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GILBERT COHEN: This is September 17, 1991. This is Gil Cohen. I am meeting with Professor Kenneth Miller of the Political Science Department, Faculty of Arts and Sciences, in Newark in the Dana Library. We were talking before, and I was asking you if you could just give a brief biographical sketch of your academic career prior to and since coming to Rutgers in Newark that would be helpful.

KENNETH MILLER: Okay. I did my undergraduate work at the University of Kansas and got my master’s degree there. Went from there to Johns Hopkins for my Ph.D., which I received in 1955. And then my first full-time teaching job was at the College of Arts and Sciences at Rutgers University. Since then I’ve been department chair and various administrative posts. Except for I think one year, I’ve always been associated with Rutgers ever since, sometimes on leave, but always…. I don’t know how far back you want to go. But I was here for a year, and then the university had budget trouble and had a chance to hire a very distinguished scholar named Stringfellow Barr and decided somebody had to go; and I went for a year and then was brought back after a year at Hunter College. Otherwise I’ve been here.

COHEN: What committees have you worked on, faculty committees—university-wide committees for that matter?

MILLER: Most of them. [Laughs] I’ve been many time on Appointments and Promotions. A lot of special committees that set up the Urban Studies Program, for example, and a couple of special committees that tried to influence New Brunswick on restructuring the university as far as Newark was concerned.

COHEN: Oh, yea? We can perhaps go into that when I get into the … administrations.

MILLER: Sure, sure. And Faculty Affairs Committee, and I was on the university senate in the first year of its organization. And a whole bunch of university committees too numerous to list.

COHEN: Uh-huh.

MILLER: Yes, all sorts of committees on graduate education.

COHEN: Oh, yes. Oh, good.

MILLER: And various things like that.

COHEN: Because one of my categories is the whole question of the starting of the graduate school.
MILLER: Oh.

COHEN: I mean beyond the actual graduate education itself, the graduate school. We’ll get into that later.

MILLER: I was the first dean.

COHEN: Pardon?

MILLER: I was the first dean. When it became the graduate school, I was acting dean before Gil Panson.

COHEN: Acting dean. Yes. Okay. Of course I want to get into that.

MILLER: Mm-hmm.

COHEN: More and more. I think… opened up. The whole question of the role of graduate study when they started off. That would be great, yes. I’ve been asking people I’ve been interviewing what the old campus was like. How would you describe the old Rector Street campus—as vividly as you can? [Laughter]

MILLER: I remember when I first came to it Dr. Fulbrunie [sp] was director of the Division of Social Sciences and interviewed me at 40 Rector Street. I don’t think I saw anything else of what then existed except 40 Rector Street. And I think I was told then it was an old brewery, which made it sound kind of exotic. And then when I came the first year, having been on a campus, a regular campus all the rest of my undergraduate and graduate days, it took a bit of getting used to; because then I think we had the old brewery and the old razor factory and the old Y and probably a few other things. And particularly remember the building at the corner of Washington Place by the park, which is now an insurance company, across from the VA. Corner building, office building.

COHEN: Corner of Washington Place and—

MILLER: Mm-hmm. You know where the VA is.

COHEN: Yes, opposite the park.

MILLER: You turn onto Houser Street, it’s on the corner across from the VA.

COHEN: So you were teaching out of there.

MILLER: And we had classrooms there, and I think maybe some of the business school was there. But it was kind of an interesting introduction, because if you taught on the first floor and had the windows open, all of the friendly denizens of the park would come wandering by and listen in on your lectures and watch you and things.
COHEN: How did you ever—how did you feel about it? I’ve been hearing that from other people, too.

MILLER: It didn’t bother me. I thought it was just kind of interesting because I’d never had this experience, and they never seemed to interfere or anything. It was just an additional audience or something. But it was different. I’d been teaching as a graduate student at Johns Hopkins, and so it was a little bit different. I was occasionally teaching University College, too, in those days. So it was basically that. I guess my first impressions, and I remember Dr. Stevens—

COHEN: Stevens who….

MILLER: Who wrote the book.

COHEN: Yes, the history. He wrote that history book.

MILLER: Got in touch with people, and I don’t know when he started the project. But I was still relatively new. And I also remember I think the Middle States was accrediting the place about that time and wanted to talk to somebody new on the faculty. And I think the first thing I told them was that you had kind of a feeling of isolation. That there wasn’t really any kind of campus community. We had then no—as we do now; even less than we do now—no place to assemble. And you met the people in your own departments which were very small then. There were three of us in political science then. And I met, you know, Henry Blumenthal and Heinz Seelbach and Paul Rosenfeld and a few others because we all happened to have offices on Lombardy Street, which again was another separate building there. And small classes, at least in political science. And in small departments you were teaching practically everything. I was teaching all the courses in political theory, international relations, comparative government, and my share of the beginning American government course. And we also gave a class in American government up at the College of Pharmacy in Newark to pharmacy students. And the classes were small. The faculty was not large. The students seemed pretty good on the whole. But there wasn’t very much in the way of campus life, I guess that’s my main recollection.

COHEN: Did the faculty have any input into the planning of the facilities, offices, and classrooms?

MILLER: Certainly not—Well, I was a very junior person. I came back as an assistant professor in, I guess, ’57. And my impression was that on that sort of thing, Dean Woodward ran things, ran a pretty tight ship. I think I was originally put on the committee that was to plan Dana Library. And before it got started, or had gone very far, I think Malcolm Talbott plucked me out of that and put me on the committee for Hill Hall which I chaired. And so we got in to some extent on the planning that way. But I don’t recall much faculty input on anything detailed in the way of planning. There was somebody that did raise the question which we answered in the negative, but probably should have answered in the positive. There was a chance to build an underground parking garage underneath the campus.

COHEN: Oh, yes. I heard about that one.
MILLER: And I don’t know whether ultimately it was a question of cost or what. But it was turned down, I think, or people—it wasn’t done anyway unfortunately.

COHEN: When you were planning or thinking of looking forward to coming to the new campus and when the transition actually occurred, how did that affect your feeling about the mission of the college? Besides from whatever official announcements may have been promulgated at the time.

MILLER: I don’t recall anything very specific about that. Probably did. But I think we thought in terms of all being together as being a big plus instead of being…. I’d had to move four or five times before then to different offices in different ramshackle buildings. And I think the idea of all the faculty being together and all the students having a central place and so forth, we thought that was important, but I’m not sure in terms of mission. I can’t recall any big discussion of that.

COHEN: There was a greater feeling of identity?

MILLER: Yes, I think that sort of thing.

COHEN: Was there any alternatives that you were aware of that were being considered for the placement of the campus?

MILLER: I recall something being said about a choice that was made at some point or discussion at some point of having a suburban location rather than an urban location.

COHEN: Do you remember where?

MILLER: Not specifically. I remember later on there was a discussion of buying some of St. Benedict’s, the gym or something when it looked like it was going out of existence. But that was after—at some point along, yes.

COHEN: St. Benedict’s in—

MILLER: This prep school.

COHEN: Yes.

MILLER: In Newark.

COHEN: In Newark! Oh, yes.

MILLER: They had a period in which it looked like they were going out of existence, and there was some talk. But I think maybe that was after the campus was already here, but we didn’t have any gym except—

COHEN: Oh, oh, I see.
MILLER: —what existed over on Washington Street, which was nothing. But that fell through. Again, I certainly wasn’t involved in any discussions about anyplace else. I just remember hearing at some point that there had been discussion of an alternative of putting it more suburban than urban.

COHEN: How would you compare the quality of the facilities that you had—classrooms and offices and so on—in the old campus compared to the new campus?

MILLER: Compared to the new.

COHEN: Yes.

MILLER: Well, in terms of classrooms, a classroom is a classroom. As long as you’ve got a blackboard and then the seats and things. So again it was useful to have them in the same building instead of having to trot around to various places. It would be more convenient for everybody, I expect. Offices? I think we all anticipated and probably got an improvement to some extent in our office facilities because when I was chairing the Political Science Department and had an office on James Street, there were what? at least three of us, maybe four in the same room. And so it was kind of a luxury to think of even small but individual offices on the campus.

COHEN: I want to move into the area of curriculum development. And first off, if you could describe…. Well, first, what did the Political Science Department teach? Who was teaching the college courses?

MILLER: Well, with three people and then for a while two people, we still tried to teach every field of political science, which meant that we were stretched pretty thin. So we covered in some way or another not all the specialties, but all the basic things in political science. We were talking about the American field, the international field, political theory, and what have you. So we had the basic courses. We didn’t have…I think students probably got pretty tired of seeing us because they kept seeing the same faces teaching political science. And people would say I’m majoring in Seelbach or something … Heinz Seelbach.

COHEN: Yes, Heinz.

MILLER: For a while we were the Political Science Department because the third member, Professor Hamlin, who goes back really to the early days, had retired about a year after I came, and was not replaced. And so it was Heinz and I for a while. And the major probably has not changed. Well, probably—let me take that back, as we say—changed that much. I think with just two or three of us teaching, it was basically that you had to have a certain number of credits in political science. The chances were that you’d get a variety of courses because you would move around between the two or three people who were teaching. As we expanded, we could offer courses in different areas. For example, when we started—or when I started—I taught a course on European governments which was Great Britain, France, anything that you could get in—everything. As you got more people, then you began to develop specialties and have a separate course on Soviet government and a separate course on the British government and offer a greater
variety. And then begin to change your requirements and say a student ought to have a course in political theory and at least one course in—

COHEN: For the major?

MILLER: —foreign policy for the major. And so on. And expand it in that way. And so we gradually went in that direction. But I think that we always required that they have some other social science courses as well as political science; we gave them credits, and we still do. So we tried to emphasize some breadth as far as we could by going outside the discipline.

COHEN: What were the basic courses? You said you taught—

MILLER: Okay.

