
An Interview with

WARREN MANSPEIZER

Conducted by

Gilbert Cohen

September 25, 1991
October 10, 1991
INTERVIEW: Warren Manspeizer

INTERVIEWER: Gilbert Cohen

DATE: September 25, 1991; October 10, 1991

GILBERT COHEN: This is Wednesday, September 25, 1991. This is Gil Cohen. I’m meeting with Professor Warren Manspeizer in his home in West Orange, New Jersey.

[Break in recording]

Okay. Now we are back with Professor Manspeizer. And as I was saying before, I’d like to lead off with a biographical sketch of your academic career, prior to and since coming to Rutgers-Newark.

WARREN MANSPEIZER: I graduated from City College with a degree in biology, a bachelor’s in geology in fifty-six I think it was, took a master’s of science in geology at West Virginia University, that was fifty-eight. And I graduated with a Ph.D. from Rutgers University-New Brunswick in geology in sixty-three. Came to the university in Newark in fifty-eight I guess it was. And taught labs there for several years. And then got I think it was a full-time appointment in sixty-three. I probably was appointed assistant professor. No, my first appointment, other than a TA, was probably in about 1960 or so.

COHEN: Your first appointment here. Okay.

MANSPEIZER: My first appointment as a TA was in fifty-eight. And then I think after that—oh, there must have been an appointment as instructor; I’d come in as an instructor, and that was probably about 1959 or 1960. So I guess I’ve been on the faculty and associated with, you know, teaching in the university since 1958. That’s a long, long time. [Laughs] I’ve seen many come and many go.

COHEN: Me, too.

MANSPEIZER: And many changes. [Laughter] Many good people, many good times.

COHEN: I’ve been going over these various committees and university groups and committees that you were on. There’s quite a list. And I think if you could just sort of pick tick them off, I think it would be useful. You really have been quite active.

MANSPEIZER: Well, the things that were most notable to me...let’s see, I guess I was on the Scholastic Standing Committee back in the sixties, and was chairman of the Scholastic Standing Committee, but we modified the way the faculty views the progress of students, particularly those who were sometimes having difficulty. Then I was asked to become the associate dean in seventy I guess it was, from seventy to seventy-one. But I also served on the Admissions Committee, served on the Student Affairs Committee back in the sixties. In the seventies I
became active—more active—on the university level and was involved in the early seventies in the University Senate. And I guess it was about 1974 or seventy-five I was the vice president of the—or vice chairman of—the University Senate, I forget the title now. The chairman at that time was Frank Genifer who is now the president of Howard University in Washington. And both of us served as faculty representatives to the Board of Governors in—I think it was seventy-six or seventy-seven. And those were very interesting times as well. I also served on a search committee that ultimately recommended Dean Robey, and that must have been in the middle or early—seventy-three I guess it was, seventy-two, seventy-three, something like that. And was also the chair of the AAUP for the Newark campus; I guess it was also in the early seventies. I don’t recall precisely when that was.

COHEN: Well, that’s okay. [Laughter]

MANSPEIZRE: Those are notable assignments.

COHEN: Also you mentioned before to me the Space Utilization Committee and the chair of the Geology Department and so on.

MANSPEIZER: Right.

COHEN: So you’ve been you know…. 

MANSPEIZER: The Space Utilization Committee was interesting also because there they were trying to…this was chairman of the university-wide committee. And the issues there were how to effectively use space.

COHEN: University-wide or just Newark?

MANSPEIZER: University-wide.

COHEN: Oh.

MANSPEIZER: University-wide.

COHEN: Yes, yes.

MANSPEIZER: There was I mean under me at that time, on the committee at that time, were the deans of the graduate school, deans of the undergraduate school, guys like Walston, and I think even the provost in New Brunswick was there at that time. I guess I was appointed largely because there were some very basic problems in New Brunswick. So they wanted somebody from Newark, an outsider to look at that. And Bloustein had asked me to look at the issues there. They were important issues, as they are today. Space is an important, you know, commodity, resource, in the university.

COHEN: For the record I’ve been asking people to describe the old Rector Street campus, and there’s been such a difference and such a change. If you could go into that in some detail.
MANSPEIZER: Sure. It brings back fond memories, Rector Street. I guess my office and the center of the college at that time seemed to be—the building at Rector Street, was it 40 Rector Street?

COHEN: Forty Rector Street.

MANSPEIZER: It was the old Ballantine Brewery.

COHEN: Yes.

MANSPEIZER: And Dean Woodward, who was a geologist and the first dean of the college, right? Appointed 1945, I think, right after the Second World War.

COHEN: I guess after it became part of Rutgers—forty-six was the year, I believe. He was the first dean in fact.

MANSPEIZER: Yes, he was.

COHEN: That’s the list I’m starting with anyhow.

MANSPEIZER: No, no, no. He was the first dean.

COHEN: Since it became Rutgers.

MANSPEIZER: As part of Rutgers University, right. And even his tenure goes back to 1929. He was a graduate student at Columbia in geology. Dean Woodward was a geologist, a very fine geologist. And he came to Newark in 1929 and offered one of the courses in the Pre-Legal Department of the law school at that time. And that ultimately was, you know, that center of that development to the liberal arts component, the School of Arts and Sciences. But anyway, the building was probably a four- or five-story building. I remember it had anthracite, a particular mineral on a particular kind of rock that was fairly common on I think the surface of the building. Or at least the lower floors Or so. It was a lot of green. It was kind of Art Deco. But I think there were some of these polished slabs of the mineral—of the rock rather—called anthracite. The dean’s office, I remember well; Dean Woodward’s office was on the second floor. And the library was absolutely spectacular. It really was a very beautiful library. Do you remember that?

COHEN: I worked on the library floor.

MANSPEIZER: It was very beautiful, yes.


MANSPEIZER: Was it sixty-seven?
COHEN: Yes. It was all one—was it wood paneling?

MANSPEIZER: Yes. Beautiful balcony on the second story. It was very attractive.

COHEN: You said the library was wonderful. In what respect? I have questions about the library later on, but…

MANSPEIZER: Well, I think—What I remember of the library it seemed to have an old-world character to it. It was quite attractive. I liked this business with the balcony upstairs, the shelves were upstairs. Everything was accessible as I recall. The librarians were downstairs on the first floor. The one thing I didn’t like about the library—it seemed like chemistry had almost all the shelf space in the library. [Laughter]

COHEN: Yes, a big chunk.

MANSPEIZER: Yes. A big chunk, a big chunk. A large chunk, right. The library was taken over by chemistry. We had a few geology books, and it was—it was a nice place to be And there were some good people in the library, yourself and Leslie was there. Yes…

[Both speaking at once]

MANSPEIZER: Alan.

COHEN: Yes, he came in after I got my degree. He was at the circulation.

MANSPEIZER: Okay, then it was Alan.

COHEN: And then I came in as his assistant.

MANSPEIZER: Yes. Okay. Alan was my roommate in New Brunswick.

COHEN: Yes. And Leslie I believe is still at the library.

MANSPEIZER: Oh, Leslie was always in the front.

COHEN: And he’s got his career in New Brunswick.

MANSPEIZER: Al. And there were a couple other people.

COHEN: I’m sure you remember Jim Merritt.

MANSPEIZER: Oh, absolutely. Absolutely. And his wife.

COHEN: Who else would you remember from the old days, probably Jim Dole?

MANSPEIZER: No. Absolutely. Well, he was a…?
COHEN: He was in the old building. He started off working, I guess assisting…

MANSPEIZER: I didn’t realize that. I remember Jim Merritt and his wife quite well. And then on the fourth and fifth floors of the building was the Geology Department. The Geology Department was located on the fourth and fifth floors. And this is kind of like in the tower of the building—two-story tower. On the first floor of the two stories there was the geology office. And I forget the secretary’s name at that time. Nice elderly woman. And Sam Agron, chairman of the department, they share a large office. And I think there were two other office—two other rooms on that floor. One was a lecture hall which probably housed about—could hold about forty, fifty students. But above that, on the top floor of the building, was I think one lab, one geology lab, a small preparation room, and one, two, three offices. One for Dr. Hamilton, one for—oh, Bill Wilds, a wonderful man—and one for Bob Ramsdale, and one for myself. My office faced McCarter Highway overlooking the Passaic River. And at that time I think I could watch them build the Verrazano Bridge. I could see that—

COHEN: Oh.

MANSPEIZER: Yes. Structures for the Verrazano—as I remember now. Really it was very nice. And the fact that that complex was formerly the chicken coops, Dan Lerman, his doves. Right. You could hear the coos in his office up there. And we opened the—you know I guess he got space on the next street.

COHEN: Was the next street…?

MANSPEIZER: On top of the admissions.

COHEN: Fulton?

MANSPEIZER: Yes, yes, he got space up there. And then that freed space for the Geology Department.

COHEN: Oh, so you got—you were up there…and why did he move, move out of that?

MANSPEIZER: I don’t know what happened before. It probably happened before fifty-nine when I got there—fifty-eight when I got there. So that’s my recollection. The other recollection I have is that since those things seem to be centered there and the students—I think physics was across the street on Fulton Avenue, their classroom. I remember having to go to one of the old hotels, that is being refurbished now for faculty meetings. It wasn’t the Robert Treat.

COHEN: Military Park?

MANSPEIZER: Military Park. The one with these large columns, is that Military Park?

COHEN: Hmm.
MANSPEIZER: Faculty meetings were held there in a large auditorium.

COHEN: I think it was Military Park at the end. I remember that people were coming, but I could be wrong.

MANSPEIZER: Yes, I think so. It’s one that’s being done today.

COHEN: Is it?

MANSPEIZER: Yes, yes.

COHEN: I’d better check it out.

MANSPEIZER: The one with very large white pillars, you know, in front, four or five large ones.

COHEN: What were the facilities like in, I mean you were a geologist. What kind of facilities did you as a geologist have compared to what you have now? Or what you have right now on the new campus?

MANSPEIZER: [Laughs] Well, even now there’s a lot to be desired. A lot to be desired. But geology no doubt is the poorest of the departments on campus and apparently has always been that way. I assume our budget is substantially smaller than any of the other departments. What we had at that time was two labs, as I said before, and at least one or perhaps two lecture rooms on the fourth and fifth floor and very small offices. The preparation room had I think perhaps one rock saw and some glass on which we could make what we call thin sections so we could study these things under the microscope.

COHEN: Microscope, yes.

MANSPEIZER: Yes. But Sam Agron was very important in developing the Geology Department, although I guess the first geologist, as I mentioned before, was Dean Woodward. Sam came from Brown, teaching up in Brown. Woodward hired him out of Brown University to teach geology at Rutgers-Newark. Sam had purchased some old, some used microscopes—petrographic microscopes—from Columbia University. They were getting rid of theirs and getting new ones. This probably dates back to around the middle fifties. And that’s essentially the only equipment we had. I don’t think we had anything more than that. Sam might have had a telescope; he taught astronomy. But that was really it. Blackboard and chalk.

COHEN: Well, when you moved to the new campus, what was the initial effect on you as a teacher, as a researcher, as a member of the faculty? How did you feel about it?

MANSPEIZER: Oh, we felt very good about it and very good about ourselves. I mean here we were not only getting into a new building with new facilities…. And Sam, I remember, had fought long and hard with I guess the people that designed the building, as well as other departments that used the building, primarily the Biology Department—Greenfield was in charge
of that—Boyden Hall. And I think the issues there were how much space should geology get? And as I recall now—Sam certainly would be the one to ask—the major issue seemed to be that biology wanted more space, and we got, you know, I guess—there are four floors, so we got twenty-five percent of the building; biology got seventy-five percent of the building. They certainly will teach, you know, three times as many students as we do. But anyway, that was—it was a good time. It was something new, and we all had great hopes and were very optimistic about the future. At the same time, we also hired, I think as we moved into the building, that year, sixty-eight, we moved in, we also hired two new faculty, one was Professor Garner, Fillmore [sp] Garner from Arkansas, and he was hired as a full professor; and the second hire was Dr. George Theokratak [sp]. Professor Garner has since retired; he retired perhaps about five years ago. And Theokratak is a professor of geology today.

I should point out also that Dean Woodward, who was also my thesis advisor for my Ph.D. in New Brunswick, he passed away. Let’s see, he was dean from about forty-five or forty-six to around fifty-six I think it was, fifty-five or fifty-six. No, I’m sorry, sixty-five. Yes, I’m sorry, sixty-five. And I remember—I was doing some fieldwork in the western part of New York State; he had asked me to get some information, some field data for him. He was putting it out another publication. He was very prolific and a very good scientist. Very well-known geologist working in the Appalachians, especially in Virginia, West Virginia, New York, and Pennsylvania. And I went up to a field area in I guess it was sixty-five. And when I came back—I got the information he needed—and when I came back, I found that he had died. I think he passed away on a weekend. But there was an interesting period afterwards which I should get to later. But the second dean of the college turned out to be another geologist, and this was Dean Gilliland. I guess he was hired—

COHEN: Sixty-five, I believe, to sixty-eight. I believe.

MANSPEIZER: Yes.

COHEN: And then Malcolm Talbott took over as acting dean until Henry Blumenthal’s tenure after the crisis here at Conklin Hall.

MANSPEIZER: So this was a second dean, you know, who was a geologist. But he was not the kind of person that Dean Woodward was. Absolutely not. He was a totally different character.

COHEN: Yes, later on I’ll ask you about various administrations.

MANSPEIZER: Okay. Yes.

COHEN: And your assessment of their careers.

MANSPEIZER: But he apparently, no doubt, was important in making these two hires. So anyway, we moved into the new building, new views, new feeling about ourselves. The department at that time—we hired, I think, another fellow shortly thereafter—Harry Pisiminder [sp]. So we were about eight or nine people in the department then.
COHEN: Oh!

MANSPEIZER: Full faculty.

COHEN: It was a big department then, relatively speaking.

MANSPEIZER: When we were on Rector Street, there were only three or four of us. By the time we moved in, we had picked up about four lines.

COHEN: Twice the department.

MANSPEIZER: Yes. Within a year or two of our move—Because at the time when we were on Rector Street, it was just Sam Agron, Bill Wilds, who had been there several years before I; he was a graduate of Columbia. Sam was a graduate of Hopkins. And then there was Charlie Hamilton who—we had a VPI, who was a mineralogist. And Bob Ramsdale [sp], who was a paleontologist, who was working for a degree out of Princeton, and myself. So there were about five of us. When we moved to the new building, Hamilton stayed for about a year or so, and then he left to go to some other school, and we hired Dr. De Suvio. Yes, Dr. De Suvio. And then Garner and Theokratak made eight. Then we hired somebody else. Oh, Chris Meyer made nine. Tom Heron made ten. Unfortunately, Dr. Wilds passed away in the early seventies. So we had about eight or nine people.

COHEN: How many are on the faculty now?

MANSPEIZER: There’s De Suvio who’s chairman. Theokratak, Dr. Pucker [sp], myself, and Dr. Alan Gates. So that’s right. Pucker also came early—probably about nineteen—shortly after the move. Probably sixty-eight, sixty-nine, seventy

COHEN: You were saying before that when the move—

MANSPEIZER: He came out of Stanford, by the way.

COHEN: Who would that be?

MANSPEIZER: Dr. Pucker, John Pucker. He was out of Stanford.

COHEN: You mentioned before that when the department made the move, you were looking forward with optimism towards the new campus. What did you expect at that time, you and your colleagues?

MANSPEIZER: Well, I guess we expected certainly more support from the administration in terms of faculty lines. We expected more money for equipment. We developed a graduate program at that time. I’m not sure exactly when the graduate program was initiated. It probably was in about 1970 or thereabouts. And we had a fairly good crop of students—perhaps as many as fifteen, twenty graduate students after a few years. But it really never caught on. Geology has
always been a small link in this chain of the sciences—or for that matter if you look at most of
the departments. And yet we do a substantial amount of teaching. And much of our teaching is
on the introductory level. We must teach, you know—at that time we probably were teaching
perhaps four or five hundred freshmen in geology. You know introductory courses. Clearly half
the freshmen were taking our courses, you know, introductory, physical geology, and historical
geology, you know, to complete that one year of science requirement, laboratory science
requirement. But we’ve always had difficulty attracting majors. Although I think when I was
chairman back in the early middle seventies, we had as many as sixty to ninety geology majors.
But then, in the late seventies with the oil boycott and, you know, the Arab boycott, and
problems with the oil companies, the enrollment has dropped substantially in our majors. But we
still must teach about three hundred undergraduates per semester.

COHEN: But how did the curriculum change in the department, the whole enrollments in
geology change? What was being offered in the sixties, and how did this change through the
seventies in terms of the whole geology program?

MANSPEIZER: Well, I’m trying to think now. I should be able to recall it. What I do recall is
that—kind of interesting. At that time in the late seventies—late sixties and the early seventies—as it is today, each of the departments was certainly concerned about its own faculty. In that
sense you were concerned about the courses that you teach and you want to protect your turf. So
it was important that, for us certainly since we never really had large numbers of majors. Our
department in many respects is similar to botany. You know having about similar kinds of
numbers, both in faculty and in students. I can recall on several occasions where geography—
there was a fellow by the name of Bob Brown and I think also Ray—what’s his name?

COHEN: De Caprio?

MANSPEIZER: De Caprio. They were trying to teach physical geography as part of the lab
science requirement. Physical geography is really our bread-and-butter course here; we call it
physical geology. So I remember there were problems there. But to get back to the curriculum,
curriculum hasn’t really changed much in that period of time—in geology.

COHEN: Yes.

