

INTERVIEWEE: JULIAN FELDMAN
Former Associate Dean of Social Sciences
Chair, Information and Computer Sciences Department

INTERVIEWER: Samuel C. McCulloch
Emeritus Professor of History
UCI Historian

DATE: August 24, 1990

SM: This is an interview with Professor Julian Feldman, formerly Associate Dean of Social Sciences, Assistant Chancellor for Computing, and Chair of the Department of Information and Computer Science, on August 24, 1990, in Room HOB-360. Say, by the way, didn't you have an office on this floor when you started?

JF: Yes. (chuckling) I think that Social Sciences was on this floor when we started.

SM: And Jim [March] was at the end in the Dean's office. Now, what I want to ask you, Julian, is could you run through question one about the changes in your program in the last twenty years?

JF: Well, first of all, let me set the record straight. ICS is a department, not a program. Social Ecology is a program. I'm not sure what the difference is.

SM: Who does your head report to, your chair?

JF: The chair of the department? Well, that has changed over the years. Right now, he's reporting to the Executive Vice Chancellor, but there was a period, you remember, when Keith Justice was the Dean of Professional and Interdisciplinary Studies.

SM: Yes, right.

JF: And at that time, Engineering and ICS and . . .

SM: And Teacher Education.

JF: Administration, Teacher Education and, I think, Physical Education . . .

SM: Yes, that's right.

JF: . . . and Engineering reported to Justice. That was dissolved when [William] Lillyman became Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs. As a matter of fact, he pointed out that making him Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs didn't cost any more money because they eliminated Justice's position.

SM: Oh!

JF: Well, it's interesting that in the latest version, I think dated May or June of this year, of the plan for the campus, there is some talk about setting up a Dean of Interdisciplinary Studies or something like that, to worry about interdepartmental, inter-school programs. I don't know if you've looked at the [planning] statement yet, but there in the preface it says one of the things which distinguishes UCI from other universities whose status it aspires to is the lack of these kinds of [interdisciplinary] programs. And so, I think this was principally Tien's idea to establish an active agency concerned with interdisciplinary programs.

SM: Who?

JF: Tien, Tien.

SM: Oh, Tien, right. Well, that's right. I interviewed him and he told me a bit about this. I'll have to study it. Now, backtrack. Who does your chairman report to?

JF: To the Executive Vice Chancellor.

SM: All right. It's unusual for a department to do that. It normally is a school or a program [which reports to the Executive Vice Chancellor].

JF: Well, it goes back into the history of the thing, and I don't remember whether we covered this before, but it certainly is covered in memoranda in the archives. I don't know how much of this you want to really go into.

SM: I'm interested, yes.

JF: All right. We'll go the long way around the mulberry bush. Early on, after Fred Tonge and I got here, after you got here in the fall of 1964, we were lobbying for something in the computer area. And the outcome of this lobbying was the establishment of a committee, which included Gerard and Saunders and Tonge and myself, and maybe somebody else, which was called Information and Communication something or other. Anyhow, I imagine there was a time before the Fall of 1964 when, if somebody raised their hand, a new department was established. (laughter) But after the Fall of 1964, when there were already twenty-five faculty members, of course, you had to have a committee to do anything. So it wasn't clear what this committee wanted to do.

Bob Saunders had a long laundry list of possible areas which might be covered, and the committee debated whether it should be an interdisciplinary effort or a separate unit or what. So, after some discussions with Peltason, there was an effort to try to hire somebody and let this person help decide what form this organization should take. So the job got offered to a couple of people on and off campus, and, for one reason or another, nothing was consummated.

So then, in the spring of 1966, Jack Peltason offered me the position. And I said that it sounded very interesting, but I was going off on sabbatical since I had been at Berkeley for five years and I had been here for two. My advice was if you can go ahead and fill it, fill it. And if, after I come back, you still haven't filled it and you still want to offer it to me, then we can talk about it. Peltason, I assume, was busy talking to the people at Illinois about a job, in addition to the things here, and so nothing much was done until I came back and he renewed the offer.

