

From the Oral History of
HAROLD E. VERRALL

Harold E. Verrall (1902–1995) was brought to the UCLA School of Law from Vanderbilt University Law School by Dean L. Dale Coffman in 1949. As assistant dean, he was one of the two faculty members who supported Dean Coffman against dissident faculty members. He remained at UCLA as professor of law until his retirement in 1970 and continued as professor at UC Hastings College of the Law until 1979.¹



HAROLD E. VERRALL

★ ★ ★

BERNARD GALM (UCLA ORAL HISTORY INTERVIEWER): [Before Dean Coffman came to UCLA in 1949], what were his major accomplishments [as dean of the law school at Vanderbilt]? Expansion of the library, expansion of the faculty — ?

¹ For further information, see the Editor-in-Chief's introduction on page 1 of this volume: 11 CAL. LEGAL HIST. 1 (2016).

VERRALL: And he had to supervise the construction of classrooms, which were far different from those of the university because the classes would be larger. So we had to have the classrooms with built-up benches and seating so that all the students could see the instructor at the podium.

GALM: Later on, when we talk about the building at UCLA and so forth, I'll ask you, or you can volunteer, for comparisons between Vanderbilt, ideas which he may have already begun at Vanderbilt, or introduced at Vanderbilt, that he later reintroduced at UCLA.

VERRALL: Well, I would say that probably his policies were very much the same, except on a magnified scale. In other words, the building we got built here was probably three times the capacity of the Vanderbilt building that we had left. Oh, maybe even more than three times, four times. But they figured the school here would be a school of 1,000 to 1,500 students, so we'd need that space.

GALM: Did you teach, more or less, the same courses that you taught before the war — Property courses?

VERRALL: That was the dean's policy. He wanted somebody who had had years of experience in teaching in the Property field, years of teaching in the Criminal Law field, years of teaching in the Procedural Law field, years of teaching in the Torts field, not quite as much, but that was the field he was going to take over himself.

GALM: I know that in the early years at UCLA he had weekly luncheon meetings with the faculty. Was that also a feature at Vanderbilt?

VERRALL: At Vanderbilt we had, oh, I would say, more daily luncheon meetings, with a faculty meeting about every two or three or four weeks. At luncheon we'd have our faculty meetings. At UCLA we also had the daily luncheons for years and years. For the first ten years of the school a group of the faculty, and indeed practically all of the faculty, would go out to lunch. No, it was about the same.

GALM: Was there any interaction with other departments or schools at Vanderbilt?

VERRALL: Really, the answer should be no. We knew many of the other department heads and the faculty, and we maintained social contacts. But

from the point of view of university functioning, no, Vanderbilt was run in a little different way, I would say each department almost separate from the other.

GALM: Did Dean Coffman have an assistant dean at Vanderbilt?

VERRALL: Well, a member of the faculty would assist on admissions. I was the goat most of the time. The school wasn't big enough to require a full-time assistant dean.

GALM: Do you recall what your first impressions were of Dean Coffman?

VERRALL: Well, I noticed the first thing he did was to fill up his pipe, and light it without saying very much, and then smoke. So I assumed he was doing that for the purpose of attracting attention to himself. He was a person who wanted to be front and center all the time, ever since I knew him.

GALM: Had you known him before he came to Vanderbilt?

VERRALL: No, I only knew him over the telephone before he came to Vanderbilt. And that was during the six months before I returned, before I left the government service and came back into teaching.

GALM: Did you socialize much with him at Vanderbilt? I mean, separate from the entire law faculty.

VERRALL: Yes. [Rollin M.] Perkins and Coffman and myself, we got together, oh, probably once a week.

GALM: Dean Coffman then was appointed here at UCLA in 1949.

VERRALL: Yes.

GALM: Before he left had he discussed with you the possibility of your coming?

VERRALL: Oh yes.

GALM: Had he discussed it at all before he accepted the deanship?

VERRALL: Yes. He had talked to both Rollin Perkins and myself. Well, I don't know just when it was, at one of our social meetings. We always talked a little bit of business as we socialized.

GALM: When did you say yes?

VERRALL: I told him that I'd like to come to California the very first time he broached the subject. So he knew it was yes all the way from my point of view. The only question would be what the university would say. They have certain procedures and they have certain likes and dislikes, like all people do. So I didn't say yes to UCLA until I got a formal invitation.

GALM: Had you ever been to the West Coast by that time?

VERRALL: Oh yes. In the middle thirties, during the Depression, I had driven out to Washington and then down from Washington to Los Angeles, all down the coast. So I'd been familiar with the California weather, California people.

GALM: Was that a family trip that you made?

VERRALL: No, just myself and my wife. We wanted to see what the West was like. We both liked it.

GALM: What did you see as being the advantages for you in the move? You were a full professor at Vanderbilt.

VERRALL: Well, the advantages would be great because the University of California never did things in a little way. So we figured from the very beginning they were going to build a good-sized law school that would have a national reputation. And, you see, Boalt Hall [University of California, Berkeley] was known throughout the whole of the United States as one of the leading law schools of the nation. And we figured that UCLA would be the same, become one of the leaders. No, we were very happy, both Perkins and myself.

GALM: When you arrived, what was the state of affairs as far as the law school was concerned?

VERRALL: They had an old military barracks that they had put some partitions in for [counts] one, two, three, four about six rooms in it. Perkins took one; I took the one next to it. Dean [Roscoe] Pound across the hall from Perkins, and Brainerd Currie across the hall from where I was. The other two little rooms were the dean's office, the office of the dean, and the secretarial office.

We were in that barracks, and then they had another barracks they were building into a law school library. The librarian, Tom [Thomas S.]

Dabagh, was there. Then they had a third barracks which was to be the classroom for that first year. And somehow or other they had, either along with the library or in a separate little building, lockers for the students and a reading room for the students. So it was really basically just some old military barracks back of Royce Hall.

GALM: What were your duties before the start of school?

VERRALL: Well, we had a problem of admissions. And the entire faculty — no, not the entire faculty. Myself and the dean and, I would assume, to some extent Perkins — I don't know that Brainerd Currie ever participated in that — we had to decide what were to be the basic qualifications and to go through the applications and pick out the best students. We clearly couldn't take all of the applicants. We had to take maybe the top ten percent, the best students.

GALM: In speaking with Mrs. [Frances] McQuade about those early years, she stated that they were really quite surprised by the number of applicants for that first-year class. There were several hundred.

VERRALL: I was distinctly surprised at that, but afterwards it didn't surprise me too much because the dean was a good talker. He liked to make speeches. He liked to be front and center, even if it was contentious. He made innumerable speeches throughout the Los Angeles–Long Beach area. Dean Pound was also in great demand, and he made numerous speeches. And the media publicized the fact that they were building up the new law school. Undergraduate student groups became very interested in the new law school, and they wanted to know what they would have to take to qualify. And so I was asked to go out and make speeches to these undergraduate university groups of students. I don't know how many I made in the Long Beach, Los Angeles, and Valley areas. Quite a few.

So there was a great deal of publicity about the law school at that time. The net result was that the lawyers heard about it, and if a youngster was going into the law school, he would ask a lawyer normally, some friend of the family. One way or another the school became known to them, and the number of applicants was phenomenal. We expected to have more applicants, of course, than we had students. We had space for only fifty students, and the number of applications was probably three times or four times that. Some of course were not absolutely complete applications. So if you'd

take, say, fifty that weren't complete, that would leave a hundred and fifty completed applications. We could only take one out of three. So we took the best, the top-notch. And it was a top-notch class. I never had a class of students that pleased me more than that original group of students. And when they got out in practice they showed they were good.

GALM: I suppose in a way they were taking a certain chance too, weren't they?

VERRALL: That was pretty well handled. Well, as a matter of fact, the faculty at their luncheons did a lot of talking about law school matters: Should we require certain courses in college? Or should we give certain courses extra weight? Should we do this and that and other with respect to admissions? And we reached the conclusion, consensus of the faculty, that it didn't make a great deal of difference what courses a person took in college, as long as he really did the work of those courses. If he drifted through, it wouldn't make any difference what courses he took. But if he didn't drift through and he really concentrated on his work and became a good student, it didn't make a great deal of difference. However we would recommend that all students take as much English as possible. Two, that they would take logic if it was given. Three, they might take such courses as advanced mathematics. Because law is breaking a complex problem down into parts, solving the problem of each part, and then building it up again; and that's exactly what you do in higher mathematics. So we discovered over the years of our teaching experience that some of our best students were students who had taken English, logic, and mathematics in college. And so while we didn't say take them, we said such courses can't hurt you. But take any course you like, because there's nothing that you can learn in college or out of college that you can't use as a lawyer, if you really know what you're talking about. So it didn't make any difference what courses they took.

Now through the publicity of our talking to students, through the speeches of those who made good speeches — and the dean and Roscoe Pound were the two that did a lot of speaking — the school became widely known. The number of applicants just flooded the school.

GALM: Did you enjoy giving these speeches?

VERRALL: I'm not a front-and-center person. I'm hesitant to get up and talk; even when I'd get up before a class, after fifty years of teaching, my knees would rattle. No, I don't like to make speeches.

GALM: But at that time it was really promoting the school and therefore was necessary.

VERRALL: Well, if the dean asked me I would do it.

GALM: Why don't we talk about the first members of the faculty. You've mentioned some of them by name, but maybe we could discuss them a little bit more — their backgrounds, and then the courses that they taught.

VERRALL: As I analyze it, the dean's policy was portrayed in the original faculty, from the point of view of faculty. He wanted somebody on the faculty of international repute, if possible, as a stimulus. So that the students would be stimulated. Because you don't teach a student anything. If he doesn't learn himself, he's not a good student. You can't teach anybody anything. He has to learn it. And so we wanted to stimulate the student body.

One of the policies of the dean, which the faculty approved of very much, was to have someone of international repute teaching. So the visiting professor that first year was Roscoe Pound. He had had at least fifty years of teaching experience. He'd been the dean of the number one law school in America for years, Harvard Law School. For thirty, forty years he was dean of Harvard [in fact, twenty years]. He'd been a judge. He'd been a graduate student of international reputation, even in the area of botany. He was the author of innumerable books on jurisprudence and was, I would say, one of the two or three leading American, what I would characterize as, legal statesmen. As a stimulus for our students it was just wonderful to have him teaching first-year students. That's in keeping with the policy that the dean had, and I know the faculty at that time approved.

So Dean Pound, with fifty-odd years of teaching experience and more experience in the field of law; secondly, Rollin Perkins, with thirty or forty years of teaching experience — also, author of at least two books in criminal law, one of which was *Elements of Police Science*, which was translated into many different languages and used throughout the world as an educational tool in the area of police science. He had some thirty years of experience, and he was also a stimulating teacher like Dean Pound, rather on the conservative side of teaching. Myself, with twenty-odd years of teaching experience, maybe a little more than that, also of the relatively conservative type of teaching. I'd taught Property Law for twenty, twenty-five years. Perkins had taught Criminal Law for thirty-five, forty years. Pound had taught

Procedure and other courses for fifty-odd years. Then the fourth member of the faculty was Brainerd Currie. He was the editor of *Law and Contemporary Problems*, one of the leading legal publications of the nation, but relatively young as a teacher, and relatively on the liberal side as a teacher.

It gave our school a little mix that way. We had the old type, Harvard type of teacher, and the newer type of teacher who would like to change courses around and like to approach courses in different ways, and be, I would say, of the Yale type, more liberal. I should say, I was a graduate of Yale, so I'm kind of fifty-fifty, halfway between Harvard and Yale as a teacher.

GALM: Did Yale have that reputation?

VERRALL: At that time, yes, very much so.

GALM: Was it the leader of the liberal direction in law education?

VERRALL: Yes. Yale and Columbia both. Yale probably first and Columbia secondly. And indeed, Wesley Sturges, at one of the meetings we had at Yale, said, "Now we have a faculty half this way and half that way. It's either going to have to go one way or the other. It's can't continue on this way." He was the dean at the time, and he made that statement. And while you can't define what is liberal and what is conservative from the point of view of teaching, we've denominated Yale as one of the liberal schools and Harvard as one of the more conservative schools.

GALM: What was the reputation of Boalt Hall at that time? Do you recall?

VERRALL: Very good, very good.

GALM: I mean liberal/conservative.

VERRALL: I would say Stanford and Boalt Hall were the two westerly schools with a real reputation for being good. And I would say probably Boalt Hall would have ranked more on the conservative side when I came out here than on the liberal side. More like Harvard than Yale. And Stanford would be more like Yale than Harvard. Indeed, they called Stanford sometimes — no, they called it the "Cornell of the West." That's right.

GALM: Why don't we go back and just —

VERRALL: Hit the faculty. Roscoe Pound. I would guess in his late seventies, maybe even eighty —

GALM: He was pushing eighty.

VERRALL: — when he came out here. He rented a suite in a hotel [Chapman Park Hotel] about a block west of the Ambassador Hotel. In the morning he'd get up, go down to the corner, and get himself a cattleman's breakfast. He liked a big breakfast. He was a big man, around six feet four, I guess, weighing two hundred and forty pounds. So he could handle a good cattleman's breakfast. Then he would catch the Red Bus — and in his conversation, no matter with whom he was speaking, it was never just the Red Bus, it was the goddamned Red Bus — and come out to campus.