COHEN: Three people taught courses, but you didn’t go into what they were.

MILLER: Everybody took American national government. And everybody took state and local government. That was a two-semester sequence, and you had to take both of them. And I think if you were a major, you took them. If you were not a major, it was one of those combinations where you had to take both semesters of the course. So if you were somebody from another department, you still had to deal with that. From then on I think it was, at least in the early days, my recollection, almost anything else that you wanted to take in political science would count toward your major. You didn’t have to have a certain number of fields or a specialty in a certain area. So we offered state and local government. And I taught early political theory and modern political theory. And I taught dictatorships, and I taught world politics. And Heinz was doing everything in the American government including constitutional law … So it’s surprising. We were teaching four courses a semester and quite often maybe four different courses.

COHEN: You taught all of them.

MILLER: Four different courses. A luxury—we had two sections of American government and two other courses. That was it. And we were still expected to write and qualify for promotions.

COHEN: How does that compare to the situation now?

MILLER: Well, I think now we’re teaching probably five courses a year in political science instead of eight.

COHEN: When did the change occur?

MILLER: The change occurred probably—we didn’t have departments in those days, of course. It was after we were organized as a department and began to have a bit of a staff, I would say probably 19—mid 1960’s I would guess that we began to maybe teach three courses a semester rather than four.

COHEN: How did that change come about…?
MILLER: Well, I think it was—that it came about in political science? Because we found that our colleagues in history were doing it, and nobody was saying it at that point. Because everyone was teaching, again, four courses a semester.

COHEN: Yes, yes.

MILLER: In the fifties anyway, late fifties into the early sixties. And then history began doing some creative things with their scheduling and nobody said anything one way or another. So we thought, well, history does it. Why don’t we do it? So we went ahead and did it, and nobody said anything to us. [Laughs] So it just happened that way. I think if we had gone too far, we would have proved something. But it seemed reasonable. And people were doing other things: we had done independent study and internships and things like that that were not counted in that four-course teaching load. But you could begin to argue if you were supervising a bunch of interns, that’s like a course, so it ought to count. And if you were doing a lot of individual studies or—We had departmental honors programs then, had some seniors whose honors theses you were supervising, that ought to count as a course. I think we just created all of the History Department’s president there.

COHEN: As the curriculum developed in the seventies, what were the main influences on curriculum development, reform, whatever? I don’t know what the word is really. But there was change.

MILLER: Yes.

COHEN: There was change. Was it just the question of new personnel coming on board?

MILLER: Requirements generally in the college or curriculum generally or department?

COHEN: Well, let’s take department first. And then lets take …

MILLER: In the department it was probably just more personnel, the luxury of having more courses. And every now and then we stopped to look at what we were doing. And we decided, well, a political science major shouldn’t be just total cafeteria-ing it where you can pick anything you want from the selection. But before you finish, you ought to have besides a beginning course in American government, an advanced course. You ought to have a course in each of the major fields of political science. I think that’s the structure we imposed. And I think it was just a feeling that if you were going to say you were a political scientist, you ought to have had at least an introduction to political philosophy, an introduction to foreign governments, an introduction to international relations and so forth. And so we moved in that direction. In a way it meant increasing the requirements on the student. But in a way it didn’t because they had an option; if we were able to offer four courses in international relations, they could take any one of them to meet the requirement in that field. So we just tried to insure that they have something, knew something about all the major areas in political science. Other than that we didn’t change—a major change—since then. The major has been…we have increased the number of credits; I think it used to be 30 for years and years. It’s now 36. And I think that’s simply because the field has expanded. There are new areas like public policy that never existed as separate fields before.
And we have people who can teach them, and we think they’re important. So we’ve tried to put in a few more courses.

COHEN: In teaching political science, how much influence on the content, pros and cons, does the historical context affect the selection of subject matter and how subject matter is taught?

MILLER: What do you mean by historical context?

COHEN: Oh, things that are happening currently such as Vietnam or what’s happening domestically…or Soviet Union… To what extent does that—

MILLER: I suppose—and I’m just sort of guessing—that foreign policy events and so on probably reinforce the feeling that a student really ought to know something about foreign policy before he leaves here, he or she. And if the person is a major, we’re going to require that they have at least something in that field and not take everything in the state government or something like that. And we’ve always had a large number of students who are heading for law school. So we’ve always had a pretty good emphasis in the department on courses that have something to do with law—although we haven’t required students to take one as part of their American government requirement and so on. So we’ve always tried to maintain that. So the vocational objectives of the students I think have played a part not in the major requirements but in insuring that we always have offerings in the legal field. And I think maybe things like the environmental movement, maybe that in particular, helped move us in the direction of more policy-type courses rather than just courses that are structural or restrictive or theoretical. Policy making: what happens after Congress passes the law or why does Congress pass the law in the first place? And what happens to the problem and so forth? And when we had to make a decision a few years after we had started our graduate program, we felt that it should have some kind of emphasis, rather than again the kind of a cafeteria smorgasbord M.A. program. We decided to give that public policy emphasis—and require course in policy analysis. So I think some of those things, looking back—I haven’t really thought about it—probably did influence us. We had always thought about civil rights and government and political theory and politics courses. And I think that probably affected the content of the courses but not in the way of introducing new courses.

COHEN: Did the demands of the black and Hispanic students have any effect on content or style?

MILLER: Again, I think probably within a course, you spent more time talking about—

COHEN: What?

MILLER: Within a course.

COHEN: Within a course, yes.

MILLER: Yes. And I think shortly after the Conklin Hall situation, maybe the next year, Bob Curvin taught a good course for us called Race, Poverty, and Protest. So you can see a direct relationship there. We don’t teach it anymore because I think it was kind of his special course.
But I’m sure we do things like that course. We used to teach a traditional course called Women in Politics somewhere along the line. Now it’s on the books as Sex, Law, and Public Policy.

COHEN: Sex, Law, and Public Policy.

MILLER: Which gets everything. [Laughs]

COHEN: Okay.

MILLER: Which Mary Seegers [sp] teaches… We were kind of amused by the title because we thought it would appeal to everybody.

COHEN: It sounds like some Broadway production.

MILLER: Yes, it does.

COHEN: Something…

MILLER: Yes.

COHEN: You were talking about graduate education, and my question is… Well, I’m going to go back quickly… We can talk about political science particularly. The second part of my question is the development and evolution of the general … if you have anything.

MILLER: Well, my recollection is that big changes—it was very traditional up until… it all depends, the late sixties and the student protests and so forth and the demand for relevancy and so forth. And the biggest—I haven’t thought about it specifically in quite a while—that the biggest changes were getting rid of the foreign language requirement. And maybe loosening up the structure of a little bit in terms of what one could take. And I may be wrong on this and probably some of your other interviewees are closer to it, but my recollection is that the history requirement used to be fulfilled by Western Civ almost entirely whether that was the rule or just the practice. And then the movement I think, as I recall, to say, well, a year of any kind of history would do if you wanted to take African history or Ukrainian history or something. I know we’ve moved away from that a little bit now. But any two semesters of history. So that kind of—those are the biggest changes. I remember the natural science requirement has—my recollection—has stayed pretty much the same from day one. But I think it partly is because they were better organized when questions of curriculum change came. And foreign language I remember we had quite a fight in a faculty meeting before the foreign language requirement was eliminated. And there was a feeling, oh, the foreign language people haven’t built a coalition the way the natural science people had to keep their requirement in. That’s what the talk was. They hadn’t been as skillful politically to safeguard their own interests. But, yes, so those are my recollections. Now you have to remember some years or semesters I was on leave or something. I think I missed some of the dramatic faculty meetings at one time or another. Plus my memory may not be complete. I’m sure it isn’t.
COHEN: I’d like to start talking about graduate education. Now, graduate courses were taught before there was a graduate school. Is that right?

MILLER: Yes.

COHEN: Let’s start here…

MILLER: We didn’t have any here. No. They were mainly in the sciences. I think chemistry and a lot of the life sciences. And that was all under the graduate school in New Brunswick. And some of us in other departments, including political science, were members of the graduate school faculty in New Brunswick. Taught courses in their graduate programs. And went down there and taught. And I guess were released from the course here I think that must have been… somehow they bought us out for a course or something. And so we participated there but on a kind of a very much junior basis. That is they had members of the graduate faculty and associate members of the graduate faculty. And we in Newark, at least in political science, were associate members. We didn’t have a vote in anything, including….. We could come to departmental graduate meetings in New Brunswick, but we didn’t have the right to vote. When we kind of rebelled and got enough support to try to change the rules, why, the then chairman of the New Brunswick department, who was the then dean of the graduate school, handed us all the rules, and we couldn’t participate in that way. But I think even than…maybe it’s a little bit later. Some of us were serving on Ph.D. committees and certainly later where we were without a Ph.D. program here, we joined dissertation committees. And then there was a change of heart in the Political Science Department. We were sort of brought in as, really as full participants because there was a change in the graduate chairman or something like that. And we were without a program. And then I think history got its graduate program, its masters program.

COHEN: Before the graduate school was established?

MILLER: I think maybe it was before. I’m pretty sure it was because again we sort of followed the history model. And we thought if they got it, we could certainly put together a program that’s just as respectable and appealing as history. And as a matter of fact, I drafted the program. And we got the approval of the New Brunswick Political Science Department. And then we got the approval of the graduate school faculty, I guess the dean, in New Brunswick, and had our program. And it didn’t turn out to be as difficult as we thought it would be. I think because we emphasized—I think this was probably the strategy, for the new, as compared to New Brunswick, small department—that we emphasized we don’t want to get into the Ph.D. business. We know we’re not ready for that. But an MA, we can do that. And we had strong arguments in terms of what faculty were to do it. So then there was this time then for a period where everything was still under the graduate dean in New Brunswick, the graduate school in New Brunswick. And then there was the creation of the graduate faculty; it wasn’t called the graduate school, as you probably know.