SM: And then went [Peltason] off to Illinois.

JF: This is sort of the story of how the department got established. And then I said that I would accept this position only under certain conditions. One of the conditions was that this would be an independent department for at least five years, not part of any existing school. So he agreed to that, and apparently Aldrich agreed to that, and it got

through the Senate. And then the question was degree-granting authority if it wasn't part of any school. Because you remember that the College of Letters and Sciences had been abolished because the deans of the schools did not want a dean of the college to replace Peltason, because they preferred talking to the Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs directly. So there was no holding company. So that's when the Council for Inter-School Curriculum got established.

SM: That's right.

JF: So that was established as a holding company, and ICS became the first unit in the Council for Inter-School Curriculum. And so that's the story of how things got set up.

SM: Well, let's proceed to the developments between 1974 and now.

JF: I don't know if I can remember all that. The recent history of the department has been quite good. Let me go back to the beginning and it may be easier to start from there. After the department was set up, it, in fact, was established about the same time as many other [computer science] departments around the country, and there was a real shortage of faculty people. Although we had faculty positions, we had a great deal of trouble recruiting. So we were sitting out there in trailers over here, along with Engineering, some other people, and a toilet trailer from the Fall 1967 until we moved into the Computer Science Building in 1970. We had a couple of part-time people and I think we had made maybe two regular faculty

appointments. Then we hired a few more and we had a lot of turnover and there was a lot of coming and going, and a lot of students started pouring in.

There were some real problems in the level of computing equipment and in getting research started, and some of our best people gave up. One of whom was John Seeley Brown, who came here before his dissertation was finished at Michigan, finished his thesis, was a Pied Piper for students, a very bright guy. But he felt constrained and he went to Burt, Beronek & Newman, a consulting firm in Boston, and then eventually to Xerox Parc. Now he's a vice president of Xerox and director of the Xerox Research Lab in Palo Alto, and he's in the national news and everything.

SM: Oh, wow. (chuckling)

JF: So we've lost people of this stature. But things started settling down, I would say, maybe ten or twelve years ago. As things started settling down, the research funding and the research programs picked up. And four years ago, there was a real breakthrough when the software people in the department got what is called a CER, Coordinated Experimental Research grant. This is a program in the National Science Foundation [NSF] that is designed to move departments up a notch. We had tried a couple of times before, and, finally, a young fellow in the department, Dick Taylor, put a coalition of people together and a proposal together and got the money. There are

about five given out each year. And, in our case, I think it was something about \$3 million over five years from NSF, \$3 to \$3.5 million.

SM: This is a CER?

JF: Yes.

SM: I've never heard of it.

JF: This was a big breakthrough in the stature of the department and in our ability to upgrade the level of computing equipment. It really gave us a big push, and also helped recruiting a good deal. Subsequent to that, we were able to make some senior appointments, which we had a great deal of difficulty making before that time.

We were quite disappointed in the reaction of the campus to the receipt of this award. When the University of Massachusetts got one, the governor invited the whole department to a party and had a big splash. And here, it seemed to us that the administration was making more of a fuss over Administration and Engineering and rewarding them more with faculty positions than rewarding ICS. And in this case, after receiving one of the biggest awards ever made to the campus, absolutely no recognition. Finally, about six or seven months after the announcement of the award, they gave the Chair a couple of hundred dollars for a party, to which none of the administration people even showed up.

SM: That's disappointing.

JF: Yes. Well, ICS is feeling that it's one of the units that is not exactly in favor in the campus administration.

SM: Well, I can't imagine why.

JF: Yes, well there are a couple of other things that have happened.

SM: So you'd say that . . . I was looking in the catalogue at your department. It's got a good number and you've got a pretty fair spread of ranks, and more, I think, now senior.

JF: Yes, between making a few appointments from outside and promoting some people from inside, the balance of people in the ranks is much better than it used to be. The other thing that characterized this period, especially the ten years from 1974 to 1984, was tremendous growth in enrollments.

SM: Yes, and that comes out every time I go to graduation. Every time, your department is bigger.

