplishment. I think, though nobody said it at the time, the intent was always to find someone who could become the chair. They were recruiting for a chair and not just a professor.

Erickson: When you came, what were the most glaring challenges that you could see in the department?

Adrian: There were a lot of them. The department consisted of good people, able people, wasn't very well balanced, and it wasn't a very up-to-date department, in my opinion—still in my opinion—today. It was a department that was behind the times. It was a traditional department and not interested in the cutting edge of the field to the extent that political science had one and to the extent it does today. It just was not. So the question was could that be changed very much. I made some changes, but other developments made it difficult to move along the direction I would like to have gone.

Erickson: Such things as what? The drop in enrollment?

Adrian: Oh no, no. Those are problems that you have to put up with in academia and I didn't worry much, but I was interested in the department as a unit of political science that was well balanced and was up to date, and it just wasn't. We had people whose training was in history and not in political science. We had people who were not only negligent of, but hostile to developments in their field—these sorts of things that I had to deal with.

I did not and was not able to deal with those too completely because of the other things that developed. I did hire in my time as chair three people, as far as I can remember, two of which were the result of political pressures on the campus. I hired Barbara Sinclair, who became everything I was hoping for. She became a first-rate scholar and publisher in her field. She stayed here a long time, you know. She left probably two years ago.

Erickson: She went to UCLA didn't she?

Adrian: Yes, she went to UCLA which was probably more appropriate for her, but it also was a reflection of the problems of the department. The department was not quite large enough to

Adrian: cover all of the field in its present day developments. We didn't have very many people who were doing research and publishing. We had a number of people who didn't do any more than they had to. It was under those circumstances, I think, that ... (pause)

Then came the real big problems of course of that time and that was the great political pressures to hire women and blacks and browns, you know, in various disguises. They weren't disguises but euphemisms about what we were doing. The problem was that the university was under great pressure to hire those three categories, and so that limited the kinds of people that I would want to look for. Now Barbara was no problem, because Barbara was a woman

(laughter)

(she counted on that), and she was also a first-rate scholar in her field by any way you would evaluate her. She was no problem. But then we had great pressure to hire blacks and browns. In my time we hired Bill Holland, who was, I think, one of the best people we could get as a Black.

The problem with Blacks was that the big, prestigious universities gobbled up anybody who was halfway respectable as a scholar. We had a hard time. We hired Bill Holland, and Bill was with us for several years, but then he had a chance to go into administration. He probably was a pretty good administrator, but he went to ... I guess he did some administrative work here, although I don't think he got along with Ivan too well. But then he went to the University of Pennsylvania where he eventually became a vice president. I don't know if he's retired now or what he's doing exactly. But the point is that he drifted off into non academic work.

The other person was a Latino and came to us with very high recommendations from Berkeley, stayed here only for a year or so and went to UC San Diego. Then he went back to Berkeley to head the Chicano Studies Program, which I think he still does. I can't think of his name now, but anyway you can see

that I was restricted in the kind of recruiting. And those two, while they filled political needs in the university, didn't help our department problems any, or very little.

Bill could teach and did teach some of the American courses, but as far as I know, neither of them did any research, which is a big problem. Research is a slow, difficult thing in that when there are opportunities for quicker ways to advance, especially through administration, the temptations were great. Both of them disappeared into administrative positions. Neither of them made any attempt at serious research. There wasn't much we could do about that really, but it was a disappointment to me, because I am all in favor of hiring blacks and browns but I think they should have to meet the other standards and that they should be able to ...

Basically, it's wrong in a university and the concept of a university to hire people for niches, for categories, instead of the person most qualified for the job. That politically is not possible in a public university or even a private one because of the requirements on research money.

Erickson: How is it decided how many people are ... how many faculty are given to a specific department? Is it based on the curriculum that has been established?

Adrian: Not really. It's pretty much of a formula thing, and it's controlled mostly by undergraduate enrollment. Political Science has had a fairly good number, a fairly large faculty, partly because in the old days, we used to have very high enrollment in the field. Today we don't get the enthusiastic idealist who's going to save the world. We don't get much of those any more because the public is so cynical about politics. The people we get are largely pre-law people now. They're what holds up the enrollment. I don't know if that answers your question.

Erickson: Yes. When you and I were talking earlier, you mentioned that when you came to UCR, they were on a semester system.

Adrian: Yes, that was one of the big issues, and it had just been decided. It hadn't been put into effect yet, and the problem was how do you fit square pegs into round holes, or vice versa. Essentially, and I'd have to go back and look at details to be absolutely accurate about it, but what basically happened was that the Regents in those days were mostly big businessmen. They were very successful in their fields, and like all business executives they were accustomed to having their way. They said this is what we will do, and they did it.

Well, some of them began to realize that the University didn't fill its physical plant, particularly efficiently, and that's true. We had an awful lot of time when the classrooms were empty and when faculty members weren't there because they were doing research somewhere else. And things like this were strange to business executives who became Regents. Somebody told them ... and I don't know who did this, but somebody told them that the way to make much more efficient use of the physical plant and avoid all that building that the University was asking for—reduce that, and the way to do that was to go to the quarter system.

The quarter system has a great beauty in the fact that you can get in a full quarter in the summer time, so you can do four quarters a year. Nobody told them about the rest of the problems that were involved. One, nobody did any investigation as to whether students would attend in the summertime. It seemed to be an incredible error. Secondly, they did not look at one of the things the Regents are usually most sensitive to—the cost of doing it. As soon as you make the summer quarter equal quarter with the other three, you have to pay the faculty members at the same rate as you pay them the rest of the year.

And at some places, at Berkeley, with its very different weather from here, many of the faculty preferred to use the summer quarter as one of their teaching quarters. And, of course, since we tend to do everything on seniority, the senior professors began to move to the parts of the quarter system that they preferred, and it ran the costs up. You had to make exceptions

Adrian: to that. But it was taken care of in many ways, because the students wouldn't take the summer session in any way like the same numbers as they took the other sessions. No special reason why they shouldn't, but tradition was the other way, and they were accustomed to the high school pattern, and they followed the high school pattern. Also, nobody paid very much attention to that, in fact, it would make a difference to the graduate program.

Well, it turns out it made all of the difference in the world to the graduate program. Any experienced department chair could have told the Regents this, but they didn't ask anybody. So we blundered into it, and we're trying to blunder out of it again. Now Berkeley has left the quarter system.

