

Maurice B. Hamovitch  
Interviewed by Frances Lomas Feldman  
In USC School of Social Work  
August 17, 1990

*Maurice B. Hamovitch was with the USC School of Social Work from 1946, and served as Dean from 1959 to 1982. Canadian by birth, he had entered the field of research in medical social work while still in the Canadian Army, then after doctoral study at the University of Chicago, he came to USC with dual interests in research and the health field. He was active in both, engaged in a variety of well-received research projects, at first with terminally ill children, then with the elderly. He was innovative as dean and served in the period of high unrest and student challenges, working with students and faculty in a way that protected the School of Social Work from the strikes and other manifestations of anger that characterized student-administration relations elsewhere. He was active in community services as well as University affairs, worked with the National Institutes of Mental Health, the Council on Social Work Education, and other prestigious organizations. The Rita and Maurice Hamovitch Research Center was established at USC in recognition of his contributions to social work education, research, and the community.*

Maurice B. Hamovitch

Interviewed by Frances Lomas Feldman  
In USC School of Social Work  
August 17, 1990

FELDMAN: Maury, the purpose of the interview is to have a rundown and some analysis, when you feel you would like to be analytic, about your experiences in the field of social work in California. However, don't feel restricted to California. Why don't we start with how you entered the field of social work, and why?

HAMOVITCH: I remember very clearly when and how and why, and with a little bit of embarrassment that I was so amazed to find myself in it! I had three majors when I was an undergraduate at Queens University, Canada. One was political science and economics, another was psychology and philosophy, and the third was English. The major of psychology was the one I was interested in going on with, except that in the late 1930s, the only psychology that was taught was not at all clinical, it was working with rats and mazes--and I had great difficulty working with those little rats.

FELDMAN: You didn't think you would be learning about human behavior?

HAMOVITCH: No. It was that I didn't care for rats, and I remember going to the psychology instructor and asking him if there was some place in graduate work where I could work with people, not with rats. Kurt Lewin had a program in Philadelphia, I guess, but it was still mainly more social psychology than clinical psychology. My professor said, "There is a profession called social work. Why don't you look into that? That sounds like it would be perfect for you." I said, "Social work? What is that?" I was entering my senior year and I was 19 at the time. He said, "Well, it used to be dominated by women; now there are some men going into the field and it is growing and really, you should look into it anyway." I was very reluctant, but I did it. I

checked around and found that there was a program at McGill University. In fact there were one or two male graduates who might be interviewed. They said, "Oh yes, it's a growing field; you should go into it." I had an interview with Dorothy King, the principal of the School of Social Work at McGill. She was the stereotype of the English social worker transformed or transported to Canada. She asked me a lot of questions and questioned my age because by that time I was twenty, but even though I was graduating, they didn't take anyone until age twenty-one. One of the questions I asked her was what kinds of placements and what kinds of jobs would be possible? She said they would have to be in a Jewish agency because Montreal had segregated federations: one was English Catholic; one was French Catholic; a third was non-sectarian, that was Protestant, and the fourth was Jewish. That's the way it went; you were eligible for services based on your mother's religious affiliation; you worked in sectarian agencies; there were no public agencies. That bothered me; I would never work except in a Jewish agency? The probable answer would be affirmative unless things change. I asked, "What if I went into medical social work, or general casework?" Well, that might be different although it might still be in a Jewish hospital. That might be possible. That was when I determined I was going to be a medical social worker. I had a girlfriend at the time who was three months older than I. She was very bright, but she was rejected by McGill because she was too young. I was accepted because I was a male. And I found that pattern was not just at McGill but in other Canadian schools as well. It was recommended that all students should get psycho-analytic experience, to go into psycho-analysis because they would benefit from this help and every person was referred routinely--but neither I nor the other male students, because it was women who needed help, not men.

FELDMAN: A kind of reverse affirmative action.

HAMOVITCH: Right, but it was a good experience. I really had a good experience. I ended

up with the social work placement in my second year in a venereal disease clinic. This was 1941, and Canada was already in the war and had been for two years. I had been in the Officer Training Corps in anticipation that when I would be graduated, I could go into the Army as an officer. When I graduated, the Province of Quebec had a venereal disease control program, and they had too few people to work in it, so they put a lot of pressure on me to work for them, only for them, and not to enlist in the Army. I wanted to enlist, however, both for patriotic purposes and for selfish reasons. At that time Canada had a volunteer army, but you could be conscripted; you couldn't be sent overseas but conscripted meant going in as a private. I didn't want to do that. If I was going to go into the Army, I preferred to be an officer. "No problem," they said, "This is much more important to Canada than you being a private or a lieutenant or left handed or in the artillery." So I allowed the clinic people to talk me out of it, working in that field for about a year. Then I got my notice of conscription. I went dutifully to the recruiting officer and said I would like to go to the artillery. I had earlier passed my exams in the Officer Training Program. "Oh no," I was told, "you can't do that. You go in as a private because you did not enlist." They asked what branch I wanted to go into. At that time you were allowed to make that choice, and I said I wanted to go into the artillery. I felt I had a chance to move up a little bit. I went into basic training. I was summoned back to headquarters and yelled at for not enlisting in the medical corps when I had all this experience in medical social work.

FELDMAN: How soon was this after your conscription?

HAMOVITCH: This was about two months later. I was still in basic training. I said, "Please do me a favor; allow me to stay because I don't want to push bed pans." I had heard stories about going into the medical corps because of prior experience, but then ending up being an orderly. They said okay. In the meantime, I was suddenly giving courses to the other recruits about

venereal disease, etcetera. Then I was summoned to headquarters in Ottawa. Lt. Colonel Williams was the man in charge of the venereal disease control program for all the Armed forces in Canada and, in fact, for the federal civilian program as well. He said, "We need you here." I asked to be left alone, to stay in the artillery. However, I was shifted to Ottawa where I spent the rest of the war in the control programs, but in charge. This was one time when, against my will, I got talked into doing what I should have been doing.

I was in charge of epidemiology, and it was a fascinating experience. I could track where the bulk of the infections came from, and could tell where the problem spots were; namely, where prostitution was most rampant. We were able to cut down on the incidence of venereal disease in the Army. Our biggest problem was in the Province of Quebec, particularly in Montreal where there was open prostitution, although it was not legal. They paid fines, which was an elaborate way of bribing; the prostitutes could stay in business, and they did.

The Colonel and I and one other person met with the mayor of Montreal, the head of the Health Department and others, to see about cleaning up prostitution and venereal disease. The mayor of Montreal was an old-style political boss--mayor Curly--with tremendous power, but he pretended he couldn't do anything. We said all the usual kinds of things that you do, like do you want your sister raped? If we don't have prostitution control, then this will happen. But we didn't get anywhere. We went to Quebec City to meet with the cardinal, saying to him that we would like him to do something about the problem. He explained that he was a cleric and could not do anything. The Catholic Church in Canada had tremendous power at that time. We suggested that he tell the priests to announce that prostitution is evil, and they should work with the judges to convince them that they should do something about closing down the prostitution houses. They couldn't do that. The Colonel said, "That's too bad. We have to declare the whole Province of

Quebec out of bounds to the Canadian Army, which means terrible loss of income.” Within one month, the word went out to all the priests and all judges from the Cardinal. The houses were closed down, and the venereal disease rate in Quebec dropped dramatically.

FELDMAN: This then was an early experience in doing research and translating the results into social policy and action.

HAMOVITCH: It really was a fascinating experience. That’s what I did the first two years when I was in the Army. Then a social service division was formed, and I was transferred to that. I taught courses to Army nurses, to public health nurses in venereal disease control across the country. Half of them were French speaking, half English speaking. I taught one class in French and one in English. There were several classes.

FELDMAN: You grew up bilingual.

HAMOVITCH: Yes, although some of the venereal disease language I didn’t learn in school, and some of the public health French-speaking were nurses a little offended by my language. But they got over it. I eventually did get a commission. I became a lieutenant, then a captain, and the social service division began. It focused on working with the families of the military, particularly when demobilization started in late 1944. That was a fascinating experience. I did some research first on the military who had been court marshaled. One of the experiences was in those detention places--which is all very vague in my mind now. It was a three-month intensive study which did influence policy. Then we moved into another phase of work, this with the Red Cross as well as with families in the military. The effort was to reconcile families, for these were men who enlisted in the war in 1939; five years later they were coming back. Many had enlisted because there were marital problems, or unemployment problems and marital problems; so they left. The marital situations weren’t strong in the first place. Five years later the men came back

expecting just to pick up where things had been left. We found that the women had re-built their lives with the expectations that their husbands would not come back; this was how they could survive five years. When their husbands returned, it was as though they didn't know how to behave because the women had become self-sufficient; they didn't know each other. Later on I worked with a doctoral student, five years ago, who was working with wives of alcoholics. The situation was the same where they had learned to live with an alcoholic. When the alcoholic joined Alcoholics Anonymous or for some other reason stopped drinking and the personalities changed, the women didn't know how to live with them; other problems were created. That was the experience in the Army.

When I enlisted in the Army, I knew I wanted to get a doctorate. When I knew I was going to be demobilized, I started to write to different schools regarding admission. There were no social work doctoral programs in Canada. The only three I knew about were Pittsburgh, Chicago, and Bryn Mawr. I inquired primarily of Pittsburgh and Chicago. Columbia didn't have a program yet. Pittsburgh said that with my experience, I probably could finish in a year or at most, two years. Chicago said they didn't admit anyone directly into the doctoral program. I could take courses and then, at some point, the qualifying examination. Then I'd know whether or not I would make it. They couldn't predict how long it would be. I chose Chicago; the standards were higher. I spent three years there.

