

INTERVIEWEE: SAMUEL C. MC CULLOCH
UCI Historian

INTERVIEWER: Spencer Olin

DATE: August 7, 1990

SO: This is an interview being conducted by Spencer Olin with Sam McCulloch on August 7, 1990. Sam, let me ask you what attracted you to come to UCI.

SM: Well, Spence, that's a very good question, which I always ask everybody in this interviewing. I had two offers at the time. I was at San Francisco State where I'd been Dean of the College, and one was to go back to Rutgers as a Dean, where I'd been for thirteen years, and the other was to come to UCI. And I figured that if I was going to make any mistakes they'd be my own here, but if I went to Rutgers, they've been making mistakes since 1776 and they'd accumulated quite a bit. Secondly, I knew the UC system. I got a Ph.D. from UCLA. I taught summer session once at UCLA and I was well aware of the system. Thirdly, Sally's folks lived in southern California, mother, father, sisters and her brother, so it would be nice for her personally. And then when Hinderaker visited me in July of 1963, he gave a very, very exciting picture of what Irvine could amount to and was. And then, on September 3 or 4, 1963, there was a Time magazine article with William Periera's picture on the front, and it talked about his planning a university, and around the university a city, and he was also actually doing some work on Catalina Island, too.

But the exciting part was to put a university in the center of a town. Then I knew if I went recruiting, if I did you, for example, I could tell you that your salary scale would be the UC. You would be a University of California man, the same salary scale, same sabbatical system, same pension system, same library support, same promotional system and research support. And when I weighed that against Rutgers, I just felt there was nothing to it, so I decided to come here.

SO: Well, great. Having made that decision, you were participating in a very important responsibility to determine academic programs at UCI. And the decision was made to develop not a college of arts and letters and sciences here, but a system based on individual schools. You were the Dean of the School of Humanities. Now, one of the schools, Social Sciences, decided not to departmentalize, but you decided to do so in the School of Humanities. Why was that?

SM: Yes. Well, let me correct you here. We were appointed as divisional deans, the way UCLA has four divisional deans, and their school of Fine Arts was quite separate at UCLA. Well, there were four divisions, and we were called divisional deans and we were under this Letters, Arts and Science. But we could organize the way we wanted to. And Jim March simply said his program didn't . . . He didn't want to have any departments at all, that he felt that he would have research clusters. And then he had this ultra-mathematical, ultra-

statistical, ultra-model-building kind of a program, so he wanted it that way.

I, on the other hand, tried to persuade him differently. I said, "Look, Jim, our graduate program is going to be big. We're the University of California, we're going to 27,500 by 1990 and you should have departments. You'll have to have them eventually." And I made the decision immediately to have four departments. I had a Department of History, a Department of English and Comparative Literature. Now, Hazard didn't want that, or he said let's try to have . . .

SO: That's Hazard Adams.

SM: Hazard Adams, the first Chair of English, that I appointed. He said, "Let's not have English and Comparative Literature. Let's just have English and then Comparative Literature will be interdisciplinary; we'll have a committee running it." Then I had Foreign Languages and Literatures and then I had Philosophy. I wanted to have Classics but I couldn't find an immediate Classics person or persons. So my decision . . .

SO: (inaudible) was part of that initial . . .

SM: That was my initial decision to set up four.

SO: Sam, I think you've mentioned three. Was history one of the four?

SM: Yes, History was the first.

SO: All right.

SM: (inaudible) it didn't matter. Alphabetically, it's English, you know, Philosophy and so on. There were four departments, and I had to go find four chairmen. Now, I proved to be correct, as far as Social Science was concerned, because Willie Schonfeld has now completed the departmentalization of his school. He got the Dean of Harvard to come in to check it through. The Dean of Harvard got another man from Harvard, plus Yale, I think it was. And they did a very fine job. I learned this in my interview with Willie.

SO: Yes.

SM: But that could have been saved if Jim had started off with departments. I might say Biology had four departments.

SO: Well, you turned out to be the prescient one on that issue, I think. How well did your recruiting go in those early years to staff the senior people in those four initial departments?

SM: Well, that was my responsibility. If you want to hang anything on me, it's those four people. All of us went all around the country.

SO: We, meaning you and Jack Peltason?

SM: No, Jack Peltason wasn't with us yet. Jack came on board on July 1, 1964. I was there in February. I was working like mad and Dean Steinhaus was working like mad to get his chairmen, and we went everywhere. We went to Harvard, Yale, Princeton, Columbia, North Carolina, Duke. I went to Chicago first, as a matter of fact, to get the ideas of Alan Simpson

who was their dean then. He later became the president of Vassar College. Alan Simpson was an English historian. He gave me some good ideas in Chicago. And I went to Wisconsin. You know, I really went . . . Of course, I naturally went to Berkeley and I went to UCLA. So I came up with the four appointments: Hazard Adams was at Michigan State; Seymour Menton, for Foreign Languages, was at Kansas. I went to Kansas, of course, looking for people. And Sherry Rowland came from Kansas and Chancellor Murphy of UCLA came from Kansas. He was Dean of the Medical School there. And then Philosophy was Abe Meldon, who was at the University of Washington, Seattle, and myself.

SO: And Henry Meyer.

SM: And Henry Cord Meyer. Henry Cord Meyer from Pomona. And that was my initial effort at recruiting. Then I think I have a question here . . .

SO: Well, did you feel too prescribed by the university-wide regulations as you went about this recruiting?

SM: Well, I don't think I did, really. The only thing it did, Spence, was to slow an appointment down. But by having an ad hoc committee confidential from other campuses and meeting them outside UC, I think we avoided mistakes. Once in awhile we'd get turned down by an ad hoc committee, and I wasn't going to buck it. I think it was a good system.

SO: What help did you receive from the advisory committee, of which John Galbraith of UCLA was then the Chair?

