



2004

Reinelt, Herbert Oral History Interview

George Blum

Follow this and additional works at: <https://scholarlycommons.pacific.edu/esohc>

Recommended Citation

Blum, George, "Reinelt, Herbert Oral History Interview" (2004). *Emeriti Society Oral History Collection*. 22.
<https://scholarlycommons.pacific.edu/esohc/22>

This Book is brought to you for free and open access by the University Archives at Scholarly Commons. It has been accepted for inclusion in Emeriti Society Oral History Collection by an authorized administrator of Scholarly Commons. For more information, please contact mgibney@pacific.edu.

FACULTY EMERITI INTERVIEWS
UNIVERSITY OF THE PACIFIC ARCHIVES



Reinelt, Herbert (1962-1999)
Professor of Philosophy

July 6, 2004

By George Blum

Transcribed by Rebecca Taylor, University Archives

Subjects: Experience of young faculty coming to Pacific in the 1960s, curriculum changes, Information and Imagination to Mentor, major personalities of his era, changes in student interests and community allegiances, evolution of faculty governance and board of regents, Pacific's contribution to Stockton.

UOP ARCHIVES EMERITI FACULTY INTERVIEWS
REINELT, HERBERT, Emeritus Faculty, College of the Pacific
July 6, 2004

BLUM: This is an interview of Herb Reinelt, an Emeritus Faculty member of COP. The interviewer is George Blum. Herb, we'll just follow the sequence of some of the questions that are presented on the traditional format of our interview questionnaire. First of all, what circumstances brought you to UOP? What in particular attracted you to UOP and the position here?

REINELT: I originally grew up on the West Coast in Seattle, so my family was out in the Northwest, and my wife's family were in California where her father was a Methodist minister. He had retired and had contracted Parkinson's disease and moved to Oakland. So we were hoping to find an opportunity to get out to the West Coast where we'd be closer to family – both my wife's family and to my own family. We'd been for three years in Minnesota at Hamline University. We were attracted to UOP because that was one of the options that was available to me at the time. There were jobs at San Jose State, if I remember correctly, and at Washington State. I was interested in UOP when they called me and asked me if I'd like to come and interview in part because of my wife's family. My wife's maiden name was Barbara Bodley and her uncle [Russell Bodley] was Dean of the Conservatory of Music at the present time and director of the A Capella Choir. She had family who had graduated from College of the Pacific, and so we knew something about the University. And when I was offered a job to come out here at the monumental salary, I think, of \$7200 a year, which was an increase over what I was getting at Hamline, I thought for the money and for the attractiveness of the campus, I would relocate out here. So primarily the move was motivated by the desire to get out to the West Coast.

BLUM: What were your first impressions of the city and the people of Stockton when you got here?

REINELT: I was struck by how hot it was. We had flown out, or driven out actually, with our worldly goods to Oakland, and my wife and I came over from the Bay Area to house-hunt and look around. It was one of those hundred degree plus days – I think it was about hundred and five degrees that day. Driving back to Oakland, to the Bay Area, around five o'clock in the afternoon after going around and looking at houses, I suddenly smelled smoke coming up from my floorboard and felt the heat that was coming up off the pavement and on to the metal of the gas pedal that had started the insulation under the floor mats to catch on fire. So I thought why, this is a hot welcome to Northern California and particularly to the Central Valley. So one of my impressions was, you know, it's hot in this place. At that time there wasn't any I-5 Freeway and so you came into town through on El Dorado Street, if I remember correctly. And as everybody who came back in that period knows, and even today if you come into the city on El Dorado Street via the viaduct into downtown Stockton, your first impression is a city somewhat in decline on

the south side. But when we hunted for houses we began looking north of the campus. We found the real estate agents were really accommodating. The houses were almost within our range of twenty thousand, approximately twenty thousand dollars, and so at least the initial impression was that the people of Stockton were pleasant and accommodating. We soon got to know a lot of people in the town as well as on the campus, partly through a program at the Anderson Y, Sack Lunch Seminar, which they had on Friday afternoons where there were some off-campus people as well as on-campus people who attended the luncheon and debated and argued about and discussed all kinds of questions from politics to religion to social affairs and whatever.

BLUM: During what years did you serve at UOP, and was all of that in one department?

REINELT: I was at UOP – I came in 1962 and I retired in 1999. So I was active here for 37 years, all in the Philosophy Department. Although later arrivals on the scene tended to identify me sometimes - some of the deans - with Raymond College, I never taught at Raymond, though I enjoyed the people at Raymond. Coming in 1962 was a fascinating time to come on the campus. The first of the cluster colleges, Raymond College, was just opening with a large number of young faculty, approximately the age of myself and my wife, and it was a chance again to get to know some new people who were fascinatingly interesting to get acquainted with and get involved in a new program.

BLUM: Was there any particular person or persons at UOP who was or were especially helpful in your initial orientation of the University?

REINELT: Everybody was helpful. Bill Nietmann, who was the chair of my department, was certainly helpful at getting me established in an office and getting me introduced to some of the people on the campus, particularly in College of the Pacific. The Academic Vice President at the time, Sam Meyer, was particularly helpful and interesting. Sam turned out to be a first-rate academic vice president. There was no dean of the College of the Pacific at that time because there wasn't any College of the Pacific. COP, to which I belonged, was not separate from the University at large, but you did have some schools like the Conservatory of Music and the School of Engineering, and the Pharmacy School had their own deans; College of the Pacific did not have a dean at that time. I can't remember – do you remember, George, when Jim Riddles and Marge Riddles started their Wednesday afternoons?

BLUM: No, I don't remember the year they started these afternoons, but it was, I think, in the mid-sixties or thereabouts that we started attending them because we did not attend the afternoons right at the beginning.

REINELT: Yeah, well, I can't remember the exact date, and I can't remember whether they were going when we arrived or not, but pretty quickly after we arrived, I think. Jim and Marge had opened up their backyard, had all kinds of tables set out: "Bring your meat to barbeque and a hot dish or salad or a dessert or something like that to share." And everybody who was, you know, a well known liberal, I think, in the community as well as on the campus got invited to Jim and Marge's. They were particularly good at inviting

new faculty so that new faculty could get to know other people. So you had lots of people there – husbands, wives, children, volleyball games out in the backyard. It was a tremendous way to get acquainted with a lot of different people from the community that I know and you know, and say hello to them to today.

BLUM: Well, I think Jim and Marge Riddles provided quite, quite an unusual opportunity for not only the University community but also the community at large.

REINELT: Right...

BLUM: to get together.

REINELT: Yeah. So, if I had to (laughs) say who facilitated my getting to know people off the campus, it was probably through the Riddles' Wednesday evening potlucks as much as anything.

