

INTERVIEWEE: DR. LAUREL WILKENING
Chancellor, UCI

INTERVIEWER: Samuel C. McCulloch

DATE: November 9, 1993

SM: Well, I am delighted to welcome you to UCI. I'll say that you're about the 108th person, and the last person I shall interview, because it is almost done, and you will be in the history. The last chapter has you and Dennis Smith and the whole . . . I should say battle with the budget and having to cope with cuts, which is a very unpleasant experience. Now, I did ask you the question: What did you know about UCI before? What did you know about us before you were approached and asked to be a candidate for the chancellorship?

LW: I didn't know a lot about the campus. I knew, of course, where it was, that it was part of the UC, and that it was one of that last group of campuses that was created. I had been on the campus a short time before I was interviewed, to look around at it. I knew about the strength of the humanities programs, particularly the current Critical Theory group.

SM: Because you have Hazard Adams up in Washington. (chuckling)

LW: That's primarily true. (chuckling) And I, of course, was aware of Sherry Rowland's work and some of the other scientific work, although my field is not really represented at UCI. But that would be the most logical linkage that I would have to know a lot about it.

SM: You got your Ph.D. at San Diego?

LW: Yes.

SM: Up here isn't this new program somewhat related to what you do, that they put into effect about four years ago? What's it called?

LW: Well, it started out as the Geosciences Program; I think they're going to change the name of it. And it's my home department, but I'm basically a geochemist that works on the solid stuff of the universe, and they're mostly working on the atmosphere and the ocean, which I think is very important and which I'm greatly interested in. But the people who are here, most of them I didn't have a direct kind of connection with before coming here.

SM: And then I asked you did you visit the campus before you received an offer, and the answer, of course, was yes, you had come up. Somebody said you came when it was raining, and that's not very usual around here.

LW: (chuckling) No, it had rained but it was not raining. It was a beautiful day, actually, that we were here.

SM: Now, what do you consider our main problems are? You came and you're already, I notice, concerned about the Far Eastern Program, and I saw you and my friend Bin Wong in a group at the University Club. But what do you consider our main problems as you take over?

LW: Our main problems are really two, broadly spoken. One, of course, is the declining support from the State General Fund for the operation of this campus and all of the UC system, and all of higher education. And that, of course, is a major

challenge, because it is not a temporary situation. Everything I have learned about the economy of California and the structure of the state budget leads me to believe that this is a . . . I'm not sure what the permanent level, but it is a permanently reduced level of State General Fund support.

SM: Are you saying then that if somebody said, "Oh, it's going to take us nine years to get back to where we were," you're saying that we'll never get back to where we were?

LW: I don't think we'll get back to . . . We could get back to where we were, but the source of funding is going to be different. Already the students are paying through tuition--or not through tuition here--fees.

SM: Yes, that really bothers me.

LW: They are paying a lot more. I don't think that will be reversed. I just think the taxpayers of California do not see themselves as being able to support all of the functions of state government, and I don't think they want to, and I think there is this attitude that users should pay for things they benefit from, and they extend that to students.

SM: Well, of course, this is going to hurt the state universities more than us, because we've got fairly well funded in private benefits and also federal funding and so on. But they have depended a great [on the General Fund]. And the junior colleges, too.

LW: This is true, and that's what has happened in these three years of budget cuts; that's why you read in the newspapers

about the California State [University] System reducing enrollment drastically, taking a number of other rather severe measures, which we have not yet done or had to do with respect to our academic programs. But it is a matter of concern, and it's an historical departure, if I may ^{say} so, from the long-standing pact between the people of California and higher education.

SM: Absolutely, and it shocks me. I couldn't believe what they're paying this year. Our son Malcolm went to San Diego, class of 1978, and we paid \$300 a quarter, \$900 a year, which is not in the tradition of the UC system. (chuckling)

LW: Right.

SM: Yes, well, I see that's the main problem all right.

LW: That is the main problem. The other problem is, because we have a College of Medicine ^{and} operate a hospital that's a substantial part of UCI, the impact of the changing health care market is a matter of great concern as to what will be the end outcome of that.

SM: Well, all of us feel concerned. When I retired in 1987 I went over to the UCI doctors. The Newport Beach doctors really weren't as good as ours, and I just thought we would do that, and we've had nothing but a very, very fine relationship. The doctors are all good. Tom Cesario is our general doctor and he's absolutely terrific. I had a heart attack, and so I'm fine, but I had to have a valve put in. I went up to UCLA because the best cardiovascular surgeon is the head, Dr.