SM: Oh, they were very helpful. John Galbraith left halfway through in 1964. He went to San Diego as Chancellor of San Diego, so we had Hugh Swenenberg of the English Department up at UCLA. Those people . . . Gleckner was from Riverside, and Carl Eckert was from San Diego, and Kennedy was from Santa Barbara, I think. And those people would come maybe once in six months, but we would mail the stuff to them. Because they, you know, acted as a budget committee. They would decide what the level should be and they acted as a committee to approve administrators. In other words, I was approved first [as professor] by an ad hoc committee from who knows where. Except I found later, George Mowry told me he was the chairman. He was from UCLA. But Galbraith's committee was very helpful.

SO: The advisory committee.

SM: The advisory committee. They would attend [meetings] occasionally. For instance, we talked about curriculum, and they helped us. This was Clark Kerr's idea, by the way.

SO: Yes.

SM: Santa Cruz and San Diego also had individual committees.

SO: What memories do you have of the large conference here at UCI held in August 1984 to layout the curriculum, which was soon to be described in the so-called "Purple Book"? And did you

agree with the breadth requirement established then of the 6-3-3?

SM: Oh, well, that's a great question. Here about fifteen of us were responsible for drawing up the entire program. Without faculty, without students, here we were alone. And the memory . . . I have to give you this: I asked that question. The reason for the length of the questions here is you're giving me two interviews. I should have had one in 1974, when the first phase of my interviewing was done.

SO: Yes.

SM: But I never did, and this is doing it both. Now, I asked that same question to all the people: What memories did you have? because we did not take minutes!

SO: Oh, really?

SM: Oh, I was sick. I was so busy thinking that I didn't think that we should have had A, a tape recorder, and B, a secretary. Florence Arnold was the secretary to Ivan Hinderaker and it was . . . So it was an exciting time. I think there were maybe eighteen. Jack Peltason was the Chair. Dan [Aldrich] would come in and out. Talking about in and out, it was the funniest thing. We'd be in the middle of some very serious thing, there's a call from Rome or there's a call from Harvard. There's a call for so-and-so. Dean So-and-so, please take the call. We were recruiting, you see. I called some fellow at the University of Texas who was away. I went

to Texas, by the way, that's where I got Keith Nelson. But I wanted another person, who had gone to France, and he called me from France. (chuckling)

I think we tried to be innovative within the University of California system. We didn't want to be stodgy. We thought up, for example, the Pass-Fail. Now that was something new.

SO: Which we still have today.

SM: Yes, we have Pass-Not Pass, they changed it.

SO: Yes.

SM: But it was Pass-Fail, and it was to encourage adventuresomeness. Let the person outside his School, say, Humanities, or say, outside of, say, Biology, would take a real program, say, in Linguistics or we would take a real program in Biology with labs and the whole thing. It wouldn't be Biology for Humanities, it would be a Biology course. And they would get Pass-Fail or Pass or Not-Pass, and we still have it. We have, I think, one a quarter or something like that, I've forgotten.

We thought of the idea of courses, not units. There might be five units for foreign languages, or even six. There might be three. But the course unit was worth four and you had to have forty-five courses to graduate, four courses a . . .

SO: Four courses a quarter, but one of the three quarters out of the twelve could be at a reduced three courses.

SM: That's right. You've got it, you have it. And you were the advisor to help all the new students understand these things. Graduate seminars we thought up. We would have liked to have handled things a little differently than some of the formal ways of doing it.

Now, as for the 3-3-6, this was the general education. And I'm afraid it was pretty much of a log-rolling political decision. I wanted Science. No matter what, they had to have it. Now, if you have a 3-3-6, three courses in one school, three in another and six in a third, you can't evade a science. You can either take six or three, but you can't evade it. I wanted that and, well, we kicked it around a lot, and I'm afraid that we could have done better. But it stuck for us up to 1979 [or 1980].

SO: Yes.

SM: And what developed, Spence, in that meeting--I can still see it so vividly--sort of wings developed in the center. On one radical wing out here was Jim March and a few others.

SO: Yes.

SM: I think Fred Tonge was there. He was the computer man. And Julian Feldman was there. He was an Associate Dean of Social Sciences. And there in the center was a group like myself and Steinhaus, and then on the right was rather conservative.

Bernie Gelbaum led the group. He was math. And I think Sherry Rowland was pretty much in that similar vein. So that's how we would argue back and forth and in and out, and out came the curriculum that you saw in the "Purple Book" and which you advised the students on when they came.

SO: Sam, let me insert a question here, because there was a position established in those days called Coordinator of Academic Advising, which I filled for a couple of years. The idea was to bring a faculty member on board with a half-time commitment to a department and half-time commitment to academic advising. I thought that was a wonderful idea and enjoyed filling that role for awhile, although the issue of academic advising has receded in importance, in terms of faculty involvement in subsequent years. Who made that decision to do that, to create that position? Do you remember?

SM: Yes, I recommended it very strongly.

SO: Really?

SM: Yes, I had an experience like that at Rutgers University. There was somebody they could go to, who was not in a particular department, and get the advice. Some of it came out of the Dean's office. I was Associate Dean of Arts and Sciences and I watched the counselling and I felt that was a good thing to do.

Now, I'll tell you the reason why we disbanded it, and it's all fortuitous when you think about it. We were set up with an ^{College of} Arts, Letters and Science. Jack Peltason arrived July first as Dean. In about three weeks, Ivan Hinderaker had been appointed ^{Chancellor} to go to Riverside. We lost our Academic Vice Chancellor, and so Jack said, "Well, who's going to be the new Vice Chancellor?" says Jack to Ivan. And he said, "You are."

SO: (chuckling) Oh, really?

SM: So Jack was elevated.

SO: Jack was elevated to ~~Dean~~ ^{Vice Chancellor}

SM: And the Deans got together, and there's a document in the archives which we all signed that said we'd like to keep this organization. Change the word division to school or college. Now, it took a bit of debate. It was debated in our Academic Senate in the first year. I remember the vote, something like 38 to 12, something like that, of the vote to have schools. I mean, there was a group of us.

