

INTERVIEW with GROVER C. STEPHENS

September 18, 1973

McCULLOCH: We're off. Now, the first question is, what attracted you to come to Irvine?

STEPHENS: Oh, I think Ed Steinhaus was the principal attraction. I was tremendously attracted to him when I came out and met him, but I think that I was ready to move from the University of Minnesota. I don't know whether other people have mentioned this as something of interest in the history of the campus or not, but my impression was that for a variety of personal reasons Irvine attracted a number of people who were restless where they were, who felt that they wanted freedom to express their ideas, and, as much as being attracted to Irvine, they were simply ready to leave where they were. It certainly was true for me.

McCULLOCH: And I think for a number of people, too, it was a combination of the challenge of starting something new and the reaction also of being a little tired of what--

STEPHENS: I think one of the implications of this, Irvine did not quite become an attractive place for neurotic dissident faculty members across the board, and yet I think we probably had a larger share of people who were unhappy at their previous institutions than would a typical campus that was mature and was simply replacing faculty. I think that played a substantial role in some of our preliminary discussions. I think all of us were anxious to avoid mistakes of overformalization of programs. We all felt that this was a fresh start and we could by-pass a good bit of the administrative complexity and the tight regulations that had characterized the places where many of us had taught before.

McCULLOCH: I think you're dead right. Now, Steve, as I remember it, you came on board around about--was it August of '64 or thereabouts?

STEPHENS: It was late August of '64. I don't recall participating in a single definitive conference from which arose the Irvine Plan. There was about a three- or four-day series of meetings.

McCULLOCH: Was that the one in October from which came the purple book?

STEPHENS: Right. That's the one that I remember. And I guess my earlier comments relate really to that. My sense of that meeting was that everyone was most anxious to keep things simple, to keep the stated requirements for the student program to a very minimum, to take the point of view that the students were adults and ought to be given freedom of choice, the whole concept of the advisor as advisor rather than monitor, the attempt to keep programs as flexible as possible, to be sure that students did not require signatures, that the red tape in their programs was minimized. All this was very prominent, particularly expressed by Jack Peltason, as I recall a matter of--

McCULLOCH: That's right.

STEPHENS: There were no substantial disagreements that I could detect from anyone.

McCULLOCH: Yes, I think that's substantially right. I thought in a way that Jim March represented the more radical thinking and, say, Bernie Gelbaum the more conservative thinking, and everything fell sort of in between, and we all, as you say, agreed. I was impressed, as you were too, at the spirit of, well, let's not make the general education requirements too complicated, let's not have everybody take English, say--something like that.

STEPHENS: This was the origin of the 6-3-3, and it was conceived of as flexible. I think we agreed less than we thought we did at that conference. I guess my memory is that the most conservative group in those discussions actually turned out to be people in the languages, and they framed major programs where more than half of the students' work had to be taken in their particular department. I remember being genuinely startled at one program-- I've forgotten which language it was--where 27 courses out of the 45 were taken in that particular department, and nobody has that kind of monopoly on virtue. So if that could be construed as the burden of what was going on, then clearly what was getting through to the person who proposed that as a particular program was not the same thing that was getting through to Steinhaus and to me. We made the biology program quite limited.

McCULLOCH: Well, interestingly, I can explain that. Seymour Menton, who was head of Foreign Languages, was not present at those meetings. He was in Kansas, and I recruited him, and he couldn't move, so he fed in his ideas, and I can remember that he acceded to the--

STEPHENS: Yes, he did. I had forgotten that it was Seymour--I remembered its being a German program.

McCULLOCH: It was, but Seymour was in charge of it.

STEPHENS: Right.

McCULLOCH: Are there any other impressions, Steve, that you have of that first series of conference meetings where we put together the purple book and sent it out; for example, the credit by examination, the notion of the pass-fail at that time it was called?

STEPHENS: The only other impression I have, Sam--I have given my impression of the general tone, which was an attempt to get away from red tape. I think in retrospect it's a pity that we didn't, in the meeting itself, do that a great deal more formally. Subsequently we've encountered,

I think, repeatedly situations where it would have been nice to recapture in some considerable detail the language and the spirit of those discussions. And the notes that were kept of those discussions are simply totally inadequate, so that I think there is now no way of really being sure that my recollection of that tone is an accurate one, rather than a personal observation and a projection.

