

Interview with: Jerome Roth

1.29.2001

Interviewed by Marcus Robyns

3301 Seaborg center, Northern Michigan University, Marquette, Michigan

Start of Interview

(Marcus Robyns) Ok Dr. Roth would you tell why exactly you became active in the AAUP? And about when that was?

(Jerome Roth) Yeah that's kind of a long answer. When I came here I was a member of the AAUP which is a national organization and their interest are in maintaining academic integrity throughout the professoriate in the country and it's been a very active professional organization for a long time. I hadn't been terrible active before I came here but when I went to a meeting of the AAUP I was a little bit shocked that it was such a small group! And I just got active in the organization as the professional organization that sort of backdoor way. They needed some people to help run the local chapter and I sort of got tabbed. One of the things that came up fairly quickly was this was about 1970, the fact that the AAUP chapter here was becoming considered about the current president and his cavalier attitude towards some of the professional standards of AAUP strongly endorsed. And that gets a little complicated what the issues were but we had some trouble here back in the 60s in which professor Harden had basically been run out of town for trying to fire tenured faculty, that's a good example what the AAUP stands for. They would have brought in the national organization and did at the time and that was in 1966 or so before I got here actually. So there was still all that sort of hanging over the campus from a fairly... that went to court. I mean the district court and essentially the university lost in that particular case. And the issue was an issue of academic freedom essentially and there was still all that hanging around and Dr. Jamrich came in after a couple years later in 68' there was an interim president Dr. Johnson for one year and he got off in a pretty good foot with the faculty actually, Dr. Jamrich and I came here exactly the same time we started the same month. So I had no preset ideas about him or the campus or academic freedom or anything else but it quickly became apparent that there had been problems here fairly recently, Dr. Jamrich was sort of a breath of fresh air we had hoped but he was a professional educator from Lansing who had been essentially picked by the governor to run the place and to replace Ed Harden. He was very confident and very knowledgeable about the budget, he knew higher ED up and down throughout the state, he knew secondary ED too, he knew all about teacher education programs he's a musician himself. You know he had good credentials and you he was Dr. Jamrich he wasn't just some guy that we got to run the budget, which kind of what Ed Harden was who really was a used cars salesman kind of guy. [Laughs] A very successful one though! [Continues laughing]

(M) Can we go back to if you were to name some basic principles then to what motivated you to join the AAUP would you call it academic freedom, tenure and...?

(J) Well I already was a member and so I just joined the chapter and I kind of got drafted into the executive committee. Lesile Foster was the professor from English for a long time and he basically had kept a really limping chapter alive, he was a very strong believer in the AAUP red book, which I had never even heard of at that point. [Laughs] and he was handing out copies and stuff he was quite aggressive about the AAUP so I guess kind of got caught up in his enthusiasm for academic freedom I had supported AAUP before.

(M) What about pay, was pay ever an issue or was it just shared governance, academic freedom, a tenure that type of thing? What was...?

(J) Yeah it was, I'd say the big issues when it came right down to it were academic freedom, we had a budget recession sort of thing in 1972 or thereabouts. Dr. Robert Glen, had just been appointed provost one of the first things he did was start slashing the budgets throughout the academic program.

(M) We are going to ask you about him.

(J) Yeah and he was very high handed about it and very cavalier too. I mean he thought it was funny [Laughs] was the attitude he had you know. He had no sympathy for what happened to the people I didn't think. And that was the impression most people had at the time, it was style as much as substance. The trouble was that there was an alleged budget short fall and that was the problem, in those days there was no Freedom of Information Act in 1972, so we couldn't see the budget so we couldn't tell if what they were telling us about the budget was true. We never had a budget shortfall like what they were talking about something like a million dollars or something was in the budget at that time that was a much bigger chunk than it is today. And so they were cutting positions basically, academic positions and you had nothing else that was being cut, that was the problem. Clearly the faculty were being targeted again it seemed to the faculty and that was a major issue, salary was one of them too it went with that. But the university always claimed poverty when it was, when it came to salary increases and they were pitifully small. You wouldn't believe what I was hired here as. [Laughs]

(M) Can we backup now and you literited to it earlier when you mentioned when you got here and the problems on campus. Can you described the McClellan affair? In a little bit more detail as to how...?

(J) I wasn't here so I can't give you firsthand information but Bob McClellan was still in the history faculty at that time and very active on campus and campus politics. Here's how that happened as I remember it. Like I said about 1970 we started hearing rumblings about you know Dr. Jamrich is not the answer to the academic freedom problems we've had here, one of the things he did for example he decided to turn down Kay hall. That caused a great campus wide fier and basically there was no appeal, I mean he basically decided to do that it was a very high handed decision. The alumni poured letters in, I mean it was very impassion stuff, Kay hall really kind of a dump in a way but he was very insensitive to what the alumni and the students faculty felt about the building. It was kind of an ugly building it looked like Marquette branch Prison North. [Laughs] you had the towers and the sandstone turrets and all that stuff, it was really just a big square brick box with a nice face on the front. But it was a landmark and he just

decided this an old building its 70 years old or 65 at the time he deiced to tear this down and build something better because you know I'm not going to have my office in there. [Laughs]

(M) How did, I know you said you weren't here when the actual McClellan event occurred but can you talk a little bit about any repercussions or how the faculty talked about it or felt about it when it accorded?

