President’s Letter—George E. Miller, Emeritus, Department of Chemistry

The University of California Irvine Emeriti Association (UCIEA) is a volunteer organization seeking to enhance the lifetime experiences of emeriti. We collaborate closely with the UCI Retirees Association and both organizations rely greatly on the assistance of the Center for Emeriti and Retirees (CER), which is funded by the Provost’s Office. UCIEA is also part of the Council of UC Emeriti Associations (CUCEA) that holds biannual meetings for information and discussions.

I encourage all emeriti to become dues paying members of our association and to participate in meetings and events. All emeriti are invited to attend the open meetings of our Executive Committee, which meets at 10 am on the first Thursday of each month at the Newkirk Alumni Center. The Committee seeks to stay abreast on all issues that could affect current and future retirees as well as to plan events of interest to our members. It is also our pleasure to select nominees for system-wide and local awards for outstanding efforts by emeriti faculty.

This is my first letter to you as President of UCIEA, assuming the role held by William Parker last year. This has been an active year for our association, with the involvement of many of our members in celebrations of the 50th anniversary of UCI as well as our own events. Also this year, the Center for Emeriti and Retiree (CER) has relocated to quality space in the Newkirk Alumni Center. Please see elsewhere in this newsletter for information on upcoming events.

This year we have been fortunate to recruit Jim Danziger, Professor Emeritus of Political Science from the School of Social Sciences, to the role of Vice-President of UCIEA. Even though retired, Jim remains very active in the UCI Senate, teaching, and campus affairs.

As President, I find I am asked to represent emeriti interests on the UCI Senate Council on Faculty Welfare and on the UCI Academic Planning Group. I report on these activities each month to the Executive Committee. A number of topics that could affect the life of emeriti are discussed within those groups. While very significant issues regarding retirement and health benefits are facing future retirees, at this time of writing, most changes in these benefits have minimal or no effect on existing retirees. Please contact me or the CER if you have specific concerns.

Of special significance at this time is the revision of UCI’s Strategic Plan. This plan would like to specify significant roles for emeriti in the main campus programs. While many emeriti are already involved in teaching, committee work, and so on, either with or without recall appointments, the sense is that, with the growth in number of emeriti, and in their increased vitality (more plan to live to 100!), more specific mechanisms for emeriti engagement to support the campus might be desirable. We could either copy other campuses and initiate a formal mentoring program (such as UC San Diego), appoint an emeritus/emerita faculty liaison to develop programs (as UCLA), or implement something different, representing the uniqueness of UCI and our emeriti. Ideas are welcome and should be submitted to myself (gemiller@uci.edu), Jim Danziger (danziger@uci.edu), or Jeri I. Frederick (jerii@uci.edu) at the Center for Emeriti and Retirees.

I encourage all emeriti to stay in touch. Keep us informed about your awards and accomplishments, that we may highlight in future newsletters and/or on our web sites. Visit these web sites for all key information: UCIEA—http://sites.uci.edu/emeriti/ CER—http://retirees.uci.edu/ CUCEA—http://cucea.ucsd.edu/. Suggestions for events (lectures, tours, other) that you would like to see us plan are always welcome.
Democracy in Peril: Global and Local Perspectives by Spencer Olin, Professor Emeritus, Department of History

Spence Olin summarizes key themes from his talk to the Emeriti Association in May 2015

The basic premise of this brief essay involves a rather outlandish assertion: namely, that an alleged decline in the practice of shared governance (or faculty democracy) in American research universities, including at UC Irvine, is relevant to a much larger decline in the practice of democracy in Western nation-states and in other parts of the world. This assertion may strike some readers as rather implausible, so let me elaborate.

We are today witnessing a kind of global contest to devise the most effective kind of government – and that contest is being waged essentially between Western-style liberal democracies (such as our own), on the one hand, and modernizing authoritarian states (such as China and Russia), on the other. The outcome of this contest is likely to determine which model will dominate the global economy in years to come.

Unfortunately, in recent decades the advance of constitutional democracy has substantially slowed, if not stopped altogether. Plebiscitary authoritarianism and autocracy are ascendant. Democracy is not. Further, while communism may be over as an economic system, it has been supplanted by authoritarian capitalism. Capitalism, as it turns out, has proved to be remarkably promiscuous in political terms. It does not require democracy to function but can obviously develop within an authoritarian political form. This is a new model of state domination that explicitly rejects liberal democracy. Indeed, authoritarian capitalism has become liberal democracy’s chief competitor.