FELDMAN: You were married by that time.

HAMOVITCH: Yes, I'd married in 1945, nine months before I left the Army. Rita worked while I was going to school. We lived in veteran's G.I. housing and everybody there was in exactly the same economic position. It was a nice compatible arrangement. Rita worked at the University of Chicago for the director of public relations, a Mr. Morganstern, who wrote all the

speeches for President Hutchings and answered all the hate correspondence because it was a “communist campus”; we had people like Paul Douglas, the former governor of Puerto Rico, Rex Tugwell, and a number of other people like them. It was a very exciting period. You would know because you came right after me. Then, when it came time to look for a teaching position, at the beginning of 1948, there were a couple of positions in Canada.

FELDMAN: Excuse me a minute, Maury, did your interest in teaching begin when you started giving those courses during the war period, or had you had that interest earlier?

HAMOVITCH: No. I think it started with that experience. I never thought about it when I was a medical social worker.

FELDMAN: So the Army did quite a lot in shaping your career.

HAMOVITCH: Oh, yes, in terms of the research as well as in the teaching interest, and in policy. Originally, I was a clinician, but I could see what could be done to influence policy and influence history. Just a side note on that in terms of a lesson I’ve never forgotten: We used to quote statistics about the incidence and the prevalence of venereal diseases, syphilis in particular. One in ten were going to get syphilis and x percent would die of syphilis of one form or another. I was curious about where we got that figure, how did we come up with it? I couldn’t find anything in the Canadian literature on that or in the files. I asked a couple of people who said we got that from the U.S. Public Health Service people who had done some research. While I was in the Army in that program, we met several times with our counterparts in the United States, and I asked them where they got their figures. What is the basis of the data? They had gotten them from the Canadian Army! I realized that a lot of public health estimates are of that nature and developed a disrespect for those kinds of figures.

But back to looking for a job. I had two offers in Canada. One was at McGill, which held the

greatest appeal; it was close to where Rita and I grew up. When I asked about the possibility of eventual tenure, because McGill had a history of discrimination against Jews, both in student admissions as well as hiring of faculty, I was told that as of then, the policy was still the same, but “hopefully” it would change. I didn’t want to sit around for “hopefully.” I applied to several places in the United States and there was the possibility of this position at USC. I checked it out with Helen Wright, the Dean at Chicago, and she said it was a one-year appointment. Wright said, however, that one year at USC with Arlien Johnson would be the same as four years of experience elsewhere; besides you never know if it might develop into a longer appointment. I had no special interest in coming to California and by this time we had a twelve-month old child. We decided we would try it. I was 29 years old; why not? We did and I arrived in Los Angeles and met with Dean Arlien Johnson. Her greeting was, “Mr. Hamovitch, you realize that this is a one-year appointment, and I want to be very clear that when Mr. Class comes back from his sabbatical in the University of Chicago that will be the end of your job.” I said I was well aware of that, but did she mind if I were to behave as though I would be here longer, for I needed to teach the course the way I thought it should be taught and not just follow somebody else’s outline. Otherwise, it would be frustrating for me and, I think, for the students also. She said fine, do it any way you want to do it, but it is only for one year. That was my start. I was prepared to hate this Mr. Class, whom I’d met briefly just before he went off to the University of Chicago. He seemed like a pleasant person, a much older man; he was 44 at the time.

FELDMAN: But he always looked old.

HAMOVITCH: That’s right, and he was very generous in sharing with me his notes and plans; he was very helpful.

FELDMAN: You were assigned to teach the social welfare courses?

HAMOVITCH: I taught all the social policy courses in the first semester, second semester, and fourth semester; and first-year research courses and the second-year research courses; I also was responsible for all the theses. I assigned them to different faculty who'd be on committees, but I had overall charge. We only had 50 or 60 second-year students and about 60 or 70 first-year students.

FELDMAN: And how many faculty?

HAMOVITCH: Not many faculty. I taught four courses per semester for at least five years. So I have a little difficulty when people complain of having more than two courses a semester. But it was exciting and at the end of that year, my employment was renewed. I had been appointed a lecturer because it was a temporary position, and I was re-appointed the next year for one more year. In the middle of that year, Rita and I were thinking about having a second child. I went to Arlien Johnson and said, "I would like to know what my chances are of staying on. Is there any possibility of getting into a tenure-track position? I am not pushing, I just want to know so I can plan my life." She thought about it and she said, "We'll appoint you as an assistant professor." Deans had a tremendous amount of power in those days.

FELDMAN: And they were not as dependent on money.

HAMOVITCH: We didn't have any soft money at that time. But all she had to do was to go to Dr. Raubenheimer, who was Vice-President for Academic Affairs or directly to the President, Von KleinSmid. That's how decisions were made. The dean and the academic vice-president got together, or the president made the decision, which is very different from today.

When I arrived, I was on a ten-month appointment, which meant I was being paid in ten monthly installments--the munificent sum of \$4,000 per year. That was in 1949, which was different from 1989, but it still wasn't very much money. We had no credit because, as a student, I think, the

only credit I had was with the milkman and the telephone company. The utilities were paid by the University and when we tried to buy furniture here, we couldn't get any credit. Finally, I was able to get Barker Brothers to trust me since I was working at the University. I had to pay back within a year, which I did, but there was no money to live on for the summer.

Arlie put me in touch with Gen Carter, who was head of the Research Department at the Welfare Planning Council. She agreed to take me on. I think it was a charitable gesture because we hadn't decided what it was she would use me for, but that she would find something for me to do during those summer months. That's when I met Al Feldman; he introduced me to you. He told me you were planning to go to Chicago, so we'd talk about it and that's when our friendship started, a life-long relationship which I value very strongly.

FELDMAN: One of my memories is when you came to Chicago to take your oral exams.

HAMOVITCH: That's right, you were there then. As a matter of fact, I went right from the orals to your "house" in the veteran's barracks and had a drink. You both calmed me down. I was scheduled to go to Alton Linford's office. He was on my committee and not yet the dean.

FELDMAN: Helen Wright was the dean, but he was really the person handling all the doctoral students.

HAMOVITCH: Yes, I remember that very vividly. That first summer I worked with Gen and Elizabeth Frank.

FELDMAN: The mother of our present U.S. Postmaster General, Anthony Frank.

HAMOVITCH: I didn't know that. And her daughter-in-law was a graduate from our School.

FELDMAN: Anthony's wife.

HAMOVITCH: That was, apart from personal relationships, for me the beginning of our very rewarding association. I wasn't then just in the Research Department; Al introduced me to other

people whom I knew in terms of some of their positions that you and they held in the Welfare Planning Council, chairing committees, and so on. The experience brought me in touch with a lot of other people, including Bob Dockson, who was the chairman of the research committee, and a man in an insurance company's research department--Samuel, I can't think of his name--and I became acquainted with people doing research in businesses with a social consciousness, which was very nice. And also you were helpful, both you and Al, in introducing me to some of the key people in the welfare scene, like Jim Barr and Art Will and the Chief County Administration before Art Will took over--

FELDMAN: Rex Thompson was the first, and then came Campion as the military replacement for General Allen. Art Will and Al Campion were more social minded than the others.

HAMOVITCH: I made a point of really spending the first couple of years going out to visit the Social Security office people and all the public welfare types of agencies as well as some of the private ones, to get some sense of the community of social work. This really was very helpful over the years, and I sometimes wish some of the younger faculty today would have the same opportunity, but now our emphases are different. But it was certainly helpful in teaching social work. I find a tremendous difference in terms of what current students know or don't know compared to former students. It is not just a matter of chronology; clearly, current students aren't going to know about people's personal experiences in the Civilian Conservation Corps or the National Youth Administration programs or WPA programs as our earlier students did in the late Forties and early Fifties. In teaching the history of social welfare, we always had students who themselves experienced those programs, and that made things come much more alive than just hearing about something from the dead past. But I noticed that even with programs like the War on Poverty program, there are very few students who have any direct acquaintance with those

programs as recipients and since World War II there hasn't been as much that they can tie to; I think that accounts for, to some extent, instances of students having reviewed social policy courses as more academic than substantive--although I must say that's changing. I think I am now finding students who are much more involved and excited about social policy issues than was true seven or eight years ago.

FELDMAN: They have more opportunities now to do something about it.

HAMOVITCH: Right, and some of the issues affect them personally in their professional lives, policies that say therapists must warn potential victims of their client's intentions. Those kinds of things make them aware that it is not just an academic subject, not just something that policy people have to be concerned about, but that as clinicians, they would be directly affected by the policies that are enunciated.

When I first came to the faculty, the key people were Arlien Johnson, Ruby Inlow, Harleigh Trecker, John Milner, Norrie Class, Rose Green, Sue Wagner (in charge of field work), and Betty Paine. That was a pretty impressive group of people and it was a little awesome because I really was literally the little kid on the block. As I said, I was 29 when I first came here and everyone else looked like they would be at least in the ancient forties. But they were very cordial, very open, which made it a lot easier. Harleigh Trecker was the only one who had children, and they were already adolescent. He wasn't there very long--about two years after I first arrived. In 1951, he asked for a raise as a full professor to \$6,000 and was told by the vice-president that if money was that important to him to go elsewhere, which he did, as dean for the School of Social Work in the University of Connecticut.