McCULLOCH: Yes. One of my greatest disappointments was that notes were not really being taken, and I didn't realize it. Florence Arnold was supposed to be keeping the notes, and she didn't, and they never were kept, so all we have now is a whole series of people's recollections, some of them taped earlier than others; for example, I did tape Jack before he left, and I did tape Bernie Gelbaum before he left. But I've simply not got around to doing it, and I don't mind, in a sense, because I think as you look back, sometimes you can see it more clearly, sometimes your emotions or what has happened clouds your vision, but nevertheless I'm doing it this way. And I hope to get everybody taped this year.

Now, about your own program, Steve--you headed up the program in organismic and cell biology. Did you find the Universitywide administration regulations helpful to you, or did you have any problems in setting up your program?

STEPHENS: No, I really had no problems, but I think that was principally because of Ed Steinhaus. Ed, of course, came from Berkeley and was simply a past master at understanding and operating within the University of California system, so the effect was that he really protected me from any impact that the Universitywide regulations might have had, partly directly, simply by being able to by-pass them in various subtle ways, more frequently by carefully explaining to me in advance what was going to be necessary. To the extent that they had any impact on me, of course it was negative.

The hiring procedure at the University of California is a very deliberate one, and I did not personally encounter any situations where I was pressed for time and failed to make an appointment because it took so long to get appointments processed. But I did have to be very careful to explain to the people I recruited how the system operated and that after they and I had reached some tentative understanding the formalization of this would be a matter of months before the appropriate committees could be appointed, review the materials, act, and the budgetary authorities--

McCULLOCH: And you did not lose anyone this way?

STEPHENS: I didn't lose anyone. Well, I think it was due to the support of Ed and Ed's care in making me understand the system, because I could start in my recruiting by explaining to a potential candidate, which I did in fairly elaborate detail, what the mechanisms were, and I tried to put this in a positive light, so that I explained that this was the University of California system of quality control and that, after all, none of them really would be interested in coming to Irvine "College"; they were interested in Irvine because it was part of the UC system. And what that meant for us as a new campus was that we had to follow this pattern of recruitment. And everyone that I really wanted to get understood that--I was able to convey that to them--and so I did not personally have any trouble.

McCULLOCH: Wouldn't you say, possibly the excitement of the program itself attracted them?

STEPHENS: I would think that's so. All the regulations meant to me, really, was that I had to take these additional steps, so I can't say they were strongly negative at that point; subsequently they proved to be; subsequently we did have problems, trying to move quickly on appointments, and we lost people at a later stage of our development, but not in those early days.

McCULLOCH: That's very interesting; I'm very interested to hear that. Now, if you had the power to change some of the procedures, what would you do? I ask people, if they've lost a person and so on, if they had to do it over again, what could be changed in order not to lose a person.

STEPHENS: Sam, I don't know. I guess I really am a believer in the faculty involvement by way of review committees in the appointment process. I suppose I would try to speed up the process, and yet that's very difficult to do when you are depending on your colleagues simply to drop what they are doing and get together and review materials and make a recommendation. I think the only thing I would hope to do would be to find some more rapid and effective method of communication between the ad hoc committees and the people who are proposing the appointments.

The present system, where this is supposed to proceed under a nominal burden of confidentiality so that the Chairman is not supposed to know who the faculty members are who are reviewing his proposal, means that all communications have to be channeled through the Academic Vice Chancellor's office. That's a long process. There is information loss, and in many respects it's a convenient fiction, because a fair share of the time you know perfectly well who the people are on the committee. And it's just a plain inconvenience not to be able to talk to them directly, and I don't think that the men who serve on these committees are that easily intimidated by administrators, and I don't think the administrators really want to overwhelm them if they have some reasons for thinking the appointment is bad. So, streamlining that channel of communication, I think, would be helpful, but I really would not be willing to give off the academic review of new appointments--I think it's a good system, even if it is clumsy.

McCULLOCH: I think that's a good answer. Now, turning to the Academic Senate, because we set up our own UCI Senate and I think Jack Peltason and

Abe Meldren and Creel Froman (I think Peltason probably withdrew from it, and I've forgotten who the three were who drew it up)--how well do you think we set up our UCI Senate? We did it in the first year, you remember, and it didn't come into operation until the end of the first year--our first year, actually, of teaching.

STEPHENS: You're referring to the initial organization--

McCULLOCH: Of our own UCI Senate.