If we can acknowledge that democratic atrophy on an international basis is a major problem, then how might we as faculty in the UC system seek to address that problem? I now turn rather abruptly to a concrete illustration of how our own campus is failing to address this larger problem of democratic deterioration as effectively as it could. As is apparently the case with other major research universities, rather than promoting and expanding democracy, it seems to me that UCI has instead become somewhat more “authoritarian” in its very basic operating principles and practices. My specific example of this problem at UCI is a simple, but nonetheless highly significant one: namely, the search for and review of academic deans.

UCI’s unusual academic structure, based not on a large College of Arts, Letters and Sciences but instead on semi-autonomous academic Schools, allocates to the deans of those Schools a major role in the decision-making processes of the campus. It therefore matters a lot who serves as academic deans at UCI.

In 2008, in response to the recommendations of a UCI Academic Senate Committee on Shared Governance, this campus adopted a document entitled Guiding Principles of Faculty Involvement in Dean Search and Dean Review Committees. Unfortunately, in subsequent years the campus has often failed to follow the principles established in that document. Space limitations do not enable me to provide here specific examples, but I would be pleased to do so in response to requests.

My basic contention, however, is that fewer and fewer dean searches are being conducted in the kind of open, transparent manner once characteristic of UCI. This contention is supported, in my view, by a report recently submitted by a special committee of the Academic Senate, which found a variety of procedures having been followed in dean searches conducted during the 2008-2013 period, some in accordance with the Guiding Principles, but often not in accordance. As a result, the Academic Senate Cabinet on June 17, 2014, strongly recommended that those Guiding Principles be used in every search for or review of deans on this campus. Only by ensuring the practice of democracy in such decision-making areas can we avoid becoming unwitting participants in a larger atrophy of democracy and in the ascendency of more authoritarian alternatives.
Recollections by Robert Newsom, Professor Emeritus of English

One of a series of retrospective essays on the early decades of UCI.

When my wife, Linda Georgianna, and I arrived at UCI in the summer of 1976, we had one tenure-track job between us, and it wasn’t mine. (Linda says it was a good time for recently-minted women Ph.D.’s.) I was four years out from my Ph.D. and had had a soft-money assistant professorship at Columbia, where Linda had just finished her degree and where we had met and married. I was a New Yorker and didn’t know how to drive, but Linda’s offer would change all that, and after events both tragical and comical I would within three years join her as a real Assistant Professor in English and Comparative Literature. The time when the hiring of spouses and partners would become almost routine was for most of the country years off, but in trying to attract strong faculty to a new campus, UCI had from the beginning been hospitable to couples who hadn’t found jobs in the same institution—often because of policies and even laws forbidding the hiring of married couples. So we benefited from UCI’s enlightened freedom from such restrictions and the fact that there were already on campus several highly successful faculty couples.

It was a very good time to be new faculty members. We had skipped the work of actually founding a campus and also the campus troubles that had disrupted UCI as well as universities across the nation in the late Sixties. The Department’s senior founders and founding junior faculty were eager to introduce us to Campus, School and Department cultures, and we were just as happy to discover that they were still very much works in progress.

The campus was very young and also very small. Not physically, but humanly. It had actual vistas (bison upon the hills!), thanks to its widely-spaced buildings and still far-from-tall trees, and thanks also to how few students and faculty there were. There was a sort of Faculty Club whose chief function was to provide lunches—soup, salad bar, bread and cold cuts—to whomever was happy to sit down family-style with whomever happened by. It was located in one of the many trailers that housed offices that had yet to find homes in the buildings then still being designed and built. Bill Parker and Bill Lillyman were regulars (referred to as “the Bills”), and there was daily mingling across Schools and ranks. There was also a great deal of optimism and faith that great things were to come. Bill Parker had many gleams in his eyes (University Hills? A time when all our typewriters would be replaced by computers?), and his confidence was infectious.

There was also an expectation that much of our attention and time would be devoted to University service. The Academic Senate had far fewer committees then than now, but the ratio of faculty to Senate committee assignments was much smaller. So with fewer faculty to go around, the chances of finding oneself on a committee were great, and like those Faculty Club lunches, Senate meetings were a great place to meet—and learn from—faculty from all over the campus. Campuswide meetings of the Academic Senate generally filled the very large meeting room where they were held in Social Sciences Tower and generated vigorous debates. There was of course competition among Schools for resources, but it played out publicly among faculty as much as privately among deans. So “shared governance” felt very much like a real power, and we were happy to wield it. Overall, we felt we were part of something big, and we were.