FELDMAN: I hope he got more than the \$6,000.

HAMOVITCH: And he got more than \$6,000. I think he got \$6,500. But it was interesting at

that period. Where to go next?

FELDMAN: Why don't you tell us a little about Arlien Johnson's belief that faculty had to be involved in the community, because you were demonstrating that.

HAMOVITCH: I think it would be interesting just to describe my image of Arlien. As I mentioned, the culture of the time was that the dean made the decisions for the School, including personnel decisions, curriculum decisions, although that didn't mean she didn't involve faculty. But the culture was that, in the final analysis, she could make whatever decision she wished. People respected that, but she very much believed in involving faculty in the decision-making and she wanted to hear from the faculty. She believed in being involved in the community, in the public welfare sector of social work. She thought it important for students to have one year of field experience in a public agency. She herself was involved in the community in a number of different ways and insisted that the faculty also become involved. I think an indication of her tolerance as a very strong person was that she could have on her faculty a confirmed Freudian diagnostician and a Rankian functionalist--and yet they could get along well. They disagreed with each other profoundly in terms of practice and theory, but that didn't interfere with their personal and collegial relationships. I think Arlien was able to instill the fact that it was okay to differ and to differ strongly on theoretical or philosophical grounds, but to have respect for each other. I think that even today--though not as much as then--there is that respect for each other. I can recall faculty meetings where there were loud voices and strong positions were taken, but then we would all go to lunch together, not just simply bearing it, but recognizing that we differed. Yet still that didn't mean the other person was less of a person. Arlien also had strong opinions and expressed them. She would disagree with faculty as well if they voiced other opinions than her

own, but she had no tolerance for people who couldn't speak up for themselves. One situation which comes to my mind had to do with the strike of the Jewish Federation agencies in 1951 or 1952, early after I arrived. That was a very bitter strike. I had witnessed a strike in Chicago before I left in 1948 which was also very bitter, and the whole community was split in terms of whether there is a place for unions in social work or whether it was unprofessional. Arlien Johnson just felt that unions did not belong in social work, and some of the rest of us felt differently. It was not discussed openly in faculty though Arlien would make comments; but nobody would pick up on them. I had only been there two years when Arlien on one occasion asked me for my opinion about it. Well, I was young; I didn't know better, so I told her what I thought. I thought that the Federation was wrong, they should bargain with the unions; unions had a place. I saw what happened in Chicago and, I said, if we teach about the rights of workers and so on, then we should practice the same principles regarding social workers. I was not saying that it should be the same kind of union--blue collar union, craft union--but there is a place for unions. I'll never forget what she said. "I respect you for having that opinion; I cannot abide some of the faculty who don't have the guts to tell me what they think. I know what they are thinking, but they are spineless. They won't confront me with their opinions."

FELDMAN: This was an old time social reformer talking.

HAMOVITCH: Right, and that was true. I remember that those comments stood me in good stead when I was dean. We had a young faculty member who was not doing any talking in faculty meetings. I could tell he was having some difficulty, that he didn't agree with all that was going on. I talked to him at one point, and he said, oh yes, he didn't agree. I asked why he didn't speak up. Because, he said, he was intimidated by the other senior faculty and didn't want to jeopardize his chances of getting promoted when tenure decisions arose. I said that was the surest way to

fulfill that prophecy was to not talk up and to not express his views, for when the faculty came to discuss his promotion, they would say he never talks up and doesn't have any ideas; we want a leader, not somebody who wants to sit and say nothing all the time. He asked what if they disagreed? I replied, "So they yell at you, but they will respect you, make you stand up." He did and then on one occasion, I noticed that he did disagree with what a faculty member was saying, but he swallowed hard and spoke up. Afterward they had lunch together, he told me, and she said, "You know I admire you." I forget the details of the incident, but he was proved right. That was something that Arlien Johnson conveyed to me.

FELDMAN: Do you think of another example from Arlien's leadership?

HAMOVITCH: An issue arose around the admissions records when I first came here. The admissions sheet specified religion, nationality, color, and all those items, and required a picture of the student. I raised a question at one point in the faculty about why we had those. The answer was that it was very helpful in terms of placement to get an idea about the people to be placed. I thought that could be construed as what today we would call racism. I asked if just having the items on the form would lead people to see us as biased, as practicing discrimination against people of color or different religions. Because USC had that reputation as a University, some wouldn't apply and perhaps it would account for our having so few from minority populations. I was jumped on by Arlien. She declared we were not prejudiced, had never been prejudiced, had always been open, etcetera. I said I was not questioning that; I was questioning the impact of how others perceived us. Other faculty came to my point of view as we discussed it.

FELDMAN: Maury, was this a form that had been developed here or was it a nationally developed form?

HAMOVITCH: It was a national standardized form we used. It probably was used in all

schools and universities. No one had questioned it. Other faculty came to the same position as I did, and it became clear that there was a consensus that we should do something to change the admissions form. Later, with regard to field work placement, we went after the issue of why we needed pictures for placement of students. Again the issue centered on whether to put a black student in an agency that doesn't serve black clients or where there are no workers who are black; would it be fair to the student to be in that kind of environment? Some of us said maybe we shouldn't use those kind of agencies. We didn't resolve that issue, but at least an important point was made, the practice then did shift; we did begin looking at placements and to talk to and influence to agencies about the practice of selections for field work. Because agencies were coming to us for students rather than our going to them, we were in the driver's seat in terms of helping to set policy with those agencies. We began to do just that. I'm pointing that out as an illustration of the kind of person Arlien was. In some ways she was a traditionalist. She would think about certain issues and argue the point, but then would listen to others, and arrive at a consensus, and follow that. This is a wonderful administrative style; to provide leadership at the same time responding to consensus, not just looking for people willing to say yes. She was willing to shift positions where the consensus indicated a different position from hers. I think that was characteristic of her. But she was a powerful person; it took a long time before I could call her Arlien.

FELDMAN: Well, she was intimidating.

HAMOVITCH: And there are people who, until her death a couple of years ago, could not address her in any way except Dean Johnson. I recall Jim Peterson, now retired, who developed the Sociology of the Family Program when he came to campus. Then the Chair of Sociology came to talk to Arlien, asking her blessings for a program in marital counseling. She said there

was no place for a program of its kind; we have a school of social work and she would fight it. I was very short with him then but when I worked with him on some research years later, he recalled that and said she was absolutely right. He would have done exactly the same thing in her position. Now it turns out that the University is big enough so that we can have both programs, but she set him straight in no uncertain terms, and he heard that from other people, but she also commanded a lot of respect.

So those were some of the things about the faculty and Arlien. I would like to go back to my first year of skepticism about Norrie Class--more than skepticism really, perhaps a little paranoia--about what this person will do to my livelihood, for my job depended on his coming back. But again, characteristic of the faculty that Arlien recruited, when he came back, he asked me what I had one with the course for advice on how to change the course. He didn't ask if I had followed his outline and say now let's go back to it. He treated me as an equal and that made a tremendous impact on me. Here there was this very senior faculty member who was clearly an expert, clearly a scholar, clearly respected by students; he was asking this young punk just coming out, "How did you do it? Maybe we can work together doing differently what I have done in the past." And that, I think, was also the uniqueness of the people teaching policy in this faculty over the years, and when you joined the faculty; in 1953, was it?

FELDMAN: 1954.

HAMOVITCH: 1954 and then the three of us were teaching social policy. Later it was you and Norrie, but the three of us taught it for a long time. It was a collegial kind of thing. From the minute that you joined the faculty, as I recall, we made some changes also because you brought in the fact that we should get beyond the beginning of the Depression at the end of the first semester--that kind of thing--which was very hard to do, but Norrie at last agreed with the idea and

allowed....

FELDMAN: And tried....

HAMOVITCH: And tried, and allowed that that was our goal, therefore, it was okay for you and me to do that, although you were better at it than I was. I had more of the University of Chicago tradition even though you too were there for years. But that, I think, has carried through in the sense that collegially we were ready to assess and modify.

1953 was another landmark kind of year. That was when we decided to have a doctoral program and, typically, Arlien thought about it. She met with--I think it was Norrie, Rose Green, and Helen Northen. We decided maybe we would have a doctoral program. Then we decided it would be a DSW rather than a Ph.D. We knew we could get either one through the University, but we chose the DSW because we wanted it to be a social work degree, identified with the profession. The purpose of the degree was to prepare people to go into academic positions; therefore, every graduate was going to be teaching in a school of social work; the title of the degree didn't matter as much as its quality, but its professional differentiation was the primary reason for the DSW. A second reason was the School would have control over the DSW degree qualifications and requirements. This meant we didn't have to require a foreign language, for we saw no point to that and, also there could be more flexibility in terms of how we shaped the program. Thus we opted for the DSW rather than the Ph.D. In the early classes, as I recall, we had Chauncey Alexander and Chuck McCann. During that early period, you came in on the faculty, Lola Selby came into the Faculty, Edith Tufts came into the faculty. Mary Lou Sommers came in at the same time that I did, and Lisa McBroom then too joined the faculty.

FELDMAN: At the time that I came in 1954, Mary Lou had left.

HAMOVITCH: Yes. One of the mistakes that Arlien made was partly related to rigidity.