He would then go into his office. It was the policy of the school at the time that the faculty would not post office hours. Their office hours would be all week, and any student was privileged to come in any time that the door was open. And if the door was closed, they could knock and see if the door wouldn't be opened. But normally the door to the office would never be closed until the man went to teach his class. So the students had unlimited access to the faculty. And that was the policy of the school for at least the first ten years.

He would come into his office and plump himself down and start to work. After fifty-odd years of teaching and sixty-odd years in the practice of law you would think he had read everything, but no. He would concentrate on reading law all day. He had a philosophy he said of setting his goals very high. He said, "Make your horizons high and as you approach the horizon raise the horizon some more." So he was working at that time on a new set of books that he was going to publish on jurisprudence. He was going to bring together his ideas that he had developed over fifty-odd, sixty years. And I would say within three or four years after he left UCLA he completed that set of books on jurisprudence, a five-volume set [*Jurisprudence* (1959)]. While he was here he worked on that as well as on his classes.

GALM: How many years was he at UCLA?

VERRALL: I would say about three.

GALM: How much influence did Roscoe Pound have on Dean Coffman?

VERRALL: I think a great deal. Coffman had been a student at Harvard when Dean Pound was there, and Dean Pound had that faculty of remembering people. Even thirty or forty years after he had met them, even casually, he could greet them by name. It was fantastic. And the same with cases that he'd read twenty, thirty, forty years earlier. He could remember

the case, the name of the judge, the principle involved, and indeed he could even quote portions of cases that far back. I don't know how he did it but he did.

And he read just about as fast as any person I've ever known. Indeed, I think I told you once that I stood across the desk from him while he was taking a book out of a cardboard carton and saying, "Jules [Julius Stone] said he would send me a copy of his book." He started turning over the leaves, and he forgot I was there for two or three minutes. And I think it was at page 78, he says — whang, with his big hands on the desk — "Jules should know better than this. Here on page 78 he says so-and-so, but back on page 14 or 17 in the footnote, he said the exact opposite." That was the sort of rapidity with which he read. He had read seventy-odd pages while I stood across the desk waiting for him to give me a copy of a speech that he had just made. And he remembered what he read. His advice to me was: Concentrate when you read, because if you ever know something you'll never forget it. Well, that's true until you get to my age, and then you start forgetting things, particularly names.

Well, at four o'clock in the afternoon then, or four-thirty — a set time, I don't know, it was just enough time that he would have three or four minutes to get down to the bus stop — he'd slam his book closed, slam his door closed, and leave, and waddle down the hill. He wouldn't walk, he'd run down the hill, all two hundred and fifty pounds of him, to catch the bus home. And he'd have dinner with his wife and probably make a speech that evening. He had taught at Harvard and at Northwestern, mostly at Harvard, most of his lifetime. Had written a dozen or more books, had made speeches throughout the world, and had been guest of honor for royalty throughout Europe. Very well known. I think he was a real stimulant to our students.

GALM: Was he a stimulus also to the faculty?

VERRALL: Very much so. You were afraid to make a mistake. Well, that was true when I went to Hastings College of the Law also. I was scared to make a mistake. So I worked harder probably than I had ever worked in my life, just so that I didn't make a mistake in his presence. No, that was a real stimulant to the faculty. And I have assumed that the dean was right in saying that it would also be a stimulant to the students. Because they did

become good students, not only the first year but the second and third year too. The second member of the faculty —

GALM: Let me just ask one thing about Pound. Do you remember anything specifically that he might have done to influence Dean Coffman in introducing something to the UCLA school that was either particularly him or the Harvard model?

VERRALL: No, I don't know. Such influences would have been accomplished by Dean Pound in a casual conversation over the dinner table at Coffman's house, or while he was drinking a highball after dinner at the dean's house or at my house. You can't tell where. The dean would, Dean Pound, would suggest and he would teach you without your knowing he was teaching you. He never looked down or talked down to a person, and even though you had made a bad mistake he would never correct you directly. He would do it indirectly, so you were not hurt. No, he was a gentleman and a scholar and a real teacher.

GALM: So the next member was?

VERRALL: Well, Rollin Perkins had taught twenty-five years at the University of Iowa and had taught at Vanderbilt, was the author of a couple books, and was a slave driver sort of a teacher. He would tolerate no laughter, no fun about anything. It was work, work, work, work. He drove himself that way, and his class was conducted that way. The students liked it because he ruled with an iron hand. He did that when he was a young teacher at Iowa, he did that when he was at Vanderbilt, and he did that when he was at UCLA. And he continued, after he left UCLA and went up to the "Sixty-Five Club" in San Francisco, to teach that way at Hastings.

The third member of our faculty was Brainerd Currie, editor of *Law and Contemporary Problems* before he came to UCLA, and a teacher of a few years' experience — I don't know how many; maybe four or five before he came to UCLA, maybe six. He was a very good teacher. By way of degrees: Pound of course had all sorts of degrees; Perkins had a doctorate in law; Brainerd Currie had only his baccalaureate and law degrees, but he was a student of exceptional ability in the field of law and a teacher of exceptional ability. After a class was ended during those first years, it was the practice for the faculty to stay at the podium and let the students come up around the podium and discuss law matters (what we called a bull

session), concerning the law of the course, as long as the students wanted to after class. Sometimes those bull sessions would last for an hour after the class. Well, when Brainerd got through with his session in the classroom, he would go to his office. Six or eight of the students would come into the office with him, and they would discuss the law with him for maybe another hour in the office. The arguments were loud and long.

One of the law students once came across the hall and said, "Do you wonder why we argue so much in Professor Currie's office?" I said, "No." He said, "We don't want you to think we agree with him in his politics, or agree with him in his philosophy of life, but we go in there and argue because he can approach the law of a case in more ways than all of us together could imagine. So we have to go in there and argue with him to get various approaches to the law given us in our casebooks." That was the sort of teacher he was. He stimulated the students to try to find out more in the cases than the average person would discover by reading the case, even though he concentrated on the reading. He was an exceptional teacher.

He was the one member of the original faculty that was somewhat a loner. He didn't seem to appreciate going out to lunch every day, as the other members of the faculty did, and he didn't seem to want to socialize with the faculty or outsiders very often. He was very much a family man, and he had a brilliant family. Indeed, his son [David P. Currie] is one of the brilliant [law] teachers of today. So Brainerd would go home. I used to go out to his place, maybe try to go out there at least once a week, and play some cards with him, just go after dinner and discuss matters with him. Play some cards with his son, play checkers with his son, who could beat me every time.

Brainerd became more and more alone over the two or three years he was here. But he was very popular with the students. When he went on, he went on to [University of] Chicago, a big, good law school. It wasn't because he wasn't qualified that he went on so early, he was an exceptional student and an exceptional teacher.

GALM: How did he get along with Dean Coffman?

VERRALL: I saw no friction whatsoever. Because Brainerd was not a person who would want to confront; if he didn't agree and if it wasn't something of real importance to him, he'd just go his way and forget about it.

Well, that was the only way you could get along with Dean Coffman, of course, because he would be delighted if you would confront him and argue against him. So I never argued against him unless it was a matter of principle; then I had no hesitancy whatsoever to speak my mind. He never took it out on me because I didn't agree with him on a point. If it was a matter of principle he would recognize it and accept it; he'd accept my position. No, Brainerd had no confrontation with the dean as far as I know. If it was, it was in private, and I know nothing about it.

GALM: I believe he began teaching Contracts.

VERRALL: Yes, he was teaching Contracts that first year. Pound was teaching Procedure. The dean was teaching Torts. Perkins was teaching Criminal Law. Currie was teaching Contracts, and I was teaching Property. Those are the five areas you normally introduce the students to.

GALM: The other member would be the director of the library, Thomas Dabagh.

VERRALL: Well, Tom Dabagh was a librarian long before the law school was even thought of, a law librarian. He had the contacts and ability to build up a library, and he rapidly built up the UCLA Law Library into a library of substance. It was a really good library. For instance, he discovered that some law school was closing and had a whole library, that he could buy the whole library. In that way, even though he got some duplicate books now and then, he accumulated the books necessary for the student use and the faculty use. For research it would take more years than the first two or three to build a library for research purposes.

Tom had a desire to stack books according to the subject matter, and he wanted to index the books according to the subject matter, and put all the contract books in one place and all the tort books in another, et cetera.

Well, that didn't work out too well because many of the books could be stacked in five different places. If you went to the wrong place first, you might have to go to four other places before you found this book. You didn't want to always go to the card index to find books. So there was a little bit of friction between Tom Dabagh and the faculty concerning the cataloging of the books and the shelving of books. In the end I believe a compromise system was developed.

Tom Dabagh then went on to the librarianship in one of the libraries maintained by the state. He was a good librarian but didn't quite fit in with the faculty during those early years. Not that he wasn't likable socially, he was. Not that he had ideas that they couldn't agree to at all, but there wasn't the camaraderie that was close between the librarian and the faculty. Which normally is true.

GALM: When he was brought on in the position of law librarian was it also thought that he might be an assistant to Dean Coffman?

VERRALL: That I don't know. I believe he would have liked to have had his hands in law school administration.

GALM: From reading the early faculty minutes I get the impression that he might have had that possible role.

VERRALL: I don't know. Knowing Coffman at Vanderbilt three years and here while he was the dean, I would doubt that Coffman would have been able to tolerate him as assistant dean at the time. Just speculating. But I really don't know. I'm —

GALM: What would have been the area of incompatibility?

VERRALL: Oh, I would just say personality, nothing else. This is speculation on my part.

GALM: I understand, I understand.

VERRALL: The fifth member of the faculty of course was myself. I'd gone to school at Iowa and Minnesota, and got my baccalaureate degree at Iowa and my first law degree at Minnesota. I'd gone on and got a graduate degree in political science at Minnesota because I could take that in a law area. Then I'd gone on and got a doctorate degree in law at Yale. (Perkins had his doctorate degree from Harvard. Coffman had a doctorate degree from Harvard. Brainerd Currie, the other member of the faculty, didn't have a graduate degree at the time.) Then I'd gone to teach at Vanderbilt for about twenty years and came out here and taught at UCLA for almost twenty years, about twenty years.

GALM: Did the faculty have any influence on the building itself?

VERRALL: Oh, I would say yes.

GALM: In what way?

VERRALL: The architects would ask concerning what we needed, and then they would draw up plans. The plans, rough plans, would be given to the dean, and the dean then would get the faculty together and we would discuss the plans.

GALM: Again, was this modeled after what he had done at Vanderbilt — the division of rooms and the size of the quarters?

VERRALL: I would say yes. There was a duplication, except the first-year classroom at UCLA was to be at least twice, maybe two-and-a-half times, the size of the first-year classroom at Vanderbilt. We didn't have an [existing] building here. At Vanderbilt we had to put the classroom into the building, and it would only take a classroom of a certain size. Here, they figured that the first-year class might have to be two hundred students. So we'd have to have a first-year classroom that would take that number of students. A second-year classroom would be slightly smaller, and a third-year classroom slightly smaller than that. Then, the small classes would be held in rectangular rooms throughout the building. We'd need a few of those.

But with the three big classrooms, with benches elevated as you go back in the room and with a baffle board at the front of the room, with a circular wooden paneling behind the podium, a student in the back of the room could hear very well. Three classrooms, really, were what the school started with, and several rectangular rooms that would take fifty, seventy students.

GALM: I know that the sectioning of the first-year class became an issue later. Were other law schools doing sectioning of the first-year class? Or was that a new endeavor?

VERRALL: In most law schools during the beginning of this century, at least down to the fifties, the classes were relatively large. They didn't section the first year. Then, the student bodies started to outgrow the schools, and sectioning was required. Just physical facilities required sectioning. I believe that it was discovered that sectioning rather helped the school than hurt it. The idea had been that you should get together all those students that are taking Contracts. It would be better to have them all together, being taught the same case the same day, so that they could discuss the matters among themselves. But they found that sectioning, even though the sections got out of whack with each other, and some of the students would

be maybe three or four days ahead of the others, still the smaller sections were producing better students. So, at least in the fifties, schools did start to section, and more recently it became a practice to section, with many sections of the first-year class rather than just one or two.

GALM: Was there any thought at the time of the new building that UCLA would be moving toward sectioning, or was that even discussed?

VERRALL: It wasn't discussed to my knowledge. But whether the dean thought about it and discussed it, you know, casually over the dinner table or in the back room afterwards, I don't know. I don't recall it being discussed.

GALM: Were you present at the ground-breaking ceremony?

VERRALL: Oh yes.

GALM: What is your recollection of that event?

VERRALL: [laughter] I don't know. I think it was Ed [Edward A.] Dickson who took the shovel, picked up the shovel, and turned over one spade of dirt. He was a member of the regents. Indeed, he was the president of the regents, or chairman of the regents.

GALM: Chairman of the board.

VERRALL: I guess they call it chairman of the board. He was very interested in the law school, and I would think he was probably the principal regent responsible for bringing a law school to UCLA. Ed Dickson, yes.

GALM: What do you remember about him? Did he come around the law school much?

