

Arthur Campbell Turner

Note of Explanation:

Professor Arthur Campbell Turner completed both the audio and video segments of the oral history interviews prior to his passing, but due to demands on his schedule, he was unable to complete the final review of the tapes. He had, however, signed his formal approval of them.

Netty Turner, his dedicated wife and partner for more than 50 years, was thoughtful enough to provide authorization to release the tapes and make them an integral and permanent part of the UCR oral history series.

Professor Francis Carney, a colleague and fellow political scientist who joined Dr. Turner as part of the founding UCR faculty a half century ago, volunteered to ensure the accuracy of the tapes through his careful review and editing and made appropriate modifications. This editing would have been so important to Professor Turner, whose personal integrity and commitment to factual reporting were critical elements of his character.

Jan Erickson
Interviewer
April 9, 2005

**Transcription of Oral History Audio Interview with
ARTHUR CAMPBELL TURNER**

April 6 and May 28, 1998

This oral history interview is being conducted Monday, April 6, 1998, with Professor Arthur Campbell Turner, who came to UC Riverside as one of its founding faculty members. He was appointed Associate Professor and Chairman of the Division of Social Sciences for UCR in July, 1953.

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

Erickson: Professor Turner, I wonder if we could start by your telling us where you were born and a little about your mother and father and any siblings that you have?

Turner: Thank you, Jan. I was born, of course, in Glasgow, Scotland. My family was middle class. My only sibling is my sister, who is five and a half years younger than I am. She is now married to Roger Parsons, a very distinguished chemist who is a Fellow of the Royal Society, and which, of course, there is no greater honor in scientific circles in England, or indeed in the world because there are foreign members who are FRSs.

My father was a journalist specializing in sports. Did you know that?

Erickson: No. I didn't.

Turner: Yes, like your husband my father was a journalist, and he specialized in sports, though I think that was what he did for a living more than his basic interest perhaps, though he was very good at it.

He had comparatively little formal education. I suppose he left school at about sixteen, but he nevertheless was very well acquainted with literature and politics and all the general paraphernalia of knowledge. His English was very good. I don't think I ever heard him make a single grammatical mistake in speaking or in writing either for that matter.

He was rather a gifted artist although he made nothing of it in career terms. I have one or two samples of his work at home, unfortunately very few.

Erickson: Are they paintings, Arthur?

Turner: Yes, but the watercolors are black and white. I have a very nice black and white sketch based on sketches made in a bar on the 27th of December, 1912 in Paris. He visited Paris several times,

and I believe studied art there to some extent, although I don't really know the details.

But basically he was a journalist in all the latter part of his life. From the early 1930s on, he was working on the Scottish Daily Express, which was part of Lord Beaverbrook's Empire.

Lord Beaverbrook was the press magnate of that day, equivalent perhaps to Rupert Murdoch today, though really less impressive. Press magnates seem to get bigger and more international in every generation.

He particularly specialized in reporting boxing. I had accompanied him, I suppose, at the ringside as his assistant to every major boxing event in Glasgow and some other places, too. In the 1930s and part of the 1940s, I sat at the ringside with Gene Tunney, who happened to be visiting Glasgow and Victor

Turner: MacLaglen. And of course, they were guests of honor and were found a place at ringside at the reporter's table, which was, in fact, extremely inconvenient for the reporters.

(chuckle)

My father retired in 1963 at the age of 73, almost 74—a record I hoped to beat but didn't. And he died in 1971. My mother died in 1969.

Erickson: What did your mother do? Did she stay at home?

Turner: Yes, she did not do anything beyond the many things you have to do as a housewife.

Erickson: Of course.

Turner: She was a very intelligent woman, too.

Erickson: Did you ever wear a kilt, Arthur?

Turner: I had a kilt when I was quite young, perhaps from the age of 4 or 5 until I was 9 or so, because kilts tend to last forever. But it was never everyday dress. It was rather a dress up kind of thing. And then many years later I had a kilt made, and I still had it with me when we came to UCR. I did wear it to a few games of the Highlanders.

Erickson: Great.

Turner: Though I really don't know where it is now, I'm afraid.

Erickson: Tell us a little about your education, too. You mentioned Glasgow.

Turner: Yes. Well, my school was the High School of Glasgow, which I think needs a little explaining. In American terms, it was not purely a high school because it took pupils (students as we

Turner: would say) from kindergarten through the sixth form until they were seventeen or eighteen, that is.

The name of the High School of Glasgow suggests rather quaintly that it was the only one, but of course, that's not the case. It was, in fact, the first one. It's a very old school which still survives.

It was founded some time in the Middle Ages, but the early history of the school is not very well known, because at the time of the reformation, a departing Cardinal took all the records to France where they disappeared. I should say that it was originally the Bishop's school.

Later on, the school was taken under the protection of the Corporation of the City of Glasgow, which is to say the city of government, but that protection proved somewhat illusory because some time after the Second World War, the City Council, Corporation of Glasgow, which had a Labor majority, proceeded to abolish the school on the ground that it was elitist, which I think one can fairly see it was. This, however, led to a

great movement which lead to the rebirth of the school as it were as a private entity.

And it is now located on the former playing fields of the school, which in fact, at no time were under the possession of the Corporation of Glasgow but had always been the property of the High School Club and Association of Alumni. So they had this other extensive property to build on, and it is now located there and is carrying on the tradition.

Barring that kind of violent change means the end of one thing and the beginning of another. You've always got a problem with institutions because institutions are always changing. People die and people retire and so on even though the institution as a corporation continues. But anyway, there it is.

I should say ... a rather extraordinary thing. The high school has produced two British Prime Ministers in the Twentieth

Turner: Century: Bonar-Law, who was Prime Minister in 1921-22 and Campbell Bannerman, who was Prime Minister from 1905 to 1908 or 09. But I think that must be regarded as a statistical freak, the fact that we have two in this century, because we had no other prime ministers in any other century. It was a very good school.

Erickson: You said you were there until?

Turner: Until I was 18.

Erickson: Eighteen. Did you go from there to Oxford?

Turner: No, I went to the University of Glasgow, which was as it were, a well-trodden road. The circumstances then were so utterly different from what they are here and now—indeed, what they are there and now, that it's almost difficult to recreate them. In Britain now, anybody who is qualified for entry to a university and who is admitted to a particular university is, as it were, subsidized, maintained on government funds throughout his

course at the university. That is something, of course, that is not the case here.

Now in those days, of course, there was no such thing. One either paid the fees, the family paid the fees, that is to say, the tuition, or one got a scholarship, which just to make things more confusing, in Scotland are called bursaries (again the French influence, bursary).

Well, every year in those days and indeed until much later (I don't know when this all stopped and gave way to the new system), every year there was a great scholastic competition called the Bursary Competition of the University of Glasgow.

If you hoped for some financial support, or if your parents hoped for some financial support, you entered for that. What kind of scholarship you got, what it was worth and so on, depended on your placing in the list. The top eighty or ninety, I suppose, got

Turner: some kind of financial support, the rest didn't. There were about 400 entrants in the year I sat the bursary competition. As I remember, I was seventeenth, which wasn't exactly covered with glory but ...

Erickson: That's wonderful.

Turner: It was good enough. I got a bursary, i.e. a scholarship, which more than paid my fees.

Erickson: Oh, so even a little extra.

Turner: Oh, yes. Fees in the Scottish universities were quite extraordinarily low in those days. So, I was at the University of Glasgow, although I began on a course that was aimed at doing Honors in English, which is of course, something like majoring in some subject here, but more so—much more so.

I began my first year with intentions of doing Honors in English, but I changed in my first year to doing Honors in History. At the end of the university course, I got First Class Honors in

History, the only one of my year to do so. Also, as a result of that achievement, I was given a scholarship, which was this time actually called a scholarship, of no less than 200£ a year.

Erickson: My goodness.

Turner: Which you could live on. I mean a man could live on that. A family would live very poorly, but you could live on 200£ a year, so it was with that I went to Oxford. But of course, we're really jumping the gun a little.

Erickson: How many years were you at the University of Glasgow?

Turner: Four. The first degree course in the Scottish universities is four years, as indeed it is here. But that's not typical of the whole country. In Oxford, it's three years, but it's four years at Glasgow.

Erickson: Did you go to Oxford then after your four years at University of Glasgow?

Turner: Yes. There was no financial problem about that because of my scholarship from Glasgow which was called the Founders Scholarship, a result of some benefactor's endowment.

However, while I was in my final year at Glasgow, I had sat for the Oxford Scholarship Exam, and I gained a scholarship to Queen's College at Oxford, which was my first choice. The scholarship at Queen's was of a nominal value of 100£ a year which turned out to be very nominal, because on being informed that I had a scholarship from somewhere else, some kind of means test came into operation and they whittled it down to something very trivial—10 or 20£ in terms of cash. But as a scholar, I had free board and lodgings during my time at Oxford, which is very important.

Also, another thing which is really, I suppose, unique to me is that I augmented my income as a student very considerably by the unusual expedient—perhaps I should say the unusual luck of winning a number of essay prizes which had cash prizes.

For example, this was the first of these half dozen or so successes, I won the Cecil Peace Prize in 1939. That's when I was still at Glasgow. This award had been financed by Viscount Cecil of Chelwood, a member of the great Cecil family, which incidentally is pronounced "Cicil" by people in the know, but it is C E C I L. He was one of the founders of the League of Nations on the British side and was quite prominent in British politics in the 1920s.

The Cecil Peace Prize was open to any student at any British university under the age of 25. As you notice, foreigners were not excluded. In fact, some years before I won it, I think 1933 or '34, it had been won by Dean Rusk, who was on a Rhodes Scholarship at Oxford at that time and was, of course, a future U.S. Secretary of State.

Turner: The Cecil essay I wrote was on the subject of the Czechoslovakia crisis of the year before that resulted in Munich of ill fame. Then there were others.

There were two Glasgow University prizes: the Henderson Prize and the Arthur Jones Memorial Prize, which were worth, if we give the Scotch touch, 60£ and 25£ respectively.

Then I also won while I was at Oxford 50£ for a prize competition for an essay on war aims run by a magazine called World Review, a very good review on international relations but aimed at the general intelligent public.

It was edited at that time by a very distinguished man in the editorial field, Stephan Marrant, who had come from somewhere on the continent as a refugee and later on, I think, was associated with Life Magazine in this country.

(pause) I'm trying to remember them all.

Erickson: (chuckle)

Turner: I've forgotten the year, but I also won a prize given by Aberdeen University but open to unrestricted competition, as they charmingly said, called the Blackwell Prize. And that was worth 70£, I think. Now, of course, these sums now seem quite trivial, because in present day terms, in terms of present day purchasing power of currencies, they are trivial. But 100£ that I got for the Cecil Prize ... by the way, it was free of tax, which is very nice, too. 100£ would now be the equivalent of ... what, \$165—and you know how little that would get.

But then, you could buy a good suit made to measure for 5£. You could buy a very good suit made to measure for 10£. So, you could buy 10 extraordinarily good suits or 20 quite respectable suits for the 100£. Likewise, a passable restaurant meal would cost you 2 and 6, 1/8 of a £, two shillings and 6 pence. A very good restaurant meal might cost you that, 6 or 7 shillings, roughly three to the £. That gives you an idea. A rented apartment of four rooms (we had five or five and a half

Turner: rooms actually in Glasgow) would run around 60 or 70£ a year. A year, not month!