COHEN: It’s still—

MILLER: No, it’s not a graduate school. They didn’t give us the dignity of calling it the graduate school now. But it…. 
COHEN: Gil Panson—now when he took over as the graduate faculty….

MILLER: Okay. Let me back… I don’t remember the exact circumstances, but New Brunswick was willing to let us have a separate graduate administrative structure and operation. But they insisted it not be called a graduate school. I think there were matters of prestige and status. So for several years [Break in recording]

COHEN: We’re back. We were talking about the graduate faculty in Newark.

MILLER: Okay. So that was consistent. We were running our own show. Two things, I think: We had the existing programs and all they were all part of the graduate faculty; that was chemistry and psychology and all of them had master’s and Ph.D.’s at that time. Not yet a Ph.D. in business, as there is now. And there wasn’t a Ph.D. in criminal justice. So it was all those areas where there had been graduate work under the graduate school of New Brunswick. And they insisted the official name was the Graduate Faculty of Rutgers University. The kind of promise that when we grew up, we could be a graduate school. [Laughter] Sort of the feeling we got, you know. We’re not quite ready to call you…. And you can’t have the deans. We had a director of the graduate faculty who in effect was the dean. And the first one was Richard Robey. And he was both dean of the college and director of the graduate faculty. So he was wearing two hats for a year or two. Okay? And we had an executive council. And we were doing all the administrative thing, very in the way of budgetary help. They didn’t give us Rutgers…They would give you something, but they were giving the resources to back. And so it was done on a shoestring. And so we were going along there. And of course there were a lot of problems between Robey and the faculty. I’m sure you’ve heard of them too well.

COHEN: Well, yes.

MILLER: I don’t remember it too well. I know for reasons unexplained sort of on the sidelines. But some of the feeling against Robey spilled over. We had an executive council of the graduate faculty. I was a member of it, and Panson was a member of it, a number of different people at different times. And we sort of rebelled. We said: We don’t think you can…. In fact we said we don’t think you can be both dean of the college and director of the graduate faculty. We think that means you are graduate faculty since your base is really the College of Arts and Sciences. You’re doing this other on top of it. We think this is giving short shrift to the graduate work here. We want a different arrangement. And so the compromise was worked. It was that there would be an associate director of the graduate faculty who would take over….Robey would continue as director; but the executive council…. The idea was to sort of make it a constitutional monarchy so far as possible and let us run the show. And it turned out that I was—I think we had no chairman. I was whatever it was—vice chairman or something of the executive council. And I ended up for a year as the associate director sort of running the graduate program from the administrative side. Sort of not being called dean then in that capacity. It was this big operation.

There was Karen Borack [sp] as an administrative assistant. And then there was a man named Brown I think; he retired a few years ago as the secretary. And that was it. And no money. And then the idea was that in about a year we would start searching for a permanent actual dean. So there was a search committee that ultimately picked Gil Panson. But the administration was for
some reason still reluctant. And we were also asked at the same time to change the name to the Graduate School in Newark. And they agreed to it. So when we were searching, we were really searching officially for a dean of the Graduate School in Newark. The search was not completed by the spring of—by whatever, by the end of the spring semester ’70, I think. Yes, ’75.

COHEN: ‘Seventy-five, yes.

MILLER: And so there was…. And I think maybe the committee had nominated Gil. But for some reason—I can speculate on the reason … I think it was because Gil was very much involved in the autonomy of Newark.

COHEN: So I understand…

MILLER: So our reputation in New Brunswick might have stood so high. So the committee ended up nominating him. But the administration did not appoint him for a semester. So he asked me to be…to continue, while they were making up their mind, as acting dean for a semester, of the graduate school, from May of ’75 to January of ’76 when he took over. So that’s sort of the history … of the school.

COHEN: Yes.

MILLER: As we know it now with the addition. And we had a lot of real problems—I don’t know if you want to get into them.

COHEN: Yes, yes! Because I think the development of the graduate school, I think, was so important.

MILLER: The two or three biggest problems: One was the nurses—I don’t mean nurses are a problem. But we started as a graduate faculty or a graduate school with traditional credentials: the Ph.D., research, before you can become a member of the graduate faculty. Now the College of Nursing is giving a master’s degree and is a part of this graduate faculty. Do you insist before you say you as a faculty member are a member of the graduate faculty that they have Ph.D.’s and have done research? Which was not typically the situation; it would have blanked out the program. Also, we were getting public administration at that time, where the possibility was that you might have some practitioners who were part of the faculty but who lacked the traditional credentials. So we turned around for quite a while, and we finally decided, well, we’re sort of say we have some Arts & Sciences. That’s wasn’t the terminology. Something like: Arts & Sciences members and applied members. People in applied fields like nursing.

COHEN: Mmm. In nursing a master’s would be okay.

MILLER: So you could expect different credentials. And we still, graduate schools still today, elects to its committees some on that basis, some people from the traditional types of programs and some specifically from…I guess from criminal justice and public administration and nursing; and so there’s still that component. So that was a big issue about how do you define membership for our specialties in these fields where a Ph.D. is not the traditional degree? Then the question
of business, whether they offered a Ph.D.; they liked to do it themselves. But we had a kind of a charter from the university that said all Ph.D. programs will be done through the graduate school. So we insisted on that and managed to work out something for that; the Ph.D. in management under the graduate school. Same for the Ph.D. in criminal justice. They wanted to have their own, but we sort of insisted. So they have their own master’s, but the graduate school has the Ph.D. So I think those and trying to get some resources, which we didn’t succeed very well in that. More battles for a year and a half or so with the administration. …

COHEN: I want to get into the area of students.

MILLER: Mm-hmm.

COHEN: The population, the change let’s say as far as demographic change, composition of the student body, their social background, that kind of thing, over the years. That would be interesting.

MILLER: Well, when I first came it was primarily a white student body, had a few black students. … an active alumni. His brother’s a congressman. But we didn’t have very many black students. And they were mostly—well, there’s always a contingent from Weequahic High School, and there were a lot from the suburbs. And how far out our reach was then, I don’t remember how far people were coming. They were a pretty homogeneous body. Most of them were first generation in their family in college, many of them at any rate. My recollection is considerably more men. My classes were small certainly in the early years this is in the fifties. And the classes were all male students. I was told that there was a traditional gathering place where the male students—has anybody mentioned “The Place” to you? [Laughs]

COHEN: No. Not that I can remember.

MILLER: It was on the corner of Broad Street and I don’t know—across from the telephone company on Broad Street. It’s across from the park near Washington Place. And it’s been torn down. But there was a big old tavern. I was informed that it was a tradition that faculty and students go there and so forth. And I’m not sure I ever got there, maybe once when some students had asked me out. Well, changes since then. Pretty obvious. More female students, certainly a different ethnic mix. Right now I think there’s a considerable Asian contingent. I read my roll in American government, 50 students, I would say a third of them are, I don’t know, are Indian or Chinese or Korean. It’s hard to compare levels of preparation and so forth. I think one tends to think, again—this may be age or nostalgia—that students were better or better prepared. But you’ve got a…even early in the 1950’s. You’ve got a mix of students; some of them are barely making it. And those who were….

COHEN: Were there any special efforts that had to be made to bring students along who were admitted after ’69 when Conklin was taken over on the question of admissions? What do you recall?

MILLER: Before then?
COHEN: Well, let’s say compared to before and afterwards?

MILLER: I don’t think so. I think students were pretty much expected to be…they wouldn’t be here…. And if they were helped it was by faculty. We talked to them after class. We told them to come in and go over things with them and help them along. I do remember at least one meeting we had for faculty members with—do you know was it Bob…who was the admissions officer at one point in the early-mid 60s?

COHEN: Yes. Right. Yes.

MILLER: Where a number of us were complaining that there weren’t enough black students, and that something ought to be done about that. And so for a while we were doing the best we could or something like that. So there was some feeling amongst some faculty that they ought to spreading the nets a little wider than they were. But I think there have been no …. massive programs or extra or other kinds of special courses … taking them. It certainly wasn’t a major matter for some faculty. We’re probably …talking about …

COHEN: You mention a couple of times Conklin Hall, and of course that was a big event. I guess the question is what conditions either on campus and nationally existed at the time to force that situation?

MILLER: Well, I may have the chronology wrong. But I see it as part of the whole period of student protests and civil rights movement. I don’t know whether it was…or…earlier, I think. So there was already ferment on the campus. And so I think the change in demography, I’d say, in Newark had had its effect on that, too. [Voices too soft to hear.]

COHEN: The moratorium in the 1970s…

MILLER: So as I remember, there were some discussions on the War but nobody that excited…. I think at this point my impression was…really surprised…by takeover.

COHEN: By the takeover, yes?

MILLER: Maybe not that they’re were protests. But that it was a sit-in, direct action confrontation. But we weren’t on top of that.

COHEN: Well, what was the perception then of the main grievance—then and let’s say in retrospect. Let’s start with two parts: At the time, if you can recollect, your perceptions and that of your colleagues as to what the main gripe was.

MILLER: Well, the thing that was emphasized in their demands and I think that we took, was black students. That the university could do better a job of recruiting and then of helping once you had students who needed some additional help. That the university was not prepared to help those who were already on board who needed help, and certainly not doing anything to spread its nets wider and recruit more black students. Certainly, as I recall, BOS’s demands that were the voice in recruitment. …giving people a chance by not—if they don’t make it the first semester,
instead of expelling them to be more liberal and give them a little more time and things. And that’s my recollection of what the emphasis. There were some other demands, I know, a demand for the African Studies or Black Studies program, which I think was already being studied. In fact I think one of the feelings of the faculty was that, hey, we’re already doing these things or starting to do them. And I think the response was, well, you haven’t done it fast enough, or you should do it more and faster; you’re going slower. Something to that effect. Sort of in the works but not an extensive urgency. I think that for the black students, it is a matter of urgency and should be done right now. But we’re not asking, we’re demanding

COHEN: To what extent was this sense of urgency conveyed to the faculty …?

