THE ROBERT MAYNARD HUTCHINS CENTER FOR THE STUDY OF DEMOCRATIC INSTITUTIONS

Planning Conference
October 15/16, 1979

October 15, 1979
9:00 a.m.

Transcript Tape N-51
Tracks I and II

CONFERENCE PARTICIPANTS: Herbert Alexander, Francisco Ayala, Barbara Babcock, Collette Craig, Hara Georgiou, Herma Kay, David Kennedy, Rob E. Kling, Otto Larsen, Hubert Locke, Michael Posner, Carl Rosberg, Robert Sommer, Bernard Towers, John Sullivan, Herbert Fingarette, Richard Hecht, Laurel Glass, Mason Gaffney, Axel Leijonhufvud

CENTER PARTICIPANTS: Brian Fagan, Walter Capps, Donald McDonald

FAGAN: --no problem. You are the man responsible for this date, today, the date. You remember we went on the whole thing around you. Oh, yes. Good morning, ladies and gentlemen. I think we should start. There is coffee on the side table, and we'll be taking a coffee break at about ten-thirty, so that will be all. We are a couple of people short who will be turning up. Professor Gaffney will not be here till noon. One of his children is sick, and he is coming in today rather than yesterday. Who else is here? Fingarette will be in later today. The gentleman whose name I cannot pronounce is here but has not yet arrived. And who's next to you, Don?

MC DONALD: Dr. Towers. He's around--

FAGAN: He's around.

MC DONALD: There's one card there we can't read, small letters, no the other one.

FAGAN: Babcock.

MC DONALD: Oh, Babcock.

FAGAN: She's here. I'd like to begin by welcoming you all. We are extremely privileged to have you all here. It is safe to say that we have no idea what is going to come out of this meeting whatsoever. And I would like to begin by doing two things. Firstly, introducing one or two key members of the Center staff, and then from there, I would like to go around the table and get everyone to introduce themselves and their discipline, and say a little bit about what they are interested in and what they do, because we found out at an informal barbecue last night that there was a remarkable variety of interests here. I also would like very briefly to brief you on the present situation as regards the Center, and particularly its relationship to the university, which appears to be to some of you a matter of some interest, as you are somewhat confused by the relationship, as in public we have been somewhat reticent about it. This has not been intentional. It is simply historical. I'd like to begin by introducing the distinguished gentleman on the far corner there. This is Walter Capps, who is the program director of the Center. He is a professor of religious studies. Do you want to say anything at

this point, Walter?

CAPPS: No, just glad everybody's here, and I look forward to this discussion we will have together.

FAGAN: And then the other gentleman at the table here is Don McDonald, who is the editor of The Center Magazine. Some of you met him last night. He will be, I think, talking to you all and getting to know you. Do you want to say anything, Don?

MC DONALD: No. I'll be listening very attentively.

FAGAN: Behind here is Pat Cathcart, who is, works with Don on the magazine. The gentleman back there is Mark. We are going to record this dialogue almost entirely for internal use. If we use it externally I think it's safe to say we will be in touch with you, but mainly we are interested in a record for our own purposes at this point. As you can imagine this conference is predominantly a planning group, and therefore anything we can pick bare from the deliberations we will use. The ground rules are that we have a set of chairs at the side here which are going to be periodically occupied by members of the local steering committee of the Center. This is a group of community members and faculty from U.C.S.B. who are what you might

call our month by month, day by day, steering committee. We felt that it would be of benefit to them to drop in and listen to some of the deliberations. Some of them will be here for lunch, so that you can meet them. The notion being that they will be getting into planning very actively in future months, once we have got a lot of input together, and we felt there was benefit in being here. I'd like to introduce Eulah Laucks, who is a member of the community and a very regular supporter of the campus over there. She is sitting in. I,do you want to introduce yourself, or would you prefer to be anonymous?

[FROM SIDE] I'm Barbara Sommers, and I'm here as an observer at----

FAGAN: The conference itself is designed strictly to plan. The agenda, such as it is, we do have, have given you. The notion is, at one point was to divide us into small groups at some point in our deliberation. However, our current thinking is to try and keep us all together. I think it would be more beneficial. We intend to be highly informal and to play this by ear. If there is a group of you who comes up with something very interesting and want to talk about it and then tell us about it, we'll break you off. Tonight at six-thirty, the chancellor is throwing a buffet dinner for you. Transport

will leave the hotel as scheduled on the agenda. We have not at this point made a provision for husbands or wives who may be accompanying you. We had not frankly anticipated any of them being here. If any of you have a husband or wife you would like asked to the chancellor's thing, if you could let me know during the coffee break I will see what I can do. This is not in any way intended to be a negative comment. It's simply the way we are set up on the basis of participants. I am asked by Chancellor Huttenback, who is the chairperson of the steering committee, or the board of directors for the Center, to welcome you here and say how grateful we are for your time. I think that's enough platitudes to, does anyone have any comments before I give you a briefing?

The Center was taken over, I am, only use the word taken over just to get us past it, by the university on June 20th of this year. Good morning.

LEIJONHUFVUD: I apologize for trying to find my own way.

FAGAN: Ah, we hide our secrets well. It was taken over by the university on June 20th of this year, at which point the old board of the Fund for the Republic resigned in favor of a board made up of

members of the board of a thing called the U.C.S.B. Foundation, which is basically the mechanism whereby the University of California at Santa Barbara raises private funds. And this absolutely exemplifies what this Center is. It is a completely independent organization, financially and practically, from the university. This statement may surprise you. But for twenty years this was a totally independent, totally neutral, organization, supported by three basic categories of financial support. The first one was grants from foundations. In the early days it lived a long time off the Ford Foundation. Xerox, Encyclopædia Britannica, and other organizations have contributed to the Center. Foundation support has been less important in recent years than support from major private donors, and please, Walter or Don, correct me if I am making mistakes historically here. And also from a membership. The Center, at one point, had a hundred thousand members. And we have in this organization, even now, an active membership organization which is involved in the administration and recruitment of members. We are now down to somewhere around twenty thousand members, and frankly the membership is falling. We are about to go out on a fairly large-scale membership drive in the next

two or three months, a decision which was only made on Friday. Our membership gets for its subscription, The Center Magazine. The minimum subscription, this is not a sales pitch, I hasten to say. The minimum subscription is fifteen dollars a year, but many of these people give more money. The Center at the moment is, to be perfectly and brutally frank, in serious financial difficulty. And one of the problems for the university is to put the Center on a genuinely self-supporting basis as far as budget is concerned. To do this, unfortunately, involves selling this building. But you are today in the dialogue room of the Center, which has been used since the Center's inception. You are probably the last major meeting, although there are a couple of dialogues still before we move, you are the last major meeting to be here. So it is somewhat of a historic occasion in that sense. We are going to move to the U.C.S.B.campus on the 29th of October. We are moving into a remodeled building there, initially just partially, and eventually totally, which will substantially cut our overhead. In addition, this building is being sold. And the proceeds from this sale will represent a source of income for us in the future. So, by selling the building and going on a fairly massive

membership drive, we hope that we will be able to make the Center self-supporting. Can we do it or not, is still a matter which has to be judged in the future. However, and this is the purpose of this meeting, we cannot go out on an effective membership drive and really intellectually answer the question whether the Center is viable, until we have done a great deal of planning for the future, in terms of program, because there is this weird Catch 22 between program, the results of program, and membership and financial support, not only in terms of membership, but in terms of foundations and other sources of funding, which we have to break out of, and solve. And it was felt that at an early stage in our deliberations that one of the things we should do with the Center in the future is to call on a much wider constituency of scholars and others to advise us on issues we should be confronting in the future shape of the program. This, very simply,is the reason why you are here. We will, of course, be consulting a very broad spectrum of other people indeed, indeed, our own community, our steering committee, many members of the faculty, and formerly, which is a process that has already started, and we are, of course,continuing to run a program month by month, which Walter

Capps is handling with great skill. So really we have a program going on, and we are looking here at the future. The discussions I hope we will have should, I think, proceed on the assumption that money is not a problem. I think the challenge here is to have very bright, forward-looking ideas. The money is a problem that we can look at in the future. If I have a sense in terms of funding and the Center for the future, it is, if we can balance the budget and get the thing on a firm self-support basis, which is possible, I think money for program and particularly for specific programs and discussion of specific issues, is going to be very much easier to come by than money for endowment. The relationship with the university itself is something that it is very difficult to define. I report to the chancellor personally, with no bureaucratic interfaces whatsoever. There are no vice-chancellors or deans parading piles of paper between me and the chancellor. This, if any of you are familiar with the University of California system, which you are, is a totally unique, sometimes very useful relationship. We are governed by a board of directors who are predominantly concerned with legal matters, with I.R.S. requirements, and also, of course, with what you might call high-level policy matters

to do mainly with finance. And we have a steering committee with which we are beginning to work closely and will be working much more closely with them in the future. In terms of accountability to the academic senate, the faculty organization in the University of California, we are currently working out the relationship, but they have a say in the appointment of the members of the steering committee. Our salaries for our staff, our conditions of service, and everything like that bear no resemblance to the universityds whatsoever. Our money comes entirely from non-state sources. Our programs cut right across disciplines and very often will be concerned with issues that the university has never really got into. The people who attend our dialogues are not going to be just scholars. It is a genuine, unique independent organization. My problem as the director is to maintain this independence, something which is not going to be easy, particularly with the pressures to bureaucratize, which we can't afford, and of course the other academic and intellectual pressures. So this job represents for the people who work for the Center an interesting and fascinating challenge. I think that's just about as far as we've got with the organization. Does that give people some background?

I'd just like to say a couple of other words. Firstly, I'd like to say a bit about my own role here, and then say a little bit about how you people were selected, because I think it's important you understand how this happened. I was appointed director at between three and a half and four days' notice, for circumstances which do not really matter here. I took the job for a year on the understanding that the critical issue was, was I the right person to direct the Center in the long term, either intellectually or as a person? The issue being the long-term health of the Center. About three weeks ago, I notified the chancellor that in my considered intellectual and academic opinion, and administrative opinion, that I was not. And that t he process of search for a successor for me should begin. This process, the reason for this decision is not that I don't like the job, it is without question the most fascinating job I have ever held. The issue is that the central issues that the Center is concerned with are not areas that I am myself either passionately interested in or indeed, have the time to make the intellectual investment to really learn about in detail. And my own interests, as some of you know, lie rather more in the past than in the future. And the last thing you want

in this Center is someone who looks into the past. You should need someone who looks in to the future. So the chancellor has appointed a search committee of faculty, with some consultants from the alumni, to look for a new director. And when I tell you that I myself am on the search committee, you will understand that there is a continuity there, an important continuity, because probably I know as much about how the Center runs as anybody does now. So, about January there will be a permanent director appointed. One of the objectives of this meeting obviously, to give this person a baseline with which to work intellectually. Until that date I intend to work for the Center to the death. Or to the life. Whichever happens. But I hope no one will question my interim nature. I really am going to work very hard to keep it and make it go. How were you selected? We wrote a letter to the president of the University of Washington, the president of the University of Oregon, the vice-chancellor for academic affairs of each of the U.C. campuses, the president of U.S.C. and the president of Stanford. We did not at this point ask Caltech because we felt that their interests were probably a little too specialized, which may have been a mistake, but we had to draw the line. And we asked them to

nominate two faculty members who were, firstly, of multidisciplinary persuasion; secondly, people from different disciplines; thirdly, people who were either mid-career or had a very distinguished track record in multidisciplinary research, and also people who were good at communicating. From what I saw last night, we did awfully well. And the names were nominated, and we wrote to you. Or called you. The day to day organization of the conference is in the hands of Carolyn Tyler, who many of you met last night. Next time she pops in I will stop the proceedings and introduce her. If you have any domestic problems, talk to her, not to me, please. Does anyone have any questions? I'd like now to go around the table and ask everybody to introduce themselves, the campus they are from, and talk a little, just very shortly, about their discipline and what they are interested in. This would be enormously helpful to us all, I think. Where shall we start, left or right? Barbara, why don't you start?

BABCOCK: I am Barbara Babcock. I am a professor at Stanford Law School. And I am interested in a range of issues, from, varying from sex discrimination, civil procedure, criminal procedure, and I have just spent two and a half years being Assistant Attorney General of

the United States, in charge of the civil division, so I have now developed a real interest in the role of the government lawyer. And the special requirements and aspects of working for the government. So I don't think I have, a really am very much a lawyer, so I am not sure that I have interdisciplinary interests, but within that role, of a lawyer, I have a lot of interests, which I guess is why I am here.

POSNER: I am Mike Posner, I am a professor of psychology at the University of Oregon at Eugene, and I study questions of brain processes underlying human cognition, and haven't had any real background in most of the topics that are involved in the planning paper for the Center.

KLING: I am Rob Kling from the University of California at Irvine. I study social aspects of computer technology. Some of the studies I do deal with empirical studies of computer use in natural field settings in organizations. And I am concerned with the interests served by computing developments, the hassle, the aggravation, the way people integrate computing into their own work lives, the ceremonies that attend computerization. Some of the studies I do deal with computer technology and public policy, and there are questions there

about interests, still interests served, value conflicts that puts, that attend different modes of computerization, what kinds of choices the public has, and so on. My academic appointment isin the Department of Information and computer science. I also hold a research appointment in a campus research institute, the Public Policy Research Organization, which serves as a base for interdisciplinary work, largely social science oriented, on the Irvine campus. Within computer science, I am known as someone who has been trying to use modes of social analysis to illuminate questions of computing, and that is something which has been relatively novel in computer science,for most of the modes of analysis are mathematical, where people build artifacts using engineering styles of construction. And is somewhat sympathetic along the, at least the questions that the Center takes on.

ROSBERG: My name is Carl Rosberg. I am a professor of political science at U.C. My professional interests are largely in political science, identified with the developing world, and I am fundamentally concerned with the problems of political change and development in Africa. I have been more, I have been concerned in recent years in trying to develop a, new theories of politics with respect to Africa, and particularly

the role of personal rule in Africa, as a different kind of political mode. Institutionally, I am director of the Institute of International Studies on the Berkeley campus. I am concerned with the fostering of international studies, and that ranges all the way from studies on strategic interests of the United States, strategic concerns of the United States, and security problems of the United States, to problems in comparative politics and comparative analysis and development with respect to different countries. We publish both policy studies on many large issues, such as human rights around the world, or technology transfer, and more recently we are doing studies on, studies dealing with Africa as well. We also study, publish research monographs, dealing with a range of questions.

SOMMER: Bob Sommer, U.C. Davis. I am in the department of psychology there, and I am an environmental psychologist by trade. I have taught at several schools of architecture and my interest is in the effect of the environment on people and people on the environment. Last year I took a half-time appointment as director of the Center for Consumer Research in the College of Agriculture, whose goals, as I see it, is to try to generate a decent data base for the consumer

movement, and kind of serve as a counterweight to some of the other pressures that are on the College of Agriculture there.