Erickson: A year, yes. You said you were at Oxford for three years. Where did you live there? Did they have dormitories as we know them.

Turner: Well, I was actually at Oxford longer because I did graduate work.

Erickson: Ok.

Turner: I lived in College for my first year.

Erickson: Queen's College?

Turner: Queen's College, yes, and my address was Room 410. I had one enormous sitting room and one tiny bedroom adjacent.

I had a "scout" which everybody had. A servant, not my servant, but one who looked after all the gentlemen on that stair,

I suppose, and who cleaned my shoes and made my bed and saw to it that the fire was lit before I got up in the morning. Of course, it was all a matter of coal fires then. I had a really rather good scout called Jackson, who was an ex-Army man. I understood from others, he was given to petty thievery. But for some reason or another, he never stole from me. Of course, I tipped him rather handsomely. Perhaps that helped.

(chuckle)

Erickson: And then you said you went on for graduate work there.

Turner: Yes. But to finish Oxford, and this is really very important. At Oxford, I studied modern history which isn't any different from studying history of Glasgow.

Actually history of Glasgow in those days, modern history at Oxford ended in 1914, which I still think is a very good place to

Turner: end it. I mean, the world changed forever in 1914, didn't it? That didn't prevent the tutors talking about later events.

One of my tutors, in fact, my tutor for European history at Oxford, was H. A. P. Taylor, who has a considerable reputation as a historian. He was not in my college though. If he wasn't a suitable person in college, they would farm you out to some tutor in some other college.

The business of tutoring, of course, is one of the distinctive features of Oxford and Cambridge, which aren't like any place else really. You went to your tutor about once a week, and you had a tutorial with him in which you read an essay that he had asked you to research and write the previous week. You read it to him, and then he would comment on it and so on. So, that went on for an hour. As you can see, it's extraordinarily wasteful in terms of faculty/student ratio.

Erickson: It's wonderful though.

Turner: Marvelous, yes. So that's the basic method. Also there's a sort of smorgasbord of lectures, which is published every term, and you go to any of these that you feel like going to, though you're usually recommended to go to this and that by your tutor.

I should say that you have two tutors normally. Two tutors at any given time in different topics preparing for different papers for the final exam. And therefore, you would write two very carefully considered essays every week.

Erickson: My.

Turner: Of course, if you weren't watching as so many students unfortunately do here, if you weren't working at any thing and if somebody lit your fire, brushed your shoes and made your bed, it was delightfully easy to concentrate on what you were there to do, which is absolutely perfect, of course.

Turner: Like everything, of course, this has changed. I'm not sure of the details now, but I don't think people have scouts any more to do that sort of thing.

And I think the newer housing accommodations for students at Oxford usually have a sort of cluster arrangement in which there are several bedrooms grouped around a central common room which all the students in the various bedrooms have as their joint area, which obviously is less desirable.

That's not how it was in my day. My rooms at Oxford, because after all, I had two of them, are now a dons room now. That is, no undergraduate has them. My room, in those days, had a plaque outside the door, as many other rooms in the nine colleges had, listing the distinguished inhabitants of the room in previous years or centuries. In my case, there was Edmond Gibson, Bishop of London, and ...

(pause) ... Well, where are we?

So, at Oxford in my final exam, I got a first, which of course, is a wonderful thing to do. I was the only first in my year at Oxford as I was at Glasgow. But whereas at Glasgow there had only been nine or ten people in the final exam in question in history, at Oxford there was something like seventy or eighty. So, it was a more formidable achievement.

Erickson: And they were all extremely bright people, too.

Turner: Well, presumably. Final exams at Oxford are an unparalleled ordeal, because really, nothing comes up to that point. I mean, you do essays for your tutor, and he may give you little tests as he chooses. And indeed, Norman Sikes who was my very fine tutor in English history, did exactly that. But the only thing that comes ... You see, in your final exam, you are being tested for a University degree. Your college is, in effect, preparing you for the final University exam according to the curricula conditions laid down by the University. But in the last resort, the only

Turner: thing that matters is what you get in your finals at Oxford. And that, of course, is the final for the BA.

I mean, there is graduate work at Oxford, of course, and no doubt it's rated higher in terms of prestige now than it used to be. But it's fairly recent. I mean higher degrees at Oxford have only come in about the beginning of the 20th century, an imitation of the German model, which also was followed here.

But the really important thing at Oxford is how you do in schools. That means your final honors school of whatever it is—your final Honors School of Modern History in my case.

The point of prestige attached to this is (or used to be ... I must always add that now) formidable. I mean really basically important. There's a preposterous anecdote which illustrates this if we have time.

Erickson: Absolutely.

Turner: This is about two old boys sitting in their London Club over dinner, and a third old boy comes into the room. One of them looks up and says, "Oh, there's Old Blank and So, whatever his name is. You know, he doesn't look like much now," he says, "but he really had a very distinguished career. You know, Foreign Secretary, Viceroy of India, and all that." The other one says, "Oh sure, but he only got a second in schools."

(chuckle)

I confess I sometimes think of Kenneth Clark, the late distinguished art historian. You know, Civilization. Well, he made it very well for a man who got a second in history.

Erickson: And you got a first.

Turner: Um hmm.

Erickson: That's wonderful.

Turner: Then in 1945, I got a post at the University of Glasgow as a lecturer in history.

Erickson: Well, that was quite an honor to go back to the school you had left.

Turner: Yes, thank you, yes. I was there technically until 1951, but I was really not there between 1948 and '50 because I was on leave at Berkeley.

Erickson: Oh, so you had come to the United States in 1948.

Turner: Yes.

Erickson: I see.

Turner: Actually, that's 50 years ago.

Erickson: That's right. Well, what brought you there?

Turner: Oh, Britain in those years was a very depressing place to live. There was still rationing, for example, of some items—I mean food rations until 1952, I think. Taxation was very high. I had an incredibly low salary at Glasgow.

In fact, I was better off when I had been at Oxford than I was at Glasgow, because at Glasgow, of course, where I lived at home when I began working at Glasgow in 1945. I was living at home, and (1) I had to pay some modest contribution to the household expenses since I now had a job and wasn't a student and (2) I had to pay the brutal UK Income Tax.

So, after two or three years of this not very exhilarating existence when really after one bought a few clothes and items like that, there really was very little of what they now call discretionary income at all. So, I thought this won't do, and of course, as we look back on our lives, I am sure all of us would

Turner: say we if we had known “that” then, how much better we would have handled things.

Erickson: Oh, right. Of course.

Turner: You know the story about May flies? May flies live for one day, as you probably know. The May fly says, “If only I had known at 9 o'clock this morning what I know now that it's half past five. What a life I would have had!”

(laughter)

Turner: Well, to some extent putting things in proportion, we are all May flies, really. Of course, the fact is that if I had known then, I could have written to Berkeley with my qualifications and probably gotten a job right away.

Erickson: Right.

Turner: I mean, if I'd written or taken the time to find out who was the chairman of the history department, I don't know whether it was

John Hicks in 1945 or not, I could have gotten a job right away. What I did was less perfect in the long run.

In 1948, I applied for and got a thing called Commonwealth Fund Fellowship. Commonwealth Fund is a misleading term. In fact, it's no longer implied. The whole program no longer exists.

It was basically Harkness money. Harkness is Standard Oil. They set out really on this part of their program, because they do a lot of medical research and other things ... they set out to do Rhodes Scholarships in reverse. You know, Rhodes Scholarships send Americans to Oxford ...

Erickson: Right.

Turner: as in the famous Robert Taylor film which we've seen. Commonwealth Fund Fellowships were going to send people

Turner: from Britain and also from some of the dominions as they were then called to places in the United States. The great idea, you see, was Anglo American corporation scholarships, a splendid sort of thing.

What they did was they brought over people from Britain and from South Africa, Australia, New Zealand, none from Canada, (too near here and unnecessary) for a year. Or if they wanted, they got an extension for two years. In order to acquaint them with American life and so forth, and then they were supposed to go back home and tell everybody how wonderful the United States was.

Erickson: (chuckle)

Turner: Well, so it is. So, I applied for this and got it, and I came to ... Incidentally, I also got my first choice in universities, which was Berkeley. I had thought at first about the University of Virginia, because I always had a thing about Thomas Jefferson, whom I greatly admire. And of course, he founded the University of Virginia.

Erickson: Oh.

Turner: But still, the University of Virginia is nowadays perhaps not quite the “big league.” So, I went to Berkeley very happily and was there for two years. Now, I had only been there only for ... Oh, I forgot that I was finishing up graduate work at Oxford. I got a higher degree called a B Lit at Oxford, which was not of any great importance, really.

Erickson: What did you call it? A B Lit?

Turner: A Bachelors of Literature.

Erickson: Oh, I’m sorry.

Turner: This was the advanced degree in history that I got from Oxford, but nobody knows what it is anyway. And by the way, later on,

Turner: in some kind of European equalization of degrees that there must have been, they upgraded it to an M Lit. So I have M Lit from Oxford as listed in the catalog.

I had only been three or four months at Berkeley. I was doing advanced work in the History Department on American history, because that’s what I thought I was there to do really with John Hicks basically, who was the Chairman of the History Department then, when he offered me a job.

That was a very difficult decision because the Commonwealth Fund Fellowship, when you accept one of their scholarships, required you to undertake on end of the tenure of your scholarship, you would return to some part of the British Empire as it was then phrased for a minimum of two years. This was clearly unenforceable, but it would have been a breach of an obligation, so it was very difficult.

But I did decide to turn down John Hicks’ offer. But you can see even now that it wasn’t a fit thing to decide. Because if I

had accepted it, I would instead have been presumably a Berkeley faculty member now. And after all Berkeley is, as dear Gordon Watkins used to say, the Vatican.

(chuckle)

And that would have been very nice. Also John Hicks was a very nice man. I would have been happy working with him. Also of some importance ... my marriage. But what do you want to talk about before that?

Erickson: Well, I was just going to ask you about the transition from Scotland to America. Was that an easy one?

Turner: Oh, yes. Yes, very. It was easy in every way going from some place where one necessarily existed as pretty near everyone was doing and then to a place where there was plenty of everything.

Turner: That's an easy transition for me. The other way round is much more difficult.

Erickson: Yes.

Turner: And of course, America was not really strange to anybody who went to the movies. And I was and always have been an avid moviegoer, even though I haven't seen "Titanic" as yet.

Erickson: Actually, I haven't either. I think we are the only two.

Turner: Yes. I think we are the only two people who haven't seen it. Although I am sure Netty and I will go one of these days. Actually, I think the best movie of last year was "Eve's Bayou" which nobody saw.

Erickson: No, I didn't either.

Turner: Eve's Bayou was a great movie in my opinion, and I'm really sorry it didn't get any recognition. Also Mrs. Brown was a marvelous movie.

Erickson: That was wonderful.

Turner: And she (Judy Dench) should have gotten the “Best Actress Award.”

Erickson: Absolutely.