Erickson: They're on the semester system.

Adrian: Yes, they went back to the semester system, but not until 20, 25 years after we've gotten into this. But it created real great problems, because the faculty, many of the faculty had no experience with the quarter system, and they really thought that a quarter should be equal to a semester.

And that created great problems for the students, who were more aware of the increased load than they were. So it took a while to get over that, and that took some doing. And Ivan Hinderaker had to find a way to deal with that, and I think he did it pretty well. We finally did adjust to that one, but it never helped our graduate programs.

It was always difficult for the graduate programs. In a graduate program, a quarter is too short a time for most of the topics, unless you carve up the topics in a different way from what you have traditionally done. And academicians, some of them, not all by any means, some of them think of themselves as gung-ho social and political liberals. But they are absolute reactionaries when it comes to the operation of the University. They never want to change anything, and if it was done this way in renaissance Oxford, that's the way it probably ought to be. This has been a problem for us in many different ways, but

Adrian: especially when this came up. Anyway, that was a problem, the semester against the quarter system. I had had experience with both, so I think the department handled it without too much difficulty, but some departments had a lot of trouble with it.

Then the other thing ... the issues when I came. The biggest issue by far, even bigger than these we mentioned, was the fact that Ivan Hinderaker had been sent here from UCLA one or two years before I came. It must have been two years.

Erickson: 1964. He came from Irvine.

Adrian: Yes. He went to Irvine as the vice chancellor, and then he came here. But he never really got his feet on the ground in Irvine.

Erickson: He was just in the planning stages.

Adrian: Then he came here as the chancellor, and for the next twenty years, there was a ... (chuckle) It sort of was Ivan Hinderaker vs. the "old UCR." There was talk of the old UCR as if it were some kind of an organization. But it didn't exist as such. It simply was the original faculty members and some who were hired shortly thereafter vs. the fact that Hinderaker was sent here to change that and make this a regular part of the university system.

I don't think Ivan realized, even though he was a faculty member himself, the resistance that would come to that. The resistance would be one thing if it were a minority, a smaller group of the whole faculty. But it was the dominant group that was hired here primarily to teach and who didn't want to do research ... and he was supposed to change this.

He was up against the tenure system and against the fact that the university administration wouldn't give him any, or almost no considerations for ... he needed additional positions in order to expedite the change ... in sort of the Franklin Roosevelt court packing plan ... if people who opposed you didn't get out of the way, you could appoint a person to replace him. FDR proposed this in '37 and created tremendous flack. It was one

Adrian: of his worst political defeats. Well, Ivan was faced with a bad political defeat, but he was very persistent and very, very gradually we brought in new people. I was one of them, of course, whose job was to overcome this “old UCR” syndrome.

Ivan had time on his side because inevitably people get old and have to retire, but it took a long time to change it. The old UCR faculty members did not ... how should I put it? They had developed some kind of a self hypnotism, a self delusion that they represented a kind of a portion of the university that belonged, and that we needed, and that we were adding to the university by having a non-teaching faculty at UCR. That wasn't true.

They also, of course, used all kinds of arguments for which there was virtually no basis for empirical support. They argued that committed researchers couldn't teach while they could. But that wasn't true.

I have had a lot of experience in this sort of thing. I've taught in the university level for forty years. Most people who are good researchers are also good teachers. There are exceptions, and they are kept on, where they'd be dropped if they weren't valuable researchers. But that's not very many of them really. The best researchers I have known have also been good teachers.

But they developed a whole folklore about this. And many of them were excellent teachers. The trouble was they didn't belong at UCR. They belonged at Whittier or someplace like that. They belonged at a good undergraduate teaching school.

Also I have learned in my years when I was at Cornell that often times undergraduate teachers simply do not keep up with their field. They teach the same thing they retire as they taught the first day they were hired on. If you do research, you don't do that. Because the only way you can do research that's worthy of publication is to look at the cutting edge of the field—the only way. And then you carry that into the classroom.

Adrian: So the assumption that a university could add to human knowledge and be a first-rate institution without doing research is not so. But it was a big battle. I mean, it didn't have to be so. They had tenure. And Ivan, of course, very diplomatic and patient ...

Erickson: Yes, yes.

Adrian: and (pause) he waited them out, but it was always an issue. I should clarify that by saying I am only talking now about the humanities and the social sciences.

The hard sciences always have done research, largely because most of them were connected to or came out of the agriculture tradition where research is always required for a faculty appointment.

It was the people in the humanities who were the ones who fought the last-ditch fight. Social sciences were somewhat divided, but not divided enough. That is, we didn't have enough empirical researchers in political science, we still don't.

I don't know what's happening now. The department has changed so that literally there is nobody left from when I retired. And I have only been retired nine years. So the turnover has been quite great. But the problem was ... I should make it clear, the problem was the fault of the President of the University, Clark Kerr, and The Regents. They should never have constituted a campus the way they did. Why did they do it?

Erickson: You mean the original liberal arts college?

Adrian: Yes. Why did they do it? They did it to save money—the worst of all possible reasons.

Erickson: Really?

Adrian: Yes.

Erickson: I haven't been able to determine whose idea that was—you know, the original concept. It was the President, you say?

Adrian: I think that what happened was, and I am not one hundred percent sure about the details--Clark Kerr was a very able person in many ways and he was a fine person, but he had to deal with practical political problems. And I think he finally went along with UCR as a low-budget campus because of political pressures. The campus probably should not have been located here. And if it had been located here, it should have been fully funded, and it wasn't.

Erickson: Oh, even then it was not fully funded?

Adrian: Especially then it wasn't. Yes. By the time ... well, how should I explain this? They always fit it into the university notches in the professorship system. But what they did was to appoint almost all assistant professors.

Erickson: Yes.

Adrian: You save money that way, but you don't build up a university of the kind you need, equal to the others.

Erickson: But they were not required to do the research? Was that the tradeoff in getting the assistant professors?

Adrian: I think what they did was to recruit mostly non publishing assistant professors. Also, when you got here, you discovered the pressures to publish weren't there. Only those who were personally driven did the research and publication. A lot of them didn't do it. Now, they were fine teachers and they worked at being fine teachers, but they didn't work at being scholars. And it has taken the campus decades to overcome that.

So it was a mistaken notion. I don't know exactly why or when the political pressures were given in to, but certainly they should have taken the position that if there is going to be a

Adrian: campus at UCR, it must be on the same basis as the other campuses. It wasn't done that way, and that was too bad. I didn't fully realize the extent of that when I came here. I might not have come if I had.