CAPPS: I have been introduced, but I will say a little more. I am Walter Capps. I have been an Associate of the Center for I think about three years, and on campus of U.C.S.B. I teach in the religious studies department, and was formerly the director of the Institute of Religious Studies there. At the Center, in addition to sort of watching and presiding over the month to month dialogue program, I have been responsible for a project on the implications of the impact of the Vietnam war on American values. And I am interested in value questions. And I think most recently the concern about the relationship between the academy and the university, and other professions.

LOCKE: I am Hubert Locke. My faculty appointment is at the University of Washington. It is in the graduate school of public affairs, which in itself is a bit of an oddity, since my academic preparation was entirely in the classics and theology. But my interest in the graduate school of public affairs has to do with what is euphemistically described there as the law and justice trap, particularly concerned about police problems in American society. But I don't have a great

deal of time to concern myself with either, any of those issues, because I am condemned to a term in university administration as vice-provost for academic affairs.

LEIJONHUFVUD: I am Axel Leijonhufvud, from U.C.L.A. I am an economist. Main areas have been macro-economics, Keynesian economics, monetary theory. I have been mostly concerned with issues that arise between competing or conflicting economic theories, rather than with the problems that are resolvable within any given theory. And that kind of interest has led me to be interested also in the development of economic theory, particularly over the last century. And that has led on into some interest in the history of science in, philosophy of science in general. And I also teach European economic history. And I am most interested in medieval economic history problems.

KAY: My name is Herma Hill Kay. I am a member of the School of Law at the University of California at Berkeley. I teach in a variety of areas, including one fairly abstract and eccentric area which we in the United States call the conflict of laws, and which is called on the Continent private international law. It deals with the question of how you decide which legal system controls conduct when two or

more are potentially applicable. Apart from that, when I start worrying about things that go on in the real world, I am interested, as is Barbara Babcock, in sex discrimination. I teach courses in family law and in community property. And my interdisciplinary work has been devoted to the effort to try and understand the cultural and psychological dimensions of law as a force for social control. I have taught joint courses with Laura Nader in law and anthropology. I do a seminar with one of Laurel Glass's colleagues in San Francisco in law and psychiatry as it relates to the divorce process, and I have worked with sociologists in trying to understand the impact of the California family law act, on what's left of the family in this state.

AYALA: I am Francisco Ayala, from the University of California at Davis. My academic affiliation is the department of genetics and I am primarily a geneticist by training. I am personally also for the last two years or so, director of the Institute of Ecology, which is a research unit, which coordinates and directs research in ecology. I am also interested in the study of ecology, and particularly the study of ecology. As a geneticist, my primary concern is with the

study of biological evolution. I am also genuinely interested in philosophy, the philosophy of science, in the technical sense of the w ord philosophy and I teach also a course in philosophy in Davis. I have been also interested in the humanistic and generally social issues related to, particularly to evolutionary problems and the genetic, possible genetic manipulation of humans and other organisms.

LARSEN: I am Otto Larsen, from the University of Washington in Seattle, where I am in the department of sociology. My primary research interests are in the realm of the social effects of mass communication and the development of social movements and what sort of a social-psychological approach to collective behavior,the development of public things of that sort. I am also concerned about the linkage between knowledge and policy, and have had some real experience o utside of the university in connection with several government commissions. The most notorious of which was service on the Commission on Obscenity and Pornography, which I can't seem to escape the labeling from. But I attempt to maintain some interests in multidisciplinary things. I serve on the Social Science Research Council, where I am currently chairman of the board of directors.

ALEXANDER: I am Herb Alexander. I am a political scientist at the University of Southern California. My interests are largely in the field of American politics, but specifically my niche in society is the financing of politics in this country and abroad. I direct the Citizens' Research Foundation, which for twenty years was located at Princeton and moved just last year to the University of Southern California. I devote a good deal of time there to research and writing b ut also to fund-raising, and so I am sympathetic with Brian, or other people here at the Center. In any case, I just published a book Financing the 1976 Election, which is a case study of the operation of public funding in the Presidential elections for the first time, in 1976.

CRAIG: I am Collette Craig from the University of Oregon, and I am a linguist. I am a specialist of Mayan languages, mostly interested in syntax. But my interdisciplinary interest, I guess, are from the multi-cultural and multilingual, myself, and observing cultures as I moved through from North Africa to France to the U.S. to Guatemala. And I am also personally, of course, interested in women issues.

TOWERS: I am Bernard Towers from U.C.L.A. from the School of Medicine.

As you can tell from my accent, I am an Englishman. I was recruited to U.C.L.A. in 1971, having made three visits as a visiting professor from where most of my professional life has been spent, which was in Cambridge, England. When the recruitment was being made, I was concerned about leaving the university atmosphere of Cambridge to come to what the late president of the University of California referred to as the multiversity atmosphere of the University of California. That is a concept that had disturbed me a good deal, because I think that we have been through a period of over-specialization, and fragmentation, of the academic communities, in which each department looks out to the outside, and very few people seem to be looking inside and conversing with each other. So I made it a point before I was recruited that I must be given the freedom to develop whatever trans-disciplinary programs, and I refer to it specifically as trans-disciplinary rather than interdisciplinary, because so many of the interdisciplinary conferences I have been to, every individual speaker speak from their own discipline, they do their own little thing, and other people do their own thing, and often, it seems to me, there is very little real exchange, real transmission of information. So I

speak of transdiciplinary programs. My appointment at U.C.L.A. is as professor of pediatrics and anatomy. My professional work is in the development of the human embryo and fetus before birth, and the changes that it undergoes at the time of birth and in the newborn period. But the university at U.C.L.A. has been very supportive of what I have tried to do, which was, starting in 1974, I initiated a program which I called the "Medicine and Society Forum." And I have some literature about it, and later perhaps you will give me an opportunity to talk about it. This has expanded over the years until we are teaching a number of courses, transdisciplinary courses, at various levels, undergraduate levels, professional school levels, trying to integrate in some of the major issues of today in the practice of medicine, the complex ethnical and legal problems that arise, educational problems, and this is done on the basis of a monthly panel discussion, which is well-prepared, but quite unrehearsed and spontaneous in the actual discussion. All of which have been recorded on videotape. And we use those videotape recordings as a, as one of the learning resources for class purposes. This now has expanded to what we call the U.C.L.A. program in medicine, law, and human values. And the three faculty

members are myself, Dr. Winslade, who is a philosopher by training, a lawyer by training, and now has almost completed his psychoanalytic training, and Mr. Norman Cousins, whom we recruited last year to our program, the editor of Saturday Review, of course. And we draw on a lot of other faculties on the campus.

McDONALD: I was introduced also, but like Walter I would like to say that one of my, give one of my interests, which is the mass media in our society. I have written a number of papers for the magazine in the last ten years on that subject, and the last one being a few years ago on the conflict of interest in the mass media, the conflict being simply that the media is charged with keeping the society informed on public affairs, public issues of the day, yet it also has a compulsion to make as much money as possible. And I examine that particular conflict. I am now interested in the possibility of proposing the idea that journalism is a true profession in the area of public affairs reporting, and what are the conditions under which the integrity of the reporting process and the reports themselves can enhance and enable rather than impaired, both from external sources of impairment, and internal, within the process of the mass media.

FAGAN: I should perhaps say one thing that Don brings to us, more than Walter and I possibly could, is an enormous continuity. He has been here for many years, how many years now?

McDONALD: About fourteen.

FAGAN: Fourteen years. So he has a continuity which in these deliberations is going to be vital to us.

GEORGIOU: My name is Hara Georgiou. I am in the school of fine arts in the department of art history at U.C. Irvine. I am actually an archaeologist. My field is prehistoric archaeology of the Aegean. So I am interested in predicting the past. And primarily concerned with ancient technology, as it is revealed by the various tools and implements that we find, some of which may be very peculiar, and which might have something to tell us about what people were doing, how they organized their economies, what the division of labor was in an ancient site, et cetera. I have had various contacts with institutions similar to this, I have worked with the Committee on Social Thought, a while ago, and I suppose I may be here because I have, I may be the one person on the Irvine campus who has lived in the most places, over the short period of time.

KENNEDY: I am David Kennedy, from the history department at Stanford. In some ways I am flying under false colors as a historian, because my own academic formation was in something called American Studies, which in my case meant two parts history,one part economics, and one part literature. And I suppose my own professional activities ever since have reflected that kind of refusal to specialize. I teach in the areas of American political history, economic history, intellectual h istory, and now diplomatic history. And my own research, I suppose, if it could be summarized under any one rubric, you might call it something like institutional and attitudinal constraints on social change. I have done studies of the birth-control movement in the United States, and recently a study of the many levels of the impact of the First World War on American society. I also for the last two years and this year will be the third, and I vow last, year, chair a program at Stanford, an undergraduate program in international relations, and that program, too, I suppose, has characteristics that are consonant with my own academic background. All of our students are required to distribute their curricular work through three tracks: international politics, international economics, and

a third track, which we call the humanities, but it really is inter-cultural relations, both in a kind of an anthropological and a high cultural sense. So I guess maybe that's why Dick Lyman put the bee on me as well as Barbara to be here.

HECHT: I hope that you will allow me to take a metaphor from the World's Series in introducing myself to you. I am pinch-hitting for John Sullivan, my distinguished colleague in classics in the University of California at Santa Barbara. Professor Sullivan is involved in a program of studies with U.C.L.A., and I'll be sitting in or exchanging chairs with him. My name is Richard Hecht. I am in the department of religious studies. My formal area of research is the Jewish community of Egypt during the Ptolemaic period and early Roman periods. I also have interests in the interpretation of the Bible in antiquity. But also I have a tremendous interest in trying to understand history in ways that have not been used before, trying to establish long revolutions in terms of the historical understanding of man, and I would like to see my interests going back into the prehistoric period and continuing up to the present.

GLASS: I am Laurel Glass, from U.C. San Francisco. By training, I am

a developmental biologist, who have been interested in cell interactions by directional, during differentiation of organ systems, particularly of gonad? And I am interested also in the lay problem of access to enough information that political decisions can be made, the pragmatics of those problems in a community. And I am interested also in questions of women's health, partly in terms of access, partly in terms of longevity of women, and aging processes as they modify quality of life for women.

FAGAN: Before I just briefly mention what I am interested in, I should mention that Herb Fingarette, the philosopher,will be, like John Sullivan, in and out, and he will be there this evening, so you will see him there, if you want to. He has been enormously influential on my thinking, certainly, and I know Walter's and Don's, on this multi-disciplinary dialogue. And his inputs will be valuable.

ALEXANDER: He's down there at U.C.S.B.

FAGAN: Yes, U.C.S.B. We are giving U.C.S.B. equal representation, so that we aren't overrepresented for obvious reasons. My interests started off in Africa, in archaeology and African history, which is truly a multidisciplinary subject, in a way that most history is not.

Unfortunately. This led me into a lot of work in communicating with the public about archaeology and inthe last ten years I have moved right away from Africa and am deeply involved in the whole problem of the popularization and dissemination of archaeology, which has an appalling public image connected with treasure-hunting. And I am getting more and more sucked into this. I am giving a series of seminars at the University of Arkansas next week on this precise subject, in fact. My current research, when I get to is, which is very rarely at the moment,is in a very way-out subject. I am looking at ways in which various primitive peoples, I am going to use the word again, just to get us by it, became extinct or nearly so, and the reasons why they did, from the perspective of history,anthropology, ecology, and archaeology, and the basic theme being that we have succeeded in destroying the people, and now we're rapidly destroying their history as well, because the archaeological sites are vanishing in the face of development. This turned out to be a rather straightforward project initially and is now becoming incredibly and hideously complicated. So my interests really are still ancient, rather than future. My contemporary issue really is, my biggest concern, I think, is

the overspecialization of academia, and of learning, in a way. I think we need more renaissance people, which is, I guess, a bias I bring to this table. Now that we have felt each other out, and know what we're doing,I think we should embark on the main substance of this discussion. This is, let us be frank with each other, an extraordinarily difficult task we are confronting here. What we have given you is a certain amount of documen tation. Let it be said at once that none of us here have any illusions. Robert Maynard Hutchins was a genius. He was a man of extraordinary vision, who, I believe, was insisting on and attempting to inplement broadly based, multidisciplinary dialogue involving not only specialists, but people who had their hands dirty, on problems, on basic issues, years before most people were even thinking about it. And I don't think any of us should have any illusions as to how difficult this is. The material we sent you was an objective statement which really was just to give you an idea what our minds were, a statement on the nature, purpose, and function of the Center, written by Don, who, of course, has a uhique, lengthy perspective on this. And a statement about the future, which, to put it mildly, is best d escribed as a rough draft. Walter wrote a draft, a version, I then

wrote one which was somewhat different, my draft was, been recast by a number of people. I expect to put it in the trash can eventually. But the idea was to focus on three things. The first one was the objectives of the Center, so that we just said what they were, and much of Walter's original draft was on the objectives. From there, I made a number of remarks, or we made a number of remarks, on this whole question of multidisciplinary dialogue. And having made them, I am really not sure that I understand exactly what we should be trying to do, and how. And I am very glad that there are people here who thought a lot about this. The third thing is the thorniest question of all, which is identifying basic issues. What areas should the Center's activities focus on, other than the ones that traditionally it has focused on, in the future? It seems to me, and I would very much like all the time, please, your input and reaction, that we should perhaps spend some time initially on this whole question of multidisciplinary dialogue, what it means and how it works. Because I think this may give us some clues where to go from there. I also would like to share with you an obsession which I have obtained quite recently from being engaged in a very lengthy dialogue with a collague of mine who is

president of the American Anthropological Association at the moment, who is writing a fascinating presidential address on the shape of anthropology in the year 2000. And he is obsessed, and I have shared his obsession now, that he is out of date in the way that he thinks about the social sciences and thinks about disciplinary shackles. I quote him. What I am basically saying, I guess, is, is the Center, should the Center be looking even further forward than it thinks it should, and are we even maybe trying to identify questions that nobody's even really tried to focus yet? I think our basic criteria, just to lay them on the table, are that these be issues of very broad interest which affect large numbers of people, and that they are issues where there is an interface between public policy decision-making and a great deal of basic research. Do you want to add to that, Donald or Walter? Does that seem fair, Don, Walter? Beyond that, we are rather with blank minds. Yes?