(J) I can only discuss that from hear say because the case had already been settled for about a year or so when I got here. One of the faculty in the chemistry department, Jon Frei had been very active in it in the legal proceeding and stuff and he sort of told me some of the things that had happened. But basically the issue was we were in a very expansion mode at the time as a campus and the university was buying up property around the campus so they could expand. West Science building was just now being renovatd well just had been built and they were trying they had big plans for more dormitories out here and they just built those. More dormitories over there, they were trying to move east on the campus and there was a lot of privet residents there and some of the faculty including Bob McClellan specifically had helped to organize the homeowners against the university campus to prevent them from having their property condemned! Which is was the practice in those days and still is really. When the greater goods is served by condonation you can actually move people out of their homes which is kind of a sacred thing. You'll still find some of those people still living over there because [laughs] they didn't want to move then and they still don't want move, there is a lot fewer of them and there is only few left I think there is a half a dozen houses left on whatever it is street.

(M) Do you feel though that the McClellan controversy was so intense that faculty remembered it and it kind of...?

(J) Oh yes!

(M) Did people talk about it or it kind of avoided people talking about it? Did they?

(J) Yeah a lot of the faculty that were here in the 70s had been here in the 60s although there was a lot of new people like me who hadn't been too. I mean they were still building up the faculty at the time that's why the sort of retrenchment we went through in 72' was such a shock we had been in expansion mode there's lots of money. In those days the golden days of higher ED all you had to do was go down to Lansing and ask for money and they just gave it to you, you know. There was no accounting for it or any competitive thing about, you only get so much you know everybody get the same percent increase all that stuff. That was way in the future in those days so in 72' suddenly the aroma flattened out and we had a budget shortfall and bang! The faculty get picked on to take the brunt of it, it seemed like, at least that's the way it seemed to everybody, we couldn't prove anything else because we couldn't actually see the budget! But the McClellan affair defiantly had fallout affects I would say with a lot of the more senior faculty who were there at the time. All of them are gone now I'm sure.

(M) Ok another event that occurred that we identified as a possibly having an impact on getting people involved was the Fred Harris case. Do you recall the Fred Harris case?

(J) A little bit. Yes.

(M) Do you remember how that impacted your organizing efforts?

(J) Yes I do remember something about that and the case was one of... he had been terminated for cause as I recall.

(M) The committee had decided that he should receive tenure and Jamrich ignored that.

(J) Basically that was the case. Now for that one I was involved in that but I was not on the committee that evaluated that whole process so my memory of that is much weaker than the people who actually looked at the case. We had a committee who actually looked at that particular case and I think we actually contacted AAUP national to help support our position. And it looked like it might be another case that might go to court and with Bob McClellan issue still fresh in everybody's mind nobody wanted that to happen again. But it looked like that might be the case.

(M) Did the AAUP national come through with some sort?

(J) They gave us initially, I think they had letters of phone calls of inquiry to the president and I think he could see that it was going to get serious. I forget how that finally resolved, I think Harris just finally left on his own didn't he? He decided not to pursue the case or something he got another position or something like that, he didn't have any future here I guess.

(M) But it did have...

(J) I forget how that finally resolved itself but it sort of fizzled out.

(M) Now here is a very broad and general question leading up until...

(J) That wasn't a big issue I guess in terms of organizing although it added to the overall flavor that this was just another guy just like the last guy, you know? And that's what people were coming to realize is that we hadn't had a fresh start with Jamrich he was very much like the previous guy in terms in spite of his personality was a lot different.

(M) Now well, in the early 70s while this is going on there appears to be some kind of competition between the AAUP and MEA.

(J) Yes!

(M) That's going.

(J) Bob McClellan and some other people in Education were very strongly supporting the MEA as, you have to appreciate there was a new law passed by the legislator that allowed state employees to organize against their employer. You know in collective bargaining arrangement. Many states didn't have that in fact they still don't, at the time only New York and I think California and maybe Pennsylvania or something like that I forget what the states were...

(M) You mean it was a state law that allowed public employees to organize?

(J) Yes. Before that you couldn't. And that meant that we couldn't either and when that law was passed, us being a strong labor state in general unions popped up all over. Corrections officers

got a union, and since the campuses in the state of Michigan are antonymous we did not have a state wide system of university professors, each campus was antonymous and there for each collective bargaining unit could be determined by each campuses faculty. There had already been one formed at Oakland University almost as soon as it happened, I don't know what it was Oakland had some troubles there similar to kinds of things that we had and they organized a union imminently as soon as the law was passed practically. And Central had also organized an EMA union or was in the process, Central Michigan was organized an EMA union. The Oakland was AAUP and there was also AFT was trying to get in on the action as well but they were not as highly thought of by university faculty. They were more of a K-12 kind of group or even more stringent union people than that as a matter of fact.

(M) Now Jim Greene has said that the AAUP probably wouldn't have called for collective bargaining election if it hadn't been for the threat from the MEA...

(J) That's right.

(M) Do you agree with that? You want expand on that?

(J) Well let me put it this way it's hard to say what would have happened otherwise. We clearly discussed it frequently about the feasibility of it and our membership began to swell as we began to talk about collective bargaining in the chapter meetings. We went from about twenty active member out of potential three hundred, we started getting people showing a lot of interest and coming to our meetings all of a sudden. And we were in the funny position having to oppose another faculty group who was trying to do something for the faculty and it was kind of an odd political situation for us, we didn't really want to oppose the MEA people but we felt it was a mistake to go in that direction.

(M) Why is that?