When Mary Lou decided she would like to get her doctorate and asked for a leave of absence for two years to go to Western Reserve University to work on her doctorate, Arlien said she could either leave or stay. It was a terrible wrench for Mary Lou because she loved it here, and I guess nobody dared to question Arlien about it; and all of us felt bad about her being so adamant, but that was policy and that was it. This tied in with something else. Somewhere around 1955, 1956--or maybe even a little bit later, Arlien commented to me about the faculty not having enough gumption, that nobody left the School. We came and we didn't leave. It was really a dig at me because I had offers to go elsewhere after I had established something of a reputation when I became a full professor, but each time I would think about it and realize that nothing was going to be better than this. Why leave something I love just for the sake of making a move? But her idea was that if you are ambitious, you leave. Otherwise, you become restless and you want to be in another program.

FELDMAN: It was really what she had done herself.

HAMOVITCH: That's right, although she stayed here twenty years as Dean of the School. She might say that was in her senior years, that when you are young, you shouldn't be satisfied to stay in the same place. I think it tied in with what was appropriate, and it was related to her notion about child rearing; namely that you prepare children to become independent and you let them go, encouraging them. She saw us as her family, and I suppose, as I think about it now, that may have accounted for the views she held.

FELDMAN: I think that is probably right because in so many ways, she dealt with us as our parent.

HAMOVITCH: Well, think about the way she treated Norrie Class and John Milner. They were really her sons.

FELDMAN: That's right.

HAMOVITCH: And they responded. In the early 1950s, interest in research led me in a number of directions. One was student research. Through the thesis courses I developed a whole series of theses dealing with the impact of illness on family members. Most of the research which had been done, and still today, is on the impact of illness the patient. I was more interested in looking at the impact on the family of the illness of a child. How does the family respond to the patient with diabetes or heart failure, etcetera? How does a wife respond to it? How do the children respond to illness? I developed a series of studies on physical illness, emotional or mentally ill or retarded people. What is it like? Throughout, the whole series of that kind of study proved very exciting and interesting to me. At the same time I was approached by different agencies, like the Veterans Administration and a couple of private agencies, to provide research consultation to their staff, to help them become involved in doing research. I accepted for two reasons; one was because I believed we could do something important; and second, because it paid and I needed the money--it was a form of supplemental income. One experience I had with the Veterans Administration led to some notions I developed of how social workers provide mental health consultation. The Veterans Administration asked me to provide consultation service to them in their training program. I asked how much they would pay for the service. They said they would pay twenty-five dollars a day. I asked if that was the standard rate? Well, they pay fifty dollars a day to psychologists, psychiatrists, and other physicians. But social workers were paid this lower rate. I said I had a Ph.D., the same as a psychologist and even if I hadn't had that degree, I had as much knowledge, and I was being asked to do the same thing being asked of a psychologist to do, that I could do as a social worker. That was the policy; there was nothing they

could do about it. In that case, I said, I will do it for nothing, but I will not do it for twenty-five dollars. They expressed regret, but believed they could not do anything about it. The next year, they called me back and we went through the same procedure. This time, however, they discovered a loophole to the effect that since I held a Ph.D., I could qualify for the higher rate. I agreed to provide the consultation, but under protest; if I had a DSW, I would still expect to get the same higher level of pay as the other disciplines. I think that is an important principle, that social workers often miss out because we tend to underrate and undersell ourselves and thereby, perpetuate the stereotype that we are somehow less worthy or less important or less knowledgeable than other disciplines.

FELDMAN: There is a general perception that part of our profession is to give.

HAMOVITCH: Right. But there is an answer and that is to give, but to make it clear that you are *giving* and not being paid. I used that example when I taught the course in consultation. I would make the point if you are going to provide consultation, either do it for nothing or do it for something that you know you are worth. The exception is an agency that can't and doesn't pay, or pays everybody on the same basis. In that event, they are not discriminating against social work. I did quite a bit of that which led to eventually becoming a consultant in the national VA to people who were in research jobs, to help them improve their skills; I feel very good about that. There are three or four faculty members currently--well, one is retired as a matter of fact, but physically and mentally able and in a very key position--who, as a result of my involvement with them, went on to get doctorates and then moved into academia. One is Jean Giovanoni at UCLA, who now is assistant provost or vice-president, Lou Carr at Howard University, and there is another who is at the University of Georgia. There are two others of whom I've lost track. That was an exciting period. It brought me to the national scene, and I felt in each of these endeavors, that it brought

credit to the School. I think to have someone from this faculty being called on to provide those kinds of services, like you, like John Milner, like Norrie Class, have done in other aspects of social work brings credit to the School. In 1956, Honora Wilson of the City of Hope, asked me if I would provide some consultation to them about a research program they would like to do. It was a program wherein children with leukemia were in a parent-participation program; the parents were invited to stay with the children while they were hospitalized, and help in their care. The children would be more involved and not quite so isolated. This was a time when leukemia was invariably fatal, no child survived more than two or three years. At first it sounded as though City of Hope wanted confirmation that the program was terrific. I said I couldn't do that, but I would be willing to think about a study that would look at the impact on the parents now. It might develop, if they were right, that the results were positive and the study could be duplicated elsewhere, but it was also possible that the results would be negative. They said okay. I went with the chief of pediatrics of the clinic, Al Knutson, who was both an M.D. and a Ph.D. in bio-chemistry, a very bright, sensitive person. We got along very well from the beginning. I wanted to do this, but I couldn't until after I returned from a year of study. I had just received notice of my appointment as a National Institute of Mental Health Senior Stipend Award. This was a new program to pay academics, primarily in the social sciences, their salaries while they went anywhere they chose to study mental health. I hadn't pointed out to NIMH that I was already a mental health professional; if they wanted to consider me as a mental health student, that was okay. I was scheduled to go to Harvard University School of Public Health where Gerald Caplan was pioneering a whole new approach to community health consultation. He was the fair-haired boy at the time. I told City of Hope that when I returned from Harvard, I would be willing to proceed with their research.

In the meantime I met with Feifel, who had done as much research on death and dying as anyone, and he was interested in this Clinic as well as in death and dying of children. I wanted to get some information as to what he was doing, to get together to avoid duplicating each other's work. No, he didn't want to meet with me. I told Knutson about it. Knutson said to tell him that if he doesn't meet with you, he cannot set foot in these premises any longer; he would not have access to City of Hope cases. Well, with that Feifel did meet with me. He turned out to be a nice person who had not wanted to meet with me because, in his experience, and it was a well-known fact in psychology, it was only too easy to have somebody steal your instruments and information, then publish them first. Consequently, both publication and promotion never came. I thought, "These paranoid psychologists!" Instead I told him what I was planning to do. All I wanted was to be sure that we didn't look for the same things. He wanted me to promise to say not one word about this research to any of those people at Harvard because "I know them; they steal!" When I got to Harvard, that is exactly what the whole climate was; to hold on to what you have.

FELDMAN: You just weren't used to it here.

HAMOVITCH: Right. And what I was told by these very strong people who have outstanding national reputations, like Tom Plant, who still holds a very high post in the National Institute of Mental Health, and an anthropologist and a sociologist, both of whom have outstanding names in research. We are not talking about poorly trained people, but they were all convinced that Gerald Caplan was stealing them blind. We would have these meetings to talk about the project we were working on, and they were afraid to open their mouths because, they said, he would take notes and the next thing they knew, he would have an article out based on their findings. I believed that, and now I can see the kind of person he was. I got along with him, and we had a great time; he was very complimentary and gave me all kinds of opportunities to do consultation. When he invited

me to do a piece of research with him, they said don't do it. By that time I had been notified--it was early in 1958--that I was being promoted to full professor. I said it didn't matter, I didn't need it as a publication, but it looked like it would be a fun thing to do. He promised he would do some of the leg work. Therefore, his name would go on first. It didn't matter to me. After all, his name began with a C, mine with an H; so it could be that the names appeared alphabetically, and I would not worry about it. Well, we did get involved with the study, and he did a great deal of the leg work; I wrote up the first draft of the report, and I asked how he wanted to show authorship. He said, "You've done it; Hamovitch and Caplan." But I commented that he'd done a lot and the C comes before H. But he said the creative part was mine. Later we became good friends. Later, too, I shared with him some of what I had been told. He replied that he had been pushing the others to publish, and they wouldn't do it; those data were getting stale....

FELDMAN: So he stepped in.

HAMOVITCH: He stepped in and did something with it. He was not quite the ogre he was held out to be.

FELDMAN: I guess there is a lesson to look more carefully at what underlies some statements.

HAMOVITCH: That was an interesting year. I took some courses at the Harvard School of Public Health. I took a course with Schlesinger, on the main campus, on the intellectual history of America, which was great. I spent a day a week doing mental health consultation, and I was invited to talk and get involved with some workshops, in the Federal Maternal and Child health program through Elizabeth Rice, who was on the faculty of the Harvard School of Public Health. It was an ego-boosting kind of experience. When I came back, and just because I had been there, I was Mr. Mental Health Consultation, which, of course, didn't make sense, and really, had almost nothing to do with what I knew, but rather with the fact that I had been there. Harry Brickman,

who was head of the Los Angeles County Mental Health Department at the time I came back, was about to launch a mental health consultation program with psychiatrists. The irony was that he invited me to provide consultation to the people he was hiring to be consultants. All were psychoanalytically trained psychiatrists, not social workers, but without community experience. The irony is that he was hiring a social worker to train psychiatrists to do community consultation, but he wouldn't hire any social workers to do mental health consultation.