I didn't realize how much resistance there was to making it a regular campus. The image, you know, was that this would be the monastery on the desert. This would be ... well, Oberlin or Pomona, but with taxpayer support. That was the idea. It should never have been accepted, never. That was the President's fault. Ultimately, he had to decide that, he did decide it.

But anyway, that was still a big issue when I came, and I realized that there was this small little clique that really absolutely and totally dominated the Academic Senate and did so for decades. These guys had unusual powers as assistant professors because there were so few above that rank. They started off as assistant professors chairing the committees and associate professors chairing the departments, and they were political powers all through their academic careers. They were a real drag on the campus. They were true reactionaries, I guess you could say. Those were the major issues when I was chair.

Erickson: I don't know the timing on this, but when UCR became a general campus it also established a graduate program.

Adrian: Yes.

Erickson: Was that here, was it already established ...?

Adrian: Yes. Ours was one of the first departments (outside ag and the sciences) to establish a graduate program. Let's see. I think this became a general campus in '62 or '63, somewhere in there, by decision of the Regents. Of course, it didn't become that instantly. Ivan then came to carry out the idea, and there was not enough money to do it properly. Ivan was kind of a skin flint anyway.

Adrian: One of the weaknesses Ivan had is that he didn't want to spend any money. He wouldn't go to the Regents and pound on the table—he just wouldn't do that. And, you know, Chuck Young did, and many others. And that was the only way you could do it. You just had to convince them that this was going badly. Ivan's attitude was that we'll make do. So although he had a lot of skills and did a lot of good things, he aided and abetted the negative approach to becoming a good campus, a good university.

Erickson: How did you go about it in your department about recruiting students? Did you actually help with that process?

Adrian: Most academicians don't see that as their job. I would say for undergraduates, of course, we have nothing to do with it at all. At the graduate level, you still don't really see it as part of your job. But I'd say that what we did was the kind of thing that most campuses do. The chair sends out letters and brochures and you answer inquiries. Even when I came we had a graduate secretary, and she always knew the answers (or most of them). A good one will know when she has to look for answers elsewhere.

I don't think we had any really great plan to do more than this. I don't think you can tell you the truth. But what we did was to try to get the word out that we had a graduate program. We then accepted the best of the applicants. I don't think our graduate students were poor students. They were generally good, and a few excellent students.

The major problem with them was that they tended to come here because we didn't have the quantitative approach, the more up to date cutting edge approach that most of the other campuses did in our field. I can't speak for other fields. I think some of them did excellently. But we always had some trouble with this because you had the feeling that you had people coming here who couldn't qualify elsewhere, not 'cause they weren't bright—they were bright, but they simply didn't want to do the kind of quantitative work and to learn statistics and

Adrian: other mathematical things they really needed to know to meet more up to date political science.

On the other hand, many of the students, while they were sort of looking for a way around the rules elsewhere, they were good students, and I am not sure that ultimately they were weakened by the fact that they didn't have the most modern approach to the field. Because it didn't solve the problems we have either. (chuckle) We've had a lot of difficulties in finding ... well, this is a whole field, and I don't want to go into it because it deals with the technical aspects of what the department does, what political science is.

But I think a lot of people that came here, I always said, wanted to become secretaries of state. They were people who were interested in public policy and not in political science. Now Mike Reagan fairly early on began teaching public policy. But public policy nationally in political science is pretty low on the totem pole. He's a very able person and had a good program going in public policy, but it was not up-to-date political science. I think Mike knows that. So it was a problem always finding people who really were interested in up to date political science.

With Barbara Sinclair coming early in my time as chair, we strengthened the program quite a bit in that respect, but still that's only one person. So in recruiting the students, we had a large number of people (undergraduates nearly always) and at the graduate level, we did until recent years ... after I retired, the number of graduate students in the program has dropped off. I think this is something that bothers the Chancellor, at least I think it is one of the things that caused him to feel that the department needed regeneration.

But we have never fully faced up to the problem that I see as having a modernizing of the department. On the other hand, it isn't something that easily can be met. It isn't, say, that if you had a Physics Department that wasn't up to date ... Let's say the Physics Department was lagging behind in teaching sub atomic physics, which is the expensive part of physics. That

Adrian: could be corrected because you knew what you needed. You don't know in political science because none of the approaches have worked very well. But there are some that we know are not going to go anywhere, and those are the ones I was hoping we could avoid and haven't always entirely.

Erickson: But to do that, to eliminate something, you would be eliminating a faculty person. Is that correct?

Adrian: Well, it could well be, or at least to change what the person taught or wanted to teach. So we never have quite solved those problems, but we kept the faculty, I think, teaching courses that the students want. Part of the problem here is, I think you can see quite readily, that we have courses that the undergraduates want to take and traditionally have been taught to undergraduates.

Most of the more recent faculty members, where they have been trying in the last several years (eight or nine years), they have been trying to recruit a more modern faculty. But they want to teach courses that the students don't want to take, especially the undergraduates. So then they have to teach courses they don't really want to teach.

You can see that there is a serious problem there, and we haven't figured out a way to go about that. I have ideas about it, but I don't know that they would solve the problem, it might help some. But that's part of the difficulties.

Erickson: How would you say that the political happenings of the day affect the campus in its workings?

Adrian: I think I've touched on a number of the things that deal with that, particularly in the apparent need to found this campus, whether it was financed properly or conceived properly or not. I think that has been a problem for a long time in adjusting to the campus.

We have some practical problems at the undergraduate level in that we recruit in areas where students tend to have lower SAT

Adrian: scores than the best parts of the state. That is something of a problem. When UCR was first founded as this monastery in the desert, they did succeed in recruiting some particularly fine undergraduate students with high SAT scores. But that was gone by the time I got here. I think probably there was found to be no magic in it.

The campus itself didn't have a great allure. I always told Ivan what we should do would be, in the days before Moreno Valley was developed, we should convince the state to dam Moreno Valley, and we should fill it with water from the California project and should advertise this as the "fresh-water" campus. Ivan thought I was kidding. What we really did desperately need was some kind of a symbol, some kind of identification that we have never had.

Erickson: An attraction.