MANSPEIZER: We’re teaching largely the same kind of basic, fundamental courses as we
taught then. Those courses include, you know, basic course in minerals, basic course in the study
of rocks, basic courses in stratigraphy and structure. You know all those fundamental courses.
But I do remember when I was chairman in 1971 quite clearly that I was well aware of the fact
that there was a problem in toxic waste disposal that was cropping up throughout the country.
That many of the wells that people—individuals—put down wound up with tainted waters. There
were problems in terms of saltation of lakes and nitrification of lakes. There were problems in
sanitary landfills. Anyway, the whole water issue, as I saw it, was very important. And we tried
to hire a hydro-geologist or hydrologist, somebody who could teach our students something
about the underground water systems. You can see now it’s extremely important, but it’s
fascinating. I tried to hire somebody in 1971. Actually I did, seventy-one, seventy-two. It was a
young woman out of Princeton who was going for her Ph.D. at Princeton. Her name was
Christine Tremal [sp]. Actually she got most of her training out of Hungary. She came here as a result of the Hungarian Revolution in 1955-56. Okay. She came here. I think she had some training over there. Came here as a Ph.D. student. Kept her for about two years. She was right on the ball. You know she introduced computer work for the kids back in the early seventies. Ground water studies. And those kinds of things, which are critical really to survive today. Anyway, we couldn’t keep her. She went into industry; industry paid a lot more money. And from that point on we tried to hire a hydro geologist, and the best we can do now is every couple of years I guess the graduate school gives us some money to hire somebody. Right now we have somebody, a fellow by the name of Dan Robide [sp], who teaches a course in hydrogeology on the graduate level. I also understand that now New Brunswick—which has a very fine department—is also trying to hire a hydro geologist. But the need is really critical. Looking back now these last twenty years, I would guess that if we were able to keep Christine Tremal, who at that time was probably one of the very rare women in science except that biology had a few: Margaret what’s her name?

COHEN: Margaret Wheeler.

MANSPEIZER: Margaret Wheeler and Helen—

COHEN: Strauser.

MANSPEIZER: Strauser. People like that and Ethel, I guess. There were very, very few. Very few certainly in geology around the country. But the Geology Department today would be in a lot better position—a different position—now than we are today had we been able to hire her. Because at that time, you know, looking back twenty years, we would’ve established a very strong program in hydrology.

COHEN: You mentioned the influence of the Arab boycott on enrollments. Could you go into that in a little detail? And recollections you have of that?

MANSPEIZER: Well, only in that what happened at that time, as I recall—that was what year, in seventy-three, seventy-two?

COHEN: Seventy-three? My chronology is not so good.

MANSPEIZER: Yes I think it was also the seventy-three war. Oil was scarce at that time certainly because of the embargo, so the oil companies were hiring. Oil companies hire, this makes a big impact, you know, on the newspapers, kids become aware of geology. And as a result the enrollments went up. So the enrollments were probably sixty or seventy. But then after the boycott, you know, was stopped or so. And the agreements, I guess, were made between these countries, it was quite clear that oil was abundant and plentiful, you know, in Saudi Arabia. So the need for geologists here in the States was not as great as it was before. In other words Saudi Arabia or Kuwait, these places like that, could then supply us with all the oil we needed. There’s an interesting point also: the oil companies were certainly well aware of this. Many of the oil companies today really do not do much exploration. Most of the work for the geologist that’s hired by an oil company, the work is largely an exploration, exploring the area, you know,
COHEN: Exploration?

MANSPEIZER: Yes, exploration programs, especially in remote areas. So oil when is plentiful, a lot of the oil companies are really not even involved in…. I mean their exploration bubble is all the way down. For research purposes it’s all the way down because oil is abundant. So places like Texaco. I’ve done consulting work for Texaco. But a lot of their work now is in the refineries, you know. They put their money into refineries. Why put the money into exploration because exploration doesn’t necessarily pay.

COHEN: Yes, yes. Yes, the influence of events. I want to go back a few years since we’re talking about what’s happening in society and its impact on the university. In 1967, if you want to start chronologically, July of sixty-seven, there were the Newark riots for several days—a few days. Of course what recollections do you have of that period? What was happening in the city and on the campus?

MANSPEIZER: I remember—I must have been teaching a course, a summer school course in sixty-seven to sixty-eight?

COHEN: Well, the riot was a few days in July of sixty-seven

MANSPEIZER: Sixty-seven. Okay. I must have been teaching a summer session course. Because I remember very vividly driving down Main Street. This is prior to Interstate 280.

COHEN: Oh, yes.

MANSPEIZER: 280 wasn’t built until 1969. Because I remember studying the geology on 280. So I remember that part clearly as well. But I remember—I guess I was going from West Orange to the school, the university on Main Street. And I was on Main Street in Orange. There was an old bank, I forget; it was probably the—maybe it was in Newark. It could have been on Sussex and Main Street or so; right on the border. I remember seeing tanks in the street, you know, personnel carriers and tanks lining the street. I’m thinking to myself I could be in the sight of somebody with a sniper, you know, scope, and I would never know, you know, what hit me if somebody were to do that. I really don’t recall seeing military presence or police presence on the campus; I just don’t recall that at all. But I did remember that other incident.

[Break in recording]

COHEN: You were describing the what it was like. Were you coming from West Orange at the time?

MANSPEIZER: Yes. We moved to West Orange in 1966.

COHEN: What was the immediate impact on the campus that you recall?
MANSPEIZER: It’s funny, you raised the question of the impact on campus, and my thoughts were still back in West Orange. I can tell you what the immediate effect was in West Orange.

COHEN: Oh, okay.

MANSPEIZER: Well, as you perhaps know, this area of West Orange it’s… we moved here, and this is a mixed community. Mixed in the sense that ethnically there’s a fair amount of Jews and I guess Italians. Major impact back here seemed to be—and at the same time there was a small Orthodox community that was starting to, you know, get started over here. And they had moved out from Newark. They were on Avon Avenue in Newark. I’m really not sure where that is, but I think that was right in the heart of where the riots were. So that synagogue moved out about—it was either sixty-five or… it was either sixty-four or sixty-five. It was here for one year. Then moved into its current facility on Pleasant Valley Way, a couple of blocks from here. But the major impact of the riot was the fact that large numbers of people from Newark, Jewish people from Newark, who’d left Newark, and, you know, had found housing over here. So as a result of that, the Jewish community in West Orange, and particularly the Orthodox community as opposed to the conservative, Reformed community, really started to blossom. It’s a very substantial community today. But a lot of the people that came here in the late sixties really came from Newark and subsequently from—at about the same time I guess you also had a large migration from people who were coming to Brooklyn from New York City because the riots were also affecting them there. But to get back to the school, to the university, I don’t recall—other than that—I don’t recall any impact on what was going on at school.

COHEN: How about student recruitment? Any impact on that that you—

MANSPEIZER: We’ve always had difficulty recruiting students. I was on the Admissions Committee and went out to high schools, you know, and tried to talk to them about the value of education at Rutgers in Newark instead of New Brunswick and all of that. So we’ve always had trouble. I remember also starting that High School Scholars program, where we would, you know, but that was as associate dean a little later on. But it’s always been a major difficulty, trying to get kids from the suburbs to come into Newark. In all reality I guess there’s an awful lot of parents out here in the suburbs who’d rather see their children somewhere else rather than Newark. So it’s been a battle for thirty years, as I recall. A very constant battle.

COHEN: How about the impact, if any, on the faculty recruitment?

MANSPEIZER: I would not have been in a position at that time to know. I know in sixty-eight—I would assume that the enrollment, student enrollment, and faculty hiring was probably at a standstill up until the point that we moved into the new building. Then we were ready to expand. And I would assume as geology picked up whatever it was, the two or three lines, you know, of faculty, other departments were able to hire as well. But I wasn’t really privy to that.

COHEN: Do you recall any—at least I’ve heard—any discussions or serious discussions about alternative locations for the new campus.
MANSPEIZER: I don’t know how serious it was, though. And that location would have been West Orange right here. There’s a public golf course, as I recall. I think this was the location that they spoke about. It was on Route 10.

COHEN: Is that right?

MANSPEIZER: Yes, yes, I think this is— Okay.

COHEN: I’ve heard bits and pieces there.

MANSPEIZER: Yes, yes. And I think there were actually debates, discussions in the faculty about that. I’m not sure—because again I wouldn’t have been in a position to know whether this was really a serious, you know, discussion or not. But I do recall, you know, the arguments went something like we could attract more students if we weren’t in Newark. But the counter argument was this is our place, and this is where we ought to develop. I don’t remember— I think I can recall Woodward being involved in those meetings, you know, faculty meetings—Dean Woodward—back in the early sixties. Early sixties? Maybe middle sixties. You know but he was not there then. I think those discussions were early sixties, discussions.

COHEN: Must have been long before—

MANSPEIZER: Yes, long before the riots.

COHEN: —contracts were let out and everything else.

MANSPEIZER: They were?

COHEN: Well, they were occupied in sixty… with the campus in sixty...

MANSPEIZER: Oh, I see what you mean. Yes.

COHEN: Construction...

MANSPEIZER: Absolutely, absolutely.

COHEN: Do you remember who were the chief advocates of the different positions or where to locate? Do you have any recollection of that?

MANSPEIZER: No, no. I could guess, but I don’t know. [Laughter] I really—I don’t know. No, there was certainly the strong sentiment, you know, our place is here. And the others were saying a more practical sentiment, we should do that. And I suspect, you know, New Brunswick said, Well, this is where you’re going to be. There’s always been that feeling in Newark, I think, amongst a large number of faculty that New Brunswick was really afraid that we would grow too large. And if we did, they would lose control over us.

COHEN: Is that right? I mean I’ve heard this, too.
MANSPEIZER: Oh, absolutely! Absolutely! All the time.

COHEN: Could you expand upon that a little bit before I miss it?

MANSPEIZER: Well, I’m not sure I can document that.

COHEN: Oh, well….

MANSPEIZER: I can’t document it.

COHEN: Your recollections.

MANSPEIZER: But, yes, I think that was in the minds of many of the faculty, that New Brunswick was concerned. I remember being deeply involved also—this is before I became associate dean—in other committees. For example, the committee that set up the School of Architecture.

COHEN: Oh, yes.

MANSPEIZER: It was the CHEN Group. I was on the committee with I think Panson may have been the chair of the committee. I remember being on it with NJIT. What I recall was that we had established a curriculum and, you know, a mission statement, goal statement, all of that, as to what the school would be like. And we knew we didn’t want it to be like Princeton School of Architecture where they were designing cathedrals, you know. [Laughter] We wanted somebody to design buildings for the poor and the needy, middle class, etc. And other kinds of things: bridges or whatever they are. And we established a curriculum. And it was agreed with NJIT that we would recommend, that the committee would recommend that the school be housed at Rutgers University in Newark. And NJIT would play a part in the curriculum by offering courses in engineering and certain other kinds of things which they have expertise in. I also was a member of the senate at that time, and we introduced the notion at the senate. It was roundly defeated at the senate. University senate said, no. That they rejected it—at that time they were building schools and programs all over the damned place. And they rejected our proposal or recommendation. So it never went before the Board of Higher Education. I remember the Newark contingency was—or the group—was really terribly annoyed. And we got the feeling that if it wasn’t going to be in New Brunswick, it wasn’t going to be anywhere. So we turned around and supported the program at NJIT. We then, our group, then said, Well, we really wanted it to be in Newark, and that was how NJIT was able to forward that recommendation or proposal to the Board of Higher Education. So I mean that’s very clear. No question about what had happened there. It was absolutely—it was politics. Politics played at the highest levels in the administration. New Brunswick—if it wasn’t going to be in New Brunswick, then it wasn’t going to be anywhere in the university. I mean I guess they felt that it wasn’t going to be anywhere. It wasn’t going to be in New Jersey.

They were also always concerned—I met with this CHEN Group. I forget the fellow who founded the CHEN. But there were a lot of committees that we served on. But CHEN was one of
these Committee for Higher Education of Newark I hope his name will come to me; I can picture him. But certainly at that time it was clearly felt by the members of the committee and CHEN that one of our major problems was the university administration in New Brunswick. And they looked at CHEN as a potential— not interloper. But they were concerned that if CHEN grew too big and the university here grew too big, that ultimately this would break away and this would start, you know, the University of Newark. And then they would be competing with the funds that New Brunswick got. Very clear.

COHEN: Was there any sentiment among the Newark faculty for a separate university, independent of Rutgers?

MANSPEIZER: Yes, yes, yes. But I don’t—I would say yes, and, you know, it goes back a long time now. I don’t remember any of the specifics.

COHEN: Was it a strong sentiment…?

MANSPEIZER: Yes, there was, there was. In fact the arguments were…you know certainly we would be more autonomous. We wouldn’t be dependent upon them. But on the other hand, you wouldn’t have the Rutgers name.

COHEN: That’s what I thought.

MANSPEIZER: That was the counterargument. Nothing more, nothing less. I mean it was quite clear that we wouldn’t be beholden to New Brunswick. Not as much as we are. At the same time you would be closer to where the money is, and therefore be able to develop, you know, the right kinds of programs for our students and research—you know all the good things. There’s nothing negative about it. But the only negative, the only drawback, that was commonly expressed was the fact that your papers would say Rutgers University. They would say whatever it was. Might have said University of New Jersey. But that was really the only thing. I’ll tell you who was also very important at this time; I think I mentioned this before. A fellow who was very critical in the early seventies, critical in terms of knowing what was going on, important to what was going on. Is a fellow by the name of Bruce Robertson. And I don’t know if anybody mentioned Bruce?

COHEN: Well….

MANSPEIZER: Very articulate, very smart guy.

COHEN: So what was his role?

MANSPEIZER: I think the early seventies.

COHEN: Yes. I mean you said he was very critical.

MANSPEIZER: Well, critical in terms of what would be the faculty. I think Bruce was an assistant dean. Probably late sixties.
COHEN: Assistant dean? Yes, I think so. Yes.

MANSPEIZER: Yes, yes, yes.

COHEN: So he was, in terms of advocating....?

MANSPEIZER: Well, I’m reasonably sure, yes. I would think he did. Not so much then, but then he went to work with I guess it was Ralph Dungan, who was the chancellor of higher education back—and Dungan had worked for the Kennedys, you know, in Washington, and I guess after President Kennedy was assassinated. When was he assassinated?

COHEN: Sixty-three.

MANSPEIZER: Sixty-three. I guess he left that scene and somehow got involved with, you know, higher education in New Jersey. Ralph Dungan—I think it was Dungan; I don’t know who else it could have been. And I think there was a lot of talk....Dungan. There was some friction I guess between Dungan and whoever was chairman of the Board of Higher Education at that time between him and the central administration And one of the ways...to bring him back to the right side was the spin-off this Newark operation. And you had all the ingredients. You had the medical school probably also about sixty-seven. And remember the medical school originally was part of Rutgers University. It’s not part of Rutgers University because the medical school is so—Rutgers so antagonized the state legislature in terms of what they were doing at the medical school, they...made it a very select, you know, institution, about fifteen or sixteen students.

COHEN: Was that the issue?

MANSPEIZER: I think that was one of the major issues. I think at that time...Yes, they were building—I think the classes.... I don’t recall. But offhand it was something like the classes were—the freshman class was like sixteen students in the class. A tremendous amount of money was spent on these sixteen students.

COHEN: On Piscataway campus?

MANSPEIZER: On Piscataway campus. And on the physical facilities. You’d walk in, and there was a marble floor—or something like that. Really luxurious, you know, structure. A piano in the middle with somebody playing the piano or something. And as I understood it, it so antagonized the state legislature, who was still in this little hovel of offices, that they realized—they recognized that the money was not being properly spent, and put it under a different institution. So the medical school is not a part of Rutgers today. But I think that was also part of Dungan’s, you know, way of dealing with the university. The university was too large. But there are the others. Certainly if you get Marvin Greenberg, you know, because I think Marvin would be very privy to a lot of those things. But Bruce was part of the Dungan administration. He left Rutgers probably in the late sixties, early seventies. In fact Bruce was—okay, now I remember. Bruce was an assistant dean under Gilliland. Gilliland, as you remember, was relieved or asked to give up his duties as dean. He was relieved of that, and it was generally thought that Bruce Robertson was very instrumental in putting the skids underneath Gilliland, very instrumental. He
was an interesting character. And I think he was Australian by birth. And I think his understanding of education was a little different than the rest, you know, than most of us here. He wanted to streamline it, modify it.

COHEN: Do you know where he went to next after Trenton?

MANSPEIZER: Yes. Of course he’s not had a good life, I think. He was in Trenton for a number of years. And I think was also instrumental in terms of developing programs for the Board of Higher Education. He then became, I think, chancellor of higher education in Missouri. And then after that it was all downhill. He got involved with a few things. I don’t know. I’d hear rumors, and I’d hear…. But I think if you’d ask Eliot, they were both in the same department, both similar kinds of characters—in a good sense. I mean they were fun people to be with, interesting people to be with. Very knowledgeable and very articulate and very bright. You could learn an awful lot from those two.

COHEN: I remember Robertson. I imagine he would be improving on the other directors of the Dana Library.

MANSPEIZER: Oh, a lot of people thought that he was...

COHEN: A very savvy guy, very quick.

MANSPEIZER: Very quick. A lot of people thought he was very cutthroat also. He established the ECH’s, and you know….

COHEN: ECH? Earned Credit Hours?

MANSPEIZER: Hours or something like that. Yes, that was his. ECH’s and FTE’s.

COHEN: Academic acronyms. [Laughter]

MANSPEIZER: That’s right…that’s right. That’s right. This is an accounting system, right? Academic accounting system. But the Economics Department didn’t quite understand either. But Bruce was good. I have many fond memories of Bruce.

COHEN: Around about that period, going back to 1969, following about a year and a half after the events in Newark in July sixty-seven, the Black Organization of Students took over Conklin Hall in February of 1969 for three days. What was the grievance as you see it?

MANSPEIZER: Good question. I’m not sure now. I would assume it had something to do with curriculum. I don’t think it involved scholastic standing because I would have been chairman of that committee at that time. It probably had to do with the curriculum as well as the faculty. Not enough black faculty, you know, to teach role models. I really don’t know, I don’t recall the issues…

COHEN: To what extent do you recall was admissions….
MANSPEIZER: But I do…. Oh, yes. Okay. Fine. That’s right, admission of students, right. But I also recall there was a list of, yes, you’re right. You’re right. It was admissions, admissions of more black students into the college, more programs perhaps that would be more meaningful for them. But I really don’t remember the specifics. But I do recall, yes, admissions. Absolutely.

COHEN: What did you think, what did your colleagues think, of the justification for the action that they took, the takeover? Was it just…

MANSPEIZER: Why did they take over the building?

COHEN: Let me rephrase that. What was faculty thinking on support or non-support of that action?

MANSPEIZER: It’s funny. I don’t remember the specifics. What I do recall is some of the really superficial things, you know, seeing banners in front of the building. I remember a list of demands. And I had been involved in it in the sense that—as a member of, or chairman of one of the committees. And then a year or two later I became associate dean. So I guess I was fairly knowledgeable about what was going on at that time. I remember going up to Malcolm Talbott who invited us over to his place. Was he provost at the time? He must have been.