BLUM: Well, let's turn to programs and curriculum. What was your impression of the changes in the programs and curriculum of UOP from your initial introduction to the day you retired? This is a very broad question, but maybe you can offer some general observations.

REINELT: Well, let me start with the Philosophy Department. Bill Nietmann had, I think, a unique idea, and I was sorry when we moved away from it. Instead of teaching the general survey courses that most universities teach in Introduction to Philosophy, History of Philosophy, Ethics, and so on, we did some of that, but we basically thought that what we should do instead of doing a history of philosophy course is to set up our own introductory courses so that they were in depth studies of the history of philosophy. So the first introductory course that people would take in philosophy was Plato. And we used a book that Nietmann put together, which was a selection from Plato's dialogues, and that formed the original and introductory course. It was a moderately good book, but at least it seemed to me that what it did with students, it plunged them with some depth into one philosopher for a term. The second semester was Aristotle, Augustine, and Aquinas and Nietmann had selections that he had taken from those three major authors, and they constituted the second course. I was to put together a course on modern philosophy, and I did such things as Descartes, Leibniz, Hume. Again it was a fascinating course and a fascinating approach in that it emphasized depth. When I put together my metaphysics class, I put it together in such a way that I started with Aquinas, doing much more in depth with Aquinas than Nietmann had done, particularly focusing on his metaphysics; then moving into Leibniz and dealing with the way in which Leibniz was a critique of Aquinas and then moving into Whitehead in some depth as a critique of the whole tradition that had come through Aquinas out of the Aristotelian tradition through modern Leibniz and then into a very modern philosopher. When new people came into the department and when Nietmann retired, everybody wanted to move away from and back to a kind of traditional program in the Philosophy Department, and in doing that, I really think, we lost something that was innovative. He also - Nietmann personality-wise - ran his own show and he would not allow more than twenty students into a philosophy

class; and, when people would complain and say that we should have more, he said: "Look, you know, you have limitations on the number of people that can take their chemistry lab, you have a limitation on the number of people that can take biology because of the number of microscopes you have," he said. "Philosophy depends upon dialogue, and the students will learn through dialogue and through questioning and discussion. And you can't do that with more than twenty students. We won't have more than twenty students." And because people didn't want to fight with him, we had only twenty students in class. And I think that was a great - a great way to go, and we lost that also later on when he left and new people came in.

At the college level - when I came- we had a somewhat typical smorgasbord of required classes without anything that was particularly unique for general education. You had to have so many classes in science or modern language or mathematics, which was an interesting pair. Certain some work in Old or New Testament, religious studies, something in philosophy, a good general potpourri without anything that held it together. We were under the gun because of the new cluster colleges that had started. Burns had started them because he had tried to upgrade College of the Pacific, which was a basic liberal arts college, from within and had failed; he couldn't get the faculty to make the kind of changes he was interested in making. So he decided since they couldn't be changed from inside, he was going to put the pressure on them from outside, and that was the role of the cluster colleges. So the cluster colleges had come in with innovative new programs: Raymond College with its three-year Bachelor of Arts degree, a required curriculum of twenty-four separate courses, with very few electives, but with an intensive program. In 1968, I think, it was, Sam Meyer had left [in 1967], Jack Bevan had come in as the academic vice president, Bill Binkley had become chair or dean of the College of the Pacific- Binkley and Bevan, working together got a Danforth Foundation Grant, to put together a committee to develop a new curriculum in general education for the College of the Pacific. I was a member of that committee; my wife at that time, my first wife having died, and having married a student, who was still a student ... was a student member of the committee. And we met all one summer, all summer of 1968 or '69. We came up with whole raft of changes to the curriculum. One, we went off the Unit System, giving so many units for a class, for a course. We went to what we called the Course System so every student would take four courses in a term. Partly, this was a result of concern about the fact that many students were taking one- and two-, three-unit classes, making that five or six, seven courses in a term; and we felt that they were so broadly spread that it would have been much better if we could get them concentrated with really demanding classes, and so they took only four a term. We also had some political uproar when the College of the Pacific faculty discovered that the Raymond faculty were guaranteed a sabbatical leave, I think, in the - was it at - in the fifth year? To begin with? After four years, in the fifth year. There were thirteen sabbatical leaves for all the rest of the University; there was no guarantee that you would get one. When we discovered what was happening at Raymond College, we said: "Wait, this is outrageous; this is unfair!"- And there was a big battle over it. And I can remember the faculty meeting where the Raymond folks were defending their sabbatical leave program, and the College of the Pacific faculty attacking their sabbatical leave program. Can you remember that, George? (Laughs)

BLUM: Oh, yeah.

REINELT: And not that we didn't want the Raymond faculty to have what they had, but we wanted everybody else to have an equal sort of program. So as a result of this Danforth Committee, the Academic Vice President agreed that departments within COP could have a similar program that was going to be guaranteed in the sixth year rather than the fifth year, but they could guarantee it only if they would consolidate their courses in the departments so that no additional people had to be hired in order to do this. So that also brought about curriculum change as we weeded out a lot of what we took to be extra courses and consolidated things into larger courses. A lot of three-unit courses were taught, and since everything was becoming a four-unit course, the need was to put all of the programs into what would be essentially four-unit courses. So a lot of changes took place in the curriculum.

We came up with what we called the I-and-I Program, the Information and Imagination Program, and that program required that every student, if I remember correctly, have three or four paired courses. And the faculty were required – who were teaching in that program were required – to put together courses that were interdisciplinary in some way or that interconnected in some way so that a student would be taking both [courses] of the pair. And there would be two different faculty that would be teaching them; they would be in probably different departments, generally were in different departments, and they would be coming at a similar topic from two different points of view. That worked out for some people very well; for some people it was a disaster. There were some people who just couldn't cope with that kind of a program. And it was never managed very well by the deans. The deans' way of getting these paired courses was to get all of the faculty together in a room and say, "Okay, pair up." There wasn't any prethinking; there wasn't any attempt at trying to do any particularly interesting things.