(J) Well MEA is mostly a K-12 kind of collective bargaining group and we were concerned and I think rightly so that any contract we negotiated would have to conform to the MEA standards for contracts. The AAUP not even being a collective bargaining organization was going to let us write any contract we wanted, now that put us more on our own but we wouldn't have to conform to some national standard contract which is what we didn't want to be leased up with. There is just problems with having to have a master agreement that is determined by somebody else, we felt that would be a bad idea. I think that was correct, I think that was a bad idea! [Laughs] so on the hand they were much more aggressive union they could get all this money behind the union organizing effort and they could get union organizers in here that could help talk people into stuff and to whip up the interest level and stuff. Well we didn't need that we didn't think, so we were in the funny position of having to be the foot-draggers basically on collective bargaining all at the same time we had to make a decision whether we wanted to do it or not and we were pretty much forced into doing it just so we wouldn't be naysayers. Because it was clear that's the tenor the way things were going and so the MEA organizers, Bob McClellan and others whom I could recall if I had some notes in front of me I guess, couple people from Education I remember, were very strife saying you want to have a strong organization this is how you do it. You get a strong national organization behind you, the AAUP is not even a collective bargaining agency so...

(M) It did by 72' declare it was you know in favor and ratified it by 73' collective bargaining so it was happening around the same time.

(J) Right right so...

(M) But it didn't have a history like MEA.

(J) That's right. And Oakland was the first AAUP chapter in this state and there weren't very many nationally even. So we looked very closely at what they had done, we had liked what they had done. They incorporated the red book, the basic document of the AAUP into the contract as a boilerplate kind of issue, they made that the legal document for the chapter and for the university when they were a collective bargaining unit. And we thought that was a great idea so that's what we went for, we said this much stronger on academic freedom and governance was really what we were after. One of the problems that was sort of a creeping problem was this, I served on the senate along with a lot of other people already even though I was just an assistant professor I was very active in the senate, it's called a faculty senate in those days, not the academic senate there is a clear distinction this was exclusively faculty. And we had a whole structure in place that had been there for some years, although it wasn't a real long standing organizing all we could do was recommend stuff including things about the curriculum. All we could do was recommend curriculum decisions, the real authority was with the academic vice president or later the provost to approve or not approve what we recommended. You know we felt like there ought to be more control over the curriculum that's traditionally the faculty's responsibility not the presidents, not the academic vice president he shouldn't be the one to propose and dispose that's a faculty prerogative pure and simple. It's an academic freedom issue again and also a curriculum issue, if we are going to be in charge of the curriculum of this university then we have to have stronger on campus language than what we had. That was one of the issue that came up during the many discussions that, I think some program had gotten eliminated or something some curriculum decision was made over in the president's office that this is not a viable program dump it, I don't even remember what it was, or some proposal from the senate had been turned down I forget why, I don't even remember which one it was. But there was clearly that element involved that the faculty were not in charge of the curriculum really when it came right down to it. We put in you know many many man hours working on a proposal and at the end of the process be told no not going to fly.

(M) Not given much of a reason?

(J) No and that was the other thing very high handed sort of imperils decision making. Something with Kay hall you know, I'm going to tear this down and build my own building here, you know Jamrich was really in your face about some of this stuff, you know he not only did have to tear down Kay he had to build his new building right on the same sight. That really offended people and put up a fairly ugly building in the process besides if he had a least good taste you know? [Laughs]

(M) So why then did the MEA fail in 1971 when they attempted to organize and there was an election?

(J) We apposed them. We said you know they are the wrong organization for this campus and we can do a better job if you just defeat them we will go on the ballot we will try again. That's when we made the decision to go for.

(M) So AAUP decided to really begin organizing in 71'?

(J) I mean we had to we couldn't just keep saying vote against these guys because clearly they had a point, we needed to do something collective bargaining was a possibility and we had been talking about it. And we weren't, frankly a lot of the people in the AAUP were not at all convinced that collective bargaining was the right way to go, we wanted to do it the more traditional arm twisting, sort of campus politics way which is the way the AAUP usually have gotten its standards in place. The university had nominally at least indorsed the AAUP red book at the times in the past, it's that they were opposed to them jus they weren't living by them. [Laughs] when it came right down to it they were violating those rules. And we had do recourse when they did.

(M) Can you then describe then the process of how you approached, starting in 71' to actually organize and get the faculty together leading up to 75'?

(J) Well Leslie Foster was very ambient about having a union, frankly he wasn't very much in favor of it, he was the president and a very active and aggressive president and a good president. He understood the AAUP policies better than anybody! But me and a few other people I guess, Jon Saair and I remember became active about that time, and Jim Greene. We began talking to them and they were not in the AAUP I think originally as I recall but became active when the collective bargaining issue became a possibility. That was probably the smartest thing I ever did was recruit Jim Greene and Jon Saari or helped to do so because I remember we had many many meetings over in the upstairs conference room in the LRC at noon time doing politics basically and at one point you know we had the votes basically in the AAUP to go that way and Lesile Foster didn't like it but he went along with it but he was really apposed I think. So we kind of took the organization away from him in a sense at least that's the way he felt about it, but it was clearly the only viable thing to do we couldn't just keep opposing MEA and we had to do something. So we went on the ballot, so Jim is absolutely right if MEA hadn't pushed the issue we might not have done it. With Leslie in charge we wouldn't have.

(M) So what did you do to get the faculty in? Did you go hand to hand, did you go door to door did you hand our leaflets what brought these people in? I mean what got you...?