SO: Right.

SM: And I'm not so sure that, if I had to do it all over again, I might not have thought about a Dean of Arts, Letters and Science. But Clark Kerr came by in the first year--maybe you remember his coming and speaking to the Senate--and he was in sort of dire trouble with [Governor Ronald] Reagan at the time, but he was in good cheer. And he came by and he said, "Please make these schools. Do what you're planning to do."

Because," he said, "you have no idea how many people report to the Berkeley Dean, and it doesn't work. The bigger you get, the more difficult it will be." So this, I think, the advantage of this system, Spence, is the Deans have a fair amount of power, and they don't really in other systems.

SO: Right. Well, that system has sustained itself for these twenty five years.

SM: Yes.

SO: And I'd like to think that having established an Academic Advising Office was useful in those early days, because we were taking some new, innovative paths.

SM: Yes, that's right.

SO: In those early days, did you feel the teaching course load was too slender?

SM: Yes, I'm going to answer that question, but I've forgot something.

SO: Oh.

SM: There was one thing we did that was innovative right away from the start. We met in August of 1964. We said everybody should take a course in a non-European country or countries. You know why it didn't work out? We had no one to teach it.
(chuckling)

SO: You had no one to do it.

SM: But it was a good idea.

SO: (inaudible)

SM: Now, about the load, I feel the course load would have been correct, five courses, plus one for advising, counseling.

SO: Six course load, with one course reduction for advisement.

SM: Six course load, with a one-course reduction. Now it worked at the beginning. I hope it worked. You were watching it from your vantage point in the central administration.

SO: Yes.

SM: But what happened was--as often happens--some people dog it and don't do their work and others take on more, but they're still stuck. They don't get put on six if they've dogged in their counseling and do a miserable job. I've had students come crying to me, "I've been misadvised," you know, and on and on. And when I was Dean I had them.

SO: Well, as a matter of fact, that initial course of six with one reduction for advising has now become so variable on the campus as, I think, to require some attention. This is not for the record, but I want to share a memo I sent to Bill Parker. Okay, back to the record. A seventh question, Sam, do you believe a four course load per quarter for a student was too time-consuming or demanding?

SM: No. I think that if it is done properly and you realize the limitations--you can't give them so much, they're taking three other courses--it works. Now, as a matter of fact, you well know, that some of our very bright students go up to five. But then some of the slower students drop to three.

SO: Not only slower intellectually, perhaps, but those who are working part-time outside, which many of our students do.

SM: Yes, well, that's another thing.

SO: Yes.

SM: And now we're beginning to take part-time students, which we never did.

SO: Right. How well did we do in setting up the Irvine division of the Academic Senate?

SM: Well, you can answer that as well as I, really, because you have been Chair of the Academic Senate, and a very good one. I would say that we had three . . . I'm going to work on that in the next month. I've finished my interviews, we're the last interview, except I'm working on Joan Irvine Smith. I think I can get her. I think I can.

SO: Good.

SM: Her mother, you know, was given the Extraordinarius Award [at UCI Lauds & Laurels].

SO: Right.

SM: And I'm to work through her. This is an aside, but it's interesting. Now the question was . . . ?

SO: Academic Senate.

SM: The Academic Senate. I'm going to work on this in the next month. I can't remember, but I think Abe Meldon was one of the members. Jack Peltason refused to be on it, but he would advise, he being an expert in constitutional law, you know.

Jack is a constitutional, really, American, political scientist on the constitution. So they did something that I think was correct. They introduced more democracy into the system than I think any other.

Example, as I remember it at the time, UCLA would elect . . . the whole faculty would elect a committee on committees or some committee. Well, there it was, it was about five, and they would then appoint all the other committees. Whereas we decided we would elect from the entire Academic Senate, we would elect our committees. Now I think it's worked well. Do you know of any other changes when you were on the Council and listening?

SO: Well, I would say in later years we had more student participation than many other divisions of the Academic Senate, to the extent of letting students serve on our committee on academic personnel, which we believe to be quite beneficial to the operation of the Senate, which other campuses and other divisions don't.

SM: Yes, well, that came a little later, and I'd like to comment on that now. I think of all the problems, all the recommendations that came out of our troubles, shall we say, or whatever you want to call them, in the sixties and the early seventies, two were the most important. One, the students insisted, and we agreed, that they should be, as you said, on every Senate committee, including personnel, they

should be on all departmental committees, on all search committees. And I think it has worked well. I think they are as conscientious, if not more . . . And then I think the second thing was the insistence on student teaching evaluations, that all the raw material be sent through to the administration and to all academic personnel decisions. Now, I have to say I don't know whether they pay that much attention and pay more attention to the research, but I think it was a big and correct move. But that came not right away. It didn't come out of our first Academic Senate when Abe Meldon was Chairman, but it came later.

SO: Yes. Well, let me ask you a related question, Sam. In regard to the operations of the Academic Senate and your knowledge of administration at UCI, did you find university-wide administrative regulations reasonable, helpful or unreasonable and obstructive?

SM: No, they were helpful. The only form of, if you want to call it obstruction, is being slow. But then they are being deliberate, usually--I say usually. But I feel that they were useful. I thought I would give you Sherry Rowland's interview in 1974 when I asked that same question. He said . . . (reading) "The university administration, are they reasonable, helpful, obstructive? One of the things that I found," said Sherry, "when I came in the summer of 1964, coming in cold to hire a Chemistry Department from scratch,

was that it's useful to have some help. The people at San Diego, and, I think, UCLA and Riverside, were all uniformly helpful, as were the people at Cal Tech and at Berkeley."