But by and large people would get together and something would happen. Some of us – the group that was responsible for putting this together I suppose you could say – thought it was really great. I can remember particularly one that I did with Don Duns: now we'd have to call it the New Human Being, then we called it the New Man. And Don and I decided to team teach it and take the full eight hours that we had a week for the class and teach it all together. We put together what I thought was – and Don did too – an absolutely dynamite pair of courses where students would do a lot of things like value clarification and personal growth and philosophical puzzling, all in one class. We also, as part of the Danforth Program, put together what was called the 4-1-4 Curriculum. The "1" was a winter term course, of one-month length. It would be a four-unit course; each faculty member would teach one course, and each student would take one course. And again, some faculty could adjust to this; some faculty couldn't adjust to it. Some faculty would try to get around it by putting together a course called "Experiencing" and would have students write what their experiences were, whatever those experiences might be, without a great deal of reflection, as far as I could tell. For some people it was terrific. I enjoyed teaching; I taught one on the nature of the self; I taught another one on the nature of evil, had students going over and interviewing people who were witches or whatever

in San Francisco, trying to come to understand what they were all about and what they thought the nature of evil was, and so on: psychological discussions of evil, philosophical discussions - great opportunities for a philosopher, probably why I enjoyed it so much having helped to create it. Not so good for people in the Conservatory of Music; they couldn't figure out what to do with the one-month term, and they complained about such things as, "But we are giving students lessons all the way through, then we have a month when they don't take lessons, then they take lessons again. What are we going to do with people in Engineering? Some have difficulty with this - people in the Sciences - puzzled what to do with a winter term." But for other departments, I think it worked out very well. So radical change in the curriculum in 1968, at the end of '68, beginning in - I think everything was introduced in 1970, if remember correctly.

I can't remember how long that lasted. The difficulties with developing the paired courses; the difficulties that some departments had in adapting to the course system; particular problem again in music, where there were a lot of one- and two-unit courses; particularly in art, where there were lots of two-unit courses, where somebody would take a two-unit course in ceramics and then they take a two-unit course in watercolor or a two-unit course in something else - they couldn't figure out how to put together four-unit courses, basically four-unit courses. The Registrar's Office had a difficult time. They were into thinking in terms of credit hours, and so if fifteen hours was the load under the unit system - and now what we had moved to four courses - that must be equivalent to fifteen hours; so every course instead of just being a course must be worth 3.75 units, and the Registrar's Office never was able to cope with the unit system. My guess would be somewhere in the late '70s that we began picking at the edges of that program. The change that came about was a change which went pretty much back to the potpourri that we'd had beforehand where everybody took a number of courses from the humanities, the social sciences, the behavioral sciences, the natural sciences, but again it had no particular coherence, and that lasted for any number of years.

BLUM: Well, it was not too unusual to have periodic general education course or program changes. Someone suggested that it's like the seven year itch, but here (laughter) it came less frequently.

REINELT: Well, as you know George, we then went through another curriculum change because of what we took to be the incoherence of the potpourri method where you pick from various areas but didn't necessarily have anything that made it into a coherent selection. A lot depended, and always has depended, it seems to me, on advisors and whether advisors directed students to take courses that made some sense. I forget the date - it would have been probably in the '80s - that we did another curriculum change - the curriculum that's going at the present time, the Mentor system with two freshman seminars, one sort of questions that are universal and enduring questions, Mentor I.

BLUM: That'd come actually in the '90s.

REINELT: In the '90s?

BLUM: Because it came with Benedetti when he became dean of the College of the Pacific, if I remember right. That was not until 1989.

REINELT: Is that right? Yeah, that's right. You're right. It's when Benedetti came and was brought in with the charge to reform the general education program. I was tangentially involved in that but not on the committee, though involved in the discussions after it was accepted, in working with the committee that put together the Mentor I program. That's fairly recent; there are lots of people that probably talk about that, or have talked about it, so I won't spend a lot of time on that. And the only thing that we can say now is we're in another period in 2004, looking at general education again. Who knows what'll come out of it? So –

BLUM: Well, do you have perhaps a brief general observation on whether you found any particular programs or curricula at UOP that gave the institution certain uniqueness in American higher education?

REINELT: The cluster colleges certainly gave us uniqueness. We got tremendous national press, I think, with what we were doing with cluster colleges, at least among the academic world. I remember listening to Don DeRosa talking about – when he came here as president – going to a meeting of presidents, a workshop for new presidents at Harvard, and having Derek Bok, who was president or retired president at Harvard, talk about what a wonderful program, an innovative program, we had at UOP with the cluster colleges. I've already described Raymond. Callison had a four-year program pointed in the direction of developing nations with a Sophomore year abroad in India, to begin with, and then in Japan later on. Covell College which was a Spanish language college with English taught as a second language. I think all three of these colleges were really unique. I think our Mentor Program was unique and, at the time we adopted it, an innovation in general education. But it also had its limits; while it required the two Mentor seminars that I mentioned, one on eternal questions, another one on contemporary issues, and then a third one in the Senior year on ethics and moral development, the rest of the program was again a selection of courses in a kind of potpourri way. In theory we were to put together “paths” that were to be integrated, but no “paths” ever got invented or accepted. I invented a few myself because I wanted to... (inaudible). So there was still a bit of incoherence in the general education, which leads to our current situation.

BLUM: Well, let's turn to some of the individuals at UOP that you have most admired. Perhaps why? Or that remain most memorable in your thoughts.

REINELT: Well, I already mentioned the Sack Lunch Seminar and the Y. The director at that time, Norman Gustavson, was really first-rate at getting together people from across the campus and making the Y a kind of center for discussion. The Y was a place where not only faculty could get together but students could get together. But there were a lot of other people – faculty members – that really were significant parts of my life: Carl Wulfman in the Physics Department. Carl and I got to know each other soon after we'd had come here; and Carl had some philosophical interests and he also had four boys who were about the same age as my boys and my daughter. Lewis Ford, whom I had met a

Yale before I came, and when Lewis came in Raymond College to do the philosophy and religion, Lewis and Anne Ford became really close friends. When Lewis left and went, if I remember correctly, to Penn State, Bob Orpinela came to teach the philosophy and religion sections at Raymond. Bob became a really good friend – and particularly a good friend when after the cluster colleges were dissolved, he moved into the Philosophy Department. Dick Martin was a tremendous presence on the campus, the provost of Raymond College. You know, Dick was charismatic and, it seemed to me, determined to make Raymond into an intellectual presence on the campus. And I think what he did really affected what took place as far as I am concerned on the campus. Bob Stewart, who was the chaplain at the time when I came, was interesting to me. Bob Stewart felt that the chaplain should be the moral conscience, I think, of the University; and he reflected a group of people who probably a year or two before I came had produced what they called the Manifesto.