VERRALL: Oh yes. He was a nice fellow to meet. He'd come around the law school. He knew the faculty by name, and we had little get-togethers now and then. The regents weren't at a distance from the faculty. Indeed, when the regents had a meeting here on campus, Dickson would invite members of the faculty over. I remember going over and meeting [Earl] Warren for the first time. That's before he became chief justice of the United States.

GALM: Oh, Governor Warren.

VERRALL: He was governor, yes. Governor Warren. They'd have their little get-together room for socializing before they'd have their formal university meeting.

GALM: The other regent that was an important southern regent was Victor Hansen.

VERRALL: Judge Hansen was a close friend of the dean's. He was a probate judge. And when the trouble arose here at UCLA he was one of the commission [United States Commission on Government Security] that took Coffman to Washington. He was a very close friend of the faculty, just like Ed Dickson was, but in different ways. Judge Hansen would have more social functions than Dickson would. We always thought of him as the lawyer who did as much as any other lawyer to put UCLA law school on the map.

GALM: Who were the other lawyers on the Board [of Regents] at that time? Do you recall?

VERRALL: I know Governor Warren of course and —

GALM: Was [John Francis] Neylan a lawyer?

VERRALL: Oh yes. No, he was a newspaperman, that's my recollection. No, I don't know whether he was a lawyer or not. [Neylan was, in fact, a lawyer.]

GALM: Dickson was a newspaperman also, from the *Los Angeles Express*.

VERRALL: Yes, but that was before he went into the finance business, savings and loan.

GALM: So the strong supporters were Dickson and Hansen.

VERRALL: Hansen, yes. There were others, I'm sure — Ed [Edwin W.] Pauley, for instance. I think Ed Pauley was a good friend of the law school while he was a regent and, I believe, a close friend of Bill [William C.] Mathes, District Court judge, who taught part-time at UCLA during the first years and was a big supporter of the school. I think he was a very close friend of Ed Pauley.

GALM: I know that Judge Mathes spoke at the dedication of the law school. He was on the program.

VERRALL: He was a big help to the faculty and to the students, and also one of the stimulants that the dean tried to give all our students during those first ten years. He always tried to have somebody of national and international repute: for instance, Dean Pound as visiting professor; Judge

Mathes as part-time teacher; Wesley Sturges, dean of Yale, as visiting professor; Page Keeton of Texas as visiting professor; Louis Sohn of Harvard as summer school teacher; Howard Westwood of the number-one law firm in Washington, D.C., chief counsel for Western Airlines, and a man of international repute in the area of administrative law, here as a summer school faculty [member].

GALM: Yet, in those first classes, there didn't seem to be a large number of dropouts, were there?

VERRALL: Oh no, not with that group. They were good. You don't get many dropouts among good students. Maybe once in a while you get a Phi Beta Kappa who at the end of the second week reaches the conclusion that he made a bad mistake: he was not cut out to study law. And he'd quit. But the dropouts were very, very few among good students, and during the first years of our law school the dropouts were negligible. We had a good student body. Indeed, so good that I didn't want to quit. Indeed, why should I have? At the end of the rebellion [against Dean Coffman] the chances of going to another law school would be relatively few. They [other law schools] don't want to take a chance after a school has had an upheaval.

But anyway, I wasn't ostracized by either the faculty or the student body. Indeed, one illustration, the dean [Murray Schwartz] was going to have a little get-together after dinner with one of the controversial judges of the District Court of Appeals in Washington, D.C. He wanted some of the faculty to just have a little conversation with this man, who was a brilliant man, and he invited me out to his home — Murray Schwartz.

And there was a Jewish law student from Beverly Hills [who] came into my office one day and said, "Would you like to come out this weekend and meet my friends and, particularly, meet Dr. Wei [Tao-ming] the Chinese ambassador to the United States, who has just resigned?"

He had cancer and was here from China to get treatment for his cancer in the Los Angeles area. So I went out to the home; I never had such a delightful afternoon in all my life. I met the ambassador, [who was] Chinese ambassador to the United States for a long time, and his wife. His wife was Madame Wei, who was one of the leaders of the revolution against the imperial dynasties of China. She wrote a book, "My Outlaw Years," no, *My Revolutionary Years: The Autobiography of Madame Wei [Tao-ming]*,

and of course she autographed it. After the meeting at this girl's house she sent me a copy by special delivery, autographed "S. Cheng Wei" (her name would be the last one of the three).

No, I never had such a delightful afternoon in all my life, thanks to one of our Jewish students. I never had any problem with the student body or their families. The rumor was that the dean was biased, and I know that that rumor was spread among the student body, because a group of students in the lounge one day were overheard to say, "Well, we have the law school now. We better be on our toes so we don't lose it." Which indicated to me that the rumor that had been spread about the dean had reached the student body. That is what it was supposed to do. It was successful.

GALM: Was the essence of that true, the essence of the rumor?

VERRALL: I was closely associated with him. At the time of the rebellion I'd been closely associated with him for eight or ten years — well, maybe only seven or eight years — and at no time did I find any evidence of bias. If you look at the student body. Well, it wasn't shown in his selection of friends or in the selection of faculty. Louis Sohn came out here from Harvard to teach in summer school and came back a year or two later. I know if there'd been any real bias during the two summers that he was here he would have discovered it. At least, he wouldn't have been back the second year. Father [Joseph J.] Donovan of Loyola [Law School] was a very close friend of ours at the law school, and I'm sure if there had been any evidence of bias Father Donovan was sharp enough to have seen it. And he would not have tolerated friendship with us if we were biased.

I believe only one time during the whole of the years I'd known him up to the time of the rebellion was the question raised, and that was raised with respect to the rise of Hitler in Germany. The only statement was the history of the period shows that the Jewish group had taken control of the universities, the control of getting chairs at the universities, and that was considered to be the number one honor of the legal profession. For instance, a judge to be invited to go to the university would feel that he was being honored. He'd give up his judgeship to become a member of the university faculties. Coffman's only statement was that history shows that there had been that sort of a problem, and that was one of the reasons for the rise of the Nazi party in Germany. The statement was, history shows

— and then it was completed with a statement: But of course such a thing as that couldn't happen here. One, we don't consider university chairs to be such a prize as they were considered in Germany. Two, we have too many chairs to make it a possibility here, so there is no chance of history repeating itself here in America. Now that's the only time that I ever recall a statement being made concerning the Jewish race.

GALM: The statement that has been attributed to him is in regard to [UCLA law] faculty appointments, and that is, the hundredth member of the faculty would be Jewish. Do you know the background on that?

VERRALL: I really don't know. I think I know where the statement came from, but I don't know any basis upon which it was made.

GALM: Did you ever hear him say that?

VERRALL: No. No. No. I don't know, I can't recall any names that were brought to the faculty as potential faculty members that would have been a background for such a statement. No.

GALM: Was there anti-Semitism among law schools at that time, either [regarding] the acceptance of students or faculty appointments? Were there any glaring [examples]?

VERRALL: Across the United States, I really would hesitate to say. I don't think so. I'd been very closely associated with the faculties at [counts] one, two, three, four, five, six schools. And at no time over a period of thirty years had I run across any indication of racial bias. So I don't believe it was common. Indeed, some of my friends in the teaching profession were Jewish at the time, at the schools where I was. There weren't many of them, but I can recall two or three now, two at least. I don't recall any bias. At Harvard they had some Jewish teachers, at Yale the same. But there weren't many of them in the teaching profession at the time. Indeed, that's not at all surprising. As a race they are a very ambitious people, and there is far more money to be made and prestige to be won outside of law school teaching. So I don't recall any bias.

GALM: Was —

VERRALL: And I say they didn't have a large number of teachers, not because of bias but because they just didn't want to be. Indeed, when you

get to know them, some of the sharpest of minds and brilliant of men are among the Jews.

GALM: I think later, when we're talking about the law school at UCLA in the sixties, we'll talk more about minorities and the role that they played in the expanding enrollment.

VERRALL: They were principally the Blacks. The problem was the same, I suppose, here as it was at Hastings when I was up there, when they were pushing for more rapid recognition and sometimes couldn't realize that the people that they were pushing on the schools were not really qualified to become law students at all. Either [they] were not capable of handling law school work because of lack of prelaw school training, or two, they didn't have the temperament to become lawyers.

GALM: What was the policy of Vanderbilt towards Blacks in the forties?

VERRALL: I don't believe it was ever a problem. It was never presented. I know of no [Black] person who applied to the law school, and so I don't believe there was any problem in the whole of the university. From the point of view of recognition of the Blacks in society, there was a different sort of acceptance than you find here: acceptance that might mean that they would go out of their way to do everything possible for a colored man who was being abused, or who wasn't being recognized, but they wouldn't want him to be in a classroom with their children. Now things like that, it is completely different than it is today, but I don't believe there was any evidence of bias, among the faculty at least.

GALM: But at the same time, were there any Blacks as part of the general university enrollment?

VERRALL: Not that I know of. No. And we had two colleges, one right across the street from Vanderbilt, and the same there. While I was in the South I didn't see any occasion, no Black ever applied, while I was at Louisiana and while I was at Vanderbilt. So I don't believe there was any problem. But if there had been an occasion I don't know how it would have been handled. As far as the faculty in the law school was concerned I'm sure they would have said admit. But as far as the administration was concerned, or the controlling bodies in the case of a public institution like Louisiana State University, I don't know what the reaction would have been.

GALM: Here at UCLA, in those initial years, were there — I know there weren't many minority applicants, but were there minority applicants who were accepted?

VERRALL: I would think that among the early students you would find some Mexican Spanish. I do know among the early students, you found some Blacks, Billy G. —

GALM: Mills.

VERRALL: — Mills was a student who felt, it seemed to me, as though he had been ostracized from society a little bit. But as a law student he not only was accepted by the students and the faculty, but he was a good student. He still hadn't quite overcome that feeling of oppression. That's my feeling about him. No, I liked him very much, and I think the faculty did, too. And he was a good student. There were one or two others. No problem really from the point of view of discrimination because we always had three or four times as many applications as we had positions. We'd take the top of the group, and regrettably among the top applicants you'd find very few minorities. It wasn't because of discrimination. They just didn't apply.

GALM: Was it that they didn't apply, or that they scored too low and so forth?

VERRALL: Oh, no. I mean if they had high scores and high college work they didn't apply. They would know that they could get into Harvard, Columbia, or some national school.

GALM: So they would pass UCLA by.

VERRALL: They would pass up the newer schools and the smaller schools. Again, I have no basis upon which to base that other than this is the way I feel that it happened.

GALM: Well, we digressed a bit. Let's get back to the building itself. Did the faculty find the ultimate building satisfactory for their uses?

VERRALL: Yes. It worked out very well during the first few years. We later discovered that we needed more smaller rooms and discovered that if we were sectioning classes, we didn't need the big rooms. So while they were happy with the facilities, they also discovered that change was necessary.

GALM: The actual dedication of the building took place on November 10, 1951. I have a program of the ceremonies for that day. I wonder if you have

any recollections. Did the faculty participate in formulating that program, or was it more or less the dean's ideas?

VERRALL: I would assume that the dean with the administration decided what was to be the character of the dedication. Probably the dean had talked with Ed Dickson and Judge Hansen and the chancellor, and they reached a conclusion that this would be the way it should be done. The faculty at that time wasn't very interested in administration. I had no interest whatsoever in it, and Perkins had no interest in administration. Roscoe Pound, he'd had administration all his life, so he was no longer interested. And so I believe the dean handled it with the university administration and Judge Hansen and Ed Dickson and others that he would talk to concerning the dedication.

I see here that Dean Pound was to be on the morning program, which is entirely justified; he was one of the two or three great legal statesmen of the United States at that time. Bill [William L.] Prosser was dean of the university law school up at Boalt Hall — a fellow student of mine at Minnesota, by the way, and a very close friend. He was probably the leading man in torts in the whole of the United States. His book on the law of torts was, and is, the number one book. He had a phenomenal record as a student and as a teacher.

GALM: Do you know if he had much contact with Dean Coffman in those early years?

VERRALL: Well, they kidded each other a great deal, but I don't believe there was a very close relationship between Bill Prosser and Dean Coffman. I don't believe their personalities were such that they would get along very well over a long period of time together. I don't believe there'd be any conflict, but I don't believe they would pull together. Dean Coffman was more apt to go over to Hastings to Dean [David E.] Snodgrass. I liked Bill Prosser very much, but I liked Dean Snodgrass [because] I could fit in with him more than I could fit in with Bill Prosser, although Bill Prosser was in the "Sixty-Five Club" when I got to Hastings, and he was a delightful man to be around.

Homer Crotty of the [Los Angeles] Bar was the other man to discuss. He was also one of the lawyers in the area befriending the law school and helping to make it, build it into a good law school. There was a lot of outside help.

Ed Dickson on the luncheon meeting; [M. Philip] Davis, another lawyer who was another very close friend of the law school, both professionally in the law school itself and socially. John Francis Neylan, another close friend of the school. [Paul R.] Hutchinson of the Los Angeles Bar the same. Bill Mathes, Victor Hansen, Herman Selvin. Again, if you are looking for evidence of racial bias, he [Selvin] wouldn't have been here if there were any racial bias. A great lawyer and a good man. [At the time of his appearance on the law school dedication program in 1951, Selvin was president of the Los Angeles Bar Association.] Dr. [Robert Gordon] Sproul, toastmaster at the dinner; [Frederick F.] Houser, a judge, another very close friend of the Coffmans and of the entire faculty during that period, one of the speakers. Erle Stanley Gardner, a very close friend of Perkins and Coffman and myself.