I didn't pick up again with the City of Hope project for I decided that to do it right, there really needed to be some money available. I decided to apply for a NIMH research grant. I did all of the right things; I checked to see who was in the review committee; I found that they were mostly sociologists or psychologists or psychiatrists, but no social workers. I thought I'd better write this so that it is statistically and theoretically very sound and the committee would not say a soft-headed social worker wanted to do some precise research on a very sensitive subject, but he could not be expected to really know research. I wrote it with great care. It was turned down because it was too antiseptic and from a person who didn't know anything about, and didn't care, about people!

FELDMAN: That's really ironic.

HAMOVITCH: The staff people at NIMH whom I knew said it was not that way; they knew me, had worked on this with me. I had consulted with them but it did not come through to the committee. Then I hired a statistical consultant, a sociologist, Abe Schneiderman, at the Suicide Prevention Center. I told him I would pay him to help me out. Here was the situation and here the criticism, and I wanted Ed to make sure that the proposal was statistically sound. He did not want to be paid, but I insisted that it was necessary in order to have real expertise, more than something that would just be acceptable. He agreed to do it. He was brutally honest; some of it

was pretty good, and some of it I accepted and rewrote. The proposal was funded for three years, and it proved a really rewarding experience. At the end, I did the same thing with Frances Feldman; I needed an editor to go through the report but wanted to pay you, you should tell me what it is going to be, and I would put the money aside for that purpose. The book came out and was very well received. I still get inquiries about that book, and that was back in 1964.

FELDMAN: The dynamics involved have not changed.

HAMOVITCH: I felt very good about that study; it was very important. I had been asked to serve as dean in various schools, and I didn't want to. I wasn't interested in becoming a dean. Also, I felt I couldn't become a dean even if I had wanted to, until I had satisfied myself that I had done some definitive research. I knew that I had been a good consultant to other people and a good teacher and had written some very acceptable articles, but I was convinced that research was very important. I have seen people take on deanships without having gone through that suffering. How could you expect other people to do research if you hadn't experienced it yourself? How can you expect other people to become involved in ways that you haven't tried? I had another very good experience with respect to research. I was appointed to the National Institute of Mental Health Review Committee. For four years I served on that committee. We passed on hundreds of proposals and that was a very important learning experience. It was a tremendous amount of work, for which we were paid a modest per diem of \$50. Somebody figured out one time that we were being paid at the rate of seventy-six and one-half cents an hour. Obviously we didn't do it for the money; the challenge itself was rewarding, the challenge of having all these scholars reviewing the same documents and then comparing where you came out with where they came out and the persuasiveness of your argument versus others in terms of whether the projects were approved or disapproved. I guess that was part of being a Sagittarius; the competition and the

challenge that goes with that. Also, while I was at Harvard, I became a member of the executive committee of the National Research Group. That was another great and challenging experience, comparing notes with other people not all of whom were social workers--there weren't many social work researchers, but anybody like Gen Carter was a member of that committee. She was very active in the social research group. It was in 1963 or 1964 that I took a leave of absence from the School to finish the document at the City of Hope. While I was on that leave, USC President Norman Topping asked me if I would serve on a committee to think about establishing a gerontology center. A group of us met, and we agreed that this would be good to have, but we stipulated that it wasn't going simply to be a research center; we would try to get some doctoral training money, and it would be interdisciplinary. It would offer no courses. We would try to influence departments like sociology, social work, psychology, education, physical education, and others to start offering courses. I served as a first interim director for one year until a permanent director was found. So here I was finishing a study on children who were terminally ill, and moving into gerontology, to the other end of the age spectrum.

FELDMAN: That was pretty dramatic, wasn't it?

HAMOVITCH: It was. This was in 1964. We had some money from Ross Cortese, who was building all those Leisure Worlds. I undertook to do a first study with Jim Peterson on how these elderly people moved into the Leisure World and how they liked it. That was one of the first studies of its kind. That summer Jim Birren was appointed to be the new director. Jim Peterson left, so that first summer I was interim director for three months, and then I stayed on as the associate director for education, a summer program. It was my responsibility to work with students we had on grants. I followed their careers and advised them in terms of their programs, whatever their discipline. The first interdisciplinary graduate was Barbara Solomon from our

School, and I think, three of her first five graduates were social workers and that established us firmly as having quality students.

FELDMAN: By this time Arlien Johnson had retired.

HAMOVITCH: That's right. Arlien had retired in 1959, and Malcolm Stinson came on in 1959 to be dean. He had been recommended by Helen Wright. He had worked with her in India. His style was very different from Arlien's. Arlien was very much involved in every aspect of the School's program. Malcolm liked to delegate and to let other people carry the responsibility, which he did freely. Not that he didn't object to people taking on assignments and falling down on them. He really believed that it wasn't a question of giving and then watching and criticizing. He had a very laid back kind of administrative style; he never objected to other people taking the initiative and even encouraged it, which was a good treat--there was more freedom than under Arlien, and you could innovate more without having to jump through certain hoops. Now, to honestly compare the styles, I would have preferred Arlien Johnson's because Malcolm's worked in large part because he had inherited Arlien's faculty.

FELDMAN: There was already a foundation.

HAMOVITCH: It's a little bit like football coaches. A football coach inherits a good team recruited by someone else; he looks good. He may be a poor coach, but the athletes had learned how to work together and to win. I think that was to some extent Malcolm's case. I think Malcolm cannot be underrated in terms of his intellectual capacity. Because of his laid back approach and manner, people didn't always think of him as being very bright, but I had discussions with him and with doctoral students in terms of dissertations where it was very evident that he was so sharp, he could make penetrating points, and we could see that he really was a very good thinker, a really good analyst. But in contrast to Arlien, he had a problem with confrontation, and

he would feel personally hurt when people confronted him and disagreed with him seriously. That created some problems, yet under his deanship, some very important things happened. The generic curriculum was developed in the School, the first in the country, under Malcolm Stinson. He may or may not have come up with the idea; I don't recall how it originated. You probably remember better than I.

FELDMAN: I think the faculty discussions looked at what was common in some of the courses and why were we repeating information.

HAMOVITCH: I know! Wait a minute! I know the actual participant was Guido Pinamonte. He was my doctoral student and did a dissertation on the use of groups by caseworkers and found that they thought they had no background in group work even though they took a required course in group work. They would go elsewhere for courses in group therapy rather than to the School of Social Work where we had some renowned people teaching group work, like Helen Northen. I guess I brought it back and maybe Malcolm picked up the point and brought it to the faculty for discussion.

FELDMAN: And at the same time, Helen was doing some work in Metropolitan State Hospital with groups.

HAMOVITCH: That's right.

FELDMAN: She was very sensitive to the fact that knowledge about individual human behavior had to be incorporated in working with groups, and the other way around; you have to understand group work dynamics to work with the individuals in a family or other group.

HAMOVITCH: I think all of these converged and Malcolm gave full opportunity for developing the idea and worked hard to make it happen. That is a tribute to his deanship. Later on--he was dean from 1959 to 1968--he went on sabbatical, and he asked me to fill in as acting

dean for him. I warned him, as I had done with Arlien Johnson twenty years earlier, that if I was going to be acting dean, I would act as dean, and I might make some decisions that he didn't like. He said that was fine. Well, one of the first things that happened was Chauncey Alexander approached me and said what about setting up a support group; would I be willing? He had talked to Malcolm several times and Malcolm agreed, but didn't follow through. Would I be willing to work with him and establish one before Malcolm got back, so it would be operating by then? On that first committee I worked with Chauncey, Al Feldman, Helen Olander, John Pixley, and there was one other person, I believe. It was a small committee.

FELDMAN: John insisted that I was on it, but I don't remember. I don't think so.

HAMOVITCH: Al was on the committee. I remember Al was very vocal, very instrumental throughout the thing; money-raising kind of brings us back to reality every so often.

Where should we start?

FELDMAN: Why don't you start with Chauncey approaching you?

HAMOVITCH: Chauncey approached me with the idea of starting a support group for the School. We didn't have a name for it at the time and the original members of the committee were Al Feldman, John Pixley, Helen Olander, and one other person I don't recall. It turns out that the ones who actually originated the idea were Al Feldman and John Pixley, who had approached Chauncey to move it along, which he did and very effectively--but never acknowledged the important fact that it originated with the other two. But it did get started, and we decided to call it Los Amigos de la Humanidad--with a Spanish flavor, given the region we live in. It still fits that program and is still going on.

Something else that was going on at the time was student activism. This was a period of the strong civil rights movement, with all kinds of requests from the minority populations among

students as well as in the community, and it was a period of strident command. Stridency was the key word; students didn't ask or didn't request; they demanded, and sometimes used four letter words where other language would have done just as well, maybe even better.

FELDMAN: And we weren't used to such language.

HAMOVITCH: That's right, it was not something we had been used to. Some of the faculty members were offended and a little bit resentful of having to respond to that kind of approach, but we had agreed that the important thing was to look at the validity of the requests rather than the form. This again was typically for a faculty which was unique, which was very different from faculties in other schools of social work. While we felt we were under fire, we were not pussy cats, and compared to other schools, we managed to contain the problems. I attributed this fact then, and I attribute it now, to the willingness of our faculty to feel secure in dealing with students or the validity of our program, and their readiness to make some modifications if they could improve our educational program. Later, deans of other schools of social work would turn to me when I became dean in my own right, to ask what kinds of students did we have; they are so complimentary about the School and the faculty, when everybody else's students were condemning the faculty and condemning the administration.