I would say that the cooperation of the other campuses, in my view, was excellent, because he knew that they would be put on these ad hoc committees, even though he might not know . . . I think maybe the confidentiality of those days of a search committee, maybe the chairman could see it [the report].

"And the cooperation of Cal Tech, which is not a member of the system, was just as good as was the cooperation of UCLA and San Diego and Riverside. But there was nothing that I could ever detect of any kind of interference or failure to cooperate. Everybody was really extremely helpful in that respect. I thought that my contacts with the chemists at all the rest of these places was really very helpful in setting up the department."

And I'll say that I found them the same way. I would get annoyed at the slowness of it. And I think we once in awhile lost a recruit. Because those were the days when people got more than one offer, and they were sitting and waiting.

SO: Well, let's shift more specifically into the School of Humanities for awhile, and let me ask you if the School of Humanities had a problem getting an MFA in Creative Writing established?

SM: The answer is we did get one with difficulty. Let me say, first, why was History in the Humanities?

SO: Good question.

SM: Well, the answer was: I said it would be. (chuckling)

SO: Right.

SM: You know, I read an article by Jacques Barzun in 1946, and he argued that history was more a humanity than a social science. Of course, it's even more than both. It's a social science, a humanity and a few other things, too. So I put it there.

Now the problem of the MFA. The statewide system had never had an MFA in Creative Writing, and they went about to budge. They didn't want to do it, but Irvine having this tradition of innovation and wanting to do a few things a little differently. But not wanting to upset the apple cart. Finally, Hazard Adams and a couple of others went and persuaded one of the statewide committees to approve a new program.

SO: Yes. Well, it has turned out to be a very distinguished program.

SM: Very distinguished. It's the second in the country.

SO: Right. In what areas do you think you've had the greatest success as Dean of the School of Humanities and, furthermore, as an historian?

SM: Well, which question is that? Ten. Well, I'd say, as Dean first, I would say recruitment was my number one priority.

And I told my chairmen, and I think the faculty when they came, I would have to live and die on that record, because I think that was fundamental. I said this because if we didn't get the very best we'd have mediocrity--and mediocrity hates excellence--and we'd be in the soup. And we have to have a base of absolutely first-rate people. So I gave my number one efforts to recruitment. First, I worked alone and got the four chairs, then I worked with them. I was fairly emphatic about a few things. I didn't turn down many appointments coming up from the departments, but I would work with them. I would always interview with them, and I think this paid off. You think of the English . . . Murray Krieger, for instance. He turns a whole program around, a man like Murray Krieger.

SO: Yes.

SM: Secondly, we got people like Hubert. The Huberts I take responsibility for in many ways. The Huberts came from . . . One was at Illinois and the other was at San Fernando State University. They both were at Illinois. And Peter Colaclides, I take responsibility for Peter. Now Calderwood and Tolliver were big. They weren't full professors when they came down, but very quickly became tenured. They came from UCLA. And picking a Chairman is crucial. Why did I pick an assistant professor to be Chair of Classics? Answer: I go around all the country, I go to Harvard, I go to . . . North Carolina has a Classics Department of thirteen people. Nobody

who was an associate or full [professor] wanted to . . . "Me teach elementary Greek or elementary Latin? I'm not going to do that!" So I'm turned towards . . . to get a fellow who I figured would be a good chairman and who could move on up and who was a good teacher and didn't mind (inaudible). Ted Brunner went to Ohio State. I was met by Ted and he has a car with all sorts of gadgets on it. I thought we were going to take off, we had all this instrument panel. And we drove around Columbus. I'll never forget that. But you see, you pick Ted. Ted gets himself a good group. Lucy's [Berkowitz] is a very fine teacher. And we have Colaclides, and then he gets the TLG. And now we're known the whole world over, everywhere in the world, Thesaurus Linguae Graecae. Joe Lambert in Philosophy we got in the second year, as I remember, a full professor. Nagel, Bert Nagel, in German. So I feel it was recruitment . . .

SO: Arthur Marder?

SM: Arthur Marder. He was my very first appointment. I was appointed on December 13, 1963, and I get a call from John Galbraith. "Hey, Arthur Marder is going to leave Hawaii and he's going to go to Duke as a James B. Duke Professor." I said, "Wait a minute, I tried to get him at San Francisco State, but we didn't have the money a couple of years ago. Well, yes, well if we can get him," I said, "we'll get him." So he was appointed in January 1964. Now that was pretty

good. So recruitment was the first and that was, I felt, I would live or die on my record, stand and fall on those appointments.

And the second decision I made, and I think it was the right one, but some wanted more interdisciplinary courses. I said we can't do it and build up a graduate program. I've got to put in senior people, who I've just mentioned, and they don't want to do interdisciplinary work. We'll just have to let that wait for awhile. Now I know a number were disappointed and so on and tried to push me into it. But I felt--I was pretty stubborn--I said we've just got to get the best senior people.

SO: Well, Sam, let me make a comment on that, because it seems to me, once again, that turns out to have been a sound and wise decision. Because as the campus has increasingly become concerned about its graduate programs, strong departmental bases with disciplinary work has proved to be our advantage. I think we are seen as an extremely strong school at the graduate level. Social Sciences, on the other hand, is seen as an extremely weak school at the graduate level, though it has enormous numbers of undergraduates.

SM: That's right. Well, I thank you. Now, as an historian, firstly, helping to recruit. I worked with Henry and Arthur, and, then as the rest of the department came on, worked with them. Our requirements we worked out, I think, were sensible.

We had a sensible major. We had the senior seminars, which I think were very good myself, wish we still had them.

SO: We're bringing them back.

SM: Although I think the colloquia are good. Oh, good. But, you know, remember when we had the department in (inaudible), we were invariably split. We were always 3 to 2 or 6 to 4 or something. (chuckling) That's all right. It didn't bother me. But the original curriculum, as you saw in the "Purple Book," when you came on board with us from Pomona, was Henry Cord Meyer, Arthur Marder and myself.