Hillel Lachs of UCLA, and then I have to have a cardiologist now. Well, the cardiologist is Jonathan Tobis, absolutely first-rate. I couldn't be better off. Now, it is a problem having to drive up, but not that much, you know, to Orange and so on. But I've got a chapter already done about how they came, and I'm now concerning myself as to the battle for the hospital and how we almost got one and didn't. Did you know that we would have had it in connection with Kaiser. Their planning group, which was five in number that were working with our people, all went down in a plane accident at San Diego, just as it came into San Diego, and that shot the . . . All the momentum was gone.

LW: I didn't know that.

SM: We never got it. We would have got it. Now, two of the deans whom I've interviewed have told me that that would have happened. So you've got a problem . . .

LW: I look forward to reading your book. (chuckling)

SM: Pardon?

LW: I look forward to reading your book, those chapters.

SM: I'd like to make it more interesting but it's not that easy. You can't say, "Well, now Arnie Binder, with stooped shoulders and graying hair, founded our Social Ecology and . . . Then he was succeeded by Ellen Greenberger, who was brightly red-haired, blue-eyed, and a dynamo, who did her five years and then went back into full-time teaching." You can't say that now, you just give a name, and I don't know what to do about

it. I'd like to make it more interesting, but I'm doing the best I can. But you saw those first few [chapters]. Clark Kerr was very pleased with it.

LW: It was very good, very interesting.

SM: Thank you. Now, well, maybe you've answered this question: Do you anticipate another reduced budget for fiscal year '94 to '95, or will it be the same?

LW: We're hoping that it . . . Our request, the university's request, is actually for a slight increase.

SM: Will the regents follow through on that?

LW: Yes, but given that the economic circumstances of the state have not improved, we're hoping that we will just not have a cut. And I don't know what will happen. It's an election year coming up and I think there will be reluctance . . . If they can think of any way not to cut higher education, I think they will hold.

SM: I think there's some pressure on them not to cut.

LW: But there is pressure, right.

SM: That's true, and that helps us in an election year. Now, the next question I asked you was: What are your ideas about the problem of East Asian Studies? And I saw you, Bin Wong, who is my good friend, and others were sitting at the University Club Chancellor's table in the corner, and I take it that something is going to happen, I hope, soon? What's your idea?

LW: Well, you said "the problem." I don't consider East Asian Studies a problem; I consider it to be a good program and an opportunity.

SM: Oh, absolutely. No, I mean a problem in the sense that the students were after more than a program, their separate department. That's a problem, see, and I think you and the Academic Senate have got to approach it.

LW: Yes.

SM: But I'm very, very sad that Pauline Yu is leaving.

LW: So am I.

SM: She is really first-rate.

LW: She is excellent.

SM: I know her not too well but know her well enough to know how well . . . I had a conference with her. I didn't make a tape, I had a conference and talked at length of how she was able to get an FTE here and an FTE there. So she got nine FTE's by three years or four years, and that's unusual.

LW: Yes, she did an excellent job.

SM: She's super-duper. I wish she could be retained here. Are you interested in a Department of [Asian] Studies, or do you think you could take . . . the historians will give so many courses and the anthropologists will give so many courses? In other words, they'll be drawn from departments into what we call a program? Just like Global Peace and Conflict Studies: Whitely is a social ecologist, see, in that department, but he heads up--at least this year he's chairing the program. We've

got this concentration of Religious Studies. Do you think this will satisfy the students, or not?

LW: Well, I think it's a good model. It doesn't work very well in universities. Everybody thinks that this is the way things should work, and I agree, which is you should have the departmental structure, and then you should be able to offer curricula, research, and so forth by drawing people together from the departments. But departments tend not to be very generous with faculty time, and therefore it usually doesn't work as well. Students and other people have figured this out, that the only way to be sure that your program has status, budget, and positions is for it to be a department, and I think that's the basic issue here.