On Richard Hasen’s Lecture by Keith Nelson, Professor Emeritus of History

Richard Hasen, Chancellor's Professor of Law and Political Science at UCI, enriched the Emeriti Distinguished Lecture series on December 5th, 2015 with a fascinating preview of his new book -- "Plutocrats United: Campaign Money, the Supreme Court and the Distortion of American Elections". Hasen contends that, by viewing "bribery" and "corruption" (which are relatively rare) as the only reasons to constitutionally restrict donations of money in elections, the Supreme Court has committed a very serious mistake.

Such an assumption, he says, has led the Court to decisions like that of Citizens United v. Federal Election Commission (2010), which eliminated limits on the campaign contributions of organizations by equating freedom to spend with freedom of speech. It has also cleared the path in lower courts for eliminating restrictions on individual contributions to ostensibly independent Political Action Committees (PACS).
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However, in Hasen's view the key problem in American electoral law is not "bribery" or "corruption" but economic inequality. Outraged by the fact that only 58 households of the 120 million households in this country gave half of all campaign contributions in the elections of 2014, he argues that the Court should allow limits on money in campaigns to prevent those with great economic power from distorting the political process. Hasen concedes that money is not the only factor in political success and that transparency laws reduce money's power, but he is convinced that the dependency of politicians on a small number of financial contributors inevitably renders them extremely vulnerable to manipulation. His solution is not simply to "repeal" the Citizens United decision, which he says as law "is too full of holes" in any event. He argues instead for a national "political change", that is, for changing the constitution through the election to office (on both left and right) of those who understand the real problem.

This, he believes, will make possible the public financing of campaigns and the limits on donation that we need to return our electoral system to health. To accomplish the former he proposes an ingenious system of federal campaign vouchers, whereby every citizen would be given the equivalent of $100 that he or she would be expected to donate in an election year to a campaign of his or her choosing. (This is actually being tried today in a number of American communities.) To establish the latter, Hasen would impose a limit of $25,000 on the political donation that any individual could make in a campaign year. Over a two-year period, Hasen is willing to have this limit raised to $500,000 for an individual. Despite the apparent size of that amount, he believes that with such limits the preponderant political influence would remain in the hands of small donors. He also contends that the cost of the voucher system (and thus the public financing) would be relatively modest compared to what is being currently spent on election campaigns.

In Memoriam

We honor and note the passing of the following colleagues:

Grayson Craig MacAndrew, Psychology..................May 28, 2015
Clayton Garrison, Drama.....................................Jul. 30, 2015
Rowland Davis, Molecular Biology & Biochemistry......Jul. 18, 2015
Lyman Porter, Paul Merage School of Business...........Jul. 2, 2015
Harut Barsamian, EECS........................................Nov. 20, 2015
Carol Whalen, Psychology and Social Behavior...........Jan. 19, 2016
Judd Hubert, French and Italian.............................Jan. 24, 2016

In Memoriam webpage: http://sites.uci.edu/emeri/in-memoriam

OLLI at UCI by Peggy Maradudin, UCIEA Executive Committee

We are looking forward to a very full and significant year for the Osher Lifelong Learning Institute in 2016. The Spring 2016 Catalog is already out and there are 44 courses listed including: UCI Stem Cell Research; Impacts of Climate Change; Topics in Medicine for Older Adults; the History Behind the Headlines (India, China, Middle East, and Korea); and Politics and Morality. There are also 14 special events including trips to an Irvine chocolate factory, the Petersen Automotive Museum, Griffith Observatory, Union Station, La Brea Tar Pits and Farmers’ Market. And we have special introductions and attendance to many UCI theater and dance programs.

We hope to relocate by Fall 2016, to our new facility at the Irvine Transportation Center which will provide us with larger space and up-to-date audio-visual equipment. Currently, courses meet in the Woodbridge Center complex. To see a full set of course offerings, other activities and full instructions on how to enroll for any courses or activities, go to www.extension.uci.edu/olli. Spring 2016 classes begin on Feb. 15 and many tend to fill up quickly.