Greetings from the Chair
Jonathan Lurie

Spring of 2019 was an exciting one for our Retirees. In April, we made an excursion to the museum in Liberty State Park, which contains among other attractions the largest planetarium in the United States, or so I have been informed. I believe that this trip, beyond the boundaries of the New Brunswick campus, is the second such trip for us. It will be followed, hopefully, by a visit this fall to the Thomas Edison site in Orange, where one of my former students serves as a Ranger, and can be persuaded to offer us an informative and fascinating guided tour. If you have never seen the Edison Site, you will find it well worth a visit, and if you have already been there, a return trip will reveal new attractions. (The main building is equipped with elevators and ramps.)

On our behalf, it is a special pleasure to acknowledge the hard work of Judith Friedman and her program committee. From where I sit as your chair, I have been struck by the incredible variety and richness of our speakers. Their topics have ranged from detection in works of art, to fleeing the holocaust in Europe prior to WWII, from issues of pollution in NJ water ways, to a fascinating presentation on taste and smell. Our meetings, held on the third Tuesday of the month, try to have a program of interest to all who attend.

My emphasis on the word attend is not a typographical error. We average between eleven and fifteen members at our regular meetings. Yet our membership list includes sixty-three retirees! Where are they? We need to do a better job of getting the word out to our colleagues as to who we are and what we offer. It is not so much that we lack members as that too many of our members fail to attend. If each of us could persuade just one of our acquaintances to attend our meetings, we could more than double the number of those who come.

Finally, a special word of thanks to Isabel Wolock, our treasurer, and Ben Beede our former Chair who continues as our secretary. If any of you have ideas or suggestions for future speakers or programs, please do not hesitate to contact either Judith or the undersigned.

With every good wish,
Jon Lurie

New Faculty Contract for 2018-2022!!

Full-time faculty and graduate assistants at Rutgers worked without a contract for nearly ten months before the administration and the Rutgers AAUP-AFT reached tentative agreement in mid-April. It took an unprecedented strike vote on the faculty’s part and a “final warning” to the Board of Governors to get the job done. Union members have now ratified what the leadership is calling a “historic agreement.”

Salaries will rise for full-time faculty and for teaching and graduate assistants, retroactively to July 2018, but in this contest, the faculty sought a commitment to equal pay for equal work. The contract spells out procedures for faculty members to apply for out-of-cycle equity correction to their salaries if they can make the case that they have suffered from discrimination. Potentially important for female faculty and faculty of color, the procedure will also allow faculty members at Newark and Camden to seek pay equal to their counterparts in New Brunswick. The administration agreed to pay for these corrections out of central administration funds.

There’s room here for just a sampling of other provisions in the new contract.

* Academic freedom is, for the first time, recognized in the contract as a right for all members of the bargaining unit.

* The administration agreed to create a University Committee on Diversity, Race, and Gender, made up of members named by the administration and by the union
and charged to recommend initiatives pertaining to hiring and retaining a diverse faculty and student body.

* Of importance to a number of faculty, especially in the sciences, is the university’s agreement to reverse its past practice with regard to green cards for non-tenure track faculty. Though the administration sponsored tenure-track faculty for permanent residency status, it has until now refused to do the same for their non-tenure track peers.

* The contract aims to halt an erosion of teaching and graduate assistantships. By various means, such as converting teaching assistantships to part-time lecturer positions, departments have cut costs at the expense of their own students who fall beyond the reach of contractual obligations. Work customarily performed by graduate assistants—research and teaching—must be performed by people with assistantships.

* Grievances about sexual and other forms of harassment and discrimination on the job are now subject to binding arbitration.

The part-time lecturers chapter of the union also reached an agreement.

Reported by Ann Gordon
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Presentation by Dr. Kendra Boyd
February 27, 2018
Based on notes prepared by Benjamin Beede

Dr. Boyd, who received her Ph.D. from Rutgers, was a postdoctoral associate in the Scarlet and Black Project at Rutgers for 2017-2018. She began an appointment as an assistant professor at York University last summer. Already, she has an enviable record as a scholar. Her impressive work includes book chapters, an editorial project, numerous conference papers, and public presentations. Moreover, she has a solid record as a teacher.