SM: Well, I don't know how they will solve it, because I've been watching how the Oriental group of students, of which I had some in my classes and enjoyed them greatly because they're very smart, but I watched them get bigger, and I watched the Phi Beta Kappa. Every year there are more Phi Beta Kappa, and the Asian students are always 22--I count them up--22 or 23 percent are all Oriental. I believe my good friend Jim Dunning is leaving us, but he would fill me in on how many we have. Oh, by the way, you'll be very helped, I'm sure, by the statistical group. What are they called?

LW: Analytical Studies.

SM: Analytical Studies, because I think you got the copy I asked for, as per students and a breakdown of students and faculty. Well, I think you got a copy of it.

LW: Yes.

SM: I think we have more . . . I think we have 51 percent Oriental.

LW: I think we're very close to 50 percent. I don't know what it is.

SM: I think it's 51 [percent]. But Jim has departed, I guess. That the way . . . I hate this [retirement blow].

LW: We've lost so many years of experience.

SM: I'm going to write in my last chapter with you and so on and Dennis [that] we're shooting holes in all our good departments.

LW: Yes, we've lost some wonderful people.

SM: It's even affected the University Club. These people could afford to come and have their lunch and so on, and they don't come anymore and we have a reduced size. It's a beautiful club and the food is outstanding, but I don't know how they can continue. Are there other changes in the curriculum that you'd like to see achieved?

LW: Well, the curriculum is basically in the hands of the faculty, and my hope is that the faculty continue to be at the forefront of their fields but also sensitive to the changing world that we're in. And I think most faculty are sensitive to that, but there are changes that are taking place around

us, and I think we need to be responsive to that. Lack of responsiveness in a public university to the public interest means that you become alienated from public support.

SM: Well, on the whole, Dr. Wilkening, we've really done pretty well here. We've tested the community; we're sensitive, I think, to what the community wants. There are certain departments, of course, I admit that are more conservative.

LW: But we have lots of advantages here because we're . . . partly because of being younger. So we started out . . . I think, Dan Aldrich was quite visionary in his view of what a public university should be.

SM: Yes, I say that in the first two chapters.

LW: And I think that the most recent survey that Mark Baldassare did that we just received--it was commissioned by the UCI Foundation and shows tremendous public support within Orange County of this campus, including very high response rates to questions like, "Do you believe that it's important to have a university where research is required of the faculty in addition to teaching?" And there's over 70 percent said yes. So I think that this university has done a good job and is very well positioned, but it's something that when you . . . We have to be careful of it as we age or mature or something, that we continue to renew our programs and keep in touch with what's going on in the various disciplines.

SM: I suspect that is the only good side of VERIP III, that if we are at least bringing in some, not wiping the position out

altogether, which is happening, but say, giving us an assistant professor. Now it isn't going to help us with a student who wanted to study with X, who's gone or retired. He or she won't want to study with an assistant professor. But that assistant professor will hopefully have good . . . Now, about the time, what time is your luncheon?

LW: Twelve. We've got plenty of time.

SM: Well, we'll stop this then at ten minutes of, and it takes us ten minutes to walk over.

LW: That's fine.

SM: I think you're right also on the curriculum, that this is what the [Academic] Senate is mainly responsible for: the curriculum and the requirements for graduation and granting graduation.

LW: Right, and setting the standards for faculty, which is very important.

SM: But I think always the chancellor, if he or she has any ideas . . . communicate with the chair of the Senate. When I was chair of the Senate, I was elected in 1978 to '80, and we were on the tail end of a lot of problems, and I would talk a lot to Dan [Aldrich], but I would have luncheons with the vice chancellor once a month.

LW: Yes, I am very fortunate that people that I am working with are wonderful, and Eric Stanbridge is the Senate chair this year and he's outstanding, and so we meet regularly.

SM: Well, he's close to you, he's a microbiologist, I think.

LW: Yes.

SM: I had a great experience at Rutgers because Dr. Waksman got the Nobel Prize for streptomycin. But he was a real humanist, and his wife was interested in music, and I attended several parties or more where he attended, and he was a very cultivated man. But microbiology has fascinated me. You know, the royalties for streptomycin went into an institute which built a building and it made . . . He got a salary while he was still active. So microbiology I liked a lot.

Now, Chancellor [Jack] Peltason's correspondence revealed an outstanding record in reaching the public and gaining their support. Do you plan a similar effort, the Chancellor's Club and all these other things?

LW: Yes.