SO: Then the four Swedes.

SM: Yes, that's right.

SO: Alan Lawson, Keith Nelson, John Jacobson and Spencer Olin.

SM: That's right. Then I was disappointed, but worked hard as an historian to get a senior United States historian. And, you know, we offered it to Carl Degler. Carl Degler came, he lectured, he got the job and Vassar put together their money. And then Stanford came at him two years later and Vassar had nothing left. They'd shot their wad. (laughter) So he went, and that would have been great to have had Carl. Then we tried Norman Graebner, you know.

SO: Norman Graebner.

SM: And Graebner went to Charlottesville where he was getting his . . . and still is getting this very, very fancy salary.

SO: Right. And we tried Michael McGiffort.

SM: Yes.

SO: And he was not approved by the budget committee.

SM: That's right, that's right.

SO: And we looked at Trevor Colborn and we looked at a number of other people. And we have finally found Jerry White.

SM: Jerry White, that's right. Who, I might say, wrote three fine books after he retired.

SO: Yes, that's right, that's right.

SM: And the other thing is I wanted to see good teaching, as an historian and working with the History Department. And I think we all did a good job, every single one of us.

SO: Yes. To this day, our department, I think, has a very good reputation as a teaching department.

SM: I think so, and I'm very interested that Nina Dayton is filling Christine Hyerman's spot. Christine was a great teacher.

SO: Yes. Well, Sam, what about shifting to the area in which you believe you had least successes, either as a Dean or as an historian.

SM: Well, I think, as Dean, Spence, I was probably too lenient. I think I didn't run a tight ship because temperamentally I don't believe in it.

SO: Right. Well, you were democratic.

SM: I want the chairmen to do their thing, and I wanted to help them so that they wouldn't have to be messed up with all this

god damn administration--you know, these papers, and reports. Let them get ahead. Let the faculty do their stuff, and I'd take it. And I sort of took a pretty lenient democratic way.

SO: Did you feel this led the chairs to bicker among themselves too much?

SM: Some, yes.

SO: Yes.

SM: Yes, I could have kicked a couple in the behind.

SO: What about as an historian?

SM: Well, let's finish the Dean.

SO: Okay, I'm sorry.

SM: I have a few other things. I think as Dean I tried to use the students. I had a council. And the council, as we went along, the black students became important. I put on Vance Fort on my committee.

SO: Yes, a wonderful person who went on to become an international lawyer.

SM: Yes, right. I'm very proud . . . And he came . . . Our committee met at my house--I remember this--and I asked Nelson Pike to come and talk about good teaching and evaluation of teaching. Well, he didn't think too much of evaluation of teaching, Nelson didn't. And Vance, I hadn't realized how bright Vance was. He took him on.

SO: Yes, Vance will do that.

SM: Took him on, straight argument, you know. Logic for logic, you know. (chuckling) Oh, that was terrific. I supported the students in a lot of the things they wanted to do. And I think that made the faculty mad. (chuckling)

SO: So you feel that your support of students was less successful than it might have been?

SM: I think it was successful, in that I got good ideas and they felt they were having their say. I think it was disappointing that my faculty thought I was listening too much to them.

SO: Right. Well, on this issue you were a little too progressive for many of your faculty, not all; but in those days, the idea of student involvement was anathema to faculty, and for some faculty still is.

SM: And also, Spence, the evaluation was . . . Some of the faculty were insecure, some.

SO: Yes.

SM: And yet, they were fine. I think they were making a mistake.

SO: Well, again, the UCI campus in 1990 is absolutely committed to the idea of student evaluations.

SM: I think it's great. It's great.

SO: The CAP will not advance anyone, in terms of a merit increase or a promotion, without concrete evidence of student input on teaching performance.

SM: Well, I was happy when that happened, very happy.

SO: Yes.

SM: And I'll tell you why. I got some money. \$550 was given to each dean. It was unrestricted. So I thought we'd really have an evaluation of all [faculty by] the students. A teaching instrument was worked out by the students. It was agreed to by some of the faculty, but it was worked out by the students. So I used this money, and I can still hear the row some of the faculty came to me about. (chuckling)

SO: Any other less successful activities as Dean?

SM: No, I've finished Dean. Now, as an historian, I felt that I put so much effort and time . . . it slowed my research. Because I wasn't going to dog my teaching, so I kept my teaching up but the research slowed down. And I think sometimes I could have done better in recruiting. You always think, you know, where did you miss? Why in the hell didn't you get that fellow that you wanted?

SO: Yes.

SM: And as acting chairman, I did okay, if you recall.

SO: Yes.

SM: But Slavin turned out to be a disappointment.

SO: That was too bad.

SM: Yes.

SO: What about problems that you see as unique to Irvine, either because it was new or because of its particular characteristics as a campus?

SM: Well, first, let's take the question of being, I think, unique. I think it was unique because some of the deans were really trying something very new. Dean Steinhaus, in my view, is the wisest statesman we had, and his reorganization of biology departments led the country. Now many of them followed Steinhaus.

SO: And survive to this day.

SM: Survive to this day. In other words, the four departments he had, he did away with all the traditional ones, Zoology and Botany and Biochemistry and so on, and he had, you know, Organismic and Molecular and Cell and Psychobiology.

SO: And Environmental (inaudible).

SM: Yes, Environmental and . . . What was it called?

SO: Ecological or something?

SM: Yes, that's (inaudible).

SO: Again, very advanced.

SM: Very advanced, yes. Population and Environmental Biology.

SO: Right.

SM: Now, the biggest change was putting Psychobiology with [the School of Biological Sciences] . . . That was the great decision. And you'll be interested in what I learned in one of my interviews. Dean Gerard, who in his way was very innovative and scared the hell out of us with all his notions of computers. He really had us worried. He wanted to have Psychobiology put back into the School of Social Sciences

because there was some very famous guy up at Stanford in the think tank, maybe the director--I've got his name written down--who would have come to us. And here they were, Steinhaus and . . .