Dr. Boyd’s undergraduate degree is in business administration, and it is easy to see from the titles of her works that she is using her knowledge of business and economics effectively in her history research. Her dissertation is titled, “The Great Migration and Black Entrepreneurship in Detroit.”

The “Scarlet and Black Project” deals with Native Americans and Black Americans in Rutgers history. The project is continuing under the direction of another postdoctoral associate appointed by the Rutgers Center for Historical Analysis.

Dr. Boyd began with findings from the first volume of Scarlet and Black: Slavery and Dispossession in Rutgers History, issued by the Rutgers University Press in 2016. This Scarlet and Black project developed in response to student concerns that the University’s 250 anniversary celebration was leaving out narratives of Native Americans and Black Americans and other disenfranchised and dispossessed populations. Their stories and the benefits that Rutgers enjoyed as a result of their dispossession is finally being told.

Rutgers began with a grammar school, an undergraduate college, and a theological seminary, which separated from Rutgers in 1856. Slavery was fundamental to the history of Queen’s College. Slave owners donated money and land to the university, which still benefits from these resources.

Slavery was deeply embedded in New Jersey. The Dutch Reformed Church was a major cultural influence in the state, and many members of this denomination who were also slave owners were involved with Rutgers. The Dutch were more prone to own slaves than English-speaking people in the state.

Philip French, who was a founding trustee of Queens College, owned many slaves and is immortalized in French Street in New Brunswick. He had advertised in newspapers several times for the return of Claus, an escaped slave, although whether or not the slave was taken is not known. A three pound reward was offered for the slave’s recapture. Breaking the bonds of slavery was difficult and expensive. Some slaves freed themselves.

Dr. Boyd related the story of another slave who belonged to the Frelinghuysen family, Ukasaw Gronniosaw. He became a Christian, and he succeeded in winning his freedom from slavery. He even wrote an autobiography entitled, A Narrative of the Most Remarkable Particulars in the Life of James Albert
Ukawsaw Gronniosaw, an African Prince, as Related by Himself, in 1772.

Public auctions in New Jersey included the sale of slaves. Ironically, money to support the American side in the Revolutionary War came from such sales. Early in the 19th century Rutgers ran into financial problems, and a number of slave owners, including the famous Colonel Henry Rutgers, aided the school. At least one slave, who is known only by his first name, “Will,” helped build Old Queens, and other slaves probably worked on the building.

On July 4, 1804, the state legislature passed a bill providing for the abolition of slavery in New Jersey. The process of abolition was protracted, with complicated legal provisions. Even at the time of the Civil War there were slaves in the state. The prices for slaves fell during the period of abolition, and more whites had an opportunity to own slaves. Meanwhile, prices for slaves in the South rose, and a number of slaves from New Jersey were sold to their new owners in the southern states. The 1804 law was intended to prevent such sales, unless the slaves indicated their willingness to go South. At least in one instance, a judge forged papers that gave a legal basis for the sale of a slave. There was outrage about this case. In any event, slaves could be forced to consent to their departure.

Dutch Reformed Church members were much divided about the slavery issue, and only in 1855 was the matter even discussed. Finally, as slavery was ending with the Thirteenth Amendment to the United States Constitution, the denomination condemned slavery.

Dr. Boyd then passed to the second volume of the Scarlet and Black, which she is editing and which covers the years 1865 to 1945. There were many pro-slavery people in New Jersey, and racism continued at Rutgers. The colonization movement, which involved sending freed slaves to Africa, flourished for a time.

Professor Doolittle at Rutgers was highly racist. He contended that only education and religious training could help “inferiors” move out of their state of “savagery.” There was significant Ku Klux Klan activity in central New Jersey and at Rutgers in the 1920s.

Dr. Boyd concluded her talk by pointing out that although Rutgers is proud of being one of the few “colonial colleges,” that legacy also includes definite ties to slavery.

The project’s first volume, Scarlet and Back: Slavery and Dispossession in Rutgers History, is available and can be retrieved from JSTOR.  http://www.jstor.org/stable/j.ctt1k3s9r).