SM: Jack's correspondence is so interesting. I went through it all up to the time he left--no, I went up to the May that he left. But Dan's was equally interesting; he wrote more, at greater length than Jack did. But Dan did a great job of it. I don't think people realized how much work he put into it. Everything was set by Dan, a real foundation for Jack to take off, and all of a sudden, we had all these Outstanding Professors coming and all this money coming in and so on.

LW: Right. Yes, I'm following two giants, there's no doubt about it.

SM: Well, I think that if you look or discuss with the chairs of whatever they're called, of the Chancellor's Club, you'll find

this is the reservoir. Some of them are scientists. I would say that the defense industry had an enormous number of engineers all through Southern California, and throughout Orange County, and these people are now in some other job, but they're very . . .

LW: Yes, this is quite true. I think one of the reasons why we get such high ratings in these surveys of the community is Orange County has a lot of highly educated people in it, partly because of the technical nature of a lot of those industries, and also a lot of the new immigrants coming in come from cultures that value the scholar or education highly, and that's a benefit to us in both ways.

SM: Now, incidentally, the August 6, 1993 *L.A. Times* has this headline: "UCI Posts a Rise in Research Funds for '93." Now, it was '92-93, but it went something like \$2 million more than we had . . . Now, I haven't seen Kathy [Jones] about it, and she's going to talk to the Chancellor's Club a week after next and I'll ask her that question. How do you account for the fact of over \$2 million?

LW: Good faculty members. (chuckling)

SM: Well, yes, that's a good answer.

LW: That's the basis.

SM: That's the basis, yes. Now, I notice when you were speaking to students, that you knew them as we went along. I couldn't even remember the . . . I don't know the lady who's just arrived in history. But you knew the [students]. Now, do you

plan any changes in your relations with the students? Do you have a council that meets with you, or what do you do?

LW: I meet regularly . . . I and the vice chancellors meet regularly with the student leadership, both the graduate students and undergraduate. That's something that's been happening. And then the other thing I've tried to do is encourage the student leaders, to get to know them, to feel that if they are upset about something that they can call me, which is actually why I was a little bit late coming out of my office, because I had a message from one of the AS student leaders saying that there was an issue that was really of great concern to some of his colleagues, and so I talked about what he was concerned about. So I'm trying to get them to understand that I'm willing to talk to them, that they shouldn't feel fenced out.

SM: Absolutely, that's the way to go. That's the way to go, and so long as they know that your door is open. I had this policy with my students. Dan was very good with students. Jack was good but he wasn't as good as Dan. These students would come in . . . Wait till you read my chapter six, which has to do with the sixties, the period of '66-67, the Vietnam War and all that.

LW: I want to read about it. I'm reading right now *The Year of the Monkey*, which was written by McGill, who was the chancellor at San Diego, and I was a student there. I had never read this book. It was published in '82 . . .

SM: What was his name?

LW: What was his name? Bill? William McGill?

SM: Oh, Bill McGill? Oh yes, we offered him a job here in Psychology, and so did San Diego, and he went there.

LW: Well, you're familiar with his book that he wrote about the sixties?

SM: No.

LW: Oh, well, he wrote about his experience as chancellor.

SM: I will definitely get it.

LW: It's very interesting.

SM: He had a bad time.

LW: He did have a bad time.

SM: Yes, John Galbraith, who was my close friend, who was [chancellor] before McGill--I'm pretty sure that's correct. You know, he really didn't want to be a chancellor.

LW: That's right.

SM: From '64 to '68, John . . . And he had this fellow, this philosopher who . . .

LW: ^oHarbert Marcuse.

SM: Yes, I think so, and he just . . . He really was . . .

LW: I know. His presence on campus incited the community. I remember all of that quite well.

SM: Was Galbraith [Chancellor when you were there]?

LW: No, I came in . . . What time did I go there? I went in '66, but I never paid that much attention to the higher [echelons], you know, what was going on.

SM: Oh, he likes students. He's a great teacher. Well, he went back to UCLA and published three more books and continued to his retirement at UCLA. Now he's living in San Diego.

LW: Well, I'll be interested to read your chapter about Dan Aldrich for that same period of time, having read McGill's book.

SM: Well, if you would like to read the present draft, I've got a package of chapters. I can put it all together if you'd like to look through it.

LW: Well, I'd like to read it, but it's not . . . Over the Christmas holidays would be a good time for me to do that.