Turner: I seem to be always liking or latching onto movies that nobody else ever sees. For example, I think the best Walter Matthau movie that he ever made was one called “Charlie Varrick, Last of the Independents.”

Erickson: I’ve never heard of that.

Turner: Quite. Well, back to our marriage.

Erickson: Well, you were going to tell us how you and Netty met.

Turner: Oh, yes, but I want to go on a moment about the position.

Erickson: Sure.

Turner: In Berkeley as a Commonwealth Fund Fellow, I had \$200 a month. Now in 1948, I could live on that very comfortably. That’s \$2400 a year, and a lot more than I had at Glasgow, believe me. So, in the spring of 1949, I bought a car along with another student, Jeffery Wilkinson, who was also from Britain.

Jeffery, by the way, was a chemist. He was already working on the Cyclotron at Berkeley. You know, the atomic research place.

Erickson: Oh.

Turner: Later on, I don’t remember ... ten or twenty years later, he got the Nobel Prize in Chemistry. He’s now Sir Jeffery. Well, anyway, Jeffery and I bought a car in the spring of ’49, which was a very nice thing to have. A brand new Chevrolet. Cost either \$17 or \$1800.

Erickson: But you shared the car?

Turner: Yes. So, it was all very nice. Berkeley in those days was really a heavenly city. Berkeley is a crummy place now. It's sort of a third world souk (native quarter). It's a mess.

It's still, of course, a marvelous center of intellectual activity, and I know all about that, too, because I've taught summer sessions a number of times at Berkeley.

As a matter of fact, I taught there in 1950 at the very end of my tenure as a Commonwealth Fund Fellow. Stayed there and taught summer session in 1950. And then I taught several times in the 1960s and '70s. I haven't taught since 1978, which was the last time there that I taught summer session.

Erickson: How about if you tell us when you and Netty met?

Turner: Yes. I lived in I House as it's commonly called—International House—and there I happened to meet my future wife Netty. Netty had been in Berkeley a year or two longer than I had.

She was, of course, from Poland. She came of a line of gentry family, who in the years before the Russian Revolution of 1917, the Bolshevik Revolution, had immense properties in Western Russia. But they lost all that, of course, in the revolution in Russia. But they still had a fair amount of property in Poland, though much less than they had before.

Both Netty's father and mother were heirs of enormous properties in Russia. So, she was born in Poland and grew up there in very easy conditions until the Second World War.

She was a graduate student there in Berkeley in Political Science but also concurrently or subsequently (I don't remember) in French.

Netty's French is very good. My French is not bad, but Netty's is excellent. Netty went to school for some years in Brussels at the Convent of the Sacred Heart. So, her French is like that of a native.

So, I met Netty, and in January, 1950, we got married. In my last six months or so at Berkeley, I was no longer living at the I House but in an apartment, which we had at the corner of Bancroft and Telegraph. It was a very nice place to be, because when I was teaching summer session in 1950, I could walk from her apartment to my class in less than five minutes.

Erickson: That's terrific.

Turner: That particular apartment house, by the way, is still there. It's called the Granada, and astonishingly, it's better maintained now than when we were there.

Erickson: How nice.

Turner: Indeed. How many things about Berkeley you can say that of. So, what do you want to ...

Erickson: Let's go on to how you came to UCR?

Turner: Oh yes, well, just to finish about the Commonwealth Fund Fellowship and it's unfortunate rules. So, being already married, we went back to Glasgow in 1950, from which technically I was on leave.

We were there until 1951, and then I got a job at the University of Toronto, which of course you know still fulfills the Commonwealth Fund's requirement. So we were at Toronto for the next few years until I was recruited by Gordon Watkins to come here.

Erickson: So that would have been after ... Gordon Watkins came to UCR in what, about 19_? (1952)

Turner: '50, I think.

Erickson: And his charge was to bring on new faculty.

Turner: But the whole thing was delayed of course because of the war.

Erickson: What were some of the things that we going on in the U.S. and the world at that time, Arthur?

Turner: Yes. Eisenhower became president in 1953, some six months or so before I came here. Conrad Adenauer was Chancellor of Germany. DeGaulle was not in power in France, though he came back a few years later. The Korean War was just ending but international tension was quite high because these were the early years of the Cold War and the future to many people seemed uncertain, indeed.

There was a great deal of interest in international relations. Oddly enough more than now. It used to be, when I was first here, I would get invitations from all over the place. The ladies

Turner: club in Beaumont or whatever would want me to come talk about the United Nations or some other current topic.

That doesn't happen any more. For some reason people are turned off by international relations nowadays. But then at that point, serious involvement by the United States in international relations wasn't something of a novelty. People were rising to the occasion, seeming to find out about it.

Another thing that was very important in those days in Riverside was the World Affairs Symposium held every year either at the Mission Inn as it was in 1953 or at the Huntington Hotel in Pasadena.

This had been started by USC and was the brainchild of R. B. Von Kleinschmid, President and then Chancellor at USC. But the governing body had people from other campuses, not only in Southern California. One of them was from Washington or Oregon, I don't know.

I addressed them first in 1953 in December, and a year or two after that I was asked to join the governing body, the executive committee. I was on that until it disappeared in 1967 or so.

It disappeared primarily because Rufus Von Kleinschmid failed to make adequate provision for the setting aside of the funds he controlled while president for that ...

END OF SIDE A, TAPE 1

and supervising events and in general functioning as the chairman of it all. That was at the Huntington Hotel, and that was very interesting work. I remember I had Russell Kirk, the famous Conservative, there and several other people of distinction. That was a very satisfactory thing to do.

Turner: However, we want to go back, I suppose, to talk about being recruited for here.

Erickson: Yes.

Turner: Well, I should say that Toronto is a great city, and the University of Toronto is a great university. I would have stayed there indefinitely apart from two things: one is that their salary scale was rather low compared with American universities.

Incidentally, that was a situation that didn't last very long, because about three or four years after I left, the Canadian government as it were, awoke to the situation and made very strenuous and successful efforts to raise Canadian university salaries up to the American level, at least. However, as you know, now the Canadian dollar is at a very marked discount, so it is very difficult to say what the situation is.

The other reason that made it less difficult to leave Toronto was that the chairman or really the head, that's the title, the Head of

the History Department at Toronto when I came—the man who recruited me from Glasgow was Chester Martin.

Chester Martin was a very dear person to me. We got on like a house on fire from the very beginning. Chester Martin was, of course, a Canadian, but he had been a Rhodes Scholar and he had gained a first in history in 1912.

There were other Oxford men there: Frank Underhill, who was one of the two or three best scholars. But Chester Martin retired, was obliged to retire on account of age rules only at the end of my first year there. Therefore, the place ceased to be as attractive as it had been.

So, I was open to offers shall we say, and Gordon Watkins got in touch with me some time quite early in 1953 about his new campus.

Turner: Now, I am not really quite sure how that happened, and he never explained it, but after all, I had been two years at Berkeley and communications do exist between Berkeley and UCLA where he was as dean, so it is possible that he heard about me from that source. Anyway, the suggestion was that I should consider coming to Riverside to help start this new campus, and I did.

The original suggestion which would have been very nice was that I should come, if accepted, some time in the spring and spend the summer at Riverside and then, be as it were, having everything underway before the next academic year began.

But in those days, there was very little campus autonomy especially in the case of campuses that didn't exist. Every appointment had to go through The Regents. That was a frightful log jam of such rather trivial business with The Regents. So, actually my appointment didn't go through until July or August.

Erickson: July as I recall.

Turner: Oh, really. No, it was backdated to July 1, but it didn't go through until August 15th or so.

Erickson: Oh, I see what you're saying.

Turner: Really, one didn't know what was happening. It was really difficult. As a matter of fact, we knew a Regent quite well. We knew Howard Nafziger, who was a very distinguished neurosurgeon at the Neurosurgical Center at San Francisco at the San Francisco campus is now named after him. Now it's the Nafziger Neurosurgical Center.

Actually, we had been married at his house on Russian Hill. Netty had met Howard Nafziger some years before when he was in Poland on UNRRA business. I don't know if you've ever heard of UNRRA (United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration). Since, of course, Howard didn't speak Polish, he had to have a sort of guide, and he and another gentleman

Turner: with him were shown around and helped and had the language difficulties overcome by Netty.

So, she knew Howard and wrote to him or phoned him when the year 1953 was getting on about this proposed appointment. And he had no share in it, of course. I think I should make that perfectly clear. He said, "I don't know, I just don't know." As a matter of fact, there was such a press of business, that somehow he never did notice that my appointment had gone through, so he never told us, which was rather baffling.

That of course, would no longer happen. The situation is ridiculous. Every campus appointment is now an affair of the campus.

So, we came to Riverside getting here in the early days of August.

Erickson: What was it like then?

Turner: Well, utterly different. Like everything else. To begin with, Riverside was a rather small town, I think, 40 or 50,000 inhabitants perhaps.

And really run by the old timers, many of whom were British or had come here from Canada, come here from Britain through Canada, perhaps for a generation or two.

I remember a rather comic incident at some early sherry get-together. I met Gordon Watkins' secretary who was Eva Trevelyan. Trevelyan is a very old Cornish name, and I made some remark to her about her distinguished name and wondered if she was related to the distinguished historian, G. M. Trevelyan, who was, in fact, related to Lord McCauley, a more distinguished historian.

She looked at me rather coldly and said, "That is the cadet branch, the junior branch." I looked it up afterwards, and she

Turner: was absolutely right! Her family, the branch of the Trevelyan senior branch, had gone to South America at some point in the 19th Century, and not having made much of it there, came to the Southern California area.

Erickson: So, you were in distinguished company.

Turner: Well, Eva subsequently married Alec Yakutis, a lawyer, who was subsequently Court Commissioner to the California Supreme Court. They had a son, also Alec, who was one of my students in the 1970s.

So, how different was it then? Well, incredibly different really. The campus buildings, for one thing, were not finished when we got here or indeed for a good many months after.

We worked in what was formerly the house, the official residence of the Director of the Citrus Experiment Station,

which is now greatly enlarged as the dean's office, or at least it was.

Erickson: Is that Campus Building North that you are referring to up on the hill?

Turner: Yes. And so we worked out of there. Everybody worked out of there. It was a delightful place, apart from being much too hot in the summer. One thing that hasn't changed

Erickson: It was very hot in the summer?

Turner: Very hot in the summer, and generally speaking no air conditioning anywhere.

Erickson: Lots of orange groves?

Turner: Orange groves, yes. And you could smell the scent in the season, and really a charming place to live.

Erickson: Where did you and Netty choose to live?

Turner: Well, we had arranged before we came here through somebody here to have an apartment in the Riverside Town House. It's an apartment development that takes up a whole city block near the library. So, we were there for a couple of months.

Actually, because of this delay in my appointment, we ended up paying rent in two places for the summer. I think I was already paying rent to the Riverside townhouse from the first of July, and we were still paying rent in Toronto.

Anyway, we lived there for a few months, and then we bought a house out in Arlington. We lived there until 1957 when we bought our present house—now present house—of 41 years. It's not quite the same house, of course. We've extended it very considerably in 1963. It's about twice the square footage it was when we bought it.

But really Riverside in most places is a delightful place entirely.

Erickson: Well, it was quite an opportunity for you to be able ...