JF: Well, things have now leveled off and stabilized around 550 to 600 majors. But for most of that period, 1974 to 1984, we had the highest student-faculty ratio of any unit on the campus; and that was not unrelated, I think, to the problem with the research program and the problems of retaining faculty. Then some constraints were put on enrollments and there is a general tendency across the country for computer science and engineering enrollments to level off or decrease. And between those two things, the enrollment problem is now under control. The question is, like the question for the

campus, where it did meet its enrollment target last year [sic].

SM: Are you telling me, Julian, that there's constraint in the enrollment in ICS for students?

JF: Yes, and a couple of other areas they call impacted areas.

SM: Yes, I know it's an impact. I've used the term myself all the time, but as I sit in each graduation and watch your students from ICS, the group getting bigger and bigger, I don't see much . . . They seem to be increasing.

JF: Well, some of it, in terms of graduation, is left over from the high period, but I think you'll see it leveling off.

SM: Now, let's go to the second question, which has to do with computer policy on the campus.

JF: Yes. Well, one of the things you left off about one of my major roles on the campus was as Assistant Chancellor for Computing from . . .

SM: I thought of that, Julian. I thought of that and I should have put it down.

JF: Yes.

SM: I'm glad you mentioned it because it's now on the tape. Because I can remember when everybody was getting pretty unhappy about computing and you stepped in and helped us a lot. I remember that.

JF: Yes, from 1969 to 1976.

SM: Did you succeed Bob Gordon? Question three.

JF: Yes. Bob Gordon remained in the job for awhile, until he left, and we changed the format a little bit, so I was put in a position above him as Assistant Chancellor for Computing. And, yes, we started making some changes. The biggest change was . . . Well, I don't know what the biggest one was, but there were a number of changes that occurred in 1969 and 1970. One was IBM terminated their agreement with us.

SM: Yes.

JF: Under which we were doing some joint development effort and they were giving us a discount on the hardware rental. And they terminated that even before we did. And then we started looking around for some hardware alternatives and so we had some changes in the hardware configuration. We also stopped this major software development effort to develop a unique piece of an operating system to handle interactive computing on an IBM system, and we bought systems which had interactive or time-sharing software available. And then a third part of the change was a reconfiguration to try to stop some of the fighting between faculty members by breaking the computing facility up into two pieces. One piece included the physical scientists and the computer science people, and the other piece included the administrative and instructional computing people.

SM: Well, what about the administration information people like Sue Frisch? I don't know what her married name is now.

JF: That came somewhat later.

SM: Oh, did it?

JF: What happened there was a couple of things. One was we were doing some administrative computing on this campus from the very beginning, even though the university mandate was to do administrative computing centrally. There were two centers called Data Processing Centers, DPC North and DPC South. The major effort was in Berkeley, there was a satellite operation at UCLA. But some of the campuses, despite all these injunctions about doing it centrally, were doing things locally. And our argument was that we were going to experiment with some interactive computing, both for the Library and for the Registrar. So, from the very beginning, that was part of our program.

SM: You dealt with Brown then, as Registrar, did you?

JF: Yes, but he hired Everman and Everman was the major force.

SM: Yes, Everman, Rich Everman.

JF: Right.

SM: So that sort of went along under the IBM operation, both for the Library there were some things being done and for the Registrar. And then, after the changes in 1969, things picked up even more. While there were changes in computing here, there were also changes in university-wide computing during the early seventies. There was an effort to increase the level of centralization university-wide, not only for

administrative computing but for other kinds of computing. So when the proposal from the central administrative people to increase their capacity was made, their activities were reviewed by a committee that the president appointed. The committee recommended decentralization of administrative computing rather than an increase in capacity for centralized administrative computing. And the only centralized administrative computing effort retained was that for the Office of the President, and every campus was essentially going to be on their own.

It was at that time that Sue Frisch, I think, was the number two or three person in that operation, and somebody else, Larry somebody or other, I think, was the first person in charge of that operation. Anyhow, University Hall distributed some of the people on their staff to the various campuses and increased the campus budgets for administrative computing, and that's how that operation got started.