GALM: Was that [friendship] before UCLA days, or did that come about at that time?

VERRALL: Erle Stanley Gardner, during the first two or three years that the school was in session, came out and talked to our students on the practical aspects of the law of evidence. You know, he was not only a great lawyer but he was a great man. He was one of the three men on the "Court of Last Resort," which court was to find out why certain people had been convicted and put in prison when they were really not guilty. The Court of Last Resort took their applications and investigated and then brought the proper legal proceedings to protect them and to make the administration of criminal justice fair and equitable. So Erle Stanley Gardner was a great man in his own right.

He'd written hundreds and hundreds of books. Indeed, the last time I'd heard, somebody said there were 300 million copies of his books in circulation. He came out and gave a couple of hour lectures to the students each year on the practical aspects of evidence. He was a wonderful lecturer, and he was always prepared. I know in his writing he was the same way. He never did anything slipshod. He always did something well. He would bring the ex-FBI man out who was his chief investigator, and they'd spend a couple hours in the afternoon, maybe three hours, with the students on the practical aspects of evidence.

GALM: Is that Marshall Houts?

VERRALL: Yes, that's Marshall. Yes. He taught at Western Michigan University, afterwards, and wrote a couple books on the law of evidence, the practical aspects of the law of evidence. Erle Stanley Gardner would come out in the morning with Marshall, and he'd go round the law offices. (By the way, if there was any bias he would have discovered it and would have had nothing to do with it.) He would come out, talk to the faculty, and go around to all the offices and invite the faculty out to lunch with him at Farmer John's (that's where we always ate our lunches whether he was there or not). He'd take us out to lunch, and at the close of the lunch he'd reach down in his side coat pocket and take out a role of bills that would choke a mule, honestly. [laughter] Money didn't mean a thing to him. Of course he was — he told me he was at that time writing eight books a year.

Once when he came out here, I believe the second time, one of the law school wives said, "I just saw an old Mexican Spanish scales downtown here in Westwood. There are the scales of justice." That was at a dinner where Erle Stanley Gardner was, and so he went into that coat pocket of his and went down there and bought the scales for the law school. They still have them down here in the halls of the law school. He then gave them enough money to build a foundation and a glass cover for the scales. They're pretty dusty right now, but they're there.

GALM: They're still there.

VERRALL: Erle Stanley Gardner's gift to the law school, in 1952, about Earl Warren, governor —

GALM: The administrators at that time, the university administrators: why don't we start first with Provost Clarence Dykstra. What is your memory of him and his relationship to the law school?

VERRALL: I remember Dykstra from way back when I was a student at the University of Iowa. They had a political science meeting of administrators of cities at the University of Iowa. They held the meetings in the old capitol of the state of Iowa. Dykstra was one of the men who came. I believe he came from some town in Ohio at that time.

GALM: Cincinnati, I believe.

VERRALL: I think so; Cleveland or Cincinnati. And when I came out here I recalled those old days. He always came over to the law school, would

walk across to the law school, and walk around and talk to the faculty. I told him about the meeting in Iowa and how I remembered him from then. He was quite a chap. Very interested in the development of the law school, apparently. And very reachable. Anybody on the faculty who wanted to talk to him, he was available. Delightful man. That's all I remember.

GALM: What about President Sproul?

VERRALL: Sproul was more up in the Bay Area, very seldom down here. Once a year, at least, he would come down here and make an effort to meet all of the faculty. I was normally delegated to go out to the anteroom and get a member of the faculty, get his name and department and what he was doing, and take him in and introduce him to President Sproul and the other high officers on the line in the next room. I don't know very much about him. Personal contacts, relatively few, only at these annual meetings. I don't know very much about him.

GALM: What kind of impression did he make on a person?

VERRALL: Very good, very good. Yes. I think he was a good administrator. As far as the law school was concerned, we had no run-ins with him that I can recall. If there were, they were on the private, and I don't know anything about them.

GALM: I think there was some criticism early on of Dean Coffman, perhaps, bypassing the local administrator and going directly to the president. Do you have any knowledge of that?

VERRALL: There was that feeling that I discovered among the faculty on this campus. I didn't know many of them but I knew some of them, and two or three of them would reveal such facts as that to me at social gatherings. I believe there's some truth in the fact that he would bypass the local administration, sometimes. For instance, I don't know whether it was intentional or just a byproduct of relationships. He would be invited over to Ed Dickson's very frequently. They were close friends, and they would discuss law school matters. As a result of that, Dickson might have got the ball rolling without having the dean first go to the chancellor and then on up to the president and then up to the regents. But I don't know that there was any close relationship between Dr. Sproul and Coffman. I didn't know it if there was; so I wouldn't believe that Sproul would have been available

to listen to him. He would have probably told him if he'd gone directly, "You'd better go to your chancellor first."

GALM: So it was perhaps more his special relationships with the southern regents —

VERRALL: I think a byproduct of that was the basis of the rumor that he was bypassing the local administration. There was a time, however, when there was very little local administration. They had the triumvirate for a while, three men [Vern O. Knudsen, Paul A. Dodd, Stafford L. Warren] were handling the chancellor's job for a while.

GALM: That was upon the death of Dykstra.

VERRALL: Yes, until they got [Franklin D.] Murphy, or whoever came in.

GALM: How did that work out as far as the law school was concerned? Did that create problems?

VERRALL: I think it did. But they would be problems that would be known only to the dean and not to the faculty. The faculty didn't mess with administration. Most of us had no concern with administration. Indeed, even when I was a vice-dean, it was primarily for purposes of admission and for purposes of having somebody that the students could come and talk to when the dean wasn't available. So I had very little to do with administration.

GALM: Were you the first individual to hold the assistant deanship?

VERRALL: I think I was, yes. That was when Dean Pound left, and the dean brought me down into the dean's office there on the first floor at the time. I suppose that's now the librarian's office. The dean was in the corner there, and then they had the secretarial office, and off on the right-hand edge of it was a small office that I had. Dean Pound had it while he was there.

GALM: Was that a move that was supported by the faculty, to have an assistant dean?

VERRALL: I have no idea. All I was told was, would you take charge of admissions and be available if students want to ask questions? It didn't mean anything, because it was just a name, and there's no salary connected with it, at least as far as I know. [laughter]

GALM: There was no compensation?

VERRALL: It really wasn't an associate dean's job at all. The handling of admissions — that was something where the girls would do all the work, and we would then divide up the applications among the members of the faculty. Each man would take, say, twenty-five and run through them and decide whether the student showed prospects of being a good student, whether he met the conditions and the like, and then send them back to me. So I just did what everybody else was doing.

GALM: Did Dean Coffman reserve to himself [the right] to accept certain students?

VERRALL: Not that I know of.

GALM: There was an issue that occurred early on for the university as a whole, and I'm curious how it might have affected the law school. That was the loyalty oath. That was in 1950, which would be about the time that you arrived.

VERRALL: The end of the first year. Yes, it was actually during our first two years in the law school. I think it did affect the law school in two ways. The law school faculty as of that time, with possibly one exception, would have seen no real problem from the point of view of academic freedom if the oath was continued. I was one of those who didn't think that it would have any effect whatsoever on academic freedom. The university faculty at that time was opposed to that. In that way, the year of the oath was detrimental. It kept the law school, I think, a little more separate from the university than it would otherwise have been. From the point of view of publicity and getting the law school before the minds of the lawyers and the judges and the business people of the community, the year of the oath I think helped the law school. The position of the university and members of the faculty was considered to be newsworthy. The media did come out very frequently, and they did come to the law school. If you voiced an opinion — and we did, at least I did — it was considered to be newsworthy and was found in some of the papers as of that time; indeed, with quotes, although I doubt that the quotes were very accurate. In that way, the university's school of law was brought to the attention of the business and professional people of the area.

GALM: Do you recall whether the subject of the loyalty oath was brought up at the luncheon meetings?

VERRALL: Well, we talked about everything at our luncheon meetings. We had a luncheon meeting every day. At least four or five or sometimes six, sometimes all the faculty, and sometimes all except one, would go out to lunch every day, and we would discuss law school matters, yes. The loyalty oath was one of the things that we discussed among ourselves.

GALM: Was there any attempt to take a stand as the school as a whole, or the faculty as a whole?

VERRALL: No. No. No. Each individual had his own opinion on how far we should go, and there was not even an indication that it would be of any interest to anybody else how we thought.

GALM: When you first arrived and during those first years, did you attend many of the Academic Senate meetings?

VERRALL: Well, I think I attended practically all of them, yes. Indeed, I had very close friends in several departments — bacteriology, engineering, particularly — but most of the faculty in the other departments of the university at that time were more at arm's length. I knew them by name, like Dean, who went down and became chancellor at Santa Cruz.

GALM: McHenry?

VERRALL: Yes, Dean Dean McHenry [university-wide dean of Academic Planning, 1960–63]. He was a neighbor of mine too, living just off the campus, and after he got down to Santa Cruz I attempted to see him once or twice. Last time I tried was a foggy day, and it was so darn foggy I couldn't even find the building he was in on campus, or I couldn't find a place to park even. So I never got to see him that time. He was very friendly. J. A. C. Grant [professor of Political Science] was friendly and invited us to his home many a time.

GALM: How was the attendance by other members of the law faculty?

VERRALL: I believe that Rollin Perkins would go with me every time I went. I don't recall whether Brainerd Currie went or not. I would think he did, but I can't say for sure. Dabagh, the librarian, I don't know about him. And Coffman, I don't know, I don't recall whether or not he attended. But I rather believe the answer was yes, that we went, the four of us at least.

GALM: A couple of issues: We'll come back to when the law school actually broke away from the Academic Senate, but one other issue was the accreditation of the law school.

VERRALL: I don't think we ever broke away from the Academic Senate. As long as I recall, we always had one or two members of the faculty on the —

GALM: I guess what I'm saying is that the Academic Senate committees didn't have control over certain aspects of administration of the law school.

VERRALL: Well, I thought that was true from the very beginning, but I don't know.

GALM: No, that was a real push.

VERRALL: We were tied with the Academic Senate, I do know, in the matter of appointments. We had to go through the procedure of the ad hoc committees, but in other matters I don't believe the committees of the university had much influence on the law school.

GALM: Well, in 1952 there was actually a resolution that went through the regents which took the law school out of the area of having their appointments go through committees in the Academic Senate, or for budget approval, and so on and so forth.

VERRALL: Well, I had no question about the — I knew nothing about the budget, but from the point of view of committee appointments, I do know that after the law school faculty recommended and the dean recommended an appointment it would go to an ad hoc committee formed in the Academic Senate. And I thought that continued throughout. I have no idea. Well, I know it did down to the time of the rebellion [against Dean Coffman], because at that time one member of the recalcitrant group went to a member of the ad hoc committee and said that although the faculty of the law school had approved [an appointment] — ostensibly that included him, and it did — he was unalterably opposed to an appointment. The appointment of a gentleman from Wisconsin, I believe it was at that time, or maybe from Iowa. I think it was Wisconsin.

GALM: Would that be [Clarence M.] Updegraff?

VERRALL: No. No. I don't want to mention names.

GALM: Well, it's my sense that this resolution was pushed through, and that it was pushed through by Regent Hansen to benefit the law school at UCLA, so that it would have autonomy away from the Academic Senate. In a sense, it also affected the professional schools that only offered graduate work. That would fit the description of the law school and not too many other schools.

VERRALL: I thought that was the way it was functioning up at Berkeley, with Boalt Hall. Of course I knew that Hastings was outside the Senate and had its separate board of regents.

GALM: And that [status] didn't change until President Clark Kerr came, and he pushed for the law school's return to full participation in the Senate.

VERRALL: That would be some of the functioning of the dean with the Academic Senate and the chancellor that I knew nothing about. Indeed, he never discussed matters of budget and matters of university control with me, and I never heard him discuss it with anybody else. It was never brought up at law school faculty meetings.

GALM: It seemed to be a really strong opinion of his, or attitude, that other university faculty didn't really have an understanding of the special problems of the law school and therefore shouldn't have control over it.

VERRALL: I believe that was his opinion. Indeed, he had stated that many times, particularly with respect to appointments. He said they didn't understand that the law school couldn't get the quality of teacher that they needed at, say, an instructor level, or even sometimes at an assistant professor level, and that the gradual rising on the academic ladder from a low position to a higher position common in the college just wouldn't function at all or wouldn't be adequate in the law school. Indeed, it was rather difficult sometimes to keep a good man more than three years if he wasn't put into a full professorship. He [Coffman] believed that the academic faculty didn't understand that. Now I don't know whether he believed that the academic faculty committees didn't understand other functions of the law school, but that's the only area in which I do know his opinion, and I knew my opinion. I thought the same.

GALM: What was the appointment procedure? Why were certain men brought in as visiting professors and then perhaps appointed, while others

were immediately brought in at, say, an assistant professor level, or associate professor level?