COHEN: He was also acting dean at the time, acting dean of the college.

MANSPEIZER: Acting dean?

COHEN: He was vice president actually. He never was provost.

MANSPEIZER: And he had a facility, he had an apartment up in north Newark somewhere.

COHEN: Right.

MANSPEIZER: And on several occasions he invited a large number of people, maybe fifteen or twenty, people from the college. And the only other person I really remember being there was Marvin Greenberg. Marvin was Malcolm’s right-hand man. And Malcolm would ask…he was a wonderful person, Malcolm. I mean devious, but in many respects maybe a little dishonest. But, you know, he had his goals and his sights and knew exactly what he wanted. And I guess the assumption was that he wanted to help the blacks. There was no question about it. The students who took over, and he strongly supported their demands. But at the same time he recognized that the faculty had a voice and the administration has a voice. And so he was trying to gain either a consensus or an understanding of what was going on. So he had these meetings with large numbers of people. I mean he would ask, you know, what do you think about this? What do you think about that? What do you think about that? And he was very open and curious as to what the positions were. Well, Malcolm certainly was a political character, and he was playing politics in the sense of trying to understand where consensus would be. How to develop consensus amongst different kinds of constituents. I’ve always had, you know, very fond memories of Malcolm
that sense. Although later on, as I recall, and you may also, in several of the faculty meetings he wouldn’t treat the faculty very well and kind of ...

COHEN: About what?

MANSPEIZER: If we go back to certain kinds of meetings, I really don’t. I mean I remember one issue—in fact one meeting that Malcolm all of a sudden fainted or collapsed in front of the faculty. The faculty sort of asked him a set of questions. They said something, and apparently they tripped him up, they tripped Malcolm up. And he was saying one thing perhaps in the newspaper and saying other things to the faculty. Remember Malcolm had a constituency that was beyond the school also. You know he had the business community out there, and the newspapers were spreading his message as well. So Malcolm was playing to several different audiences. I remember once in a faculty meeting, they really got to Malcolm. And I think he collapsed right in front of them. He had to be taken off. It was on stage.

COHEN: Must have been Conklin. Conklin probably in the lecture hall, in the basement. Otherwise it would have been in Boyden labs as I recall.

MANSPEIZER: Those meetings were in Conklin. I don’t remember specific issues. I remember certain incidences which you could pick up. You know the fact that they went down to see Mason Gross and banged on his door at night and made him come out.

COHEN: Who did?

MANSPEIZER: The black student organization. And they showed him a list of demands.

COHEN: At his home?

MANSPEIZER: Yes.

COHEN: What other incidents like that do you recollect?

MANSPEIZER: None really. The scene was, I guess, somewhat blurred there—for me—between specifics. And perhaps I should have read, you know, some of the history, looked up some of those reports before. Between what was going on there and what was going on in the outside world—

COHEN: What was going on in the outside world?

MANSPEIZER: There was unrest all over. Columbia University specifically is outlined certainly by Archibald Cox. You know it was a crisis in the university, crisis at Columbia, I think. But, you know, he had written, Archibald Cox had written a report about the events at Columbia. But, no, no, throughout, whether it was Columbia, Wisconsin, or Detroit, there was unrest all over. And I would assume in large part the issues were quite similar throughout. That is the blacks in case of students or citizens, they wanted to be part of the society, wanted a larger part of society. And in this case the students wanted to be admitted to the university, and they
wanted certain programs that would aid them, recognizing that they may not be as prepared as some of the white students. They wanted certain programs, you know, to help them along. And I do remember when I became associate dean in 1971, I had written a report on some of these programs.

COHEN: You mean the remedial program?

MANSPEIZER: The remedial programs.

COHEN: Okay.

MANSPEIZER: Students were asking—and I’ve taken a very negative view toward this, toward the remedial programs. But I think at that time, if I remember—and I think I wrote it for the dean of the college or it might have been the year before that I wrote this—if I remember correctly the students would take, for example, a course in psychology, Psychology 101 or something like that. Then they would take a remedial course in psychology. At that time I’m not sure. Initially I don’t think they were given credit for it. If they were given three credits in psych, they were perhaps given one credit in this remedial course, or perhaps they actually didn’t get any credits in the remedial course. And the thrust of my report was that I didn’t think these remedial courses were helping the students because after a while the students became dependent upon the remedial courses like that. So where they started, for example, with a course in—a remedial course in science or a remedial course in sociology, then particularly Psych and Soc and English and Math there would be a remedial course. And they wanted to develop one in geology and one in chemistry and one in physics and one here and one there. And I kept saying, these poor students to go to school for whatever it is, three to four hours for that particular course and maybe fifteen hours in all, the poor student has to go out to work because they didn’t have the financial means to go to school. They had difficulty studying at home. And now in addition to this, they have to take other courses, you know, to remediate that. Now where does this thing end? It puts a terrible burden. And I think at that time there was some faculty—I guess my feeling may have been that, and I don’t have these reports, I don’t recall the specifics. And I think I was also critical of those faculty…which ultimately became, I guess, Academic Foundations. And so at that time—this is going back twenty years and doesn’t relate to the people there now—but I think they were just trying essentially to develop their own turf, legitimizing their own positions there. So the faculty was being asked to support this other group of faculty that really didn’t have the same kind of credentials that they had in terms of they didn’t have PhDs. They didn’t have the traditional kinds of credentials. And so they were then asked to support programs, but they questioned on the one hand the legitimacy of the programs where the people with a bachelor’s or a master’s degree in psych could put on the same kind of course that a Ph.D. did. Although I must admit that the people in psych and soc were a lot more sympathetic than the people in the sciences and perhaps in the humanities, you know, to that. The focus of my point was that—and I was able to show in terms of statistics—that I don’t think it significantly helped the student.

COHEN: At that time?

MANSPEIZER: At that time. But what it did do was ask the student to spend all this additional time in class for no additional credit or maybe it was one credit or something like that. And even
today I think there’s a remnant of that because I think there are some remedial courses that some students take.

COHEN: What do you think has been the long-term effect of the Academic Foundations now that it’s been in business for the past twenty years or so? Have you had any direct experience?

MANSPEIZER: I really can’t— No, no. Many years ago I did. Many years ago—do you remember Bea Segal?

COHEN: Yes.

MANSPEIZER: She taught science. And she came to me once—let me see now how this all goes. She wanted to offer some kind of remedial course for geology. The problem was she didn’t have any geologists on her faculty, you know, to do this, this kind of a thing. Typically the science program in the Academic Foundations, at least at that time, going back ten or fifteen years, there would be Bea Segal who probably had a degree in biology or perhaps had somebody else in chemistry; that’s about it. So they would teach basic principles of chemistry and physics which are important but in reality may not be critical to a student’s background, you know at that level, in geology. Geology’s a different kind of a science. A lot of involvement with deductive reasoning. A lot of it deals with students being able to at least visually, understand, what a mountain is, a stream, and things like that. And a lot of these kids, unfortunately going back again fifteen years, the videos that we see now on the tube are really excellent. You know if a student just turns on Channel Thirteen or one of these other channels, the Discovery channel or so, they get a pretty good sense of what’s around them, you know, the world today. And they can walk into a geology class without ever having seen a volcano and understand what a volcano is. But to go back fifteen years ago or twenty years ago when many of these things were not on television or these nature programs were not as common as they are today, that our problem in geology was taking kids from the urban area, and perhaps from the ghetto, and trying to tell them what’s out there in the outside world, you know, that may be totally foreign to them, and talk about earthquakes and falls and fossils it’s a totally….

COHEN: [mumbles]

MANSPEIZER: Yes, yes, yes. It’s not easy to deal with. But anyway, her problem was she didn’t have the instructors to teach these kinds of things, you know, to offer some kind of remedial course. So she would try to do that, by what? By having somebody sit in on one of our classes. And then that person next semester would teach the course. That’s absurd. You know you just can’t…you have to have a feel, a working knowledge. You have to have some understanding of how the field works rather than just reading the book. It just doesn’t work that way. That was really the basic problem. Your question was?

COHEN: Well, were the programs effective? In the long-run anyway, especially during the seventies and into the eighties, your perception of the effectiveness of the Academic Foundations….

[End of Tape #1]
COHEN: We’re back with Professor Manspeizer. Well, we were talking about the….

MANSPEIZER: The effectiveness of the….

COHEN: Yes, if you have any sense of how effective the Academic Foundations program was?

MANSPEIZER: No, I really can’t. I really don’t have a good sense of it today. I think if one was to look up the document which I wrote maybe twenty years ago, there the study was made that—I mean it was quantified. It had data included. I really don’t recall today. And today even in geology I know recently I called the Academic Foundations—I think it was last year—to see if there were tutors, you know, to help some of my students. They didn’t have tutors, perhaps because they didn’t have the money.

COHEN: Oh, you had students in your classes who—

MANSPEIZER: Who needed help.

COHEN: Who needed remediation? Right, yes.

MANSPEIZER: And they were not able to provide the help simply because they didn’t have the money to hire the…At that point I think they were willing to or had hired their own students, their own graduate students.

COHEN: Needed remediation in what?

MANSPEIZER: In geology.

COHEN: In geology.

MANSPEIZER: In geology.

COHEN: I thought it might have been in math or something.

MANSPEIZER: No, no, no. Just in geology.

COHEN: Just in geology.

MANSPEIZER: Yes.

COHEN: What kind of remediation? Are we talking beginning students in a survey course? What kind of remediation would a student need in a beginning, let’s say geology survey, geology course? What kind of remediation would they need?

MANSPEIZER: Well, students have questions, and I think remediation involves largely the interpretation of reading and comprehension of the material in the book. So students don’t understand.
COHEN: Is this a question of lack of scientific background? Lack of reading comprehension?

MANSPEIZER: Okay. Yes, yes, absolutely, absolutely, absolutely. And that’s what I tell me students every…okay. I’ve taught geology…I’ve been teaching here for thirty years. Generally, my grades tend to be a little lower than others. I give my students multiple-choice quizzes, thirty to fifty questions on a multiple-choice quiz. And they tend to average somewhere between sixty and seventy-five. Maybe there’s another peak, at about eighty to ninety, you know essentially the modal. I’ve always been disturbed by the fact that—and I tell my students this right in class the first day—disturbed by the fact that a lot of people that get the eighties and the nineties may not even attend class. So I don’t take attendance. But they have the ability to read the book and understand what they’re reading and spout it back. Student takes—I permit students to come to class with an index card, and they can put anything they want on the index card—anything. Take a three-by-five index card. In most cases the student uses the card; I think they need it. Because geology, the problem with geology is that there’s a lot of terminology. A lot of new terms, whether it be plates and plates related to— you know terms related to earthquakes or igneous rocks, metamorphic rocks, certain kinds of processes. They’re overwhelmed by the terminology. So I permit students to come to class with an index card.

COHEN: For their tests?

MANSPEIZER: For their tests. Anything they want to put on the index card is fine. Chemical formulas, you know, certain kinds of relations, definitions. I don’t ask them definitions. I just expect that they know what these words mean when they see it in the context of a question. Most of the questions are designed to get the students to think, I tell them that. So there’s relatively little recall of fact. They need the index card because I think many of them need a security blanket, you know, with the glasses. So it’s fine. I’m even toying with the idea this semester, they can have three or four index cards, and may even give them open-book tests within a limited period of time.

COHEN: These are all short answer ...?

MANSPEIZER: All short answer. I tell them how to take a short-answer test. You know in most cases you can eliminate two. Well, to get back to the question. I think the major problem—and I’ve told Bea Segal over and over and over again—it’s not our scientific principles. Because geology, a lot of geology, is really just common sense. You know fundamental principles in geology, the most fundamental principle is what? That in a stratified sequence of rocks, the older ones are at the bottom, the younger ones are at the top. It seems so simple, and it is basically simple.

COHEN: As you said before, seems rational.

MANSPEIZER: That’s right. That’s right. But the students have difficulty reading, comprehending, and understanding what they’re reading and understanding questions that it’s asking. So when I explained that to the kids, that it disturbs me that students don’t go to class and can do very well. On the other hand, a lot of students come every day. And unfortunately we
don’t get too many—I don’t get—too many black students. I get some Asian students now. But I don’t think geology has ever had a large number of urban, you know, students from the urban areas. And it’s unfortunate. I think the reason for that, they just can’t relate to geology. It’s totally foreign to them. And it really is unfortunate, but that’s the way it is. I don’t know how that could change or we should change the curriculum to accommodate these students. I feel badly about it. I feel badly that students are there every day and still have difficulty answering these questions or really understanding what the question’s about.

COHEN: So what you’re saying it’s combination of just simple literacy on the one hand, and at the same time basic lack of conceptual …?

MANSPEIZER: Yes. Geology’s very interesting.

COHEN: Geology’s….

MANSPEIZER: It’s very visual also, you know. Unless you can visualize streams and floods and sediments and deposits, things like that, it’s hard. I think it’s a lot easier today for students who are willing to turn to Channel 13, you know, every once in a while. See something about nature, something about birds and natural terrains and things like that, you know.

COHEN: What can you say about the let’s say sixty-nine, seventy ,after the big crisis years. What were your perceptions of the level of preparation of students coming in in the early seventies and now? That progression.

MANSPEIZER: In general?

COHEN: That progression. Yes, in general, let’s say. Yes.

MANSPEIZER: Well, as I said, in sixty-nine I was involved with scholastic standing, from about sixty-six to around sixty-nine or so. And seventy involved in the dean’s office. I was fairly understanding or knowledgeable of what students were doing. And I guess after…. And one of the fears of the school also was the fears of faculty, I guess, primarily was that if you, if they agreed to—what was it?—open admission, open enrollment…. That phrase was always a problem to the faculty.

COHEN: It was never open ...

MANSPEIZER: No, no. It’s not open. But they thought it would be something like City College or Medgar Evers or something like that, where anybody who’s a graduate. Or for that matter open in terms of like California, where anybody who’s a graduate was then entitled to go to one of the…you know graduates of high schools. But the question is where within the state system? In fact it’s Bruce Robinson who would oftentimes use that as an analog. This is what we should. Rutgers should be reserved, you know, for the better student—clearly the better student. Community school. And I guess in a way that’s what the state has. I guess, looking back now, I guess our feeling was that the quality of the students dropped substantially. And along with that, it was also felt that, I think, ethnically it was a major change. Certainly there was an increased
number of blacks and a decrease in the large number of Jewish and Italian students that were at the school. Jewish and Italian I think were probably the primary ethnic groups that were there in the fifties and the early sixties. And the school, I guess, had a fairly good reputation at that point. But I understand now that the quality of the students is much better than it was in the....

COHEN: You’re saying the eighties.

MANSPEIZER: I think the pendulum has gone back the other way. I think the quality is pretty good.

COHEN: Comparing levels of preparation.

MANSPEIZER: Yes, yes. But I’m not involved in the same kind of thing. So I really don’t see that. I can only speak of, you know, the kinds of students I see in geology. And as I said before, unfortunately we really don’t have very many black students or kids from the urban areas. We have a large number now of Oriental students, which is absolutely amazing because I really didn’t.... And in a way geology is somewhat insulated from the rest of the campus.

COHEN: Why?

MANSPEIZER: In the sense that the composition of the student body in geology, I think, is probably a lot different than the average composition of the student body at the college. If I had to say, if I had to give you a rough calculation as to what I thought the ethnic break-up of the school was right now, the school....

COHEN: Yes, that would be great.

MANSPEIZER: This is just kind of visual, you know.

COHEN: Sure, sure.

MANSPEIZER: From the seat of my pants—

COHEN: We’re talking about here, now.

MANSPEIZER: Pardon?

COHEN: You’re saying now or....

MANSPEIZER: Now, now.

COHEN: Compared to?

MANSPEIZER: Oh, let’s say.... Oh, alright, I’ll give it to you in the fifties.

COHEN: Sure. Okay.
MANSPEIZER: All white.

COHEN: Yes.

MANSPEIZER: And I guess based upon the names and the people I recall, probably fifty percent Jewish, fifty percent Italian.

COHEN: Right.

MANSPEIZER: And probably that number going into the time before the students took over—the school, there was maybe two percent black, and they were probably quite justified. Maybe five percent, you know, black. I can’t remember what my class looked like. But in the seventies, if I look back now, I probably had as many as fifteen or twenty percent black at any one time. No Orientals.

COHEN: In your classes?

MANSPEIZER: In my classes. I’m talking about general geology.

COHEN: Sure, sure.

MANSPEIZER: First-year courses. I don’t remember seeing any Orientals at all. I’ll tell you another tale a little later on. [Laughs] But just remember.

COHEN: Okay.

MANSPEIZER: But now I look across the student body in the class, I would guess, if that was representative of the college, I would say that, I probably have about four or five black students, there probably are fifteen Oriental students, maybe five or ten, you know, Spanish-speaking students—Spanish-looking students I would say. And the remainder would be whites. Oh, and in terms of names, no easily-recognized Jewish names. Still some Italian names. East European has also dropped substantially. But that’s the tale I would like…. But anyway, to get back to the question, yes, I would see that that…and I know that those latter percentages are—I assume those are not the percentages at the college level.

COHEN: Sure.

MANSPEIZER: I assume that blacks and Hispanics make up much more than what I can see, and Orientals are not as abundant as they are. Okay. So I think in that sense we deal, rightly or wrongly, with somehow a skewed population. And I think that’s unfortunate.

[Break in recording]

…happening in the outside world. These are students from Eastern Europe because of the unrest in the fifties, right? Their parents said, well…and this was the new crop of kids that came
through the university. There would be an interesting thing to look at, the ethnic—ethnicity—of the school as suggested and indicated by the names of the student body.

COHEN: At that time when you were reading this list of—were there Oriental students coming in?

MANSPEIZER: Oh, very few. Very few.

COHEN: So when you mentioned to Malcolm about making the joke about the difficulty in pronouncing names, your difficulty was in pronouncing East Europe names.

MANSPEIZER: Absolutely. Oh, absolutely. There’s no Orientals, virtually no people from the Eastern Pacific or anything like that. And I think it was clearly a reference to admission of blacks, you know. And these other names, this other population.

COHEN: And your difficulty...