FELDMAN: Striking.

HAMOVITCH: And were striking in some cases, but as I said, I attributed what happened here to the fact that the faculty were ready to respond. I'll give you an illustration. It was in April of that year or, perhaps, the following year (graduation was held in June) that first-year students had come in and said they would like to make some modifications in the curriculum for the second year. We discussed this, and I agreed the proposed changes might make some sense, we would give them some thought and discuss the matter next year. They said, "We can't wait till next year,

we only have one more year here.” I said, “Forget it. There is no way that we could do that. It takes some time; things can’t just happen.” They replied, “Why its just matter of changing this, that, and the other thing.” I said that as a matter of fact, it possibly could be done if the faculty is ready to make accommodations, but administratively it would be difficult, but I could probably work it out if they agreed. I would take it to the faculty now rather than later. Faculty listened, then said that was what we have been talking about for some time; if it could be handled administratively, we’re willing to do it--and it was done. Now that kind of thing is why the students responded so positively; the fact that the faculty were willing to listen to reason. The students were also appreciative of the fact that the faculty were not willing to cave in to whatever they demanded. They realized it would reduce the quality of the program and that they were not in the position to make all those decisions, so if the faculty would say no, we think this is wrong, that was it, and we got no argument. Our students never struck or did any of those other protesting things. Years later, some of the minority groups were asking for a quota system--that there should be a percentage of 20, 25, or 10 in the distribution of minority populations: Black, Latino and Asian. The faculty and I agreed completely that we would never do that. UCLA’s dean said the same thing but that faculty did not back him up, nor did the administration. He eventually left under protest because his deanship had been undermined. And the community groups still picketed UCLA every year but not USC.

FELDMAN: Without a quota.

HAMOVITCH: What we did agree on was that we would accept any qualified minority person. If a minority person was turned down and claimed to have been unfairly treated and if that person were willing to sign a release to give his or her name and the information, the situation would be discussed with the community group. If they found any evidence that in fact there was

discrimination, that these people were qualified, then the group would have cause for argument, and we would take it from there. But they couldn't find such an instance. The next year there was a situation where a black student had applied with something like a 2.3 grade point average in her upper-division years. Her father was a professor in a medical school and had been for a long time, long before the civil rights movement, so he didn't have his position because of blackness. Her mother was a medical technician, one brother was in law school, and here was she with a 2.3 grade point average. Now either she wasn't too bright--which happens, for sometimes you get one child who is very bright and one who isn't--or she was lazy, but in any event, her grades were not a reflection of discrimination or of disadvantage. The group agreed. That was the one and only case that was challenged. That did it. Years later one of the groups was again picketing UCLA. I screwed up my courage and asked for an explanation for why in all these years we had never had a quota, we have said no to various kinds of things, we have failed students, and we had never been picketed, whereas UCLA had a quota system, and even exceeded its quota; it had changed programs, and still they were picketed. What is it? I am not looking for trouble, but what is it? They replied it was because they knew that the School, the administration and the faculty, are committed to the idea of affirmative action and had demonstrated their commitment but not at the risk of lowering standards. With UCLA it was a political game, UCLA doesn't believe in it, and so the pressure had to be kept on constantly. I think that is the difference, and that's why I go back to Arlien Johnson in terms of the kind of quality she instilled, and I go back to her idea that an administrator has the right and the responsibility to lead and to be forceful. And to argue back, to take positions, and to be professionally responsible. Those are the kinds of people we have had for the most part over the years, and I think that is what saved us during that whole period.

The other excitement in that period, of course, centered on all those retreats we had in which the students really confronted us; those were primarily ventilation episodes, I think, more than anything else. But the retreats at least gave the students the opportunity to offer “facts,” to know that we were willing to expose ourselves to respond and to listen to them, be we would still emerge with whatever position we had taken and they then had to abide by it. I think it was played out healthily.

FELDMAN: Yes, Maury, I think it really was testimony to the quality of leadership that you brought, leadership based on understanding dynamics of human behavior and how people behave under certain circumstances.

HAMOVITCH: I appreciate you saying that, but it could not have possibly worked were it not for the faculty.

FELDMAN: It had to be a team effort.

HAMOVITCH: And that was what was not happening at Berkeley, where some of the faculty in fact conspired with the students to oppose the administration and the rest of the faculty. I think it reflected the culture of a faculty that did its own research and didn't communicate much with each other and, therefore, it was perfectly consistent with the fact that a number believed in this kind of community social action and encouraged the students, without thinking about the rest of the School. I think if anything makes us unique among schools, it is that basically there is this commitment to the School apart from a concern about one's own advancement.

FELDMAN: That is a pretty basic principle and what we try to teach people who want to become social workers.

HAMOVITCH: Right. But I jumped ahead of myself a little bit because I started to speak about Malcolm's return after a year in Ceylon. When he came back, he found that he couldn't

content with the change in climate, and he simply announced to me that I should take the deanship as of July. I said it's not your school to give. In the first place, the faculty has to make that decision and the administration of the University makes that decision. Besides, I don't want to be a dean; you're assuming too much. I like what I am doing, and that's why I haven't taken those other deaning jobs. He said, "What about these others? Do you want somebody like (he named names) to take over the School? You've got a lot invested in this School." That did get to me, and I went home that night, talked to my wife, Rita, and asked what she thought. She said, "Do you want to or don't you want to?" I said "I don't really want to, but I feel maybe I should think about whether the faculty would like me to do it." She thought that would be the worst reason to take the job. If that is the reason, she said, I'd be a big failure and hate it. She said that the first time a faculty member crossed me, "you can't just say, I'm only doing this because you asked me to. Either you want to do it," she said, "in which case you are going to do something with it, or you don't want to do it." I then had to be honest with myself, and I realized I would like to see what could be done.

FELDMAN: You knew what you would be getting into.

HAMOVITCH: That's right, because I had some experience, and I said that the first time I lose a night's sleep, I am going to announce my retirement from the job. Through all that period, I didn't lose a night's sleep because I was confident that things would be okay. Anyway, Malcolm gave up the position.

FELDMAN: I think it is important to note that the faculty was unanimous in voting for you.

HAMOVITCH: Well, you chaired that committee.

FELDMAN: I remember when Paul Hadley, the academic vice-president....

HAMOVITCH: No, it was Tracy Strevey.

FELDMAN: Yes, Strevey, and then the man who went to Hawaii, the chemist--Kloetzel. They met with the faculty and asked if we were doing this just because it was easier; I think you were not in that meeting.

HAMOVITCH: That's right.

FELDMAN: Just the faculty was meeting and as chair of the committee, I was the one who had to lead the discussion. The administrators wanted to know whether we were taking the easiest way to handle the deanship; we said no, we had polled all the faculty and there was not a single dissent, only enthusiasm. They said they hadn't had this experience elsewhere in the University, and I remember we thought that was funny because, we said, there is no other school of social work in the University. Strevey said they would convey our recommendation. The fact that this was unanimous, enthusiastic support was very important.

HAMOVITCH: I don't recall hearing that. That year Norman Topping was the president, and I did meet with him; I knew enough about administration and organizations to know that this was the time of my maximum leverage. I pointed out that in effect I was taking a cut in salary by taking the position for I would have less income from extra-curricular activities. That was all right, but I needed three new University-paid positions in order to develop a program adequately. He said okay and also asked me about whether I wanted an associate dean. I thought not at this point; to have someone between me and the faculty and between me and the students would be a mistake. I would, however, like an administrative assistant who could take on a lot of chores that I would feel responsible for, not as a gate keeper. Again he said okay. That's when we hired Lenore Blauman. She was bright, but I didn't know what the job would entail. For me she was the perfect person. She had flaws, but for me the appointment turned out well.

FELDMAN: She was able to do the things you needed.

HAMOVITCH: Right. In that period, of course, we did spend a lot of time trying to educate ourselves about ethnic minority content and cultural differences. We tried several things. We had a special course on working with minority groups but before the semester was half over, we agreed that that was not the way to go. The ethnic groups themselves were asking us how one can teach all about working with Hispanic people in two sessions or three sessions or even in four sessions, that there are many difference in and among the ethnic groups. With regard to the Asian populations, that came out very clearly. With more discussion among ourselves as well as with outside groups, we agreed that we would try to infuse the ethnic content throughout the curriculum. That we have been trying to do, more or less effectively, over the years--sometimes less, sometimes more. I think it is still a problem because there is so much that is hard to get in, and I notice that there is a resurgence of the notions that there should be special courses.

FELDMAN: I think it is a critical thing that will always be coming back.