Adrian: Yes. So that was a part of the political environment of the campus. Also, I should mention in this connection that the Regents have changed enormously since the university became a great university, which it did right after WW II. In those days, The Regents were interested in ... They were competing with the east, of course. They weren't thinking about good education as such. They were thinking about a university that would get a lot of attention as a great university.

They were very much interested in building up the University of California in general. These were Regents with an enormous amount of clout with legislators and with administrators at the university. These were guys who thought in terms of getting something done, and they got something done by calling the appropriate person or chair in the Legislature and telling them to do it—and they did it!

That doesn't happen anymore, and we don't have those big-thinking Regents any longer either. The last of them were still on the board when I came, but they've all since been replaced by bean counters. They are interested in "do we have X percent of Latinos in the student body?" ... things of that sort, which

Adrian: are important political questions, but they don't make for a great university necessarily. They might, but the two are two different problems, and Regents rarely look at the question of whether this is a fine university or not. In fact, the university has lost some ground. The accelerated retirement plan cost Berkeley a good deal more than is publicly known.

But those kinds of things just come with maturation, I think, of the university and the political climate changes. I don't think there's been a governor since Edmund G. "Pat" Brown who really recruited Regents who would get the job done. They've recruited Regents who were good political appointments. Those two are not necessarily the same thing. So that's been something of a change in the political climate, I think.

Erickson: That's interesting. The UCR leaders during your tenure ... would you say that they've been appropriate individuals for their positions?

Adrian: Overall, probably mostly. Um ... I would say Ivan was a good appointment in general. He had a lot of political and administrative skills and he had a lot of patience, which is certainly required.

What he didn't have was this tendency to pound on the table and say, "We need more money." Which we did. I am not in favor of spending. I think universities can be operated on a good deal less money than they are operated on, but you've got to know what you are doing and have the power to do it. And he didn't have that power. In many ways ... he wasn't able to carry out some of the things I am sure he'd like to have done.

But then he was followed by a number of chancellors who were appointed because they had the right political qualifications. We appointed a woman, we appointed a Latino, neither of whom was qualified for the job. It wasn't until the present chancellor that we got back into ... apparently at this point, people gave up and said, "Well, let's appoint a traditional type of chancellor." So we are back to that now. But there have been some problems ...

Erickson: We had Ted Hullar in there, too.

Adrian: Oh, yes. He was a total disaster, of course.

Erickson: Oh? Ok.

Adrian: (chuckle) He wasn't as much of a disaster here as he was at Davis. Hullar's biggest problem was that he grandstanded to the citizens, the leaders of Riverside, and he never followed through on anything. He talked of something, and then he talked of something else. He flitted from one idea to another. I think he was neither qualified for nor did he have the right temperament to be a good chancellor.

Erickson: Who was the dean when ... ?

Adrian: Yes, I wanted to say something about that. The dean had just become Carlo Golino, replacing Tom Jenkin. Tom Jenkin had replaced Bob Nisbet. Nisbet was out of Berkeley, but the other two were out of UCLA. Nisbet was a great scholar and he was a fine, fine person. He was a lousy administrator.

Then Golino and Jenkin. Jenkin was a fine scholar and a very impressive individual, but he had an attitude somewhat like Ivan's. He would never give you support when you wanted to do something new and different. If it was going to cost an extra dime from The Regents, it seemed as if Tom didn't want to help. And he tended to support the original UCR clique, because he himself was a non publisher.

Golino was quite different. Golino was eager to see publication and development. The trouble was that people never completely trusted Carlo. I liked him. I think most people liked him, but he was the kind of person who never would do something in a straight simple way if he could find a devious way to do it. And that isn't the way it's usually done in the academic world. In the business world, you kind of expect that. You don't expect that in academia.

Adrian: So these were not great administrators, but basically, I think they were pretty good. Our college had a couple of good administrators. Let's see ... Golino was followed by Reagan. The present dean came after I retired, so I just don't know him well.

Erickson: Well, let's move a little to your writing style and your research. What kind of research did you do?

Adrian: I tried to do research that represented the modern trend in political science. I did quite a bit of quantitative studies of (pause) urban politics mainly, but some American. I did a lot of publishing.

Erickson: Do you like to write?

Adrian: I write quite easily. Some people might think it's torture. It never has been for me. By the time I had retired, I had written over 100 articles and ... oh, I don't know how many books ... 14 I figure. But some of those are major revisions of existing textbooks. It's hard to say how many books because some of them were textbooks that were revised. But I always liked to write. It's very difficult even if you like to do it, it's hard work. And writing is a difficult thing at least for two reasons: (1) is because it is always something that you have to do yourself.

Erickson: Oh, you didn't have graduate students who could help do some of the research?

Adrian: In the social sciences we don't do much of that. I did always have a graduate assistant who did some work for me. But ultimately you do it yourself. You have to decide what you are going to use, and you have to write the article which is the hardest part of the article or the book. You have to write it yourself, and that's hard work. Also, if you don't do it, if you don't write the page is empty at the end of the day, and you know who's to blame. You can't pass the buck. We live in an age of passing the buck, because it's a bureaucratic age and in a bureaucracy you can always do that. But you can't do that in writing.

Adrian: Also, I think that it is very difficult because of the fact that you have to face up directly to peers who evaluate your work, and they can be pretty brutal. Some people can't take that, and so they can't publish or at least they can't publish anything that is peer reviewed. They can publish pop articles, but if you have to face your peers, it's very difficult. Some people can't do it.

Erickson: How did you learn to accept the criticism?

Adrian: Oh, I don't think you learn it. I think that some personalities can do it and some can't. As to how I learned to write, I remember as a graduate student I was told by several professors that I wrote well. Well, as far as I know the only way you learn to write well is to read a lot. I have done that since I was a little boy. So that's how I got into it. Then you get into a habit, and also you feel you aren't doing your job.

You know, you have to be driven by some feeling that this is something you've got to do, you've got to finish it. So you are largely self policed. You don't get promoted just by yourself, but to a large extent, you decide what you are going to work on and when and how much and how hard.

That's unusual in our society, I think. Novelists are about the only people I can think of who fit into that, and they do an entirely different kind of writing. But it's the same self discipline. It's the same need to do it, and you can't blame anybody else when you don't get it done or if it's no good.

Erickson: Well, how did you handle that balance, Chuck, with being the chair of the department, being a professor, being a teacher ...

(chuckle)

and then the service part, too. How did you balance all that?