(J) They perceived there was a problem and they recognized that the AAUP could be the best answer, they just weren't sure whether AAUP had the kind of tradition and knowledge of background of collective bargaining was needed, that's why people were tending to go look at the MEA possibility really strong they had a long tradition of collective bargaining. So what we had to do was convince them that we were serious about it, not only did we have to decide to go on the ballot, we had to convince them we were going to go whole hog. We wanted to win.

(M) Ok how did you do that?

(J) Well I felt for me and a few other people to just to jawbone people, we went around talk to people who were active in various departments when it came time to muster the votes and stuff I had a telephone tree that I organized I had a bunch of people I would call up and they would call a bunch of other people and so on. To turn out the vote on short notice or turn out membership on short notice to have meetings, we had emergency meetings and stuff fairly often it seemed like! I don't know how we did all that my god! [Laughs] I don't remember, I can't remember all the things we did. In some cases I wound up spending entire evenings just calling up people and talking to them and commiserating with them and saying we think we have a better solution you know.

(M) Did everybody do that did Jim do that? Jon Saari?

(J) I think they did somewhat but it seemed I was the secretary quite often and that it seem a lot of that feel on me. Everybody helped out to a certain extent but the issues of who to jawbone were probably left mostly to me. I think Jim was more... the office has changes so my memory of some of that is a little vague. We exchanged offices but there is a basic core of people; Jim Greene, Jon Saari, me, Lesile Foster we finally got some active interest from the school of nursing. Turns out a lot of the nursing faculty were very interested in this and they had a crisis there which I don't remember the nature of at this point but they had been slitted by the president in some way, I forget how. But the entire nursing the faculty was up in arms I remember about something that happened, I don't even remember what it was now. They joined up almost at mass. [Laughs] Yeah and that was one our strongest departments initially I think. In chemistry for example half of the faculty never did join, I don't think because they just didn't think that collective bargaining was a good idea. The sciences tend to be a little bit more conservative about stuff like that. It was about half of the faculty did and half the faculty didn't, it caused some divisions in the department for a while. It caused divisions in a lot of departments for a while frankly, you know whether to vote for or against and the faculty were kind of split on the issues in many ways. In the end though everybody really came around, I mean as the process went along Dr. Jamrich did, it seemed like everything he did helped us. He just couldn't stop screwing up.

(M) Can you explain or describe some examples of what he did?

(J) Well continued using high handed techniques you know the veto power kind of thing. Probably the thing that turned people off the most when it came right down to... well the first thing he did was he went into a delay mode, he challenged the ballot, did you hear about that?

(M) Yeah.

(J) That cost a whole year of time, and what he was trying to do was run us out of money, he was hoping he would kill the process by drawing up the big guns holding up the wires.

(M) Trying to use an oppressive opposition.

(J) Exactly and he knew that we didn't have any money, I mean we weren't part of a national organization that was collective bargaining all we had were our local dues. And here we had to go out and hire a lawyer to fight the university you know. I'm not sure how we worked the budget

for that [Laughs] I'm glad I wasn't treasurer that year! But we got Neno Greene to become involved and I'm not sure if that was the first person we talked to but he was the one of our attorneys that we consulted with. That was probably a little later though, the initial process we winged it on our own without an attorney basically, we did our own legal work, and Jim Greene did the legal work and it turned out he had a real nose for the stuff.

(M) Still does.

(J) Still does and you know he is brilliant, he researched the laws which he didn't know that much about before I don't think, and the issue was a ballot issue. Dr. Jamrich challenged our ballot that we were proposing to run the election on I mean we brought in the state labor relation board people, they certified that we could have an election, that we collected cards, we found out how to do that we had to learn how. [Laughs] We were ground zero when we started and basically we got lot of our information from the MEA guys! [Laughs] We watched what they were doing and they were passing cards around so we passed some cards around too. We thought we had a better solution though so it was kind of worth it and again I wasn't terribly involved in all the mechanic of some of that but passing cards was one of the things we did do and having people sign up as members, all you had to do was pay your dues and sign a card and you were a member. With the understanding that we were going to go on the ballot and you know...

(M) So was there anything else....

(J) Ballot delay issue I think everybody saw through right away as just a delay tactic and a method to try to delay the ballot and that really pissed people off.

(M) Light of the literature that we have seen from Jamrich that he has written, he constantly reiterating over and over again that there is consistence governance that he opened up the process to people, that everybody would be for it and so forth.

(J) And every time he did something that showed what a lie that was. He was deluding himself at best, he wasn't deluding anybody else though. I think, yeah he did say you know the university describes to the red book and all that stuff but when it came right down to it he did always what he wanted because it was clearly the old style university grandfather university president making the decisions for the good of everybody kind of attitude. But what that meant was he went against most people's wishes in a lot of times and he justify by saying I'm the president what else do you want me to do? He did not run by conscience he thought he did perhaps but he liked to think he did, he liked to be liked you know? But that doesn't mean that he ran the place like it should've by any means. He was delusional about it almost at various points, in fact that was one of the things that really turned the election for us. When it came it right down when we finally did get the ballots out, two days before Election Day one day, two days I think he came around to the LRC when they tore down Kay hall they turn all the faculty who were in Kay hall here into the LRC basement. In these little cubical, they didn't call them cubical in those days but that's what Gilbert would call them, that's what they were. They were tiny offices with no privacy and they jammed everybody in there! Except the people in West Science were the only other faculty on campus a few in what is it Carrie Hall I guess was still there but just about everybody who vacated Kay Hall had been jammed into these tiny cubical it was very insulting kind of thing to