MILLER: Well, the faculty kind of deliberated after the fact, you know. I was the department chairman then. I recall that once the building was taken over, Malcolm Talbott called a meeting of the chairmen. He didn’t call a faculty meeting until later. There was some criticism from somebody in the administration said well the faculty obviously were delinquent in that they didn’t meet. But he called the department chairs together and said, Well, this is what BOS is demanding. This is what the university’s position is. Take this back to your departments and, give me your responses.” My recollection is he said I’ll decide whether to call a faculty meeting and if enough departments are in disagreement. These were not the same positions that were contained in the agreement. I think the response of the departments was, okay, …then these are the response on the part of the university. And we did not have a meeting yet. There were a lot of other kinds of discussions going on. But the faculty as a whole had no opportunity to express its feelings about everything until a week or so after the university had reached an agreement with the black students. Then we met to tidy up things. So there was a feeling that we had not been consulted. And we had a sense of urgency. The building was occupied. Other things were happening. And there were threats and phone calls and bomb threats that sort of thing…something should be done. But you also sort of felt you were on the sidelines because we didn’t know exactly what was going on, what was being negotiated, what was being decided, what somebody else was doing. So it was a confusing … situation, which I got in on the next year because I was associate dean of Arts and Sciences for a year, and Henry Blumenthal became dean and we had to try and put together after the university had decided on all these—on the Urban University program, admissions and so forth, without really planning for them. Then all of the brunt sort of fell out of the college administration to make arrangements. So I guess your question was whether there was a sense of urgency. There was. But there was also kind of a feeling that we don’t know what’s going on, we’re frustrated. And then decisions were being made elsewhere and we don’t know about them. They’re not even talking about after the arrangement.

COHEN: Did people, you feel sense the potential danger?

MILLER: Yes, yes. There were all sorts of stories going on. I think after Imperiali… Some other students were getting ready to storm the building and oust the students over there. I think that was …and all sorts of things like that.

COHEN: The other side of it, the student activism point…anti-Vietnam…. How did that affect, what kind of an effect did that have on teaching, relations with faculty and students?
MILLER: Well, it probably meant that you devoted more of your classes to talking about getting involved in protests and things like that; so that affected the content in that way obviously, it would have to. Again, had some students who were very interested in closing the university down and going home, and they called for strikes or something. I don’t remember exactly. But I do remember and you sort of felt in between because there were students who wanted to continue their classes. And some of us sort of reached a compromise and continued our classes. But if anybody felt that there were more reasons that they should not be there, that they would not be penalized. So I don’t recall it disrupting our classes too much. I don’t think—I think it politicized the students in some departments more than others. Sociology students were some of the most active, more than the political science. Maybe they were politicized already because of the nature of their subject. But, oh, we had some who were very active in calling boycotts and strikes on the one hand. But I don’t think it affected our department too much; we had some faculty members who were involved in teach-ins … and that sort of thing. And others who were not. And fortunately over the years it’s accurate to say our department has been the department that hasn’t had any big ideological differences.

COHEN: I was wondering about that.

MILLER: Personality—some personality conflicts no doubt. But it’s never been split the way some of the departments are. There have been disagreements and political differences and that. But we’ve always, for some reason, worked together pretty well. And so none of these things really affected the department …

COHEN: To what do you attribute …?

MILLER: [Laughs] Selection of good people since I’m one of them. I don’t really know. It’s just that…. We have had people who certainly haven’t been mamby-pamby in their political opinions or anything like that. But on a personal level people pretty much got along well together. So these events usually found us pretty unified. You may have run across something that the faculty adopted after the takeover of Conklin Hall, like everything was then called Omnibus Resolution. Did you see that?

COHEN: I think I did and the statement about the response to the action.

MILLER: Yes. Which the faculty adopted after cutting out part of it. But that was really written by people in the Political Science Department. If you noticed the people who signed it, there was Ferguson, there was Samuels, there was Weicker [sp], there was Miller, and….

COHEN: Now what was the content of …?

MILLER: Well, it—I would have to go back and refresh my memory. I think it indicated that in effect we were not opposed to changes, and we endorsed a lot of things. And we objected to some of the procedures, and we didn’t think that things—should be no occasion in the University for that kind of confrontation and politics and so forth. And I think it was an attempt to sort of pull things together at the end and indicate that the… Because the fact that they sort of came
off—my feeling at the time was—I think that’ll take us back to that topic if you want to go elsewhere, was that the faculty was bearing a lot of the burden for what happened.

COHEN: Yes.

MILLER: They were being criticized by legislators, by Ralph Dungan. In fact two or three of us had a secret meeting with Ralph Dungan, the chancellor of higher education. To say, Okay, this is the faculty’s position. Never gets in the paper and never gets taken into account.

COHEN: Can you account for that?

MILLER: Well, we thought we got a very bad press. And there were a half dozen or so of us who were pretty active in the college; that was Charlie Pine and Gil Panson and Henry Blumenthal and … and …Walter was in on some… I think through …Kane who lived in Livingston maybe. He was in the legislature. Through him we got the … and arranged a meeting.

COHEN: I see.

MILLER: We had dinner with him someplace. And our feeling was that the Star-Ledger was not accurate in its coverage, and we sounded like a reactionary and racist faculty who was opposed—had been opposed—to all changes. And now are still opposed. And we just wanted to try to ….where it counted.

COHEN: Do you think that that meeting had any effect on the content of Dungan’s subsequent report?

MILLER: I don’t know. I don’t know. I’d have to go back … I haven’t had a chance. … We felt that he had a, when he gave his report…I do recall… We were trying to, and I think we did in fact, there was a resolution that the faculty adopted unanimously that…an account of what happened to make it available…

COHEN: What recollections do you have of the chief players in the crisis, both sides?

MILLER: Both sides? Well, I didn’t know any of the students involved at that time. I got to know …

COHEN: Joe Browne and Vickie Donaldson.

MILLER: I didn’t know them. Now, Vickie I met her afterwards. And some of them may have …

COHEN: Harrison Snell?

MILLER: One or two of them were political science majors and had my class…. 

COHEN: What recollections do you have of the role of Bob Curvin?
MILLER: Nothing very specific. I’m not sure whether I knew him at that time or shortly there after…. [Too soft to hear] I think that there was a suspicion of hostility between Malcolm Talbott and Bob Curvin.

COHEN: Yes, I was going to ask about that, just how would you view his role specifically in the negotiations.

MILLER: Well, I think a lot of us, talking about that meeting. … This is what the university’s response was.

COHEN: Yes.

MILLER: A list of the demands, and told us what the response was, and we all thought it was reasonable [Too soft to hear anything] The university was …. from the admissions office and so forth and so on. And I think the feeling was that in the course of the negotiations a lot of these points were abandoned without any more consultation. And they would have felt that—well, betrayed would be a too strong word. But that the university had a reasonable position and got under pressure without consulting anybody, and maybe some decisions ought to have been faculty decisions and presented to the faculty after the fact. So I think for many faculty there was certainly distrust, dislike in the Talbott aftermath. Admitting that he was a very capable man…. But he hadn’t played straight. I guess that’s all …. And the feeling that we had jolly well better get our act together and get a dean because we did have a search committee that I was on. [Both speak at once] …Henry Blumenthal. Because we felt… our feeling was Henry knew what he wanted; I think he was sincere in that. He was chairman of the committee. And some of us felt…the real feeling on the committee’s part was that we needed somebody who knew the situation and who had the respect of most of the members of the faculty and could put us back together. And so he prevailed on that…

COHEN: And this committee was appointed when…was dean to…. 

MILLER: I think it has been appointed probably prior. I don’t know exactly when. But Talbott was acting dean, as Gilliland had—

COHEN: Yes.

MILLER: Then been ousted or had resigned. And so we had a search committee with two students on it which I think was kind of unique. There hadn’t been student representation before. And you’re going to be out of tape; I’m talking too much.

COHEN: Oh, no, no, no! I’m just making sure that my machine is running.

MILLER: And I think that the feeling was we want to come up with a nomination of probably just one person because we don’t want the administration to play fast and loose with us. And then I think that, if I remember correctly, after we made our nomination and Henry agreed with some reluctance to accept it, we then went down and met with Mason Gross and said, This is
why we are giving you only one name. This is why it’s this person, and this is why Henry Blumenthal should be ….. So that’s how that came about. But I think the search committee really started working in earnest. It was probably, for reasons I’d prefer not to go into, there was some pressure from the university to make certain kinds of… I can …. That we resisted partly because …[too soft to hear]. Been through the battles, and we knew he was sympathetic to the future of Newark as we perceived it. As I said, it was well-respected. And so we didn’t want to come up with three names. We wanted to insist that our choice be successful. [End of Tape #1]

COHEN: Yes.

MILLER: There are several ways you can look at it.

COHEN: Right, right. We were talking before about students and the question of admissions standards and preparation and so on. And I was going to ask about to what extent, if any, there was both “grade inflation” in the seventies? And if you could assess the general situation.

MILLER: Yes. Well, I wouldn’t limit it to the seventies. But I think it’s really been a national phenomenon.

COHEN: Oh, alright.

MILLER: Not just a Rutgers one. At least other colleges and colleagues complain about it, that there’s been that tendency nationally for grades to be higher than they used to be. And again, that may be part of the nostalgia that students used to be better and so forth.

COHEN: Mm-hmm. Yes.