HAMOVITCH: The doctoral programs went through a number of refinements. When I first became dean, there were a number of undergraduate programs developing across the country, and there was a strong movement to have accredited undergraduate degrees as a step, then move into the professional school for a one-year masters degree beyond for those with this BSW degree. I was invited to give a speech at McGill University on curriculum-building, and I took a very strong position opposed to the whole notion of a BSW degree. Than, two years later, I found myself coming back to the faculty and saying perhaps we should try it, before the end of the five years to decide whether we should continue it. We set it in motion. In our accreditation review report, the only criticism we received was that the program was too good, it looked too much like a first-year masters program. That in fact was a violation of the concept that students should be graduates and should all go into practice immediately. With this degree, we should we were

socializing them to the notion that to be a real social worker required a two-year degree program, starting with the BSW and then going on to the second-year Master's level. We admitted some students from the baccalaureate program into the Master's degree level. We did a study with second-year teaching faculty. They were not aware which were the BSW students and which were the non-BSW students; their performance seemed to be okay, but still the persistent comment kept coming up among faculty teaching these courses that the students were too young, that they didn't have enough life experience to respond to or to even ask relevant questions. John Milner, who is an excellent teacher who believed in the undergraduate program, said that he taught the whole course in the first three weeks because there was no discussion; that he had to then move on to other things to manufacture issues for them to discuss in whatever way they could discuss. He said the problem was that they were behaving just exactly the way they should, like adolescents--and they were adolescents. Then we noticed some problems in the field, in the second-year field placements. The more we worked on the problems, the less happy we were with the program. Probably this was the first and only program we started that we stopped. No--that is not quite true; we had a couple of others we voted out of existence also.

FELDMAN: But on the basis of knowledge.

HAMOVITCH: Right. I think it was a truly noble experiment in the sense we were willing to say no on the basis after examining it.

FELDMAN: And to draw somebody into operating it; Bob Roberts.

HAMOVITCH: Yes. We brought in some of the senior faculty members to run it. Barbara Solomon, John Milner taught in it. It wasn't that we were assigning junior faculty to it; we had senior faculty teaching the courses, faculty who were committed to it, who really believed in it. And then we decided not to continue it.

Another program that we started was what we called a satellite program, for students in orange county, Riverside, and San Bernardino Counties. We set up one in orange County and one in San Bernardino. We did that in response to the demands in those communities. After several years, we found that there was decreasing response. Actually we had a third program; these were all part-time programs, and we had one also on the main campus. What we found was that we weren't getting many minority students in these other areas. The minority-student population had been addressing the needs of minority students for part-time programs. We have far more minority students in the main campus programs, but in the two satellite programs, the applications were decreasing because we had already educated the group that was out there; primarily they were people working in public welfare agencies. We kept the part-time program on campus, both day and evening programs, and students did come to it from the other areas but there weren't enough to warrant a class. That was in the middle 1970s. But in the 1980s, we found in Orange County a demand for social worker education. Long Beach State was setting up a program then. Bob Roberts came to the faculty to ask if we were willing to establish a Tri-County program, teaching in Orange County, but accessible to Riverside and San Bernardino Counties. He had heard from the community that there was a lot of anger against USC because we had started a program when it suited us and stopped it when the programs didn't suit us. No one bothered to mention that there weren't any takers for the program, which was why we stopped. We did learn from that experience, and I think the program currently is a better program and more realistic, and is more likely to continue than the other; we are now talking about an expanding population rather than the population only of social workers in a place looking for training.

FELDMAN: I think another element that probably makes a difference now is that the University itself began to move into Orange County where they had not previously given that kind of support.

HAMOVITCH: That's true, and there is a new USC presence and a lot of USC alumni living in Orange County. I think another reason for its success is that we now have a full-time administrator on that program. She is out there recruiting, whereas in the previous situation, we waited for people to apply.

FELDMAN: I think it was in your administration that we began to emphasize research. Or was this started with the Regional Social Welfare Research Institute?

HAMOVITCH: That's right. Early on, with your help, we set up the Social Welfare Research Institute with Social and Rehabilitation funding. Gen Carter had told us about it, and when we received the funds, we decided to recruit and hire her.

FELDMAN: She had headed research in that federal department.

HAMOVITCH: Yes. We asked her to head up the Regional Institute and that developed some very fine research. One study was of the attitudes in the general population about welfare recipients and, contrary to all the newspaper articles and some of the other researchers, the Institute found that there was an overwhelmingly positive feeling in the population for public assistance programs. And your project came out of that.

FELDMAN: The Alaska Project.

HAMOVITCH: The Alaska Project was kind of an off-shoot; it wasn't directly under the Institute, but it was related; it was separately funded.

FELDMAN: Yes. The primary contract was the State of Alaska and me, with federal money. But we wrote a separate piece for the statistical and other work that was between the State of Alaska and the Research Institute. One of the other things that the Research Institute was involved in was with the Catholic National University.

HAMOVITCH: Oh yes.

FELDMAN: We had an important role in that, not just in carrying out our part of the training but, I think, a healthy respect for us was developed among people in these other schools because of what we were teaching here. This showed up repeatedly in the written documents that we saw.

HAMOVITCH: Yes, they were some very good documents that came out of that project and a couple of good conferences which were hosted before the Western Region schools to which our current dean came. I think he hadn't had much contact with our work, and he could see there some of the things that we were doing. I think he was impressed.

FELDMAN: Well, actually we had an earlier administration project in your tenure as dean.

HAMOVITCH: That's the other one. I guess I mixed the two of them up.

FELDMAN: He was already at the University of Washington, but we still worked collaboratively on that project, and we developed from it the CO Administration curriculum. I was involved with that because the grant was made to me.

HAMOVITCH: That's right. I neglected to talk about something else we developed; the joint degree and the dual degree programs. One was in the Gerontology Center very early on. We recruited Al (Feldman) for that because he was on their payroll heading up the training program, and included in that was the dual degree program with the Gerontology Center. Al became on of the first to teach the course in community practice, community organization, and administration. That was a baptism of fire for all the people who taught it, including Al. It was hard because here we were adding a course to students' loads during a period when the students were beginning to think in terms of very clinically-oriented private practice. Why did they need another policy course? They still talk about it as a policy course, but it isn't; it is a practice course, it's a community practice course. Al had adopted that program and while it was under his tenure in heading that dual degree program, we had excellent field placements for the students--quality

placements. He had established the Leonard Davis School of Gerontology. After he gave up that position and retired, Betty Hartford took it on. She tried to maintain those placements, but it was the beginning of a losing battle. Current field faculty had some reservations about the quality of the second field placements the students were getting; and we don't have as much control over them as when Al and Betty were there.

FELDMAN: But I think it ties back to something you mentioned in our interview, the fact that faculty under Arlien were expected to be part of the community and to know the agencies through their own contacts with the agencies. That was Al's philosophy too, and I think that is what gave strength to that earlier gerontology program, but that concept decreased over the years. I think the lack of direct constant involvement with agencies really led to having the placements at a lower level.

HAMOVITCH: Field coordinators do that now. But here is one instance where we don't have control over the field placement; interestingly, the person who heads it is a graduate in the masters program and has a doctorate in another field. They just see things differently. It is hard; while Al was heading up the program, it really was a quality program; now it is different.

The other dual degree program is the one with the Hebrew Union College. In that one the second-year placements are determined by the other component and there have been some problems, but they are more under control at this point and there is about the same kind of relationship between the two components of the program. Those are two viable programs.

There is a smaller program with the School of Public Administration. Every year we have two or three students who enroll in it and it is one where we have complete control of the field placements as well as largely internal course work. We have one with the School of Lw. This was at their initiative, as was the one with the School of Public Administration. There also is one with Urban

and Regional Planning, but I am not positive about whether that is a formal program.

FELDMAN: Maury, was it during your deanship that our relationship with the medical school strengthened, and we had joint teaching?

HAMOVITCH: That's right. It was with your friend who was with General McArthur.

FELDMAN: Roger Egeberg.

HAMOVITCH: Roger Egeberg was the one who initiated it. I had had some relationship earlier with Bob Tranquada, and at the time, Bob was running the County USC Medical Center and, Roger Egeberg was the dean. He came to us and asked about having a joint appointment, that they needed a social worker on their faculty; would we help find one. They would insist on a joint appointment of a qualified person, who would teach courses in the School of Social Work as well as in the Medical School. We did explore and came up with Elsbeth Kahn's name. The medical faculty interviewed her and our faculty reviewed her qualifications. She was appointed, then subsequently reappointed and acquired tenure. She taught for us for a little while, but not in the last seven or eight years because of the demands on her time there. But we were brought closer. This relationship was continued by Egeberg's successor to some extent, but wasn't as keen. There were a number of occasions when we were able to have joint projects, including a couple of research projects.

FELDMAN: But his successor, Alan Mathias, whom I saw yesterday at a meeting, said to me Elsbeth has a good program and he said he'd certainly learned a lot of respect for social work through the School of Social Work. I was surprised that he made such a point of that and that it has given him a new respect for the social work staff at the hospital. And he attributes this experience to her. I was a hard task-master as president of the President's Advisory Council. He didn't know that social workers had "gumption," I heard yesterday. But he tied Elsbeth and his

respect for her to our School.

HAMOVITCH: Oh that's great. So there are those programs. In 1979, I decided I didn't want to end my career as an administrator. I had started as a teacher and researcher, and I wanted to end that way, to do it while I was still young enough and without people saying, "He got tired of the deanship so he is retiring to become a faculty member." I did that and, again, you were chair of the committee to recruit the new dean. Roberts was appointed, and I think that was a good choice. I was fortunate that Kathy Ell, the new faculty I had hired as one of my last hirings, was doing a project and asked me if I were willing to work with her and the other person on the project. That was exactly the kind of thing I had in mind, and so I did get involved. These last ten years--I thought it would be five years--have been very rewarding, and I've done what I said I would. I would like to add a postscript; over the course of the years, I was involved in the social welfare community, particularly one agency, Frieda Mohr Center of Jewish Family Service.