Presentation by Dr. David A. Robinson, N.J. State Climatologist “New Jersey’s Changing Climate” April 17, 2018 Based on notes prepared by Benjamin Beede

In addition to being the New Jersey State Climatologist, Dr. David A. Robinson is a professor in the Rutgers Department of Geography. His undergraduate education was at Dickinson College. He then moved to Columbia University, where he received an M.S. and a Ph.D. Having come to Rutgers in 1988, he moved quickly to associate professor and then professor. In 1991, he became the New Jersey State Climatologist, a post that had been established in 1979 by Governor Brendan Byrne. Dr. Robinson is the longest serving state climatologist so far. Thirty-nine states currently have climatologists, and all but two have state climate offices, and there is a national organization of those holding such positions. The state climatologist is usually at a state university, although sometimes the person is not on a tenure-track line. Unusually, Georgia has moved its climatology function to the environmental agency.

The aim of the climatologist’s office is to help people make decisions about how to react to climate change. Dr. Robinson’s office studies increased temperatures, changes in precipitation, weather variability, and the rising sea level. In addition to awarding grants (state, federal and private) and providing one-to-one consultations, it maintains a website, which includes a review of about two thousand words that deals with weather patterns during the previous month.

The state climate office includes an assistant state climatologist funded through the NJ Agricultural Experiment Station, in addition to four other staff and several student interns who are largely grant funded. The office that operates the Rutgers New Jersey Weather Network is a constellation of 65 stations around the state that provides observations of a variety of weather conditions in real time every five minutes. It also coordinates a statewide volunteer precipitation observing network. Hundreds of reports from these citizen scientists are received each day, their observations transmitted to a national organization.

There are many reasons for climate change. The climate is changing more rapidly than in the past. Human beings are responsible in good part for this recent development. Human activity affects the weather through the amount of air conditioning being used, for example. Up to 1960 there was no difference between human and natural effects.

Over tens of thousands of years, the orbit that the earth follows around the sun determines climate change. Twenty thousand years ago North Jersey was covered by thick ice. Plant material found under the ice is helpful
in detecting older patterns, with carbon dating employed over the past 50,000 years.

There is significant variability in precipitation, droughts, and storm patterns in New Jersey, making the creation of a climate model difficult. Scenarios for emissions vary, moreover. This makes it difficult to project just how rapidly the climate may change in the decades ahead.

Slight changes in weather patterns can have profound effects. The last three years have globally been the three warmest since accurate temperature recording began in 1880. Much of the increased heat is going into the oceans, which means warming will continue. In fifty to sixty years there will be substantial climatic differences. There will be more than a one degree difference in temperature from today, thereby increasing the “greenhouse effect,” which Dr. Robinson compared to people placing an additional blanket on beds; the bed being Earth and the blanket being the greenhouse gas enriched atmosphere. Using Seaside Heights, New Jersey, as an example, Dr. Robinson discussed the tremendous social and economic impacts of a higher sea level. “Sunny day flooding” can occur, making this a challenge that requires attention. Speaking to NJ water issues, Robinson stated that despite droughts at times, New Jersey is characterized as a “precipitation-rich state.” Droughts, however, can be more serious than occasional flooding, as they directly impact all state residents and may last from months to years.

Ultimately, Dr. Robinson’s message was that we cannot expect to fully mitigate our way out of this situation. While we should make efforts to, for instance, use clean sources of energy and less of it, we must be able to adapt, to become more resilient, to climate change. Adaptation requires activism and leadership. People need to know about climate change, in order to understand developments and to react to them appropriately.

**Presentation by Dr. Jonathan Lurie, Professor of History Emeritus**  
“Robert Mueller and Evolution of the Special Prosecutor”  
May 23, 2018  
*Based on notes prepared by Benjamin Beede*

This presentation was originally proposed by D. Antebi. Dr. Jonathan Lurie agreed to discuss the office of special prosecutor when the speaker who had been asked to make the presentation was unable to do so. Dr. Lurie has a notable reputation as an expert on the United States legal history, constitutional development, and the United States Court of Military Appeals.

The presentation had three segments. The first consisted of an historical perspective on the office. One such prosecutor, Archibald Cox, was then considered at more length. Finally, Robert Mueller’s recent investigation of the election of 2016 was described.

Corruption is a part of human nature. Thus, the question arises whether it can be curbed. Idealism and realism conflict on this point. Undoubtedly, penalties for public officials found guilty of corruption can be and need to be increased.