Adrian: (sigh) Who knows? I think most faculty members who are reasonably successful have to do all those things. I suppose you give a little favoring to what you prefer, but I've always

Adrian: liked to teach. So ... in my personality, I am constitutionally (chuckle) unable to go into a classroom unprepared. I couldn't do that. Some people can and do, but I just couldn't bring myself to do that, nor could I call in sick or some dumb thing like that. I was just always, always prepared. I probably wasn't the greatest teacher in the world, but I always was ready to teach what I was supposed to be teaching. And I liked to do it. I think that's a big part.

Erickson: Yes. I think so.

Adrian: Also, I think that teaching is a kind of rewarding thing. It's kind of unusual ... All of academia is different from our society and, therefore, the university is pressured to become more and more like the rest of society. I think eventually we'll lose out. That's what will happen. But professors are still pretty much dictators in the classroom.

That's against almost every value that our culture stands for today. You know, it's a wonder that they aren't taking votes on whether it was an adequate lecture today or whether this should be included in the professor's lecture and so forth. There are pressures, and there have been, for that sort of thing. It hasn't won out yet, I think in part because a lot of people realize you can't run a university as a democracy. But there are a lot of people who would like to. So we have a built-in conflict with society.

And there were a lot of other aspects to it, too. These show up from time to time. The kinds of things, kinds of research that are done, reports that are done. You know, these are things ... well, we live in such an egalitarian age that even the fact that professors think they are good enough to evaluate society in some small aspect of it (you always take a thin slice). But even the fact that people think you can do that is highly criticized, because you aren't supposed to evaluate people. Everybody is supposed to be equal. You know, there is a kind of mass self delusion in our society today that makes it more difficult for a university (to perform its functions).

End of Tape 1

Erickson: Let's talk about the students you knew in the early years...

Adrian: Yes.

Erickson: and compare them to later years, to about the time you retired.

Adrian: I looked at that question and I wondered what to say about it. It's a very difficult question to answer.

Erickson: Well, I was thinking in particular about the early students ... when you came here in the 60s that was about the time of student unrest. And so was their focus different and were they ...

Adrian: Well, yes. I thought you meant did we have better students in the early days than we did when I retired.

Erickson: Well, that too.

Adrian: And that's the question that's hard to answer because I would say that in strict ... something like SAT scores, the answer is yes. But in terms of overall ability to grasp what is being taught, not really. We certainly didn't make conscious adjustments to it, but there might have been some adjustments that we made recognizing that we had a broader social spectrum we were recruiting from.

But the problems of recruiting minority group people are related to things outside the university for the most part. They are related to within the group. Blacks have a lot of problems because of something nobody wants to talk about, which is that there is no intellectual tradition among Blacks. Compare them, let's say to Jews or Mormons or compare them with Japanese-American or Chinese-Americans—all of them have powerful intellectual traditions. And that's unfortunately missing among Blacks. It's not the fault of present-day Blacks, it is a fault of the fact that their ancestors were slaves who ... It was a crime in many Southern states to teach a Black anything. So how

Adrian: could they have an intellectual tradition, you see? The closest thing they had to it was the church and things like gospel singing and so forth. Those kinds of problems are not created by the university, but we are expected to solve them. Well, it's not easy. Nobody quite knows how you take care of a problem of an intellectual weakness, absence. You never have a problem with the Japanese or Chinese in that respect.

Erickson: Yes, but the fact that they are being educated now at university levels, will that not level out at some point?

Adrian: We hope so, but we don't know. Of course, it will in terms of overall ability, nobody has shown that there is any substantial difference from one group of human beings to another. So probably it will.

The thing in politics ... you know, everything has to be solved by tomorrow morning. That kind of thing is going to take years, decades and that, of course, is a big part of the problem. Nobody wants to wait that long.

Well, let's see. The other part of your question ... the one you had ... Oh, you were thinking about the pre-60s students against the post-60s students. Again, not easy to answer. In some ways, the 60s did some good in a lot of ways. To my thinking it did a great deal of harm, and we have not overcome the difficulties done by that.

One of the biggest problems with the 60s uprising ... whatever you'd want to call it ... the unrest, was that it was so terribly anti intellectual. By its nature, it was opposed to what universities do. Active efforts to reform society to bring people into the mainstream who weren't in the mainstream, these things are not part of a university's job. Many of the students felt it should be. We don't know how to do those things. And we can't do things we don't know how to do. Besides, they were opposed to an intellectual approach to any of these problems.

Adrian: So the result was that the university changed. Yes. The faculty, however, has enormous powers of resistance, and again, what typically you do in all political situations is to give some ground but not too much. The real successful administrator, the real successful politician is the one who know is how much ground to give and not to go further than that.

I think that we gave a lot of ground in areas where, in time probably some good will come of it. Black Studies, Chicano Studies, Women's Studies—all of those were new when I became chair, approximately at that time.

For the most part those programs with some partial exceptions, especially with women, the programs though were in large part not programs that would deal effectively with academic subjects, intellectual things. They were grinding political axes that didn't have very much to do with the university.

But this was a place where kids who wanted to do these things were at the age of being university students, and they thought that universities had a lot of liberal faculty who would support them and things like this. Unfortunately for them, they didn't realize that the faculty is liberal only when it doesn't cost them anything. Whenever it did, there was a lot of reevaluation.

So in the end, yes, there were some changes made. There was a general downgrading of the grading system in the 60s. That has never been replaced. You know, the students today would be shocked to learn that in 1950 or even 1960, a faculty member rarely gave more than 10% of the class As (undergraduates I am talking about now).

That's not true today. I don't know what they are doing today. I imagine it's 25 to 30% As. It's a re-conceptualization of what a grade is. It did a lot of damage to the best students. The best students are always at a disadvantage in these social movement changes with one exception: The best students who wouldn't get into college otherwise.

Adrian: And, I must say, because of my own background, I am not very sympathetic to those people who say, "Well, we have some very bright Blacks. Very bright Latinos. Bright women." Women especially, because they are really a separate problem. They are always lumped in because it was convenient politically to see women's problems as the same as Blacks problems. They weren't, of course. The women who were upper middle class women were upper middle class people, and you can't compare them with Blacks coming out of the ghetto. But we had to because politically that was the way it was seen.

That was shameful in many ways, but I think that we had a tendency to look at the problems in a way that would ... (pause) get rid of them. That is, accommodate to them, deal with them as much as we could. Most people didn't want to continue fighting these battles. That's true of anybody, including the chancellor. But in any case, I suppose that what we did was to accommodate to the changes, minimize the damage, take advantage of any advantages.