MANSPEIZER: Yes. Oftentimes I guess I would argue Malcolm. In retrospect maybe it was because I’ve oftentimes argued with Malcolm about the wisdom of taking in, you know, more urban students. On the one hand, the problem—not the problem. On the one hand there is the advantage of educating them. On the other hand the problem of, you know, what happens to the school. Does it go like City College goes? And I’m a graduate of City College. And certainly the name that City College, that graduates had back then…back then it was a lot different than what City College evokes today. So I mean that’s always a problem. And the faculty’s concerned about that. Has to be concerned with that for itself as well as for the students.

COHEN: What can you say about the interests that you’ve seen in the— the shift in interest of students, subject interests? Majors.

MANSPEIZER: Probably nothing that would….

COHEN: If you could generalize.

MANSPEIZER: No, except to say that I guess in the early seventies and large sixties—early seventies I guess—as a result of general unrest in the outside world, the real unrest in issues related to Vietnam and Cambodia, and the general unrest in the cities and the universities, and in the United States, and, you know, problems like that, that at that time many more students majored in social sciences, and psychology. Today I don’t know what the enrollment is in those departments. Perhaps it’s dropped substantially. And there seems to be little interest in the sciences. I mean the excitement seems to, you know, involve those departments and those disciplines more than the sciences.

COHEN: In talking about student activism…. The anti-Vietnam War movement was around for a number of years. Well, in the first place, how did that activism affect your teaching, if at all.
MANSPEIZER: No, I don’t think it ever really got into the classroom in terms of the teaching. There were certainly major issues that seemed to—or these issues seemed to creep into the college faculty, into the faculty meetings. I remember one very vividly. I’ve seen many faculty who remember. There was a faculty meeting. And there were strong personalities in faculty in the early seventies. Guys like Charlie Bieterman [sp] in philosophy. Dan Lerman in psychology. Leo Troy who’s still around. These guys typically took, you know, opposing viewpoints on issues, particularly as they were related to the university. Or how these outside issues were impacting the university. Dan would always take the position, Dan Lerman, he tended to be more liberal. So to him the outside world was significant in respect to what was going on in the university. He tended to be more sympathetic, more understanding to leftist causes or more liberal causes, as opposed to people like Leo and Bieterman or Greenfield. I can remember one faculty meeting where before the meeting could begin, there’s a large sign up, something about get out of Vietnam or get out of Cambodia. And it might have occurred shortly after the killings at Kent State.

COHEN: Yes, 1970, the spring of seventy. Yes.

MANSPEIZER: And I remember they were all—terrible faculty meeting seeing all that. You know really vicious arguments and debates that were occurring at that time in the faculty. I don’t remember what specific issues and how they related to the school. I remember the general tenor was pretty mean. You asked—in fact you asked the question before—about, I think, about when kids took over the building, the Black Organization of Students. At that time, if you recall, the faculty meetings would be well attended. I mean we had a large faculty. When I was in the associate dean’s office, there were about three hundred-and-some-odd faculty. Today you’ve got maybe two hundred-and-some-odd faculty. Faculty meetings were well attended. And well attended not only by faculty but by students. And there was a general feeling that the students, particularly the students who took over the building, were trying to intimidate the faculty. There was a very tense, you know the meetings were very tense, the faculty meetings were very tense. And arguments oftentimes or discussions or debates would oftentimes involve whether those students should be there at faculty meetings. I don’t remember any of the specifics, but I do remember—I remember seeing a lot of campus policemen, you know, the campus police in the faculty meetings at that time. Then there were discussions, should there be campus police [laughs] at faculty meetings, and is this, you know, a police state. And the whole business like that. But times were very tense. But again, as I mentioned before to you, there was an interesting dynamic. It was absolutely fascinating.

COHEN: Yes, that’s what I wanted to ask. Could you get into that in some detail? On the one hand it’s tough…

MANSPEIZER: Unfortunately I don’t remember the specifics. But I think anybody who was there at that time would recall with some…I don’t know if I can get the right word, not with pleasure. With a—what am I thinking of? But they would recall, you know, with some—delight is not the right word either, of those times in the past, about things that were going on at that time. Not because of acrimonious debate. But because of the behavioral characteristics of the people and the dynamics that would occur during those meetings and during that period of time. There were a lot of good arguments, a lot of good debates, a lot of good dialog that would be
presented by people like Bieterman or people like Lerman. People like that who really were quite intelligent people—very articulate and with the ability to present their arguments, very clearly, and have a very strong backing in the faculty. On the other hand, there would be those who, you know, support people like Dan Lerman. Or Greenfield. And the tension was high. And oftentimes, you know, a comment from the faculty would bring out a lot of chuckles and laughter just to break this tension. But those scenes were priceless, and unfortunately we really don’t have a good description of the way that people behaved. And in many cases, I suspect for myself also, that a lot of times you took a vote, or, you know, you voted. Your vote may not have been the proper vote. That perhaps you were just protecting something that you had, somewhat myopically. But I can’t give you specifics except in terms of curriculum. That was always—oh, that was absolutely....

[Both speaking at once]

MANSPEIZER: Absolutely the case. Absolutely. But it was also true for the enrollments. Should the faculty change the enrollment policy or admissions policy?

COHEN: Or scholastic standing?

MANSPEIZER: Generally scholastic standing…that I tried to do when I got into scholastic standing in the sixties was to make it much more objective. I don’t think it was ever a major issues.

COHEN: Is that right?

MANSPEIZER: No, I don’t think so. I don’t think it was any one—any of the demands that were presented to Mason Gross or presented to the faculty. What we did at that time, in the sixties, was to put the students—their grades were somehow on a computer. And had to read the certain cutoff points. You know of a certain size point or something like that, given the number of credits, you know, that we would put you on probation. You’re on probation two semesters in a row, then you were dropped with the understanding that you could appeal it. Then we’d have this long procedure of appeal where students could appeal, appeal, appeal. So what we did was somehow artificially, you know, present cutoff points.

COHEN: I see.

MANSPEIZER: But then if the student really wanted to continue, then all they’d have to do is appeal, you know. And in most cases the appeals were successful. And then we tried to show also, and I think I have figures that show, that, yes, the student appeal, you know that the students’ success rate would be much higher than if we weren’t trying to be helpful. Something like that. So I don’t think that was ever an issue. But certainly admissions was an issue. Minority faculty. The women’s issue was certainly....

COHEN: What were the admissions issues, as you recall it?
MANSPEIZER: My guess it was to admit a larger number of students who did not meet the qualifications set down by the faculty, with the understanding that could be successful if at the same time there were other programs that would help them, you know these remedial programs. I guess that’s—I don’t really know.

COHEN: The issue about women’s affirmative action?

MANSPEIZER: That was more issues that were brought up I think a little later on, though, in the history of the school. And they seemed to rally around one or two faculty: Helen Strauser was one. She was one of the primary, you know, faculty involved in that. Maybe Paula Hayne, but I’m not sure about Paula. But certainly Helen was. Judy Weiss, yes, she may have been involved in that, and somebody else at that time with that. I think Helen was the principal one. There was somebody else, and I don’t remember who it was.

COHEN: Probably it was—well, one of the people I’ve heard related to the faculty was Dorothy Dinnerstein.

MANSPEIZER: Dorothy. Yes, Dorothy was important in that as well.

COHEN: You talk about this interesting time in a very positive way. I mean…I’m trying to think what term you used to describe the….

MANSPEIZER: It was good.

COHEN: Very, very. Yes, you said….

MANSPEIZER: It was good in the sense that….

COHEN: Yes, okay. What I’ve been getting from some people—and maybe I’ve been misreading them—sort of a negative response: It was very difficult and painful. And yet you’re conveying that it was a very interesting period.

MANSPEIZER: Absolutely, absolutely.

COHEN: Oh, I guess my question is why was it so interesting? Was it just a clash of—you just wanted to get involved in arguments?

MANSPEIZER: Well, clash of personalities, clash of ideas. Yes, those were all good things. Those were all positive as I saw it. And the faculty, you know—democracy in action really. I think there were negative aspects about it. Certainly there were negative aspects about it. You know the faculty was not united. It set up different camps, which I guess in some respects is negative, and it may have split certain departments as well. I never felt intimidated by any of this in the sense that somebody had a scorecard, that would say that Manspeizer is leaning too much to the left or whatever I was. I never felt that. The school has certainly had interesting times in the past, the young faculty have been listed as being essentially unwanted. You know the case of Mo Fridley?, isn’t it? Fridley? Finley?
COHEN: You mean Moses Finley?

MANSPEIZER: Moses Finley.

COHEN: Finley, oh, yes. In the fifties. That was a bad time.

MANSPEIZER: Well, it was a bad time. But I never felt—and I think Sam Agron was one of those four or five faculty who was—assistant professor—who stood up for Moses Finley. There were other young faculty who didn’t, who undoubtedly felt, you know...who were intimidated by those events. But I never felt it in this case here. So I just looked at it as being positive in the sense that people of different persuasions, different philosophies had an opportunity to get up and articulate those—and the faculty votes. I think in a democracy this is what democracy is about. The negative aspects were, however, you couldn’t do any work. You couldn’t do your research. [Laughter] It was absolutely almost impossible. I mean you couldn’t do both. You couldn’t be involved in university affairs, which I was at that time, and then do your research. The one thing that worried me—and I’m certain it’s true of everybody on the faculty—that you were concerned that when students took over Conklin Hall, Boyden Hall, which was next door, would be taken over. Well, certainly it could have been one of those buildings. And then you couldn’t get in to get your research. Concern of the faculty, and I guess people in the History Department talk about that, was that you were locked out of your office. You had no way of knowing if somebody was rifling, you know, your desk or your filing cabinet, going through your personal notes, going through your research notes. And you weren’t privy to your material. You didn’t know whether somebody had started a bonfire. You know at some schools that did happen.

COHEN: Right.

MANSPEIZER: So I don’t know how the people in the History Department discussed that with you. But anyway, that was a fear of mine and a fear of a lot of people that I’ve known in the sciences. You couldn’t get into your lab. You know I mean if it had happened in Boyden Hall—in fact they might have been more effective had they taken over Boyden Hall because you couldn’t do your work.

COHEN: Was this a fear also in connection with the anti-Vietnam War activism when you say students taking over buildings?

MANSPEIZER: I remember it as when BOS took over the building.

COHEN: Oh, so you’re going back to the...

MANSPEIZER: Absolutely, absolutely.

COHEN: Yes, yes.
MANSPEIZER: Because in the Vietnam...I'm trying to think whether the students took over buildings.

COHEN: I don’t believe that happened.

MANSPEIZER: They might have taken over little labs.

COHEN: There were sit-ins…

MANSPEIZER: No, they sat in on the dean’s office, which was good. Right.

COHEN: There was a lot of activism…

MANSPEIZER: Yes, they took over the dean’s office. That was fine.

COHEN: Yes, yes. That was cops on campus at least once. And there was a [ ] building. But there was no actual takeover.

MANSPEIZER: No. I think—so in that sense I think that was a bad time because you couldn’t do your work, you couldn’t do your research. But otherwise I thought that was fantastic. It was a wonderful time to be around.

COHEN: Well, alright. What has happened since that wonderful time. What—

MANSPEIZER: The sixties and the seventies, the early seventies.

COHEN: What we replaced that over the time?

MANSPEIZER: That’s asking a fascinating question. Because I think what replaced it—I would say what replaced it in the seventies, in the early seventies, middle seventies—was a faculty feeling its oats. A faculty saying that we have the power—maybe we even got it from the students somehow you know.

[Break in recording]

COHEN: We are back. Now we were talking about—my question was, you know, what replaced this very interesting period of the early seventies of ferment and dialog and so on, and we were getting into that.

MANSPEIZER: Yes.

COHEN: What was the outgrowth of that? Maybe that’s a better way of putting it.

MANSPEIZER: Okay. Well, I can respond by saying that chronologically what happened, and it may very well have been an outgrowth. Is that chronologically after, let’s see, in the early seventies, there was a period of, not unrest, but there was a period of change in the
administration not of the university; although I guess at that time Mason Gross retired and then Bloustein came in. When did Bloustein come in?

COHEN: Nineteen seventy-three.

MANSPEIZER: Seventy-three. Alright. Okay. So maybe Mason lasted along there. But before that, in the college, you have a terrible turnover, I mean a very substantial turnover. Gilliland is essentially bounced by the faculty. Votes of no confidence for Gilliland. He’s a terrible administrator. Didn’t quite understand what the East was about at all. And the people that recommended Gilliland—I don’t know, well I know who was on the committee…. Gilliland was from the Midwest, somewhat older than the average faculty. Couldn’t quite understand what the liberal, you know, Eastern faculty was about at all. He came from big schools like Ohio State and Nebraska. And not a particularly nice person. But that’s something else. But never really understood what this school was about of the faculty or tan urban setting was about. Didn’t last very long. He was replaced by Malcolm who was acting—is that right?

COHEN: Talbott then became acting dean.

MANSPEIZER: And the faculty was very suspicious of Malcolm because Malcolm, as I said before, had several different audiences that he was playing to. You see he was also I think involved in some kind of—he was involved in Newark.

COHEN: Community organizations.

MANSPEIZER: Yes, right. Yes.

COHEN: The BIC, the Business Investment Corporation.

MANSPEIZER: Yes. Right, right. So they were somewhat suspicious of Malcolm and perhaps for cause. Although, as I said before, he’s—many, many wonderful traits about Malcolm Talbott. And then Malcolm was replaced by—is it Henry?

COHEN: Well, then Henry followed him.

MANSPEIZER: Henry became…. There was a search committee, Henry was on the search committee, and somehow Henry was recommended. Right? I served under Henry who’s decent, a very decent man. One of the reasons he only spent one year in the associate dean’s office—and for that matter so did what’s his name? Ken Miller spent one year as associate dean, and I can speak for myself—was because Henry kept everything in his vest pocket. Today there’s a tremendous amount of freedom of information amongst people in the dean’s office: associate dean and the dean. I knew virtually nothing. I had to deal with students on a daily basis, and deal with the department heads on a daily basis. And Henry would have the information about budgets and moneys and things like that. Somehow that was a state secret. That was guarded by Henry and Henry alone. And Henry’s colleagues. And there were two or three at the university, two or three at the school, that were very influential. Both chairmen of science departments. Anyway, so Henry took over. But then after a while—Henry only lasted two years I think. Then
he retired, and he was…. Then there was a search committee. I was on that search committee, and the search committee met for two years.

COHEN: Gil Panson was acting dean for that period.

MANSPEIZER: Oh, okay, Gil Panson was acting dean. Okay. The search committee had a number of really interesting characters, one of whom I think might have been Gil Panson. But there was—what’s his name? Eliot and myself and Dan Lerman. People of different persuasions, you know, and really a very good group of people. And I remember at the end of the year we recommended three choices, you know, yes, made recommendations of three people—was it Bloustein who was president at that time or might have been—I don’t think it was Mason Gross.

COHEN: Bloustein? What year again are you saying?

MANSPEIZER: Probably around seventy-three or seventy-four.

COHEN: Well, that had to be Bloustein.

MANSPEIZER: Okay, then it was Bloustein. We recommended three people: one was a dean from Boston College, one was dean from I don’t know, somewhere else up in the Massachusetts area or New York area, and the other person was the strongest of all. I mean one person who had principle on his side, and that’s the one we really wanted. But that, of course, was never accepted by Bloustein. [Laughs] It was interesting because we were very suspicious. The college was very suspicious, the college faculty was very suspicious of administrators, and we thought we had found this one person who certainly would be our spokesman and would represent the faculty well. He was a Jesuit minister with academic training.

COHEN: Hmm!

MANSPEIZER: But Bloustein, [laughs] … He was absolutely the strongest. Yes, yes, yes. He was very, very good. Yes. And we knew that he would be very forthright and no nonsense. [Laughs]

COHEN: And work well with the faculty.

MANSPEIZER: Yes, yes, yes. But stand up to New Brunswick. Because we were concerned at that time also—we raised the question we raised before about New Brunswick’s handling of Newark, you know.

COHEN: Yes, sure.

MANSPEIZER: So this guy, he would have been very good. But anyway, so the committee met a second year. And in that second year we had some interesting characters again on the committee. I don’t know who was acting. Gil Panson must have been acting, I guess.
COHEN: From seventy-one to seventy-two. Henry Blumenthal was sixty-nine to seventy-one. And then Gil Panson seventy-one to seventy-two.

MANSPEIZER: Okay, Panson, again. Okay.

COHEN: And then Robey came on as dean.

MANSPEIZER: Okay. So we recommended Robey. Robey was very bright, young, articulate. He came from Columbia University. So he came from an urban setting. He was an associate dean, graduate dean of the—associate dean of the graduate school. And we thought he had all the right qualifications. As it turned out, Robey was a big disappointment to a lot of people. I remember one day somebody said to me—somebody came to me. And at that time geology—we’d just lost Bill Wilds. Right. It must have been about seventy-two or seventy-three. We’d just lost Bill Wilds, and we tried to rehire Bill Wilds’s line. And Robey would not permit us to rehire on that line. Picked the line and gave it to somebody else in another department. So I was pretty disturbed with Robey as chairman of the department. To make a long story short, somebody came to me from a different department and said Robey is a disaster. You’ve got to do something about Robey. So as a faculty we did, we put together a committee. And the committee ultimately forced Robey out. I think it made it uncomfortable for Robey. There was a vote of no confidence. And it went right through. It was a difficult period. But you asked the question, what replaced that kind of politics and excitement and interest in the faculty. From a chronological point of view, this replaced it.

COHEN: Okay.

MANSPEIZER: The whole Robey affair lasted for about three years. I guess about three years. Unfortunately he passed away. I would think that the faculty, that kind of debate, the kind of atmosphere that was created as a result of the Vietnam War and so forth, the BOS takeover, those kinds of meetings were really intense. And in that sense I think some of the best arguments, the best discussions in the faculty, you know, came out in the early seventies. And it was when the faculty was feeling their own oats, felt it was in command of their own destiny, had recommended Robey. Robey didn’t work out, and they wanted to get rid of Robey. We got rid of Robey, you know, and then went on from there. And I’ll tell you after that there was another search committee when Norman was the acting dean, probably in about seventy-four, seventy-five. Something about seventy-four. There was another search committee. I think I was on that search committee. We recommended Norman. The committee only recommended one name to Bloustein, one name because we were suspicious at that time of everybody, and we said the only person we really have faith in is Norman. And we wrote. The idea there was to pressure Bloustein into accepting Norman. There were something like two hundred, two hundred and fifty letters that were sent in support of Norman. Nobody sent, you know, any other kind of letter. So the point was quite clear that Bloustein…. The terrible unrest that occurred during the Robey period was very disturbing in the university because the university couldn’t do its thing. The administration couldn’t do what it wanted to do in Newark because of all this ferment that was going on in the faculty. The Board of Governors would read it. I know because in seventy-five or seventy-six I was on the Board of Governors. I was our faculty representative on the Board of Governors. And the Board of Governors would see all the minutes of the faculty. They’d read
about these things, that there were certain issues that were defeated by the faculty, criticizing...you know the faculty criticized Robey. This and that.