Those functioning as special prosecutors have sometimes had other titles, such as “independent counselor,” but the role has been the same, regardless of the name. Such figures have always been attorneys with impressive credentials who came from outside of the administration being investigated.

Special prosecutors have often been criticized and have sometimes been dismissed by the president. The first special prosecutor was appointed in 1875 to investigate events during the Grant administration. President Grant fired that person. By 1900, the office of special prosecutor was an established institution. Such people have not always been appointed by the president. Today, congressional initiatives for special prosecutors are commonplace. Ninety-nine per cent of such initiatives are ignored, however.

Corruption during the administration of Warren G. Harding led to congressional action when Owen J. Roberts, later a justice of the United States Supreme Court, and Atlee Pomerene, a former senator, were appointed to investigate the accusations. When Attorney General Harry A. Daugherty’s brother refused to testify to Congress about the Teapot scandal that related to the leasing of navy oil fields, he was arrested by the sergeant at arms. Daugherty argued against the authority of the Senate to question him. Attorney-general Harland F. Stone and former Attorney General George W. Wickersham acted for the Senate. Wickersham contended that both houses of Congress could have special investigations conducted, and the court agreed. Willis Van Devander wrote the United States Supreme Court decision that upheld senatorial authority.

The second segment dealt with the Watergate controversy. During his confirmation hearing, Attorney General Elliot Richardson promised that he would appoint a special prosecutor to examine the Watergate episode. His choice, Archibald Cox, eventually demanded the release of certain taped conversations. President Richard M. Nixon and others of his administration objected to that demand. Nixon fired Cox, and Richardson and his Deputy Attorney General William Ruckelshaus resigned rather than follow Nixon’s order to fire Cox. Finally, Solicitor General Robert Bork fired Cox. This was the famous “Saturday Night massacre” that began Nixon’s downfall.

(Jon Lurie was a fellow at the Harvard Law School and attended a course on administration law taught by Cox.)
Legislation passed as a result of the Watergate scandal directs that a three-judge panel is empowered to appoint a special prosecutor, and in 1999 new rules for such prosecutors were adopted while Janet Reno was attorney general.

The tapes showed corruption close to the president, who took the lead in trying to produce a cover-up.

The last portion of the presentation dealt with the investigation of alleged interference by Russia in the United States presidential election of 2016. Trump probably assumed that he would be cleared by Attorney-General Jeff Sessions. A special prosecutor, Robert Mueller, former head of the F.B.I., was appointed, in accordance with established guidelines for such a procedure.

Mueller has a distinguished record of public service, including combat experience as a marine officer in Vietnam. His reputation for independence and for decency put him in a strong position. Clearly, no officer of the government, including the president, should be above scrutiny. Nevertheless, Dr. Lurie said that he is skeptical about the likelihood of President Trump being impeached.

Fascism emphasizes the importance of the state. Right wing elements in this country distrust the state, even wanting to deconstruct it to a degree.

Fascist regimes are often racist. Certainly, there has been and continues to be racist and ethnocentric attitudes in the United States.

A theory by Theodore Adorno has linked fascism to what he termed the “authoritarian Personality,” a phrase that describes people with rigid ideas, seeing issues as “black and white,” and an emphasis on discipline. Such individuals are often in search of security and community, on their terms. Chaotic situations may lead such people to crave stability.

Some members of the police may exhibit such feelings, which can be reinforced by their contact with criminals.

An old theory related members of the rank and file in fascist movements to marginal elements in society, a view somewhat akin to Marx’s references to a “lumpen proletariat.” In Germany, Seymour Lipset identified small town, middleclass Protestants as especially inclined toward fascist views.

In Germany, a segment of the capitalist class favored fascism. In the United States, too, there is no “capitalist consensus” behind Donald Trump.

Emotion plays a role in fascism and among the right wing in the United States. Fascists and other right wing extremists are often critical of liberal rationalism. Yet, the application of rationality and modernism are necessary in time of war. The irrationality of extremists can be related to their anti-Semitism.

Dr. Oppenheimer’s presentation stimulated a vigorous discussion.