In the early days, when I came here, we used to have faculty meetings where all the faculty would retreat for a day to some place off campus and discuss the campus issues. And apparently a year or two before we came, George, the four, probably four or five faculty – my predecessor, Ron Santoni, Glen Price, Norm Gustavason, Jack Mason, James Gardner in the English Department – put together a criticism of the University, in particular, speaking from the standpoint of College of the Pacific, of the fraternity/sorority system, what they took to be the anti-intellectualism, perhaps in some ways, which they apparently presented at the faculty retreat. That really upset some of the people on the campus and, as a matter of fact - I've mentioned Sam Meyer, who was the academic vice president – but it was really clear that Sam wanted to have control of the academic program and basically wasn't going to tolerate that kind of activity. So, basically, as Bill Nietmann told me later, he told Ron Santoni, "You know, you are not going to get ahead at this University. They're never going to give you a decent salary raise and/or a promotion." A basically similar thing was told to Glen Price in the History Department. I remember sitting one time talking to Sam Meyer about the chaplain, and he pounded on his desk and said, "I will not go back to the chapel as long as Bob Stewart is the chaplain." And I don't think he ever did. So there was some authoritarianism at the time. There must have been lots of other people on the campus. I'm trying to remember -- Larry Meredith, when he became chaplain, was probably the most innovative person that ever hit the campus. As a chaplain, he was incredibly interesting. Larry, I think, all his life has been fascinated by whatever was the novelty that was taking place within the culture. And whatever was happening, whether criticism of communists, you'd have Angela Davis in the chapel to speak; if it was the drug scene, he had Timothy Leary into the chapel to speak. I can remember Timothy Leary sitting up in the front of the chapel, gazing at the rose window, cross-legged with a couple of candles lit on either side of him. I was sitting in the choir loft, if I remember correctly, just slightly behind him. I mentioned Jack Mason in the Sociology Department; Jake Jacoby in the Sociology Department; Malcolm Eiselen, whom I deeply respected in the History Department; Malcolm Moule in the History Department – just tremendous people. Malcolm, slightly blue coloring as a result of being gassed in World War I, but tremendously -

BLUM: Malcolm Eiselen?

REINELT: Malcolm Eiselen, yeah – but tremendously reasonable, thoughtful in the department or in the faculty meetings. Tremendous group, just a tremendous group of faculty. New faculty that came in Callison that I got to know: Jerry Hewitt, Gil Schedler, crazy Joseph Botond-Blazek (laughter), John Morearty. You know, John was a fascinating colleague, and it was rather disappointing when because of his antics he didn't get tenure at the University.

BLUM: Well, maybe we could move on to perhaps some comments about changes that you observed, for instance, in the student culture over the generations.

REINELT: What seemed most significant to me is the way in which student culture seems to have been affected by economic factors in the society. Students in the initial years that I was here were interested in ideas, were constantly asking questions, pushing you. Along in the early '70s, when there was a recession and jobs were hard to come by, students became incredibly career-oriented, at least within the College of the Pacific. I don't know what it was like in other units of the University, but at least within the College of the Pacific there was more of an emphasis upon getting a job, establishing a career, less excitement about ideas, and you had to really struggle to get students involved to the same degree that they had been involved in earlier years. I don't think, from my perspective, we've ever since then gotten away from that mentality, as I see it. There always have been a number of students who were really good, as good as any students, I'm sure, anywhere in the country. The University has changed in that we did not have a Business School when I came here; we had an Economics Department and Business was an element in the Economics Department. People that I admired or were memorable reminds me of Sid Turoff. Sid was in economics but from a business point of view; he had a labor background; he wanted to develop a business school and along with other people who were in the Business in the Economics Department, they pushed until they really did develop the Business School and separated from the College of the Pacific. I had contact with Sid on all kinds of University committees—on the Academic Council that I was on—it seems like forever, though there were periods when I—when I wasn't. And we would argue; and Sid was marvelous, even if Sid was in opposition to you, he'd tell you, "I'm opposed to what you're for; I'm for the alternative point of view, and this is why I'm for it, and I'm going to fight you tooth and nail." So you—you'd fight with Sid. Sometimes you won, sometimes you lost, but he was just a first-rate, interesting individual. - What else about the students?

BLUM: Well, how about a sense of community as far as the University is concerned? Did you ever sense that there was a notion of community among students and faculty?

REINELT: I would see it among particular students. Since in the philosophy department we had a limitation of twenty students in a class, the number of students that I would meet in a particular year, or even over a four-year period, was limited. In the philosophy department we had some tremendous students, particularly in the late '60s. One of the things that may have helped me in that period was that my wife, who was herself a student at that time, was part of a student group, so I had some contact with the students.

Jim Irwin was a philosophy major, but Jim was also active in the radio program on the campus, and later on when we couldn't afford a full-time director of radio, Jim took over the radio, KUOP Radio, as administrator. As a student, Jim wanted to learn something about Martin Buber, and I told him, "Look, okay, I'm not going to take on an extra class, but if you want to work up a course on Buber, and if you can get students who are interested in it, I'll sit in and be a member of the class. Jim put together a course on Buber, and he and I worked out the readings; we had about 10 or 15 people that sat in and studied Martin Buber for a semester. I've never had any student before or since that did anything of that sort. There was a sense of community among that group of students. Some of them later on went into the armed services. One in particular—I recall—into the Air Force, one was a colonel in the Army. Partly they were brought together by the Y, but partly, it was in the Philosophy Department - tremendous sense of belonging to each other; and I think those friendships, many of them, have been returned to the present day. I don't know—I don't have a strong sense of what was going on the campus as a whole. I've never had a particularly close relation to any of the fraternity or sorority houses; I got invited to dinners and things of that sort, but that would be just a limited contact. I did have the sense that those were strong communities, not necessarily committed to the kind of values that I would hope that they generally were committed to, but nevertheless they were strong communities on the campus. Their participation, for example, in Band Frolic, as you can recall, George. I don't know what went on over at Raymond, but at least within COP there was a period before Band Frolic of two to three weeks when they were rehearsing where we would almost get no work done. But on the other hand, Band Frolic was a tremendous community experience and it drew people together in a kind of competition to see who could put on the best performance from across the campus. Those things we've lost, and I have the sense that at the present time there's in many ways less a sense of community across the University than there was at that time when we'd have such things as Band Frolic, when we still had the football program and basketball, and when we were putting on Christmas pageants from the chaplain's office and a Christmas program. What I am struck by now is the degree of community that I do find in the various ethnic groups. You have the Mexican-American students putting on a program, and clearly they're connected with each other; you have the Vietnamese students or Buddhist students putting on some kind of a program; you have the Hawaiian students putting on a Hawaiian program. So—and I've had some, you know, connection with some of the religious groups. I think that some of the conservative religious groups, particularly, oh, what is it, what's the one that meets on Friday evenings? Do you know? It's not InterVarsity, I don't think; they may be connected with InterVarsity or Campus Crusade or something, but there's again, there's a hundred students, maybe a hundred and fifty students that are a part of that group...

BLUM: Well, I'm really not much aware of—

REINELT: —and, you know, that I've not gone to many of their meetings, but there's clearly a strong sense of community among those students. So it seems to me that community nowadays is more dispersed. Black students have a Black Students Association. Not too many things that draw the students together across the campus in the

same way, I think, that may have happened, that certainly happened within COP, in the early days that I was here, early years that I was here.