have happen first of all. People were really pissed off about that who had to endure that for the next twenty years really. Temporary offices they were called [Laughs] well it was twenty years of temporary offices is a long time! Even then whatever they got was probably not going to be temporary they were going to be there for quite a while but there was no building plans in the future for faculty office building or anything like that. They knew they were stuck in there for quite a while and people were really not happy about that, it wasn't that they got jammed into those tiny offices they were brand new after all and the building was even new it had just been opened but it was just had the fact that they hadn't had anything to say about it! It effected half of the faculty at least! And they really kind of steamed about it! It turned out to be a good thing for us though because all I had to do was go across to West Science, I could talk to half the faculty [Laughs] when I wanted to do some politicking you know it was easy they were all right there! Where before I had to walk all over campus! [Laughs] It was a lot of work! It really helped but it came right down to it Dr. Jamrich had never been seen over there since the temporary offices had opened and by this time it was 1974 or 5 or something. Several years had gone by in this whole process and the faculty had been squeezed in there for several years and nobody had seen Dr. Jamrich over there ever before. Never been around the faculty offices that anybody could remember. So what happened? The two days before the election he comes over to the faculty office, LRC starts pumping hands and saying I hope you vote the right way and stuff you know. It was so transparent and negative political that it just turned everybody off. People who were going to vote against the union, both unions voted for! [Laughs] Everything he did helped! He shot himself in the foot every time because he just didn't have a clue about what the issues were. He thought he was doing a good job, I'm sure he convinced himself that he did but he just was not, he didn't have a clue what the issues were. The issues were the faculty wanted to have some say in running the university that's basically it and he didn't want them to have that. He felt that he was giving them all, well that was it he was giving them. What he thought they wanted. But he felt it was his right to give or to take away.

(M) Now Jim also talked about the selection of Glen as provost as a being a major catalyst.

(J) No question.

(M) Can you talk about that a little bit? Can also go elaborate more about Glen after the fact, after he becomes provost and how that affected things?

(J) The dean of Arts and Sciences that hired me was Tom Griffiths who happened to be in the department of Chemistry he went on sabbatical shortly after I was hired so I didn't really see him in office very long and Bob Glen was hired as his replacement... as the dean of Art and Sciences. He was in the position for about three years when Jamrich decided to go into a provost structure for the university, I'm not sure how that really is different than an academic vice president except that they have more budget power. I can't remember the exact sequence of events but Bob had not been appreciating himself with the faculty in Arts and Sciences during his short tenure as dean. So...

(M) Why was that?

(J) Well he just had an abrasive style, he was a very literate, articulate person but he had this acid sense of humor and in many ways he was a mirror of Dr. Jamrich that is I'm in charge. And you may not like my decisions but you don't get a vote, more less that was his attitude about things. [Laughs] And every department had some kind of a friction with him at various times I mean he was not an appeaser by any means he didn't not like to smooth things over personally I think a lot of people liked him because he was so glim and he had such a clever sense of humor and he was so aeriodite you know he had the equipment that you wanted to have in the dean of Arts and Sciences or in a provost for that matter. Academically University of Michigan graduate the whole thing! Well one of the first University of Michigan people happen to be in a position of authority, almost all of our administrative were from Michigan State before that. There's a strong tradition of Michigan State people here and that was part of the trouble, Ed Harden, Jamrich, everybody who had been involved in the 60s through the 70s were from Michigan State it seemed like. Partly that was because of the governor George Romney I think he had some connections there or something, I'm not sure why that had happened anyway. But we had a long tradition of Michigan State people here which is not a bad thing except I think one of the things that Dr. Jamrich did when he came here was he wanted to make this the Michigan State of the north, so we had extension programs all over the U.P very expensive ones and he was doing that while he was telling the faculty that we are poor and we had to lay off people. But he is pouring down money in rat holes all over the place that really didn't just warrant the attention or the money, and it was that kind of thing. That really made people angry, they could see the money was there was lots of money there and it was just that it was his decision was the faculty were the most expendable. You know it was all about enrollment just like it is now, you know it wasn't such a crisis issue as it seems to be sometimes.

(M) Ok how do you preserve though let's get back to how the faculty preserve Glen's election? Were they...?

(J) It was not viewed with great admiration and rejoicing because we already had a history with him and we knew what kind of administrator he would be and he was very high handed while he was in office.

(M) So why do you think then, the way it we understand what's happened was that the committee present their selections and Glen was not up for the top three. Then you have Jamrich pick Glen.

(J) Exactly yeah I remember that now that you said. Well because I think Bob he were up in mind about which way this place ought to go and Bob had the balls to make the tough decisions and take the heat, Jamrich didn't like taking the heat he liked making the decisions but not taking the heat so he wanted to be loved. You know it felt very transparent but Bob appointed to be the hatchet man and yes I remember that very well surprised I forgot that issue but there was a committee and they did the recommendations and that is actually true Bob was not on the list yet he was appoint. It was a fairly typical Jamrich decision, you know I know what I want I'll let people go through the motions of picking, thinking they are involved and then I'll do what I want. And that's was exactly why we had to have a union! That is a perfect example of why we need the union [Laughs] he was going to let us go through the motions spin our wheels, waste

our time and then he was going to do what he wants anyway. Very typical, very typical and yet it wasn't so much Bob Glen as it was the way the decision was made that really infuriated people and then Bob knowing he was persona an grata as far as faculty was concerned basically got even. Yeah that's the way it seemed like anyway he seldom took, didn't not to miss an opportunity of rubbing it in that he was the provost and he was in charge even though he wasn't our popular selections you know, he never said so in so many words but he said he took glee in turning the night you know? [Laughs] And that you know I can't believe after he was bounced from that position with the new president Appleberry in 82' he went back over in English I'm surprised how they didn't shoot him after hours or something you know he was roundly despised and hated for his...