For example, we would get more really fine black and brown students today, people we would never have gotten before the 60s movement. But as I said, I wasn't very sympathetic to this because of my own background. In my day, you solved these problems on your own. If you couldn't afford to go to college, you earned your money to go to college. Today, they want somebody to help them do it. We didn't think of having somebody outside of the family help us. Today that's kind of routine, and the result of that is probably that you get a lot of people who want to get college degrees, get credit for being in college, don't want to do the work.

There are some, among the minority, who do want to, who very much want to be advanced. And that's fine, they do all right, because they realize that there's one basic person who has to do it, and that's yourself. But that was a problem that came up in the '60's. Overall at the end of the '60's, with the end of the uproar, the University had changed some, but I would have to say not in its basic way, in its basic instruction. And we've widened the social input to the University. How much that is

Adrian: going to benefit is not known yet, I would have to say. People who think they have answers to that are kidding themselves. We just don't know. We know what we have to do politically, and we know that probably out of this, almost certainly, is going to come some good in the form of students who would not have gone to college otherwise. (And society needs far more college educated people today than it did sixty years ago).

I'm keenly aware of the desirability of getting those people into a university, because of my own background again, but I am not sympathetic to the way they want to do it, which is to have it done for them. Nobody learns by having somebody else do it for them. That is one of the things, you know, that is a unique characteristic (of education).

Learning has to be done by the individual ultimately. Teachers can help, teachers probably help less than they think they do. Mostly, people learn and advance because they want to, they're willing to commit to the effort, and above all, they never believe this silly nonsense you hear, that learning should be fun. Learning is work, and it will never be anything else. It can never be anything else.

So those were some of the kinds of issues that we had in the '60's, and I guess that we tried to deal with. I still think though that fundamentally we are not willing to look at those issues, work them out completely. I think the reason we're not is that the issues themselves are so politically loaded, that it's very difficult to give honest comments. I'm saying things to you that no politician publicly would say, and that's a problem. How do you deal in a modern society with questions that shouldn't be swept under the rug? But we haven't solved that problem (of sweeping) either.

What else did you have here (referring to the printed questions).

Erickson: Well, let's talk about ...

Adrian: Oh, the committee system.

Erickson: And also, you brought up a point that you wanted to talk about being a professor and compare that with the early days.

Adrian: Oh, yes. Well, very briefly on that ... When I entered college in the fall of 1940, I think that the faculty member then was a very exceptional person who was regarded with a certain amount of deference and was considered to be quite an important individual and above all was considered rather different from the rank and file of society. You weren't a freak exactly, but you were somebody who probably approached things a little bit differently. Or you willingly waded in and took on difficult conceptual problems and tried to deal with them and then tried to explain to those people who didn't want to work as hard as you had.

Now faculty members today are different from when I was an undergraduate. In the fall of 1940 almost every faculty member had a broad education, and they could talk and think in terms of a variety of things whereas today, the pressure is to specialize—even the undergraduates. Now everybody specialized, of course, even in those days, but even the undergraduates do so today.

When I was an undergraduate, you weren't allowed to declare a major before the beginning of your junior year. Today they want to do it the day they come on campus, and they think they know what they want to be and what they want to study. In one sense, that's ridiculous and in another sense, it's the result of the extreme specialization that's necessary in a world that has had a fantastic expansion of knowledge since I entered college.

It has produced the professor ... Well, in drawing a boundary, the ideal professor in my day would follow a normal distribution curve, which is ... I don't know if you know anything about statistics?)

Erickson: Not much.

Adrian: But Napoleon's hat viewed from the side is the shape of a normal distribution curve with the bunching of it in the middle and then going down and petering out until you have the extremes of the very knowledgeable, the completely unknowledgeable, the left wingers, the right wingers and so forth under the edges of the curve.

Today, you have what is known in statistics as a high purtosis, that is, you have the distribution curve but it goes up very steeply, very narrowly and very steeply and then descends very rapidly. In other words, you have people who know a great deal about some little subject and almost nothing about a lot of others.

That wouldn't have been allowed in the faculty that I knew as an undergraduate. You couldn't be an ignoramus in literature but know a great deal about subatomic physics or some specialized aspect of subatomic physics.

So that today, we have that change to super specialization, and the other thing that you have today is the fact that faculty members have relatively modest status. They are viewed sort of the same way as high school teachers. Nothing wrong with high school teachers, but there isn't much of a status differential today. There's some. But there was an enormous status differential when I entered college. When was that ... that was almost sixty years ago now. So that's been a big change, and I think it creates some problems of the kind of people who are self selected for graduate study.

Why should you get a Ph.D. today and all of the anxieties and efforts that are required to get a Ph.D.? Well, I think that you are getting some decline in the willingness of people to get Ph.D.s, and also I think that the people who do it today less and less really want to teach because they are so overspecialized. Anyway, those are the kinds of things ... it's a field of declining status ...

Erickson: I see.

Adrian: at a time when more than ever is needed because there are more college jobs today than ten years ago, than there were fifty years ago and so on.

Erickson: Now let's talk about the committees.

Adrian: Well, I don't want to say much about the committees excepting that ... on what committees did I serve? I served on every committee that I considered a major committee. And I chaired every one of them at one time or another. Most of that was a great waste of time.

Erickson: Really?

Adrian: Yes. I think that if I had to do it over again I would have done what Barbara Sinclair did, to name one person who very frankly did it. Barbara simply avoided committee service where she could and she never became the chair if she could avoid it. Because she wanted to spend that time in research and writing, which in her view had a higher payoff. I think she was being rational about that, and I think that was true. I wish I hadn't spent so much time on these committees.

One thing that happens, and it's unfair in our system is that if they find that you are pretty good at chairing a committee, you never get out of chairing committees.

Erickson: That's true.

Adrian: That's what happened to me.

Erickson: You couldn't say no.

Adrian: I did say no a few times, but I said no on the committees that I thought were of no real importance or maybe that I had no real interest in. It was difficult for me to say no for the same reason that I couldn't go to class unprepared. The same reason. You are driven by your own personality to do these things right. And also, on some of the committees, occasionally there was

Adrian: something important that would come up, and I would feel that I'd rather be chairing it than anybody else I could think of.