BLUM: Well, maybe now we can turn to some other considerations, shift gears a little bit. What is your personal opinion of the administration, past and present?

REINELT: Bob Burns, who was the President when I came, was a fascinating individual - great political skills, good manipulator. I think he represented the University and protected the University really well at the state level, probably keeping Stanislaus State College out of Stockton, and putting it down there in Turlock. Sam Meyer, as I've already said; Sam had the capacity to go out and hire, I think, really terrific faculty. He may have had trouble after he'd got them here living with them, but probably in many ways brought in more first-rate faculty than has happened before or since. He was helped by the fact that the cluster colleges were coming in. Opinionated in many ways, you know, but I always got along with him. He for some strange reason thought that I was an okay person, and I really enjoyed him. The administration in general at that time, institutional advancement, development was weak; alumni office was weak, weak all the way up as far as I can tell, into the current generation—the current administration. Stan McCaffrey did some good things. Probably the best thing that he did was buying the old Delta campus, which we now call ourselves South Campus, although we don't do that so much as we used to. But he was authoritarian, couldn't listen to anybody else's opinion besides his own, whether it was faculty or administrators unless they were agreeing with him; alienated the faculty early on. I think that his personal problems, his drinking problem, his own personal insecurity, made him a very poor president. He didn't advance—besides the purchase of the Delta campus—very much in any of the other areas. When Stan left, and we got Bill Atchley, we went (laughs) - some of the faculty had said it was difficult to think that anybody could make Stan McCaffrey look good - but Bill Atchley seemed to have that talent.

It may be the case—and I wish I knew—that both of those administrations were hamstrung by our Board of Regents. The Board of Regents seemed to be pretty detached. The Board appeared—from the outside, at any rate—to be dominated by the Board President and two or three other people on the Board. How much support the Board gave to the administration is a real question. My impression was that Bob Burns pretty much could get the Board to do what he wanted. With respect to either Atchley or McCaffrey, I'm not sure. It seemed to me their relationships were limited.

You'll recall the coup within the Board of Regents that brought Dale Redig, [former dean] of the Dental School into the chairmanship of the Board. That was a tremendous change within the Board, and the faculty felt that there was a chance—just a chance—that some real changes might take place in the relationship between the Board of Regents and the University. The counter-coup that brought Bob Monagan into the chairmanship of the Board, and which weeded out some of the people who had been involved in the coup against the Eberhardt administration, was something that we in the faculty looked upon with suspicion. Bob Monagan turned out to be an incredible Board President, who worked with Don DeRosa when Don DeRosa came in as the president of the University,

who really put together a first-rate Board. So we had twenty-three years during the McCaffrey and the Atchley years of what I would consider to be second-rate, if not third-rate administration, across the board, pretty much. Some good deans, but, well deans were in a position by and large with McCaffrey, as I understand it, that they couldn't really express personal opinions. If they did express personal opinions that were opposed to the administration, they could be in trouble. The present administration - I was on the Presidential Search Committee [and] Bob Monagan was the chair of that committee. He ran that committee in the most democratic fashion that you can imagine. There were a couple of times when Bob and I thought that some particular candidate was a good candidate and other people on the committee didn't think so, and the person got bypassed. Bob and I would laugh, but Bob, you know, never tried to impose his will. He did a tremendous job as the chair of that committee. We ended up with Don DeRosa and one other candidate whose name I forget, either of whom would have been a tremendous president from my point of view. We couldn't have lost with either one of them, and I think Don DeRosa has done a fabulous job; not that I agree with everything he's done, but he's done a fabulous job as the president of the University.

BLUM: Could you comment a little bit on the kinds of changes that under Bob Monagan's chairmanship occurred on the Board because at least you were an insider in the sense that you saw directly what was happening, since as chair of the Academic Council at that time you sat in on the Board meetings.

REINELT: Yeah, I was the chair of the Academic Counsel the first year that Don DeRosa was here as president. The first thing, practically, that DeRosa did was to put together, with Bob Monagan, a Board retreat at Feather River. And as the faculty representative to the Board, which is something that happened a little earlier with Atchley, I was invited to that retreat. And at that retreat, we had workgroups that looked at all kinds of issues having to do with the University: what the responsibilities of the Board of Regents were; looking at areas in the University that needed to be improved in some way or other; looking at financial problems within the University; looking at faculty administrative staff and Board relationships. They were really first-rate, open conversations. And I can remember, David Gerber at one meeting just inveighing against, the faculty, what the faculty were like and his distaste and disdain for the faculty, and I said to Dave, "Dave, you and I have to talk," and we sat down one time...

So Dave Gerber unloaded on me about his attitude toward the faculty, and after he finished, I said, "Okay Dave, let me ask you some questions or say a few things and ask you some questions. "Basically," I said, "you folk on the Board of Regents saddled us with dreadful presidents, authoritarian folk, who wouldn't listen or who felt somehow or other that they simply could control everything that went on in the University." "Oh," he said, "not McCaffrey." And I said, "yeah McCaffrey." And I talked to him about some of the things that McCaffrey had done, how we were trying to work through a governance system that McCaffrey simply imposed and said to the Academic Vice President, -it was Cliff Hand at the time - "Write it up, and that's gonna be it." Operations manual, basically what it was, wasn't just a governance system. And I said "yeah"— and then I talked about the way in which he would dress-down deans, faculty, and others who

disagreed with him. I said, “You know, we spent twenty-three years in which the faculty have held this University together.” And I said to him, “When did you get involved? You know, really get involved? I’ll bet it was when the faculty got really upset and started criticizing the administration.” And he said, “Well, yeah, that was it.” You know, they loved the University. He can talk about the University and his time at the University, gets teary-eyed talking about the University—loved the University. But he hadn’t a clue as to what was going on, and I think that was true for many of the members of the Board of Regents. Individually, I found them really good people. They were certainly friendly to me as a faculty member; they listened to what I had to say at the retreat. They stated their point of view and the problems that they had; I stated my point of view and the problems that I thought we as faculty had; I ended up liking most of them. Well, I don’t know any that I really didn’t appreciate in one way or another.