ALEXANDER: I am prepared to start off as a devil's advocate here, because I attended five different sessions of the Center, over the years, and have been in contact and have known many of the people who were involved in the Center. And I have somewhat of a pragmatic mind,

and I think that in one sense it would be beneficial to the Center if we tried to compare the Center, its successes and failures, but especially its failures, over the past few years, to survive, in effect, as an independent organization here, to compare it with organizations of a similar type which have been successful. And there are a broad range of such organizations. I think of Brookings, I think of the American Enterprise Institute, I think of the Aspen Institute, and I think it would be desirable to point out the differences between the concepts of the Center and those other organizations which are surviving, which are doing well, and, you know, which I have faith will continue to do well, in the future. Having participated in some discussions here at the Center, I have got to say, frankly and maybe not very cautiously, that I was never very impressed with what went on here. I had respect for Hutchins, but I have got to say that I had problems with Hutchins and the kind of dialogue which he attempted to construct here. And I think it's fair to say that in the academic profession generally, the Center was not highly regarded, because the Center was anti-empirical. The Center was truly an ivory tower. The Center did not seem to base its dialogues on fact and reality. And I faced that question here a

number of times, whenever I would open my mouth, and spout a fact or a figure, Hutchins would say, "We really don't want to get down to that level of fact and figure, you know, we want to think grandiose thoughts." And I think that the connection between fact and reality and theory is an important one. I'll give you just, you know, just an example. My discussions here were in the area of the political process, and my specialty has been the financing of politics, where campaign contributions come from, how they are handled, and how they are spent. And I got off on the wrong foot the first time, you know, by saying we have to look at this in perspective, and we have to look at how much money is spent in this country in politics, in relation to gross national product, in relation to disposable personal income in relation to certain indices, and what we're talking about here is a fraction of one per cent that is spent on politics, and you've got to understand it in that way, you know, whatever the costs are, whether they are high or not, you have to think in relation to the resources that could or should be available for us. And I was put down right away. "We don't want to know how much money is spent in politics." Well, how can you decide public policy, you know, without

consideration of reality? And I am probably getting off on the wrong foot here, too, you know, by being as frank and as open as I am, but I really believe that in the academic profession there was very little utility to what was discussed here. I rarely would see in political science literature footnotes relating to discussions that took place here, on public policy issues. And if there is a warning in that, I think it is that the Center has something to learn from Brookings and the American Enterprise Institute and Aspen and others, and not be as anti-empirical as I think it has been in the past.

LOCKE: Let me raise, if I can, a counter-theme, which Professor Alexander's remarks helps me to surface. And I think we need to emphasize at the outset on your behalf, Professor Fagan, or at least I should like to emphasize, on behalf of the Center, how important it is that the Center really remain independent in fact as well as in principle, from the university. I am struck in reading the materials you sent us that you give emphasis throughout to the Center's concern always ultimately with the question, what can be done? That is not a concern that the university has as a dominant, and some would even say an appropriate, interest. And I suggest that part of the difficulty

you will find as the Center increases its interactions with the academic community, and as in fact you move physically into the university's environs, is that that concern, should it remain a part of the Center's operation, and I, for one hope it will, will increasingly place you at cross-purposes with your academic colleagues.

McDONALD: I just want to add that this what can be done question, which Hutchins always insisted on as being the ultimate purpose of the dialogue, sometimes did give the impression that he wasn't interested in facts, or research, or in empirical research. But I always heard him say, and he said it, you know, both implied it and was explicit there, that we want to go, we want to include the research but go beyond it to ask that question that Mr. Locke emphasized, what can be done afterward, after you do all the research? In other words, he always wanted the people to come here prepared with the research, and have it behind them, and use, so it may be that in that case that you had some bad experiences, I don't know, I wasn't, I couldn't vouch for that; but that's a very important point, the practical philosophical approach. He wanted, he said, what is, you have to have the research, it was the old fight he had at Chicago, too, as you probably know, with

the scientists. They said, "Here are the facts." And they didn't want to go beyond that, the implications or the social implications of the facts, and he wanted to go beyond the facts. But I don't think he wanted to ignore them. I really don't. I've always thought -- I start sounding defensive, defending a dead man.

FAGAN: Professor Ayala--

AYALA: Yes. You gave us a very prospective and very brief review of the history of the Center, and I think we all have some familiarity with what it was doing in the past. You have mentioned in passing that some programs are still going on, and I wonder, and I think it relates also to the point that has just been made, I wonder whether it might not be useful if you would give us some information of what is happening right now, what sort of programs are going on. It gives us an idea of where we are before moving further.

BABCOCK: And if you could add to that, would you, which I think would be helpful, is exactly what is the Center? I mean, what, how, what staff do you have, and what's the budget--

FAGAN: O.K. Shall I?

Too faint

McDONALD: a--all_____table over here____--

FAGAN: Yes, shall I--O.K. The--

MCDONALD: --just the ocean--

FAGAN: The hot air we are generating, also. The staffing consists of myself--

BABCOCK: You're on Center salary--

FAGAN: I am on, I am a member of the faculty, at this point half my salary is paid by the university, but it will be more in the future. I am on a hundred per cent time for the first year, after that, the thing will change. Then there is Walter, who is the program director. You are on fifty per cent time, right? I'm talking about strict administrative division.

CAPPS: I don't think I know, I think I'll know in January, but for the moment I am either half time here or I am being paid a stipend, and I am full-time at the university, I--

FAGAN: There is a --

CAPPS: Until the building is sold--

FAGAN: There's a long dispute going on --

CAPPS: There is a lot of history here we probably don't want to get out on the table. But it focuses very directly on my salary and the

amount of time that I am being reimbursed for.

LARSEN: You are being paid.

CAPPS: I'm not so sure. I'm not sure of that.

FAGAN: Then we have, I am going to sort of deal with this kind of by divisions, well, it's the best way. Then we have under me, we have the administrator of the Center, the administrative secretary, whatever you like to call her, administrative assistant, who is Barbara Green, some of you met her last night. And then you have a director's assistant, who really is a sort of secretarial person cum run the place. Then we have Don McDonald on the magazine, and Pat Cathcart, who works with him, does the copy editing, a lot of production work. They are a kind of sub-unit within us, really. And then we have a number of people who work with us by the hour, most of whom come and go. They help Walter, Gladys the receptionist, who does work on the programs too, and Mike, who's there, who's supervising the move, among other things. So I would say our permanent staff is about four or five people, bas ically. Our budget,I cannot give you precise figures, I don't have them myself. We are looking at a budget in the tune of half a million dollars a year, to pay everything with, once the building

is sold, assuming. Half a million. That includes, of course, the cost of producing the magazine, which is expensive, plus the cost of membership, which are expensive, so we don't have a great deal of money at the moment. What we are trying to get toward is a base budget, which allows us to survive and run a modest program. From there we will go out massively for a specific program.

GLASS: The base budget is half a million?

FAGAN: I hope so, maybe a little more--

GLASS: The magazine runs in the red?

FAGAN: The magazine runs in the black, right? Well, the membership pays for it--

McDONALD: --membership brings in enough money to pay for the publications, and a little bit over. So the magazine can't claim that it alone is supporting itself, because the people give money to support the Center, and then part of that money goes for the magazine.

POSNER: How much of this half a million dollar budget a year is discretionary, and how much--

FAGAN: Not much, not much, I can't give you a precise figure, we don't even have it ourselves, because much depends on the price that comes

for this building. Not a great deal.

McDONALD: And then how much fund raising we are going to do in the next six months or a year--

FAGAN: Yes, for example, we've got--

POSNER: What's the range--

FAGAN: Difficult to give a figure.

GLASS: Your board members might know--

FAGAN: No, it's not so much of that, it's a question of looking down the future when the building is sold, but if you said twenty to thirty thousand dollars a year, that's ambitious.

LARSEN: Well, if you sell it for a million and a half, and you get--

FAGAN: We're in debt for half a million, for a start.

LARSEN: Well, if you invest a million dollars, you don't get very much return on that--

FAGAN: No, much depends on membership. It's, we will just, if we're lucky and sell the building we'll just about break even and have about between ten and thirty thousand discretionary.

GEORGIOU: Capital or income?

FAGAN: Income. But, again, well, on the other hand, you see, what we

have coming in the year, certain amount of major donations, and those, of course, go into program. So not much I think is the best way to put it. I am sorry I can't be more definite. I simply don't have figures, I don't even have accurate projections, because we've got a declining membership, which we're trying to turn around, and that is the big variable.

TOWERS: During Hutchins' years, which were about twenty, I think, here, the over-all expenditure was, I heard a figure of twenty-six million. Is that about right?

FAGAN: I believe that is about right.

TOWERS: The average was something over a million dollars a year.

FAGAN: Yes.

TOWERS: How much of that was going to the permanent associates, and how much was outreach, drawing people in for conferences?

FAGAN: I am speaking from his, do you know anything about this at all, Walter, have you gone into--

CAPPS: I can't tell you the percentage on that. I think--

FAGAN: Substantial?

CAPPS: If Mrs. Laucks wants to speak about it, she's, or Don, they have

been here longer than I have.

McDONALD: I don't have those kinds of figures off the--

FAGAN: Off the top of my head, at one time they had sixty employees--

McDONALD: We had seventy-five or eighty at one time, employees here, we had about twenty permanent Senior Fellows, and--

TOWERS: All receiving stipends--

McDONALD: Right. And then four or five dialogues a week, almost one a, on the average of one a day for the first fifteen years. And many of those dialogues were led by outside people who were paid stipends to come in. And then a lot of the money was used to start up the publications program in 1967. A great chunk of money had to be used just, like inertia, we started from nothing, you had to go out and acquire members. And it was very expensive to send out millions of pieces of direct mail copy to get a hundred thousand members, at the peak. And, of course, there's a normal attrition that goes on each year. And about five years ago, the board of directors made the decision that they could no longer invest money in compensating for attrition of membership, in other words, going out and acquiring new members to make up for the ones that were leaving. So therefore it's been on a gradual slope for the last five years, a

downward slope. Because no monies were invested to acquire, as every organization has to do, keep acquiring new members.

LARSEN: One hundred thousand members down to what now?

McDONALD: About twenty or twenty-five. Could I just ask on, you mentioned three institutes seemed to be going O.K., Brookings, A.E.I, and Aspen. But Aspen is heavily subsidized, I think, by Robert Anderson. He's been giving several hundred thousand a year to make up for their deficit every year, and is Brookings, does Brookings get government money?

ALEXANDER: Brookings has a large endowment, and Brookings also has contracts with government, so that that is run, perhaps, differently than an organization such as this.

McDONALD: Well, the American Enterprise Institute is ideologically conservative, and I imagine they have infusion of support--

ALEXANDER: Largely corporate support, as is Aspen, I believe, largely corporate support. And I know that Aspen has also had support from the Shah of Iran, when he was able to support--

McDONALD: Well, the Fluor Corporation was giving it until recently--

ALEXANDER: Others like that. We have, I don't mean to suggest that the same sources should be available here as there, but rather to look at

the ways in which these organizations are able to attract interest on the part of certain constituencies. I might have added the American Assembly as another example of--

McDONALD: Is that the --

ALEXANDER: A relatively, no, no, that's the one operated by Columbia University, you know, in which they take a policy issue and invite fifty or seventy-five people over a weekend, and come up with a series of policy recommendations, and then publish a book that consists of the background papers that are written for that, as well as the recommendations that are written by the rapporteurs of the various panels, and then they have a plenary session, which comes up with final recommendations, on specific issues. But those are funded, I participated in some of those, and those are funded by, I think on an ad-hoc basis, depending on what the issue is, they seek out support from constituencies that are interested in those particular interests.

McDONALD: The reason I, I just want to say the reason I knew that Aspen was in trouble, because they were looking at us a few years ago, too, we were both in trouble, you know, the deficit. And their board of directors, led by Bob Anderson of Arco, said, well, we've got our own

deficits, they were running about 350,000 a year in the red. And he was coming up with his own money for that.

ALEXANDER: But you see, one of the important things there is not just how they financed themselves, but what they do--

McDONALD: Yeah, I know--

ALEXANDER: What they do--

TOWERS: To pick this up, survival of an institute like this depends entirely on the excellence, the academic excellence of the work that is done, and the production, what finally comes out at the end of it. And I would like to support what Professor Alexander was saying, that this particular institute often seemed not to concern itself with the, with basic realities. That is was rather high-flying and ivory-tower-like. It often seemed to me that the results of the things that I read, was like a, you know, contemplation of a collective navel here in this room. With nothing substantial emerging at the end of it.

McDONALD: I'm going to sound defensive here, but the last--

TOWERS: Sure--

McDONALD: --the last year we've published in the magazine, dialogues from the table on such things as our Camp David approach to Middle East

diplomacy, the psychological effects of unemploy ment on a person who is unemployed, the superpower rivalry in the African continent, and we had, you know, the soft energy alternatives to the present mess we're in on energy, we've had any number of, I think, very pragmatic, very realistic, if you want to say, dialogues. But--

TOWERS: The topics are there, certainly, but it's a question of how you approach that topic and whether you start, as Professor Alexander wanted to do in his dialogues here, on a basis of reality, or whether you want to start--

McDONALD: Last month we had a dialogue with Al Sindler of the U.C. Berkeley's school of whatever it is, Graduate School of Public Policy, on the Bakke-Weber cases, decisions, and what, some very practical and political, very hard-nosed political discussion on that, so I really, you know, I'm starting to sound too defensive, I guess, but when I hear that we're not, we're ivory tower, and then other people in the ivory tower say we're not ivory tower enough, we don't do enough research, and we don't do enough pure research, you know.

FAGAN: I think, it's difficult being chairperson, I am going to occasionally put my hand up, because I think it would be helpful at this point, before

we come on to Richard, get started all this, is to ask Walter to say what we have been into in say, the last three or four months.

CAPPS: Well, I think it's very useful to begin the way you began. I didn't think your conclusions quite followed. I think it's useful to compare the work that has gone on at the Center with other successful think tanks. But I think there are, their number is diminishing, and I, the Aspen Institute is in terrible trouble. Brookings may be doing well, but they are tied in with governmental policy studies, and heavily financed federally. The American Enterprise Institute has a strong ideological base, which the Center once had. The Center had that in its beginning. I think one of the things that happened to the Center is that ideological, I mean, the concern that it had at the beginning has become so diffused now that there's no clear idea, and in the absence of a clear idea, I am getting back to the question about program, we have had to do certain number of things simply to survive for a while. We know that we are in a transition period, so in the middle of June, when this happened, and the university took over the Center, we decided there would be four categories of interest, just rough frameworks of interest. We would deal first with the question of intellectual leadership. I think we are dealing, working

with that subject because it helps us to define our purposes. I mean, we think about what is the new purpose of the Center. Of course, all of it in my mind is backward. I mean, here we have an institution which is trying to find its purpose. I think the successful institutions are the ones that have a clear idea, and they create an institution to further the idea. Now we have the institution without the idea, and it is frustrating as can be to work with that. I am not going to do it much longer. The second thing that we thought about doing is working with the society in transition, with the American society in transition. We get into policy areas there, we can talk about the dynamics of change, we are thinking about certain institutions that are in the process of transition, education, law, government, we are having a program next week on changes in, regarding the contemporary family. And then a third area, general framework for discussion, has to do with science, technology, human values, human freedom. That's been a long, the Center has had a long investment in that subject. It will be the subject of discussion at the next William O. Douglas Inquiry, which will be held in Los Angeles, after the first of the year. And then the fourth area is an area in which Brian has interest and expertise,

and that has to do with the relationship between this country and developing nations, Third World concerns. Now, that is as far as we've gone in sort of identifying some frameworks. Now, what we've done beyond is to become as opportunistic as we can be, in the absence of a budget. We call upon people who come through town to make presentations. We have been drawing upon sister campuses within the U.C. system. We have a paper coming up in a couple of weeks by Professor Brown, the U.C.L.A. School of Public Health, on the relationship between medicine and capitalism. We have somebody from Berkeley School of International Studies, Gene Rochlin, on plutonium power and politics. And we've been operating this way with approximately one dialogue session per week. And in all frankness, the purpose right now of the dialogues is to be able to continue having material flow to the magazine or keep the magazine alive in order to keep the membership list up to a certain kind of respectable level. But we do not have a clear, organizing idea for the future, and I think we're back to the purpose of this conference.