MILLER: But I have a feeling that we may be—and I’ll speak for myself—that maybe I demand a little less of my students than I used to. That they don’t write as well. They’re not as well prepared, and I think that’s pretty much true across the board, regardless of whom we’re talking about. And you get discouraged about term papers and things and writing. And I decide, well, I’ll require something different than a term paper. Then I go back to it and things. So I think that I probably grade a little easier than I used to. And I think a lot of my colleagues do, too, frankly. [Laughs] I’m speaking not just in political science. But I think it’s—no, I think it’s been a national phenomenon. I think it probably reflects the changing composition of colleges and maybe the poorer jobs the high schools are doing than they used to, poor preparation that students have, regardless of where they come from.

COHEN: What recollections do you have of students, outstanding students?

MILLER: Specific ones or generally?

COHEN: Well, specific ones if you can address that.

MILLER: Okay. Alright. Well, the first class I taught here had about five students in it. And I think three of them went on to law school, one is a judge, a superior court judge, I think, in New
Jersey. The other two, last I heard, were practicing attorneys and doing okay. And the fourth one went into the New Jersey civil service and was fairly high ranks in the—whatever the New Jersey Civil Service Commission recruiting, employment and whatever it’s called now. I had people going to the Foreign Service. Had some librarians. Ben Beatty in the—

COHEN: Oh!

MILLER: Was one of my students.

COHEN: Oh, good old Ben okay! Yes.

MILLER: And some have gotten into teaching at one level or another. And a lot of good students. I think the biggest proportion of our students in political science, as I mentioned, go on to law school. So we’ve got a lot of lawyers scattered around, some of whom I’m in contact with and some I’ve lost track of. I think the tendency is to lose track of them after a while…and so forth.

COHEN: Who’s the superior court judge?

MILLER: Suprantelli [sp], Gene Suprantelli. Probably graduated in ’56, I would guess. And oh! Another guy who was of some prominence in New Jersey, Edwin Steare [sp], who was in the attorney general’s—state attorney general’s—office, and he was the one who was sort of the monitor or the trustee for I think the Teamsters in New Jersey whom they were under judicial control on and so forth. So got some good ones there scattered around.

COHEN: So there was a lot more of, you said, students.

MILLER: Yes, yes.

COHEN: But for the time running, I’d like to move over from students to faculty.

MILLER: Mm-hmm.

COHEN: And I asked about memorable students. If you could recollect some of the memorable teaching experiences. [Laughter] Did you have any epiphanies?

MILLER: Oh, no.

COHEN: No, no?

MILLER: I suppose the one that I remember best—and I don’t know that it was a teaching experience—was just before Thanksgiving vacation. Classes broke up. During Thanksgiving vacation my wife went into the hospital, and we had twin daughters.

COHEN: Oh!
MILLER: Came back to class on Monday and announced in my class that I hadn’t finished grading exams or something because something unusual had happened. And it’s the only time I had a standing ovation in the class when I announced that I had twin daughters. [Laughter] And the next year I had a Fulbright to go to Copenhagen. And the students—maybe in that class or maybe in all my classes—put some money together and gave me a nice set of luggage when they heard I was going abroad. So that stands out as, you know, one of the things I always remembered. I haven’t reached that height again if you have to have twins in order to get applause. [Laughter] It’s not something you could repeat—repeat performance. But I think some of the best classes and the most fun are when you have simulations of some kind. When you make up a project like when I used to teach foreign policy, why, we would maybe do some kind of mock UN or something on some issue. In some of my foreign government classes we’d have a conference on Northern Ireland in the British government class. And I’d give all those to them and do that. Doing something like that in American government now. And if you ask a couple of my students what they remember—you know Marty Bierbaum [sp]?

COHEN: The lawyer?

MILLER: Yes. Used to be in the MPA program here.

COHEN: Right. And he’s been rather active in the Students’ in the Alumni Association.

MILLER: Yes, that may be so. He’s on the state planning board—the state planning commission—now. He was one of our students and then went on to law school and got a Ph.D. as well. So he was one of our success stories. He always reminds me of a seminar I taught when we had enough of the luxury, and we had enough faculty members in the sixties or seventies, so we could give seminars. So we would have smaller groups sitting around doing some research and things, which we can’t do now because we don’t have enough faculty members. And I did one on Borstein Beblum [sp], the economist, political economist, who was an iconoclastic sort of fellow and said a lot of interesting things. And Marty tells me how frustrated they were all semester because I would never tell them anything about him. You know I would never—I wanted them to form their ideas. And they wanted me to give them the conclusions.

COHEN: Uh-huh.

MILLER: And so I would deliberately try not to evaluate in the last few meetings, not to push my own interpretations because he’s a man you have to read carefully and interpret. So it was a very frustrating semester for some students. I kind of remember that. And I’m sure there are other things, too. But those are ones that come sort of to mind.

COHEN: Talking about teaching, in the seventies there seems to be a perceived conflict between teaching and research as a result of the requirements for promotion. How did you see that?

MILLER: The thought was there even before the seventies because we had to, you know, from the moment you got on board at Rutgers, you knew if you were going to be promoted, you had to have done some research. Maybe not as much as is now required. I guess my feeling always was that you ought to have a balance of both. That if you’re going to be a good teacher, you certainly
have to be doing some things yourself so that you could speak from firsthand experience and bring it to the classroom. There probably were some—or are—some great teachers who do superlatively well, and they ought to get rewarded and promoted on that basis. But they’re fairly rare. Quite often there are people who are good teachers and popular teachers, but who really ought to have that extra dimension of trying to do something maybe not on the frontiers of knowledge, but something additional besides meeting the classes and teaching them. I’ve been on A&P enough to know that the emphasis has changed at Rutgers; there’s much more on the publications than there ever was before. But I think even before the turmoil of the sixties and early seventies, you were ideally looking for somebody who could do both. And I think maybe we’ve gone, personally speaking, too far in the other direction where we now have excellent researchers on the faculty who never teach a class or never have seen an undergraduate. And I think one of the nice things about Newark a few years back was that, you know, the Danny Lermans and the people who were recognized…nationally and internationally recognized scholars taught beginning classes in psychology. And you saw them in the classroom. You didn’t have to be just a Ph.D. student to see them.

COHEN: And today?

MILLER: Well, today I don’t know. But I see, you know, the research institutes and so on, and then they’re teaching Ph.D. students.

COHEN: Yes, yes.

MILLER: And to doing the research. And maybe there’s a kind of advantage, a fallout from that. The argument is that it’s to the advantage of everyone, but I think it would be nice if some of those people were teaching an undergraduate class and brought that knowledge and research skill, what they’re doing, in there.

COHEN: Around about that time the question of tenure seemed to be—there seemed to be conflicts over tenure; it was emerging as more of a problem. Is that right or wrong, in your perception? Let’s say in the seventies as more people were recruited.

MILLER: Yes.

COHEN: And the AAUP was increasingly active. How would you assess the role of the AAUP in defending—

MILLER: Since its…

COHEN: —within that?

MILLER: The AAUP has had different roles. When I first came, I joined it, and there was a Newark chapter. And we met—it was meet occasionally and talk about a few issues. But it really wasn’t a part of the life of the campus then. Then it disappeared from Newark. And any of us who wanted to participate had to go down to New Brunswick. We could be members sort of like being on the graduate faculty. And I went down occasionally. And then after a while I got to thinking we ought to have it back up in Newark. And so I talked to the people in New
Brunswick. And Hy Zimmerberg in the Math Department was the president then. And they said, Fine, we’d be happy to see a strong chapter in Newark. So we moved it back up here. I may have been president the first year. Then I remember Walter Weicher and I went to Arthur Conoye [sp] in the law school and asked him to be the next president, figuring he was a recognized name. That was before it was a bargaining agent or anything like that.

COHEN: Oh!

MILLER: So it came back to Newark then and was simply an organization. And I think we’re better off having had it as a bargaining representative. I think it’s limited in what it can do, what it can accomplish. But given the limitations, why, it’s better to have it than not to have it. And I like to see, as a political scientist, checks and balances.

COHEN: Checks and balances?

MILLER: Yes, I like to see some check on power that can be sometimes arbitrary.

COHEN: Now also during this period the question of affirmative action in hiring and promotions of women and minorities came to the fore. Well, let’s start with the Political Science Department. How were the affirmative action requirements—what methods were used to recruit, to promote?

MILLER: Well, already and for some time, it had women members of the department.

COHEN: Yes.

MILLER: Problem was that I think most of the university then from the department that as—after the glory days of money and things coming in when we started reducing the size of departments here. And of course that’s not just a recent phenomenon. But we were a department of maybe 15 people at one time. Now we’re down to six or seven.

COHEN: Oh!

MILLER: Full time—maybe seven or eight. I haven’t counted exactly. But we were probably 15 full-time people. But as we hired people, we were usually given authority to hire at the junior levels, hire assistant professors, which meant when you come to the hard times, those are the people who because they don’t have tenure get laid off. And so we were probably 40 percent women I would guess before talk about affirmative action came along. But then as the department shrunk, some of them were let go. So once the university began to have affirmative action policies, we of course tried in our recruiting, the few times that we’ve been able to recruit over the last ten years, to find qualified women and minorities, and they’ve been pretty scarce in political science. Well, minorities in particular. So it’s been very difficult to find a black political scientist to hire. And we’ve tended, we think, to end up with the most qualified person regardless of gender or race or anything else. Lisa Ho was probably our last woman appointment, or won out over a couple of men. And then the only appointment we’ve made since that time was a man who won out over a woman or two. So it’s really been no problem for us, I think. The problem
has been more in retaining, and that’s usually been forces beyond our control. I mean if you’re told you’re going to lose two lines this year, who are the two? Well, the two whose contracts are up for renewal, they’re gone. There’s nothing you can do about it.