But I had some worthwhile experiences on the committees. I think we should find a way to reduce the committee system. The theory is that it makes a more democratic system. I'm not sure it should be that much more democratic.

(chuckle)

I think it's wasting time. But I had some very good experiences, especially on the Budget Committee, now called the Academic Personnel Committee, because you make real decisions that have consequences for faculty members or people in the professor series. The other thing was that I chaired that committee for two years.

And somewhat later, I also chaired the committee ... what is it? It's an elegant name, I love it. (pause) The committee that advises the University of California press? Editorial Committee it's called. The Editorial Committee. Helped the editor in making decisions. Actually you have veto power. The editor never publishes anything where he can't get the support of a majority of the committee. I chaired that committee for two or three years. I was on it for five or something, but it was a very fascinating committee. And for somebody with my broad background of interest, it was wonderful.

Erickson: You would be wonderful in that.

Adrian: And I enjoyed doing it and learned a lot. I also spent a great deal of time on it that you can't replace. The committee kept meeting in various places, which meant you spent travel time. But it was worthwhile.

Those two committees were worthwhile. The others I have doubts. I was asked on a number of occasions to serve on a committee that was a very touchy political thing.

Adrian: Once the chancellor—I guess it was still Ivan, was asked by the university president to complete a master plan, an academic master plan for this campus. And nobody could ever get it done. So Ivan then decided ... You know in administration if you can't get it done, you find some way to pass it off to somebody else ...

Erickson: Assign it to somebody.

Adrian: and so he went to the Academic Senate chair and asked if they couldn't create a joint academic/administration Senate committee to prepare a plan and gave them a deadline yet. This is the kind of thing that isn't done in academia. We don't like appointed committees in the first place, and we don't like deadlines in the second place. So I was asked to chair the darn thing. And we did prepare and complete a plan. It was such an unlikely thing that I suppose I should be proud of it in a way.

(chuckle)

But it was another waste of time, because I don't believe in those kinds of plans. I think that politics drives planning, intellectual exercises don't. Anyway, the committee was later found to be so ineffective that it was dismantled. We no longer have a Committee on Planning.

But for one brief moment I helped Ivan get out of a jam, and I shouldn't have done that. It was his jam, and he should have solved it. I don't really know the background of why we couldn't come up with a plan, but we couldn't. I was fairly new on the campus at that time. It wasn't until later that I realized that (chuckle) in a way I had done a monumental thing. I had done something that nobody else up to that time had been able to do. And we did have a report that did serve as the academic part of his plan.

Erickson: So you should be proud.

Adrian: I guess so. (laughter) But I didn't really see it that way until later on. I must say that I spent far too much time on it.

Adrian: We had a Committee on Educational Policy. I thought the Committee on Educational Policy was basically a waste of time and so are a number of other committees that have certain status to them but really don't accomplish very much. The Committee on Educational Policy. Who really determines educational policy in the university? The departments do! So why have a campuswide committee on it? But we did, and I spent some time as chair of it.

Erickson: When I saw you a few years ago at a reception I believe it was, you said that you were writing a novel.

Adrian: Oh, yes. But I abandoned it after a while.

Erickson: Oh, that's too bad.

Adrian: I didn't realize that I had told anybody about that. I was interested, you see, because I lost a leg the year after I retired, and so I am not very maneuverable.

Erickson: Um hmm.

Adrian: And the greatest thing that has come along for me is the computer.

Erickson: Absolutely.

Adrian: I also have arthritis in my fingers. And I used to be a good touch typist, but I couldn't do it any more. I could never correct all those errors on a traditional typewriter, so I've been lucky in that regard. But I was looking for something to do, and I thought maybe I would write a political novel. But the training that an academician gets is so different from a novelist that ...

Erickson: The writing style and everything is different?

Adrian: Yes. Even if you can do the style, what you do you see... The novelist ... Say I am reading a novel in a field that I know very well intellectually. They are constantly shaving edges, they are

Adrian: cutting corners, they are telling half truths and things of that sort, or they are just finessing a whole big problem to get on with the story.

Erickson: Oh.

Adrian: And that goes against all that you are taught. Academicians are often criticized for the fact that they never can say this is the answer, simply. They always want to modify it. And that's necessary intellectually in academia, but it doesn't make for novel writing. So no, I gave it up.

Another fellow and I, a long-time friend of mine, have finished a book which we hope to get published.

Erickson: Oh.

Adrian: It's finished, and it's a book on a bunch of biographies of people who were important in the 20s, because that's an interesting decade. People important in the 20s. Only a few of them are politicians. Mostly, we just did it for fun. I don't know if it will be publishable or not. Depends if we find the right editor who thinks it is. But that has been an interesting thing.

I said I was never going to do any more political science after I retired. Basically I have not, but I am working on a book on the decline and fall of democracy and looking at, in a pop sense without the usual requirements of specificity that you have in academia, I am dealing with the whole matter that people aren't voting today to start with the basic point of it. Why aren't people voting and what's the consequence of this? What comes of democracy if voting, which is sort of the fundamental, basic stone of the whole system that holds it all together, what happens if it's pulled out of there? I am looking at some of these questions. It's a fun set of things, but I am not trying to make it an academic study. I am trying to do this to help people understand when the next potential election comes along, what's happening and why.

Erickson: That's an interesting topic.

Adrian: Yeh. It's a fun thing to do.

Erickson: What made you decide to retire?

Adrian: Health reason, primarily. I am in pretty good health, but I developed diabetes when I was ... how old was I? (pause) I was 55 or something like that. 56 it was, because it was ... I developed a kind of a harsh form of diabetes, but also one that turned out to be fairly-well controllable. But before it was controlled, it had pretty much destroyed my peripheral nerves. I don't have any feeling in my fingers or in my remaining foot. Also, it destroyed the circulation in the small blood vessels, especially in the arms and legs, mostly the legs. Those are the big problems for a diabetic.

Well anyway, the point of it is that I simply no longer was able to get around the way I needed to. And I wasn't concerned about graduate students. I could meet with them by arrangement, even at home if necessary. But I didn't think I could do an adequate job for the undergraduate any longer. I needed help in getting around. For one thing, we spent a whole year trying to avoid the amputation.

Erickson: Sure.