SM: Well, I'll give it to you. Dennis Smith, bless him, he's read it. I'm amazed that he took that much interest. And of course he's leaving, but he's read everything and made some suggestions and so on. Clark Kerr has gone through everything.

LW: Good.

SM: So I'll put it in, and you might like to read chapter six, because I said to Dennis Smith's secretary, "Why don't you read it, too, and tell me how you like it." So she did, too. "Oh, yes," she said, "I relate to chapter six." She said, "I was at Davis then when we had all those problems." (chuckling)

LW: Well, I always find reading these histories very informative, so I'm really glad that you're doing this. When I went to the University of Washington, I read the book that had been

written for their centennial. It was not very well-written; it was hard to read.

SM: Was that Gates? Was that Gates's history?

LW: Yes, I think that was. I found it hard to read, but it had wonderful, wonderful . . . not just what happened, but kind of the environment and the circumstances and insights, written in that style of history which, I guess . . . I don't know, it seems to be fading, to a certain extent, but I found it just delicious. And I often quoted from it when I gave talks, because there were some wonderful things that happened.

SM: I'll tell you one of the most amusing books. This is my friend Stull Holt, who is a great historian, who went to Washington, W. Stull Holt, and it's called *An American Faculty*. (inaudible) Oh, it is so good. You can get it out of the library.

LW: Oh, great, I'll read that. Another one of my favorite academic stories is the biography of Herbert Eugene Bolton by his student--^oBannan, I think it is.

SM: Yes, I've read that.

LW: What I liked about it is, of course, being in the younger generation, to look back and see how in the thirties how much life was the same when you were ^{an}the academic. He was always fighting with his publishers over his deadlines for his books, and it was just wonderful, all the academic politics and everything. I just found it . . . It was so comforting, in a way, but very interesting.

SM: Well, there are two other books I recommend: *Growth of Academia*, Mary McCarthy, which was really Bard College.

LW: Right, I have read that book.

SM: And the other one is *The Doctor's Oral* by Stewart, George Stewart, who was a professor at Berkeley.

LW: Oh, I don't know that one.

SM: An English professor. Oh, it's way back--way back--it's thirty years ago.

LW: Oh, great.

SM: Now, so you don't plan any changes in your relations with the students? You want an open door in order to keep in touch with them. Do you plan any changes in working with the faculty?

LW: Well, I'd like to have an open-door relationship with the faculty. (chuckling) That's where I feel I'm furthest behind in getting to know people. I arrived in the summer. I got to spend quite a bit of time getting to know the people outside of the university pretty well, and I concentrated on getting to know the student leadership in September right as they were coming back to campus, and they come back a little bit early and have some retreats and things. And the faculty, ~~it is~~ ^{who} then most recently ^{came} around, and ^{then} came, unfortunately, my inauguration right at a time when I wanted to be spending a little bit more time getting to know faculty members, so I feel like I'm about a month behind where I should be in

getting to know people. So that's what I'm really trying to do now.

SM: Well, may I just make a suggestion?

LW: Sure.

SM: I suggest that you be sure to go to the Senate meetings. Because they give a slot to the chancellor as a part of the agenda, and this is your chance to say what you want and ask questions of them.

LW: Yes.

SM: Both Dan and Jack were very, very punctilious in attending Senate meetings.

LW: Regrettably, they scheduled two Senate meetings this year on top of regents' meetings, which was an unfortunate . . .

SM: Well, you've got to go to the secretary. Garland Parten would never make that error when she was there. There's a new person who is very nice, Pat Murphy. But you've got to say, "Please don't schedule a conflict [with Regents' meetings]."

LW: Well, now we know, but it had happened before we realized that that happened.

SM: Well, so long as Eric gives a special statement or a letter from you. Oh, I said, "What are your plans for working with the Academic Senate?" Do you have any suggestions as I wind up my work as UCI Historian? I hope someone will be appointed to replace me. I say that because I was unofficially Historian from 1964, or even 1963. I said [in 1964], "There's got to be an Historian." Dan said, "All right, you're our

unofficial Historian and you conduct some interviews." Well, I undertook twenty-eight and I had . . . let me think, Dan's full support, and they got the money to make the transcriptions. That's where the money comes in. You transcribe once, it comes back to me, I correct it, you correct it . . . Well, you can't correct it, but you can see where I made an error. The tape will be the story. So then I was busy writing a book on Australia river boats, and I didn't come back, and Jack did make me an official Historian, and I'm officially the Historian as of 1988 when I retired. (chuckling) And I did get a little stipend to do all those interviews, but the stipends, of course, ceased as of a year or so ago or more. Somebody ought to be UCI Historian and they ought to make some tapes. And it is expensive, unfortunately. The problem of transcriptions and so on. Dennis, bless him, gave me \$200 for this interview. This is about what it will run. But somebody's got to be Historian. And the scientists always--well, they don't always, they sometimes say, "What are you worrying about history [for]?" But I worry about history. (chuckling)