There were limited expectations from the Board, I think, up until Bob Monagan became the Board chair, and Don DeRosa became the president. I think there was minimal financial support for the University from the Board. There was some; but this most recent financial campaign was interesting to me that before the campaign ever started, \$24 million had been raised by—from the members on the Board. That would have been an impossible thing to take place with respect to previous Boards. There’s been an attempt to broaden the character of the Board. We had a lot of Board members who were farmers or who were lawyers; we didn’t have many that were CEOs of companies. Don DeRosa had brought a fellow from, I forget what it was, the Association of Council of Governments, or something like that. It was to sort of lead, facilitate the Board retreat. And he talked to the Board about the kinds of people who ought to be on the Board and the kinds of breadth of interests that they should bring to the Board, and that our Board was too narrow in the kind of people who were on it. So a lot of thinking began to take place at that initial Board retreat. For the first time, I think, the Board set goals for itself as to what they were going to accomplish in the next year and in the next five years. And I think this has become a yearly practice of the Board on the Board retreats to do this kind of thinking. This is not a Board that is detached in the way in which previous Boards have been detached. There are always good people – Joan Cortopassi was always involved in what was going on; Nancy Spiekerman was tremendously concerned to connect with the faculty; Gail Kautz was really active. And what’s interesting is some of the women that were on the Board most closely related, connected, I think, to the faculty. I don’t have a sense, however, [now]- we did have some programs of an informal sort where there would be, you know, dinner that the members of the Academic Council could meet with the Board. Has anything of that sort gone on, since you’ve been sitting on the Council?

BLUM: No.

REINELT: So there may be less general ability for faculty members to meet with Board members and get to know something about the Board members that was taking place in the earliest period. I think probably in the late days of the Atchley tenure, partly because there were a number of people like Jim McCargo and Dale Redig and, I can’t remember some of the other folks, who were part of the Board coup, who were really connected

with a lot of faculty, and who would meet with the faculty on an informal kind of basis. But I've been impressed, I've really been impressed by the changes that have taken place on the Board. I think as I've talked with the other people who have been chair of the Academic Council after myself - I think all of them have felt that they can go to the Board and speak their piece at the Board meetings, and they're accepted as a member of the Board. They're not a voting member; they're there as a result of their office. Certainly the two or three or four that followed me before my retirement, I had no question but that they really were effective in their relationships with the Board. Peg Langer, I think, was very good; Audrey O'Connell the Board adored—(laughs). Audrey could never—never hold her peace when it came to speaking to the Board about what the faculty concerns were. So I think the Board probably has a much clearer sense about faculty concerns than they ever had in the past.

I've been impressed in general with this administration. I think, probably, we have the best people in institutional advancement that we've ever had. With Bill Coen, I think, we have somebody in the Alumni Office that brings some real expertise into the Alumni Office. I think our connections to alumni are better. We aimed at having 14% alumni contribution, people contributing to the annual fund drive, and they achieved it this year; I think it's about 14.7%, something of the sort. We've increased the number of alumni clubs across the country. I think there are 12 at the moment; they're hoping to increase them up to 15. There's been a real attempt to reach out, I think, to the cluster college graduates. I'm not sure how successful it is, but there's been a real attempt to do that.

It's an amazing thing, I think, from the standpoint of faculty, to have faculty salaries as part of the budget. If we were ever to get salary increases in the past, and I sat on the Budget Committee for a number of years, the Financial Vice President would come in with all of the facts and figures of what were going to be in the budget, and then we'd look to see if there was any money left over for faculty salary increases. That doesn't happen since Don DeRosa came. The intent and I think the practice has been to include faculty salary increases as a part of the budget itself, not something you tagged on after everything else got taken care of. We have always talked up 'til DeRosa came that we were going to get ourselves within the 60th percentile of Category II A Colleges and Universities; we never achieved it; we're at it. They're attempting to achieve salaries within disciplines that are comparable to those on the average across the country and, while I have some skepticism about doing that, in the fairness of that, at least, I think, they're doing it. So that there are—there are goals that they're setting out to achieve, and they're achieving them. Some criticisms: I think we suffer, as every university seems—most universities seem - to be suffering by the fact that every administration, properly so, has to worry about the bottom line: are we going to have the money to run the programs. What that has done, from my point of view, is push us in the direction of adopting programs which are going to be moneymakers. That has driven us more and more into career development programs—into developing a pharmacy school, into a physical therapy program, into expanding business administration, and into expanding engineering; and those are good programs. But along with that, I think that what makes the University a university - its general education program, and its liberal arts program - is suffering. I'm really distressed at the fact that they have sort of combined Classics,

Philosophy, and Religious Studies; and I haven't paid much attention to that, but it just makes no sense to me. Back to students. The student body—you were talking about community - I think when you and I came, you would probably have had to hunt for non-Caucasian students. There'd be a few black students—on the football team.

BLUM: There is more diversity.

REINELT: But now we have 30% Asian students, many of them South-East Asians, who have come as a result of the Vietnamese War. They're oriented, many of them, toward pharmacy or toward professional education, and when you talk about developing a campus community, those students are very different in their outlook and their interests. I've found, and, I think, we still find that in general engineering students, pharmacy students, business students, and others that are in those pre-professional or professional programs are narrow in their focus. And I don't think we do an adequate job of expanding the way in which they look at the world; the liberal arts just haven't done it. And this is not just our problem however; this is a characteristic across the country, but we haven't been a leadership in moving in the opposite direction, and that's a problem that I have.

BLUM: Well, we really could turn just to one other very important component of the University, quite possibly the most important - the faculty. What changes have you observed in the relations between the faculty and the administration over the years? Did or have the faculty become more united or fragmented? And especially - you may have some comments - in light of new developments in academic programs, and, not necessarily purely academic programs, how the faculty essentially comes into play there.

REINELT: Let me first here—talk about what the relationship between the faculty and the administration was when you and I came, George.

BLUM: Yeah.

REINELT: There was the Faculty Council that you may remember.

BLUM: All too well.

REINELT: The Faculty Council was made up of full professors and deans, and it was headed up by the Academic Vice President. So here you and I came in 1962, this whole group of young, active, engaged faculty members, and we looked at the fact that except for occasional all-faculty meetings.

BLUM: Once a semester.

REINELT: (Laughs) Once a semester, usually we had no voice. So it didn't take very long before a number of us were involved in wanting to have a change in the governance, in who represented the faculty. And a committee was formed, and I forget how it came about. I think it was probably Sam Meyer that enabled us to get started, although it may

have been Wally Graves; I can't remember which academic vice president it was or what the years were. My sense is it was in the late '60s.

BLUM: Well, Sam Meyer, if I remember right, left in '64. Wally Graves came after him and departed in '67; that's when Jack Bevan came.

REINELT: All right, I think it was when Graves was here.

BLUM: Yes, it was.

REINELT: We had a committee that I was on to develop an Academic Council. And we came up with the notion that we should do away with the Faculty Council—so-called Faculty Council; that we should have a more representative Academic Council that had just faculty on it so that it wasn't a dean and faculty group but was a faculty group that represented the faculty voice. And as you know, we came up with a Council which had representatives, so that every school or college had at least one representative, and it represented basically the number of faculty that were in the school or college—broadly across the University. At the same time that then meant that the deans became part of an Executive—what'd they call it? The Executive Committee, or...?