Adrian: That meant that I was in a wheel chair most of the time. (chuckle) I had to have help getting pushed around the campus, you know. It just wasn't the right way to do it. I did find it a learning experience. Again, if you are a decent professor, you find everything a learning experience! But what I found was that it was extremely important when I was in that wheel chair that when I taught the class, I got out of the wheel chair, collapsed the wheel chair, put it aside as much as I could, and sat in my regular chair. I couldn't hop up to the blackboard the way I used to. But I could get there. I could sit down and teach it mostly as I always had. But I discovered early on little tiny things that indicated you lose the aura of authority if you are in a wheel chair.

Erickson: Oh.

Adrian: People think if your feet don't work, your head probably isn't working either. I found out right away that was a kind of unconscious thought by people. So I decided to retire. I was 66. A lot of people grabbed at 65 and retired. I intended to go on as long as the university would let me, but then when I found I wasn't really doing an adequate job for undergraduate teaching, I decided to quit and I retired. When I was 66, I retired June 30 of 1988—ten years ago. No, that isn't right, is it?

Erickson: Well, you know what? I've got it here. Yes, June 30, 1988.

Adrian: Yes.

Erickson: But you missed the VERIP.

Adrian: I missed it by about a year. But you see I made a good deal of money in textbook writing, so I wasn't as concerned about that as a lot of the faculty members were. I don't think that really was a very important thing to me, although some people thought it was very important. You know, they said, "It isn't right. You missed it by one year and get nothing."

But life is made up of drawing lines, and they are often arbitrary. No, it didn't bother me.

Erickson: You've been retired for ten years, but do you have some thoughts about the campus today? Is that a fair question?

Adrian: Oh, yes. I think that the campus has recovered from its days when it was not being lead too much. The new chancellor is working pretty hard at doing what I like, which is being a traditional chancellor.

Chancellors are not as important as they think they are. No administrator is. That is to say that basically the faculty does the work of the university, and the people who are involved in

Adrian: the organizing of the work are the administrators, and they are important, but they are never quite as important as they think they are. They always have an exaggerated view of their own importance; therefore, they are quite happy to overpay themselves.

For the most part, I think that the campus today is ... what should I say? ... inevitable. What's happening to it is the inevitable development of the campus and of the university. I don't think there is much room for negotiation on that. I am not entirely happy with it, but I also think that it's necessary. Most of the things that have happened are really kind of necessary developments, maybe not quite the way they were done, but they had to be done.

I have always thought you have a large portion of the faculty that is unrealistic about some aspects of their own beliefs, that they are inconsistent. They think of the one moment. You know, they are liberals, and they want to see or do things that are associated with liberalism. They want us to bring in the minority students who have been largely left out of the system in the past and all that sort of thing.

But they also want small campuses, and they want to have their own way of doing things, and they don't want to lower standards. All those things are nonsense. You are going to have a big, crowded campus, and you are going to lower standards, and you might as well face the fact. But they don't like to. Well what you do is to kid yourself, of course. But I would say that the things that have resulted in that respect are inevitable.

Also, another development is that we lower standards because we are admitting ... mass educating is really a contradiction in terms. Education is a specialized thing for people who not only want to learn but can learn. The more you spread it out, the more you have to lower standards.

I think that politically that's necessary today. Probably a lot of people who are more liberal than I am say that that's the only

Adrian: fair way to do it. But at the same time, what we are doing is developing more and more specialization.

And this sharp peak in the middle of the distribution curve is, I think, a reflection of the fact that our society is more and more living a delusion. We talk in terms of more democracy, greater involvement of more people, people really equal, and all those sorts of things. But the people who really run the world are the people who are at the peaks of those distribution curves. They are the people who know these kinds of specialized knowledge. And that's just the way it's going to be.

Again, my feeling is it's pretty much inevitable. We want both goals. We want the advantages of high tech. You get that only one way, higher people who understand it. And at the same time, we want a broad egalitarian society. They are contradictions in terms. They are contradictions in goals. It seems to me that again, they are pretty much what we need. They are inevitable. We demand both of the goals and we kind of tend to not see what we don't want to see in the system.

I think that the goal of egalitarianism has to be separated from the goal of intense technical knowledge, which is what our society depends upon today. But we don't want to see an inconsistency in this kind of thing, so that what we get, of course, is very specialized graduate programs and very general undergraduate programs.

It works out all right as long as somebody doesn't point out that really it isn't egalitarian at all. I think that is a natural result of the developments in the two hundred years, almost three hundred years, since the industrial revolution. As soon as you began to develop a technology, you had to develop people who understood the technology, and that meant you had to have people to teach the experts on it.

Erickson: Interesting.

Adrian: And at the same time, we want to have everybody having the same opportunity of going to college. I proposed to Ivan at one time that when people enrolled at UCR, we should give them a bachelor's degree, and that then they could concentrate on getting an education, not just on the kinds of things that were required to get a degree.

I think in many ways, it's also true that we probably should just declare that the people are educated, you know, and then go on and take the people who really want to learn and teach them.

But that of course ... Ivan always thought I was kidding. Well, I sort of was. You know, the defense always would be, "Well, the bureaucracy won't let you do that."

That's true enough, you couldn't do it that way, but there is a fundamental inconsistency in which we are becoming constantly a more technical society requiring more and more specialized knowledge, while at the same time we want to spend more time giving everybody some knowledge of a technological society.

People without skills today are doomed. They are going to be poor. We can do a lot of talking, but at the end of the talking they are still going to be poor. The answer is that you have to develop a specialty. Most of the specialties don't require a great deal of education. Most of them require training, and that's another story I won't get into.

But increasingly we are training people rather than educating them. By the standards of 1940 when I entered college, that's very much the case. People don't seem to be too concerned about it because most of what is involved in learning about ... oh, politics and learning about the social system, learning about literature—most of those things are today translated to the public in terms of television. Television is the great leveler. And it's a pretty low level. That's not going to change either. But what it does is to give people a kind of superficial sophistication.

Adrian: The really important developments are pretty much hidden from most of society, and I think we have today a system in which the rich get richer in the same way that the educated get more educated. And nobody pays much attention to it. At the same time the rich are getting richer, the poor are getting poorer, you see.

And the same thing is true in education. We get more and more specialized education, but the poorest educated people have more education than they once had. It's a strange system. In a way, it's an illusion. We kid ourselves into avoiding facing up to it. But it seems to work, more or less.

Erickson: Is there anything else we didn't have written down that you'd like to talk about?

Adrian: I don't think so. I think we've covered a great deal.

Erickson: We certainly did, and I thank you very much for this interview. It was very interesting.

End of interview