So there was a lot of dissension, there was a lot of discord in the faculty due to Robey. So it was quite clear to us that Bloustein didn’t need another Robey. Didn’t need an affair like that. So what happened was we chose one person, recommended one person. And the mission of that committee was to recommend three so Bloustein would be given his choice. Right? We recommended one, and then followed it up with support letters. He really had no alternative, and he knew that. I think he had no alternative. And if the faculty—if he didn’t accept Norman, he was going to be in more trouble than he really needed to be; that is Bloustein was going to be in trouble. So this way he could, you know, the faculty had their representative, you know, they could rely on Norman. And this way they probably felt a lot better about Bloustein also.

COHEN:  What happened then—

MANSPEIZER:  And it’s not just Bloustein, it’s the central administration.

COHEN:  Sure.

MANSPEIZER:  I mean Bloustein’s a decent guy, I worked with him for many years. I really liked him. Some of the other people he had with him, you know, were different. I had no respect of them.

COHEN:  So Samuels was back in seventy-six, seventy-seven, I think he was appointed seventy-seven. And his term— Well, actually from seventy-six to eighty-two. This feeling of faculty autonomy, faculty—the word today—empowerment, did that resume after the difficult time with Robey? What has happened since that time?

MANSPEIZER:  I was on sabbatical seventy-seven to seventy-eight. And from really that point on, I really dropped out. I don’t know.

COHEN:  Do you have any sense about what it is now?

MANSPEIZER:  Oh, it seems to be very docile. Yes. There are no—I don’t know if there are any strong issues that have come up, you know, in the last ten or fifteen years. Perhaps, you know, maybe curriculum is an issue.

COHEN:  Multiculturalism?

MANSPEIZER:  I don’t know.

COHEN:  Is that an issue right now on this campus?

MANSPEIZER:  How?

COHEN:  Well, in terms of curriculum, getting away from Eurocentric study?
MANSPEIZER: I don’t see it. It might very well be. It might very well be. But myself I don’t see it. Generally, especially in our field, geology seems to be kind of divorced from that. I mean I generally teach my course on a kind of worldly basis anyway. You know I talk about places where, you know, kids don’t know anything about. I tell them to spend some time in Bolivia or Rwanda, you know, Tanzania. You know I show them on a map. We try to make it the worldly, we talk about, you know, the Alps or … the Japanese Basin, the Pacific Basin. So I don’t know how that would impinge upon us. And as I pointed out, ever since about, after the time working with the Board of Governors, which was very pleasant…. I learned a lot there also. A lot of decent people. You know who really tried hard to get the university to work, you know, in the proper way ever since then. Then I went on sabbatical, and I really haven’t spent much time involved in the politics of the university. But I think that’s—the question that you raise, I think that would be an outgrowth of what happened at the end of the sixties. See, there you had to focus on those issues. Some of these kids took over a building. There were riots in Newark. Those were concerns. You know now the university is no longer isolated or insulated from the outside world. The outside world is there. They had to own up to it. The faculty…. Interesting also is that faculty began to talk about it from one department to another.

COHEN: Yes.

MANSPEIZER: Before that, oh, I can remember being employed over on Rector Street. But then maybe you only had forty to fifty faculty. You know it was a different group. And then once we got to the new building, you know, in sixty-eight, sixty-nine, all of a sudden there were four hundred faculty, you know. So it wasn’t a small little enclave of people. It’s different.

COHEN: But do you feel that they really welcomed this period of friendliness on the faculty, that this is what made it possible for the faculty to take a strong position particularly on the Robey question? To assert itself during that time. Is that what you were saying?

MANSPEIZER: Yes, yes.

COHEN: The faculty really felt that it had the autonomy.

MANSPEIZER: Yes, yes. I think so.

COHEN: To do, , to take an action like that.

MANSPEIZER: It would be an interesting thesis to follow through and see what happened on other campuses. See if indeed there was a lot of unrest, you know, right after the period of major unrest, where kids took over the buildings, you know, Cambodia and the Vietnam War, get out of the war. I mean those issues were then expressed somehow in different ways on the various campuses. So faculty were really talking about important issues. But if you look at the issues before then, I’m not sure they were significant. I remember the faculty meeting where, in the old building on Rector Street, the issue was they didn’t have a faculty room or club or something like that. And I think it was a faculty facility, we didn’t have a lunchroom or whatever during the Rector Street, and they wanted to use the facility at the Newark Athletic Club; I think it was on
the next block. It was on Fulton. I remember there was a long discussion, you know, a meeting or two meetings on whether we should try to join them. I mean that was the kind of issues. And I think that’s where we are today. We’re at the same kind of thing. I mean you go to a faculty meet and they’re really, oh!

COHEN: Is that good or bad? In terms of how a university should be run.

MANSPEIZER: Bad. Bad. No, I say that’s really interesting. In terms of the dynamics of universities, it’s terrible.

COHEN: Why?

MANSPEIZER: Because it’s like a nonbeing. Like there’s nothing going on in the university, other than people doing their research.

COHEN: Is there any other way to go about?

MANSPEIZER: But there’s also—it has something to do with the interaction of people in the university.

COHEN: So what’s lacking?

MANSPEIZER: What’s lacking right now, I think, are the interesting issues in the faculty. I don’t think there are any issues.

COHEN: Is this just typical of the Rutgers in Newark?

MANSPEIZER: No, it’s probably particularly the times. It’s probably particularly the times. The only time the faculty gets up to really discussing issues is why? Is during times of curriculum change? Because there they’re concerned about their own department and their livelihood, and their colleagues as well. You know the pie is so big. Somebody’s going to win, and somebody’s going to lose. I’m not sure those that really…. I mean they’re expressed in other ways. They’re expressed in terms of academic principles and discipline and the vales of learning math or psychology or geology and things like that. But I think what the real issue is—one of the major issues—certainly has got to be what happens to my job and what happens to my young colleague that we just hired? You know that person, has to give his opinion. So it’s…. But today I don’t see it. I mean what issues have been—

COHEN: Well, I mean issues on other campuses, at least in the presence of the whole question of multicultural education, political correctness. I mean these are the things that are coming to the fore; the newspapers are full of that stuff, I think, about the issues of race relations on the campus, that kind of thing.

MANSPEIZER: You can see it in Newark?
COHEN: I mean, yes. I guess that’s a good question. I mean to what extent does the issue of correct speech and not being offensive and being very sensitive to people’s feelings and particularly among different ethnic groups. I mean are those issues now, or into the eighties, that you see?

MANSPEIZER: Well, you raise an interesting question. It certainly has been the focus, at least around here, has been on Professor Jeffries at City College.

COHEN: Yes. That’s at City College.

MANSPEIZER: Okay. But those are the same issues, you know. Should you be sensitive to your colleagues and to your students in that sense? If you ask me my feeling about Jeffries. Since you didn’t, I’ll tell you anyway. Okay? It’s interesting because I’m a graduate of City College. Based upon what I have read in the New York Times, Jeffries has documented or demonstrated virtually no scholarship in the traditional sense. You know he’s got one book that he edited, in which he wrote not even a chapter in the book, for which he wrote a forward or an introduction. And he’s got an article in the magazine section of the Amsterdam News. That’s it in terms of published papers. So how did that guy ever become—how did that fellow become a full professor? It has nothing to do with the new president now. This is President Marsham back in the early seventies who gave him that title. If it happened here, certainly my position would be the same: He doesn’t deserve it. Absolutely not. Does academic freedom protect him, you know, from the outside world and therefore he can say anything he wants? No, but if it’s in terms of his own scholarship, that’s fine. Fair enough, documents it….

COHEN: Yes, I wanted to ask you—going back again, talking about the role of the faculty, speaking out on issues other than their immediate discipline; let’s say going back again to the anti-Vietnamese War movement. What was your understanding of, or your feelings about, the appropriate role of the faculty?

MANSPEIZER: Yes, that’s good. I think—

COHEN: In that.

MANSPEIZER: I think my feeling, I suspect, I don’t remember, I can’t remember the specifics, but I think it may have been—the question was, is it appropriate? I don’t remember how these issues were raised or raised in the faculty. But there were issues, I think, motions that were made to get out of Vietnam. Is that an appropriate motion for the faculty to deal with? No, I don’t think so. No, no. But if it was rephrased so that somehow it impinges upon work at the university, yes. Then I could see that there would have been appropriate. I guess I’m not making myself clear as I can.

COHEN: So I’ll maybe rephrase my question. I think you answered part of it in respect to the faculty move on whether the war should be prosecuted….

MANSPEIZER: I don’t think that’s necessarily appropriate. I don’t think that’s an appropriate issue for the faculty if we’re just dealing with that issue. But if that same issue is couched with
respect to how it affects the university, what we do in the university, then I think that would have been proper. Well, the case of—what do you call it? The case of Dow Chemical and napalm. Alright? Should the university be involved in it, that’s a perfectly legitimate question to raise in the faculty. Yes, I think so. And I’m certain that those questions were raised, you know, in the faculty. You know Dow Chemical and napalm.

COHEN: How they were related to the teaching.

MANSPEIZER: Or how they related to the research effort in the university, should the university deal with that? Should the university sponsor that kind of research? That’s a perfectly legitimate question, you know.

COHEN: How about the use of university facilities in teach-ins to provide a podium for faculty members to stand up and offer their opinions—in many case presumably out of their field, for psychologist to get up, that’s all right.

MANSPEIZER: I don’t mind.

COHEN: Did you find any problem with that?

MANSPEIZER: No, no, I don’t. No, I don’t. So long as they’re not getting credit for it. I mean somebody in psychology doesn’t get credit for teaching a two-credit course on political science or something like that. Yes, yes, yes. It’s not that person’s academic expertise; the person’s not hired for that. I mean not even remotely. The more interesting question is, what would happen if the same person, let’s say Yale Ferguson, or Walter White from political science, wanted to deal with that, the class…. And I think if that…Pros and Cons of the Vietnam War or something like that, whether we should go into China or what have you. Yes, those are important issues, and if taught by the right faculty then perhaps they should be given credit. Last year I taught—last semester—I taught a course, partially taught a course, with Judy Weiss, some course on certain environmental issues, certain issues related to the Persian Gulf War—oil. Right? So I really can’t see the Persian Gulf War, I mean based upon my background as a citizen, I don’t think the students should get credit for that, you know, for listening to me on those issues. But on the other hand, if I can discuss why oil occurs in the Persian Gulf, how it occurs there, and what impact it has on the world, yes, that’s perfectly legitimate. I have a certain expertise in that. So I would take issue with somebody on the faculty who wanted to deny me the right to talk about the Persian Gulf War.

COHEN: You mean in the classroom.

MANSPEIZER: Right. Or, in that context. In her classroom. I mean she’s dealing with certain kinds of issues as related to science or scientific issues. Or other issues that relate to the word around her. Yes. But much in the same way. I don’t think Dan Lerman or somebody like that shouldn’t—shouldn’t receive credit, or his students shouldn’t receive credit, for that. But, you know, for teach-ins that dealt with, you know, Cambodia and Vietnam. On the other hand, if he wanted to offer a course that dealt with the psychological impact, you know, then that probably would be all right. That’d be fine. And I think that again is probably one of the good things that’s
happened as a result of the war and the unrest is that there are these mini-courses and programs that have opened up for the students. I don’t mean war is good.

COHEN: Sure.

MANSPEIZER: I mean it enabled us to package subject matter. That’s okay. That’s fine.

COHEN: What can you say about the university and how effective the university has been in Newark and in the area of affirmative action? Let’s start with recruitment of minority faculty and go on from there. How have they gone about it?

MANSPEIZER: I really don’t know. I’m not sure how I can even answer that.

COHEN: In the seventies.

MANSPEIZER: I can only think of the one case we had that was Christine Tremal. We hired her but couldn’t keep her because, you know, industry paid so much more than we could. Geology, again, is very peculiar. Because you see back in the seventies there probably were three—and I think I knew two of them—three black Ph.D.s in geology. Now let’s assume that’s our starting point. We’re going to hire Ph.D.s because that’s traditionally—that’s what we do. So one of the fellows was teaching at City College on a part-time basis. One of the fellows was chancellor—who ultimately became chancellor of Higher Education in—Oh, chancellor not of Higher Education, that was Frank Genifer in Massachusetts. But he became chancellor of the University of Massachusetts. A geologist by the name of Gromley. I forget offhand who the third person was. So there weren’t many to begin with, you know. So your pool is virtually nonexistent. So we couldn’t hire any blacks. Did we advertise? Yes, we advertised. But in a way we knew that they were really not available.

Later on in the eighties and go back to hydrogeology, we’re still pushing all this time to get somebody to teach hydrogeology on a full-time basis. Probably in about eight-five, eighty-six, eighty-seven, we got a line to hire a hydrogeologist and found a black hydrogeologist, really an African from Nigeria. I think, who was finishing his Ph.D. in Ontario at—it slips my mind; I can’t remember the name of the school. But the school is premier in North America for teaching hydrogeologists. There’s no question about that person’s abilities or skills or background or anything like that. So we wanted to hire him and brought him down and offered him a position. We didn’t get him because the university screwed up the letter. What happened was—and I don’t remember the specifics—but the gist of it was he was a Nigerian student who was studying in Canada. But needed what? a green card or something like that?

COHEN: I guess so.

MANSPEIZER: Some kind of visa or something like that.

COHEN: Yes, yes.
MANSPEIZER: To work here. Now I’m certain Sally Zeiss could fill you in on the specifics or Andy Bacilio [sp] could. But something like this happened: He was coming in from Canada, and he needed I guess this green card or something like that. Somewhere in the application it said, Is this a permanent job or a nonpermanent job? Or something. I guess he wouldn’t have gotten a green card if it was a temporary thing, because really Nigeria wanted him back there …. Eva shows him a letter, or the university checks off that this is a tenure-track position. [Laughs] So the fellow who was, I guess, reviewing these documents was very sharp. Said it was tenure track, it was a permanent position, therefore you don’t get the green card.

COHEN: Oh my god.

MANSPEIZER: Right. Absolutely. So how does the administration— In this particular case they screwed up royally. But that’s really our only involvement. I know personally…I was chairman of the A&P Committee, Science Section, last year. And the question came up about…we had an applicant, an old person, not a new faculty. Well, he was new faculty with us. But a fellow that’s been around for a while and in the Physics Department. And we unanimously supported him. Some had a few questions obviously, but personally I think we have exceptionally. In the sciences, I don’t know if they have a black in chemistry. And I don’t know if chemistry simply says, well, there’s less blacks in chemistry than there are in geology. I suspect that’s not true. But I don’t know if there are any blacks in that department. In biology there probably are a few. Offhand I can’t….

[End of Tape #2]

COHEN: Anything we haven’t touched on?

MANSPEIZER: I can’t think of anything. I’m curious what others may have come up with.

COHEN: Well, for instance, the question of—one of the questions—ideological positions of the family when it comes to hiring of faculty, things like that, ideological left/right, that type of thing in hiring and appointments and promotions and stuff. That surfaces in some discussions.


COHEN: Yes, I think in the English this has come up.

MANSPEIZER: Ideological? What kind of ideology?

COHEN: Well….

MANSPEIZER: Do you mean in terms of the discipline, or in terms of their politics?

COHEN: Their politics.

MANSPEIZER: Oh, never. Absolutely not. Absolutely not. No, I think it is an issue. It probably is an issue. I’ve been on several grievance committees, and no doubt that those are issues in the
reappointment motion that come out. And that’s unfortunate. And it always comes out. No doubt about it. I’ve seen enough A&P, I’ve seen enough grievance hearings and promotion documents that it’s quite clear. That if you have people of different ideological positions, that invariably is going to creep in somewhere. And that’s too bad.

COHEN: I think there was discussion about the appointment of Bruce Franklin to the faculty, or a discussion in the press and so on.

MANSPEIZER: No, it should not. No, no. No, no, no. Although it is interesting. I remember Sam Agron reviewing Bruce Franklin’s papers. And I don’t recall whether that was for appointments or for promotion of Bruce Franklin. And Sam’s, I recall, absolutely in some respects the ideal faculty member. So he really was quite intelligent and quite focused and very honest. And I remember those issues were bothering Sam because Sam read Bruce Franklin’s works. And I remember him saying—I don’t know how he voted or anything else like that—but I remember him saying that he was concerned and disturbed—maybe this shouldn’t be on the tape. I remember there were things in the writing that concerned him and perhaps others as well. So I mean unless he was really outrageous—I mean if it was a fascist and somebody or certainly an anti-Semite or certainly a bigot, you know, any extreme point of view. And then probably with the understanding that it would not be good, you know, for the school to have that kind of lightning rod. I mean it’s not good for the educational process and the processes that go on in the school, if it wasn’t that extreme, it wouldn’t bother him. But I think those were the things, as I said before, those were the things that I really found exciting about and fascinating, you know, about the university, were the intellectual discussions that were held, and of course appearing with different ideologies. Absolutely. Whether it be black-white, whether it be, you know, war hawks, doves, or any of those things. Those are very educational—at least for me it was.

COHEN: Okay. Thank you very much.

MANSPEIZER: Okay. [Break in recording] And I thought some had taken the position, some men, or at least almost like a backroom kind of discussion, barroom discussion, that they were going to benefit because of the discrimination of a lot of other women. In other words, they themselves may not have been discriminated against. But they were going to benefit by others who were discriminated against. That’s really about—it doesn’t really have much….

COHEN: I wanted to talk just a little bit more about—you’ve mentioned various administrations, and if you could…. Oh, I think let’s take a couple of minutes to do that. The establishment of the graduate school. Why was the graduate school established? There were graduate courses given before the graduate school.