KAY: Could I ask a historical question? I really have only been involved in watching the Center kind of from a distance. But when you put such emphasis on the question, what can be done? What was seen by Hutchins,

or the people around him, in the, at the beginning years, as the relation between what went on around this table and what, if anything, was ultimately accomplished in that sense?

FAGAN: Don, do you want to --

McDONALD: Well, Hutchins' usual reply to that was a typical Hutchins flippancy, and that was, "Well, what has Harvard accomplished?" You know, how can you measure, how can you really put on a graph--but he was very, in his more serious moments, when he would address himself to that, as to what was accomplished, and what effect did you have, again, though, there was no way that you could, you know, tabulate it, or quantify it. But we had certain kinds of indices, like letters from people, reprints from materials from The Center Magazine, from Center publications before there was a Center Magazine, we had Occasional Papers. The frequency of reprints and the number of requests we got from professors and others for multiple copies, forty or fifty copies for the classroom use, those are all part of the record here, inside the archives, which we have, you know, complete records of that kind of resonance, or feedback, from the outer world. And then, you know, such obvious things, like Senator Fulbright inserting something in, some thing from the Center

publications, in the Congressional Record, or a newspaper, the Washington Post reprinting an article on, say, fair press and free trial, free press and fair trial--

KAY: So the notion was that people would come here, and discussions would go on, and points of view would become crystallized, people would see things more clearly, and then they would go back out, and whatever they were doing, they would help, and--

McDONALD: They would have some influence, too. But also when the publications program and the audiotape program, is a very important outreach, so to speak, of the Center. Big piles of tapes are still going out to people on, who ordered them for classroom use, and so on, seminar use, on, oh, Judaism and its, and the cultural effect of Judaism in America, and, oh, media problems, and so on. In other words, the audiotape program is also an outreach--

KAY: And that's an educational function.

McDONALD: Right. And a lot of our tapes are used on FM college stations and other FM stations in the talk format, talk shows, public affairs format.

FAGAN: It is amazing how widely they're used.

McDONALD: Yeah, it is. Those are the kinds of pieces of evidence of what effect are you having.

KAY: So it is the force of the ideas that were developed that is primarily seen as the product that will translate the analysis to the reality.

McDONALD: To the real world out there. And a person that reads an article in the magazine, we assume it has, if it's an influential leader, has some influence in the, so we have a second-stage effect influence on people. If a teacher has a classroom of two hundred students at U.C. Berkeley, and is using a, or is affected by materials that they are reading from the magazine, we assume that our outreach has a ripple effect, it goes --

KAY: And is the thought, bear with me one more second, is the thought that when you move down to U.C.S.B. there will be a format that's roughly like this, with the table and the microphones, and that that procedure will be the procedure through which you function, regardless of what the topics are, or the issues, that that format is to be taken as unquestioned, or as basic, or--

FAGAN: No. I think our rubric is to question everything and retain that which is effective. We have traditions, obviously.

KAY: Yes. But you are going to take the microphones with you.

FAGAN: Yes, but it will be a different technology--

McDONALD: Here's an example. We got a letter from somebody in India, who, in the U.S. Information Library there in Calcutta, or Delhi, or wherever it was, commenting, writing back to us on an article that they read in The Center Magazine, which the American government had put in their library, in the embassy there, or the U.S. Information Service embassy office. It's hard to tell--

FAGAN: We undoubtedly have a whole row of people. I am going to take David, then I'm going to take Rob, and then I'm going to take Hubert, and then, if that's O.K.I don't like to impose structure, but I have a--David.

KENNEDY: I felt a little embarrassed at first, it was going to take me so long to get up to speed here, but I see this is a common problem. So I'd like to ask two more informational questions, if I might. One is, I've heard some references to the publications program. I know, of course, about the Magazine, you have now mentioned the tapes. I wonder if you could describe more fully what the publications program has been, and what it's likely to be. Secondly, actually of more interest to me right now, I wonder if you could describe, give us the profile of your member-

ship, and who the members are that you've lost, and who have you retained.

FAGAN: O.K Let me talk first on the publications, and Don and Walter, correct me if I'm wrong again. There is only publication at this point, safe to say, that it is ongoing in the future is The Center Magazine. This appears commonly every two months. Unfortunately, as of next March, we have had to cut it back to a quarterly. In terms of material, it makes life a little easier, but the impact on the membership could be serious. We don't know. We've had to do it because of fiscal. We have a tape program. It is retrospective in the sense that we send material out to people, very surprising, as Don said, how much stuff is sent out. At this point we have a book program which is kind of like a book club which sort of totters along. The tape program is in suspense account? because we can't afford it. However, I have a suspicion this is going to become a very active area once we take off again. I think it's of critical importance. Membership, it is ter, do any of you have any experience with membership organization? This has been an interesting, very interesting, and I think it's worth spending three or four minutes on this, because it really gives us a cast as an organization which is a little unique. We have a membership which is extremely loyal. We are down on the loyal

core. My impression, and there is really no way of measuring this too accurately, is that our membership is relatively liberal, relatively affluent, contains a high proportion of elderly people, many of whom, if they were not at the University of Chicago with Hutchins, knew him in one form or another, and that it does not include a very large number of academics. That may not be true. I am guessing. We have everybody in this, what I see are the letters from people turning membership down, who have not, who are quitting. Many of them have quit because they don't like us to be associated with the Lawrence-Livermore lab. I am not joking. That is a reason given consistently. Other people are concerned because we are going to lose our independence, which is something we keep on coming back to. A third reason, I think, is a lot of people are tired and elderly, and it's reached the end of the line, and the university is a good excuse. They feel that Hutchins is dead, and he is now honored by the name of the Center being changed to the Hutchins Center, et cetera, et cetera. The difficult thing about membership is what it costs to maintain it, as Don said. The cost of a membership drive for the Center is going to be between fifty and seventy-five thousand dollars. And what

you basically do is keep a revolving float going, which you always have to reinvest to keep your membership there. When they first went up to a hundred thousand, they had a sixty-four per cent retention rate, which is unreal. That is really something. Which is unreal. It's incredible. It's high. Normally, it's nearer fifty.

McDONALD: The money spent to acquire that first batch of members was in the areas of three hundred thousand dollars a crack to send out direct mail. That's how much was being spent to build up the membership.

LOCKE: And what year was that figure reached?

FAGAN: 1970?

McDONALD: 1969 or 70, 68, 69--

FAGAN: Now, what we are doing almost immediately is going out on a drive, a modest one, to reduce attrition rate and to attract new members. But again, we are talking about putting some money almost into escrow and turning it over. It's a fascinating field, it's brutal, it really is.

McDONALD: Let me ask an information question. Is the direct mail, the new direct mail person, going to aim at certain demographic--

FAGAN: He is--

McDONALD: Is he going to go--

ALEXANDER: Who is doing it?

FAGAN: A guy called Robert Bason, who is an expert at it. We are, that is some thing which is being worked out this week. But it is going to be a slightly broader one than before.

KAY: And each member contributes fifteen dollars?

FAGAN: Fifteen dollars minimum.

McDONALD: It hasn't been raised, either.

FAGAN: It hasn't been raised. The thought of raising it has crossed our minds. However, at this point the less we do to aggravate our attrition, the better, and that could be a way--

TOWERS: It always seems to me it's one of the cheapest organizations to belong to. Six copies of the Magazine for fifteen dollars a year.

McDONALD: Well, and you were getting World Issues for several years, too, another five issues of a magazine.

FAGAN: Anyhow, we thought of that one.

McDONALD: On this fifteen dollars, just to add another point, many people are asked if you can afford to give more, and the average has been around seventeen dollars, really.

FAGAN: Yeah, most people give a little more. This was a strategy we--

KLING: Yeah. Let's go back to Walter Capps' observation. At this point there is an institution which is looking for a purpose, as it were, and what might be lost if the Center was folded? What in the basic, our public affairs, the United States, among the American intellectual and political institutions would be lost if there were no Center any longer, it went the way of--just want to say one other thing. While I am impressed by people writing for copies of articles, almost anybody who writes a sharp article about some issue of timely importance is likely to get some requests for reprints by somebody, even if the article is quite poor, people use it for classroom use, as an example of poor analysis. Moreover, I am now taking sort of a sharply negative stance, moreover, to the extent that the Center relies upon people who have independent reputations, if it, if the Center simply provides one outlet for them, The Center Magazine, no doubt they would find other outlets and those media would be simply then getting the requests for reprints. So the difference--

LARSEN: --can be xeroxed, you know, get all you want--

KLING: Yeah, but the question I am trying to ask is, is there a specific way of thinking about what the Center has contributed as a model of inquiry, or as an institution, to American intellectual-political life,

that would be lost if it were simply to be folded next week, with an, the last issue of The Center Magazine being a kind of an obituary, grand issue, in black borders.

FAGAN: That is an entirely legitimate question. Hubert?

LOCKE: In good Talmudic fashion, let me try to answer Professor Kling's question with a question. I am surprised, and mildly disturbed, in Professor Capps' description of the alternatives for the Center in the future, that I don 't seem to hear the possibility of the Center continuing on the very clear and explicit and avowed ideological track that characterized it from the time of its founding until about 1970. And I wonder, in fact, whether the Center has backed away from what, at least to the best of my knowledge, has always been clearly associated with the history of now the Hutchins Center, i.e., it was a child of the McCarthy era, it reflected in that period the only avowed, clearly liberal in a radical sense, center of th ought and inquiry in the United States. With the rise of the American Enterprise Institute and Brookings and Rand and all the rest of those operations, it would seem to me its ideological role left of center becomes even more important, and more vital. The fact that it's reached its peak, that it did reach its peak membership in

1970, at the height of a period in which this country was, I suppose one could say going through some of the most intense turmoil we've had to live with over those kinds of ideological questions, should say something about what the core of its support was. And thus I guess I am inclined to ask whether there isn't a recognition that that kind of liberalism just, for better or for worse, isn't in fashion in American society any more. People are much more prepared, both corporations and individuals, to pour money into American Enterprise Institutes than they are into Hutchins Centers. I can, caught up in my own analysis now. I can't help but venture a judgment. If the Center is prepared to back away from that tradition, then I would say the answer to Professor Kling's question, is that it well ought to go out of business. Or at least it ought to take Mr. Hutchins' name off its masthead. I respectfully, and in a calmer mood, would argue that there is simply too little of the kind of radical democratic inquiry going on in this nation, of the sort that this Center, with all of its problems, has represented for twenty years. And if it isn't prepared to deal seriously with that, then I don't think it has much of a mission, or that it ought to.

FAGAN: Thank you. I am asked, before we stop, to read you a message.

The smoke, smell of smoke, is due to furnace trouble. The fire department is here, and everything is under control. We should probably say something to the participants so they will not be alarmed. Otto, you've been waiting very patiently. Do you want to say something?

LEIJONHUFVUD: You told us this would probably be the final conference. I didn't know this was the way it would end. The I won't be so eager to be in on the--

FAGAN: Ascend to heaven--

LEIJONHUFVUD: Well, I have a few reactions now. I think it was clear from reading the packet, and so on, that what you said, that there is now a lack of purpose, unclear purpose. It's clear that ideology is almost gone, at any rate. What struck me was that, with an unclear purpose, with the ideological drive gone, you were holding on to the formats. The packet we got is full of repetitions, that refer to the format of these dialogues, the dialogue, multi-disci plinary, and so on. And the question that comes up, then, is yours, whether one of the reasons for the Center's eventual failure might not have been that it held onto this format, which was something that Hutchins, I guess, had once defined, and didn't want anybody to tamper with. Whether that's gone on too far,

and we should look at that as well. It's clear, I think, that the Center was not highly regarded,as you also said, in academia, in part because people didn't think much of the dialogue. On whether the Center would be missed, well, I think it's obvious that the way it's running now, nobody would miss it next week, no. So that question ought to be raised, not in relation to its present status, but to what is was in its best days. And the question then really is, what were, what would the Center have counted as its past successes, and what were their nature? Could we look at some topics or some dialogues that took place here at one time, by the Center, actually managed to be way out ahead of public opinion and form it. Can you unearth some examples for us, where the Center really paid off? One of the possible topics, I think, for us, for a Center conference, except I am afraid it sounds backward-looking, rather than forward-looking, I think that I have thought of, has to do with what Professor Locke has said. I think that in a sense to say that the Center came as a reaction to the McCarthy era, almost puts the Center, puts the Center with the wrong historical reference, historical reference to the wrong generation. It was sort of a New Deal, the New Deal generation's reaction to the McCarthy era which makes it twenty years older, as it

were, and what you said about the membership, I think backs that up. Yes, that kind of liberalism has gotten consistently weaker in the United States. I think it would be very interesting to ask why, what have been the weaknesses of that political movement in the last couple of decades? One might be a simple overconfidence. The one time that I sort of got to sniff the atmosphere at the Center, when Hutchins still was around, I felt that it was almost tangible in the atmosphere that the verities of New Deal liberalism were eternal. And would last whether you thought very hard about those values or not.

FAGAN: I am going to, I'm afraid, to exercise my chairmanly authority. I have been asked by the tape gentleman if we can break for a moment while he changes a tape. I think coffee is also ready. Yeah. So we'll break for about five or ten minutes, five or ten minutes, start off again with you, if I may--

BREAK

MEETING RESUMES AFTER BREAK
10:55 a.m.

Transcript Tape N-51
Track II

FAGAN: Richard, you are the first. Would you care to start us off?