STEPHENS: Initially I think we did it naively, but we did it pretty well. We had the same kind of spirit, particularly when Peltason was influential here, the same spirit of wanting to streamline operations and minimize red tape. I remember I was the original Chairman of the Educational Policy Committee.

McCULLOCH: I remember that, yes.

STEPHENS: And Jack would meet with us repeatedly to urge upon us concentration on essentials and minimizing concerns with particular persons and so forth, and I think the spirit in which that was done was excellent. Almost immediately we began to run into technical problems with the Universitywide Senate. And, of course, after two or three years, it was downhill all the way until now we are virtually paralyzed.

McCULLOCH: We tried to get these areas--what are they called, not an exemption, there's a word for it?

STEPHENS: Variance?

McCULLOCH: Variances--we repeatedly failed to get these variances which we asked for.

STEPHENS: Oh, I think that's partly it, but I think it's partly just a change of us as a campus for reasons I'm not altogether clear about. But I thought the initial organization of the Senate went forward very well.

McCULLOCH: And we discussed very openly, for example the Medical School, for example athletics, for example whether we should have or not have a College of Arts, Letters, and Sciences. We had very substantive debates, with everybody coming.

STEPHENS: Yes.

McCULLOCH: And faculty were not frightened of what other people might think. I recall Steve Shapiro's getting up and arguing why we've just got to have a College of Arts, Letters, and Sciences and why and so forth and so on.

STEPHENS: Sure. Yes, right. Well, I think that our initial organization of the Senate was in line with our original discussion that led to the Irvine Plan. It was an attempt to keep it a humane forum for discussion among colleagues.

McCULLOCH: My guess is that the polarization that took place in the winter of 1968-69 really hurt the Senate, and from that point on it never functioned as it did in the early days. People just didn't come, and we are a young faculty, and to polarize is an interesting thing when you consider what a young faculty we have at Irvine.

STEPHENS: Yes.

McCULLOCH: I think we have had only one retirement, and that's Ralph Gerard.

STEPHENS: Well, I think, of course, that the polarizing event was the discharge, or the proposed discharge, of Kent, Brannan, and Shapiro.

McCULLOCH: Right.

STEPHENS: It turned out that Kent finally was retained. I think when it happened at that point, at least my view of that (I agree with you)--I think that that particular polarizing discussion was a terribly destructive and polarizing event.



McCULLOCH: When they literally split to each side of the Science Lecture Hall.

STEPHENS: Yes, literally to each side. But I think that was a tremendously important event in our history. I think the reason it was and the reason it was so deeply divisive was traceable to our early ideas about what we could do with a new campus. And I know that in the first two or three years that I was here, as you point out, in the Senate discussions there were no distinctions between tenured and nontenured faculty members. The atmosphere was one of open discussion and completely fearless discussion with no thought that such openness could, in any way, have an impact on the ultimate decision as to whether an individual would stay or not. Those considerations were simply set to one side.

McCULLOCH: Yes.

STEPHENS: Then quite suddenly, with the proposed firing of Kent, Brannan, and Shapiro, we had a case arise where men were being let go, and it wasn't clear that they were being let go because they were incompetent in their jobs. And the suspicion suddenly arose, whether correctly or not, that the combination of outspokenness, abrasiveness, life style, our relations with colleagues was in fact a major factor, or at least potentially so, in these decisions. And as this got discussed, this became more and more deeply divisive and finally led, as you say, to literally lining people up on the two sides of the room in almost equal numbers, and it's sometimes described as a split of the junior faculty versus the senior faculty. That's perhaps 80 percent true. However you interpret that whole episode, the campus has never been the same since. I now know essentially no one in any of the areas except biological sciences; by contrast, I was on reasonably friendly relations with, I think, people in every major discipline prior to that split.

McCULLOCH: I wonder also though, Steve, whether it wasn't also due to the fact that we were getting bigger, too, that we had organized into schools rather than a College of Arts, Letters, and Sciences, that we didn't have a Faculty Club that really had a large membership where people of different disciplines could sit down at the table and talk and exchange views, or any other social or even intellectual occasion such as a colloquium or something whereby we could all get together and talk. I rather think it is a combination of all those things. But, most of all, I really think that, believe it or not--and I was in favor of the organization of the schools--I think we became too separate.

STEPHENS: I think all those are factors. That's a later point in your items.

McCULLOCH: Yes, right.