BLUM: It was called the Executive Committee.

REINELT: Something of the sort, Executive Council or whatever, anyway it was a council of deans across the University. Faculty, I think, really began to get involved, and, you know, trying to have a voice in what was happening in the University. Dick Reynolds—from the Art Department - was the first chair, if I remember correctly, of the Academic Council.

BLUM: Yes, yes.

REINELT: And Dick was a good chair, a good, solid chair. And from that day forward, I think the Academic Council has pretty well represented the faculty point of view in relationship to the administration of the University. A lot of it depended on the character of the chair of the Council, and there were some periods when - I know, I've mentioned before when Stan McCaffrey simply wrote his own operations manual because he got tired of trying to negotiate it with the faculty - that there was no protest almost at all from the Academic Council because at that particular time we had a fairly weak chair on the Council. And by talking with him I said, "(name unclear), what are you going to do?" And he said, "Well, it's all done—I guess we won't do anything." So there was hardly, as far as I could tell anyway, any protest. But, aside from a few times, such as that, I think that it's really been a faculty voice. I think—and you've been on the Council recently and I've not kept up with it, so I don't know—it seems to me that it still remains a voice, but there are not that many, as many disagreements with the administration as there had been in the past, so there are not that many debates. So that was a change that took place. In relationship to the Cluster Colleges, COP then did not have an identity, and Jake Jacoby [coming from the Sociology Department] was appointed dean of the College of the

Pacific. Once we'd gotten the Academic Council through, some of us felt that there should be some faculty council in College of the Pacific that would represent the faculty in relationship to the dean and to the administration. So I remember being on that committee, and going in and talking to Dean Jacoby. And Jake was a little upset, and he told us at one point, "I don't want to be just the secretary of the faculty!" He had the feeling, I think, that the faculty were going to overwhelm him; and from that point on, Jake and I always had a kind of teasing relationship. Whenever I'd see him, he'd say something like, "Well here—okay Reinelt, what are you going to do to me today?" or something of that sort.

BLUM: (Laughs).

REINELT: We were always good friends; but, I think you know, someone, who as Jake, had come up within the traditional framework of the University as a student and then as a faculty member, when he became a dean, was not anticipating that he was going to have an upstart college faculty that wanted to work with him and wanted to help him—(laughs)—to develop his program. So we put together the College of the Pacific - what do we call it? Was it College Council or whatever it is?

BLUM: COP Council.

REINELT: COP Council, right. I don't know whether that was a good thing or a bad thing. In some ways, I think, it was good because it gave the College a bit more identity, but we were just creating faculty bodies, one more thing after another, you know, to take our time away from teaching—and more committees, and more committees. And that Council has done some really good things, but it's never been as effective, it seems to me, as it might have been, although I was never on it, so I don't have a clear sense about that. Anyway, partly, that's there is owed to some of the things that I was involved in. One of the things that really interested me when I was doing an interview with Gaylon Caldwell, who was the dean at Covell College, was to talk about, at least during the McCaffrey years, what went on at the Executive Committee, the Council of the Deans; and basically, he said, they never discussed policy. They'd sit around and drink sherry or something like that with McCaffrey, but they never discussed policy. And he said all the deans were afraid of the faculty (laughs).

BLUM: (Laughs).

REINELT: (Laughs) As a faculty member, I can't believe it. That blows my mind, and I presume it's different from dean to dean. But the thought that somehow or other the administration was really concerned about what they took to be the growing power of the faculty really amazes me. And I never would have thought it was the case, because I think we always felt that we were powerless (laughs).

Did the faculty become more united or fragmented? Well, more united in the sense that at the Academic Council level there was a real discussion of the University policies; more fragmented in the sense that—we had all these schools and colleges—what—nine of

them, and in many respects almost no interaction between the faculties except on a personal level, I think. And that was a change. When we—when you and I first came - the Faculty Dames were the real source, it seemed to me, of getting together people from across the campus; there was always a Faculty Dame sponsored picnic in the fall.

BLUM: Socially at least.

REINELT: Social get-together. As far as I know, there is nothing now that gets together families across the University in a social way.

BLUM: I think they are trying to organize a fall get-together of some kind, but I've never attended one, so—

REINELT: Well, it was smaller—there was a smaller group of faculty then, but I can remember, meeting out at Mickey Grove and having a large group of people—kids and wives and husbands and so forth - all interconnecting with each other and getting to know each other across the campus. The All-University Faculty meetings, I thought, were useful. Once the Academic Council came into existence, those went out of existence except on rare occasions—maybe once or twice a year, and I don't even know if we've had one recently because it was always hard to figure out what we were going to talk about when we got all the faculty together. So there were assets and liabilities, it seemed to me in developing a more coherent faculty governance system in terms of all the faculty getting to know each other. So I think there's camaraderie within the schools and colleges; there are a minimum number of people in any of the schools and colleges that get interested in what's going on outside of their own school and college and therefore get to know other people—maybe one or two from the Conservatory, two or three from the Business School.

BLUM: Well, from my personal recollection, the place where at least in earlier years I managed to meet other faculty members across the campus was on faculty committees.

REINELT: Yeah, right.

BLUM: Yeah, because the representation was supposed to be campus wide, but then later on, depending on whether one still served on any committees or not, it sort of faded away.

REINELT: Yeah, if you served on the committees, you tended to meet the same people from the Conservatory or the same people from Engineering or the same people from Business. And you did—you did meet other people, but the kind of social acquaintanceships that in the earlier years were possible didn't happen in the later years. Now partly it had to do with the size of the University. I think when we came, if my memory doesn't fail me, there were about seventeen hundred students, and there probably were, maybe, a hundred and fifty faculty; but I'd be surprised if there were more than a hundred and fifty.

BLUM: I think there were probably a few more students, closer to two thousand.

REINELT: When the Cluster Colleges got going.

BLUM: Yeah. After that the enrollment expanded, sometimes contracted.

REINELT: Right, but now we're up about forty-three hundred on this campus?

BLUM: Right.

REINELT: What—two hundred fifty faculty, two hundred and seventy-five faculty, I don't know what there are at the moment but probably between two-fifty and three hundred.[Close to 325, G.B.] Much harder to get them together, much harder to get to know them. So more united in the smaller groups, but more fragmented in terms of the larger group. My sense is that it's probably inevitable.

BLUM: Well, lastly, let's turn briefly to the community. What kind of contribution do you feel UOP has made to the Stockton community?