The results of the 2016 election brought Dr. Oppenheimer to begin thinking about comparisons between the United States and fascism in Europe, a process that led to this presentation. He distributed two highly useful charts. One began by showing similarities between Germany in the Weimar era and the present United States and then compared the ideology of the Nazis with that of right wing extremists in the United States. The second was the initial program of the Italian fascists, which seemed radical in many respects, although many elements were never implemented by Mussolini.

The problems of Germany were vastly larger than those of the United States today. An important idea in the revisionist movement in Germany, including the Nazis, was that the country had been “stabbed in the back” during World War I by Marxists, liberals, and Jews. Some in the United States believed that the Vietnam War was lost, because it failed to give more resources to the conflict, but that is hardly a critical issue.
Dr. Fenyk is the Executive director of the Lower Raritan Watershed Partnership. She received a Ph.D. from Rutgers, the State University of New Jersey in 2014. Her dissertation is titled “Citizen Expertise and Advocacy in Creation of New Jersey’s 1987 Freshwater Wetlands Protection Act.”

Dr. Fenyk began her presentation by stating that there is a distinct disconnect between people and their waterways, despite the environmental, economic, and recreational importance of those waterways. She explained that a ‘watershed’ separates water flowing in various directions, that is, rivers, basins, or seas. New Jersey, though, has taken a major step in fostering wetlands by passing the Freshwaters Wetlands Protection Act of 1987, which reflects the state’s determination to administer the provisions of the Clean Water Act passed by Congress within its jurisdiction.

The mouth of the watershed is at the Amboys. At the head of the watershed are ‘brownfields’ that are the worst in both New Jersey and the United States. There is a need to restore these areas, or simply to put them “off limits” to both development and recreational purposes, although development should be discouraged in the flood plain. A significant portion of the population of New Jersey, about 870,000 people, resides in the land included in the watershed.

The Lower Raritan Watershed Partnership was established in 2015. It began by testing water quality. Another activity has been and continues to be trash removal. Interestingly, artists have come to use some forms of trash for exhibits. A strong relationship has developed between the watershed group and CoLAB Arts.

Dr. Fenyk distributed a list that described the “Top 10” concerns, and then she discussed them. Government policies or their absence is one problem.

Hidden that is, underground, streams are a significant issue. About seventy-five per cent of the streams in the watershed need to be diverted, in order to bring them back to their natural state. Another issue is the lack of security in the watershed, which has attracted homeless people, who add to the continuing degradation of the environment.

Hydrology continues to be misunderstood at various levels, both governmental and private, which retards restoration. Pollution remains a challenge. There is a toxic mix in waterways, which produces high bacteria levels and the dying of fish. There are no specific limits on pollution of the area. Even mowing grass near the streams needs to be prevented.

There are positive indications, too. Less methane is being reported, for example. Ocean fishing is being extended, and catches are larger. Fishermen are cooperating by helping monitor water quality. An impressive restoration of a forest and wetland has been undertaken successfully on Staten Island, which consists of eighteen acres and includes a mill pond and other features.
My research, much of it in collaboration with colleagues in the organic and inorganic areas, led to over 160 publications dealing with a variety of topics including dynamic nuclear polarization (DNP), electron transfer in metal complexes, collision mechanics in liquids, crystallography and boron chemistry. The synergistic interaction of a physical chemist (me), an inorganic chemist and an organic chemist was unusual at the time and worked well. Without undergraduate and graduate students, postdoctoral fellows, and faculty collaborators, none of this would have happened.

I held several administrative positions. I was Department Chair from 1977 to 1983 and oversaw the administrative and physical consolidation of three chemistry departments in New Brunswick (Douglass, University, and Rutgers Colleges).

I was a charter member and then chair of the Committee for Standards and Priorities from 1982 to 1989. The Committee evaluated academic programs, centers and bureaus and advised the Office of the President on matters related to program development, academic structure, budget, and capital construction.

I was the faculty chair of the Rutgers High Technology Bond Committee which helped pass the $90 million Jobs, Science and Technology Bond Issue in 1984.

I was the New Brunswick Chair of the Steering Committee and helped organize a Capital Fund Raising Campaign which generated $166 million for the University's Fund for Distinction.

I also chaired the President’s Committee for Computer and Information Service that developed a long-range plan for the development of instructional, research, and administrative computing at the university.