STEPHENS: But there's one other thing that is perhaps implied in what you said--I think as much as anything else the mere fact that we had been in existence for four years was important, because we really had to face at that point the whole set of problems relating to promotion to tenure of the young men we had brought aboard in 1965, and whatever we might have thought in our naivete the situation would be, it was clear at that point that we had to make real decisions. I think many of us were just not prepared for that. We had put off thinking about that and felt, I am sure very unrealistically, that we could have a kind of nonjudgmental community, and in many respects that's what we did have for two or three years. This has been repeated in the history of the University of California. The same sort of situation occurred on the Riverside campus where initially they thought of themselves as the Amherst of the West, and they felt that, if they designed a strong undergraduate teaching program--

McCULLOCH: I think it's Swarthmore, because Swarthmore is coeducational. Amherst is just men!

STEPHENS: All right, all right, I'll buy that! And they attempted to do that, and they acquired a reputation along precisely those lines, but after they had been at it for a few years, when their young people began to come up for promotion to tenure, again the UC system demanded that there be input from other campuses, and naturally the response of these outside members was, well, where is the evidence of scholarly activity for these people? And it was a very disillusioning thing to realize that the ground rules were, in fact, the same.

McCULLOCH: They had a double problem, too, Steve.. They had that happening, and then they were told by Clark Kerr (they didn't elect, they were told) you are going to become a general campus, you've got to put in graduate work, and here they were recruited to be Swarthmore of the West, the undergraduate teacher, the small institution going to not more than 2,500, and then they were told, you are going up to 27,000 or certainly 20,000. And so they had a double blow. A lot of people came up to tenure at the same time, and then they were told, you are going to be graduate teachers-- you have to be graduate teachers.

STEPHENS: Yes. Well, I guess what I was going to say, we certainly did not encounter that situation nearly as drastically. There was never any doubt that we were a general campus, that we were undertaking scholarly activity, that we were going to have a major graduate program. And yet, the fact remains, I think, that partly because we were expanding very rapidly, partly because the young people that we brought aboard did not have to be judged in the first two or three years, we went through a period from perhaps 1965 through 1967 of almost an agape, a nonjudgmental community of scholars where at least one could set to one side and hold in abeyance the

ultimate judgments that had to be made. And I think much of the emotional response to the discharge of Brannan and Shapiro came from the reluctance to face up to the realities of having to make these judgments. I don't have any bitter feelings about the events in that period, except I guess I do feel conscious of my own naivete, and I do have the feeling that in retrospect, as a community of scholars, we behaved with a remarkable lack of emotional balance. That clouded the episode.

McCULLOCH: I don't think any of us who reflected on it and reflected on the effect of it were very happy.

Let's change to a more positive area. In what areas do you think you have had the greatest successes? I'm thinking of your department you've built, the program you've built, your own individual research, your department as it is now. How have things worked out?

STEPHENS: Oh, the department that I built made me very proud and pleased; I really can't think of any major mistakes that I made. And that was not, I think, primarily my fault; I think that reflected the guidance from Steinhaus; it reflected a lot of consultation with the other department Chairmen. At the time I resigned the chairmanship--

McCULLOCH: What year was that, Steve?

STEPHENS: '69.

McCULLOCH: '69?

STEPHENS: Yes.

McCULLOCH: June of '69?

STEPHENS: Yes. At the time I resigned, we had a very open, very democratic department. I think everybody felt that he could express himself freely with no concerns about retribution or discrimination following from this. Subsequent to that, I can't imagine that we could have attracted anybody better than Howard Schneiderman, and yet the communication in that

school and in the department has, I think, badly decayed. And I don't know that it is Howard's fault--it now is simply a larger organization, and it would be a superhuman task.

Steinhaus was literally open at all times to everyone in that organization from assistant secretaries up to his department Chairmen, and how he managed to do that I have no idea. Certainly one of the things that made it possible was the relatively small size of the unit. Schneiderman simply physically cannot do that, and he is not merely Dean--he is department Chairman, he is head of the Center for Pathobiology, he is head of the Developmental Biology Laboratory, so he obviously has to organize his time very tightly, delegate decisions, make policy statements and policy judgments, and simply assume that these will be appropriately diffused outward and assume basically that his faculty is not going to get paranoid, and, of course, faculty members simply are by nature paranoid, so that doesn't work as well as it should, and yet things are very good. But, in my view, much of the personal communication, which I spent a lot of time with and in which Ed set the example for me and was simply superhuman in implementing, has now disappeared. And the result is, I think, considerably more isolation within the school.