SO: Ralph Gerard.

SM: Ralph Gerard meeting Aldrich. And McGaugh had said--that's *in* the tape--McGaugh said--I can tell you this--he said, "I'm going home. I'll sell my house and go back to Oregon." Then Steinhaus said, "I'm going back to Berkeley." And that was that. Now you won't find this anywhere except in my interviews.

SO: Right.

SM: But that was unique. I think Steinhaus was absolutely exciting and brilliant, and the devotion of his chairs to him was really something.

SO: Yes.

SM: And March, on his side, was very innovative. I think he went too far. I think he was too mathematical, too ultra-statistical model building, with two years of math ^{*required*} in college. Now it's only one, but it's still one ^{*year of*} math, and they have two years. I think Gerard was quite unique in wanting all this computer work. And we talked him out of it, we just had to.

Then, secondly, I think, what made us unique and new was Dan Aldrich. I think Dan Aldrich, as a leader, was quite

remarkable. And he led in such a way as: You want to try this out? Go ahead. (chuckling)

SO: Yes.

SM: And he had his door open to every faculty, any student, any staff could go in and reason with him, you know. And I think he was a great Chancellor, I think he was a great human being. The interviews I've had with the students that I've done, just terrific. I had Diana Janas and she . . .

SO: Mike Krisman? Did you interview Krisman?

SM: I'm interviewing Mike. I'm going by his home or I'm going to do it by giving him the questions and having him answer them.

SO: So you would say some very innovative leaders, academic leaders?

SM: I think so.

SO: And your second point was . . .

SM: I think Dan Aldrich, as a Chancellor and as a leader. I think innovation because, not for the sake of innovation. And the students were such an interesting group. They went right along with us. You didn't get any kind of . . . I think that Diana Janas said . . . I asked what kind of teaching did you have? Just great. I said, "How was your B. A.?" She said, "I didn't know until I got to Northwestern where I got my M.A." She said, "I could keep up with all of them." (chuckling)

SO: Right.

SM: So that. And I think this is where you can help me. I think we're unique and we're special because Orange County is different. And I think ^{of} the high tech all around . . .

SO: Yes, the climate of innovation and of growth and perhaps dynamism.

SM: And I think the other one with the Graduate School of Administration, GSA, it wanted to try Business and . . .

SO: Public Administration.

SM: Public and Medical and Educational, and no one has ever tried that. And in my interview with the Dean there and so on, I was surprised with how many of the businesses around have come in and taken seminars.

SO: So we had a lot of momentum in the sixties and early seventies. But could you talk to us a little bit about the impact on UCI of the tremendous budget cuts that occurred during the seventies, particularly under the governorship of Ronald Reagan.

SM: And Jerry Brown. I would say that our morale suffered. I think we had this great excitement and we had this wonderful excitement of our staff, and then we went into the sort of moribund. We went into a trough in the seventies because we were told, and I was told as Chair of the Academic Senate, you're not going to have any more buildings except Social Ecology. And good old John Vasconcellos, he helped that through every inch of the way.

SO: Yes.

SM: He got that building for us. But they said you're going to send your students to Riverside, you're going to taper off at 15,000. And the faculty is going to close down almost, in terms of recruitment. And Jerry Brown followed Reagan and he was just as bad. Great is small, remember?

SO: Yes.

SM: "Great is small."

SO: "Small is beautiful."

SM: "Small is beautiful," yes. So I felt that the morale .*Question #*
Fifteen.

SO: Was the impact of federal reductions as damaging to the campus as was the impact from state budget reduction?

SM: I think we weren't quite as bad off. We weren't quite as bad off. We managed because of the brilliance of our leaders, the Sherry Rowlands and Jim McGaugh, all those people who get these rather large grants, you know, of \$100,000, \$500,000. They managed to keep it. I can remember the budget in 1978 was 24 percent state and I've forgotten how much federal, and the rest from the endowment of the universities.

Okay, the next question is: do you like the liberal arts organized into ~~S~~^{a College of} schools or into Arts, Letters and Sciences? My answer to that is this: I think that this organization is better. It's better because the Deans have some power. But

they've got a little fiefdom out there and . . . it's a downside. . . In a liberal arts College of Letters and Sciences--they get to know the faculty by serving on College committees. The only way we can get to know our faculty is in the Senate. Now, the Senate, thanks to you and our (inaudible), and myself who saw to it that we get an unbalanced election . . . The election cannot be, what's the word . . .

SO: Dominated by any one school.

SM: Dominated by any one school. I think my answer to that question is: I prefer the present Schools and I think Clark Kerr was right.

(End of Side 1)

SO: All right, this is the second tape of an interview conducted by Spencer Olin with Sam McCulloch on August 7, 1990. Sam, in 1975, you were appointed Coordinator of the Education Abroad Program. What would you describe as your achievements in this program?

SM: Well, I think it's a very great program. When you consider that 1,000 students [1200 now] around the University of California are overseas for one year, taking work in the courses and lectures of that country, meaning you have to learn French or German or Italian or Swedish or whatever, and they get a whole year's credit, and they're overseas, they can travel, they meet foreign students, they make great friends. It's a well-organized program. It began in 1962 with sixty-seven students

going to Bordeaux, all of whom were very familiar with French, including Juliet MacCannell who's in our English Department. She was at Santa Barbara or Davis, I think. It's well organized. It's fairly rigorous. And that was my job, to have interviewing committees that weeded out some of the students that you didn't think either linguistically couldn't cut it or academically. They have to have a 3.0 average, Spence, so you don't have much chance of the students not doing that well.

But we had rather a tough time in the very late seventies and early eighties when we had a bit of a recession, if you recall. And the parents couldn't come up with the money, and, you know, more than half of our EAP students are on financial aid, so it dropped a little. Now it's picked up and is doing extremely well.