LW: Oh, so do I. History is my favorite recreational reading, so I think some history is extremely important.

SM: Well, I'll tell you a good book to read then. It's called *The Road from* ^uCorrain. *sp?*

LW: I've read it. (chuckling) It's a wonderful story. Are you Australian?

SM: Yes, I came from Australia as a sophomore to UCLA.

LW: So do you think her picture is [accurate]? I found her book

. . .

(End of Side A)

LW: We were^u on the road from Corrain. (chuckling)

SM: Well, we were talking about this delightful person who was
[the author]. What's her name who wrote *The Road from*
Corrain?

LW: Jill Kerr Conway.

SM: Jill Kerr Conway. Now, I think her husband died recently.

LW: Oh, really?

SM: I think so. He was older and he met her in Canada when she
was vice president there. I met a former president of the
University of Toronto, whose name is . . . Oh, damn, I'll
think of it, but he was president through the sixties and he
knew her quite well and spoke very highly of her.
[President's name is Dr. Claude Bissell.] But I just know her
as a writer. She's terrific.

LW: Yes.

SM: But there was another book, *The Doctor's Oral* is good.

LW: Okay. Well, I'll look for *The Doctor's Oral*. That sounds

. . .

SM: It's by George Stewart. I expect we have it in our library.
We've got a very good library.

LW: Yes, probably.

SM: We went to Russia last summer, an interesting trip where you go on a boat from Moscow to Saint Petersburg, using the canals. You go through eighteen locks.

LW: Wow!

SM: And it was a terrific trip.

LW: How wonderful.

SM: We stopped every day. We were four or five days in transit. We stopped every day and went and saw something.

LW: How many people were on this trip?

SM: There were, I think, 200, maybe not quite. There were at least forty Brits there, and they had to change their cash into dollars. [Dollars were the only currency on the boat.] This was a Russian crew. The Swiss did the food and did the gift shop and all that. The Russians ran it, the Russians served us. The girls were very good and spoke quite well, spoke good English. The stewardesses and the cabin stewards were good, spoke well, but the heart of it were the Swiss, because you know how . . . I can see why a good watch is made by the Swiss. They're so persnickety, everything has to be . . .

LW: Yes, everything has to be just so.

SM: So the food was terrific and everything went well.

LW: That's great.

SM: But I found when I got back that we had eight books on Rasputin. When I was there I got interested in seeing where he was murdered. They pointed out, "That's where he was

murdered." Now, I don't have anything more now. If you have any wind-up comments to make . . .

LW: I don't. We talked about some gloomy kinds of prognostications for the California economy, but I think that UCI will grow and prosper. The prognostications for the economy look pretty gloomy right now, but the demographic change, in terms of just the numbers of young people who are now in the K through 12 system . . . See, we've been having to build all these elementary schools and so forth, they're coming, and they're going to want to have college educations, so I think that there will be a demand.

SM: Yes, and you'd better be careful on this demography, because they were so wrong in the seventies. My chapter is called "The Unexpected Slowdown, '71 to '81." We were made to it, and Dan was unhappy, but we slowed down but we still kept our students. We kept ahead so that when '80 dawned, or '81, and the budgets got better, all of a sudden it was . . . The next chapter is going to be called, "UCI, Under Construction Indefinitely."

LW: Under Construction Indefinitely, yes.

SM: The students and I used to get annoyed at all those concrete mixers going on and so on, and that was a fabulous period--a fabulous period.

LW: So I feel optimistic about our prospects.

SM: I think that the demography shows that it's moving up to the year 2000.

LW: Oh, yes, definitely.

SM: So anything else you'd like to say?

LW: I think that's it, Sam. Enjoyed it. Enjoyed the conversation.

SM: Thank you very much.

END OF INTERVIEW