HECHT: Well, I wanted to respond to Professor Alexander's critique, as well as to also respond to Professor Kling's observation and also develop a, my own reflection on Professor Locke's comment. And I think that on the whole, that Professor Alexander mentioning that there was a suspicion among the academics of the United States about what was going on here, simply on the basis of whether it was factual. Another easy criticism would be, well, it was never precise, there was a great deal of imprecision here, in the discussions, et cetera. And I wonder if that doesn't reflect a larger issue, which was Hutchins' critique of American education, and how American education itself wasn't daring enough, wasn't speculative enough, that it always was very, very careful. What I understand to have taken place here at the institute was sort of something different from what goes on in the academy. Also, the question of what would happen if, or what would be lost if the Center collapsed next month, or disappeared? Well, it strikes me that one of the most important vehicles for the transmission of precise discussion about issues of grave importance would disappear. I really don't think that

we in the academy have much to say, and are read very carefully, by the --

TOWERS: By the academy, you mean--

HECHT: The university. What are we doing there? How many of us really intend our work to have some impact, either on human understanding of the past, the present, or the future? I think we are much too consumed with our own specializations ever to venture a generalization about what constitutes the fabric of life. So I would say that one of the most important ways of transferring, making ourselves understandable to a larger general public, would be lost. In regard to the lack of radical democratic thinking, as Professor Locke suggested, I think that's correct. I think that we need to cling to the ideology of the Center, and over the months of August and September, I went back over my copies of The Center Magazine, and it's quite clear that Hutchins' ideology, if you can use that term, was not as confined as we might suspect. In fact, if you look through The Center Magazine over a period of almost ten years, you will find that there were at least three things that were on Hutchins' agenda, as structured by The Center Magazine. The first was the, the early warning of dangers to the fundamentals of American life, democratic life. That's one issue. The second issue, and I think this perhaps has

had a great impact was what you might call cultural-historical issues. And the third issue was a return to an issue that Hutchins and the Center discussed five years before, three years before, questions such as the Presidency, how has the issue of the Presidency changed, over a five or six or even a ten-year period of time. Continually going back to those issues and reviewing what the status of the issues were, some years removed from the initial discussion. In all three of those, I think if you look back over The Center Magazine, you will find that it was characterized by radical thought. I think that that is absolutely vital in terms of maintaining the identity of the Center. I hope that it isn't equated ultimately with the sorts of things that go on in Brookings, because I can't make any sense of that, or even the Aspen Institute. Indeed, I don't quote The Center Magazine in any of my writing, but I think I have learned from it. And I think that's our, most important task. That is more of a homily.

FAGAN: Yes, Carl.

ROSBERG: Since we are in this general discussion as to what the future mission of this Center is, the mission is, will be, what is, is going to be the impact of the university upon this Center. Because you are now

going to be part of the university despite the fact of your, that you will be financially separate, independent, but you will be under, you will be close to a university world now. And it just seems to me that you, that context will have an impact some way. And perhaps one of your missions should be, what impact are you going to have on the university?

FAGAN: Otto, you were about to say something just before we broke.

LARSEN: Yes. I have to fit ?? it in between these last two remarks here, I'd like to, I'm not going to talk about that one. It is clear that, well, one interesting thing seemed to me is this morning that the word democracy hasn't come into this discussion yet, and this is the Center for Democratic Studies, or whatever the title is. And so I have been thinking about this notion of radical thought. It's interesting how in the cycle of ideas, things that were once radical become conservative. And I have also heard therefore described this morning that this institute, or this Center, is independent, objective, neutral, and there is some concern that that kind of thing has, members have withdrawn because it didn't have the old New Deal ideological bite. But it occurs to me that it's possible,one of the models, that neutral objective, or scholarly critical inquiry could be a pretty radical thing today. In fact, it'J

rare. And that it is useful. And it could be consonant with the original mission of this Center. Now, therefore, I am pressed ti try to think of new ways to, or additional ways to address the concerns of the Center. And last week I saw an article in the Christian Science Monitor about something that might seem quite remote, but I hadn't been aware of this. One the French-Swiss border, there is an acronym called CERN. It is a center that has been operating for twenty-five years, it's a research center, and I realize that the Hutchins Center is not a research center, as such, although that might be an option. I doubt it. But this center is for research in high-energy particle physics. And for twenty-five years now, since the Second War, Europeans, and now Russians, Chinese, and American researchers are cooperating, and they have become to me a kind of an interesting challenging symbol. Now, you can say, in that realm it's easier to cooperate in work on certain basic issues, the nature of the universe, et cetera. Well, in the literature that we have we keep talking about basic concerns. And it seems to me that one of the things that are missing, and I noted, wonder about it when I read the goals of the Center, turns out to engage in continu ous dialogue aimed at clarifying the basic issues facing American democracy.

When I read these problems, I keep seeing the American focus, and it seems to me if we want to have an additional challenge, that it must become comparative. In fact, if you're going to New York, if you're going to Rockefeller and Ford, who I deal with in other contexts, the comparative thing is useful. More than being useful, it seems to me that if we, have become very much oriented toward comparative perspective, and I don't even want to apologize for the neutrality,objectivity, or independence, because it seems to me there is an ideological twist there that would be appealing, and could be a dynamic. Certainly the issues that confront the world, not just American society, need to be spelled out with alternatives, and so on, and that there is a place for that, and this, to some extent the, this Center has done that in the past. And I think it can still be, and must be, a place where multidisciplinary yes, but multidisciplinary doesn't automatically mean comparative. And if we are also serious about multidisciplinary, I am glad to see that there are people here from the physical sciences, but I think there should be more representation of that. And I think the interpenetration of all the disciplines, across the board, biological, physical, social, humanistic orientations are represented. There is a tilt here toward

the humanistic and social. And that's only part of the intellectual realm. And I would like therefore to see more global, comparative, and I think still tied with the analytic,critical,objective spelling out of alternatives would make a very radical position out of the Center, given the state of the world today.

FAGAN: Michael, you look as if you are about to say something--

POSNER: Yeah, maybe it fits in with this last comment. And what I have been thinking about is what's been raised here about possible directions for the Center, because presumably over the next day, we will begin to crystallize what some options might be. And I think all those options are tied in with how you raise funds, what information you have to gather about what your success and failures have been, and all that. So presumably it would be useful for this meeting to develop some options or directions that the local people here could think about. And some of them seem inconsistent to me, and you can't seem to, I don't think you can choose all of them. Maybe you can have some combination of them, but let me just go through the ones that I think have been mentioned here, that seem to be options for the direction of the Center, which everyone seems to agree is without direction at this point. One of them

is, that has been raised, is that it has to be ideological, it should be ideological. It seems to me that would be an interesting direction, a very liberal, militant center. It creeps into some of the work here. For example, only Republican candidates for President are talked about as not having any leadership capability, so there, it, presumably then they are somewhat, and it does seem to me to be maybe impossible to maintain that ideological bent and be part of the University of California at Santa Barbara, even with this autonomy. And so I think you have to examine whether it would be possible to have an ideological bent and be part of the university. I think this would be very difficult.

FAGAN: Which is sort of what Carl was saying, right?

POSNER: The second option that seems to me to be a possible one, although it would be difficult, different direction for the Center, it's one that kind of generally eschewed here by saying it's got to be independent, is to associate the Center more closely with the West Coast universities. Obviously someone has thought that that might be a reasonable direction, or else those of us who don't come from the State of California, at least, wouldn't be here. And it might be possible to ask what strong services a Center like this could offer which would help to develop particular

interests which might dominate on the West Coast, and which might be very important for the development of the particular problems of this area of the country. And maybe those would be basic questions. Maybe they would be broad. But they would at least allow you to ask what impact have I had in the tax legislation, or the zoning, of the State of California, or in the comparison between, say, the tax system in Oregon and Washington and so on. And that may be a little bit mundane, as a direction for the Center, I think, but I think that at least it's something that's fairly concrete, might be, make it possible for the universities on the West Coast to make sort of contributions, perhaps not in money, but in perhaps allowing professors to take a certain amount of leave time to come to the Center to present papers and so on. So that there could be that sort of educational mission. And that seems to be rather different than a sharp ideological bent, and it may be more consistent with your new location. A third area that I think is fascinating, because it seems to me to be an important way of the future, and something that's represented here, and that's the frankly international look for the Center. And that's what, I think, Otto was talking about. The term "Third World" is complex because it's both a rich world and a poor

world. There are some very rich countries in the Third World now, as well as some very poor ones. And there undoubtedly would be the opportunity for financial income by attempting to deal with problems that have to, that relate different communities in the Third World to the United States. And no doubt being on the West Coast here there's strong interest among students and faculty, for example, in Latin America, and that might be an important direction for a Center that's not duplicated by other activities. And might even involve some income, and particularly might catch changes in which the United States has been so self-concerned with American democracy and American leadership and so on, to a time when it, I think is clearly coming, when the United States will just be one country among many countries who have great wealth and power and so on. All, I am sure there are other ideas and directions, but it seemed to me that it probably won't be possible to take them all, and they all have lots of implications as to how you raise funds, and how strongly you maintain this idea that we are autonomous, and we don't have anything to do with education, how strongly you say, well, we are going to be judged by the impact that we make in the real world, rather than the academic exercises that we produce, or the reprint requests that

we get, and so on. So that I think someone is going to have to spend some time articulating these and the other options that are going to exist, working out what their financial and so on might be, and what sorts of data that the people here would have to collect in order to make a convincing case that the Center could play any of these roles.

FAGAN: Bob. Oh, Rob.

KLING: I guess that I see a couple of thrusts in the last few moments of the conversation I'd just like to draw out. I think the earliest examples that are contrasted with the Center were the American Enterprise Institute, Brookings, and Aspen. And of those, not to fault your empiricism too terribly, I don't think the American Enterprise Institute is markedly empirical in its work, nor to the extent that it gets any notoriety, is it because of the soundness of its empirically grounded research. But of the institutions--

ALEXANDER: Oh, I think the --

KLING: No? Well, as a reader of some of their periodicals, there is a lot there, their work is as much ideologically oriented, and its sharpness on the American intellectual landscape is because of its ideological orientation. And that's what it provides as a distinctive

institution, as I read it, in contrast to, say, the Aspen Institute, where politics are somewhat more muted.

ALEXANDER: O.K. Just let me ask you one--

KLING: That's a very important role, for an institution, but that, the, very different from saying it's primarily objective, if that were--

ALEXANDER: Just let me, just let me adjust one fact there. The American Enterprise Institute has a whole series of "Canada at the Polls," "Israel at the Polls," you know, a number of electoral studies, for example, which are, it's really the only institution in the country that is emphasizing the electoral process. There is no ideology involved that I've been able to see. It's comparative, because it covers many countries. And it's empirical. And--

FAGAN: Excuse me, this is a very specialized institution--

ALEXANDER: Well--

FAGAN: -in its way, a highly specific purpose, right?

ALEXANDER: Well, that's part of it, yes, but that's part of their program.

LEIJONHUFVUD: I think you are flatly wrong there. There are no lack of sort of conservative, hackwork institutes. They are all over. And the way, the reason the American Enterprise Institute has sort of made it,

has had an impact in recent years, I think, fits Professor Alexander's bill perfectly. They know what they are talking about most of the time. At least what I have read.

KLING: O.K..Let me just--

LEIJONHUFVUD: They are ideological, sometimes, but they commission good studies. They commission good studies--

ALEXANDER:So does Brookings.

LEIJONHUFVUD: Yes.

ALEXANDER: You know, Brookings has its token Republicans just as the American Enterprise Institute has its token Democrats.

LEIJONHUFVUD: I am just backing Alexander up, saying, never mind the ideology, Brookings or the American Enterprise Institute.

KLING: Oh, O.K., well--

LEIJONHUFVUD: Why they have an impact is that they know what they are talking about, and are--

KLING: Well, you, you know, I was thinking about what would happen if the American Enterprise Institute left the American landscape. It's much clearer to me that they have made an impact in at lea st grounding

a kind of a conservative political analysis. And it's something to be, would be clearer what would be lost if they left than if, say, any university, multidisciplinary center left the American landscape. And it strikes me that the hole that's missing, in part there's a hole for a complementary kind of analysis these days, coming from a liberal, or a radical, democratically oriented perspective. And that's where there's a real hole in the United States at this time.

McDONALD: Well, for that you have the Institute for Policy Studies in Washington.

ROSBERG: I don't know that that's completely right, it's also the quality of the material that's coming out. That's the difference, I think, one of the cutting edges of this is the quality of the analysis, and that varies enormously, particularly in the foreign policy field.

FAGAN: Which kind of brings us back to what you started us off with, which is data. The quality of the data is very important.

KAY: Were you finished with what you were saying?

KLING: No, I haven't.

FAGAN: Sorry.

KLING: There are some other models that have been mentioned. One is

a multidisciplinary study which focuses on the process. But it strikes me that there are many multidisciplinary institutes or at least interdisciplinary institutes at many universities which, while they often specialize foci, if you pick any of the issues which are listed in the public affairs agenda, no doubt there are a couple of places in the country that do substantive work on any of them. And that as a consequence it's not clear that if the Center simply developed a process-oriented focus, emphasized being multidisciplinary, dealing with public affairs, it would particularly add much. Nor am I at least personally struck by trying to find some thoroughly new agenda or some thoroughly new focus that gives, at least makes use of the letterhead and the endowment. For example, turning internationally, well, if someone cares about it, maybe it's worth doing. I mean, that's one of the, Hutchins is so thoroughly identified with the Center in the way that charismatic or strong individuals are often identified with any going venture, that it might pay just to turn it over to the University of California as an organized research unit and let faculty members who care about something use it for that something, if it is going to be some focus which is wholly disconnected with any past that the Center has. I suggest that

there be some continuity, either ideologically, or, I have a stronger sentiment for that than I do for its particular scholarly process. But if there is not to be any continuity at all, and it's a letterhead searching for a purpose, and let some faculty who have a purpose thereby bowdlerize it for their own interests, or kill it. What else would it serve? What else would it serve at the Center for the Study of Democratic Institutions if there's no continuity with some of its past?

McDONALD: May I speak on that? Because I think there is continuity, and I think there is a purpose. I'll try to organize my thoughts. Hutchins used to say that our only prejudice is, speaking of ideology, our only prejudice was democracy. And again, it sounded a little flip, but it really meant what he said, in that the purpose of the Center was to clarify basic institutions which had to do with, or basic issues which had to do with such verities as justice in a democratic society, freedom, and equality. Now, those are all abstractions until you make them real in the sense of the equality of your analysis and the type of problems that you grapple with, take on for study. And he also said that the interpenetration of the intellectual with the political was a part of

the purpose of the Center, that the academy seemed to be too much concerned with the intellectual and that the people running the political processes were not concerned enough with the intellectual. And he saw a need for some kind of institutions which would being together intellectual political principles to bear on political realities. And I think this is, you know, I think that's pretty radical, as somebody said here, I think, down at the end of the table, pretty radical set of, a pretty radical agenda to be a center of independent thought and criticism, looking forward to a more just society, more equitable society, and a freer society.