And promoting those that we’ve had. We had a tussle over getting Lisa Ho promoted to associate professor. Had to fight with the university on that. And we’re trying to get Mary Seegers [sp] promotion through now, this year. So we’ve gotten women as far as associate professor level. We’ve yet to break through on the full professor level. And it’s not because the department is dragging its feet, I don’t think. So where it’s impacted that is simply to make sure in any search that we conduct that we really look carefully, which we hope we would have done anyway. [Laughs]

COHEN: I want to go back to something I should have brought up in connection with Conklin. Before Conklin there were the riots in Newark in 1967, July of ’67. And I just wanted to get your thoughts on first…. What recollections do you have of the time of what actually happened?

MILLER: I really have no recollections at all because I was away that summer. [Laughs] So I read about it in the newspaper. And I don’t remember the chronology exactly, but—I was out in the Middle West someplace, back in Kansas, I think, when everything was happening. So really it was all over…I think it had started about the time maybe that we left, maybe a day or two after. And it was well over by the time we got back. So I know nothing about it except what I read.

COHEN: How would you assess, though, in retrospect its impact on the development of the campus?

MILLER: I don’t know. I don’t have a specific enough recollection thinking about it in those terms. I think—let me back up on that.

COHEN: Yes.

MILLER: I think we’ve always felt that we—I mean many of us on the faculty—that it hurt us as far as student recruitment was concerned because it made people feel that Newark was not a safe place to be in, and it was a place of violence, and would you want your child to go there? And so forth. And I think in terms of repercussions, that’s one that we’ve always thought has harmed us, giving an image of Newark, and you’d much rather send your child to New Brunswick or someplace else rather than a city where they might be in danger.

COHEN: Do you have any feelings of the evolution of that impression over the years? Has that impression weakened?

MILLER: I think it’s probably weakened, and I think it’s probably…there are several things that went together. Not only was there that image, but for a long time students had better facilities in their high schools than they had here when we were without a gym and without buildings and thinds. So that—and without dormitories. And so we didn’t have the amenities to offer either. So I think they sort of ran close to each other. I think there’s still something of that fear that one
picks up from parents or from—when we used to have recruitment days, and parents came with their kids, and you had a political science table here and something else. Sometimes there’d be a little reluctance still. That was not five years ago or so. I don’t know whether it’s still there now. But it lingered for quite a while. Whether it’s completely gone now, I don’t know.

COHEN: I want to discuss the various administrations in the university and locally—that is on the Newark campus. But starting off with the top. How would you compare the administrations of Mason Gross and Edward Bloustein, if you have any perceptions of that?

MILLER: Mason Gross I felt ran a very personal type of thing. He was very approachable. You didn’t see him too much in Newark. But somehow you had the feeling that you could go and talk to him if you wanted to like this committee did. But he would listen to you, and he was a kind of friendly, open type. That sort of impression. And that he was very much…there was a much smaller central administration, so you felt that he was more involved with that. So he had his provost—I think Schlader [sp], Schlader?

COHEN: Richard Schlader, yes.

MILLER: Was one who was doing a lot of the administrative work. But they were, as far as we were concerned, pretty much the central administration. And you could contact both of them. And you tended to theorize—I did—Richard Schlager who seemed more the bureaucrat, and that Mason Gross sort of…already be pretty dried in his opinions an not so open; may have been a wrong impression, but not so open to discussion. Gross you thought you could talk things over with him. This may have been an erroneous impression, but that’s what I have. You know when we had problem, we could go to the top and talk to him about it. Bloustein I think we didn’t know as well. We tended not to see his presence so much. And he had created, I think, huge layers ultimately of bureaucracy between him and anyone else with all the assistant vice presidents and vice presidents and so forth. Some of it quite naturally; when the university got bigger and were doing all sorts of other things, you have to do that. And you had the impression that he was more concerned with external relations rather than internal relations. And other people were, you know…. Henry Winkler, who was more like Mason Gross, I think, in that you could go and talk to him while he was here. That was fine. But the other people after a while became kind of faceless individuals. You didn’t know who they were. This was my impression. There was less of that kind of connection as it became a bigger and more bureaucratic place. And that, I was going to say, that Bloustein seemed the chairman of the board who was concerned with fundraising and things like that,, and those kinds of external relationships. Gross was the president of what was still a fairly small university in many ways—seemed that way—and kind of more the personal touch.

COHEN: How would you assess faculty-administration relations during those two …?

MILLER: There were a lot of battles during the Gross years. I’m not saying…. Because we were always insisting on more autonomy, particularly in the ’69-’70 period. And when there was this bond issue for higher education, we felt that Newark was not getting its fair share. And there was a strike, and students and faculty went down to New Brunswick, and they closed classes
here and tried to have teach-ins in New Brunswick and have representation at the board of governors because we wanted more of the bond money and so forth.

COHEN: Bond issues.

MILLER: And we had a lot of things going on with trying to figure out how Newark could become more autonomous, both in this Rutgers setup which Dean Woodward had started in sort of his farewell address or shortly before when he said he envisaged a time when Newark colleges would be spun off—that was the expression he used—from Rutgers and take their independent role. He got into all sorts of hot water with the Gross administration then for suggesting that. But even in the Gross years, around the same time as the Conklin Hall stuff, trying to get some changes. We wanted a provost for Newark, we wanted a senate for Newark, we wanted, maybe eventually, more control over appointments and promotions here in Newark. And then we were thinking of the California system with greater autonomy for the individual campuses. And some of that has come about. I don’t know whether our efforts had anything to do with it. But certainly a lot of things we were pushing for—dormitories and equal treatment for students here as far as amenities were concerned. If you had dormitories in New Brunswick, health services, and things of significance, why, every student ought to be attached to them. So we did a lot of pushing during Mason Gross’s presidency, and I’m not sure during his presidency, I think these changes came about after his presidency. But even then we didn’t feel I think as antagonistic to him as many faculty members, I think, ultimately did toward Bloustein.

COHEN: Why? Why this antagonism?

MILLER: I think part of it was going back to the AAUP, that we had a bargaining agent; we had a conflict every three years with the administration.

COHEN: Over a contract.

MILLER: Over a contract, and it was never negotiated on time. And Bloustein…. I remember the AAUP distributed a speech that he had made someplace else.

COHEN: Oh yeah…

MILLER: And how terrible it was running a university with them and so forth. So I think that sort of entered into it. Though we did get some of these changes we wanted certainly during his administration. Maybe that was a spin-off from the changes in New Brunswick, too.

COHEN: Malcolm Talbott. How would you assess his contributions beyond Conklin Hall?

MILLER: Pretty well—Beyond that? It was good to have somebody who was thinking of Newark and who was able to, as provost and for a while when he was wearing both hats as dean, to have a way of reaching the central administration, to getting their ear and getting things for Newark. And so I think that was his strongest point, that he felt…for the first time there was a Newark voice that could reach directly official channels—central administration—rather than a collection of deans, each working out of his own or her own individual treaty with New
Brunswick. And I think up until Conklin, there were very good relationships. My recollection is that. And then Conklin, there was this legacy of kind of suspicion and why weren’t we consulted? Whose side is he on? That sort of thing. Not all the faculty. I mean there were some who I’m sure didn’t feel that way. But again, you know, we like to have our own dean. And then we’d like to push for autonomy and get the things we want for Newark. And we always emphasized in the changes we wanted, the faculty to have a voice in picking the provost and picking who was going to be our ruler in Newark. So that was partly I think a reaction to that we were not consulted on the fact that there was to be a vice president for Newark or who it was to be and so forth.

COHEN: Why did Talbott not get the position of provost? It’s my assumption that he wanted it.

MILLER: My assumption would be that because of these feelings, that there just wouldn’t be necessarily an era of peace and harmony. I think that would be enough. I remember—and this is a part you should not quote—that Dean Heckel at the law school, who was a very good friend of Talbott’s, was actually raising that same question maybe at the time a provost was to be picked. Some kind of fancy club down here that the university has a membership in that has—what is it?

COHEN: I think I can….

MILLER: I forget the name. But he was taking individual faculty members, and I guess he—I don’t know for what reason; maybe our names had been there as chairmen of committees or something. But sort of individually taking us out to lunch. And one wondered why. And …

COHEN: Heckel…

MILLER: And he would sort of be saying, well—he was president of the university senate maybe about that time, or I may be off a bit. But anyway, he was up there. He was dean of the law school. And he tried to figure out why was he taking him to lunch. And of course the question usually came to him asking, well, why is there all this hostility to Malcolm? And I think it was just that, you know, if you’re looking for a top administrator for a peaceful reign, you maybe better get somebody who is not going to be controversial.

COHEN: Malcolm brought his successor—actually he was the first provost officially.

MILLER: Jim Young?

COHEN: Jim Young. And how would you assess his time?

MILLER: A nice guy, not a strong leader, concerned with Newark, didn’t have the clout, I don’t think, in New Brunswick that Talbott had. Basically kind of shy. And you know you could—One nice thing about him was his door was open; if you wanted to go talk to him about something, you could about something significant or you thought was significant. And he’d listen and be very nice. You wouldn’t know whether anything was likely to happen or not as a result. [Laughs] So he didn’t have that…. Talbott had a kind of a strong identification with
Newark as a place and as a school. And he’d taught in the law school. So he had those personal feelings and connections which I never felt Jim had. I liked him, got along well with him. He was provost when I was acting dean and so forth. So had some dealings one way or another with him there. And didn’t feel that he was as strong a leader as perhaps we needed at that time, though he was a nice guy. I liked him. [Break in recording]

COHEN: Herbert Woodward.