Turner: Oh, yes. It was extraordinary. I mean, this is not a normal feature of an academic life. Very few people ever have this opportunity to start to take a hand in starting an entirely new institution.

Erickson: Was that one of the factors that you considered very strongly?

Turner: Oh yes. It made it extremely interesting. I would have gone anywhere in California that offered such an opportunity. We didn't know a damned thing about Riverside.

I remember when we were driving here, we came down through San Bernardino, which was not attractive. We said to each other, "My God, is it like this?" Well, fortunately, it wasn't.

Turner: It was a marvelous time really, absolutely exhilarating. And of course, I was one of the half-dozen people who really shaped this campus.

Erickson: There was Provost Watkins and you. Now was Mr. Nisbet here then?

Turner: Yes, you've got it right. Actually all these other people were here before. I think Watkins had some difficulty in finding one that he thought suitable for Chairman of the Division of Social Sciences.

Erickson: I see.

Turner: His close friend and associate, Jack Olmsted, was Chairman of Humanities. Olmsted had been, I think, Associate Dean under him at UCLA.

Erickson: Oh, I see.

Turner: So, he brought Olmsted with him. Nisbet, of course, was recruited from Berkeley, and Spieth was recruited from CCNY (City College of New York). Conway Pierce, chemist ... I don't know where he came from.

Erickson: In what capacity did Spieth come?

Turner: As Chairman of the Division of Life Sciences and Professor of Biology. I should say that Watkins, about whom we might talk at some length if you want to ...

Watkins was a very gifted man, but also in many ways, an odd man. He had been a Welsh coal miner in his early years, and by God, he had learned habits of frugality, which remained with him throughout his life, not only concerning his own money of which he left an enormous amount considering university salaries in those days. I think he left about \$400,000, which was very hard to accumulate on the kind of salaries that even full professors had then.

Turner: I'm not sure if he had ever in his life been in a plane. He certainly did not customarily employ planes when he went out to recruit faculty in the east as he did when he recruited me.

Erickson: Would he have traveled by train?

Turner: By train, yes. He had great gifts. He was a marvelous speaker but somewhat odd. And on the question of frugality, I was appointed at a lower status level than the other three division chairmen, which I think was unfortunate and a mistake from the beginning. I was made Associate Professor of Political Science, Step 1, whereas the other three were full professors.

Yes, you got it right about the set up. The six people who essentially created the campus in those early years were: Watkins, the Provost; Nisbet, the Dean; and the four Division Chairmen: Conway Pierce, Physical Sciences; Herman Spieth, Life Sciences; Jack Olmsted, Humanities, which was the largest

of the divisions, a reason I'll explain in a moment; and my Division, Social Sciences.

My division comprised the following subject fields, which later on downstream became separate departments: Anthropology, Economics, Education, Geography, Political Science, Psychology and Sociology.

I appointed the people in all these fields with dauntless effrontery. (chuckle)

I think most of my choices were pretty good. Apart from that, of course, there were a few other people who were very important: Edwin Coman, the Librarian; Clinton Gilliam, the first Registrar; Jack Hewitt, Physical Education. When I say we ran things, I mean that in a much simpler, more direct fashion than anybody runs things now.

Erickson: Do compare that to today.

Turner: In the question of appointment, for example. Nowadays, we have a very elaborate procedure for appointment. We bring out people here. I mean, we compile from their references, a short list. We make a short list of three or four and then successively, we bring them all out. They are here at university expense for a couple of days, maybe longer, and they give trial lectures, they interview faculty members, and so on and so on. And then they are dispatched and expenses paid back home.

There was nothing like that then—nothing. For example, I was interviewed in a hotel in Washington in 1953. It was at the Easter break and I drove down from Toronto. Gordon and Underhill who was Secretary/Treasurer of The Regents were in Washington, lobbying to get possession for the university the Canyon Crest Housing, which was an emergency housing project during the war.

So, I was interviewed then and after a long and rambling conversation with Watkins at breakfast in Washington with Netty there, I finally said, “Well, Gordon, what about the appointment?” He said, and I quote verbatim, “Oh, that. I’ll wire Nisbet and tell him to get on with it.”

(laughter)

Erickson: As complicated as all that!

Turner: Yes. Nowadays, of course, to some extent it’s all forced on us by law, Federal or State law, or the fear of being sued. Everybody goes about trying to guard their flanks and their backs nowadays under the real fear that if they don’t, something very unpleasant may happen. In fact, it may happen anyway, no matter how careful you are.

But things were much simpler then, and of course, the results were at least equally good to what they are now. So we ran the campus for approximately the first ten years, and we did it rather well, I think.

Turner: I don’t know quite why, but the decision was made in 1960 sometime, to wind up the divisions and go to departments. I think on the whole, this was a mistake. There were real virtues in having people within the division in different subjects talk to each other and understand each other and each other’s problems and so on.

It seems to me that the divisions could have been elevated into deanships with departments under them, but that’s not how it was done.

Now perhaps this is a point or perhaps you want to talk about it later, about the essential nature of the campus in those years.

Erickson: Yes, please do.

Turner: Yes, well, Gordon had a particular vision for the campus or scenario, and I have never been able to find out how far this had official authorization. I talked to John Gabbert the other day about this, and Justice Gabbert didn't know either. I don't know whether this was the authorized version that was authorized by The Regents or not.

But Watkins essentially viewed the campus as having a number of characteristics which set it apart from all the others. It was to have a rather restricted enrollment of 1200 or maybe 1500. It was to have no graduate work. It was to have a very heavy emphasis on teaching and the importance of good teaching.

And it was to have a common core program of humanities, our Western Civilization Program, which would be obligatory for all students. Now, all of that with the possible and arguable exception of the emphasis on teaching went by the board.

Erickson: You mean the Board of Regents?

Turner: Well, I'm using the expression "went by the board," ... just whoosh.

Erickson: Oh, I'm sorry. Ok.

Turner: Went by the Board, too, as you say. (chuckle)

So, by 1959, we became a general campus with a totally different mandate. Now as to these points, I had never really seen the validity in the restriction in size. It seemed to me that in the long run, it couldn't possibly fly in California, keeping a campus that small.

Turner: And no graduate work, well ... equally, I had my doubts about that. I had never worked in those very small, prestigious American campuses like Swarthmore or whatever. The University of Glasgow when I was there had about 5000 students, fewer of them than we have at UCR now. Likewise, Oxford, although I don't know the total enrollment, had relatively small enrollment compared to now, but considerably

larger than Gordon's version for this campus. So, I didn't really see that as working in the long run.

I thought the Western Civilization program, compulsory on all students, was a very good idea, and I still think so. And I regret very much that it was abandoned, somewhere around 1960. I think that was a colossal error and one thing that made us utterly distinctive.

I should say that whereas I was skeptical about this, I am quite sure that Spieth and Pierce never accepted this version from the beginning.

Erickson: Of the smaller campus?

Turner: All these things, smaller campus, no graduate work ... I think they intended from the beginning, although probably they never said so, or they wouldn't have been here.

I think they intended to subvert it, quite clearly. On this, I think they had as a powerful ally, Al Boyce, the Director of the Citrus Experiment Station, who was, I think, a very powerful man and

Turner: was definitely their ally in heading the campus in the direction of graduate work, particularly in the sciences, which was what mattered to him and to them. They were, of course, victorious.

Gordon Watkins retired in 1956 on account of age. I think the retirement age at that time was 65, possibly 67. It was raised to 70 much later. As his successor, Spieth was appointed the Chairman of Life Sciences, and he was Provost and later Chancellor until 1962 or 1964, I think. Something like that ... I'm not sure of the year.

Of course, Spieth took the campus in that direction, the direction of creating graduate work. That's what happened when the campus was renamed as a general campus in 1959.

Erickson: Did they have to recreate the process then, of establishing it as a general campus. Did it have to go to The Regents again?

Turner: Oh yes, that was a Regents' decision certainly, but I don't think it was anything more than a matter of deciding on it and voting to do that.

Erickson: I see.

Turner: I don't think it was to be compared with the original birth of the campus.

Erickson: Professor Turner, approximately how many faculty did you hire in the first year or two?

Turner: It was a gradual process of course. I would typically go east sometimes by train, not always, depended on where I wanted to go first, and interview a number of people.

I usually made my base at a club in New York, and they would come in ... if they lived within any reasonable distance from New York City ... but I also did a lot of traveling.

Turner: I remember one horrible winter's weekend I spent in Buffalo. Because in those days, the university had a ridiculous rule that you couldn't spend university money outside the borders. So, I couldn't go to whatever Canadian university the person was at to see them.

Erickson: Now did Netty go with you?

Turner: No, never. The university would never have paid for that. No, Netty stayed home. After all, we had a daughter.

Erickson: Oh, no. I didn't know that.

Turner: Yes, we have one daughter.

Erickson: Where does she live now?

Turner: In Pasadena. And she has two children, one of whom, Kevin, the boy is now at Grass Valley north of Sacramento as a California Civil Servant dealing particularly with problems of troubled teenagers, which he appears he's very good at. And our granddaughter, whom perhaps we'll be seeing this afternoon, lives in Pasadena, not with her mother, and works and also attends Pasadena City College.

Erickson: What is your daughter's name?

Turner: Nadine. Granddaughter is Adrienne.

Erickson: I was wondering if Netty, in those early years ... if she helped you in this recruiting process? If not in travel, when they arrived here.

Oh, yes, certainly. She also helped me in cases where I couldn't make up my mind. I remember, in particular, the rather difficult case of a man called Hugh Aitken, who was on the faculty here from 1955 to 1965, though actually he was busy doing other things part of that time and on leave.

Turner: The trouble about Hugh Aitken was that though he was a rather distinguished economic historian, even in those days, he had a speech defect. He had a stammer which came on him every now and then. Although he was at Harvard and had a research appointment at the International Research Center, they'd never given him any teaching appointment.

I couldn't make up my mind whether to risk him or not, because he was very good as a writer, as a researcher, and, also, if you overlooked the fact that he was going to sort of break down every quarter of an hour, as a teacher.

So, I remember discussing that, but not only that, with Netty. And she was, as always, a great help in making up my mind. Of course, once they were here, we did an enormous amount of

entertaining, completely uncompensated actually, especially for my division but also to some extent for other people on campus in our house out in Arlington.

As to numbers, over the whole period of my chairmanship for the division, I suppose I appointed sixteen or seventeen people. That doesn't add up to much in terms of each field, of course. It's two or three.

But to begin with, some fields had only one person in them—John Goins in Anthropology. I think Political Science had only two or three—myself, Francis Carney and Dick Longaker, who afterwards went to UCLA. But in all, I would say about sixteen or seventeen.

Erickson: What was the ratio between student and faculty?
Approximately.

Turner: Oh, a lot of students to very few faculty at first and gradually tilting the other direction of course. I mean, our ratio at first was preposterous. I think about 140 students. Their names are all in concrete over there near the cafeteria. And about eighty faculty members. No place to hide was the student motto.

(chuckle)

Turner: So, yes, Netty helped me a great deal in being chairman and getting to know all these people. At one time we knew all the names of all their families.

Erickson: There was a wonderful group of volunteer leaders in the city who made UCR a reality by talking with the Strayer Committee. Did you have much interaction with that group?