(M) Can you talk about anything that happened that he had done after his selection and up the election that might have really got people jabbed except for just the selection, did he make any immediate decisions?

(J) Well there was this budget reduction in 72' or 3' I think that he was very involved in...

(M) But he wasn't selected as provost until when was that?

(J) I think it's 72'

(M) Was it 72'?

(J) I think so sometime around there.

(M) Ok so the budget decision?

(J) So almost the first thing he did was cut the budget you know? So you know suspicions confirmed as far as the faculty was concerned this is just what we expected from this guy. You know he had to make some hard choices, that was the time and point where summer school was dropped from the university annual budget, summer school had to swim on its own, we are still working with that system now. That was one of the things that was done, actually that was Don Hickident who became dean of Arts and Sciences after Bob Glen that was one of his brainstorms was to take summer school which was a drag on the budget out of the annual budget and that would help balance it. What that meant was we couldn't offer much of a summer program because only the course of it had some sort of minimal enrollment that could ever be offered and summer school pretty light anyway. But that was one of the ideas it was fairly complicated issues, I remember having many meetings with Don Hickident over this but basically the budget goal that we had to meet was imposed by Bob Glen and without any real review by the faculty. That is, there was no need to demonstrate that there was a budget reduction necessary, in other words a retrenchment was at hand practically and that was the threat was if you don't find the money in the budget then I'll have to terminate positions because we have a serious budget problem here. Well what is the budget problem? We never had a budget problem before, why do we sudden have a budget problem? You know it seemed like it was artificial and you'll find people who believe to this day that it was, it was cooked up, because we could see this money that was going out these extension centers, huge amounts of money going to all sort of boondoggles, yet there was no money to do the basic business of the university. That just doesn't

seem right and in those days the president didn't have to prove there was a budget reduction, he just had to say there was. He didn't have to prove a thing he just had to say trust me. Well we didn't. [Laughs] At this point we no longer trusted the president and Bob Glen is you know just the hatchet man for the president so we didn't believe him either and we went through the exercise and they had a budget reduction we did some pretty radical things that have influenced us to this day but that nobody, I still don't believe that there really was a need for that. Maybe it was inevitable I think the subsequent years showed the budget reduction worked, that was just the first one we just never had to deal with that before and to me at the time you got to love the first one, the first major reduction we had to endure it seemed like artificial.

(M) Part of you didn't think it was real because you weren't given any information?

(J) Right

(M) And they say that it's not the case but you didn't have the freedom of information...

(J) Right and you know not only is there a Freedom of Information Act but collective bargaining requires that and that was one of the major issues for having a collective bargaining agent. We can require the university to share the budget information with us before they declare a financial exigency that was actually already in the red book which they said they said subscribe to but they never shared the budget information at any kind of throw away to prove that such a budget reduction was in fact necessary. That was one of the major driving forces that convinced a lot of people that we really need a union so we can demand the budget information when we need to do this, and that they cannot just trump this up every time they want to get rid of some people or keep us busy trying to solve budget problems that are artificial.

(M) Can we move to...?

(J) That was the perception anyway.

(M) Ok the vote occurred, AAUP won and now we move to negotiations in the contract. Now you were on the...

(J) Let me tell you about the elections though that year.

(M) Oh ok.

(J) I don't know if those guys remember this or not but I had been on the executive committee for of the AAUP right from the beginning at one form or another I held every office except president and I said Eddie now that the ballot issue is going to be settled it looks like we are going to have an election next year for sure, we just have to pass enough cards, get enough members, get on the ballot, continue doing what we are doing we are going to win we got a good chance anyway. In the end it's a serious challenge though and it looked like it might be a 50/50 vote, the issue is the ballot issue I don't know if you recall what the issue was there?

(M) The departments heads...

(J) Well the department heads were one thing but no Dr. Jamrich actually had a very good point, the problem was the ballot was to really two votes. There was MEA, AAUP, and no agent, well

that's two different decisions really. Are you going to have collect bargaining or not and if you do who is the agent going to be is the second vote? Ok he argued that's what the ballot should be, it should be two votes because its nonsense you know, people are going to either want it or they are not. You already win. And you know no agent can be, you can call it the Jamrich party or something if you want but [Laughs] but you have to vote right for you. And that's the way collective bargaining ballots had been constructed in the past so he had a good legal point in a way but there was plenty of precedence for doing the way he was going to do it. So that dragged out for a year clearly it was settled, we knew how it was going to be settled...

(M) How was I settled?

(J) Well we were going to have the ballot the way we wanted. Cause there's plenty of precedence for doing it that way. It's wasteful to have multiple elections you know, technically he had a point the decisions are really separate but that had already been resolved by many presidents before that. Not in the university system maybe but in other collective bargaining votes. So you know when it came time to select a new executive committee for the coming year which was going to be a big vote year, and I was still on the executive committee and I certainly willing to do my part and the plan that broke down was Jon Saari was voted president that year and if you look at the official records you'll see him as the president of record during the ballot at the time. And I was vice president and I'd been secretary the year before or something like that, and so we doing our job and organizing the union and trying to bring in more members from disenfranchised people who were changing their minds I think. You know we were trying to get more people involved in the union because we were trying to convince them that it was inevitable which it was I think. Once we changed presidents all of sudden we were going to the vote and so one thing I didn't know was Jon Saari had applied for sabbatical leave! And he got it! [Laughs] For the second semester well that's when the vote was so without realizing it, I said I didn't want to be president during that but it feel to me to actually run the election that semester because Jon was gone! And frankly that was a little more authority then I really wanted at the time. [Chuckles] Not that it changed anything that I did it was just a lot more responsibility fell on me and I felt very unprepared for that. Jon will confirm that if you ask him I'm sure. That sneaky devil. [Laughs] He didn't know for sure if his sabbatical was going to be approved I guess but I don't recall him mentioning that when he ran for office! [Laughs]

(M) So how did you run the election?