MILLER: Okay. My first dean. Didn’t get to know him very well the first year. Then I had the experience of being fired in effect because of budget…. So I didn’t think too much of him then because he said, “Oh, we like your work, the students like you, etc. But we don’t have the enrollments, etc.” So I went away for a year. And then about the spring of the next year, Ed Fulbright [sp], the Social Sciences Division director, called me up and said, “Would you like to come back?” And I said, “Maybe under certain conditions. I’d like to be an assistant professor.” [Laughs] And he said, “Well, come over.” And he said he had talked it over with Woodward, and Woodward had said, “Well, wouldn’t that look a little funny to bring somebody back that we in effect have let go?” And Fulbright said, “No, not at all.” And Woodward said okay. And so then I thought Woodward was pretty good because jobs were hard to get in those days; teaching jobs were really, really tough. And so I knew nothing about Rutgers-Newark really when I came up to be interviewed. But I was happy to get the job at what seemed a decent salary in those days. Woodward liked to run the show and ran it. I always thought of him as an old military man who would like to run that kind of a ship, which didn’t—

COHEN: Which is what he was.

MILLER: Yes, which was what he was. His experience was in military government, I think, or part of his experience. I don’t think he carried it over. But I think he had his inner circle of older people who had been here. And so the younger ones were out on the fringes. There were faculty meetings and things, but I wasn’t really involved. And decisions were clearly made up in his office. And you didn’t…. He was always kind of brusque and I’d say military-like. You know no-nonsense type of guy. And looking back, I think he had some visions about Newark that came out in some of his reports as to what he wanted Newark—Rutgers-Newark—to be as an institution. And so he probably—

COHEN: What were they?

MILLER: Well, he thought of it as a place that had great potential, that had a good faculty, the nucleus of a good faculty that was much better than our competitors in northern New Jersey. And that with the right facilities and some encouragement from New Brunswick, some attention, that could really be a center of learning and a very good institution. He thought it was already, but could be even better. And, you know, I don’t recall him ever saying that. But some of his, I don’t know, annual reports or things that were quoted in the newspaper about the time he was retiring sounded very good. Then he was succeeded by Gilliland.

COHEN: Yes, William Gilliland.
MILLER: William Gilliland. I always got along well with him. But of course a lot of the faculty, again, felt that he was not supplying leadership, and I tended to agree with that. I was a department chair, and I never had any problems with him. But he, again, was sort of like an outsider coming in and never being a part of the community, never really—which is always going to be the case or likely to be for a while. And then never really coming to grips with things. And probably not very happy as a dean really.

COHEN: What was the specific issue—or was there a specific issue—which caused …?

MILLER: I don’t remember whether there was now. I would have to go back and look at faculty minutes. But there was a lot of discontent. And we were beginning to have some pressures from students because I remember one of the big issues was that, again, the sociology students were very unhappy with whatever their chairman situation was in the department.

COHEN: Mm-hmm.

MILLER: And I think they wanted more of an urban emphasis. And this was prior to all the emphasis on the city that came later in the sixties. But I was on the search committee that was to pick a chair. And our instructions were to—that we’ve got to get somebody with an urban interest if we could, as chair. And I think he was ill prepared to cope with student pressure. And there were some things about CIA negotiations—or CIA recruiters on the campus that came up. And didn’t get the impression of strong leadership from him. I don’t remember frankly if there were specifics beyond that. And I think that—was that when Committee One was appointed?

COHEN: I think so.

MILLER: Was that Gilliland or was that Robey? I don’t remember.

COHEN: I thought Committee One was the activator after the…

MILLER: Yes. I think maybe so.

COHEN: Was that the committee that was responsible for actually—that organized the opposition effectively….

MILLER: It became the center of the opposition. I don’t think they ever came out directly as an anti-Robey committee. And I think maybe I was gone for a semester on leave someplace. So I was not….

COHEN: Committee on Governance—is that what that was?

MILLER: It was called Committee One.

COHEN: Committee One.
MILLER: There was a Committee One and a Committee Two. And when I came back, I was on Committee Two, which was to do something I think about the curriculum. But by that time they’d gotten—the dean had been ousted, and Committee Two never did anything because the real purpose of Committee One was to, I think—I gathered—to get rid of the dean. But what they were ostensibly doing was looking at the structure of the college and defining laws and powers and committee powers and so forth. And so if that was Gilliland, that was aimed at him, though I get mixed up as to what was aimed at….

COHEN: The first time it was organized. Then it was reactivated, I think.

MILLER: Yes. I would have to go back and look at the minutes. So I can’t remember, Gil, any specific incident or set of incidents. I think it was kind of a cumulative thing. He just hadn’t developed the respect and loyalties. But I got along. He did fine by political science. [Laughs] He was okay. And he hired Norman Samuels. I was chair of the department when we needed a new assistant professor. And one of the applicants was this chap who got his Ph.D. from Duke named Norman Samuels. So I called him in; he was one of those who interviewed. I took him in to see Gilliland. Norman and I have a story that we keep telling each other about the interview with Gilliland, in which Gilliland seemed mainly interested in talking about what he was doing with petroleum engineering or his interest in oil or something. And Norman came out of the interview saying, “What the hell is going on here?” You know. And I had to take him—buy him a cup of coffee someplace and say, “Well, look, don’t pay any attention to a lot of the deans. We want you in the department, and things are fine in the department. So I hired Norman Samuels and started him on his career at Rutgers.

COHEN: The rest is history.

MILLER: The rest is history. [Laughter]

COHEN: That’s history—no, political science.

MILLER: Yes, or a combination. So then Richard Robey I guess was next.

COHEN: Henry.

MILLER: Henry.

COHEN: After the acting deanship.

MILLER: After Talbott. Henry was a great teacher, but I think he was not so well equipped to be a dean in those troublesome times. He was a wonderful teacher of the old school. But I think it was a different school. I mean it was a different sort of ballgame after a while. And I was his associate dean for that first year that he was dean.

COHEN: Yes.
MILLER: And that was when the so-called Urban University—this was when all the new students had come in, the black students with no planning about facilities and no assurances about money and overcrowded classes. And everything sort of dumped on us to cope with. And people sitting in in the dean’s office throughout the year of the Sociology Department and so forth. So that was a rough year, and I decided not because of that—not because of those disturbances—but I just decided I didn’t like…. Henry liked to do everything himself. So it meant his associate dean was primarily doing things like signing drop slips for students who wanted to drop, you know, after the deadline and things like that. Henry said, “I’ll take care of everything that has to do with the faculty and the budget,” you know, the interesting part of the thing. And you take care of all the student things; which meant doing the paperwork, and there was an assistant dean, too, Foster Burnett. And I think that Henry probably would have been happier if he’d stayed in the classroom and continued to—he did continue his research after he left the deanship, after he retired in fact. And I don’t think anybody lost respect for him. But I think he probably would have agreed that it was not the happiest time of his life.

COHEN: He got into that in his autobiography.

MILLER: Yes, yes. You know he was in the school here. He was proud of the fact that when he met a class for the first time, he said, Now this is what you can expect. I’m tough. And you’re going to do this, and you’re going to do that and you’re going to do that; which worked as long as you had students who reacted positively to that. It didn’t work in the sixties, the late sixties.

COHEN: The sixties and seventies.

MILLER: Yes. He couldn’t do it. And you know if you have that kind of you’re there to work, and you will work or you’ll fail my class, well, I think it was more a problem in I wouldn’t say a rigidity of attitude, but he had a different set of expectations of what students should be like, and they weren’t like that anymore. And I think that made difficulties there.

COHEN: Gil Panson was acting dean for a year.

MILLER: Gil was acting. And then Robey came. Gil was very consultative. He set up a three-member committee, of which I was a member, to be…sort of kick any problems around with us before he decided. I think Charlie Pine and I’ve forgotten who else. Two or three others. We were sort of called in every now and then and informed of what was going on. This is the problem. What do you think about it? He didn’t necessarily take our advice, but he was I think very good. And low-keyed, which was probably what was needed then. Didn’t get excited, didn’t feel that…. And things had sort of settled down, too, I think, a little bit by then. Maybe I’m not sure of the chronology once more. Not sure whether he wanted to be dean. I had a feeling that he was kind of unhappy with what the search committee was coming up with; if somebody had twisted his arm, he might have been willing to continue; I’m not sure he was a candidate for it, but he may have been. I wasn’t on that particular search committee, which came up with Richard Robey then. And again—okay. During the last tough year of Robey’s deanship, I was doing the graduate work. I was associate graduate director, and was running the graduate faculty.

COHEN: Oh, yes. The faculty….
MILLER: And he was still director in name, but he wasn’t, you know, really doing it. So I felt inhibited in getting involved. He was in a sense my superior on the graduate faculty. So I was not actively engaged in rebelling against him although I shared a lot of the feelings. But, you know, the situation was such—you can’t if you’re somebody’s vice president so to speak. You don’t get involved; you’re in a different role. He kind of epitomized—is that the word? He told me once that he felt that the reason he was brought in as dean was that he was an outsider, and that only an outsider could wield the broom to clean up the place.

COHEN: He actually said that?

MILLER: Yes. That’s almost a direct quotation—very close paraphrase. Don’t know why he told me that. But he felt—he said, “Otherwise they’re going to pick somebody from inside. But I took this as a signal that they really wanted the house cleaned. So they brought in somebody.” And I think maybe that attitude—and again I can’t remember the specifics too well—was displayed in some of his actions and then created the rest.

COHEN: When you say “they,” now the search committee was a…what was the…?

MILLER: I guess it was a faculty search committee. I don’t recall.

COHEN: Local faculty?

MILLER: Yes, I don’t know is that they had any—now have sometimes some outside people from New Brunswick or from the administration. I think they tended—certainly the committee that picked, that nominated Henry—was a faculty committee plus two students and no outsiders. And I would guess that the committee that picked him also was. And I think they probably came up with three names instead of just one, and that he was the university’s, the president’s choice then—or maybe the vice president’s choice or whatever it was.

COHEN: They did come up with three names?