VERRALL: Well, the bringing in of visiting professors during the early years was in keeping with the policy that the law school had at that time that we should expose the students to people of great reputation in the legal profession as stimulants, and that the first-year students should always have the best possible teachers. So we got visiting professors at UCLA so that the first- and second-year students — first-year students particularly and the second-year students secondarily — would have the best possible teachers and contacts with leaders of the profession. That was why Wesley Sturges, dean at Yale, was brought here as a visiting professor; that was why Percy Bordwell of Iowa was brought here as a visiting professor; and Merton Ferson; and Dean Keeton of Texas — all because we wanted to keep our students in contact with leaders of the profession.

Now, there was no intention that these visiting professors should continue on as professors, although every effort was made to convince Dean Sturges that he should stay on out here. He seemed to like the Pacific Coast. And every time it was raised he would say, “You get the dollars. Then you get the teacher.” [laughter] But I don’t think that the dean or anybody on the faculty thought that there was a possibility that Dean Sturges would actually come here. Although the weather and the conditions were so good, and he liked them so well, that there was always a chance that he might just say, “Well, I will.” But during the two years that the banter continued that I was party to, he never said yes.

Then, too, Dean Keeton of Texas was a man, I think a relatively young man, who had a real reputation and author of some books, and we did try to convince him to come to UCLA. But he was so widely known and so popular among the business and professional and political leaders of Texas that I didn’t think we could ever induce him to leave that state, and that turned out to be true. Although he said he was really interested in the school and he would consider it, he always in the end said no. Now, the other visiting professors, besides Sturges and Keeton, were here only because they were recognized men in the field; and two, we couldn’t get young men to teach the first year with the same degree of expertise that these visiting professors could give the first year.

GALM: What about summer school, or summer session?

VERRALL: In summer school, again it was the policy of the school to attempt to give the students contact with leaders of the profession and also to broaden their view concerning the scope of law, particularly some — let's say, Louis Sohn was brought in from Harvard, a leader in the area of international law and international relations, both because he was a good teacher and because he was teaching in an area that we didn't cover at all in our law school. It would give the students a broadening experience.

GALM: Was it ever used as a stepping-stone to appointment or as a recruitment device?

VERRALL: Not that I know of. No. Not that I know of. Of course, some of the men who taught in summer school were being considered. Some of the members of the faculty might not have met them and might not have known them beforehand, and they were brought to summer school perhaps for the third reason. But normally it was to give the students courses that they could not otherwise get; and two, to give the students courses that were broadening, give them a better understanding of the whole of the body of the law; and three, to give them contact with a different type of teacher.

GALM: Who determined the curriculum content and the teachers of summer session?

VERRALL: Those were matters that were considered months ahead of time at the luncheon meetings and at the faculty meetings.

GALM: Later on this seems to have been sort of a bone of contention, especially the regular faculty appointments to summer session.

VERRALL: The regular faculty would like to have an appointment to summer school. It kind of gave them a few extra dollars, and they were very interested in that. I know I was. But I don't know that there ever was a bone of contention. We certainly could not have a summer school taught only by our own faculty and have it accomplish the objectives that we thought a summer school should be directed towards.

GALM: I guess it was that later on there seemed to be more of a formal device, or formula, for rotating summer session teaching appointments.

VERRALL: I don't know what happened, but during the first ten years I don't believe that was true, although during the last two or three or maybe four years of those ten years there might have been a trend that way.

GALM: I think it was a move to allow more members of the faculty to have an opportunity to teach in summer session.

VERRALL: Well, I believe that when only one or two of our faculty could be teachers in the summer school that they passed that around.

GALM: The matter of accreditation by the Association of American Law Schools: From my readings it seems that Dean Coffman did not want to push for full accreditation until the matter of the relationship with the Academic Senate was settled. Do you have any knowledge of his wishes in that area?

VERRALL: I would assume that the question of accreditation was discussed with the leaders of the law schools association and what they considered to be important. Indeed, some of the things considered important were in writing: for instance, the question of library, and the question of number of faculty, and the question of faculty experience. I would assume that if he didn't push something, it was because in one or two of these areas of importance we were too close to the line, and it would be disastrous to ask for accreditation and have it turned down. I don't know anything about that, from the point of view of what was UCLA's experience: Why didn't they push it in 1950? Why didn't they push it in 1951? Whichever year they could have first pushed it. But I don't know.

GALM: Did you attend any of the early meetings of the association? What was the faculty participation?

VERRALL: I think I attended all of them, practically —

GALM: Was it common for all the faculty to try to attend?

VERRALL: Yes. Sometimes one member of the faculty couldn't make it. I believe when we were going to go to New York, to have the meeting in New York City, I believe maybe one or two members of the faculty couldn't make it. I don't know how many went that time; I think just three: Coffman, Perkins, and myself. I may be mistaken in that. Of course, I think Dean Pound would go to all meetings if he could make it, unless he had

some other appointments that he had to keep. I don't know about Brainerd Currie in those first three years, whether he attended the association meetings or not. I should remember but I don't. For years I had attended all of the meetings. While I was at Vanderbilt, except during the war years, I attended all of the meetings. And during the early years at UCLA, I think I attended all the meetings.

GALM: Do you recall whether there was much resistance upon the main library's part to let the law library be more independent from its administration?

VERRALL: No. I just assumed that the law library would have to be and was to be a separate library. It could not possibly function with the main library doing the purchasing and doing the cataloging and doing the shelving and things like that. That was so tied up with the other functions of the law school that I would have said it was impossible to have a law school unless the library was subject to law school control and was not subject to university control.

GALM: Do you know whether its book budget, the law library's book budget, was part of the total library budget, or was it a separate entry in the law school budget?

VERRALL: I think it was a separate entry as part of the law school budget, and during the early years I think the regents may have provided a special fund for law school library acquisitions.

GALM: To catch up or to expand?

VERRALL: Very necessary, because sometimes we would get a chance, for instance, to buy a complete library. A local library, such as Los Angeles County Bar Association's library — that one certainly was not available — some local library was available throughout the United States, and we would then buy the entire library. We were very interested in buying original law materials, the case reports from various states, down to the time that West Publishing Company started to publish the reporter system. Then of course we would try to have the local publication and the West publication, the same case in two books. But it was very difficult to get those original volumes, and if they came up, they were very expensive.

I believe that was the reason why there was a special fund raised to permit us to buy that sort of books.

It was a hassle to get a library that was an adequate library for student and faculty use during those first years. And Tom Dabagh did a wonderful job. He knew the used-lawbook dealers, and one or two of them went out of their way to accumulate the necessary books for us. One dealer would buy them in Europe, particularly in England, and all throughout the United States, and he would give us the first shot at buying them from him.

GALM: I'm going to change direction a bit. We talked about the [university] administration and the law school's relationship with various members. I think we talked about President Sproul and Provost Dykstra; but Provost Dykstra died in 1950 quite suddenly, and then there was the committee of deans, the three deans.

VERRALL: The triumvirate they called them.

GALM: How did that work out as far as the law school was concerned?

VERRALL: When Dykstra was here he was very intimate with the members of the faculty. He would come over — I would guess he was in my office in those first six or eight months that I was here maybe at least once a month. I'd see him in the law school, oh, practically every week. He was very interested in the development of the school. The triumvirate took over, and I don't know really how they did function. I didn't know whether there was any conflict between them and the law school or not. Indeed, I would have assumed that there was not, because it wasn't brought to my attention. If it was it wasn't serious.

GALM: What is your impression of Chancellor Allen?

VERRALL: Well, I'm going to have to answer I liked him personally, but I don't know anything at all about his acceptance as a chancellor of a university. Whether he was successful, very successful, or even better than that, I have no idea.

GALM: His relationship with the law school certainly must have changed from when he first arrived. He really oversaw it for a while — didn't he? — before the acting dean was brought in.

VERRALL: Well, he tried very hard to determine how to go about solving our problems and, I think, once in a while felt like he should wash

his hands of the whole deal. But he was unsuccessful in getting a dean, although once or twice we came close. For instance, Professor [Howard] Williams of Texas seemed very interested and seemed as though he would be our dean. Indeed, the whole faculty at that time assumed that it was settled and that there were only little details that had to be worked out between the chancellor and Williams. He, in the end, said no — greatly disappointing, I'm sure, the chancellor and, I'm sure, the faculty. They then said, "Well, maybe we can get an interim man here." And the chancellor asked me if I knew anybody who I thought could handle the job and would do it. I suggested Everett Fraser, dean emeritus of Minnesota. The chancellor approached him, and Fraser said, "Well, I fought legislators and university administrations and students for forty years at Minnesota, and I just am happy here at Hastings. I don't believe I want to leave this happiness and get into a mess down at UCLA." So he turned the chancellor down. Sometime later — I don't know through whom the contact was made, it wasn't through me — another dean from a Midwestern school, Dean [Albert J. Harno] of Illinois, was contacted and asked to take over as [acting] dean for a year or two to see if he couldn't aid the chancellor in ironing out the problems of the school.

GALM: Why don't we go back to how this all evolved. I think one way of approaching it would be [to speak about] the expansion of the faculty. You talked about the initial faculty that were here to take on the first-year class. I've checked over the various law school catalogs and the [faculty] minutes and have noted various members as they came on. It seems that two members that came on in 1950 were Professor Chadbourn, James Chadbourn, and Kenneth York.

VERRALL: The law school knew that it would not be able to continue to get full professors like the school started with, that we would have to bring in some younger men over the years, and after the first year or two, some very young men, just starting to teach, and let them work their way up. What was necessary of course was to get experienced teachers for the first year, because it was the school policy that the first-year courses should be taught by the best men of experience that were available. Indeed, that was why over the first few years we had three or four visiting professors. But for the second year the university would go along with at least one man

of some experience and one man of more experience for additions to the faculty. Chadbourn had had several years of teaching experience, was the author of a book used by students in the procedural area, and we had to have a Procedure man and an Evidence man, Procedure for the first year and Evidence for the second. He seemed to be the best available man for the job. York —

GALM: Do you remember who may have proposed his [Chadbourn's] name, or how it came to the attention of the faculty?

VERRALL: No. The deans of Harvard, Yale, and Columbia, particularly those three schools, would pick up the names of their graduates who wanted to be teaching, or their graduates who had been teaching and wanted to change or were interested in changing positions. In addition to that, the West Publishing Company representative, who visited all law schools throughout the United States, was somewhat a man who was somewhat a clearinghouse for people who were interested in teaching. Now, either from some dean or from the West Company's representative, the dean got a hold of Chadbourn's name. I don't know how. I think he was teaching at that time in Pennsylvania. He had taught in some other eastern schools, but I think he was teaching at Pennsylvania.

GALM: So then you were talking about Kenneth York.

VERRALL: Kenneth York didn't have as much experience, but according to the dean of the school where he was teaching, he had a great potential. He seemed to be sharp minded and a good teacher. I don't know, again, how his name was brought to the attention of our dean. But the dean did bring the two names, one or two other names, to the faculty's attention, and we discussed the matter of who would meet our needs. We needed of course a Procedure man and an Evidence man, because Dean Pound wasn't going to continue on for very long, maybe a year or two, it looked, at the most. You couldn't keep a visiting professor more than a year or two, and anyway he was getting old and he wanted to get back to his writing and finish his five-volume book.

Chadbourn was a good choice. He was as good a teacher as you could expect anybody to be. Indeed, he was an excellent teacher. A rather uncouth teacher in class and would even swear about or at students, you couldn't tell which: but they liked him even though he was very roughshod

in class. And he was a good teacher. Also he was teaching in the two areas we had to fill: Procedure and Evidence.

York was also a teacher in the areas we had to have a man, and was a man of real potential. Whether or not he was successful in the classroom, with other members of the faculty he was considered to be very sharp minded and an excellent man in the areas where he was going to teach.

GALM: Then in '51, Edgar Jones, or Ted Jones, came on faculty.

VERRALL: We got two men from the Mideast, Jones first and then [James D.] Sumner secondly. At that time it was known to the faculty that we would have to get in some of the younger men just beginning to teach, because the university would not tolerate us getting all full professors, or even assistant and associate professors, at a high salary scale. Of course you couldn't get a person such as Chadbourn at the lowest possible salary scale; he wouldn't be interested. But some of the younger men who had very little teaching experience, if any, would have to be brought in, and we would have to determine whether or not they had potential so as to be kept on. Jones was invited out; he came out and met all the members of the faculty in their offices and at two or three dinner engagements. The faculty thought that he would be a good choice to bring on as a new young member of the faculty, to start to build up youth on our faculty.

GALM: What area of law teaching?

VERRALL: I don't know at that time what his interest was, but at that time we knew that we would have to have somebody in the Torts area. The dean had been teaching Torts, but with the administration of the school and with sectioning probably shortly in the future, we would have to have a Torts man. I believe he was also interested in some other area of the law, but I can't recall what it was.

GALM: And so the other man that you said came from — what? — from the middle-east area was James Sumner.

VERRALL: James Sumner.

GALM: And what was his background? Do you recall?