McCULLOCH: Do you have many meetings with the whole school?

STEPHENS: Very few.

McCULLOCH: Like once a quarter or twice a quarter?

STEPHENS: Oh, theoretically, we try to have one once a quarter. I think, in truth, we might have them twice a year, and when we do have them it isn't clear that we get anything substantial done, so they don't amount to much.

McCULLOCH: You'll be interested--when I was Acting Chairman last year (one year), I think I worked harder than when I was Dean, because I had 17

or 18 people plus secretaries, plus TAs, and you're getting up into the 20s and 30s, and I constantly worked with them, and I constantly met with them, and I really worked tremendously hard, and I realize what an amount of time you put in, if you want to have a smooth-working department.

STEPHENS: Well, you certainly have to get around physically and talk to every faculty member for some reasonable period of time. Every couple of weeks you simply have to go in and--with some people more than others--but you have to stay in contact. But that has dissipated.

The other things you asked about--I'm quite tickled with the way my research program has developed. This was one of the things that brought me to Irvine. I've wanted to be at a seacoast--my own research program made that very attractive, and in fact it turned out that it has developed very well so that I'm very pleased about it.

I don't want to seem too negative about the department--I'm not, it just seems to me that the immediacy of communication no longer is there. Certainly, in terms of communication with other segments of the campus, that's down to practically zero, and it's based entirely now on personal acquaintance, and there are no mechanisms for throwing me into contact with the people in the humanities or the social sciences or physical sciences. The squash court is the only one, and unless you can play squash--

McCULLOCH: Or possibly in an ad hoc committee.

STEPHENS: Right, yes.

McCULLOCH: Are there any areas in which, I said here, you have had the least success or where things didn't work out? Well, you've said that you felt you didn't make any major mistakes.

STEPHENS: No, not in building the department. If you interpret that question more broadly, as I would be inclined to do, then I think we've had the least success in creating a sense of community on the campus. This was

something that we did a lot of lip service to in our early discussions. It was something I think we genuinely wanted to do, and yet at every critical juncture it has been sacrificed. And much of what we were saying earlier about the relative professionalism of the school organization, the deep split that has developed in the campus, my feelings about the decay of communications in the School of Biology--all of these things to me simply indicate our failure in creating a community even among the scholars on the campus who are alone a community that would embrace the faculty, the graduate students, the staff, and the students in toto--it just doesn't exist. That's our big failure.

McCULLOCH: Yes, I think that's a fact. It's something we ought to try to do something about, and I don't know what we can do. You'd be interested to know that Julian Feldman wrote a memo to the Chancellor, saying that maybe he was getting sentimental and old, but he wanted to have all the founders of this campus get together (it's a year and a half, you know, to 1965-75)--and we ought to bring them all together and maybe add people like John Galbraith and Ivan Hinderaker, who were here in the beginning (of course, Jack Peltason can't come), and have a three- or four- or five-day conference and talk about what we thought we wanted to do and what has actually transpired and what we might do to change things. We might even prepare some papers, might even put them together. He wrote this about a month ago to Dan. I don't know what the response is, but I would favor that. I'd like to have us get together and face up to things we did achieve and didn't achieve.

STEPHENS: Well, I don't know, Sam. You're the historian.

McCULLOCH: You can't put the clock back, I know that.

STEPHENS: It seems to me that tapes like this ought to be fascinating. If nothing else, they would show a pattern of retrospective falsification of reality.

McCULLOCH: Yes.

STEPHENS: I remember riding back on a plane with Jack from some conference or other--

McCULLOCH: Jack Peltason?

STEPHENS: Yes, and at one point he turned to me and he said, "You know, we ought to be writing all this down. We'll never make anything out of it after it's over and done." I don't know if there ever was a point when it could have been written down. I would approve of Julian's idea. It would be fun to hear what other people thought had happened. I'm expressing my ideas.

McCULLOCH: Yes, I'm delighted. Now, what problems are unique to Irvine, I mean as you came to us and as you worked here with us, either because it's new or because it's a particular campus? What problems did you feel were so very different? You were at Minnesota, were you not?

STEPHENS: Yes. Minnesota, of course, was a huge campus. Well, let me see. The problems associated with being a new campus, I think I've said in earlier discussions some things about that. I'm not sure they were problems--I think there was a naivete, a feeling that we'd escape reality, that we could indefinitely postpone what I'd call being judgmental. That, and I think we were naive and unrealistic in our pronouncements to our early students of our intentions to create a community. We've covered all of that.