I was Associate Provost for Academic Affairs in the Sciences in New Brunswick from 1990 until 1992 and Provost and Dean of the Graduate School from 1993 to 1996. In addition, I was on the Board of Directors of New Brunswick Tomorrow from 1994 to 1996.

I also was active in the American Chemical Society (ACS). I was the University Representative on the Council for Chemical Research (1982-92), the program co-chair for the Middle Atlantic Regional Meeting (2005), Chair of the North Jersey ACS Section in 2009, and ACS Councilor representing the North Jersey section from 2009 to 2014. I was inducted as an ACS Fellow in 2012.

A friend noted that “Joe Potenza never met a committee he didn’t like.”

What were your major accomplishments and sources of satisfaction while you were at Rutgers?

In addition to the teaching, research and service I described above, it gives me great satisfaction to hear from former students and a good feeling to know that they are doing well professionally. I just learned that one of my undergraduate students is receiving the distinguished Trueblood award from ACS in 2019 recognizing exceptional achievements in crystallography. Another undergraduate, now a Harvard professor, is working on a ‘green leaf’ to provide cheap energy for underdeveloped populations. I hoped that I inspired and helped them in a small way to make important contributions to science and mankind.

Did you receive any award /honors before or after retirement?

Besides the teaching awards mentioned previously, I also was an A.P. Sloan Foundation Fellow (1971-3) and received the Alexander von Humboldt Senior US Scientist Award in 1974. I spent a year in Munster, Germany, doing research (and travelling in our Opel whenever and wherever in Europe possible). It was a wonderful experience for me and the family, although our sons took a while to adjust going to German schools and complained about having to keep up with the classwork they were missing in their Highland Park classes in addition to doing homework from their German school classes.

What did you do before coming to Rutgers?

In 1955 I started my STEM education at Brooklyn Technical High School, one of NY’s special high schools requiring an exam for admission. My wife attended a similar high school, Hunter College HS. Tech had a rigorous curriculum and prepared me for the next step of my journey, the Polytechnic Institute of Brooklyn (now NYU Polytech) from which I graduated in 1962.

The tuition scholarship, together with part-time work, allowed me to attend Poly. Room and board were provided at the family home in Long Island City, NY. Poly required two years of ROTC in lieu of gym. I stayed in ROTC since I felt it was better to be an officer because we still had the compulsory draft and the Vietnam War was looming on my horizon.

I was commissioned as a second lieutenant in the Corps of Engineers upon graduation. I was able to get a four-year deferment in order to attend graduate school at Harvard (1962-66). My thesis advisor was Professor William Lipscomb (future Nobel laureate in chemistry) under whom I researched the structure of carboranes using X-ray crystallography. This was in the pre-
computer age, so a small structure took 6 months to complete. Fortunately, I was a TA (teaching assistant) and then an RA (research assistant), which helped me financially. I found that I enjoyed teaching and research in a university setting.

Upon successfully defending my thesis in the summer of 1966, I was ‘able’ to join the Army as a first lieutenant, even though I technically graduated from Harvard the following June. Not too many graduates were sporting the Army crewcuts when I went to graduation.

After training at Fort Belvoir in Virginia, I received orders to report to Fort Monmouth (which I had never heard of) in New Jersey to work on radio signal amplification using a dynamic nuclear polarization technique. As fate would have it, the technique was also useful for studying collision mechanics in liquids.

I worked under Edward Poindexter, a distant cousin of Henry Torrey, who was then RU Graduate School Dean. We published 14 papers in leading journals during my years at Ft. Monmouth. I resigned my commission as a Captain in 1968. My army career, essentially a post-doctoral experience, led me to Rutgers and influenced my research and teaching for the next forty-four years.

I found out later that because I had a PhD in the sciences I was kept stateside, instead of being shipped to Vietnam or Korea, because President Kennedy had wanted to make advances in science to get us to the moon and didn’t want scientists to be on active duty in war zones.