MILLER: I think they probably did. I’m just guessing on that, because we were sort of instructed on search committees I’d been on. We had to come up with several names, maybe three. And we deliberately didn’t in the Blumenthal one, the one that resulted in Blumenthal, because we wanted to make sure that he got appointed. So I’m just guessing on that. But that was what he told me as his interpretation. “They” meaning, I took it, was the central administration, not the search committee. And I ought to go back and read some of the minutes because I don’t recall. I just recall that a lot of people thoroughly detested him by the time he had resigned the deanship.

COHEN: What was the issue that forced him out?

MILLER: I don’t know. I think it was purely a lack of consultation, a feeling that he was making decisions, a feeling that he was often arbitrary in his decisions, that he had his own agenda that might be different from the faculty’s agenda, and he was going to do that. Now,
don’t ask me for specifics because at this point I can’t recall. That’s just my impression. And as I said, I was sort of out of it because I was busy doing something else the last year when things kind of came to a head there. So that’s….

COHEN: And his successor was Norman Samuels, the present provost. He was dean until 1982, when he took over as provost…I’m getting my dates wrong.

MILLER: Well, whenever. Whenever. Of course I’d known him for a long time, since, as I told you, since he first came in to be interviewed for a humble assistant professorship. And then he had gone away to Medgar Evers and then had come back.

COHEN: Oh, that’s right. I was going to say….

MILLER: Yes. And he had really, I think, decided at the point that he left Rutgers that time that he was kind of headed for administration and came back as, I guess, Henry’s associate dean for a while, I think.

COHEN: I think you’re right.

MILLER: I think he did. Warren Manspeizer succeeded me as associate dean. And then there were a lot of associates. And so, you know, there’s a different kind of relationship because I knew him personally and could—we wrote a book together.

COHEN: Oh, did you!

MILLER: Yes. We edited a book of readings, on American government.

COHEN: Oh, a book of readings. I didn’t know that, that you’d collaborated.

MILLER: And tended to agree for the most part on things generally. So we had a good relationship. And I think that people saw him as someone who had the interests of the college at heart and was an insider. I think they always…. If people have some kind of respect for them or appreciation of them, they have an easier time than bringing the outsider in. And he was conciliatory. And he was certainly well known by the faculty. And after the turmoil of Robey, he seemed like a good choice, and I think did well, and probably I’ll end my comments there. [Laughs] Because we’ve had a few battles since then. But he’s very capable and very skillful politically. And certainly has pushed the interests of Newark.

COHEN: I want to just touch on the library.

MILLER: Oh, yes.

COHEN: Almost the penultimate topic. What has been your experience—I’ll divide the question into two. In the first place with the collections, how useful and whatever you want to say.
MILLER: Well, increasingly useful with the new techniques and new bibliographies and computers and so forth. And sufficient staff. I think, you know, we go back to 40 Rector Street.

COHEN: But how about during the seventies, the period were talking about?

MILLER: In the seventies?

COHEN: Sixties and seventies, that sense of development…into the early eighties.

MILLER: Yes. I think—maybe this is more me than the library—but I made more use of interlibrary loans and getting things, research things, through the library in the probably late seventies and eighties than before.

COHEN: More use than…

MILLER: Than I did previously because the kinds of things I was working on, even in the early seventies, were things that we didn’t have the collections for. And I don’t recall using or having the library…. Okay, I’ll take that back. I was going to say that I don’t recall using interlibrary loan very much to get things. And I would use like—go to New York Public or to New Brunswick or something like that.

COHEN: Before the move to the new campus?

MILLER: Yes, or even after the move for a while. And then I discovered that the library could get things through this research library connection that I could get Danish newspapers for example, and exotic things like that.

COHEN: Yeah.

MILLER: Parliamentary debates and so forth. And from then on it got much better. And now I use it very extensively to try to get all sorts of things. So I think it’s partly because of changes in technology and partly because you were always, particularly in the seventies, always understaffed and probably still are. Was there quite a big turnover at the top, too, in terms of librarians? Or …?

COHEN: Well, there were quite a few … [Laughter]

MILLER: I can’t even remember all the names.

COHEN: Three, four….

MILLER: But there seemed to be kind of a lack of stability at the top.

COHEN: Yes.

MILLER: So you never quite knew whom you were dealing with then.
COHEN: There’s been a lot of turnover.

MILLER: Yes, yes. And I…. Well, my comparison probably is not between the seventies and now, but between, say, the Rector Street library and now. There was all the difference in the world.

COHEN: I mean that’s really going into the early eighties.

MILLER: Yes, yes. But I think it’s greatly improved. And it’s been very helpful in my research. And I think you’ve got some…. Wanda I think is a tremendous help to me.

COHEN: Oh, yes, she’s terrific.

MILLER: In getting things. And I couldn’t have—the last couple of books I have done without her helping tracking down stuff and reminding me of stuff. And saying, “Don’t forget they didn’t send you that microfilm. It was out, and you’d better ask for it again.” And, you know, going beyond what I expected in some cases. And other people, including yourself, have been very helpful over the years, too.

COHEN: I was wondering about that. Generally what can you say about the development of…you’ve seen the development of service generally, public service in the library since you’ve been here? Especially in the seventies again, late seventies.

MILLER: Yes. I think better in the reference section and in circulation. I think circulation is a weak spot in the library, if you want to talk frankly about that, in terms of attitudes and service to people and so forth. The professionals in the reference division are always there to help you. And if they don’t know, they’ll find out for you. And the circulation, it’s a job. It’s a different sort of thing.

COHEN: It’s a job, it’s a grind.

MILLER: And then that’s probably the difference. There was something else I was going to mention, I’ve forgotten. I think one of the big problems still continues to be journals. They’re so expensive now.

COHEN: Oh oh oh. That’s a good point.

MILLER: And it used to be that we were told, well, if you want a new journal, then cancel an old one.

COHEN: Yes. Well, that’s …

MILLER: I know. And they’re terribly expensive. But there are lots of good journals that we don’t have. And it’s inconvenient to have to order them from someplace else or go somewhere else to find them. So I would say in terms of keeping up in your field, there are half a dozen good
journals in political science and the social sciences that we don’t have. And the fact that they’re in New Brunswick is not too helpful.

COHEN: Have you submitted these kinds of requests recently?

MILLER: Not recently. I think we gave up actually.

COHEN: Well, you could try again. I mean …

MILLER: And if it’s in the law school, again, that doesn’t help us too much here.

COHEN: No. No, that’s right.

MILLER: Because they get—I think— I’m not sure whether— It used to be that they got the British journal *Political Science* so we couldn’t get it, we were told, and that sort of thing.

COHEN: Well, yea, I think the system…

MILLER: I think there may be, used to be, some closer connections to the departments. And I’ve seen with political science that Heinz Seerbach was always cutting deals and working with Madeleine De Santos.

COHEN: That’s right and she retired and….

MILLER: And so I don’t think we have any contact now. It’d be nice to have someone to work with, have a link there.

COHEN: Let me make a note of that.

MILLER: Yes.

COHEN: Okay. I just have two more questions—or one more question.

MILLER: Okay.

COHEN: Is there anything that we’ve touched on you’d like to go back to?

MILLER: No. I think the fact that I’ve been here all this time really except for the second year when I went to Hunter; I took a year off and went to California to see if I liked being graduate dean of a university out there and decided I missed the East, and for family reasons we liked the school system and all sorts of other things here, and came back. I’d taken a year’s leave to do that. And aside from a Fulbright to Demark and a few—

COHEN: That was a…
MILLER: And that was early on, in the early sixties. And then occasionally a fast, but not recently, for that I’ve been here all the time. And I guess that’s a testimony to the fact that I pretty much like the place. And it’s been a good place to teach. There have been various pressures from time to time. But I think maybe coming in when the pressures to—if you wanted to get promoted, you had to do all this teaching that we’ve described and so forth. Once you get through that, why, it maybe doesn’t seem so hard anymore. And so I’ve had some opportunities to go elsewhere, but I’ve stayed here. So that’s—I don’t know any specific point I need to go back to.

COHEN: Okay, okay. One final: Is there anything we haven’t talked about that you think we should have talked about?

MILLER: You might be interested in—we touched on it just in passing. That the faculty did make some very strong efforts to push for autonomy and to not only in the graduate—the graduate was part of it, but also undergraduate—to get more autonomy for the Newark campus. And I think that pressure was coming from the Newark College of Arts and Sciences. In law and business, I didn’t hear of anything. They were always pretty satisfied, I think. And that was kind of interesting. Probably early seventies, late sixties. Though once you’ve said that it existed, maybe there’s not too much else to say. But there was really a considerable concern in a faculty that I think was more united or knew each other better than the faculty now to keep pushing New Brunswick for change and for greater independence and more buildings, amenities, faculty, etc., in Newark. And maybe that paid off. But again, it may be something that once you’ve said it existed, that’s all you need to say about it. I’ll probably think of some other things, but that’s….

COHEN: One thing I’m thinking of which I’ve asked you before—just as a final, final, final—the impact of the business programs on the college.

MILLER: Certainly made it a different place. I think when I came, there may have been an undergraduate business program in the school of business. And then they got out of that after a while. And that’s when we inherited it. And then—yes, that’s a big subject. I’d have to think a little more about that. But I think it really has had an impact on the school, the fact that 40 percent or more are business majors. Or more than that. Yes, yes. And to that extent it’s less of a liberal arts and sciences place than it used to be.

COHEN: Yes.

MILLER: Because the majors require so many courses there, that the chance—I think we, in a way, shortchanged the students; this is their opportunity to explore fields. And if they have to take 60, 70 credits to complete a major in accounting or business and their required courses, that’s about it. They can’t really explore. So I think we may be shortchanging them in the process. They don’t have that freedom to explore or at least in the same way once they get out of here.

COHEN: Okay. Thank you very much.

MILLER: You’re welcome. I didn’t know I could…. [End of Tape #2]
[End of Interview]
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