Specific to Irvine, I think many of our problems have sprung from geographical and cultural isolation; we simply are out in the middle of the chaparral. And Newport Beach has many pleasant things about it, but a cultural center it is not. And our students are isolated physically; they are isolated culturally; we have not created a community for them, and it seems to me that that's one of the predominant characteristics of the campus.



McCULLOCH: I think that's very well stated. I think that Jack Hoy apparently wants to try to develop more of a cultural center and something on the weekends that will keep the students interested and not wanting to dash home and just leave the place and so on.

STEPHENS: Yes. Well, a side comment about that--I guess I have been disappointed, though I understand why it had to happen, but I have been disappointed at the professional attitude of our School of Fine Arts. Given a different level of support and a different orientation, they might have contributed very strongly toward such a community. I can understand why Clayton feels he can't do that, and yet it's a pity.

McCULLOCH: I think you're dead right. I haven't talked with Clayton yet, but I feel that with this budget squeeze, when he really might have expanded and added to his faculty and they in turn would have given performances and done things, they felt they couldn't. And when they wanted to put their graduate program in, and which they did, but at an enormous cost--

STEPHENS: Yes, yes, yes. Well, the faculty is overworked. I guess what I was alluding to is what is probably the necessary policy of restricting their courses essentially to their majors and choosing their majors really by professionally oriented criteria.

McCULLOCH: That's another problem, because in the 6-3-3 there are really very few courses open.

STEPHENS: Well, a kid who wants to learn to dance can't do it here, that's all there is to it.

McCULLOCH: That's about right. Well, what would you do differently, if you had to do it all over again, Steve? That leads into our next question, and maybe--

STEPHENS: Sam, I really don't know.

McCULLOCH: Well, the question is, do you like--I remember your position at the time, you preferred a College of Arts, Letters, and Sciences, and you begged us, I remember, in a very good speech in which you indicated that professionalization could result if you had schools or colleges (we were calling them colleges at the time)--at least the faculty would meet and so on, and the barriers that grow up between departments were not as serious in your mind as those that grow up between these divisions which would be called schools or colleges.

STEPHENS: Yes.

McCULLOCH: Now, if you had it to do over again, would you have argued more persuasively and maybe--although I don't know whether we would have. My position was the other way; I thought that the schools or colleges were the answer. I'm not convinced that I was right. I do meet quite a bit with some of the biologists--I see them in the University Club, and I go talk with them, and I even am friends with some of them, but I miss the time when I knew every one of those people.

STEPHENS: Yes. Oh, I still feel very strongly, as I did then, Sam. I argued for that as effectively as I could, but I think the things working against me were the obvious difficulties and deficiencies of the scheme that has such a diversity of department Chairmen reporting to a single Dean, and those are real problems, and I felt that those were not as serious as the divisive potential of organizing in separate degree-granting schools. I still feel that way. I wish we had done that differently.

McCULLOCH: I think you had a lot going against that proposal: Number one, programs like Jim March's and Clayton Garrison's almost depended upon being separate schools or colleges; then you had Clark Kerr coming and literally giving a talk and saying, "Now look, Berkeley doesn't have it, see how big they've become, and we can't manage this liberal arts college, and don't make the mistake we made."

STEPHENS: Yes.

McCULLOCH: And then you had the Deans themselves--all of us were convinced at the time that this was the thing to do, and it made a great difference, I think, to this University.

STEPHENS: Yes.

McCULLOCH: Are there any experiences in the early years that we've missed that you think about?

STEPHENS: No, I don't think there is anything that I could add that would contribute to the historical record of the campus.

What I would like to say is, I guess I would like to express regret about the passing of what was, at that time, a real sense of community. I genuinely miss not seeing my colleagues from other disciplines. I don't think that that route can be retraced by expedients like a stronger Faculty Club, a change in organization. I think our history has changed us so that that can't be recovered, and yet the days when it was possible to walk in and chat casually with literally everyone on the campus are very, very attractive in that respect. And I suppose what I want to say is that I really am grateful for the (about) three years that that lasted; it was a remarkably broadening and wonderful experience. I'm sorry it's gone.

McCULLOCH: Yes. Well, we had the experience--with us, you see, in this one building in which you're sitting, we had humanities, social sciences, and fine arts, and the Graduate School of Administration; they were all in one.