VERRALL: He also was young and maybe had one or two years of teaching experience when brought here. I believe he was interested in the area of conflict of laws and some of the course areas that second-year and third-

year students would take. Like Jones, he was taken on with an idea that in a year or two we could determine whether or not he showed prospects and would be given a tenurial position.

GALM: In 1952–53 Ralph Rice came on faculty.

VERRALL: He was sold to the faculty by Berkeley, as I recall it. We had to have a person interested in income tax, and whether Berkeley said they had somebody who was interested and was available for transfer or — I don't know how the question was raised, how his contact with this school came about first. I have no idea. But I do know that it was Bill [William L.] Prosser, a classmate of mine at the University of Minnesota when I was a student, who said he was a man of good potential, and that rather convinced me.

GALM: Was he a young man at that time?

VERRALL: Yes, yes. He'd had some years of teaching, maybe two or three years of teaching, but he also was relatively young in teaching and I suppose would have to be brought in at an assistant or full professorship. I don't know how long he'd been up north.

GALM: During those early years someone that appears as lecturer was Judge [William C.] Mathes.

VERRALL: During the first years of the school, as part of the policy to keep our students in constant contact with leaders of the profession, one method was to bring in lecturers and part-time teachers. Judge Mathes was selected because he had the reputation of being actually the brains of the District Court of this area, of the federal District Court of this area. He was a brilliant lawyer, a good judge, had been very prominent in the legal profession as a judge, and was, I suppose, a politician in a sense, too.

GALM: As a lecturer did he have any influence on, or did he participate in, faculty decisions?

VERRALL: He would be invited to the faculty meetings, of course, [but] being a judge of the District Court, he could attend very few, if any, yes. But he was very interested in the law school throughout the existence of the law school in its first years and his existence as a lecturer at the school.

GALM: In what way?

VERRALL: If I had any problems, didn't really know how to go about solving them, I had no hesitancy in calling him. And he was the person who asked me to write up my opinion of what caused the rebellion, what it really was, how it was organized, and the dangers the law school faced as a result of it, saying that: "Give it to me in writing and I will see to it that it gets to the proper people."

GALM: Who would have been considered the "proper people" at that time?

VERRALL: That was up to him.

GALM: But would that be people outside of the university administration?

VERRALL: I would not think so; it would be university administration. I know he was very closely in contact with members of the university, leading members of the university. He was personally friendly with regents. I could name two or three of the regents, but I don't believe I should. I know three at least, but I don't think I should mention any names.

GALM: Would he be considered a supporter of Dean Coffman?

VERRALL: I would answer yes. At least I was a supporter of Coffman, and he [Mathes] was a real support as far as I was concerned. My feeling was that he would be one hundred percent in favor of the position Coffman had taken and that I had taken, and one hundred percent opposed to the position taken by the recalcitrant group, although I don't know how he would have solved the matter if he had been called upon to solve it.

GALM: But, again, I get back to the question, as lecturer did he have any real say as a faculty member, as compared to the other professors?

VERRALL: I would say if he voiced an opinion to the dean it would have more weight than if I voiced an opinion.

GALM: Because of his own personal stature?

VERRALL: Yes. Officially we didn't count votes. For instance on appointments, where we discussed a new appointment in a faculty meeting, if more than one person voiced concern and the concern was based upon fact and not upon assumptions that had no foundation, if there was any real concern that the man would not fit in the faculty and one member of the faculty, with some basis for voicing such a concern, voiced that concern, that would be the end of the matter, right then. There is no use to bring

somebody on the faculty who wouldn't fit, that would cause any feeling or any dissension. And if Judge Mathes had been asked to voice an opinion, if he knew anything about it, his opinion would have been given great weight I'm sure. But I don't think he would have voiced any opinion, basically speaking, because he wouldn't know these prospective faculty members. He would have no understanding of how they were situated in the law school field. And he wasn't a person to jump to conclusions: he was a judge.

GALM: Then, to sort of bring it up to 1955, in '53-54 Richard Maxwell was appointed.

VERRALL: Well, I know how Dick became a member of the faculty. We were in need of more men interested in the field of Property Law. It was getting too much for one person to teach all the first-year students and then to teach the other Property courses. That was particularly true because I was developing an interest at that time in Community Property Law and was working on the first edition of the book [*Cases and Materials on California Community Property*], which was completed shortly after that and has now gone through five editions. It has become the book that's used by all law schools in the state of California teaching Community Property Law. I cornered the market for some reason or another.

GALM: A good market to corner.

VERRALL: Which is very nice because it did result in a few dollars, but not very many. But we needed somebody to come into the Property field. The dean asked me if I knew anybody, and I said, "Well, personally I know of several people but I just don't believe we would want them in this school. Let me go to Dean Fraser, who knows far more about teachers than I do, and ask him if he knows of anybody who has real potential as a Property Law teacher and is available." So I went up to Hastings to see Dean Fraser, and Fraser said, "Well, I know of just one person, who is now teaching in Kansas" — I believe it was Kansas, might have been Oklahoma, I think it was Kansas — "and wants to get away from the prairie states, either to the East or to the West, that you might invite out and talk to him: Dick Maxwell."

When I reported that to the dean he immediately contacted Maxwell and sent me to the airport to get him. I didn't know what he looked like because he was at Minnesota several years, two or three years, after I was

there, and I didn't know him as a student. But in the airport there were hundreds of people getting off airplanes, but I saw only one cowboy hat. I said, "That's him!" and walked up to him, and that was Dick Maxwell. So I was responsible for Richard Maxwell coming to our faculty.

GALM: Now, he was involved in oil and gas.

VERRALL: Yes, very much so.

GALM: Did that [specialty] continue on at UCLA — immediately?

VERRALL: Oh yes, we needed somebody who was interested in Property Law and was also available to teach the advanced course, which we thought we had to teach, a course in Oil and Gas. It would be a course that would be taken as an elective course by third-year students primarily; a few second-year students might want to take it, but mostly it would be third-year students.

GALM: So you were really starting to build the third-year elective courses?

VERRALL: Oh yes. And broadening courses we were convinced that we would have to get into. We would have to have courses in International Law, courses in Comparative Law eventually, and courses in Jurisprudence particularly. In the end, of course, we did get somebody [Herbert Morris] from the philosophy department who was a lawyer also to teach a course in our law school in Jurisprudence.

GALM: How was the priority of future courses determined?

VERRALL: I don't suppose there was a priority of courses.

GALM: In other words, how did you determine that now is the time that we need somebody in a particular area to teach?

VERRALL: Sometimes it was when the man was available, and sometimes it was when the course was necessary and we had to go out and seek a man to teach it. Mostly we would determine the area where expansion was necessary, select the course, and then seek a man for the course.

GALM: But this was based on discussion by the faculty as a whole?

VERRALL: Oh yes. This was the type of thing that we discussed at our luncheons during those early years: Where should we go first? Of course, we knew [we] had to get second-year courses, and what was necessary

there was pretty well determined. And certain of the third-year courses were pretty well determined; we didn't have to make choices. We had to have those courses, such as Income Tax, such as the Corporations course for the second year, such as Evidence. Those courses had to be in there; we didn't have any choice. And that was basically true of all courses.

But every once in a while somebody would want to teach a specialized course, and in the main, when an established teacher, a man who had taught for three or four or more years, wanted to teach a specialized course that he got interested in, in the main the school would let him try it once to see how it would work out, to see if it was acceptable to the students, to see if it was acceptable to the other members of the faculty. So a man wasn't denied the privilege of expanding.

GALM: In those early years, was there much student initiative as far as asking for courses?

VERRALL: Not that I knew of. If they wanted a course that was not taught, or wanted to get into a course when we considered it to be too early for them to get into that course — they should have a better foundation before they took the course — the student would go to the dean, I suppose, with such a question as that. He did not discuss such a matter with individual members of the faculty as far as I know. He might have discussed it with individual members of the faculty, but he never discussed it with me. So I don't know whether he discussed it.

GALM: I guess later on when students actually participated on committees there would be more of an avenue for them to introduce student opinion or interest.

VERRALL: Yes, I assume that —

GALM: Also in 1953–54, Arvo Van Alstyne came on.

VERRALL: I don't know how he got in contact with the school or the school got in contact with him. He was a devout member of the Mormon church. He was a good teacher beyond question. He had certain ideas that were completely different from the ideas of any member of the faculty. Personally I liked him very much, but I had a completely different philosophy of life than he had. He was very interested in the underprivileged group and he could see the good in a man much quicker than he could see the

man's limitations. Now that was my assessment of him. I thought he was a good teacher and was very sorry when he decided to move on.

GALM: Allan McCoid was appointed as assistant professor that year.

VERRALL: Yes. Allan was a person of a very sharp mind, and it was my opinion, seeing him function as a law school teacher, that he was misplaced in the teaching profession.

GALM: In what way?

VERRALL: Well, I just didn't have the feeling that he was going to continue to be a good teacher and would get a reputation that would help the school. Now, why, I just don't know. Personally, I liked him and I thought he could do a good job, but for some reason or other he just didn't seem to fit into the operation of, at least, the University of California, L.A., School of Law.

GALM: From my review of the materials it seems that the majority of the faculty supported his continuation on the faculty. Is that an accurate reading of the times?

VERRALL: I don't recall the details of the matter or whether it was a majority of the faculty or not. I do recall that there was a difference of opinion among the members of the faculty concerning whether he would develop as a good law teacher. I don't know what position I took at the time, whether I would say he has possibilities and we should let him continue on, or whether the possibilities were relatively remote and it might be better to replace him. I don't know my position as of that time. But I do know that some of the members of the faculty believed that he would not develop into a great law teacher and that it might be risky for us to continue him on.

GALM: I guess what is difficult to determine from this [vantage] point, or from this point in time, is whether the faculty stand was more against the handling of the matter of the appointment, whether that was more [the issue of] the vote than the actual qualifications of the man. Whether it was—

VERRALL: I don't recall that there was any problem —

GALM: Whether it was more against Dean Coffman's way of handling the whole matter, and therefore they came out in support of him.

VERRALL: Well, I really don't know. I do know that there was a clash of personalities [between] the dean and certain members of the faculty. Whether they would seize upon a matter of this sort, blow it up because of that clash of personalities, I don't know, I don't know. It's entirely possible. I don't know how it was handled, whether there is any detail in the procedure that would lead to questioning the procedures. I have no idea that there were any problems. I didn't really know that there were any problems at that time. If there had been I probably would have — well, I might have remembered them, but I don't recall any problem concerning the procedures of that case.

GALM: What are your recollections as far as when the rift began and what form it took?

VERRALL: I suppose it began as early as 1951 and '52, because there was a clash of personalities beyond all question. The dean was aggressive, argumentative, and desired to be front and center all the time. And he would sometimes not recognize the contributions of members of the faculty. At least he would not mention them when he was talking about certain programs that had been successful in the law school. He'd talk about the programs; he might leave the impression that he was the person really responsible for the progress and would not recognize that a member of the faculty might have suggested the idea or made a major contribution to the success of the operation. That of course would be irritating to some members of the faculty who at least would like to be recognized as contributors.

Also, because he was aggressive and argumentative there was a basis for conflict there. Some members of the faculty perhaps were not able to adjust to his temperament and to his procedures, and would start to become irritated, would discuss the matter among themselves, and would become more and more remote from the dean and [from] the old habit of having daily luncheon meetings and practically living together as members of a faculty. There was a beginning of a division very early — I would say '52 or '53 — due to this clash of personalities. They could see the bad points but would not see, or at least would not recognize, the man's good points. He did have bad points, there's no question about it, but he had many good points. And he'd done a tremendous job in establishing the law school and starting it on its course.

GALM: Do you feel that with the growth of the faculty in numbers and breadth the luncheon meetings were an effective way of administrating the law school?

VERRALL: Well, I would answer no, and that was becoming an impossibility. It never was the official way of administering the law school. It was a basis upon which the dean could get an idea of faculty thinking very easily. But, as the faculty got larger, luncheon meetings became more difficult, and having all of the faculty at luncheon meetings was just an impossibility. No, the luncheon meetings ceased to have the importance that they had during the first three or four years. The faculty meetings became more regular and were the basis upon which the dean would get faculty input; [whereas] in the early two or three or four years, he got faculty input both at the faculty meetings and at these daily luncheon meetings. The luncheon meetings were never really part of the law school administration. They were just a basis on which the faculty and the dean, the administration and the teachers, could get to know each other.

GALM: It seems as though it did come down to two views of administration.

VERRALL: Yes. The dean was operating the law school in the old Harvard fashion. There were two schools of thought concerning operation of the law school. Most law schools as of 1950, and before, were operated according to the law school functioning of the Harvard Law School — really with the dean [as] the administrator and the faculty [as] the teachers.

There was of course give-and-take between the two. A few law schools had started to develop the idea that the faculty should be far more interested and far more involved in administration. They were referred to in the faculty circles as the “New Deal” schools, sometimes the “progressive” law schools, and the like. Principal schools at that time, I would assume, were Yale and, to a slightly lesser extent, Columbia. Some other law schools were branching off that way.