GLASS: And yet the question has been asked here, is did they in fact--

McDONALD: Did they, in fact, do it? And somebody said, what are your success stories? Well, there have been some. But again, how do you define success? How do you define--

GLASS: Association--

McDONALD: Pardon me?

GLASS: How much intellectual excitement went from the dialogue participants or from the associates--

McDONALD: Into the political process?

GLASS: That really did interpenetrate?

McDONALD: All we can hope for is that if you put out enough materials, written, and audiotapes, and so on, and if they, to the extent that they do clarify basic issues, that there are receivers on the other end, listening to the tapes, and reading the magazine, that isn't enough? I don't know what else you can--

GLASS: --ask for a mind that is changed because it's been part of the conversation--

McDONALD: A mind that has been changed?

GLASS: That you go on working with ideas that you may have come with, and then they turn alive and you are asking different questions because we've talked. And this I'm not hearing--

McDONALD: Well, I don't--

GLASS: I am not hearing that people--

McDONALD: I must be very frank. I don't know how you can identify, reach out and find who those people are that you changed. I have an act of faith, that, and hope, mostly faith, that some minds were changed and some ideas were affected by the clarification process here.

LOCKE: But that may be an argument with format, not with purpose.

McDONALD: The purpose was that Hutchins--

LOCKE: I think Professor Glass's comment runs in that direction. I think, I too have some misgivings about the appropriate of the format, twenty years later. But the purpose, I think, if we can separate those two, at least I hear several of us trying to say to you that the purpose of a Center of this sort, devoted to those kinds of issues, is still one of the most important single things we could identify in a contemporary society.

McDONALD: Well, that's what I believe. I believe that's true.

LOCKE: But I suppose that, just at the risk of beating this to death, that maybe one of the things we should give some time to is whether or not that format accomplished its stated purposes--

McDONALD: That's a historical question question, sure, sure--

LOCKE: Can it do so today, or are there other ways you might want to get at it?

McDONALD: And we are told that the day of liberalism and radical thought is dead, it's a whole new ball game, this other game's in town, and so on. And I don't quite believe that. I think that to the extent that we are basic and do go after important issues, it's still a good game. And can

I just say one thing about basic, why the basic issue format, or vocabulary word came into the whole thing is that the Center, there wasn't a Center twenty years ago, but there was a Fund for the Republic, which was the parent organization, which preceded the Center by five years. And the Fund for the Republic began studying what they called burning issues, McCarthyism, that was the biggest one at the time. And somebody around Hutchins said, one of his directors said, "Well, it seems to me we are just putting out brushfires all around. McCarthyism rears its ugly head here, and we give some money to some Quakers who defy McCarthy. And then we do something else over here. What are the basic, underlying causes? Why is a phenomenon like McCarthyism, or say cultural isolationism, so rampant in America? Why don't we have a center, not a research center, but a study center, which would look at the basic causes of these burning issues. And that's how the basic issues program got started. It was to get beyond the headlines and underneath in a sense the headline issues of the day. But if we can't, the question is how well did we do? It's the historical question, how well have you done that? And we can cite some that we think are success stories, but that's a matter of opinion, as to whether they were successes or not.

LEIJONHUFVUD: I want to make one connection with what I said before. And I want to raise another question that we've only skirted so far. Posner said before that the Center would have to choose, that it couldn't do all things at the same time. And suggested some alternatives. And my reflection was that obviously the Center has refused to choose in the past. There has absolutely been an unwillingness to exclude any potentially important topics. I, I, yeah, I think there is nothing that you would rule out, like Horace. O.K.? And that's,O.K. Now, the point about that, I think, is that that's obviously tied to the format. You could not refuse to choose, refuse to exclude, if you were actually doing research here, and putting resources into decent research. It's the, it's tied to this dialogue format. And it's very hard to think of any other way that you could go on in this way, being interested in anything except to stick with something like the dialogue format. But I am skeptical about that, as I have said. The other thing that I think it is time that we asked, before we go on much further, is whether we could have an avowedly ideological Center within the University of California. I think that if you announced that that's the way you are going to go, you are going to find that the new setting into which the Center is

coming into, is going to be one that shows you a great deal of enmity. And it is going to cause you tremendous problems.

ALEXANDER: And the purpose of dialogue is to seek the truth, and the truth may not be any particular ideology.

McDONALD: Right. Ideology ought to be defined a little bit. Does it mean dogma, political dogma?

AYALA: One could be flippant about that. I could quote something which shocked me when I first came to the United States. Some religious organization in the United States and elsewhere, with, it says that the only belief that they have in common is not to have any belief in common. Well, you know, it might be that ideology, the kind of ideology that we are talking about, the ideology of the Center, might be not to be committed to any ideology, which in a way will be the requirement of truth, whatever that might be, not to be committed. But I would like to comment on the whole matter of purpose, as has been called purpose. But before that I want to make another remark, not totally relevant. Professor Larsen mentioned CERN in Geneva, as an example of a place where people from different countries and different interests come and interact. I think that they do interact there, but it is, it does

not prove that people can interact ideologically. I believe that it can ['t??] be done. So what keeps them together is just instrumentation, it is that simple. It is that the European countries realize none of them could build the kind of big cyclotrons and other instruments that are necessary for high-energy physics research today. So they put their money together, created a center,the way it operated is that you, like Oak Ridge in the United States, is sort of write there and ask for time, to be given a few hours, a few days, at such and such a period of the year. You go there --

LARSEN: But could you imagine a social or a cultural counterpart for survival?

AYALA: Well, the whole point is that it builds with instrumentation that none of them come by, none of the countries, not to speak of the institutions, can acquire individually. And that's what keeps them together. It is, that, by and large, is just an administrative device of research time in big equipment. And people come there and do a little bit of research. They go back to their institutions and that is the end of the interaction. Maybe while they are there, they talk to their colleagues. But hardly much interaction. There is another center like

that now in Europe in Heidelberg. The acronym escapes me at this moment, but it is in, the Institute for Molecular Biology, Center for the Studies of Molecular Biology, again because molecular biology nowadays requires, you know, very expensive instrumentation. But left that aside, I think that that, all the issue that you raise as to what I think relates to the purpose. And I very much agree with that. And I wonder whether you may help us, help me to focus some of the things that has been said with respect to continuity, and what is the purpose of this insti, this Center. The Center is called the Center for the Study of Democratic Institutions. It concerns itself largely with the study of institutions, but it also concerns itself with the study of how you call them, issues. The issues were, had largely to do in the past, as I understand them, as I understand the history of the Center, they were issues that had to do with a, I don't know how to put it, with the structure of society. Now, I think what Professor Larsen mentioned, and it was mentioned perhaps also by others, was that maybe we should broaden the scope of that. That is, one could not continuity with the Center and with the kind of, you know, historian intellectual exploration that the Center used to do, and not limit ourselves to the study of the

structure of the democratic society alone. I think, what I am trying to say is that I wonder whether we should not discuss explicitly this matter, whether the purpose of the Center is going to limit itself to the kinds of issues and institutions that were studied in the past. When we received the invitations to come here, at least when I did receive it, I thought perhaps it was in the minds of the, of the people who were organizing this meeting, was to explore the possibility of broadening the scope of issues that had been considered in the past. I was much disappointed, I must say, when I read the position paper, disappointed in a, if you wish in a sort of self-centered way, because it seemed to me that the issues mentioned there were the same kinds of issues that have always been explored by this Center. And then I was wondering what am I doing, as a natural scientist, here. Surely I am concerned with those issues, but I have nothing really to report in terms of scholarship or vision there. So I was under the impression that at least it was going to be explored, the matter was going to be explored whether the Center is to continue dealing with this social democracy, or this, let me put it differently, the issues that concern the structure of a democratic society, or whether it is going to be dealing

with intellectual issues in general. That is, the Center could conceivably, in my mind at least, maintain a continuity, maintain its tradition, and just broaden its scope very much, and converting a center of exploration & a study of intellectual issues in general.

FAGAN: I just, just make just a point, this is again not defensive. The position paper I gave you was written very largely from what you might call archives. And it was written with a purpose, which I did not make explicit, which was to get you to react. I think it has succeeded. Because you are so right.

TOWERS: Can I just say one word about CERN? I haven't followed it in recent years, but certainly during the first ten years it was very interesting that by collecting scientists from different countries and with different interests, doing extraordinarily good work, the papers that came out of CERN were always a produce of CERN. And the individual contributors to the research were not individualized by name. It would have meant a paper being co-authored by thirty or forty authors, very often. And so instead they always produced the research papers as a product of CERN, which to me is a very significant social event. And I was looking forward one day to the Nobel Prize being given to CERN.

Because the Nobel Prizes given to individuals, I think when the history of this century comes to be written, will be shown to have been ultimately a destructive, in a sense, of true transdisciplinary studies, or true cooperative studies, of any kind. Individual scientists try to make their mark, and God, you've seen them, you know, hanging on, waiting, waiting, waiting for that phone call. And eating their hearts out. It's a thing that academics tend to do a great deal, looking for the next promotion, or the next step, or the election to this society or that society. We all of us need stroking from time to time. But the individualism of the university setup, as it seems to me during this century, I think is destructive of the concept of the university itself. It leads to the multiversity, that Clark Kerr used to talk about, whereby, I think, we lose the possibility of dialogue, we lose the possibility of true transdisciplinary studies. And that is why I think so many of the dialogues that have taken place here, at least from my readings of the reports of them, have really been statements by individuals of their individual views, with then a reaction from somebody else, but with no true meeting of minds, it has seemed to me very often. And I think you have to adopt a very specialized technique to get true transdisciplinary

studies going. And sometime during the course of today, I would like to talk about the techniques that we have been developing down at U.C.L.A. to get true interchange, which we must do for a pluralistic society, we must create an atmosphere of tolerance for another person's point of view, and an atmosphere in which there is genuine listening and genuine learning by scholars from those, scholars from other disciplines, who in order to communicate at all, must get beyond the jargon of the discipline. Easiest thing in the world to spout jargon from one's own field of expertise, but if you're really trying to get a meeting of minds, and understanding of the basic issues, then you must eschew jargon, and you must be prepared to listen. You must be prepared both to teach and to learn at the same time. And if you do that, then real changes of mind do take place. And people go away different from how they came. So many, many meetings, it seems to me, people go away with exactly the same ideas that they brought to the meeting. They haven't changed a whit.

McDONALD: Herb Fingarette's going to talk to that, too, I think, when he comes.

FAGAN: I was going to say could we start the meeting this afternoon

with that? Because I think it would be a good kickoff point, because Herb Fingarette, he, a philosopher, will be here this afternoon. And he has been thinking a lot about this thing. I saw Walter first, I think, and then--

CAPPS: I was just going to ask him to elaborate, but if we do it this afternoon--

FAGAN: I think that would be helpful. Yeah.

KLING: Yeah, well I just have a quick observation, and it's that it seems that there's a, to me a tremendous tension between the conception of a study center in which there is some kind of dialogue between the participants, which may be of tremendous value to them as individuals, whether or not the Center has any labeling of a product, like CERN. And that's sort of one model. Another is a Center which produces products which have the institutional label on it, in some way or another, and perhaps with individual authors, and has distinctive stream of intellectual products coming out. And what I hear you speaking about is a kind of educative process, which is important for the participants, and has validity, whether or not it leads to products which have an institutional label. Is that correct? It's a very different model than

I hear it spoken about when I hear people say, well, what's the impact, at least in a public way.

TOWERS: Well, you have the same structure in transdisciplinary work, workshop or whatever it is, that the products of that workshop and the meeting of minds that takes place, can then have an impact outside. It may be done by the written word, although I think in this day and age, the written word is really outmoded. And I think we have to go to other means of communication, such as your audiotape, or such as we've done on videotape, where the amount of transfer of information, which is done by body language, can be recorded, because if you take a transcript of a videotape, you lose about half of the informational content, of what took place in the discussion, because --

GLASS: You also, however, increase the length of time that is required to [a draft? address? ] with it, with what is essentially a static medium, which is transmitting only to you, with which you are not--

TOWERS: The written word--

GLASS: No, a videotape.

TOWERS: The videotape.

GLASS: One reads much faster than one observes a tape.

TOWERS: Yes, but it's a question whether--

GLASS: And one is not participant in the sense of addressing a person, when making use of a tape or a book.

TOWERS: Well, it all depends how the tape is being used for instruction purposes. And I'll talk about that a little this afternoon. Because there the tape has a starting point that will stimulate the dialogue, stimulate the further discussion, and you can have audiences, I have had audiences, two or three hundred, who have been raring to go at the end of a tape discussion, and ready to interact with one another.

FAGAN: This must be a remarkable tapes.

McDONALD: You mean, when you say the written word is outmoded, are you making an either/or, you are not, I hope you are not, either a videotape or a written word.

TOWERS: No, I am a bibliophile and I love the written word. And yet I think it has been essentially a two-dimensional mode of communic ation. It's written in linear script, and it breaks everything up, and I think a lot of our problems of understanding today is because we've been too committed to two-dimensional thinking, and two-dimensional modes of expression.And I think in this complex day and age, where we have some

understanding of the evolutionary process, of developmental processes, we have to think not in two dimensions, not in three dimensions, but we have to think in four dimensions, in that we have to think in terms of process, in terms of process and development. And that's intellectually very stimulating, very challenging, and it's also very difficult. But it seems to me that it offers the hope of true understanding, meeting of minds from different specialized disciplines.

FAGAN: Yes.

GEORGIOU: We are throwing around an awful lot of different issues here. We started with hard facts, bottom line that leads one to think that, about budget, that leads one to think about what is the purpose of the institute, et cetera. Everything that we have been given is just terribly vague. I'd like to go back to an idea that was spoken about earlier. You know, where has all the membership gone? And I think it's gone because the issues are no longer issues that are of any vital importance, or are considered to be possible to discuss. We are talking about equality, freedom, justice, truth, apple pie, et cetera, et cetera.

McDONALD: Those aren't issues. Those are objectives.

GEORGIOU: Those are objectives. They are points of discussion. Would

we agree on that?

McDONALD: No, I really have to insist that those are not basic issues. Those are the principles and goals of a democratic society. The issue is the exclusionary zoning, which excludes low- and moderate-income people from certain parts of the city. That's an injustice. And those are the issues that are taken up.

GEORGIOU: O.K. I take the correction, then. The point still remains the same. I think people have very much lost faith in the possibility of achieving those. And perhaps the methods that have been explored here no longer are valid today.

FAGAN: Yes.