I'll tell you one rather interesting thing. I was Director of the Australian Center for two years, and I tried to get the students involved in various things that were important. I got them to meet the governor of Victoria, the governor of New South Wales, one of the supreme court judges, and I would see to it they could have a little money if they wanted to go to certain plays or concerts and things of that nature. And I found that the students, with one or two exceptions, did extremely well.

And you'd be amused with one story. The governor of New South Wales has a lovely old government house. It was opened in 1844 by Governor Gipps, whom I wrote a book about. Well, we had to meet the wife, too, of the governor, Lady Somebody or other. And one of my students said, "I'm not . . ." The aide de camp came to us and he said, "You're going to have to curtsy." The men will bow and the women will curtsy. She said, "I'm not going to curtsy. I won't curtsy for anybody." I said, "Listen, if Chrissie Evert Lloyd and [Martina] Navratilova are going to have to curtsy before the royal box, you can do it here." (chuckling) So she did.

SO: Well, that is a good program, Sam, and I'm sure you enjoyed your involvement with it.

SM: I did, indeed.

SO: In 1978 to 1980, you served a two-year term as Chair of the Irvine division of the Academic Senate. Could you describe for us your major achievements during that position?

SM: Yes. My number one objective was communication with the faculty of what was happening in the Council and in the various decisions that the president was suggesting be made when he met with the Council. All chairs of the Academic Senate, as you know, go to Berkeley mostly, but some in Los Angeles, to meet with the president and the senior vice presidents and so on. I wanted what they had said to go right down to the faculty, and so I initiated a series of bulletins,

trying to make them interesting and trying to make them not more than one page or one and one-half pages.

Secondly, I had laid out a platform of what I felt we should do, and one of those was this communication, and I think I stuck to it and they knew what I was trying to do. Thirdly, I would say, as a result of this, that every important decision of the Council went to our faculty right away. Fourthly, I spoke up at the Council maybe more than some others did. President Saxon was the president at the time and I don't think he really . . . A very pleasant fellow, but he didn't really appreciate shared governance, and I felt he wasn't giving us a fair shake. One of them had to do with the library and the little-used books to be sent out of our library to repositories in Los Angeles and the northern campuses at Berkeley, at Richmond. And I got finally dressed down on this by your friend Swain, Donald Swain. (chuckling)

SO: Donald Swain.

SM: Who went to Louisville as president. So anyhow, I said I had not conducted an ad hominem attack on Mr. Salmon who was putting all these things through. Fifthly, I worked very hard to encourage the faculty to serve on the senate committees. And you went even further and got⁺ all the senate committee chairmen to make their reports and inform the faculty of what they were doing, and that was a very good move. Sixthly, Jim McGaugh considered me sort of competition and, you know, a

threat. When I'd try to point out to Jim, "Look, Jim, I'm trying to help you. The faculty and the administration have got to work together." Once you've got that, it'll be just fine. I had a monthly lunch with him, I had a monthly lunch with John Whitely, the Vice Chancellor for Student Affairs, I had a monthly lunch with Ed Arquilla, the head of the Medical School, ^{Council} that's their senate. And as a matter of fact, I usually had an extra meeting a month with Arquilla and myself and McGaugh.

SO: Yes. And did you meet with Dan Aldrich once a month, too?

SM: Yes, I met with Dan. Dan was fine. Dan was fine. Seventh, I succeeded in watching over the search committees. You know, you were given the right to look and to comment on a search committee. In those days, there were only about eight to it, and I did feel I had some influence. For instance, in Social Science they were looking for a new Social Science Dean. They got Linton Freeman and I just changed things. And they agreed. Eighth, I succeeded in setting up some important committees, which were confidential. For instance, one had to evaluate the Chancellor. We were the first to evaluate Chancellors. And they were Irvine, Davis and UCLA. I think that's right. And so I succeeded in getting the best [committee members]. I didn't have too difficult a time, but I did have some.

And, finally, I was even asked to conduct a review of the UCI plant sciences, and this is how it happened. ^{As a practice} I wrote to everybody, and I'm sure you did, too, who had anything in the paper, you know, that they had succeeded in doing something. And they had an article on Joe Arditti and his orchids. So I wrote and congratulated him and he wrote back saying thank you and everything, but you should know the plant sciences are not being treated fairly, and ^{Santa} ~~on a~~ whole bill of particulars. So I thought about this and I said to ^{myself} "Look, we can't let this go by. And Schneiderman won't let this go by." Jim McGaugh didn't want to get involved. It was his school and what have you. He said, "You handle it." That's a hell of a thing. "You handle it."

SO: Right.

SM: So this was right at the beginning of my being Chair. So I said, "All right, we'll get two outsiders, very famous ones." And I talked to people who I respected. I got Kenneth Thimann ~~(?)~~ who was at Santa Cruz, who was the great professor at Harvard for forty years, who taught Schneiderman himself. He was a plant physiologist, I think. And then I got Gifford. His name was Ernest Gifford. He was Chair of Botany up at UC Davis and is the editor of the big botany journal. And I wanted someone inside who was a statesman, respected, but not in Biological Science. I got Fred Reines. And I persuaded all these people to serve. And I said, "Now, all the

reports, all things should be open. Interview anybody you like, but the report must be published. I don't want any of it confidential." So, well, they all agreed to do that. I cleared this stuff with Schneiderman. They were unhappy, but they went along. Well, Schneiderman, I don't know what he thought. So that review turned out to favor Joe Arditti. It was very interesting.

SO: Oh, that's interesting.

SM: So that's what I feel I achieved.

SO: Well, that's an impressive list of contributions, Sam, in a very difficult job.

SM: It was difficult.

SO: Can you give us some comments on UCI's developments in the last five years or so, from the middle eighties to the present?