And many of the faculty in schools throughout the United States were developing the feeling that administration was so intimately tied in with their work that they should be consulted more frequently, and committee actions started to become common. Faculty committees were appointed to help the dean, and if the dean worked this out well, he could adjust his administration to the faculty’s desire to have some input in administration. I

don't think that the dean at UCLA was capable of making that adjustment, and so in our faculty, a group developed. They wanted to be consulted in administration. They wanted to participate in administration. They were not getting recognition as similar groups were being recognized in other law schools in the United States. That was the change of the period.

GALM: So were the days of the autocratic dean numbered?

VERRALL: I think so. And the man who was able to adjust his control by bringing in the faculty and letting them participate [would] go on as dean, but if he couldn't make that adjustment, eventually he would have to be replaced.

GALM: Do you know of any other law school in the United States that had as public a struggle as UCLA did?

VERRALL: At that time, or as early as 1951, I did not know of any similar problem in any law school. I was told later on that there had been a similar problem in a law school in the East, and that a member of the UCLA law faculty was involved in that struggle and that it was conducted in the same way that the struggle was conducted here. But I didn't know at that time.

GALM: I don't understand. Was it someone who was there at that time and then came to UCLA?

VERRALL: Yes.

GALM: Of the [new] members of the faculty, the new appointments, had many of them had this type of administrative experience with committee action on the part of the faculty?

VERRALL: I really don't know, but I would say at least some of them knew about it, had discussed the matter with other members of the faculty, or other faculties, and were rather interested in a similar type of participation here. But I really don't know that any of them had had actual experience in that area. Of course, even at Vanderbilt, which was conducted in the old Harvard style, the dean [Coffman] did turn over to faculty committees certain matters. Now whether he did it because he just didn't want to do the work himself, or did it because it was good administration to recognize that the faculty wanted to have an input, I don't know. But I do know that there had been committee action on certain matters.

GALM: It seems that so much of the conflict centered around appointments and control of — or at least the faculty's input into appointments.

VERRALL: Well, I don't know really how that could have been, because under university policies no person could be appointed to the school until the faculty had voted an approval of the appointment. That would call for the matter to be brought before the faculty and would give the faculty an opportunity to voice opinions. Now, in addition to the faculty vote, which had to be shown on the papers before it could get to the chancellor and the president and to the regents, there had to be — the dean would have to bring the matter of the appointment to the attention of the faculty. It would be to the whole faculty; it would not be to a special committee appointed by the dean from faculty members to consider the matter and to report to the faculty. Now, some of the members of the faculty would like to have had it that latter way, but that was not done. Indeed, the matter was presented to the entire faculty, and the entire faculty then would discuss the matter and vote upon the matter. The university required that.

GALM: Dean Coffman of course was very conservative in his politics —

VERRALL: Oh, I would assume he was a — yes, I remember he was a close friend of Knott of Knott's Berry Farm —

GALM: Walter Knott.

VERRALL: — who was a dyed-in-the-wool conservative. He was asked to join a conservative group composed of, I think, a newspaper editor up around the Bay Area, or some business executive up there, Knott, and several other persons, some of them down in Orange County. Yes, the dean was very closely associated with people that I considered to be the conservative wing of our body politic.

GALM: Well, later on when it was brought to the chancellor's attention, it seems that one of the charges made was his resolve not to appoint any "left-wingers."

VERRALL: That I can't understand. I wouldn't say that it was true, because of the members who were selected to our faculty both — well, let's take just visiting professors, both sides were pretty well represented. You couldn't get a better representation than Dean Pound for the conservative and Wesley Sturges for the liberal. Then, from the point of view of

people who were selected to become members of the faculty, you would, I think, say that Brainerd Currie was [a liberal]. I know he was obviously considered so by me and by other members of the faculties of the schools that I knew about; he was a liberal, very pronouncedly. Chadbourn was considered to be one of the liberals in the teaching profession. And in a sense, although not quite as much so, Dick Maxwell. Now from the point of view of liberal/conservative, I wouldn't be able to rate Sumner or Jones. No, I don't believe that there's any truth to that rumor that he would see to it that no liberal was ever selected to our faculty.

GALM: No, I think the word used was "left-winger." Did left-winger have a farther-left connotation than liberal?

VERRALL: I wonder what a left-winger could be as far as law teaching is concerned. That I don't know, other than a liberal who would be interested in teaching courses that had never been taught before, combining courses that had never been combined before — that sort of liberality. I don't believe that experience shows that he would not tolerate that because he did. And he would tolerate teachers who really thought that was the way things should be. Now, from the point of view of left-winger, if you mean somebody who wouldn't take the anti-communist oath and call him a left-winger, I don't have the slightest idea whether he would have said, "He'll never be on my faculty," or not.

GALM: It seems that one professor who was suggested had had a connection with civil liberties, specifically the American Civil Liberties Union, and that seemed to be enough of an association to nix his chances for appointment.

VERRALL: I don't know who suggested him or who was suggested.

GALM: How would he have felt about the ACLU at that time? Do you have any idea?

VERRALL: I would have figured that he would have said membership would cast some doubt on the integrity and character of the person, as far as he was concerned. But I don't know whether he would go any further than that.

GALM: I know later —

VERRALL: If somebody would have recommended [somebody] that was not considered because of that I don't know about it. Because if somebody

recommended somebody to the dean, and it ended there, the members of the faculty wouldn't know anything about it. The dean wouldn't mention a matter like that.

GALM: I know later there was a suggested symposium, or something, that would have brought the law school and the American Civil Liberties Union together on the same program. I know that there was faculty — dissension perhaps is too strong a word, but there were two viewpoints on whether there should be any [participation].

VERRALL: Yes. I would have questioned whether a new law school should enter into such a program or not, and I would have opposed it if I had known about it. And if it had been mentioned I would have voiced my opposition just as freely as I've done here. I might not thereafter have recalled that it had been mentioned at that time, but I would have opposed it. I don't believe that such a combination of a new law school and a group that was a matter of contention throughout the United States would have been desirable. I would have doubted its desirability. Why should the law school get into somebody else's fight by just joining in a program?

GALM: I think the two sides seemed to be as you've presented them, but someone suggested that because the law school's image was ultra-right, perhaps it would show an openness.

VERRALL: That is the only other side to the question. I would not have wanted to take the risk personally, but I am a person who normally would give a person a chance. Indeed, my philosophy of life is everybody's entitled to his position until he proves to me that the position is untenable. I might have been able to be convinced that we should have taken a chance if the matter had come up and had been debated in front of me.

GALM: Well, let's get back to the divided faculty and how it came about and how it was resolved. It does seem that the fall of 1955 was when it reached a point of division that caused certain members of the faculty to go to the chancellor [Raymond B. Allen], or address a memo to the chancellor.

VERRALL: Well, if that had been the way it had been done I don't think we would have had the problem we had. The attack was more secret and underhanded than that. If that had been the way it had been done — there was a growing dissension, and the chancellor should try to determine its

extent and iron it out — that would have been the proper way, I think, to have solved the problem. But the matter of rumors and secret activity had already created a wide dissension that could not be solved that way.

My recollection was on one of the appointments the matter of appointment was discussed in the faculty meeting, everybody was asked to voice his opinion, the faculty vote was taken, and the man was to be appointed. The dean approved it and sent it to the chancellor, and the chancellor sent it to the ad hoc committee. I was surprised when you said that we didn't have any contact with the Academic Senate because at that time we certainly did. I thought it continued forever. But anyway, a member of the ad hoc committee reported to the dean that a member of our faculty had come to him saying he was unalterably opposed to the appointment and that two or three other members of the faculty likewise were opposed. Why, I don't know. The member of the ad hoc committee didn't say why. But the member of the committee thought that that was an underhand way to interfere with the administration of the law school.

Secondly, there was a spread of rumors from some of the members of the faculty to the students that there was racial bias and that the future of the law school was threatened, not immediately but over the years. This rumor became widespread among the student body. Indeed, a group of the students discussed the matter in the student lounge, not knowing that somebody at the next table drinking coffee wasn't a member of the student body and reported back that the conversation was, in essence, "We have the law school now. We better work our fannies off that we don't lose it."

GALM: I don't quite understand that.

VERRALL: Because of racial bias. So I do know that the attack on the dean wasn't a direct request to the chancellor to consider the question of faculty participation in law school matters, and the fact that the dean was losing contact with some of the members of the faculty, and something should be done about it. It was more secret and underhand and got to a point where I believe students went to the chancellor too. Then the chancellor had to take matters into his hands. Then it was too late to do anything. In other words, it was impossible at that late date, when the two or three members of the faculty, three or four maybe, went to the chancellor, it was too late for an adjustment to be made. The only hope I think the chancellor had at that time was

that the dean would resign and another dean would be appointed who could adjust to the need for faculty participation in the law school administration.

GALM: The chancellor did meet with members of the faculty.

VERRALL: Yes, indeed he attended some of the faculty meetings. Those meetings he attended were very calm and collected, and those meetings he didn't attend were riotous over that six months' period.

GALM: Eventually he did appoint a committee, a university-wide committee, to investigate the dean, so to speak, or the charges.

VERRALL: I don't know about that. I don't know about that.

GALM: Were you never called before that committee?

VERRALL: Nope, never even heard about it.

GALM: No? It was chaired by — I guess he would have been vice-chancellor at that time — Vice-Chancellor Knudsen. [Knudsen was then dean of the Graduate Division and was appointed to be the first UCLA vice-chancellor in the fall of 1956.]

VERRALL: No. I never heard about it.

GALM: From his [oral history] recollection, it seemed that the members of the law faculty were interviewed. You have no knowledge, no remembrance of that?

VERRALL: Nope. No, I was never interviewed.

GALM: Did you ever speak directly with Chancellor Allen about the situation, or did he seek your opinion?

VERRALL: He never asked me concerning the details of any conflict. He did ask me if I could carry on the normal functions of the school, other than certain details that were far beyond my handling, such as any matters of budget, salaries, and like that. I had nothing to do with that; he'd do that. But he asked if I could handle the other matters, such as admissions and the ordinary functioning of the day-to-day operation of the school. Never did ask for any of the details concerning the conflict. Never did ask for an opinion of what course could be taken to solve the matter. I would have said at the time that if my understanding of the facts was correct, the only possible solution that would have the least adverse effects on the

future of the school would be that certain members of the faculty should move on. I think he was hoping that the matter could be solved in some way where there would be no open revelation of the extent of the division, or how it took place. No details would be known. It would be solved, and the school would go on normally in the future.

I was convinced that we would have a great deal of difficulty in getting new faculty members with experience or administrators for the law school unless something was done. I mean, so long as people could undermine the operation of the law school and get away with it, plant rumors and get away with it, get rid of the dean that way and stay on the faculty, then we would have a great deal of difficulty in the future.

Well, he thought perhaps differently at the time. So he attempted to get a dean, and he asked for names and he got names from the recalcitrant group and others. Every one of his attempts, although momentarily successful, turned out, no, we don't want the job.

Then he took the second step, and he said, we'll put somebody in as an interim dean. Well, he'd already asked me if I thought I could handle the school. And I said yes, but I knew at the time there was no hope, because I'd been associated with Dean Coffman, and a member of the faculty had come to me and said, "If you want anything done don't you suggest it be done, because if you do the answer's going to be no."

So I knew that I could never get along with at least three or four members of our faculty, and so the chancellor would have no interest whatsoever in my taking over. Anyway, I really didn't want it.

GALM: There are still some questions I would like to ask about that final period of Dean Coffman's deanship. I guess one of the questions is, do you feel that he made any attempt to reach compromise with the dissenting faculty?

VERRALL: I don't know as a matter of fact. My impression of the man leads me to say the answer should be, no, he did not make any attempt to adjust to their demands. Indeed, if their demands were voiced and got to the chancellor, it would be after the rumors had been circulated and the secret attempt to undermine law school procedures had been revealed to him. Under the circumstances I don't think he would have ever compromised with the one or two or three members of the faculty that were really involved, that really led the rebellion and created the dissension.

GALM: Would you be willing to identify who those people might have been on the faculty?

VERRALL: I would prefer not to. I think the school has recovered from the trauma of the day. The men have proved good law teachers, and it wouldn't help the school and it wouldn't help the men one bit just to name them. No, I would prefer not to name them.

GALM: OK. During this period did Dean Coffman discuss the situation a great deal with you?

VERRALL: No. I should say further on the last point though: I don't know that two or three of the members of the faculty who went along in the rebellion, I do not know whether they knew about the rumors. I do not know that they knew about the underhand way of interfering with the appointment process, for instance. They may have known it, they may not have known it. I do not know. And it would be too bad to tar them with a brush that was not meant for them. No, I would prefer not to mention their names because they've done a good job since. Now, with respect to the dean, your last question —

GALM: Whether he took you into his confidence much during this period?

VERRALL: No, he did not. Indeed, I believe the only statement he ever made to me concerning it was that the rumors and the activity of some members of the faculty had made his administration of the law school impossible and that he had the promise of an appointment to a national committee [United States Commission on Government Security] to sit in Washington that would require him to be absent for a couple of years, at least one full year and maybe two full years, and when he came back he would not be dean. That was the only mention he ever made to me of the dispute.

GALM: Do you recall how the word was given to the faculty about the resolution of the matter?