POSNER: I don't think that things that have been thrown out are quite random. They go together in special ways that I think we have to consider, if we try to package any kind of possible, after all, we aren't going to make the decisions here, but try to give people who will be making decisions some kind of alternatives to make. For example, the kind of program that Professor Towers was talking about, my guess is, depends on some sort of educational mission. He is located on a university campus, and he's got built in the people who can observe and can work

work with the tapes in courses and so on. And this institute, this Center, could probably go in that direction. In which case it probably would not care very much about private membership, but would try to get its program closely, and it probably wouldn't worry so much about a complete autonomy from the university, it would probably try to get its program closely associated, so young people, postdoctoral people, doctoral people, and so on, would come to sit in and institutionalize the results of the discussions, as any educational institution really does. And that's quite a different direction, and not an uninteresting one, but a different direction from going out for a public subscription because your main thing is a magazine, which is read by non-academic people, and so on. And so I think it's true that there are a lot of ideas, but I don't, they link together in particular ways. And I think at some point in the conversation, probably tomorrow, people are going to have to link together the various things that would make a possible center. And there are really a number of different schemes or scenarios that have been presented here. And as I say, I don't know that we're going to make any, come to any agreement on it. I don't have any really strong view of my own on this. But someone is going to have to make a

decision on it, or decide that it isn't necessary to make a decision, and the current kind of general, very general approach, trying to sort of do everything, is itself viable.

FAGAN: I'm going to throw a, did you, a perhaps non-existent cat among the existent pigeons. Several people are murmuring, I think, and saying, and fairly explicit, is the Center totally out of date in its concerns? I hear about New Deal liberalism. I am an Englishman by birth. I don't know what New Deal liberalism is, particularly, and I have never studied it. And are we completely out of date? Should we start again from scratch, intellectually, in terms of the things we are looking at? Are we in a society, one, the biggest impression I have of all of you people is that you are all working with issues of absolutely fiendish complexity.

AYALA: I would make a non, very informal comment, but I hope relevant. Being an evolutionary biologist, a person of the science of evolution, I believe very much in evolution. I think there are two possible mistakes. One is to completely deny the roots and the traditions. I think it will be, you could certainly start a center with or without, with the same name or different name, and start from scratch. I think that probably

would be a mistake. The Center have served some purpose. I think we could try, with this, what I thought when I read the position paper, is what was being intended, although I must say to your credit, Brian, that your original letter was framed in a broader way than the position paper eventually was. Anyway, one could try just to keep doing the same sort of thing in the same sort of way. Which as I said, that is the message I got from the position paper. I think what, if the Center is going to survive, like any organism, any species that tries to survive, it has to evolve. I think it is better to keep the roots, I think it is better to keep moving, not to keep doing the same thing, because things which reflected the vision of a man or a group of people at a certain time in history, if one keeps that static, eventually it dies out. And I think part of the problem of the Center in recent years have been, it has been evolve insufficiently. So I don't know where we, the Center should evolve with. I think it should evolve. And it seems to me recent history clearly support that. I would hate the notion of just breaking totally and radically with tradition. The Center has served a purpose and the historical roots are going to help.

FAGAN: Yes, Herma.

KAY: I think, you know, one of the problems that we are grappling with here is that the Center unfortunately has a patron saint, and I think that there's a lot of weight that's going around the table about, you know, whether Hutchins' name ought to be left on the Center, if the ideals are going to be changed, and how we are going to carry on this kind of thing that had, after all, a very particular origin and history. And it strikes me that somehow we are going to have to come to grips with the question of whether we are going to try to carry on down in Santa Barbara something that Hutchins thought was important, and try and follow that format, and try and keep the inquiry closely structured to the things that he thought were important, or whether we are going to try and expand this, and get rid of the sort of weight of the dead hand, and say, O.K., there's a spirit there. And we ought to try and find the questions that are present now, that would have been the kinds of questions that would have been consistent with that kind of motivation. You know, it's one thing to have a charismatic leader who dies, and then to have people who come along and try to carry on the tradition. It's something else to find another charismatic leader and to let that person do, as Professor Kling said, what that person finds interesting

and stimulating. And I think, you know, there's a basic difference there.

FAGAN: Very important point.

SOMMER: I am a little curious about what mechanisms for succession were built into the Center, you know, in the first place, or during the last decade. Obviously, when one runs an organization, one realizes one is mortal, and other people will eventually take over, and that the organization will need a budget to continue. There must have been some kind of consideration of the future in an organization like this.

ROSBERG: Charismatic leaders don't provide for that.

CAPPS: I am sure Don knows more about this than I do, but I have been very impressed in looking back over the history of the Center. I was not part of it, although I have lived in Santa Barbara for fifteen years now, and been up here on many occasions before I was more formally associated with the Center. I was impressed with Robert Hutchins' ability to anticipate and to pick out people to carry on the work. However, what he didn't anticipate is what just, that the Center would cease being a private institution and would go under the auspices of the University of California. Now, I, my own feeling is that it probably, I don't know what would have happened had that not happened. But he, I am not even

sure he would have approved of that, had it, had he been around to watch that. When Chancellor Huttenback asked me, the first time that this thought occurred, what I thought about an association between the Center and the university, I said, well, that would kill the Center. I think maybe the Center would have died anyway, but I am sure that Hutchins did not think about a formal alliance with the University of California, and for that reason the lines of transmission weren't worked out very well. He did have other plans, I'm sure, had the Center remained in private hands. While I am talking, I'd like to pick up on what Professor Kay said. I think one of the, being in religious studies, I pick up on thoughts like this. Let me, one of the important elements to the future of the Center is to understand, try to understand, how significant the mystique of the Center has been. I have been concerned that little by little, probably by necessity, we have been chipping away at those components of the mystique which will probably be the only way in which the Center can survive, and included in those things I would list, well, the presence of the great man, for one thing, Mr. Hutchins, who dominates everything. Not only Mr. Hutchins, but he had a group of very illustrious minds that he had collected. I think when the Center began to disintegrate,

or to deteriorate, was precisely the time that the majority of those people were no longer here. I mean, they, there were certain squabbles that occurred, some of the people died, very few of them are around any longer. And the group that is, has been assembled now, by the university and by what we can do locally, with all due respect, is not of the caliber of the original set of people. Another thing that Mr. Hutchins had going for him in the beginning, which we do not have, is adequate funding. He always had somebody there who could pick up the bill. I was at Colorado during the summer, and made a four-day study of the Aspen Institute, which is another one of Mr. Hutchins, the product of one of his ideas, and has the same combination there. He had Mr. Benton at the University of Chicago, he had Walter Pepke? at the Aspen Institute, but there was always adequate funding to initiate a venture of this kind. And then another thing that the Center had as part of its mystique is this place, this building. Now, I don't know if we can adequately calculate what happens when you move off this hill onto a university campus, into a building which some people, somebody said, the story that will appear in Time magazine, if it occurs, it it appears, is, will be titled "From the Mansion to the Barracks." That has a tremendous kind of

psychological and emotional effect, I think, on the future of the Center. Because you come up here, and it looks like there is really something going on here, marble halls, and this kind of room, and everything that goes with it. In addition to all of that, the Center had a great ability to anticipate. I don't think that the ideology, the original ideology, is dead. I just think that there are other segments of the society which are caught up to where the Center was in the beginning, and that has become, it becomes difficult to know how to anticipate now for the eighties. I think the agenda for the twenty-year period was a very, very good agenda. It was worked out and it was very well conceived. But at this juncture it's difficult to know what Mr. Hutchins or anybody who would be in that position would do if he were simply starting the Center, given the needs of the democratic society at this particular juncture. One final thing, is that as part of the mystique there were great, there was a great, a large network of interrelated components. The Center was never really independent. It was independent from federal, from state-supported institutions, but it was linked in with the tradition of Great Books, it had part of the Socratic dialogue as part of its oprating assumption. There were a lot of, a network of attitudes about the power

of the Graeco-Roman literary tradition, which was all part of this. The same mix of things is implicit in the work of the Aspen Institute. The tie with the University of Chicago was always strong. I mean, always the majority of the people sitting around this table had some close connection, either presently or formerly, with the University of Chicago. And I would say the most, all of those things have disappeared in the last twelve months, and that, well, I don't have to draw that conclusion, I don't know how you put the pieces back together again, to re-create the mystique upon which I think the long-range viability of an institution of this kind rests.

ALEXANDER: Can I just interject to ask who were the great minds? I don't ask it in a derogatory way, but really, names fail me, at the present time. Can you go through a list of people?

CAPPS: Don could do this so well. The original group included Rex Tugwell, and Reinhold Niebuhr was out here, they were all people of recognized accomplishment. Mortimer Adler, who were the others, Don?

McDONALD: Gunnar Myrdahl--

CAPPS: He was here from time to time--

ALEXANDER: Well, you said, you see, you said there was a collection of

great minds here. And--

McDONALD: Well, one person's great mind is another person's pygmy. But Scott Buchanan,who had a pretty good mind, and Stringfellow Barr, but I don't, I am not sure that the majority of people, Walter, were University of Chicago oriented, I really, you know, there were a few from Chicago, but they were never on the staff. I mean, Buchanan was in and around Chicago, and Bill Gorman. But the actual staff, and, I am not going to get, I wouldn't want to get trapped into saying we had all great minds around here. There were some good minds, but were they great? That's another historical question, really. But the people were stimulating--

FAGAN: --were--

McDONALD: Well, they were stimulating, no,he is talking historically, he is talking historically.

KENNEDY: But speaking historically, that group of people had a certain generational commonality, had undergone a similar historical experience, they had a certain implicit agenda for themselves. I think the absolutely central problem that we are failing to get a handle on today is that we don't have that kind of easily assumable common agenda. If we could

specify that, we would be sailing.

BABCOCK: Would it be useful to ask what the Center could do, or what contribution it could make that a university couldn't make, or the programs within a university cannot make, because I can--

McDONALD: The thing that happens around here, happens right up to the last meeting we had, is that academics come in here from universities, and they take part in the dialogues, and my question frequently to them is, "Do you have anything like this on your campus?", and they say no, in fact they initiate, frequently, they say, "I wish we had something like this on our campuses. Now the answer to your question, I think, is that the universities could do more of this, or could do all of it. But historically they haven't been doing it, and Dr. Towers, last night, was telling me, and today telling us, about what he's doing in an area at U.C.L.A., and that's the first I've heard, really, of that kind of truly transdisciplinary, not just getting different disciplines around a table, but going beyond the disciplines.

TOWERS: And it's a very difficult task, you know, and you have to work hard at it and think very hard about it, because the power of the departmental structure anywhere in the University of California is

enormous. And the isolationism that exists between departments, between different schools, is incredible.

McDONALD: If you weren't there, would your program exist at U.C.L.A.?

TOWERS: No. No.

McDONALD: That's one of the answers.

TOWERS: But I think now that it exists, and it has been shown to be effective, I don't think it matters if I dropped dead tomorrow, the thing is going to go on.

McDONALD: Wellk I think you need a person with a strong motivation and energy, like you, and imagination.

TOWERS: Yeah, but I have now discovered others who have similar energies and motivations, and they would pick it up at the drop of a hat.

LARSEN: There is something else besides departmental isolation, I think, that's new in the last decade, or strongly emphasized, and that is, within each of the disciplines, certainly in the social sciences, you can call it chaos, or you can call it pluralism. There aren't the unifying elements, paradigms, whatever, any more. There is just a whole series of things going on, and therefore, I take it that, you know, even if you got one, if we had representatives here from only one discipline, it

would, in a sense, be an accomplishment. You don't even talk to certain colleagues, somebody working on coordination, somebody on something else, you know, and I think therefore that the confrontation of ideas of all of these various sources is the novel and needed experience. I worry a little about the, I guess the movement from the hilltop to the campus. It will take a struggle to maintain that kind of identity there.

FAGAN: And then there is another, I guess, what Bob was saying, I'm sorry Hubert, I'm going to get, is something which was, has been stressed here for many years, and that is bringing in people who are outside the academic rubric. That is claimed. I used the word claimed, I don't know whether it is negative or positive, to be a feature of Center dialogue. And at this place it is very difficult to achieve. For exactly the same reasons.

McDONALD: Chancellor Huttenback said when he announced the merger, was working toward the merger, with the university, he said, this is one thing we don't want to lose in the merger, is the non-academic, infusion of non-academic thought and people into the Center. He didn't want it to become a faculty exercise.

FAGAN: Which sometimes in the discussion this morning I have felt perhaps

we have occasionally forgotten. But I may be just giving a reaction.

Hubert, do you pick this up?

LOCKE: I have two outbursts, most of which have been anticipated at this point. But one is that if, in fact, the Center is to become a place that will permit academics to overcome the disciplinary fragmentation and isolation of their own campuses, then I, in all due respect, to both my own vocation and my esteemed colleagues, I hope you do go out of business. And I would not see that as a very fruitful enterprise, and certainly not worth the time and energy that it will take you to go out and mount the membership and the endowment and such-like to bring that off. It is a major judgment on the academy that we can't pull that off within our own ranks. And if we can't do it on the campuses, I don't hold out much hope for your being able to do it, particularly as you move from the mansion to the barracks. The other comment is to pick up again on one of Professor Capps' observations, and to suggest that while obviously the spirit and the legacy of Robert Maynard Hutchins is a very critical part of this whole endeavor, I would respectfully offer that that's not the major problem that the Center faces, at this point in time. And I'd like to try to frame that

matter, if I could, in a slightly different fashion. It seems to me, as I read your statement of purpose, the background papers, and particularly with your added comment that this has been framed from the archives, what I get is the sense of a situation which hearkens back, Professor Alexander commented at the breakfast table this morning, and since then, in our commentaries here we seem to have been at opposite polls of the discussion, let me now quote you, with great support, and one sees the Center described here as a place in which the great minds are brought together to deliberate on vital issues, fundamental to democracy in a democratic society. And then somehow the results of their deliberations seep out, in very direct ways, through, primarily through the magazine, et cetera, to a larger public, a public at one point that could be numbered at least as a hundred thousand people. It's, it's in that sense, reminiscent of Professor Alexander's comment this morning about the problems of the American Presidency in the last, in recent years, in which we can identify at least two Presidents, one Democratic, and one Republican, to stay perfectly objective about the whole business, who have felt somehow that they could communicate the goals and objectives of society

and generate a kind of popular response to those articulations of goals and objectives, by leaping over the organizational and political structures of the society, and appealing directly to the, to the masses. And if that is true, as I think it is, I think one sees the same thing implicit here. And I merely, with apologies for this long prologomena, asking if that perhaps ought, shouldn't be one of the major changes that you contemplate, i.e., that the structure bringing the great minds together around this table, who will deliberate the great issues and then feed the results of their deliberations through such channels as The Center Magazine, noble though that is, and as exciting as that has been for the twenty to a hundred thousand who read The Center Magazine, may not be the way in which to try to bring about a discernible impact on American society today, and especially those quarters concerned with democratic thought and its analysis with respect to contemporary social problems.Does that long tirade come through at all?