SM: Well, actually, I didn't know that. I've talked to Carl Hartman, you know, and he very sadly had that stroke.

JF: Yes.

SM: He's left-handed and the stroke is on this side, so he's using his computer to get material for me. I gave him a whole series of questions. He's very knowledgeable about computing. I was impressed. But you're saying then that each campus now runs on its own.

JF: Administrative computing, yes. There are some coordination efforts to buy one central payroll program and have campuses make local adaptations. And some need to transmit certain information in certain form to the Office of the President, but, essentially, each campus is on its own for administrative computing.

SM: That's interesting.

JF: Registrar, Payroll, Accounting, you know.

SM: Yes. Well, that's very useful.

JF: Information Systems.

SM: I'm always interested when they flash on the screen everything about me and what's happened and how much I can get for my pension and so on.

JF: Well, that is a central system that we have remote access to, but the payroll data is provided by each campus to the central system.

SM: I see.

JF: We haven't really finished number two, the changes in campus computer policy.

SM: Yes, I'd like that.

JF: This administrative computing was one aspect of it. After I resigned as Assistant Chancellor for Computing . . .

SM: In what year?

JF: In 1976. There was a decision, I think it was mainly McGaugh's decision, which Aldrich agreed to, was to de-

emphasize computing, at least central computing. And so my successor was not given the title Assistant Chancellor for Computing. He was given the title Director of Computing, and was . . .

SM: Who was that?

JF: Dave Sheldon. And he was . . .

SM: S-H-E-L-D-O-N?

JF: Yes, S, as in sugar, H-E-L-D-O-N. He's now the Vice Chancellor for Business at Santa Barbara. But Sheldon was then told to report to the Vice Chancellor for Administration, or whatever Schwartz's title is.

SM: Yes.

JF: So that was an effort to downgrade computing and that coincided with some technological changes and economic changes in the field and a widespread growth on the campus of, first, mini computers and then personal computers.

SM: Yes, here you see a computer. [Points to his office computer]

JF: Yes. Well, that's symbolic of what's happened to the computer on the campus. There was a great deal of distribution and decentralization, and the central campus facility was essentially doing less and less business and became less important to the academic, i.e., instructional and research programs on the campus. This caused some problems because this was a cost center and the question was what to do about it. There were some changes in hardware and some changes in

policy. For example, ICS got this CER money from NSF and had gotten some earlier smaller amounts of money from NSF and bought some machines for itself, and the computing facility was operating some of these machines for us. And, similarly, Physics got a machine and the computing facility ran that for them and tried to make some changes for the computing facility to adapt to the changing world.

But there were very dramatic changes, probably the most dramatic of which was the purchase of this large Convex mini-super computer last summer. You can probably get more on that from Bill Parker.

SM: Unfortunately, I did Bill Parker about a year ago.

JF: Yes. Well, they tried to hire some people to run what is now called the Office of Academic Computing. The name of the computing facility was changed, I don't know, a year, year and a half ago. It's now the Office of Academic Computing and then that's to distinguish it from Sue Frisch's operation and other operations around the campus. There was also some change in the funding policy. I think it is less of a cost center and a recharge operation than it used to be. But they tried to hire some people to run this revised Office of Academic Computing, with a special emphasis on this super-computing capability, but that fell through and then the general purpose utility Administrator, Bill Parker, got this job.

SM: So Bill Parker . . . What is the title now, again?

JF: He's Director of Computing.

SM: Director of Computing.

JF: Director of Academic Computing, I guess.

SM: Okay, and he got a great big machine?

JF: A super-computer, yes.

SM: Okay. Well, now what about question four?

JF: There's a longer story about the super-computing thing, but I don't . . .

SM: Well, let's hear it.

JF: Part of the changes in campus policy . . . When was this? About four or five years ago, the Senate committee on computer policy convinced the administration that they ought to come up with \$20,000 to fund an external review of academic computing on the campus. And so they brought in some outside people, including Fred Tonge, as an outside person.

SM: Did they? Where is Fred now?

JF: He's at Santa Clara. He left here to go to . . .