Turner: We got to know individual members of it, of course. Judge O. K. Morton, who had been a leading figure in that group was dead before we came here.

John Gabbert we got to know very soon and very well, and he remains, I am glad to say, a good friend to this day.

That was the body that got the campus here. I mean, not only did they help in founding the campus, but they also saw to it that the campus was here and not somewhere else over by Kellogg for example, thirty-five miles to the west, which was one possibility. So, they were very important indeed, and we got to know them. But they were not much directly involved once the campus was going.

But of course, the CUC existed and continued to play a very helpful role in every way as it still does, indeed. There were two bodies that linked town and gown.

One was actually called Town and Gown, but it has subsequently disappeared, quite recently actually.

There was a Citizens University Committee and to some extent they overlapped. I had the impression at first that the Citizens University Committee was essentially a citizens committee, that is to say, it was a town organization. Relatively few of us at first were members. There was just these core people really. I don't think there was much effort made really or much encouragement

Turner: given to other faculty members to join CUC. That was all changed much later.

CUC has become a much larger organization even within the last ten years than it ever was before. So that, I think, answers that point.

Erickson: Let's talk about the interaction that you, as faculty, had with the Citrus Experiment Station.

Turner: Yes, well of course, we did react with them. In some cases, we were on committees with them.

Erickson: What kinds of committees?

Turner: Well, promotion committees, for example. Promotion committees, of course, did not exist at first. But in a year or two the question of promotions did come up.

In the scientific subjects, of course, we simply didn't have enough people to staff committees, and so we used committee members who were either in some relevant subject from the CES or from UCLA. We did a great deal of ferrying back and forth from Riverside to UCLA in those days. That was before the freeways connected us.

Erickson: So it was all driving, or was there other ...

Turner: Oh, no. We always drove, yes

Erickson: Uh huh.

Turner: And we did in time ... I got to know a great many of the CES people, the Citrus Experiment Station people as it was then called. Of course, we got to know them very well. We were all members of the University Club, the Faculty Club as it was then.

Erickson: Did Provost Watkins play a role in bringing those two units together then?

Turner: Yes, but it was rather tricky. Technically, Watkins was in charge of the whole campus, including CES. But in practice, I think, CES under Al Boyce ran its own affairs and was pretty well autonomous. But of course he had the responsibility.

I would say that the CES people had rather a certain amount of ambivalence about our coming because it disturbed a lovely status quo that they had for decades. I thoroughly understand this. I mean, their lives here were paradise.

To begin with, they were on the 11-month rate. They had a higher salary than any ordinary professor in the college would have, because they are on the nine-month rate. I've forgotten

the percentage, but the 11-month people get considerably more, something like 12 to 15% more.

Erickson: Oh.

Turner: They had that and they had their work to do, their research work to do, and they had nothing else to do. They didn't have to teach and their committee service was, I assume, rather minimal. So, it was just a delightful life.

And they, of course, were on very close terms with the townspeople, many of whom were in fact orange growers.

So there was a professional association and a very strong friendship connection there with a great many townspeople, many of whom we got to know in our early years here also. It wasn't just the CES people once we had arrived.

But the question of the interaction of the faculty of the Citrus Experiment Station with us, as it were, wasn't really solved in administrative terms of tables of organization. That wasn't really solved until Hinderaker's time.

Erickson: Until Hinderaker?

Turner: Yeh, it was really Hinderaker who solved that one. And it's been on that basis since, quite satisfactorily, I think.

The interview is being continued on May 28, 1998 with Arthur Campbell Turner.

Erickson: Professor Turner, would you explain a little about how you went about establishing the new division?

Turner: I did not, of course, have an entirely free discretion in that matter, because the general cadre or the general framework of the division was already laid down in budgetary terms and in terms of which fields had to be covered and by how many people in each field. That had been done. I mean, the budgetary bit was arranged no doubt by the Provost within his budget, but the actual layout of the various appointments and their levels were laid out by Dean Nisbet.

So I had certain positions to fill and certain salary levels.

And I may say here that not only in the Division of Social Sciences, but all the divisions on the whole campus, the level of initial appointment was extraordinarily low, and I think it was technically a mistake because we had extremely few people at a senior level.

Hardly any people except the division chairmen, in fact, had tenure. Philip Wheelwright in Philosophy had, and perhaps Jim Pitts in Chemistry, but I'm not sure there were any others.

This was an astonishingly low level of appointment and gave a certain kindergarten air to not only the students but the faculty.

Turner: And of course it was a great consequence later on that people moved upwards into the various stages of promotion in step with each other. So instead of having almost everybody assistant professors, you had some years down the line everybody being associate professors and everybody being full professors and eventually everybody retiring at once, which was not good from any point of view.

It would have been much better to do, as in fact the early chancellors at San Diego did, to have a decent distribution of positions over the various levels and ranks and to enable, therefore, the campus to get older in a more orderly and distributed manner among the various levels.

But Gordon, for some reason, perhaps he was oppressed by budget necessities, did it this way, but I have never thought it was a particularly good idea.

Anyway, I had these appointments to make, and I had a certain number of applications already, actually not very many. And I also began to write to various senior people I knew at various universities right across the country to see whom they might recommend among their younger faculty or people who were just reaching their Ph.D. In that way I got quite a roster of names in all the seven fields.

And then some months after first arriving here ... I don't remember exactly when ... perhaps in December or January. That would be January, '54, I would go east and interview a considerable number of people in various cities, and then I would come back and make a recommendation to Nisbet and to the Provost of whom I thought we should appoint. That's how it went.

We usually got the people we wanted because at that point our salary levels were rather better than those of most universities in the country.

Turner: Over the last 45 years or so, this has sometimes been the case and sometimes conspicuously not the case. That is a factor that makes a great difference to the ease of recruitment. So, in this way, apart from the one or two appointments that had already been made by Nisbet, we filled up the various slots in the seven subject fields for which I was responsible.

We got going teaching on a rather low level and a rather minimal level in February, 1954, and then much more completely in the following fall, fall of 1954.

Erickson: Would you tell us some of the faculty recruited in those early years?

Turner: Surely. I had, you remember, seven subject fields for which I was responsible; that is to say, Anthropology, Economics, Education, Geography, Political Science, Psychology and Sociology.

In Anthropology, we had only one position at first and for several years. It was fairly typical of the minimum level of appointment that we had at that stage of the campus.

The man I appointed there was John Goins, who was a very dear friend to many of us and who died long ago in 1972, I believe. He was a Southerner and possessed many of the charming and many of the irritating characteristics of Southerners. He was a very strongly individual person and didn't have very much time for authority in any shape or form.

He had spent some time in the high Andes with the Quichua people. He had written a book on that. I believe it was his doctoral dissertation, which was in fact his only substantial publication in the relatively short time he had here. So he was the anthropologist, the only one at first.

Later on we got a man called Winans from the University of Washington, who was not only a rather able anthropologist with

Turner: a broad sphere of interest but also wrote some science fiction novels, which of course, in some sense connected up with his interest in anthropology.

Economics: The first appointment in Economics was Carl Uhr, Swede by birth. One of the things I remember about him which is probably irrelevant is that he liked to smoke cigars.

You could tell when Carl was smoking cigars because the air circulation system—not the air conditioning system—but the air circulating system would waft the smell and no doubt the other chemical factors in his cigars throughout the whole building.

Carl had written a book on Knute Wicksell, the Swedish economist. He was, in general, interested in questions of public policy. He stayed with us until his retirement a few years ago and he still lives in Riverside, I believe.

In Economics we also had Jerry Rothenberg, who left afterwards for Northwestern University.

We had a man called Corbin, Donald Corbin, who was very able, but he was really less of an economist than an accountant, and if he had been here long enough to participate in the rise and foundation of the business school, I think he might have made a considerable career here.

But in fact, he was rather given the impression that someone who was primarily an accountant was not quite what we wanted here, and after a rather relatively short time, he left for the University of Hawaii and has lived in Hawaii ever since, though he did revisit us in some celebratory occasion five or ten years ago. I forget exactly what.

Education: In Education, the situation was peculiar because we really had only a few general courses in education. We did not have a School of Education, we did not train teachers professionally.

Turner: All that came perhaps a half dozen years later with the foundation of the School of Education and with my appointment of Irv Balow, who of course, became one of the great luminaries on campus and a very useful reserve dean who worked in various capacities and who retired only from these various activities recently.

Irv Balow was one of my very best appointments, and it was he who was responsible for getting the School of Education off the ground.

Geography: In Geography, I appointed Homer Aschmann who was an energetic and able man with interests particularly in

South American, but also in various other areas. He had attracted my notice, I think, before I ever considered him by a paper he wrote on the slang used in a prisoner of war camp.

This was rather interesting talk, with, of course, an anthropological dimension as well as a linguistic one. It was called Creedy Talk. I've forgotten where I came across it, but it was a very good paper, and I was very glad to have him along here on campus.

It was very sad when Homer Aschmann died a few years ago at no very great age. He was, when John Goins was alive, a very close friend and collaborator with Goins. Of course, their interests in human geography on Homer's part and anthropology on John Goins part linked up well. We didn't have anybody else in geography for some time.

Political Science: Well, in Political Science, of course, my first appointment there, I believe, was Francis Carney, who though retired is still a quite prominent figure here around campus and who also is quite well known in the city, perhaps possibly because of his marriage some years ago to Jane, who is a very prominent attorney in Riverside.

Carney is an extremely good teacher and got the Distinguished Teaching Award. He has broad interests. He has published

Turner: articles even on subjects as far away from political science as architecture. I think he once wrote an article on architecture in the New York Review of Books.

But his interests are primarily of American politics. He is a Californian. I've forgotten how he came to my notice, but I was very happy to appoint him and have always been happy that I did so.

Then there was another man called Malcolm Smith, who didn't in fact last very long and went to Hayward, I think. He was not really one of my appointments; however, he was already on the books as a Nisbet appointee before I got here.

There were several others, but the main appointments in Political Science, the people who were here for a considerable time came later.

People like John Stanley, who died tragically just a few years ago, who was to have been chairman on his return from a successful two years in England as Deputy Director of the Education Abroad Program for the United Kingdom and Ireland.

And Michael Reagan, whom I appointed in 1963, I think. And of course, in the same year that I appointed John Stanley, I appointed Ron Loveridge, who has become Mayor of the city and is so at the moment.

I appointed Stanley and Loveridge in the same year in 1965, and they in fact arrived on campus and in my office the same day. But consider how extraordinarily diverse their destinies were to be.

Psychology: We had a man called Eisman, who afterwards left for the University of Wisconsin, the Milwaukee campus. And we had a man called Caylor, whose rather unlikely specialization was the behavior of worms (planaria, I think we call it).

Turner: And of course, my most distinguished appointment in Psychology though it came some years later, was Austin Riesen, who was a very distinguished research worker using primates and who I think ... I think he remained here until retirement. He was somewhat older than I was.

Erickson: Wasn't Dr. Riesen appointed after his retirement to the National Academy of Sciences?

Turner: Yes. I am not sure if it wasn't posthumous. He was very ill for some years.

Erickson: I think it was after his death.