LARSEN: --go directly then, don't use the two-step flow, seek a broader public, is that the implication, or--

LOCKE: No, I think a narrower focus, Otto, on two counts.Number one,

I am struck that the name consistently has been the Center for the Study of Democratic Institutions. And yet, as I look through both the issues historically that the Center has focused on, and indeed your own issue statement, a lot of those issues don't have any kind of institutional context, or if they do, it is such a broad one as to be--

LARSEN: Because they aren't democratic--

LOCKE: That they are not democratic, right. And I wonder if a contribution could not be made more precisely and specifically, sharply focused, by really recapturing that dimension of the, of the Center's concerns. The second is that there is still, and this is one thing that the A.E.I. pulls off well, and Brookings is their liberal counterpart for, pulls off well. I'd still want to identify with Kling on that point. And that is there is some attempt, not just to leapfrog over the established institutions and reach a broad and amorphously defined public, but some attempt really to influence policy and decision-makers, that I think still can be done within the framework of the Center without violating your 501C3 or --

LARSEN: You mean institutional institution--

LOCKE:Indeed, indeed so, Otto. For example, you know, what would

happen if they picked up you and your counterparts in the Social Science Research Council and brought you together and asked you about the substance of social science research inquiries in contemporary American society, and their implications for democratic theory. That, I would find a very exciting undertaking.

LARSEN: Or the thing that's going on at U.C.L.A., about which we haven't heard in detail yet, but the point that you made earlier, that the academy hasn't been able to pull this kind of thing off. Now, how about, and a Center that could germinate that kind of notion. I'd like to really see, I see a real mission there for a center to do that, try it.

LIEJONHUFVUD: I think when we talked about Brookings and A.E.I., the point that came up before was, those two were mentioned, examples of institutes that are actually effective in Washington, and so on. And when they were mentioned before, the point was that they stood out from a host of other ideological outfits, by the quality of their empirical research. And that's what's the reason that they were effective.

LOCKE: I don't--

LEIJONHUFVUD: But turn it around. Turn it around and say, now, among all the places where decent empirical research is being done, which includes all the social science departments around, of any quality, and why don't they have any effect. And I agree, it is because they are not ideological. And somebody else has to pick up and make political ammunition out of what they are doing. And I agree on that. Which brings me back to my previous comment. Once you move off the mountaintop, how are, you are not going to be allowed, I think, to define yourself ideologically on a U.C. campus. It's not going to work. Another comment that doesn't relate to that, just a note. When you are talking in social sciences about problems that have to do with the design of institutions or organizations, there is one assumption that you always have to make, and that is if you design an institution so that it relies on its functioning on the presence of great minds and great men, it is going to fail. O.K. And so I think we'd better cut out the reference to great minds. If this place is going to work down at U.C. Santa Barbara, it's going to work, just confine yourselves to the academics. The size of mind that you'll have to rely upon will have to be sort of the average tenured U.C. faculty

member. And if you don't set up the Center for that, it will work with that, as its input, forget it.

LOCKE: I really don't think, if I could venture another comment, and as a footnote to your observation, when you first raised the matter about whether indeed moving to the Santa Barbara campus, the Center could afford any longer to have an avowed and explicit ideological bent, and my initial response was to agree with you entirely, I now want to modify that just slightly. I don't think you would need to change in substance anything that appears on page 1 of your statement, clarify through dialogue basic issues confronting a democratic society, main focus on the institutions of, et cetera. But I do think there has to be some very clear and explicit understanding of what that means in the light of the Center's history, and here the spirit and legacy of Hutchins becomes extremely important. And some commitment to that, on the part of the Center staff and its governance mechanism. If that's absent, I think the Center will really be in trouble. But you could wing it in the academic setting. We have all sorts of things that float there under innocuous titles, that do, and descriptions, for that matter, that are into all sorts of ideological binges.

But I am, I guess I am more concerned with the point you underscored, that in some sense it has to do with whether this is understood by those who are really a part of the core of the Center's operation, as vital to its mission, before you make that move on October 29 or 27 down to campus, because when that happens, if the lack of clarity and definition which appears to be the case at this point, is still true once you got there, I think it's all over.

LEIJONHUFVUD: This doesn't give you much time. May I answer a little bit? See, I, something like an ideology I think must be present, and it must indeed have some connection with tradition. I think that you said before that you should widen the range of issues, that is indeed very desirable. I think Hutchins was always able to do that, by saying, if the problem is big enough, so that it's a challenge to American democracy, consequently, the Center for the Study of Democratic Institutions has to have a dialogue on it. And that can still be applied. The question is, when you come down on campus, exactly how, suppose you have dialogues on a succession of topics like this or wider, what is going to distinguish the Center from the sort of U.C. Santa Barbara convention, you know, academic convention center, or something

like that, or conference building? And it has to be something in the way of ideology, but, so I think we have to concern ourself with ideology. The kind of ideology it cannot be, I think, is, my impression of the Center is that if you dipped into its dialogues of ten or fifteen years ago, when they, particularly when they were reviewing the issues that Hutchins had a continued interest in, which he took up every four years, well, when they took it up, you know, for review, it would pretty much come up like sort of updating Hubert Humphrey's election platform from sixty-eight to thirty-two, and that's the way it better don't be on campus.

TOWERS: I am sure that any institution must have an ideology. I don't believe that it, that this institution will survive if its ideology is political. And I think the ideology that we must stimulate and pursue is the ideology of the traditional university inquiry, which is free and untrammeled, in which there is free exchange, which is critical, in which everybody can have his or her say, and in which there will be a tremendous amount of information exchanged, of engagement of minds, with a view to determining the problems that exist, various possible solutions to those problems, and it doesn't have to be all one

track, it can be a variety of different possible solutions, and then, for the transmission of that, which is a major part of the university's commitment, the transmission to other people, in particular to young people.

FAGAN: That is a nice point. What I would like to do is just take David's comment, and then I want to try and just throw on the table some things that we have said this morning, and then break for lunch with an agenda for this afternoon. I see an agenda beginning to shape. David.

KENNEDY: Well, I will just offer this in the spirit of randomness, which characterized most of the other commentary. It does strike me that the very title of this Center as it has existed up until now, if we examine the legitimacy of that title as against the record of what the Center has apparently done, that there is something not legitimate about the title, because the Center purports to call itself the Center for the Study of Democratic Institutions, whereas I get the distinct impression, both from my prior occasional knowledge of the Center's deliberations and what I have heard here today that the Center really tended to be a center for opinion about democratic

institutions in the most pejorative platonic sense. And I think this leads me to react rather sharply to the statement made at page 6 of your position paper, where you listed as a danger that the Center, as a result of its move on campus, might become a place where academic research is carried out. I understand the force of the word academic there, but if we factor that word out of the sentence, it strikes me as really egregious to say that there is really a danger the Center might become a place where research is carried out. It seems to me there is an opportunity here to rectify one of the great lamentable deficiencies of the Center's operations to date, and to take advantage of the university setting by becoming a place where research is carried out or commissioned, or directed, or sponsored in some fashion. I don't think that means necessarily abandoning an ideological understanding of where the thrust of the Center's activity has to go. The very selection of topics and personnel and so on can certainly show some kind of agreed-upon convention of what are the issues the Center concerns itself with. And that can have an ideological definition. But I really think it would be tremendously unfortunate if advantage were not taken of this opportunity to do research and thus

answer in part the objection about the empirical anemia of so much of the prior activities of the Center.

LEIJONHUFVUD: There is a similar outfit on the right-wing side, the Hoover Institution is trying to bail its way out of. In that case, not intellectual and financi al bankruptcy, only intellectual. Which might be easier.

FAGAN: I am going to throw out the, this has been a random discussion, but it has been very valuable to me. I am just going to throw out some things which have come to my mind, questions, I guess, and I think most of all of them get picked up as we go along. It seems to me this afternoon that there is benefit in starting with Bernard and the transdisciplinary approach. I think this--

ROSBERG: Model.

FAGAN: Model. Model. Good word. I think, then, I would like to do a lot more talking about ideology. I think I've got a lot to learn about this. Again, please revise this agenda if you feel this is an inappropriate moment to get into this. But this seems very much at the core of things. The questions that have come up to me, and these are not all of them, and they are not necessarily in order of importance.

One of them is, should the Center survive at all? This question has been asked. Another question that's been asked is, is the legacy of Hutchins, his beliefs, weighing us down too much? Should we abandon most of his operating principles or the mystique? And Walter very eloquently pointed out the dangers and the importance of the mystique, and the dangers of losing it. Should we engage in research or commission or sponsor it? What options does the Center have for the future? And there are various ones that are listed. And we also, a question which I had thought about but never really focused myself on, was the whole question of reaching out to the public and the wider audience, something we really haven't faced as an issue, and Bernard's remarks about two and four-dimensional inquiry are important here. And time and time again, we come back explicitly, or implicitly, to this question of the common agenda. Those are the things that hit me hard. Some of the things.

ALEXANDER: You still left out research.

FAGAN: Rsearch. I said it. I said it. I said it. Because the most fundamental thing to me, and this frankly has bothered me about the Center in the material I have read sometimes, is this, that, of course,

I am an archaeologist, and we archaeologists, and it's interesting that there were two of us here, really are very concerned with facts and empirical data. I have sometimes felt that the Center's dialogues were weak on this, having read them. I have only been to one, myself. And this one was weak on data, appallingly weak on data. Oddly enough, it involved, among other things, the archaeology of the Aegean. It was weak. It was retrospective futurology, fascinating subject. I think this is probably one of the major focuses that we've got to discuss. Does anyone want to react to my statements?

POSNER: Would it be possible to clarify the decision-making process after this meeting? I mean, some sense that the meeting is going to talk over things, and there is apparently a search for a director of the Center, and so on. And I wondered how those various things are articulated. What policy decisions are going to be made, as you see it, over the coming months?

ALEXANDER: That's right, and is it going to be a person at the University of California at Santa Barbara, or an outsider, or--

FAGAN: To answer the last question first, our budget more or less dictates it will have to be somebody on the faculty at this point.

The decision-making process from here on out, obviously I will have to feed into the search committee the notions that come as to the role of a director from this meeting. Yes, this will go into the job description. I really don't know what the decision-making process from here on out is. I may know more tomorrow. It involves a series of rather complicated variables. The most fundamental question which is going to have to be answered, and this is being put on the table in a really rather ruthless, in fact, rather brutal question, is should the Center continue at all? That is a decision which has political fallout, obviously. It is a question which people have very strong views, members, for example. That question is going to be resolved in one of two ways, either by dollars and cents, which we really have no control over, at this point.And the second one is a deliberate decision. That decision will involve, for example, the steering committee and the board of directors, and a broad spectrum of people. The decision which way we go I suspect is going to have to evolve. So I don't really know. I don't really know how to answer your question.

McDONALD: --that with Huttenback, or when the university merged, the agreement was made to the old board of directors, that the university

would keep the Center in operation for a minimum of three years, it was made in writing.

FAGAN: That is correct. But what was not, however, specified, was in what manner you would keep it in operation.

McDONALD: They say, when we are talking about survival, I mean, I think that we have to --

FAGAN: I think what will happen, probably, is that the new director will be handed such developmental materials as we have had, and said, you fell passionately about this job, shape it. Which is kind of what we, somebody said, I think it was you, which is, I think, probably the way it's got to go. One of the reasons I felt I was not equipped to do this job in the long term is exactly that. I do not feel this passionate concern.

ALEXANDER: What is the composition of the board of directors, in terms of university and outside?

FAGAN: The board of directors is a somewhat unsatisfactory body in the sense that it is too administrative. It consists of two or three very important U.C.S.B. alumni with tremendous clout, and tremendous potential. They are young people. It consists of several what I will

somewhat charitably call bureaucrats, who are there on official functions and only one faculty member at the point, at this point. The big weakness on the board is a lack of faculty members. This is going to be rectified. Intellectually, the big input is the steering committee, who are faculty.

ALEXANDER: What about the outsiders? I mean, people who have been on the board in the past?

FAGAN: They are now our national advisory board, and they are meeting on November 30, at which, again--

ALEXANDER: But they are not on the actual board?

FAGAN: No, they are an advisory group.

McDONALD: Two--

FAGAN: Two members are.

McDONALD: Morrie Levenson and Eulah Laucks, and Vesta Hutchins.

FAGAN: And Vesta Hutchins, two members are. Important members.

LARSEN: I have run out of questions with respect to our possible role. This is moving into the University of California, and yet you have reached out to universities up and down the Coast. Is there any special implication of that geographical reach with respect to the

possible mission or function? Or is there, you know, you could have done this a lot of different ways. But you did reach up and down the coast, and one of the options that you outlined was that this may be a special opportunity to be shaped in some way. Is there any thinking about that? What is the implication, in other words, of the selection?

FAGAN: The implication, as far as I was concerned, very simple, a very strong conviction that firstly, the Center itself, much of it through no fault of its own, has got somewhat isolated, particularly isolated from a lot of basic research which is being done. And that's no fault of it, just in a different, different sort of set of variables. The second one is that U.C.S.B. geographically is somewhat isolated, and one needed to systematically make sure that the wide constituency were involved. Also, and this is my strongest conviction, that probably the new Center, or the future Center, could be an absolutely invaluable tool for a lot of different people. And one of the most significant things to me that came up, I think it may have been David who said it, was this whole business of younger scholars and exposing them to a broader environment, for example, mainly convictions that this is important, an instinct that it's important. Because as you say this

can become an organized research at U.C.S.B. and die. Just die bureaucratically. Or live but become something of a dichotomy?

TOWERS: Brian, I can well see that the search for a new director could not possibly be a nationwide search in the sense that the institute would not have the funding available to carry the salary of the new director. So presumably he must be a member of the University of California at Santa Barbara. But I don't see that it's necessary that you should restrict your inquiries to the existing members of U.C.S.B.

FAGAN: Yes, that is not being done.

TOWERS: Because there would be no reason why in this enormous University of California, with its nine campuses and so on, it would be very simple, I should have thought, if an FTE cannot be made available, to transfer an FTE from one campus to another. It's not as simple as--

FAGAN: We are--

TOWERS: It's not as simple as it sounds. It's not impossible to do.

FAGAN: You might find someone who would want to take some form of leave of absence or transfer for a couple of years, or something. No, we're going to go right outside the system, no question of that, oh, yes. The search is going to be as broadly based as they dare.

One of the major disadvantages, oddly enough, and you people have obviously spotted this, that I suffer from, probably to a greater degree than Walter does, and I think probably Walter suffers from it to some degree, but has never articulated this, is a lack of experience at reaching out this far with your mind. This is not easy. This is not easy. Upon which note of defeat, I think it's time for lunch. Thank you. We'll resume at about one-thirty, or maybe a little later than that.

END OF MORNING MEETING