REINELT: Well, I think we make a lot more of contribution than the Stockton community is inclined to think we make. Number one, we're the largest employer in the community, and that means that economically we make an incredible contribution just by the fact that we're here. But secondly, the programs in the Conservatory have always been a significant part of life of the community. In the early days, and still, you know, basketball, sports programs were—are important. I think the fact that we had to give up the football program was felt as a real loss by the University—and by the community. That was something we had to give up for financial reasons, and I think a lot of former football players and a lot of community people don't understand that, but that was a program that was dropped in the first year of Don DeRosa's presidency. It's too bad that the Board didn't do it before he came so that he didn't get tagged with that, because it was clear from the Board committee that had already acted on it before he came - headed up by Gary Podesto - that the program couldn't [continue].

BLUM: In fact, I remember that it was actually Bill, the predecessor of DeRosa—

REINELT: Bill Atchley -

BLUM: who proposed that football be phased out.

REINELT: Right, right.

BLUM: Some of us didn't take that—seriously.

REINELT: (Laughs). But it wasn't clear he took that seriously—but he was on the right track. In the last year there was a three hundred thousand dollar deficit and the Board set out to try to find the money, and I laid out for Bob Monagan what monies I thought they

had found—that they were going to take the money that they were getting from Coke machines and so forth, and apply it to the athletic budget. But basically, Monagan told me, nobody wanted to give. And whether they were Board members, whether they were community people, they didn't want to give. They couldn't find anybody. You know if those folks had really wanted that program - three hundred thousand dollars - they could have raised it and kept it.

BLUM: Later on, DeRosa pointed out it would take eight hundred thousand to cover the deficit.

REINELT: (Laughs). Yeah, right. But that's a loss because I can remember in the early years going down with my kids to Pacific Avenue and watching the parade at Homecoming. And we've lost, you know, we don't have the same kind of thing that draws people back together as Homecoming did; and we've not been able since we've dropped football to find anything that functions in the same way. But there are a lot more students that are active in the community. We've got a tremendous program in terms of tutoring that students do. I think there are personal members of the faculty who have been involved in community activities; and I think of Jerry Briscoe and all of the stuff that Jerry's done in politics over the years. You can probably think of others that were involved in the community.

BLUM: Well, I'm thinking in terms of overall contribution the Community Involvement Program is really the most valuable asset that the University has had.

REINELT: Yeah, I think originally, what was the program going to bring—two hundred students?

BLUM: About two hundred and fifty.

REINELT: Basically from under-privileged backgrounds who ordinarily couldn't have afforded to come to UOP.

BLUM: And it was started in '69.

REINELT: Yeah. And I think it's been reduced down to about a hundred and fifty, hasn't it? Something like that.

BLUM: I don't know.

REINELT: I don't think we have the full number that we had.

BLUM: No, not two hundred.

BLUM: If we've ever really had the prescribed quota.

REINELT: Yeah. I think we were going to bring in about fifty a year on the average was the aim. But I agree with you that program has gone on for years, and has brought some really pretty amazing students on the campus.

BLUM: Who are now community leaders.

REINELT: Exactly, exactly. It has had its problems, both in administrators and in campus attitude toward the program. But basically it's done some tremendous things for students within the community. With the contemporary concern about students having an experiential component to their learning, there're going to be a lot more students who are involved with internships in the community, I think, in the future. I think that's probably just getting started. No, I think the University is a tremendous presence within the community. We're always – we're oftentimes getting called upon to comment on when some project in the community is or by the city government has been put forward to get whatever expert opinion might be on the faculty relative to what the project is.

BLUM: I see this is especially true of the Business—

REINELT: yeah, the Business School has been involved—

BLUM: or the Sociology Department -

REINELT: has been involved in surveys. If one sat down and really tried to lay out the kinds of things we are doing in the community, I think the community would be surprised as well as we would be surprised with the number of things that we are doing. Yeah.

BLUM: Well, in conclusion - or do you have some?

REINELT: One thing that we didn't look at on the campus and its activities during the years that I was on the campus: you may remember, George, and I thought it really was one of the better things we ever did—the teach-ins that we had during—as it were—

BLUM: Yes, during the—

REINELT: the Vietnam War, where we—

BLUM: Indeed, that's right -

REINELT: Where we—where we cancelled classes for, what—two days? At least a day?

BLUM: Oh, it was a day at a time, I think.

REINELT: Yeah, yeah, for a day, and we brought in people from off campus, I think. What's his name - Brzezinski - came to the campus on one of those days if I'm not mistaken.

BLUM: Don't remember that.

REINELT: Well, or somebody else—that came over from the University of California and got into a whole lot of issues about the war, the significance of the war, and whether we should be in the war, and what the aims of the war were.

BLUM: And faculty members from the community on campus, also.

REINELT: Yeah. Right. Oh, yeah, we all—a lot of us were small group leaders for various discussion groups. I thought that was a tremendous thing that we did during that Vietnam War era. And other things that we've done just in the last couple of years in relationship to the Gulf War, the war in Iraq.

BLUM: Yes, yes.

REINELT: The panel discussions that we've had that have been open to the community and involved community people. And I think have been informative and significant. There are a number of community people—it's just astonishing to me—that come to the Tuesday World Forum that the School of International Studies puts on. I'm impressed by the column that Margee Ensign writes for the Stockton Record. And again, all these are just things that are beginning to pop into my mind, ways in which we're connecting with the community. Yeah, now—what was the last one?

BLUM: Well, maybe we can have some comments on what do you see as being special about UOP in the past, and in light of that, what hopes do you have for the institution's development in the future?

REINELT: I think probably what's been special from my point of view is the openness that we've had, the innovating in one way or another: innovating with respect to the cluster colleges; innovating with respect to faculty governance; innovating again and again with respect to general education programs. I hope we'll continue to innovate in the future. I hope that as we move into rethinking general education now that we'll innovate again. I must confess, I'm impressed by the new, young faculty. I have the impression, at least within COP, that many of the departments are as strong as they've ever been. I hear good things about your history department; I think the philosophy department is pretty strong, and we have more majors now than we've ever had. And my understanding is that we may be able to—we need to, as Lou Matz takes over the general education program and moves out of the philosophy department - be able to hire somebody, because Lou is a fabulous teacher and shouldn't be in an administrative role. But he's got the other kind of vision that we need. So I'm hoping that the faculty will—and particularly the liberal arts faculty - will get together and will think—and I'm not too optimistic—about what the liberal arts role ought to be and develop a fresh way of approaching the liberal arts. The task seems to be immense as I say. The student body is so different than it used to be. Taking the students that are in the professional schools and trying to give them a broader vision seems to me to be the challenge of the 21st century in education at UOP. I think the

general thrust of the administration is good, is solid. We're developing a reputation as a first rate educational institution out here in northern California, and we're developing on a national level. I hope we live up to it.(Laughs.) That probably does it.

BLUM: Yeah. Thank you.