Turner: He was a very distinguished man and was appointed to the National Academy of Sciences not long ago. He was one of the many distinguished people on this campus who have added to our distinction by the large number of people on campus who have so been appointed.

Sociology: In Sociology, I am not sure that any appointments were made on my own responsibility, because Nisbet was himself a sociologist and tended to keep these appointments in his own hands.

I'd like to go back a moment and say something about one of my most distinguished appointments in Economics. That was Hugh Aitken, H.G.J. Aitken. I had some difficulty in getting Hugh appointed. Because he had a speech difficulty, he broke into a stammer sometimes in the course of lectures.

For this reason he was at Harvard and had a research appointment there, and it took a certain amount of determination to get his appointment past Nisbet and Provost Watkins, but I did. Afterwards, the campus became very keen to keep him here and gave him rather noticeable accelerations with a view to

Turner: doing that, but they did not succeed. Hugh was here from 1955 to 1965.

Another appointment in Political Science that I failed to mention as we were going through, was that of David McClellan, who was of course the subject of some jokes because he was rather obviously another Scotsman. He was here from (pause) I think 1955 to something like 1968.

Not only a very good teacher and quite a distinguished contributor to the field, he wrote a book about Dean Acheson, but also a very popular individual whom everybody liked. Robust, extraverted, outgoing man with a large and happy family. We have all missed David ever since he left.

Erickson: Dr. Turner, would you discuss the concept of Shared Governance?

Turner: Certainly. This means, I take it, the considerable role in the affairs of the university played by the Academic Senate by the professors. I have never seen any comparative study on this question, but my impression certainly is that this system has been more highly developed in the University of California than in any other major American university.

I am not sure about the comparison with European universities, possibly the faculty has a more traditional powerful role there, but certainly here the large part in decision making played by faculty is outstanding.

Faculty determine what courses may be taught, whether the course descriptions are satisfactory, whether such and such a major may be allowed to come into existence, or indeed, possibly on occasion, to be abolished. All these are essentially Senate decisions.

I believe this power-sharing arrangement, which gives so much power to the faculty, was originally a donation of the Regents, a grant by the Regents, back perhaps in the 1920s. But it has been

Turner: so long in place that it is now traditional and revered and basically unchangeable.

It is on the whole a good thing, though I don't think faculties are any more sensible than other people. But at least they should know what they're talking about in terms of curriculum and majors and courses.

This kind of division, of course, is not always scrupulously observed on either side, I suppose. But it is certainly true that faculty sometimes express public opinions which, in fact, are not their business at all in terms of the basic rules of shared governance.

For example, when Clark Kerr was rather summarily “sacked” by The Regents, there was a great deal of faculty protest to this and motions passed in the Senate expressing disapproval. But after all, the question of who is President, or indeed who has any major administrative appointment is not a faculty decision.

But on the whole the system has worked very well, and I think has really contributed to the strength of the University of California.

Here at Riverside, however, although that was certainly what we were working towards, it simply did not exist at first because as what I have said is made clear, at first there wasn't any faculty to share governance with!

The administrators were here first when there wasn't any faculty, and faculty only came in dribbles over a period of a year or indeed several years, so that it took considerable time to create the kind of faculty that was capable of sharing governance, and indeed, at first it was virtually impossible to staff committees required by such a system because you didn't have enough people.

Turner: In fact, you kept meeting the same people meeting under different titles and with different functions on successive days, because that's all the people there were.

Also, another consequence was that we were much more reliant on sharing our committee work with people at UCLA. For example, on appointment and promotion committees, we often simply had to use people from UCLA to staff committees at least in part.

Erickson: Well, if you don't mind, I'll change subjects here. I'd like to talk about students for a while.

Turner: Yes, certainly.

Erickson: In the '50s, that was before the Master Plan. So, what were the academic standards that you used for selecting those first students?

Turner: Well, an interesting question, of course, but not really a question I am competent to answer, because I was not in the Registrar's Office.

Erickson: Right.

Turner: And all I know really is that the early students were, in fact, extremely good students. As we can see from the distinguished careers that many of them followed. People like Bill DeWolfe;

Charlie Field, Justice Field; Sue Johnson and many others who were on campus as students in those earliest days and who have gone on to very distinguished careers indeed.

Yes, they were very good people, and I think that on the whole, we have continued to recruit very good students. I don't think there's been any real change in that.

Turner: But in a campus where you have 8, 9, 10,000 students, individually distinguished students are, of course, harder to spot than if you've got 100, 200, 600 or 1,000.

Erickson: Um hmm. Could you describe the students in the '60s during the period of unrest?

Turner: Yes, certainly. The unrest here was never as bothersome as it was on major campuses. To some extent that's a factor of size. If you have 1% or 2% of students who are determined to create a disturbance that matters at Berkeley or UCLA, because it may

add up to several hundreds who can create a sizeable riot as in fact people like Mario Savio did.

But if your 1 or 2% are of that mind, out of perhaps a thousand or 1,500 students, it really doesn't matter very much at all. However, we did have our demonstrations here and our marches and whatnot. However, in those days, and I don't remember in what year various things happened, we did have various demonstrations.

We did have demonstrators marching through classes and demanding a "dialogue" about Viet Nam or other major questions of the day.

I never had a great deal of sympathy with this kind of thing, because I do not think that kind of thing should be permitted to disrupt academic work. But in fact, it was so permitted, even here and notoriously at Berkeley.

I remember on one occasion, I don't remember the year, perhaps 1967 or '68 or '69, we had a speech here by Hans Morganthau, the great political scientist. He was basically critical of the Viet Nam War, but he didn't really enjoy very much popularity on that account, because he felt that it was a considerable policy mistake.

Turner: He did not get on his high horse or get emotional about it or think that it was an enormous moral wrong, because in terms of a world which has produced a good many enormous moral wrongs, he really didn't think it was that big. But he thought it was a policy mistake.

But of course, a speech saying that in the 1960s was not liable to engender enormous enthusiasm.

I also remember one occasion when I was talking at a conference in San Diego organized by a man down there at San

Diego State called ?. (editor was unable to recognize this name on the tape).

Anyway, I have forgotten what my talk was about, but I think it was about revolution. During the question period, somebody asked me a question about disturbances on campus, and there was indeed a reporter present.

My answer to this particular question got a good deal of publicity. It was, of course, the subject of my talk, whatever it was, that got no publicity at all.

(chuckle)

But I said in response to this that I had a rather qualified liking for such matters, because in my view the operation of the university or any campus depended basically on a division of labor. The administrators were there to administer. The faculty were there to teach, and the students were there to learn.

And I thought that nothing but disorder and confusion could result from people overstepping the bounds of their particular roles. This slightly “dry sherry” remark, possibly this “Scotch” understated remark got rather surprisingly national publicity.

It was treated in an editorial with approval in the Wall Street Journal a few days later.

Erickson: My goodness.

(chuckle)

Turner: I think it was a somewhat simplistic view but basically correct. I would still stand to it. But our disturbances here were on the whole rather slight compared with what we had to deal with elsewhere. I remember on two occasions I did something to prevent or calm possible tumult.

One occasion was in 1970 and the other occasion was in 1972. I remember what the two crises were about, but I can't remember in what order they occurred.

On one occasion a speaker from the Department of State, a quite distinguished member of the department who was later assassinated, I think, when he was U.S. Ambassador in Cyprus. Anyway, he was to speak on campus on the mound outside the Commons, which was then widely used as a forum as speakers, though not used at all now curiously.

Anyway, he was to speak there at a lunchtime meeting. However, a student activist had in fact got hold of the place (the mound) and the microphone somewhere around 11:00 o'clock. At 12:00 o'clock, I had the problem of what to do about it.

Oh, I have forgotten to say that the original idea was that the Chancellor was going to introduce the speaker from the Department of State. But the Chancellor declined. ...

(chuckle)

Turner: Declined this glorious occasion. I got a phone call half way through the morning asking if I would do it.

Erickson: Now which chancellor would that have been?

Turner: Hinderaker. And so I had the problem of introducing the man from the Department of State and of getting rid of this activist who was monopolizing the position.

So, fortunately... fortunately, he was a Political Science student, and (I can't remember his name and perhaps it's better left in oblivion. He will remember it if he should ever hear this). But anyway, it was there on the edge of the Commons building, which is only a few yards away from the mound.

At one point when he had momentarily run out of breath, I simply signaled to him and said, “Gary (or Joe or whatever his name was), I’d like to talk to you for a minute.” And of course, that was the crucial moment. I mean, would he come or would he just go on?

Erickson: Right.

Turner: But he came! And I said, “You know, this is all fine. You are exercising your freedom of speech rights, etc., but there’s a scheduled speaker here at ten past twelve, so would you please vacate in the next five or ten minutes and let me have the field?” And he did.

Erickson: Oh, well, how nice.

Turner: And then two years later ... I’ve forgotten what was the occasion of that ... (pause) One of these occasions, though I can’t remember which is which, we had embarked on a little incursion into Cambodia. Never a particularly good idea at any time, I may say, and certainly not a good idea at that time. But this had generated great fury in certain quarters. So, that’s what the protests were about, either in 1970 or 1972.

Then the other occasion, the 1972 occasion, was when we had inadvertently probably bombed Hanoi, or dropped a few bombs on Hanoi.

Turner: On the second occasion in 1972 ... I should say, by the way, that when I introduced the man from the State Department, he was not, in fact, going to talk about Viet Nam at all. That wasn’t what he was here to talk about.

So, I said in introducing him, “So and so has a distinguished career in the State Department, and so on and so on. His subject today, you may be disappointed to hear, is the Middle East (or

whatever).” I said, “You may not find this very interesting today, but that’s what he’s going to talk about. And if it doesn’t seem of interest to you, then you don’t necessarily have to stay.”

(chuckle)

On the second occasion in 1972 ... So it all went smoothly, nothing happened. Not a dog barked as Cromwell remarked on a previous occasion. ...

In 1972, there was more upheaval about bombing Hanoi or the other business whichever it was. The Chancellor, in order to let off steam in an orderly way and not in an unpremeditated and riotous way, organized discussions or dialogues. He had various panels meeting in the morning and various panels meeting in the afternoon.

He organized a lunchtime meeting at the mound at which the topic would be whether we were justified in being in Viet Nam at all. He said, of course, the problem was to get somebody to give the case for our being in Viet Nam, and could you do that?

That was like wishing I was in Viet Nam myself at that point. And so I did, and I’m very happy to say that I got a reasonably respectful hearing and was not interrupted in any serious way.

Turner: I began by recalling an occasion on which Arthur Balfour, the one-time British Prime Minister, had been handed some rather nasty assignment and said, “I have been handed a poisoned chalice.” I said, “You must remember that I am here this morning to not necessarily voice my own views, but to make a case. I have a brief to state. I will argue the case, and that’s that!” That went over all right.

Ok. So much for disorder on the Riverside campus. Nothing much since then except an occasional protest to then-Governor Reagan.

But I had no part in that, and it wasn't terribly important anyway, though it did result for a number of years in The Regents never meeting here.

Erickson: Oh?

Turner: Yeh. They restricted the meetings to well secured places in Berkeley or San Francisco or UCLA.

Erickson: In your early days, describe a typical day. Where was your office on campus and did you have a secretary? How did things operate then?