In that connection, I want to make a comment about some of the people I have met in my earlier experiences and with whom I had contact over a period of years. Some were pioneer type of women in social work, like Honora Wilson of the City of Hope Medical Center, and Frieda Mohr at Jewish Family Service. It was a whole generation of women in social work who really provided not only leadership in developing programs, but they were able to maintain very good programs. After the women left, the programs changed. Because of the increasing complexity of social work administration, there was a shift from women administrators to male administrators--a little bit of what I ran into on my entry to social work. Before Honora Wilson had developed the City of Hope Social Service Department to the point that it was the conscience of the hospital, I remember meeting with the administrator of the hospital who had asked me if Dr. Knutson had a deal with Honora; was it because she is great, "But she is demanding; she keeps on

pushing and pushing.” I said that was why she was hired; he wanted someone who would do just that.

Ever since I gave up the deanship, I have been on the Board of Directors of the Jewish Family Agency, and it’s kind of fun. It’s a whole different kind of board; it violates all kinds of principles; it is personalized and involved. The first meeting that I attended shocked me. I was sitting there in front of Barbara Weitzman, and they were getting almost into personnel matters. I said would you like me to say something or dare I say something, and she said, “No, you need to attend a few meetings to get the flavor of this board. It is a different kind of board than you are used to, but it works, and I really don’t intrude.” They are very involved, and I have come to have tremendous respect for those bright board members, half women and half men. The women are not there because of their husbands’ money; they are there because they have ideas to contribute. I think that is part of the board’s vitality. They know that they have to make a substantial contribution to the agency, but that is a given; they don’t have to be persuaded to do that. Beyond that, they are there to provide advice and help in decision-making, interceding on behalf of the agency and other groups in the community in United Way meetings and in Jewish Federations budget hearings. They are not there just to lend their names or contribute money at key points; they are there for other reasons.

You were asking me about the University and the School. I think even from the beginning under Arlien’s predecessor, Bogardus, the School had a reputation that was that this was an important part of the University; it wasn’t just something added on. It had an integral part in the play of the University, and Bogardus had a role to play. I think Arlien was listened to both by Von KleinSmid and Raubenheimer. I don’t know about Fagg, but there was respect for the School and for some of the faculty who were involved in various activities. I think that later on, your

contributions certainly added to it.

FELDMAN: You were responsible for that, you know. Do you remember that first committee we had on insurance and faculty and staff? You were on it, you chaired it and then asked me to take over. While I had chaired other committees for the University, like Student Financial Aid and so forth, I had dealt with very small numbers of people. But when the Insurance Committee became active because the trustees were going to make \$10 a month available for every employee, and we had set up a committee across the board, not just faculty, but others, the reporting from that committee to the University Senate and then to other groups at the University, made social work very visible. It was your turning that committee over to me that really propelled me into the limelight and therefore, the School. So you were responsible.

HAMOVITCH: But you had to do it. You had to do it the way you would do it. Anyway, the thing is that over the years, I think, there has been the continuing input from selected faculty members--not a lot of our faculty--who are that involved in the general University operations. But you were, Ruby was, I think Betty Paine was for a while, Norrie and John in different ways with other selected departments within the University.

FELDMAN: Yes, primarily with the Delinquency Control Institute.

HAMOVITCH: The Delinquency Control Institute and Sociology Department. Other people like John and Norrie were known in certain circles; Sam Taylor is known in the administration of Urban and Regional Planning, even in some parts of Education. Kathy Ell is well known in the research areas, so there is a visibility of the School in contrast with many other schools of social work in key places. Not only did they simply know about us, but you were president of the Faculty Senate; you were chair of the President's Advisory Council; I was chair of the Dean's Council. Barbara Solomon was Dean of the Graduate School.

FELDMAN: You had chairing roles in various significant committees through the University.

HAMOVITCH: There was a point when I think you were chair either of the Senate or the President's Advisory Council, and I was chairing the Council of Deans; people were saying the University was being run by Social Work; there were deans who were really, truly envious because of both of us. And Barbara had direct contact with the President and with the Academic Vice President in close relationships. It did feel to a lot of people like we feel about some other parts of the University, like the Law School, that they have too much power or whatever; that is how it was viewed at that point. You are right. I did serve on a number of University-wide committees over the years, and I think that is important for the School, and I hope the School continues to recognize the value of that. It pays off in so many ways. For example, being on the University Appointment and Tenure Committee for two years as I was, gave me an insight into the way that committee operates so that we never had a recommendation for promotion or tenure turned down. There was one we submitted that we knew we wouldn't be able to defend, but any we felt strongly about were approved by the University. I was on the Graduate Scholarship Committee. Two of our doctoral applicants got funding, and I know they wouldn't have if I had not been on that committee. I was the chairman of the Graduate School Curriculum Committee for two years, and made things we had on the line just sail through--changes in our program. The visibility of the School has an estimable value in terms of receptivity to program changes that we or the dean ask for, and I hope we continue.

There is the Faculty/Staff Counseling Center that was part of your efforts; it is a viable program run just by the School of Social Work.

We did some research at Fairview Hospital and demonstrated the value of the small group placements of mentally retarded, and Dr. Tarjan really picked up on that research and used it in the

legislature for a bit of funding. We did an experiment where they had to do their first interviews within 30 instead of 90 days, and we found as a result that some people belonged back in the hospital, but more people were able to stay out longer because there was earlier activity. They picked up on it and those kinds of research projects, which didn't get published, were used within the agency, and I think that is something important. We sometimes don't recognize the value of administrative research which leads to policy modifications or support. Not all research needs to be published in order to be useful. Yet, while I was dean, more and more we were pushing for the research responsibilities of the faculty in terms of promotability. Part of that University culture is changing, yet I believe that it is important for faculty to contribute to knowledge, to do research and to publish.

FELDMAN: I think it's not possible to overestimate what the contributions to community social welfare programs and policy have been; they are a matter of record.

HAMOVITCH: In the last five years of my tenure as dean, the University began to request from deans their plans, particularly development plans and development goals. We had to prioritize where we would place different interests and, with consultation with faculty, I came up with the idea of the Research Center. If we were going to require faculty to do research, then we had an obligation to provide the means to make it possible and to encourage it, including seed money for young faculty or for senior faculty to develop proposals which could be funded. This was high on my priority list, but it was like pie in the sky. I would put it in without much expectation that anything would happen. Two things did happen in that last year of my tenure. One was that Los Amigos asked me what would I like; they would like to make a substantial donation to something in my honor. I said the one thing I really can't afford is the Research Center for I knew that we were talking about maybe \$10,000. Before that, Robert Sutro had heard I was retiring and he

would like to make a substantial contribution to the School. He was going to be selling his business, making a lot of money, and he would pledge \$100,000 to the School in my name. When he asked what I would like, I said the "Research Center," that would be a really great start. That is how it got started. He didn't come through with very much of the pledge, although he still might before the year is out. But with that, we had the opportunity at least of getting started. Then when Rita died, I added her name because she worked with me a lot on some of the research that I had done and was very involved. We got more contributions so that there is a fairly substantial amount. When she was a student here, Jack Levin's wife, who was a quadriplegic, had been so touched that we had accepted her to the School, that we bonded. Also you and Jack Levin had a relationship, and they had offered money for scholarships for handicapped persons through the University. We were the only two who were invited with President Jack Hubbard and his wife, when they made that substantial contribution; that also made it possible to keep going, and I feel very positive about that.

FELDMAN: What else do you think of when you look back over these 40 years with the School?

HAMOVITCH: There were specific incidents that were gratifying, but I think sometimes about why I never left, even though I had some attractive offers and was tempted at times. When I say attractive, I don't simply mean in terms of monetary remuneration. I guess the collegiality of the faculty is one thing that stands out in my memory all the way through, with minor exceptions. I didn't mention my activities with regard to the Council on Social Work Education. I was on the board of directors and several key commissions and, also, did a lot of field visits for accreditation purposes. Each time I would go to a school, including places like Columbia, Hunter, Michigan and Berkeley, or smaller school, what always stood out was the collegiality of our faculty. When

I say collegiality, I don't mean just nice people, but people of substance who felt secure in arguing with each other without getting overly contentious and certainly not personalizing.

I didn't want to have power for the sake of power, and faculty wanted to be faculty; they didn't want to be administrators. Faculty said, "You take care of salaries and salary decisions; you take care of these other things we don't want to do." I remember that when I took that sabbatical in 1972 at the height of the student activism, I said, "You have to develop a governing system and the best time to do it is when I am not around." I remember the hassles to get people to really pay attention to this. When it was constructed, the dean had veto power. I said, "Wait a minute. Shouldn't you put something in there to the effect that he or she has a responsibility to explain why the veto on a decision, not just simply go veto it?" Okay, they said, I could add that. After we got this underway, faculty said it was taking up too much time; why go through this? That is the flavor that can only come with people who are secure in themselves and with the administration. That is one overall impression that I have of a good feeling. The second is the opportunity to do the things that I wanted to do. I love teaching; I love the research; I love the committee assignments--not only the assignments in the University, but the assignments within the School and the assignments within the community. I always had friends who had far more money than I did, but they all envied me. I would talk about what I was going to do and what was going on, not that I have to get up and go to work. This place and these people; that is what I will miss.

FELDMAN: Well, you'll miss it and the School will miss you, except that you know it doesn't have to be that way.

HAMOVITCH: No, and that's important. I think I can still maintain relationships without having to be a "has been."

FELDMAN: That's a good point on which to end, Maury. Thank you very much.