STEPHENS: Yes.

McCULLOCH: Over in your building, you had all the sciences and, in addition, engineering.

STEPHENS: Yes.

McCULLOCH: And I suppose, inevitably, when the Engineering Building was built and the Computer Science School Building was built, Information Science, and the Fine Arts Village was built, and the Social Sciences, I think those events just took the people away. Now, what can we do? I've been trying to push the University Club, and it has been increasing in numbers, and we are going to get an extra trailer.

It is fun to sit down with about three or four different disciplines and chat and really have an interesting discussion. It doesn't always happen, but it does happen some of the time. But I wonder if there is something--we stand at 7,000 students; we stand at about (what is it?) 300 faculty (I've forgotten the figures)--

STEPHENS: I think it's more than 400 now.

McCULLOCH: Is it? With the Medical School, I suppose it is.

STEPHENS: Yes. Oh, I don't know, Sam. Maybe the change is as much in me as it is in the campus, and yet I don't think that's totally true. Perhaps it is no more than that it was a small group. Of course, if you had the experience here in this building with the units that you mentioned--if you go back to 1964 we were all in those two temporary (I shouldn't call them temporary), those two buildings over on what is now the Receiving Center.

McCULLOCH: Well, that was the most exciting year of my life, because literally under one roof we had the Chancellor, Vice Chancellors, all the Deans, department Chairmen, architects, and Student Affairs, so that we would be in and out of each other's offices, and we would have that big meeting room where we all met, and it was the best year! But you have to admit that, if you don't have students and you don't have faculty, you have an unusual situation!

STEPHENS: That's surely true! Well, I guess the other thing that I would like to say is that I really think that we have done very well. I think our major problem is the lack of the sense of community, but certainly we share that with just lots and lots of other institutions, and in many respects I think we have done about as well as we could have realistically hoped. If we didn't do everything we wanted to do, maybe that's because we were not realistic.

McCULLOCH: Well, thank you very much, Steve. This has been very pleasant. I hope to have it typed up, and I'll show you the transcript when it's done.

What I'd like to say, Steve, is that I've always admired, I think, the biology program maybe more than any of the others, maybe because I understood it better. I had some problems understanding the social sciences and what they were trying to do with this ultracomputer, ultramathematical, ultrastatistical--but I felt a special kinship to Ed and to you four Chairmen and to the program, and I think that we do have an image. We lack an image in general out there, but I think that the biology is called the Irvine Program, and there isn't a place I've been to that doesn't know about the Irvine Program in the biological sciences.

STEPHENS: Yes.

McCULLOCH: And now that you're coming to the fore, for example, history used to be the number one major at Stanford; last year it's gone down, slipped to four, and biological science is number one. The American Council on Education got out a report about six months ago--biological science is the number one choice.

STEPHENS: Yes. Well, Ed was right at the forefront of the events that led to that. He was a member of a couple of national groups that discussed biological curricula, and his idea of a core program, his idea of the

organization of the school, and I think his guidance of his four Chairmen and repeated conversations with them--all these are factors. Another thing that Ed did--he was an astonishingly good public relations man, and he spent a lot of time simply speaking to high schools, to community groups, explaining to them what his vision of biology was.

McCULLOCH: Yes, and I did that, too, and I used to run into him often.

STEPHENS: Yes. And I think you're right. I'm startled to hear from our undergraduates. I teach a little seminar-format course for freshmen, and they will inform me that up and down the state is that the biology program at Irvine is superior. I think, in fact, we are overestimated regarding our program.

McCULLOCH: Well, I think as an undergraduate program I had a question asked me about a month ago by my own son, who was interested in biological sciences, and so I went into it in great detail--Davis versus San Diego versus Irvine--and there wasn't any doubt that Irvine around about the state had the best undergraduate program. Then when it comes to a more specialized kind of program, San Diego apparently has one particular branch--

STEPHENS: San Diego is very strong on molecular biology.

McCULLOCH: Is it cell? Molecular.

STEPHENS: Yes.

McCULLOCH: Okay. Well, that was it. But I was very interested. I was interested in the notion of what people out there--what is the image of Irvine? Well, we come through at different schools.

STEPHENS: Yes.

McCULLOCH: Some come out, and some don't.

STEPHENS: Yes.

McCULLOCH: Yes, okay. Well, I just wanted to get that on the record.