Turner: Yes. As I have suggested already in dealing with faculty appointments, everything was distinctly minimal. Gordon Watkins probably was operating on a very tight budget. He certainly maintained a tight hold on things on campus.

No building had air conditioning, except, of course, up the hill, buildings that had plants or some other kind of research life in them, because there's no telling the plants that they must keep a stiff upper lip and bear the summer heat. They just die on you. So, we had no air conditioning, and we had a minimal supply of telephones.

Turner: There was one telephone for me and one for my secretary and another one for general use, which was in an enclosed call box in the division office. When somebody wanted to use the telephone, (a faculty member), he had to come into the office, ask my secretary's permission and presumably get it and go and use the telephone. Likewise, if somebody phoned him, we had a

buzzer system, which I subsequently had ripped out when we all got telephones, whereby the secretary could buzz his office.

So it was all rather minimal. I had, indeed, a secretary but that, too, was at a rather minimal salary level. I had a secretary right from the beginning, though I had the duty of choosing her. I mean, there was one budgeted.

My first secretary was a very nice Bostonian called Eleanor Tubby who had been working at the Peabody Museum at Harvard and had come west. One of her Bostonian aunts said, "Well, I hear you're going west, Eleanor, but I hope you won't take your best china with you." Evidently, the aunt still believed the Indians were on the loose in this territory!

(Laughter)

Eleanor subsequently married a man who is doing very well in advertising and still lives in this region.

Incidentally, Eleanor's brother in law was Ron Chilcote, whom I appointed in Economics, but who subsequently left for ... Well, I appointed him in Political Science, but he subsequently migrated to Economics, and he's still around on campus, not retired.

Erickson: Did you have a lot of meetings? Did that take up a large part of your day?

Turner: Yes. But not perhaps as many as the time is taken up now in the case of top administrators. Things and meetings tended to get settled rather informally. In most cases, it would be the four division chairmen, perhaps with the dean, perhaps not. Very occasionally with the Provost, hardly ever really. Mostly with Nisbet. And so the same people who knew each other well could get through business pretty rapidly.

Erickson: Um hmm.

Turner: Then, of course, we had the occasional appointment or promotion committee, though the promotion committees came along later.

My day. I would get to my office, I suppose somewhere between eight and nine and Eleanor (or whoever succeeded her) would have prepared the mail, and I would probably dictate letters for a while. I liked to dictate as I said to you before, I think.

I was always very keen in those days for having a secretary who could write shorthand, and all my early secretaries did.

Among the best of these early secretaries was, of course, Evelyn Eden, who subsequently became the chief administrative officer of the permanent civil servant so to speak in the Graduate Division ...

Erickson: Oh.

Turner: where she worked for a great many deans until her retirement in 1986.

Yes, well after dictating letters there might or might not be a meeting on campus, and of course, although I didn't teach at all in the spring of 1954, from the fall of 1954 onwards, I taught, though rather less than other faculty members. So the day passed.

Turner: And sometimes, of course, I had to go on trips. Sometimes I had to go into UCLA for a meeting.

Erickson: Was there as much paperwork as we seem to produce now?

Turner: No, not so much as now, because the early photocopy machines were really very primitive. I remember it well even into the middle 1960s, anything you photocopied tended to be rather dim and on yellowish paper. Nothing like the perfect copies we have now, and that really discouraged the making of excessive copies, which was perhaps a good thing.

No, there was not so much paperwork. And of course another factor which is outside the power of the university, outside its policies, is the amount of paperwork that simply has been imposed on us by the government of both state and federal.

There are so many things that you must do to guard against possible prosecution or against possible suits by people who claim they've been wronged that you have to be very cautious.

And all that generates more paperwork than we used to have. This is not an improvement, but it's something we simply have to deal with.

Erickson: Well, you have worked with each and every chancellor or provost here at UCR. Would you please offer some comments on each of those?

Turner: Well, with some reluctance, yes. Watkins, of course, our first man, our founder, the one therefore who played a unique role had many gifts. He was an extraordinarily good speaker. He could charm the birds off the trees. He had a rather charming Welsh accent, and he was very competent, very shrewd.

Turner: I don't think he had a large vision for the future of the campus. His vision or scenario for the campus was, as you know, a very limited, small-scale design with rather few students—1000 to 1500 and no graduate work.

There were other good aspects of his scenario such as the emphasis on a common core program and the emphasis on the importance of teaching, but in general it was not a plan or a scenario that was going to lead to any great or well-known campus probably.

He had to retire in 1956 because of age, what the retirement age then was, and that was really too soon. He had actually a very short time in which actually to run the campus, which didn't get going in any sense at all until the spring of 1954.

He was succeeded of course by Spieth, who had in fact been Chairman of the Division of Life Sciences. Spieth was Provost and later renamed Chancellor for some six or perhaps seven years, I think.

Erickson: Could I interrupt?

Turner: Yes.

Erickson: Why was the title ... at first with Watkins. Why was that Provost and then changed with Spieth?

Turner: Yes, yes. Spieth's great achievement, of course, was to guide the transition from the Mark 1 or Watkins Scenario to UCR as a general campus. This occurred basically in 1959 and led to embarking on a considerable range of work in graduate studies and granting of graduate degrees.

Along with that went the change in the title of the chief campus officer. The change of name was part of a general rationalization in the structure of the university, in which there had been, up to this point, some anomalies.

Turner: The head of UCLA at first rather pejoratively called The Southern Branch, had of course, been called Provost for many years or perhaps decades.

But in the late 1950s, it was decided, wisely I think, that every campus should have its own chief administrative officer and that overall, of course, should be the President of the University. And that of course, is what was done.

Each campus got its own head with the title of Chancellor, and the President of the University was overall with universitywide responsibilities.

What, of course, makes the higher education system in California very difficult to understand for people outside California (and even perhaps some inside California), this is precisely the other way around from the situation in the state university campuses, each one of which has a president and the chancellor of the system is overall.

Erickson: It's just to confuse us all.

Turner: Yes, just to confuse easterners, right. Spieth carried through that transition to a general campus, which implied quite a lot of things including the establishment of a School of Education, the first move in the direction of professional education.

These were not entirely easy changes to carry through, because there was a good deal of resentment even, perhaps unease among faculty members who had in fact been hired in terms of the original Watkins version of the campus.

May I claim for my own credit that I never hired anybody telling them that teaching would be much more weighted for promotion and research less than it was on other campuses.

Turner: I never said this to anybody, because I did not believe it. I said to everybody I hired or appointed that they would be judged according to University of California standards, which are three main considerations or criteria: teaching, research, university and public service and that I had no doubt that the same criteria

would be used in the case of UCR faculty when they came up for promotion or consideration of accelerations.

Of course after Spieth, after that relatively short reign, came Hinderaker's rather long reign.

We didn't get any more professional schools, but I think Hinderaker deserves great credit in getting us through the various possible crises of that period with absolutely minimal trouble.

And it took, for example, considerable courage on his part to handle the question of the Black Studies Program as he did. So, his reign must be considered successful even if not strikingly innovative.

Erickson: There was also a period during Hinderaker's tenure that the enrollment had fallen dramatically, too.

Turner: Well, yes. It had fallen. This was a period that led to some talk of the possible abolition of the campus, which I was always rather skeptical about because if we had been abolished, it would have amounted to a confession on the part of The Regents that they had done something that was, in fact, a very large scale spectacular mistake, and I really did not think The Regents would ever do that.

I felt it was something that if waited out, as in fact they did and we did, things would come right in the end.

Of course, the reason for that drop in enrollment for a time is, I think, rather obvious. It was the foundation of the Irvine campus ...

Erickson: Oh.

Turner: ... which, in good traffic conditions, less than an hour's drive away, which is in a clearly better climate—cooler in summer

and has many other obvious advantages that would appeal to young people. It's not to be puzzled about, it's fairly obvious.

Of course, it was a period of some difficulty, and as you remember, I said with a touch of sarcasm in some public talk of that period, "We all know, of course, on biblical authority that where there is no vision, the people perish, but what we are wondering about at UCR is the other proposition. Perhaps where there are no people, the vision perishes."

(chuckle)

In the 1980s due to various unfortunate circumstances, we had a succession of rather short-lived heads of the campus who were for the most part very good people but lacked the chancellorship to make their policies and personalities have impact on things.

I particularly regret the early death of Tomás Rivera. He was a very good friend and, I think, a very distinguished appointment.

And Rosemary Schraer's death also was tragic. We have, in fact, lost two chancellors to sudden heart attacks.

Erickson: And we had Dr. Hullar in there, too.

Turner: Oh, yes. We had Hullar. He's one of them, yes. But Hullar left, of course, in circumstances that pleased nobody in the method of transferring.

Erickson: Why don't you talk a little bit about how that happened?

Turner: I don't really know how it happened!

(chuckle)

Turner: But shared governance really took a back seat there. Hullar was transferred to Davis with apparently very little in the way of notice or consultation to anybody on this campus.

Erickson: David Gardner was the President at that point.

Turner: Yes, yes. Now, of course, since the spring of 1992 and Rosemary's unfortunate early death, we have a very distinguished chancellor indeed, whose energy capacity, eloquence, indeed, every virtue is quite extraordinary.

I'm speaking on the 28th of May, and I must say that his speech last night recording the progress of the campus and his future hopes was quite extraordinary and eloquent and an energetic performance. Thoroughly justified in every way by the extraordinary and wonderful things that are happening.

Erickson: That speech was to the Citizens University Committee at their annual meeting.

Turner: Yes, that's right.

Erickson: Well, the campus today. Would you say that it has lived up to your expectations?

Turner: Yes, I think so. It has really exceed them, because the original mission was really quite a modest one. It was admirable, high quality in every way, but on a small scale. And I think what we are heading for now is real fame, real world-wide distinction, which we are beginning indeed to achieve already.

Erickson: Um. Let's switch topics a little bit.

Turner: Indeed.

Erickson: I know that you served for a number of years on the editorial committee for UC Press.

Turner: Oh, yes.

Erickson: Would you talk about that experience?

Turner: Yes, I'm very happy to because it was really one of the things I have done as a faculty member that was the most enjoyable, although in fact it had no particular connection to UCR. The University of California Press became ... it was founded 100 years ago in 1893 to give an opportunity for publication of learned papers written by faculty members.

And its role and the actual physical appearance of its publications remained quite modest really until a really great director came on the scene in the person of August Fruge. He became director in the 1950s and was director until somewhere around 1970, I think. He was succeeded by another distinguished director, Jim Clark.

Nowadays, it publishes a number of books which is equaled only by Harvard, I think. In other words, it publishes a great variety of material, not all of it by UC professors, and it enjoys a high reputation, and its books are admirably designed and in all is a very successful organization.

It is unique among American university campuses, though I think the structure is similar to that of Oxford in that the essential decisions about publications are made by the faculty members who comprise the University of California Press committee. They make the central decisions.

They are representative of all the campuses, the larger campuses having usually three members and some having two and some having one. At the time when I was a member of the committee, we had one member. Now we have two.

I became a member of the committee in 1959, I think and was a member of the committee from that time until 1965. I was Chairman from 1960 to 1965. This was a very enjoyable duty

Turner: for me, though it was by no means the only thing I was trying to do at the same time.