(J) Well we ran our usual, you know we had to run our telephone trees and stuff like that, we had meetings and we would go around you know politicking everyday basically. Some people we knew were never going to change their minds, they were going to be opposed to any new in form. We didn't try to rub up against those guys too much and antagonize them but there were lots of people who were trendsetters who just weren't sure which way to go, having a union faculty union on campus was a new idea they didn't know what to think of that exactly. They thought somehow that diminished us in some way to do something that, that made us a lot more like the K-12 teachers instead of being university faculty, they were worried about image and stuff like that as much as anything. So all those kinds of perception issues that were a serious concern, I felt that way too! I didn't want to have a union really but there just didn't seem to be

any other way to take over the position that the faculty should have hold on any good campus. We had good faculty here but they were effectively in powerless situation and they were trying to grab control at least some of the issues that they felt the faculty should have on a university campus! Especially the curriculum and not being terminated for dubious reasons because somebody declared a financial exigency which is questionable. You know.

(M) Well you talk about then the negotiations, you were on the bargaining committee I believe?

(J) I was but I was never on the bargaining team.

(M) No you were on the negotiating team.

(J) I was on the negotiating team.

(M) Not the bargaining team. What can you remember about the negotiations and the final contract?

(J) Well that kind of blurs together because it was involved in a couple of them but initially our main effort was to get the AAUP red book installed as part of board plat of the first contract. We actually gave up a lot to get at because Jamrich took the position, well here's your first contract we start negotiating from ground zero, you are going to have to negotiate everything. We did extend a lot of efforts on what we considered governance issues and that's where we really had the advantage over the MEA they were not strong on governance issues, they were strong on salary issues and people were concerned about their salaries but they were much more concern about their careers! And their careers is closely tied to have something to say about the university's future, and otherwise they were just employees like the janitors or anybody else and that just the way Dr. Jamrich would have liked to kept it. So that was really the issue that turned the election for us, it wasn't really close at the end. I got to count the ballots by the way and I will never forget him walking up behind me and getting the final tally and looking over my shoulder and he was shocked that no agent got very few votes, I mean they got like twenty percent of the vote or something it was pitiful it wasn't even close. You know there was no question of having an appeal or a run-off or anything like that it wasn't a landslide but it wasn't really that close and he was shocked by that! He shouldn't have been I knew we were going to win, I had done my homework, I told everybody but he was shocked. I think it was genius sincere surprise, he just didn't know what was going.

(M) He just didn't know.

(J) He thought he did that was always the way with him, he thought he knew what was going on but he never really did know. It fit like the issue with consistence governance, he never really understood why we didn't like the way he was doing it. He never got it! God clueless isn't quite the word I guess but it's just the sort of thing when you influence yourself with people you hear what you want to hear and he was hearing what he wanted to hear which wasn't really what was going on. It wasn't untrue it just wasn't what was going on, the people he talked to always smiled and said things were fine but they weren't! You know it's the case of hearing what you want to hear I think.

(M) So we understood that you had... the administration then was very rough and being led by Glen and Jamrich and others were, which we are going to make this as difficult as possible then initially with the negotiations?

(J) Right.

(M) Every single item had to be...?

(J) Right that was their initial stance and Jim Greene was our first negotiator and he did not flinch from that, he has great credit. I mean he was at a very difficult spot, he had never done any negotiating before! What you have learned about negotiation you picked up on some something self-taught basically. The AAUP wasn't really that much help because they weren't really a collective bargaining agency although we had other contracts we could look at and stuff. Jim was a quick study and it was a good thing he was, I practically couldn't have done that job myself.

(M) Oh I was on the negotiating team with him this summer and I...

(J) He is is amazing isn't he? He's amazing. You know he picked up basically on his own and I don't know how he did that.

(M) I don't know how...

(J) He is a just very quick study and very bright guy who sees the other guys position right away. [Laughs] Knows what they are up to imminently. One of the reasons he is clearly one of the reasons why we won the election too, I think people recognized that with bright people like that running the union they had a good chance of doing what we said we were going to try to do. Without somebody like that you know Jim was in a very visible position there on the executive committee and jawboning, debating that's his strength. We had many open forums to discuss the issues, what would happen with tenure, what would happen with salaries, what would happen with governance, what would happen with all these issues under collective bargaining, we had lots of meetings like that. Jim always held the floor and he convinced a lot of people that it could work and there is no question that he was one of the main forces that... I don't think Leslie Foster was ever sure whether it would ever work or not he didn't really oppose us in the end but he was no longer on any executive committee by the time the votes actually were counted. He disassociated himself from it he didn't think the AAUP we should be in a collective bargaining business basically.

(M) Ok so you don't remember much then about the negotiating?