VERRALL: As far as I know it was never given to the faculty, just how it was to be resolved. We were told that the dean was going to go to Washington and serve on this committee for a year or two, and that they were looking for a new dean. That's as far as I know the faculty were advised concerning the matter. What was to be the future of the members of the faculty who were the dissidents, or what was to be the future of the faculty

who were not, was never mentioned. We just assumed that the dispute and the solution of the dispute would have no effect whatsoever upon the faculty. It was that that led me to doubt that the solution was to the advantage of the law school. I thought it would be dangerous if they didn't do more than that, but the chancellor knew more about administration than I did, and so I didn't bother myself.

GALM: Did you submit your resignation as assistant dean, or did you continue on?

VERRALL: I think that my being assistant dean was more or less just a matter of a local name rather than any official appointment. I was just to take charge of certain matters of law school administration, such as admission of students and handling of some student complaints and the like. That was all I had to do. I wasn't assistant dean in any sense that I would act for the dean in his absence. No.

GALM: So in a sense it was tied to the tenure of the dean himself.

VERRALL: Yes. Yes. Nobody ever asked me about it. I never even considered the matter. It just worked itself out without any help on my part or anybody else's part. I just ceased to function in those minor ways that I'd been functioning when the dean asked me to.

GALM: Did you ever hear, after the matter was settled, how Chancellor Allen was judged on his handling of the affair?

VERRALL: No, I did not hear. Indeed, what his recommended solution was and how it was to be carried into effect was never revealed to the faculty as a faculty, the faculty of the law school as a faculty. We just saw the developments and had to assume that this was part and parcel of his solution of the entire case.

GALM: Do you feel that he ever openly listened to the dissenters?

VERRALL: I have no idea. Indeed, I didn't even know as a matter of fact that any members of the faculty actually contacted him. I assumed they did, but I did not know that as a matter of fact. He was not apt to talk to individual members of the faculty, advise them concerning such matters.

GALM: At this time it seems that he requested from individual faculty members their suggestions on the future educational policy of the law

school. Do you recall that? I know you wrote a proposal. Was he sounding out the faculty?

VERRALL: No, I don't think so. If he did make such a request I did not know about it. The only request that ever was made to me concerning how the matter could be solved, or should be solved, the dangers of various types of solutions of the problem, the only request I ever got was from Judge Mathes, to put it in writing and he'd see to it that it got to the right people.

GALM: What were the major points of how you perceived what was happening?

VERRALL: Well, until it all burst all I knew was that some members of the faculty could not tolerate the dean as a person. There was a clash of personalities, I put it that way, and that I didn't think there was any hope that the differences could be ironed over; that eventually it would come to a head, and either they would have to leave the faculty or the dean would have to leave the faculty, one or the other. It had gone too far to be ironed over and have a compromise solution. Well, I'm sure that Chancellor Allen thought that a compromise solution was possible, and apparently he attempted to take that course. I was doubtful that it was possible and voiced my opinion to that effect. But I don't know enough about administration to know whether a compromise was possible. I just think that Chancellor Allen probably did the right thing.

GALM: I know one of the things that the dissident faculty wanted to accomplish was the reappointment, or continuation, of Allan McCoid. And it seems as though the chancellor did side with Dean Coffman in this situation. That it was in his hands — the ultimate choice.

VERRALL: That I don't know about. The members of the faculty who approached the chancellor in that matter, if they did, are unknown to me. And the fact that they approached him [is] unknown to me. Indeed, this is the first indication that I have had that any such group existed or any such group took any action whatsoever.

GALM: How did Dean Coffman adjust to becoming a professor of law?

VERRALL: Well, when he came back he didn't mention the old days. He didn't seem to be ill at ease. He rather seemed to be relieved. I never heard

him say anything against any member of the faculty because of the years of rebellion.

GALM: Any bitterness?

VERRALL: As far as revealing it to me, no. Whether or not he felt bitterness is another matter. That I don't know, but he never revealed any bitterness to me. Of course I would assume that he might have been very distant from certain members of the faculty. That they would notice and I wouldn't notice.

GALM: Did it ever surface in faculty meeting discussions?

VERRALL: No. No. I don't think I ever heard him voice any opinion concerning administration, in faculty meetings or outside of faculty meetings, that he would have conducted things differently, for instance. No. I think he just accepted it.

GALM: One of the things that seems to have been pushed through during that period was the faculty bylaws. It really defined the faculty's role as far as the administration and functioning of the law school.

VERRALL: Well, that of course was to be expected, because many members of the faculty were of the position that a law school faculty should be active participants in the administration of the law school; in many ways that, in the past, had not been true. At that time they wanted to establish a new procedure for the handling of law school matters. I don't know the extent to which those bylaws went. My forgetter is getting better every day, and I don't recall how far they did go. I do know that prior to that, matters of budget and matters of salary were not even known to the faculty and were not discussed when appointments were made. Those matters were handled between the dean and the chancellor, as far as I know. Afterwards, I don't know. At faculty meetings such matters did not come to the attention of the faculty, and whether or not committees had been appointed to work with the dean, the acting dean and then the final dean, I have no idea. I know I was never consulted or named to any of those faculty committees, if there were any.

GALM: What was your personal attitude towards the idea of faculty bylaws?

VERRALL: Well, I think every faculty should have bylaws upon which to act. And there should be an understanding of who is responsible for law

school operations: the dean or the faculty, or the dean or faculty committee. I think that was and is a necessity, yes. If you're going to have a happy faculty they have to know where the responsibility is.

GALM: It seemed that one key issue was the faculty's ability to call a faculty meeting if they felt that an issue required it.

VERRALL: I can imagine that would be true, and as a matter of practice I would think that would be a good idea. If the faculty or a certain number of the members of the faculty could petition for a meeting at any time, I would have approved such a course.

GALM: An acting dean was appointed, and that was Albert Harno?

VERRALL: First of all, the chancellor asked me if I could locate or if I knew of anybody who I thought could handle the law school during this period of trial and tribulation. I did suggest Everett Fraser, who the chancellor contacted; but Everett Fraser, ex-dean of Minnesota, told the chancellor that he just didn't believe in his old age he should tackle another problem. He'd been a dean for forty, fifty years and he didn't want to do anything more like that.

Then Harno was secured. I don't know, I didn't suggest Harno's name because I didn't know he was available. If I had I would have suggested his name, too, because he was a Big Ten dean of experience. When you have to deal with the legislators and the politicians of a whole state to administer your law school you have to be good, and so I would have suggested him, just like I suggested Fraser. But anyway, he came and, again, never commented at all, in my hearing, about a divided faculty. He merely took over and did the job. He never asked about individual members of the faculty, never asked me at least. So whatever information he got concerning the dispute and how it was to be handled he must have secured from the chancellor or other members of the faculty, because he didn't get any information from me.

My fear at that time, of course, was that the rebellion would have put us in a position that we would find it very difficult to secure experienced personnel, either as faculty or as administrators. And before Harno was appointed, the chancellor attempted to get a permanent dean; that was when [Howard] Williams came out here, and we thought we had a dean. But within a few days after he got back to Texas he notified the chancellor that he

wasn't interested, and that was when the chancellor tried to get an acting dean for a short period of time while a permanent dean could be secured.

GALM: What do you see as the contribution or accomplishment of Dean Harno?

VERRALL: Well, during the period he was here there was no further confrontation among members of the faculty. I'm sure if any confrontation was revealed to him he would have stopped it with an iron hand. So his mere presence or his actions — I don't know which, maybe both — resulted in a faculty which operated rather smoothly with no confrontation as far as I could see.

GALM: Did the faculty meetings quiet down?

VERRALL: Oh yes. Oh yes. They were quiet, objective, just as the meetings were when the chancellor was chairing the committees, yes. I don't know that you knew Harno, but he was little. He didn't do much talking, but he was on the job mentally and physically. If anything like an improper statement would be made he wouldn't tolerate it, no. He was a good person for the interim deanship.

GALM: So it sounds like he would have the respect of both parties, or both groups?

VERRALL: I would say beyond all question. If there were any others who opposed the transition — I opposed it, not opposing the transition as such, I opposed it because of the way it was done, with rumors and the like. That would be the area in which the school would be damaged. The fact that some of the faculty didn't like the dean because of a personality complex, or something like that, that wouldn't affect the school at all; that's everyday. But when there's reportedly an underground method to challenge the dean and get rid of him, that hurts the school, and over the years it hurts the school. It normally would take a [law] school ten or fifteen years to get over such a blow as that. And we were having difficulty getting a dean, and so I was really much afraid of our future when Harno came. I was less afraid of our future as a result of Harno's being there. Because he was good — there's no question about that.

GALM: I asked you earlier, off tape, what the substance of the rumors were.

VERRALL: There may have been more than one rumor, but as far as I know from the three sources available to me: a statement, or a question from a student, was the dean anti-Semitic? Two, a conversation overheard in the student lounge between four or five Jewish students intimating that the dean was anti-Semitic, which came to me through two other people. And three, a statement by one member of the faculty prior to the leave of absence of the dean that unless we actively recruited Jewish teachers, our school would never go very far, wouldn't progress very far. When I put the three ideas together I reached the conclusion that the rumors that had been circulated were that the dean was anti-Semitic.

GALM: Did you ever have a sense how widespread this rumor was, whether it reached national, whether it was known among —

VERRALL: Other schools?

GALM: — other schools, other faculty?

VERRALL: I would assume it was known. How it became known, I don't know. All I do know was some members of other faculties at association meetings had asked me questions concerning that period. Which would indicate to me that they knew that there had been a rebellion here.

GALM: During Harno's tenure, and it was a very brief tenure, there were two faculty appointments, Murray Schwartz and Addison Mueller, and these men of course stayed on the faculty.

VERRALL: Addison Mueller had been one of the (as I call them) activist-liberal teachers at Yale, and was reputedly an excellent teacher when he was at Yale. He'd been working on a new way to handle the Contracts courses in law schools, which was typical of that liberal faculty idea that was spreading out of Yale and Columbia. And some of the members of our faculty were inclined to like to experiment that way too. I was too. I like to experiment, but in a more limited way I would believe. When it became known that he was available — how it became known I don't know — I think every member of the faculty was delighted that we had at least a chance to get him. I would assume that the members of the so-called rebellion who wanted more faculty participation in law school matters would have been delighted to have him. I would expect that Addison would be

such a person himself. He would like to participate, I think. I liked him very much, and he was a good teacher.

GALM: It's my understanding that he had been approached during the Coffman period.

VERRALL: That I don't know, I don't know. Because he was at Yale —

GALM: At least to the point of a visit out here.

VERRALL: He was at Yale, and while he was at Yale of course he wasn't available. I think he left Yale when his father died and he had to wind up some of his father's extensive businesses. To my understanding, he wasn't available until after that. So I have no idea whether his name was suggested before or not. Or who knew him even, I didn't know. I didn't know him before.

GALM: Then Murray Schwartz came on.

VERRALL: I didn't know anything about Murray Schwartz until he got on the faculty. He was a member of the faculty. I considered him to have a great future. Later on, in an administrative way, he was an excellent administrator too. (Indeed, when I came out here for these lectures [the oral history interview], the person I thought of going and saying hello to was Murray.) He was a good teacher, a delightful man. I don't think there was any opposition to the appointment of either one of them.

GALM: Then Richard Maxwell was chosen as acting dean.

VERRALL: They didn't tell us that he was chosen as an acting dean when he started to take over the administration. I assumed that he was appointed as a permanent dean at that time. We'd had a little difficulty in getting people from other universities who had no part in the revolt here, or weren't even on the faculty when the revolt occurred, and I just assumed they picked Dick because he could get along with both sides of the faculty if both sides continued to exist. You had to have somebody to do that. If there still was any contention, you had to have somebody to handle it, and he would be capable of doing that.

GALM: What were his positive qualities?

VERRALL: Well — [pause]

GALM: I guess being a diplomat or being able to bring —

VERRALL: Well, he was willing to listen — I think that's positive — and not to jump to conclusions, not to assume things. No, I would say that he is typical of a person who could be a dean. You have to be able to listen. You have to be patient. You can't assume things. You have to be able to see, and to hear, and to listen. I mean really hear things.

GALM: What type of personality did he have, or does he have?

VERRALL: Basically, my first impression would be he's slightly on the retiring side. The exact opposite of Coffman, who always wanted to be front and center, and pushing himself no matter who was involved so that he would be front and center, even though that resulted in contention. No, Dick was more easygoing, attentive, a little on the retiring side if either way. Not aggressive but on the retiring side, I would say. However, he was capable of taking a position and doing it with an iron hand if necessary. I always thought very highly of Maxwell. Indeed, he is on our faculty because of me. I secured his name, of course, from Fraser — I didn't know him before that — and suggested the name to the faculty, and the faculty approved it, and he came out. He was a good addition.

GALM: Do you recall what he may have done specifically to rebuild the reputation of the school or to improve the morale of the faculty?

VERRALL: No. That is something that you don't get details of. It's a continuous process. Both with respect to the student body and with respect to the members of the faculty, it's a continuing process. It's slow. You have to be patient. You can't push it.

GALM: So there was nothing dramatic?

VERRALL: No. No. I don't think it could be, personally. Too many different personalities involved. It can't be pushed. He was the type of person who I think had the patience and the stick-to-it-iveness to do it.

★ ★ ★