SM: Yes, I'd like to do that. I would say that there was a very important development that sort of was a turning point in some ways. It was when the University Club, I think in 1981 or 1982, and the Student Center opened. We'd never had one, you know, (inaudible). We couldn't get a Center because they had to have a two-thirds vote and so forth. Well, finally, you know, they got it. And I think that did a lot for the morale of the faculty, I know, those who go to the club; and it meant a lot for the morale of the students. But actually, in about 1983, I think, with the leadership of Dan Aldrich and

following with the leadership of Jack Peltason, suddenly, that whole excitement and feeling that we're really going someplace is reflected in all the interviews I've had, with only one exception. One program was kind of unhappy. And outside of that, everybody is fine.

First, we got the public statements around 1983 of the Irvine company saying here's a million and a half dollars. You're an important institution. You're now a countrywide important university. We'll give you one and a half million dollars. And Bren, he gave his extra million to the Bren Center.

Secondly, we got university housing. That made the difference. I know you're happy there. We would never have gotten at least three of our Distinguished Professors.

SO: That's right.

SM: And we certainly wouldn't have some of our medical school people if we hadn't got it. So I think that was crucial.

Then setting up these Distinguished Professors. I've been doing a little research for these interviews and I notice we've got six of them. A man like Duncan Luce, for instance, he's a member of the American Academy of Sciences. He comes in and he sets up this research unit in mathematical behavioral sciences. So what's that do? That makes Kim Romney happy. Kim Romney was March's big catch. Harvard full professor of mathematical anthropology, one of the best, and

he brings him here. But, you know, I think poor old Kim felt a little lonely. But this Duncan Luce group, he's all happy. He's putting out one article a year, he told me in his interview, and he's really happy, I think, that the other distinguished faculty [are happy, too].

Then we thought of a very interesting idea. We, meaning, I guess, Murray Krieger in English. They wanted to get the one-third position, but not have it evaporate every year. In other words, you could get your pension and all the things with it. So, did you know that Wolfgang Iser from Heidelberg, Jacques Derrida from, I think, Cornell, Jay Hillis Miller--oh, he's full, excuse me. Hazard Adams is now on this one-third. For the rest of his time, he'll be down here on one-third, .3, and he gets his pension and gets everything else. So the Distinguished Faculty are the part-time or the Distinguished Faculty like Jay Hillis Miller, who came from Yale.

SO: And Jack Greene.

SM: And, of course, Jack Greene who has come to us from Johns Hopkins in History.

And then next, the Bren Fellows. I think that's a great thing. I think Jack worked very hard on that with a lot of them. And something like one and three-quarter million goes into it. The first Bren Fellow is a chap, Ayala, who's a distinguished, I think, psychobiologist.

SO: No, he's an environmental biologist.

SM: Is that right?

SO: Yes.

SM: Yes, I see him at the Club.

SO: Miledi is the psychobiologist.

SM: Miledi. Well, he was one--you'd be interested there--that we tried to get him in 1964.

SO: Really?

SM: Yes, he was the coming man in London.

SO: That's right, in London.

SM: Dean Gerard in February of 1964 went to a Cambridge University, England symposium and he tried to get Miledi, but he wasn't ready, but now we've got him. And Bill Lillyman went over to help make the contract and so on.

Then the building. I think the building does more for a faculty than any other, really. When I talked to James Stofan in his interview, he said when he came ^[for his interview] and he said, "When I saw a building going on," he said, "that's a healthy campus. That's a good place to come to."

SO: Yes.

SM: Well, as you know, \$300 million between, say, 1983 . . . Well, the Bren Center opened in 1986, right? So, say, from 1984 to 1990, to now, \$300 million. Social Science Building. Excuse me, new Physical Sciences, \$20 million; Bio Sci, \$30 million; that dance cathedral, I don't know what they're

building, it cost quite a bit. Over there next to the . . . where they make the scenery on fine arts. That's for dance. Then they tripled the Student Center, which I think was very necessary. I don't like some of the architecture. A new GSM building. The new Irvine Berkeley Theater, and, of course, the Bren Center, I think, made a lot of difference. The Bren Center was great. And new buildings in the medical area.

SO: Yes.

SM: I think Sally, when she had her operation and was in the hospital, it was new. And they're having a big cancer building going up now.

SO: Impressive developments.

SM: Yes, they are.

SO: Sam, what would you have done differently over the years, if you had possessed the opportunity to do something different?

SM: Well, Spence, firstly, I would like to have worked something out--and I think we might have if I had twisted enough arms--to have not only the building of our graduate program, but to have a little more interdisciplinary work. And I know that Clay Garrison was interested and I know Hazard Adams was. He floated several ideas, but we didn't get it.

Secondly, I think if I had to do it over again, I wouldn't have changed a lot of those appointments. I think Ted Brunner was a stroke of great luck. He's a genius, in terms of all these mechanical things and how he does his TLG.

Murray Krieger was an enormously successful appointment. I think that's all.

SO: All right.

SM: I think I might have taken a couple of other jobs I was offered, but I didn't. I think I had a responsibility to the faculty that I had recruited. And then, by 1970, I think that I didn't get any more offers.

SO: Yes. Well, ^{are} ~~are~~ there any experiences you've missed, do you think?

SM: No, I don't think so. I don't think so. I think, if I do, I'll tell you.

SO: You can add it later. All right, this completes the interview with Sam McCulloch.

SM: Thank you.

END OF INTERVIEW

POST-INTERVIEW ADDENDUM

When discussing my policy as Dean, I observed that it was generally a loose rein. I preferred to give the chairmen as much latitude as possible. In one area (recruitment), I was totally involved and adamant that we recruited the best possible men and women.

I would like to add another area in which I was strict--the area of student relations. All the faculty in the Humanities must keep office hours religiously. I did not wish to have students complain to me that so and so was not in his or her office when scheduled to be there. Also, I insisted that all faculty must meet their classes on time, and, if sick, arrange for a satisfactory substitute.