(J) The specific negotiation you'll have to jog my memory but I remember we went for the governance issues first as we promise, that's what we said we would do and that's what we did. And we gave up a lot of salary money to do that, we started off with some proposals there you know we had some sort of salary scale or something but we really couldn't spend a lot of time talking about it because the governance issues were complex and how to institutionalize the academic senate as a governing body of the university and build that into the infrastructure of the curriculum and give the committee of under graduate programs essentially the authority to make all curriculum decisions, which nominally they had before but now they had the strength of a

legal contract to back them up, they couldn't. Their options in the senate and things could not just be blown off.

(M) So the contract included language then that specifically put the faculty in position for determining control?

(J) At this contract or the next one we had to give some concessions that from some administrators were able to serve on the senate so it became the academic senate after that and I think that was in the first contract right away. They would not agree to have a faculty only senate make those decisions and I guess we had to concede that probably appropriate that the administration has to be involved at some level but I think initially they had no votes and also they were greatly outnumbered in terms of members. So we weren't too worried about it but it did establish the precedence that led to the current senate structure where there is probably as many as two administrators on there as anything else.

(M) Their major opposition was just that they be included in the process?

(J) Right.

(M) Initially and you have to commit to make that decision.

(J) And for promotion and tenure and evaluations became much more formalized I think after that and has continued along those long which is not necessary a bad thing. It's just has been a lot of paperwork, previously I think people could be recommend for promotion and tenure and things like that almost on the signature of the dean or somebody if they liked you. He has supporting documents but you don't get these annual reports like this one everybody like we do now. You know things were much more fluid in those days but that was part of the problem was if you had the dean or the president or the vice president didn't like you, can get a very negative recommendation too or prevention from getting tenure and you know how do you challenge that? It was already a process in place at that time but it became much more formalize and much more... how should I say... institutionalized then it had been before. We worked all that out in the first contract and one of the issue that...

(M) You are talking about the personal files.

(J) The personal files was an issue, I don't remember if it was in the very first contact but I believe it was. There was a case that came up through the AAUP before we were unionized in which statements were made, allegations made, there was nothing in the file to support this but the guy was essentially forced to resign based upon what had been said. One of the problems we ran into was there were files all over the place on people it was a very messy process, the dean had a file, the department head had a file, the faculty member had a file, the academic VP had a file on everybody! Not all the files were the same! There was various statements in one file that weren't in other, it was not clear whose file was the official file. Well nominally at least it was the academic vice presidents, or the provosts but in fact the department head had the most information on given faculty member but that wasn't the official file so when you came up for evaluations and when these kinds of allegations came up, where do you get your information is the issue! There were lots of files around, so we formalized the official file process so that there

was only one official file on a faculty member and that department heads had to forward copies of anything they wanted to keep on somebody. You couldn't keep all of these allegations and vague illusions and innuendo kind of statements in the departmental file and then they used that to get rid of somebody because you know, I heard you'd been dating your students kind of stuff, when there is nothing official like that. If you are going to make that kind of charge you better be able to back it up and you shouldn't be able to fire somebody based upon rumors which it seemed like it happened. Or at least forced them out, it was going to go to court or something if they wanted to fight it basically. And one of the issues that was important in the process was files, whose files had what information and when we tried to get access as to counsel this person, which the AAUP does in cases like this including the local chapter. Leslie Foster was very good at this by the way, he served as sort of a grievance officer before we had a union, he had handled a couple of sticky cases including the Fred Harris case I believe but he did that sort of on his own you know he was the grievance officer and he examined the case very closely and he was very good at that. But we did run into a problem there that we couldn't find out what the official information on this guy was and we couldn't get access to the files we didn't that was the other issue! We couldn't get access to the official file! The faculty member couldn't get access to his own file, to defend himself, he couldn't see what was in it! So how can you defend yourself, I mean it's a basic prominence of academic freedom, it's a basic prominence of US jurisprudence you ought to be able to see the evidence against you and we couldn't! So that became the personal files seemed like a petty issue in a lot of ways but it's very important when you run into a problem, once the basics of the information you are going to base the grievance on or you know the decision on and you better be talking about the same information and it better be in one place not scattered all over the place which is the way it was. So that was a provision of the first contract because people were sort of aware that there was a case out there like this where they didn't have the details of course, they couldn't but there were lots of rumors, you know campus politics and rumors get around campus pretty fast. People knew what some of the issues there were and that somebody had a fairly strong claim against somebody with no bases and the guy was basically forced out I think. Whether the guy is guilty or not of whatever was alleged is irrelevant. The issue was we couldn't get his file to defend him or to condemn him either and that was very odd but that was another typical high-handed move you know? I have the files they are my files you can't see them.

(M) It's power.

(J) Yeah it's a power issue that's right. Knowledge is power and they are my files.

(M) Well we pretty much exhausted all the questions I have is there anything of importance that we missed? Any fundamental theme, philosophical position or anything else that or even an event that might be important to understand the initial push?

(J) The initial? No I think that was it, it was a governance issue it was a matter of who runs the university. Is the university of the board of control? Is it the president or is it the faculty? We all had different opinions about that depending on who you are talking about. The faculty here rose up and said the faculty should be the university, not the president. That was heavy stuff at the time and you know nobody ever said that to a president here before, they never had the balls. Ed

Harden you didn't say stuff like that too he'd fire you on the spot. [Laughs] Dr. Jamrich at least tried to follow the rules up to a point but he really pretty much felt the same way Ed Harden did about who ran the university it was him. Period. And this is my empire and I run it the way I want... and yeah I have to follow some rules but I can basically can do what I want. You know basically were told him that's not the way a university should run, maybe that's the way you want to do it but good universities don't run like that.

(M) Ok we want to thank you very much sir for your time.

End of interview