And then I was a member again in 1980 to '83 and again in 1990, which, in fact, was after I retired. I had nine years service on the editorial committee ...

END OF SIDE A, TAPE 2

Tape ran out and a few words were lost.

... possible items. And then when they've done that, they usually make telephone calls to people whose interests seem appropriate to some manuscript they've got asking if this person might like to review this manuscript for the next meeting of the editorial committee. And then that is what one has to do.

At each committee meeting, and these occur I think ten times during the year with two months out in the summer. Every month, not always at Berkeley, in fact in earlier days, on all the campuses. I think they now confine their operations and committee meetings to Berkeley and UCLA.

At each committee meeting, one has to report on the manuscripts one has read. There would be at least one probably in the case of each committee member, perhaps two, even three if I remember. And then there is some discussion and the committee votes either to pass the manuscript for publication or not.

Now I don't remember any occasion ever the director of the press said, "I'd like to publish this even if you chaps don't." I don't remember that ever happening. Now it can happen the other way 'round in terms of a director's veto because the cost is prohibitive. I mean, he might say, "I really don't see us doing

Turner: this. Let's say that we want to publish it, but we'll hold it over until next year and I'll see what the financial situation is." That can happen.

Now the most distinguished piece of work that we produced while I was chairman, was the great new editing of Pepys Diary in eleven volumes. Pepys, of course, it was the Admiralty administrator in the 1660s under Charles II, who wrote a diary which was only decoded in the 1830s and which is one of the great resources for that period.

It had been edited several times from the 1830s on but really not very well and in some case expurgated because Peep's had quite an active life, not only in administering the Admiralty. There were some bits of it that censors and previous editors omitted, but our version is quite complete, absolutely complete and unexpurgated, though I wouldn't really recommend searching through the eleven volumes for the "dirty" bit, because there aren't really that many.

(chuckle)

Well, apart from that question, of course, it is a great piece of editing. A very distinguished piece of editing, and it was very expensive. We did it in cooperation with Bell, the London publisher. That will stand as a monument of scholarship for at least a century. In fact, I don't see why it would ever have to be done again. It's a superb piece of editing and is greatly to the credit of the press.

Another thing I remember particularly is the occasion of President Kennedy's death. When I was chairing a meeting in Royce Hall at UCLA of the committee, an aide came up to me and handed me a slip saying that the President had been shot in Dallas. And that's one of those occasions in one's life, that one never forgets. Never.

Turner: As I said, sometimes one could get loaded down with as many as three manuscripts for a particular meeting. Some time in the early 1960s ... I don't remember if it was before the division

had broken up or not ... In other words I don't remember whether I was Chairman of the Division or Chairman of the Department of Political Science, which it became on the breakup of the division.

But anyway, I was doing a number of things at the same time, and I got this rather heavy load of manuscripts. And I remember one evening in the place where I usually stayed in Berkeley—Grandma's Inn on Telegraph, which is a rather large private house once and has been converted to a nice, a very nice little hotel though some of the building is somewhat ramshackled and some of the floor isn't quite level. But it's a place I always enjoyed staying.

Anyway, I had these three manuscripts to think about and devise reports on for the next morning, and I started work after getting something to eat around 6:00 p.m. and worked steadily in the lounge of the hotel right through until about 11:00 p.m. while the staff of Grandma's Inn plied me with coffee and the occasional piece of pastry. But I survived and reported the next day.

Erickson: Good. Arthur, do you ever go back to Scotland for business, or do you still have family there?

Turner: I return to Scotland occasionally, yes. But not very often. My sister, my only sibling, lives in Southampton. Her husband, Roger Parsons, is a distinguished scientist and Fellow of the Royal Society. He was in the University of Southampton as well as earlier working for the French government and earlier before that at Bristol. So, I return sometimes and visit them.

This doesn't always involve a trip to Scotland, because although they have a house in Scotland, they are mostly in Southampton.

Erickson: What's the thing you would say you miss most?

Turner: Um. (chuckle) Well, that's very difficult because the Scotland I miss perhaps isn't there to be enjoyed anymore anyway, here or anywhere else. Oh, I suppose I miss the friends of my youth because when one leaves there on a permanent basis, one basically reduces one's friends and even one's family links to a rather minimal stage, a minimal level. So, I miss that.

I must also say that in the middle of July or August in Riverside, I rather miss the climate of Scotland.

Erickson: Oh sure.

Turner: Since, I don't think anybody particularly enjoys 110° heat in Riverside, that's not peculiar to me.

Erickson: Well, let's talk about then your signature. And I would say that is your Plymouth. When you came here some 50 years ago, you were driving a Plymouth and you continue to drive the same car today. Is that correct?

Turner: Yes, yes. I'm not a great help to the automobile industry, although I do have other cars. I think in regard to the Plymouth and maybe some other things, my motto has always been Lord Falkland's, "When it is not necessary to change, it is necessary not to change." And I've never really seen any reason for giving up the Plymouth. It still drives and it has been kept in order very marvelously by a succession of mechanics. I like the car. It's very spacious, and it's got lots of room inside.

Erickson: And everyone recognizes you, too.

Turner: Yes, I'm sure. All the police know it. It's great really. I don't much use it for longer drives. I have in the past driven it to Berkeley when I was teaching summer session there.

Erickson: Uh huh. Do you continue your research and do you still write publications today?

Turner: Yes, oh yes. I still have an office on campus. And of late years, I also have a computer. I continue writing. I have contributed to the annual supplementary volume of the Encyclopedia Americana, which is published in the early spring on an annual basis covering events of the preceding year and updating the basic encyclopedia.

I have contributed to that for a number of years. In particular, I write on the Middle East. I have written on other topics for them, too.

For example, last fall in November and December of 1997, I contributed, I think, seven articles on Middle East topics. One was a general Middle East round-up article. One was a biographical note on the new President of Iran. And there were five country articles. And that also is not just an activity for November and December. It implies that it involves collecting material throughout the year.

I have also written other things I have published in other encyclopedias, and I have published other things.

For example, a fairly recent publication of mine quite outside the field of the Middle East or International Relations, was an article on armed conflict in the science fiction of H. G. Wells, which I contributed to a volume called Fights of Fancy, published by the University of Georgia Press.

Erickson: I was going to ask you if you have gotten used to the computer. I mean, is it an asset to you, for example, when you are doing this work for the encyclopedia?

Turner: Oh, yes. It's immensely helpful in getting news on the Internet. You can call up in a most extraordinary way a printed version

about something that had happened only two hours before perhaps.

I am going to go over to my office now, and I am sure there will be all sorts of reactions and news about the Pakistani nuclear tests which happened yesterday.

So, it's extremely useful for getting recent news. And also these things can provide the basis of a file on any particular country or any particular topic as the year goes on.

I use it to some extent for email though possibly less than some enthusiastic people on campus. I also use it to some extent as a word processor though less so, because although I can compose in any form really, in dictation, in handwriting, on my typewriter, on the whole I prefer the typewriter.

I have a very good Smith-Corona which has a device whereby you can correct mistakes and I find that very useful. Of course, you can do that on the computer, too, but I find the typewriter quite adequate.

I sometimes use the computer for composing, but it's not what I would use commonly.

But the computer is enormously useful and has a great many capacities and abilities which I am still finding out about.

Erickson: Oh yes.

Turner: As no doubt we all are, because one of the greatest computer experts on campus, Larry McGrath, in the computer assistance office said to me the other day that new stuff keeps coming out so fast, it's almost bewildering. He said that, so one is entitled to feel that one can realize there are things out there that one could do that one hasn't done so far.

(chuckle)

Erickson: Dr. Turner, is there any aspect of your work here at UCR that we haven't covered that you might like to bring up at this point?

Turner: I think one thing that as far as I can recollect we haven't mentioned at all is my role in founding graduate work on this campus. This campus, of course even before the college was founded, did in fact encourage students to do research work.

I mean, there were students here helping established Station members who were doing research for which in the end they would gain degrees, some of them doctorates.

But these were not doctorates of UCR. There were no such thing. They were awarded as doctorates of Berkeley or UCLA.

Erickson: Oh?

Turner: And that, of course, had been going on for decades, though not ... I don't think any large numbers were involved.

On the impulse of a number of people on campus, notably Herman Spieth, then Chancellor; Conway Pierce, Chairman of the Physical Sciences; and Al Boyce, too. But there were others.

It began to be felt that we should embark on graduate work. Watkins had retired in '56 and so his say so no longer mattered. In fact, he was at Santa Barbara.

So, these people wanted to push ahead with graduate work, and I had no real objection to this because that was one bit of the Gordon Watkins scenario that sounded rather implausible. There never was any great emphasis on graduate work at Oxford or Glasgow or Toronto. Indeed, at these places the primary emphasis tended to be on the level that you achieved in your first degree. Still, it was graduate work at these places, and I shared to some extent in it.

Turner: But anyway, in 1958, campus departments, which had several faculty and which had already a high level of research

productivity were being encouraged to embark on doing graduate work and preparing people for graduate degrees, MA or in some cases Ph.D., and they began to produce programs.

Now, if anything like that was done, and of course, it had to have the Regents' approval before we could embark on this at all, but that was obtained as part of becoming a general campus. When this was done, of course, the course programs had to be authorized by the appropriate body, which was in fact the Graduate Council South.

In those days, there were two Graduate Deans, one at Berkeley for all the northern campuses and one at UCLA responsible for all the southern campuses.

The dean at UCLA, for a number of years then and a number of years afterwards, was a very dear friend of mine called Gustav Arlt, Professor of German Language and Literature.

In 1958, Riverside began to have a representative on the Graduate Council South. Spieth asked me to be that representative, which I continued to be until 1961 when there was a reorganization and Graduate Council South went out of existence.

So, I traveled into UCLA in addition to everything else I was doing, including the editorial committee and the division. So, I traveled into UCLA pretty often to work with the Graduate Council South and got to know their routines.

By the year 1960 or '61, we had about thirteen graduate programs, mostly in the natural sciences but not all, approved and in place—13. In 1960, I believe, I was given the rank of Associate Dean of the Graduate Division, Southern section, and I held that position for the following year.

Turner: Then in 1961, as part of a general restructuring of campuses and organization, such as the re-titling of chief campus officers, in

1961, it was decided, by whom I don't know, but anyway, with the Regents authorization to create separate Graduate Divisions on each campus that had graduate work and to have a dean there.

So, in the summer of 1961, July 1961, Riverside began to have its own autonomous Council and Graduate Division, and Ralph March, who was an entomologist, was appointed dean. So that concluded my role in creating the Graduate Division and graduate work here.

Erickson: Yes, you did create it. And did you continue in the Associate capacity or ?

Turner: No, that ceased when Riverside got its own division and its own dean. No, that appointment ceased. So that was an important part of my activities in these three years.

Erickson: Oh, absolutely.

Turner: Very important and important for the future of the campus. On the whole little remembered now because the people who around at that time are for the most part not here at all.

Erickson: Well, now it's documented so everyone will know.

Turner: Yes, well, we hope so. Thank you.

Erickson: You're welcome. Thank you very much for participating in this interview.

Turner: A pleasure really. Thank you, Jan.

END OF INTERVIEW