MANSPEIZER: Well, first of all I think my involvement there, if I remember correctly, I was either on the committee that, you know, recommended the establishment of a graduate school, or was certainly on the first executive council of the graduate school. So I did have some knowledge as to what was going on at that time. And you’re right, there were courses being offered, but a lot of those courses were offered through New Brunswick. And the programs up here were really not independent, you know, of New Brunswick. I guess the faculty feels that in order to legitimize itself in part, you have to offer graduate work and graduate courses. So in a
way it was first really doing something which had been traditional, you know, in academic circles and historically. I guess basically the answer. Also to be independent of New Brunswick.

COHEN: What effect—

MANSPEIZER: I mean for myself I feel that that’s an important issue. If I was asked to teach graduate courses for New Brunswick, I most likely would not do it. I mean if there wasn’t a graduate course up here. If this graduate program up here was to be dropped, I wouldn’t want to go there.

COHEN: You wouldn’t offer to go there. What effect did the establishment of the graduate school have on undergraduate education, do you think?

MANSPEIZER: Well, I think in our case it’s been positive. Because in our case the undergraduates—no, the graduate students—are given fellowships, teaching fellowships; they’re TAs. A lot of them are. And they then teach the labs. So the labs are taught by students who presumably have some qualification, and at the same time, can respond to us within the faculty. If they didn’t teach the undergraduates, then we would have to teach the undergraduate labs. I mean someone would have to teach undergraduate labs; presumably it would be the faculty here. And you just can’t do all that at the same time. You can’t teach the lectures and the labs and work then essentially a nine-hour schedule or eight hours or seven hours. So there’s a problem, a problem in terms of properly utilizing the people that you have there. If they went out and hired more faculty to do that, then you’d be hiring essentially high-prized people to teach the labs. It gets to be fairly expensive. You know we run something like twenty-four labs or twenty labs. Now if each faculty taught three classes, there would be seven faculty just to do that. Right?

COHEN: Mm-hmm.

MANSPEIZER: So you’re talking each faculty, let’s see, a minimum of about thirty thousand, thirty-five thousand dollars. We’re talking about an increase of almost a quarter of a million dollars just to teach the labs. Or drop the labs. You know that’s the only alternative. So I mean in that sense it’s been good for everybody. At the same time it offers the students, you know, a stipend of some sort. The students—I don’t know what their TA pays them. But it does pay them the tuition, fringe benefits, and a whole bunch of things. And it probably amounts to ten to fifteen thousand dollars a year. That’s nothing to sneeze about. A lot of schools, a lot of universities, these days are not able to offer teaching assistantships to students, to graduate students. As a result of that, the graduate student has to come up with ten or fifteen thousand dollars to go to school. That’s not chicken feed either.

COHEN: With the increase in emphasis in the university to do graduate work through the graduate school upon research, publication, grants, and so on, what effect has this had on the whole promotional opportunity for faculty?

MANSPEIZER: That’s a tough question. I think it certainly has placed great demands on the faculty. It’s made it more difficult, I think, for faculty to—some faculty—to getting tenure.
COHEN: When did this get started?

MANSPEIZER: I think so. And I’m really not in a position to answer that. I suspect, you know, several years back, bigger over time, and, you know….

COHEN: Seventies, or…?

MANSPEIZER: I don’t think it was in the seventies.

COHEN: What was happening in the seventies in that vein?

MANSPEIZER: There were several episodes. I don’t remember the chronology. But it probably goes back…. I guess it was much…. Because of the increase in enrollment when we moved into the new building, the increase probably—I’m not sure, if they were war babies or not, you know. What happens is that we hired a lot. So we had somewhere in the neighborhood of four hundred faculty. That number is down now considerably. So at that time it probably was much easier to get tenure. I feel very fortunate coming here at that time because I got tenure probably in 1973, I think it was, and was promoted associate professor. Could my record—could I get tenure now with the record I had then? Absolutely not. No question about it. I would not have been promoted and receive tenure. I just didn’t have the kind of qualifications that they want now.

COHEN: Oh. It was easier in the early, middle seventies?

MANSPEIZER: Much easier. Much easier.

COHEN: Than in the eighties.

MANSPEIZER: But there was a period, however, when it became very difficult to get tenure.

COHEN: What was that?

MANSPEIZER: I don’t really remember. It probably, I would guess, was about seventy-four, seventy-five. Maybe seventy-six. I remember that the financing in the university became very difficult. I don’t remember when that was. But if you look back at the AAUP records, I mean if what’s-his-name was alive, he’d probably know the number.

COHEN: Norman.

MANSPEIZER: This whole notion…. And I think I was probably on the Board of Governors at that time. It probably was about seventy-five to seventy-six and the business about financial exigencies. Remember? That the university could not claim that—you could not deny somebody the promotion if that person had essentially met the objectives of the job.

COHEN: Oh, yes.
MANSPEIZER: Because the university was claiming that it didn’t have the finances. The university would then have to document, you know, its finances. And there was a whole AAUP, you know, floor case and a lot of hearings, a lot of discussion amongst the faculty, the senate, and amongst faculties as to that particular thing. In fact it came out with Appendix D and Appendix E. It was about…. Come to think of it, it was about seventy-six. So it was difficult at that time to get…. And there were a lot of grievances. That whole grievance procedure I think essentially started about then as well.

COHEN: How effective was the AAUP?

MANSPEIZER: At that time?

COHEN: Yes, at that time.

MANSPEIZER: It probably was reasonably effective. I think were it not for the AAUP as a kind of counterbalance, the university would have run roughshod over most or a lot of departments and a lot of the people. Absolutely. I mean there were those from certain departments that made it difficult and were taking the money and putting it into other kinds of things. Not that that money shouldn’t have been put into those other purposes. It should have been. But not at the expense of those people who were doing precisely what they were hired to do. You know? And it’s not ambiguous. I think the promotion procedure, although somewhat cumbersome, at least is fairly clear. You know we’re are graded on this, this, this, this, and this, whatever it was. Teaching effectiveness, research, you know, general usefulness, whatever that all meant and all those other kinds of things. And if you did that and you did it well as attested to by the faculty in your department, then you should be promoted. You should not have been denied promotion because the university says we don’t have the money for it. The university’s got the money for a lot of things, of the golf courses and things like that. You know football teams and a whole bunch of other things like that. So they can’t claim they don’t have the money. So I think in that sense, I think, yes, I think the AAUP was effective, I mean they were absolutely. And it was an important balance and it’s an important cause. I remember being on the university negotiating team, bargaining team. That was a terrible experience.

COHEN: Oh, you were.

MANSPEIZER: Oh, it was awful. I don’t remember when it was. Probably about seventy-five or seventy-four or something like that. I guess I was vice president of the AAUP, so it was all in that.

COHEN: President of the local?

MANSPEIZER: The local.

COHEN: The local.

MANSPEIZER: Terrible experience. Were you in that also?
COHEN: I served as president of the AAUP a few years ago, but that was after the teaching faculty apparently lost interest.

MANSPEIZER: Oh. No, this was awful.

COHEN: Why was it awful?

MANSPEIZER: Because I really felt the university...all those claims that you hear about the university not bargaining in good faith, they were true. Or at least not—they would miss meetings. They wouldn’t show up. They would not be prepared. They would say, well, the matter is under discussion in the administration. It’s in whatever—Edward’s hand or Bloustein’s hand or Marvin’s hands, you know. And you could hardly get an answer from them. And when the time to settle on the contract came, I mean everything fell into place, you know, because they had all those answers. It was just not in their interest. Maybe it was in their interest to just keep the money, leave it in the bank, and earn interest on it. But it was not a pleasant experience. It was not rewarding in the sense that you’d sit down and have a discussion, an honest discussion. I think the AAUP was honest in what we did, and we had our positions, and that’s it.

COHEN: Well, during those difficult times of negotiating, what role do you think President Bloustein played in that event? Was there any sense or any feeling of who was pulling the strings?

MANSPEIZER: No, it could have been Susan Cole or somebody like that, you know. And I don’t think it was Marv. It might have been Marvin, but Marvin was always, sat quietly. I had no feel at all for who was doing what. All we knew is that in general they were ill prepared, and they couldn’t discuss the issues with us. And then they always said, Well, it’s not us. It’s the state. The state hasn’t given us the money to pay for this. No, no. They’d play these games. And it got to the point where I…I don’t like to go to New Brunswick. I don’t go to New Brunswick if I can help it, it’s almost like being summoned, you know.

COHEN: Yes.

MANSPEIZER: Then you go there and spend the time going there, and nothing much happens. So I found it very disturbing...so I didn’t like that. But I do think the AAUP is an important force—or should be.

COHEN: I want to go over this here. Some of the committees that you worked on, principally you said you were on the Student Affairs Committee, and that—liaison. This is the.... If you can pull it out of memory, what were some of the issues addressed at that committee?

MANSPEIZER: Don’t remember one.

COHEN: Don’t remember one.

MANSPEIZER: No. Not even one. But what I do remember is kind of interesting. What I do remember—in fact my wife recalled it some time ago, is that back in the fifties, we acted as
chaperons—it was either to a fraternity, a sorority, or something. And there’s a bunch of nice kids. There was something in James Street. Might have been even the nursing students, you know, they had a party or something, a gathering. So I think in retrospect that’s kind of funny.

[Laughs]

COHEN: In the sixties—

MANSPEIZER: Right, right, right. Might have been the fifties.

COHEN: Yes, someone else might have said something about chaperoning back in the fifties and in the sixties. [Laughter] And everything that signifies, yes.

MANSPEIZER: Do you think that word’s still in existence? [Laughter]

COHEN: In one of the old dictionaries.

MANSPEIZER: But that’s what I remember about student affairs.

COHEN: You were on the Space Utilization Committee…

MANSPEIZER: Yes that was interesting.

COHEN: What did that involve?

MANSPEIZER: There were problems, I guess—and this is 1977. I got a letter from the union, President Bloustein asking me to serve on his committee and then convening committee, and serving as chairman of the committee. I didn’t know what was going on. I was this kind of neophyte coming from Newark to deal with an issue in New Brunswick. I had worked with Bloustein before on several other things and Winkler also. In fact—I will come back to this in a second. On a committee that dealt with big-time football. Should the university go big time, bigger time, and all of that? I was one of two representatives from Newark on this committee. Winkler chaired the committee.

COHEN: Who was the other representative?

MANSPEIZER: A fellow—Tom Something-or-other. He’s now—he was a student at that time. It might have been a senate committee. This guy Tom, short, stocky guy, he’s in the Phys. Ed. Department now. I sometimes see him around. But he’s an instructor for phys. ed. And the issue was should we go big time football because we would make all this money and fame and fortune and all that. I wrote a negative report and said absolutely not. And somewhere in my report it says—in fact there’s a news clipping of it somewhere, something about it. And I think I said something like students in Newark don’t even have a handball court. [Laughs] Something like that. Don’t even have a place to get a snack, you know. And here they’re talking about big, big-time football, bigger time, spending millions of dollars and all of that. And one day I turned around, and I give the report to Winkler. And then I see the report is highlighted in a column by Bob Braun. And there it is in the Star-Ledger. Oh, God! But anyway….
COHEN: You mean your part—

MANSPEIZER: My report.

COHEN: Your report, yes.

MANSPEIZER: I think the citation—the heading—was something like SHOULD RUTGERS GO BIG-TIME FOOTBALL? Or something like that. And then he presents this minority report. So anyway, I’m not sure how we got onto that. Oh, the Space Utilization Committee. That’s what it was, space specialization…. How do you effectively use space, and how do you dole out space? It was an interesting experience, that whole episode was interesting because there are some major problems in universities today. Who does the space belong to? I mean does that space over there belong to geology and chemistry and physics? Is that their space, and the faculty? This is my space. That’s my office, you know. It doesn’t belong to the university. I mean we agree it belongs to the university; but as long as I’m here, that’s my space. And this is the way departments think. They cherish the space that they have. And there are many stories. And in fact you’re talking about Newark. One of the most outrageous things is the amount of space that physics had when they first moved into that building at Smith Hall. The story goes they had floor upon floor—and it’s still true today—two or three floors with nothing but offices that are all theirs in physics. There’s no students at that time, virtually no students. And they had space, you couldn’t believe how much space that they had. They’ve since lost some of that space, but even to this day they retain a lot of that space. But other departments were not allocated any space at all. But that was like one of those outrageous stories that was told about moving onto that campus. In this case one chairman was very powerful and was able to assume all of that. Anyway, to get back to space utilization, there are problems in the—there were problems in New Brunswick, and Bloustein asked me to chair this committee to see if we could resolve some of those problems. At least establish certain principles, and we did. But there were major problems just sitting in there. There was this guy Wolfson who was head of the Math Department. He was very powerful in the graduate program. And this chairman of geology, this guy David Kramer was on that committee. I mean all these real hotshots and what’s-his-name? He’s a historian, his wife. The oldest, McCormick She was the scheduling officer; you know things like that. So it was a very high-powered committee. We came up with the principles. We agreed, you know, to certain kinds of principles. Forwarded it off to Bloustein. But I don’t think it has ever been…. You know except at the university. It was an interesting experience. It was a good experience.

COHEN: You were chair of the Geology Department for what years?

MANSPEIZER: I think it was seventy-two to seventy-five. I don’t remember. I should have looked at my…. Maybe seventy-two to seventy-six because I have a feeling I must have been chair for more than one year—I mean more than one term. But I’m really not sure. Major events, yes.

COHEN: Yes, during your tenure.
MANSPEIZER: During that period of time I think the most major thing is, I had taken over from Sam. Sam was essentially the chairman for maybe twenty years. Sam Agron—a wonderful, absolutely super person. Nicest, most decent person I’ve ever met in academia. A really honest guy. A spade is a spade, what you saw was what you got. A wonderful teacher only students didn’t appreciate it. Very knowledgeable guy. The major event at that time—at least during seventy-two to seventy-five, was the death of Bill Wilds. Absolutely traumatic experience in the department.

COHEN: Can you talk about Bill Wilds?

MANSPEIZER: Absolutely a wonderful guy. I mean when I came into the department there was Bill and Sam and two other guys who have since gone. Bill was a decent guy. Good fellow, fun, you know, to be with. But honest as Sam was. But both cut out of the same mold. Bill was a master teacher. He was absolutely a marvel. You could watch Bill—and I spent some time teaching with Bill because we used to teach these intercept courses in the summer.

COHEN: [unintelligible]

MANSPEIZER: Yes. Upgrading science teachers to teach geology. A lot of these teachers are biologists who have some biology training—or chemistry. And then ask a teacher—earth science and geology background. So we were asked to...you know we taught programs for a couple of years. Bill was a master teacher. He would not only present his material being very knowledgeable and articulate; he’d have, you know, the correct kind of pedagogical stance, position. He knew how to teach. And he was a marvelous drawer. He was an artist of sorts. He would draw with his two hands like this, with his right hand and his left hand, and he would erase sometimes with his left hand at the same time he would draw with his right hand. And in front of you he would evolve different kinds of organisms and plants, of dinosaurs. He was absolutely.... And the students would be in awe of Bill. They would just look like that with big eyes. And these were all professional teachers. You know they couldn’t believe what they had seen on the board. He was absolutely incredible. He could bring the subject alive. Unfortunately he died and untimely death. It was an accident.

COHEN: An accident! I thought he....

MANSPEIZER: He spent the last couple of weeks in Maine with his family, his wife and son. And he had fallen. He was taking the boat in.

COHEN: Oh.

MANSPEIZER: At the end of the year. Slipped and broke his arm or shoulder, something like that. And it was set up there up in Maine. They drove back down here. He was in pain. He went to the hospital in Montclair. What’s the name of that hospital? Mountainside or something like that. And they reset it. But what happened is that Bill is a pretty good-sized fellow. They put this huge cast on him. He had difficulty breathing. He wound up with pneumonia. So in order to counter the pneumonia, they gave him certain kinds of medication which brought on an embolism. And he died. It’s a clot. It was just a terrible sequence of events. That was it. But it
was quite a shock in the department. Really a shock! I mean he was a wonderful person. I would say in those three years, in that period of time, that was the most significant thing that happened to the department. I mean others might disagree. We might have begun the graduate program at that time. I just don’t remember. But other than that, nothing much. There was…. You asked before. Yes, there were discussions about curriculum. There were curriculum changes at that time. I remember trying to develop curriculum changes wherein we all take, students take, physical geology and historical geology with terms now that…..

COHEN: Mainly historical, did you say?

MANSPEIZER: Physical and historical. The courses now are titled differently, but it’s still physical and historical. And I wanted to change it to give the students more options in the courses that they chose. So that all students…. The plan was—the proposal, which was passed ultimately in the department—the proposal was to offer a course in physical geology in the first semester. And then in the second semester, instead of taking historical geology, which is a very difficult course to teach—students really are not interested. Really it’s tough. It’s tough to teach. The subject matter is very, very broad. But so instead of everybody taking that course, they had options: They could take a course called Historical Geology, which really dealt with the physical and the organic evolution of the earth; a course called the History of Life, which is a good course dealing largely with evolution and the evolutionary development of different forms of life; and the course called Gems and something—Gems and Minerals I think it was called—which dealt with things like the origin of, you know, diamonds and emeralds and things like that. And then there was another course called Environmental Geology. So that students—there were four or five courses; students could take their pick. And I guess at that time in the curriculums throughout the country, much like students would not necessarily be taking Western Civilization, they could take, you know, maybe a semester of Western Civilization and follow that up by taking a course in the history of South America, the history of the Caribbean, right? So it was in line with that, freeing up the curriculum. And we passed it, but with great difficulty because in my department at that time were two fellows—Gilliland and Garner—both full professors, who really [were] obstinate and very difficult people to deal with.

COHEN: Gilliland and who?

MANSPEIZER: Garner.

COHEN: Oh, Garner.

MANSPEIZER: Both full professors from the Midwest, and they were tough to deal with. And it caused a considerable amount of friction within the department as well.

COHEN: So the new courses again were?

MANSPEIZER: Four new courses that the students could take were Environmental Geology, the History of Life, Historical Geology, and Rocks and Minerals or Gems or something like that. I forget. It might have been Fuels and Non-Fuels. It was a course that dealt with inorganic kinds
of things in geology. But other than that I don’t recall anything very significant, you know, during that period of time.

COHEN: How did they—those courses again. Were they just emerging because of changes in the discipline itself?

MANSPEIZER: I think geologists were looking at the discipline a little differently. They were saying that not everybody in geology has to take these, you know, all have to take physical geology and historical geology.