**Going back to earlier days, had you always planned on having an academic career — doing what you did?**

I was always interested in science, reading many science fiction books and dreaming what could be. I also diddled with the popular chemistry set for children. My best friend was a humanist and we would spend many hours debating science vs. the humanities. He broadened my mind and world, introducing me to good literature, music (he was a pianist), and the arts. He went on to become a professor of English and Italian at Brooklyn College. But I really didn’t make up my mind to go into academics until I ended my army career. Industry was certainly better paying, but I loved research and enjoyed teaching, so I decided to ‘go for broke’ and applied to various universities. I chose Rutgers because it was the right fit for me, a New Yorker for most of my life. Our families still lived in New York. And I had come to feel at home in New Jersey.

**If you were to do it all over again, would you pursue the same career or would you choose another one?**

I think I was very fortunate in being given the opportunities that led me to a fulfilling life. I wouldn’t want to change it, except I would not have started smoking when I was 13.

**Is there any one event or experience or person that had the greatest influence on your life? If so, please tell me about it.**

That’s very difficult to answer. When I was young, my mother always encouraged me (and maybe pushed a little) to do well in school. She had high hopes for me. Of course, my wife, Janet, whom I married in 1964, was always there for me and still is. But I think the person who really changed my way of thinking was my humanist friend, Bobby, who lived across the street in Long Island City and who I mentioned previously. Even though we disagreed and had different weltanschauungs, we relished our late night ‘discussions’ over coffee and cigarettes, each thinking we knew how to solve the world’s problems.

**What did you do after you retired?**

Rutgers was kind to me and let me keep my office, probably in the hope I would clear it out. I continued to go in, read some chemistry, finished some papers for publication, met with colleagues at lunch, etc. I also continued to play tennis until a few years ago. I still go into the office, but not as often, and I go to the gym. I attend meetings, such as the Retiree Assembly, to hear talks and meet stimulating people. Janet and I go to performances at Mason Gross and the NJ Symphony in New Brunswick. We used to attend the Met opera in NY with a group until a few years ago. Now we periodically go to the opera at the Regal Theater.

We travel and visit friends and have family gatherings mainly at our home. Family gatherings are never dull. One son Marc, born in Boston while I was in graduate school and now living in Connecticut, is an avid Red Sox fan. His brother, Mike, born in Jersey at Patterson Army Hospital, roots for the Yankees. They each have a son and daughter. Our grandchildren range in age from 11 to 23. We also like to travel and were glad to climb Machu Pichu while we still could and also happy to have toured Turkey in better times. A cruise to the Mediterranean and Adriatic was particularly enjoyable. That and doctors’ appointments keep me busy.

**What do you see as the best thing about retirement?**

Not being bound by the clock. I never understood why the traditional retirement gift was a watch. And let us not forget free parking in most Rutgers parking lots allowing me easy access to what RU offers, such as Mason Gross, the Library, the Zimmerli Museum, just to name a few.
Are there any drawbacks? Do you have any regrets?

So far, so good. Just wish my body was 40 years younger and I hadn’t smoked for 30 years.

What advice would you give to others who are planning to retire?

Everyone has their own dreams to live. Now is the time to do it. My friends remember my advising "Onward and Upward" when I ended a lecture or said good-bye.

So onward and upward!

MOVING ON!!!!

Richard Quaintance has moved on to Boulder, Colorado! His new address is: 3455 Table Mesa Drive, Apt. G165, Boulder, Colorado 80305

RETIREE ASSEMBLY MEMBERSHIP DUES

The fee for AAUP-AFT Retiree Assembly membership is $10 per year beginning each September. If you haven’t already done so, please send your check to the AAUP-AFT office at 11 Stone Street in New Brunswick to cover the year 2019-20 (sorry, cash cannot be accepted). You may also renew membership for one, two, or three years by paying $10, $20, or $30.

The AAUP-AFT faculty union subsidizes the Retiree Assembly at the rate of $20 per member who joins by November of any given calendar year.

Below is a list of organizations and their contact information including web sites you may find useful

AAUP Emeriti Assembly
11 Stone Street
New Brunswick, NJ 08901-1113
Phone: 732-964-1000
Fax: 732-964-1032
E-mail: aauplegals@rutgersaaup.org
http://www.rutgersaaup.org/Emeriti-Assembly

RWJMS Retired Faculty Association
http://rwjms.rutgers.edu/faculty/index.html#

Retired Faculty & Staff Association
http://retirement.rutgers.edu/

Rutgers Retiree Benefits
http://retirement.rutgers.edu/retiree-benefits/