COHEN: I see. I see.

MANSPEIZER: That especially for introductory courses, the students should be given other kinds of, you know, material. So that if you look around the country, we might have something….

[Break in recording]

COHEN: Yes, we’re back. We were talking about the various committees that you worked on and you also were…. Was it in Newark rep?

MANSPEIZER: No, no. Faculty representative.

COHEN: Faculty representative for the College of Arts and Sciences.

MANSPEIZER: No, no.

COHEN: I’m sorry.

MANSPEIZER: It’s the Board of Governors has—at least at that time—had two faculty and at least one student—

COHEN: Oh, I’m sorry.

MANSPEIZER: —on the Board of Governors. We were—I think we were non-voting members of the board. Yes, I don’t think we voted. Okay. And we were chosen from the senate. I guess that’s what it was. Two members of the senate.

COHEN: I see.

MANSPEIZER: So one member was Frank Jenifer, who later became the chancellor of Higher Education of Massachusetts and president of Johns Hopkins—not Johns Hopkins, Howard University. He was the chairman, so he was selected or elected; and I was the vice chair of the senate, so I was elected also to be faculty representatives to the Board of Governors. And that was a very interesting experience. A lot of very good, very decent people on the board. You know Bloustein was there and all the assistants to Bloustein. But the board members themselves,
you know, are the general community: business people and academicians from other places. It was an interesting experience. You know Sonny Werblin is a member of the board. And I guess the president of Johnson & Johnson. Places like that.

COHEN: What developments did you—

MANSPEIZER: The only thing I can really recall right now was an amicus brief that was submitted by the law school in Newark in support of affirmative action as it related to the Bache Case. See, Bache, remember, the one in California, that had come up at that time. And the issue was being heard before the United States Supreme Court. And as common practice, a number of institutions around the country are submitting briefs for or against, you know, the issue that was. And the law school had prepared a brief under the direction of a good friend of mine subsequently, what’s her name? Oh, God! I can’t…. It’s terrible. Sheppard, Anna Mae Sheppard. You know Anna.

COHEN: I know of her..

MANSPEIZER: Very good.

COHEN: I’ve seen her a couple of times.

MANSPEIZER: Okay. Anna Mae…I think it was under her direction. And they prepared a brief about so-big maybe a hundred pages or so, why the court should do what it should do, you know, and to knock down I guess Bache’s claim. And somewhere— And they needed the Board of Governors and wanted the Board of Governors. I guess it was supposed to be a brief prepared for the Board of Governors so they could then submit it as a document from Rutgers University in support of the Bache claim. Okay. Affirmative action related to Bache. And I remember going through it and reading the sentence that said at that time that all faculty are biased and discriminate against students and something like that. You know it was absolutely terrible.

COHEN: The brief said that?

MANSPEIZER: The brief said that.

COHEN: Yes. Mm-hmm.

MANSPEIZER: And there was really no prior explanation, you know, about that. And I took a very strong position, you know, that the faculty’s not biased. I mean some may very well be biased. Now I’m not sure if this was supposed to be an inherent bias. I don’t remember the specifics of it. But I do remember very clearly, you know, that coming before the Board of Governors, and they did modify it. Or otherwise supported the amicus brief. I was on the board in ’seventy-five to seventy-six. No, seventy-five to seventy-six.

COHEN: Is that case this old? My gosh!

MANSPEIZER: Yes. It could be seventy-six.
COHEN: Yeah, smack in the middle of the seventies.

MANSPEIZER: Yes. Of course the next year I was in the Dead Sea doing work there. I was on sabbatical. But that’s one of the issues I recall. There were other kinds of issues that, you know, were brought up. I think a lot of what was done in the Board of Governors was certainly done behind the scenes, you know. It would come to a vote, you know, at that time.

COHEN: What kind of research were doing in the Dead Sea?

MANSPEIZER: I worked on the breakup of continents and how continents split, you know, as part of the plate tectonic motion. So the Dead Sea is a certain kind of movement that occurred. And what I was doing was working—I had a desk at the Geological Survey of Israel. And working from that point along the West Bank where the Dead Sea is, right along the rift. And it was part of my overall study program. I studied there. And, as you know, I spent the last twenty years on and off—or twenty-five years—in Morocco studying there. Same thing, same kinds of processes. And Morocco was formerly up against central New Jersey and along a part of North America. Studied the processes by which the two broke apart. Studied the same processes in East Africa in places like, you know, Kenya, Burundi, Rwanda, Tanzania, along the East African Rift system.

COHEN: Morocco was at one time next to New Jersey?

MANSPEIZER: Oh, yes, yes, yes. When did that—what….

MANSPEIZER: Two hundred million years ago, the two were connected. So that’s what I was doing.

COHEN: You can give or take a couple of years.

MANSPEIZER: Give or take a couple of years. So in what do you call it…. Yes. That’s right. Well, you have my book about New Jersey?

COHEN: Yes, yes. I didn’t realize that bit about Morocco though.

MANSPEIZER: Oh, yes. Oh, yes. Actually, Morocco was really up against probably Nova Scotia. It’s slightly north of here. But not significantly north. I mean it’s much easier to say it was up against [claps]…

COHEN: That’s okay.

MANSPEIZER: It’s probably Mauretania.

COHEN: It’s a fascinating concept.
MANSPEIZER: Oh, yes, yes. It’s easier. Easy enough to document for the geological record, sure.

COHEN: You talk about generally tectonic plates and movement over millions of years. Oh, well, it’s over there. But I then when you say, hey, Morocco near New Jersey It’s sort of hits home.

MANSPEIZER: Probably Morocco and New Jersey are about…if you stood along the shoreline, today’s shoreline, and Morocco is probably about four or five minute miles east of here—north and east of here—it’s two hundred millions years ago. A lot happens over that period of time.

COHEN: A lot happens in thirty years. [Laughs]

MANSPEIZER: Right, right. This is it. This is one’s life.

COHEN: Okay. I just want to get to the area of the administrations, and if you could give your impressions of the administrations starting with the administration of President Gross. What recollections do you have?

MANSPEIZER: All I remember of President Gross is that he handed me my diploma when I got my Ph.D. a long time ago. Other than that—and I recall the way the press described Mason Gross being summoned by the students, black students, you know, to answer the set of demands. And it seemed like a terrible way, you know, for the administration to be—and president—you know to be remembered, you know, in the middle of the night. So that was…. But I assume he was a decent enough man and tried his best to do what he thought was right.

COHEN: Edward Bloustein?

MANSPEIZER: Well, I liked him. Yes, I liked him. Yes, I liked him, I liked him. I liked where he came from, his background, his training. You know decent enough man throughout much of his life I guess. I don’t know—I suspect another administrator could have dealt with Newark differently. It was a time of rapid growth in Newark. There were enough changes going on. And if you really had the vision, you know, the kind of worldly—much more worldly vision—of what Newark could be, what the university could be, then I think it’s conceivable he could have helped Newark more than he did. But one is always suspicious that they kept—they wanted to keep Rutgers in Newark so that they could control it, control its growth and development. But, you know, that’s pure speculation. I don’t know. But as a person I kind of like that.

COHEN: You’ve talked a little bit about Malcolm Talbott. What was his overall contribution to the university in Newark?

MANSPEIZER: I suspect it was positive. Certainly he gave courage to minorities to go to school to get educated, become educated, and that’s all certainly to the good. Very good. And I think he found a way in which he could do it, you know. Which he could contribute to the education of minorities. And at the same time, to elevate, you know, the City of Newark to make
people proud of the city by focusing on the university and what the university could do. I think in some respects Malcolm, come to think of it, was not only a positive element, but in some areas I don’t think understood the college as the faculty understands it. I think he probably thought that the college could do more for Newark in a very practical way. Faculty doesn’t look at itself in the same way that, for example, the two-year institution might look at it in terms of developing skills and trades and things like that. I don’t think many on the faculty think that they can solve Newark’s problems. You know we have a different notion of our mission, that our mission is to liberate one’s mind rather than, you know, to liberate one, you know, in terms of occupation or skill. And that’s all we really can do. I think Malcolm coming from the law school—and I’m not really sure what his undergraduate education was; of course I don’t know if he had an undergraduate education. That is to say I don’t know if he had a liberal arts education. That lawyers at one time went right from high school to a law school. It’s like the school of—you know a pharmacist can do the same thing without necessarily getting an undergraduate liberal arts education. Like engineers.

So I think, you know, based upon his training in law and in the practice of law and the fact that he taught people who could do something concrete for the people out there in terms of handling their cases and things like that. University people don’t—I mean arts and sciences people don’t deal with things like that. We can just give them, you know, try to make them understand and to think and to reason, you know. And it’s a totally different thing. So I think in that sense, Malcolm probably didn’t understand the faculty. And as I recall no, I think many people—I hear that phrase over and over again: Malcolm just doesn’t understand us. Malcolm doesn’t understand us. So he probably thought that we could do a lot more, and he became frustrated at this because he probably didn’t understand. Not that people were trying to frustrate Malcolm, but…. Oh, he was wonderful in many other areas. I liked Malcolm as a person, as a character, you know, because he really tried to do something that was right. Wonderful spokesman. He was really dynamic and had presence. He had an army, you know, Malcolm…. Malcolm was all right.

COHEN: Why do you think he didn’t get the job of provost?

MANSPEIZER: Oh, I don’t know. I guess— Oh, I guess the idea at that time was that…what was going on was the notion that it would give him too much of a power base. He would be too powerful. Malcolm was too important a character. He had the power base in Newark. So he had the urban poor. He was well known amongst the people of Newark. He had the urban poor, he had the business community, he had Prudential. He had all the ingredients. Now if you give him vice president or provost and give him an academic base, I think that was where the problem…. Who became—was that Horace?

COHEN: Well, Horace was acting provost for another year or so before James Young took over as actually the first provost.

MANSPEIZER: Horace made a mistake also, saying too much.

COHEN: What was that?
MANSPEIZER: I don’t remember. He came out with a statement also. He questioned Bloustein about something. It had something to do with support of Newark, moneys, you know. I mean all this money was going into building in New Brunswick, right, the Piscataway campus, and they knew it was coming here. He in reality probably wanted more money for his school of management, if I know Horace. [Laughs] Jim Young? A nice guy. What did the faculty think of him? Totally ineffective. This was a difficult time also as I remember. There were always groups of faculty going over to speak to Jim Young and making demands on him, Jim Young. You know basically a decent guy who probably—who was thought amongst the faculty to really owe his allegiance to New Brunswick. And so nobody really trusted Jim Young either. And that’s when Norman comes into the picture. See, Norman has that kind of support. I don’t know if he still does. Because I would think that a lot of the faculty even now don’t know Norman. And I’m talking about this guy. I don’t know about the graduate school and the law school and all of that. And they probably a lot of them don’t know or realized that Norman was a member of our faculty, that he lifted himself up to that position. But when Norman got the job, sure, this was our man now in that position. It was our man that was now a member of our faculty, who was leading the college. So they had tremendous respect and admiration for Norman. Yes. What he’s doing, I don’t know if that’s, that’s something else. Norman would be more effective in the dean’s office, I guess.

COHEN: The deans are, before we mentioned, Herbert Woodward after…

MANSPEIZER: No, he was—I really don’t know how he was as a dean. He was there. He didn’t seek the job. You know how he got the job. When we became part of the state university, he was in Bulgaria or something like that. He was a colonel. He got a telegram that said “Congratulations now that you’re dean of the college.” Or something to that effect. I suspect there’s a lot of backbiting there also. A lot of people didn’t want him. I mean people like the guy in botany if you know who I mean. And other heads of departments I don’t think cared. I don’t know how he was as an administrator. As a geologist, he was very good, very well respected. And I think perhaps more of his interest was in geology than in deaning, you know, so to speak. But he was all right, but certainly not the kind of person who would be a modern dean, no. Absolutely no. The other guys…. I don’t know. I think we lived through some very interesting times.

COHEN: Yes, right.

MANSPEIZER: The sixties to the mid-seventies. Unfortunately, I didn’t review the history. You know so there’s a lot that I just don’t remember.

COHEN: You’re doing great. You already made the comment that William Gilliland was….

MANSPEIZER: He was a disaster. No. And I think he just didn’t understand what was happening. He was also—he’s since gone, and I’d rather not speak ill of the dead. But his character was quite flawed in many ways. He was interested in other things. A bright guy, no doubt about it. But his interest was elsewhere.
COHEN: His successor, Henry Blumenthal, was after Malcolm Talbott served as acting dean. How would you assess his deanship?

MANSPEIZER: A good, decent man, who would now try to do the right thing. The story about Henry that went around was that he needed to be loved. He had no family. I think he had a brother or something. You know I don’t believe he was ever married or had any children. So the story was essentially that, you know, the students were his children. And they loved him. They loved him, absolutely loved Henry. Absolutely. You know he was a kind of father figure at the school. But as an associate dean, he presented a problem because his students would come to me and say, we want to do this or that or something like that. And I’d say, Well, regulations say you can’t do it. It’s unwise or something like that. Then they’d go see Henry. Henry: Of course! No problem. [Laughs] No problem. Then he would sign off on it. So if the student was persistent, they could get what they wanted. But generally speaking certainly a grandfather type. As an administrator, I don’t know. I think part of the problem with all these administrators is that once you’re there so long, you really have all these cronies and people who evolve into friends. And it’s difficult to do something out of the ordinary.

COHEN: Acting dean after Henry Blumenthal was Panson for a year. Any impressions about his brief term?

MANSPEIZER: In some respects Gil was probably the best of the administrators because Gil has always been able to get more than he probably rightfully deserves. [Laughter] Yes, Gil was an effective administrator, whether he was the chairman of his department, he was the chair of a committee. By the way, all these people have Newark at heart. All of them. I mean it’s Rutgers Newark. I don’t know about the city, but certainly in terms of the college. Every one of them. Whether it was Woodward…well, Gilliland was difficult to figure because he really was an outsider and probably had a terrible time trying to, you know, get on the inside track and get along with people. He was a little different. But all those: Henry and Malcolm and Gil, they certainly all wanted the best thing for the school. And they were proud of the school. All of them were very—Norman. Robey was also an outsider.

COHEN: Yes.

MANSPEIZER: I think it becomes very difficult for outsiders to dean or to do right because they don’t necessarily have the background, the backing of the faculty. David…. 

COHEN: Well, getting back to Robey. What went wrong with the Robey administration?

MANSPEIZER: I think it was during the Robey administration that the faculty had to give back a lot of lines. And I suspect what motivated these people is really the budgets in large part. So when the budgets were good, and everybody got lines and everybody was happy, they were very pleased. Under Robey’s tenure I think that’s a time of financial exigencies in the seventy-threes and seventy-fours and seventy-fives. So there was a lot of friction in the university at that time, a lot of problems. You had to give back lines, and the pie is only so big. So if you take from this one, you know. So I said, Well, why don’t you take from this one? Why do we have to give back two lines? You know somebody’s got to make a judgment. So, you know, in a situation you
always have a bad guy. You know that’s the problem with that is you’re going to run into that kind of a thing. So what happened with Robey? Robey had to give back lines. When Bill Wilds died, they didn’t replenish that line. We didn’t get another line; I don’t think we did. If we did, we had to wait or something. But the point was he had to give back a line. And his judgment is that he was going to take from geology. Anyway, so if he’s giving back forty or fifty lines, a lot of people are angry at Robey or were angry at Robey. And the person that came to me said to me, You’ve got to do something about this guy. Why he came to me? I don’t know he came to me. We had just lost our line with Bill Wilds, or somebody else’s line. And it was easy enough to get a group of people together who had the same goal and mission. And over a period of, I don’t know, a couple of months, a year or something like that, they made it pretty difficult for Robey. Very difficult. We had or mission and goal; he had his goals. There’s also a suspicion that here there was this new fellow on the block, and Bloustein needed the lines in New Brunswick somewhere. Admittedly it was difficult times in the state. So Bloustein needed the lines, and Robey was giving him our lines. You know I don’t know how much truth is in that; perhaps no truth. But at the same time that they were taking from us, there was an awful lot of building in New Brunswick and hiring faculty.

COHEN: How did things change when Norman Samuels took over as dean?

MANSPEIZER: By this point I’m really out of it. Late seventies I was on sabbatical. Norman had certainly many friends in the faculty. He was different—different. I don’t know if the financial situation was any better than it was at that time. I just don’t know. But Norman had a…Norman also has a different way of speaking to the people. He makes you feel, at least with us he makes us feel, you know quite comfortable. And he’s giving it to you straight in a different, you know, persona than certainly with Robey. Robey was in some respects like Bruce Robinson, you know. Bright—not to say Norman’s not. Norman’s also bright, but a different—his personality is different. You know quick talker. And before you know it then you could be snowed by some of these people. And I can’t answer that.

COHEN: Ok, a couple more. I want to just talk briefly about your experience with the Dana Library. And you mentioned something earlier, way earlier, that the old library was…

MANSPEIZER: Right. Yes.

COHEN: I was wondering what your experience has been with the collections through the seventies, with the new Dana Library now.

MANSPEIZER: Oh. Okay. The most positive thing right now I could say about Dana Library is the change that has occurred in interlibrary loan. I mean that is much to the positive. There’s a big change in that. In the past I would need something, either a document or something, and it took, you know, weeks and weeks and weeks. And unfortunately oftentimes I’d find myself at odds with Wanda, you know. It was terrible. I tend to be an impatient person anyway. And I’d come in and say, “Wanda, I’m waiting and waiting. Where is this stuff?” And I guess it wasn’t her fault. I guess…the facilities weren’t there for her to, whether they were Xerox or fax or whatever they do now. They do it much more effectively today. That’s certainly one area that’s been very good as I see it. On the downside is the journals in geology. As you know, we’re
probably well down on that list. So we lose a lot of journals or have lost journals in the past, in
the recent past. And what’s there is just really bare. And that’s why it’s more important for us to
have interlibrary loan, you know, than perhaps other departments. What was always somewhat
antagonistic was chemistry. Chemistry always seemed to have their own collections, right?

COHEN: Well, that depends…

MANSPEIZER: You know historically, over historical time. They’ve had their own collections.
And I remember there was something about something’s come to Dana Library or maybe when
Dana Library moved from Rector Street the issue was, you know, what about the physical
chemistry journals, these kinds of journals. Where do they go? So I’m not even sure—I was
assuming you have some, I guess they got allocations to buy their own and stuff like that.
Whatever it is, there was always I guess a difference in the way chemistry was handled as
opposed to the rest of the people. You know seem to have been handled at least, and it becomes
very difficult to write a paper. And much of my stuff is not provincial by its very nature. You
know it deals with stuff in Germany, France, and Morocco, this country, that country. So it’s of a
widespread nature. There’s a lot of interlibrary loans. And it becomes very difficult then to
publish.

COHEN: When did you see the big improvement in interlibrary loan? About what year?

MANSPEIZER: I would say about four or five years ago, three years ago. Something like that.

COHEN: But in the seventies you had problems?

MANSPEIZER: Oh, yes. Absolutely. You know. I mean ask Wanda, Wanda may remember. I
just say….

COHEN: A lot of people besides here would.

MANSPEIZER: I couldn’t— you know, very difficult to do anything in terms of publishing.
And then about the same time we were also losing journals. So that was…. There was something
else about—there’s something on the tip of my tongue. Oh, yes. One of these days I’ll learn how
to use all your computers in the library. That might help. [Laughs]

COHEN: Me too, me too.

MANSPEIZER: But I think that’s wonderful that the kids can come in and take a computer and
know what they’re doing and, you know, find their journals. I think that’s great. There should be
more of that.

COHEN: Okay. A couple of windups. Something—a couple of things I’d like you to go back
and ask you before the final wrap-up question. You mentioned before that once before we were
thinking about the negotiations meeting with the students who took over Conklin Hall. And you
got some impressions of some of the leaders of that group. I wondered if you could recall…
MANSPEIZER: Yes. And I’m trying to think what those meetings were. But I mean vaguely I can recall people like Marvin McGraw, who seemed to be very bright, very intense. Vickie Donaldson also an extremely intense person. Well focused on what the issues were. And I think it was difficult to sidetrack, if one wanted to, either of those. I think those, the two of them, were very good.

COHEN: Were you on the Negotiating Committee?

MANSPEIZER: No. Not necessarily negotiating. I think we were there—I was there with there were meetings in Malcolm’s office or in places like that, where perhaps ten or fifteen members of the faculty were listening to—it could have been a list of demands. I don’t recall. Brown—Joe Brown?

COHEN: One of the leaders.

MANSPEIZER: Yes, I always thought he was as good in terms of getting his demands across as McGraw. But McGraw was much brighter, much better. Now the other one may have—he seemed a little more flamboyant. But I thought the two most impressive ones in terms of their positions, their arguments, presentations, were Vickie Donaldson and Marvin McGraw.

COHEN: Is there anything that you want to go back to _____ that we’ve touched on? Anything we haven’t….

[End of Tape #3]

COHEN: This is Gil Cohen. It is Thursday, October 10, 1991. And I’m speaking again with Dr. Warren Manspeizer in his office on the Newark campus. We’re talking about the whole area of tenure. And I guess my question was, how, in your perception, the tenure decisions, either within your department or the college, affected relations among faculty and between the faculty and the administration?

MANSPEIZER: Well, without having given this much thought, and without having records, you know, to speak from, I think in most cases faculty support faculty, and the administration supports the faculty. I think that clearly is the majority of the cases, certainly over historical time. But there have been other times, certainly at this college and throughout the university, where that’s not been the case. It certainly wasn’t the case back—when was it? In the late seventies I think, or middle seventies—during a time when finances were very difficult. The economy of the university was very difficult. And as faculty we used to speak, used to utter this phrase, you know, financial exigencies. The university, I remember, trying to…would indicate that the financial problems as such meant that it would be more difficult to get tenure. Faculty would pick up on this. And the administration I think came back and said that essentially, no, if the faculty deserves tenure, then the faculty will get tenure, if I can remember. That they would not deny tenure on the basis of economics.

There are a lot of games that are being played and have been played, you know, in the university when it comes to promotion, tenure, and reappointment. The faculty within a department, as I see
it, typically tried to develop, you know, the proper materials that would enable somebody to be promoted within that department. Sometimes—I think the situation in the past has gotten out of hand, especially when it came to letters of recommendation. Letters of recommendation were promoted by faculty within a department to support somebody.

COHEN: You mean outside letters of recommendation?

MANSPEIZER: Outside letters of recommendation. Now they have a system wherein it’s more difficult to do that because I think the letters are now—letters for the letter of recommendation, I think it’s now sent out to the dean’s office so the dean knows precisely who’s getting these letters and who’s responding to them. In the past it was conceivable or possible for the department chairman to get a letter of recommendation that was somewhat negative and toss it in the basket and nobody was the wiser. But now I think that’s more difficult to do. There are also—I mean a large number of grievances also indirectly speaks to the issue of problems between the faculty and the administration in the award of tenure. I’ve sat on grievance committees where the administration just seems to be—they seem to go out of their way, you know, to deny tenure to somebody who at least outwardly seems to have—who should have received tenure. I don’t know. There are games that are played both ways and are still being played both ways. And so you do have a grievance.

COHEN: What alternatives, if any, are there to peer review?

MANSPEIZER: Well, tough question. I’m not sure. Can you think of any?

COHEN: No. Maybe the corporate type of model where the evaluation and everything else is done by quote, “the supervisor,” that type of thing. I’m not proposing it.

MANSPEIZER: I see. I see. That would be an interesting—

COHEN: Versus the academic model.

MANSPEIZER: Yes, yes. That would be interesting. I suspect the problem in all of this is that if you give that to the administration, the administration has the ability to do that. And I would assume that they would take into consideration things that are beyond the faculty’s ability, such as financial matters or they don’t like the person, you know, man, woman. The subject matter is not in vogue. Shall we get rid of that department? You know there are a lot of things that could come up and perhaps still do come up behind closed doors. I suspect there is a lot of discussion other than those basic factors that go into promotion such as publications and teaching. It probably…. I don’t know. I think that would be very negative certainly from the point of view of the faculty. Absolutely.

COHEN: Now just to sort of wrap it up now, if you can just touch on what are the main reasons for tenure?

MANSPEIZER: Well, supposedly one is academic freedom, permits academic freedom. And I’m not really sure whether that’s true or not. I mean I’m not sure when the last case of academic
freedom, you know, was brought to the attention of the faculty here or elsewhere. But could the administration use that? I don’t know. Perhaps in a fair world it would be a little more difficult for them to deny promotion or to get rid of a professor because the professor said something. As in the case, for example, at City College, Professor Jeffries. He said something which outwardly was outrageous to a large number of people, although presumably he had support from a large number of people as well when he made those statements. It’s funny because I’m an alumnus of City College, and I just recently got—just yesterday in fact—I got a letter from the president, Harolson I think it is, of City College, in which he addressed the whole issue of Jeffries. And in the letter he really said my hands are tied. There’s nothing I can do about his tenure. He has the right to speak. But it was interesting because he said that he now has invoked a special committee that will look into his right to remain as the chairman within the department. Almost saying, well, I think Jeffries is going to remain as professor of whatever it is—Black Studies, African Studies. But the chair seems to be up in the air. Could it be used? I suspect that if there was no academic tenure at City, you know, Jeffries might be in more difficulty in that respect because of public pressure. But I think maybe Jeffries perhaps would not have said what he said, you know, if he didn’t have tenure. It’s a problem, an interesting one at that.

COHEN: And then any other uses served by tenure as far as the operation of the college?

MANSPEIZER: It certainly offers the faculty some security. It offers the students security as well, especially in a graduate program. And undergraduate programs. If for example the administration felt that they didn’t want to continue with that program and got rid of the department or several members of the department, then what happens to the students? What happens to a student, for example, in a graduate program where the professor is let go? If the student’s doing work under a particular professor, then that student now becomes—probably won’t finish up, but won’t develop and won’t continue within that particular program unless he goes with that professor. But if that professor is not offered another academic program, then the student’s in great difficulty.

COHEN: Just a couple of windup questions. What’s your perception of the tenuring process at Rutgers University? How does it compare—I realize there have been changes and revisions in an attempt to simplify the whole promotional procedure. But in the seventies how complicated was it?

MANSPEIZER: It was complicated. It’s quite complicated. In other words the promotional document is started at the departmental level and that’s after some discussion presumably within the members of the department. The document is prepared by the chair with the consent of the department, both the take-in materials, and then sent to the dean. The dean takes the material and gives it to an A&P Committee, Appointments and Promotions Committee. They review the documents which include also letters of recommendation, that includes the materials, the published materials of the candidate. They make an evaluation that it’s a recommendation to the dean. The dean then makes a recommendation to the provost. The provost makes a recommendation to the Summit Committee. It’s somewhat simpler now because in the past a second set of documents went to New Brunswick for the departments in New Brunswick to review those documents as well. And I think that material then came back to either the dean…I forget where.
COHEN: You’re not talking about the section?

MANSPEIZER: Yes, the section.

COHEN: You’re talking about the section. Oh.

MANSPEIZER: Yes, yes. The one for a particular discipline.

COHEN: Yes.

MANSPEIZER: I don’t think—that no longer exists. But instead they have what they call a reader.

COHEN: Oh, yes.

MANSPEIZER: There is a member within the university, either here or New Brunswick, who presumably reads and writes a critical analysis of the person’s writings. But it’s interesting. Even within the university—I know last year I served on the A&P Committee, and I chaired the Science Section of the A&P Committee. And we were reviewing a letter that was submitted by two readers in New Brunswick in a very, very large and a nationally-known department. And the review letters came back saying something like we don’t know very much about this subject.

[Laughter]

COHEN: What did you do with that one?

MANSPEIZER: Oh, you know, they went on to explain or to critically evaluate. But it was obvious that the subject matter that the professor here was writing about was in such an area that the people in New Brunswick didn’t know anything about it. They didn’t know very much about it. They said they disqualified themselves as experts in that field. But it was an interesting review anyway.

COHEN: How would you compare them with the complexity of the …has there been a significant simplification of the process involved since the revisions since the late eighties as compared to the seventies, late sixties and so on?

MANSPEIZER: No, I don’t think there’s a substantial difference.

COHEN: Oh.

MANSPEIZER: No, I don’t think so at all. I mean it’s substantial in the sense that it still goes through a number of different, you know, levels of review. Which raises also another interesting point: If the reviewer, the expert, the outside reader—and these were all professors of note, professor twos, in a very large and nationally-known department. If they had difficulty, you know, understanding the thrust of this person’s research; then certainly the people on the A&P
Committee had less of an understanding, although we’re a group of scientists. The question is, what is the dean really reviewing?

COHEN: Yes.

MANSPEIZER: What is the provost reviewing? What is the Summit reviewing? Are they really reviewing the substance of that person’s research? I don’t think so. They have to be reviewing something else. I mean as far as I know, none of the people on the Summit were, in this particular case, none of them had that particular field—were in that field. So I’m not sure what they’re really reviewing.

COHEN: What do you think?

MANSPEIZER: Well, I guess on the one hand that is a recommendation, which brings to mind a very enlightening case that I participated in on a Grievance Committee, as a member of a Grievance Review Committee where we were looking at the issue involved in part involved the letters of recommendation. You know what really did those letters of recommendation say? And as members of the Review Committee, the Grievance Committee, we couldn’t see the letters of recommendation, but we could see a report that was submitted by I guess two members of the faculty that looked into the letters of recommendation. In other words, the letters of recommendation were not available to us. And the reviewers of the letters of recommendation said that they were fine letters of recommendation and fully supportive of the candidate. The administration took the position that, no, the letters of recommendation didn’t support the candidate. So at that point we called in the chief administrative officer in the university, which was not President Bloustein; maybe he wasn’t chief, second chief, and that was Alexander Parn [sp].

COHEN: Alexander Parn [sp].

MANSPEIZER: And we asked him. We said, “How is it possible—“ And this was also a very large department; perhaps the largest department in the university. Where the candidate had overwhelming support here in Newark. He had fairly strong support in New Brunswick; that’s ninety percent of that discipline, of the section in New Brunswick. This is a case that goes back probably three or four years ago, although the hearing was, I think, last year, two years ago.

COHEN: The late eighties then.

MANSPEIZER: Yes. Oh, yes, yes. Late eighties, middle eighties, or something like that. We said, “How is it possible that the letter was written by faculty members of different universities to faculty members here in this particular college—“ Because letters are written to the chairman in the department. And then those letters are then reviewed by other members within that discipline, and all of these, you know, faculties, various faculties within the discipline, strongly support and read the letters of recommendation one way, and the administration reads it totally differently?” The response from Dr. Parn was something like, we’re the only people in the university, the Summit Committee, we’re the only people in the university who can properly evaluate those letters, which seemed to be absolute nonsense. And in fact we said so in our
review of that particular case. That there seemed to be in this particular case, whether it’s right or wrong, there was prejudice on the part of the administration—not for the person, not as a personal prejudice, but rather a prejudice against the particular discipline—or sub-discipline—within the field.

COHEN: Going back, what were the periods, what time during the past, let’s say, fifteen or twenty years, sixties, seventies, has it been most difficult to get tenure on this campus?

MANSPEIZER: I think it was in fact the seventies, I think, during the time the university was complaining about finances. In fact, if I’m not mistaken, at that point—and you might check the record—the university came out with an Appendix B or Appendix E, that spoke of, you know, other issues, other factors that might be involved in tenuring somebody. I think the finances were in there. But I remember something about it, that it was a little different than we’d seen before.

COHEN: Anything else that you can think of that you might want to talk about, about the tenuring process?

MANSPEIZER: No. I mean offhand I can’t think of any. I would if I could. I don’t know. I guess tenure is good certainly from our perspective, the faculty, you know. Certainly tenure is good in that it enhances, you know, faculty members’ opportunity to do research, to do work, to develop students, to develop programs, to search for truth. And without it, I think the university might be a little heavy-handed in what it did. I think it might be motivated by factors other than research and teaching. It probably would not be a healthy environment to work in without that. And I don’t doubt that many faculty as they’re approaching the end of their tenure, that is to say before they retire, many faculty probably would be let go, you know, when they’re fifty or sixty. And this way the university can save a large bundle of money, a tremendous amount of money, and probably would put the money into other programs and hire young faculty at a third the cost.

COHEN: Did we talk about the question of academic freedom as one of the reasons for tenure?

MANSPEIZER: No. But I’m not sure how viable that whole thing is. Well, I mean except for the case of Jeffries.

COHEN: Yes.

MANSPEIZER: For our own case here, you know, it’s hard to really address that whole issue. And so would faculty have academic freedom if they didn’t have tenure? I don’t know. Perhaps you can look at it from another way, look at it from the assistant professor who doesn’t have tenure. Do they practice academic freedom? Sure they have academic freedom to do what they want. I mean that’s probably true within limits. Certainly a Professor Jeffries, without academic—an assistant professor I doubt would say what Jeffries said. It would certainly be apolitical—it would be a stupid move on that person’s part. Maybe that’s not right. It’s not. It’s not a stupid move. If indeed the facts were correct and if indeed it was a matter of principle, then the person should take that position. And we’ve seen in the faculty certainly during the Vietnam War and Cambodia, I mean there are a lot of young faculty without tenure that got up and spoke their mind and spoke their piece. Were they then wrongly affected by that? You know perhaps
so. Perhaps there were some members, in your own department, who said, with that person’s political viewpoint, we don’t need him here in the department. No doubt it happens with certain kinds of studies as well. I’m not sure you’re ever going to find out, though. I mean I don’t think you ever get the real numbers. Much in the case like, you know, sexual harassment. It’s very difficult to prove. Certainly there are probably many cases where a young assistant professor cannot do the kind of research that they want to or have been trained to because their department needs that person in a particular field. If that person wants to stay on, perhaps he has to do certain kinds of research.

COHEN: And then once they get tenure, then they can…

MANSPEIZER: Then they might.

COHEN: …some work that they really want to do.

MANSPEIZER: Yes, yes, yes. I know for myself tenure was difficult to get. But I became much more productive after I had it. Much more productive.

COHEN: After you—

MANSPEIZER: Oh, absolutely. Absolutely.

COHEN: Can you expand on that? Because wasn’t the impetus to turn out more work, more publications?

MANSPEIZER: Remember I was on the faculty for a long time. So back in the sixties, the amount of research, maybe research publications, didn’t amount to what it does today.

COHEN: It wasn’t required.

MANSPEIZER: Well it was required…

COHEN: To the extent that it is today?

MANSPEIZER: I don’t think so. I think we were much more lax.

COHEN: Oh!

MANSPEIZER: I think it would be very difficult for most of the members of the faculty—this is probably true of most universities—to get tenure today than it was.…

COHEN: Then it was then.

MANSPEIZER: Yes, twenty, thirty years ago. I think the standards certainly have changed. I think everybody acknowledges that—recognizes that. So we spent a lot of time doing other kinds of things which might have been very useful to the university. So I got involved with, you know,
different kinds of committees: admissions, academic standards, you know, things like that. And scholarship was rated a little less important I think than it certainly is today. Absolutely. But you still had to publish.

COHEN: Sure. So how did getting tenure stimulate this growth in your productivity?

MANSPEIZER: I think I had much more freedom to do what I wanted to do. And I had less concern over the whole thing of tenure, having to produce.

COHEN: I mean was part of the motivating force the next promotion or was that the consideration? Or was it just what you just said, there was more freedom to do what you wanted to do?

MANSPEIZER: Yes.

COHEN: Follow the paths that were maybe more fruitful to you.

MANSPEIZER: Yes, yes. It was much more fruitful. And it may be true of other members of the faculty. I suspect it was. So I was much more productive after I got it. You know the problem with tenure also is that you consume a lot of time with paperwork, putting the package together.

COHEN: Oh, I see. Oh, boy! Wow!

MANSPEIZER: That’s a lot of time.

COHEN: Oh, yes.

MANSPEIZER: And you’re not very productive at that time because your mind is really somewhere else, your concerns are somewhere else. And I’m certain that’s true of most people here. A lot of faculty certainly are concerned—young faculty—are concerned with tenure and rightfully so. So they turn out, you know, a lot of publications which I guess is good. I don’t know if he needs to turn to his classes. I don’t know. It’s…. Certainly it’s changed.

COHEN: Okay. Thank you very much again.

MANSPEIZER: Well, you’re quite welcome.

[End of Tape #4]

---------------------------------------------[End of Interview]---------------------------------------------

Reviewed and Edited by Catherine Carey 4/16/2013