SM: Oregon State.

JF: Oregon State, and then he went with Tektronics, and then he went to Santa Clara.

SM: Well, go ahead.

JF: Now, this outside committee said yes, some people are okay in this highly distributed, decentralized environment, but some people, especially new people, are not in very good shape and

the campus has really neglected academic computing and they ought to do something about it. So, after this report came in, Parker brought this up to the Council of Deans and he asked people . . .

SM: Excuse me for interrupting. Can I get a copy of that report? Is it confidential?

JF: Sure, you can get it from the Senate office.

SM: Okay, thank you. I will, because that's important to me.

JF: Yes. So Parker brought this report to the Council of Deans and he asked two questions: One, has anybody ever lost a faculty member they really wanted to keep because computing was inadequate? And the only person who raises his or her hand is the Chair of ICS. Has anybody failed to hire a faculty member they really wanted to hire because computing was inadequate? The only person who raises his hand is the Chair of ICS. He said, "Okay, let's go on and pay attention to things that are of greater concern to you," and he appointed a committee to worry about data communication on the campus and that was sort of the end of it.

Well, this Parker committee on communication meets a few times. But then, about six months after he asked these two questions and he got these negative responses, there's a meeting of this committee, and the Dean of Physical Sciences and the Dean of Engineering all of a sudden say, "We have to have a super-computer. We cannot compete without one."

SM: We had lost people and (inaudible).

JF: We can't hire people, our people can't do first-class research. This is six months later. Very interesting, particularly in light of the fact that the National Science Foundation during this time established these super-computer centers for university access, one of which is at La Jolla. But no, we have to have one on campus. Well, this was sort of interesting. Anyhow, these people finally convinced Bill Lillyman to make a commitment, I think, of something like \$1.5 million a year over five years, to provide super-computing capability on the campus. And the result of that a couple of years later was bringing in this Convex.

SM: Is Convex spelled C-O-N-V-E-X?

JF: Yes, right.

SM: I do this for the transcriber.

JF: Yes, the transcriber. I think what happened from 1976 to 1990 in computing on campus is decentralization, distribution, general de-emphasis of the central campus facility, including individual machines, departmental machines, personal machines, the growth of management computing. And then a bit of a resurgence with this super-computing emphasis, because no individual department had the financial muscle to do this.

SM: Well, you've really answered question five. In other words, what future do you predict for ICS between now and the year 2005.

JF: No, no, that's not five.

SM: Well, let's go back to four then.

JF: Let's go to four.

SM: Yes, I always am interested since I've had your ICS students in my classes sometimes and they're always very good. The question I ask you for is I'm looking at your graduation this spring.

JF: Yes.

SM: And I was amazed at the number of Orientals. It seemed to me to number something like 75 percent.

JF: I think that's probably a little high. The last time I looked at the numbers, the percentage of majors was around 60 percent.

SM: That could be. I was just looking at them.

JF: Yes. But, in general, you know, the campus has a very high enrollment in Orientals and there's a bias towards those areas, Physical Sciences, Engineering, Computer Science, that don't require a high level of language skills.

SM: They're very skillful in math and things like that.

JF: Yes. So I think that's the explanation. If you look at the statistics, what is also interesting is the gender differentials. The campus as a whole is about fifty-fifty undergraduate.

SM: Male-female.

JF: Male-female. A few more females. But ICS majors dropped over the last five years. If I can remember correctly, I think it's something like from 39 percent to 29 percent females, so that's higher than Engineering and maybe higher than most of the areas in Physical Sciences. Maybe we could do better, but nobody quite understands why this big drop. But it's not only a local phenomenon, it's a national phenomenon. One of our faculty members, Nancy Leveson, has done some work for the National Science Foundation and documented the fact that this is a national phenomenon.

SM: That's interesting, really interesting.

JF: Yes. So that really requires, I think, some study.

SM: Yes, someone to research that.

JF: I talked to Dave Bruce's wife, who is a sociologist.

SM: Yes, I know her well.

JF: And she said she thinks it's more of a sociological trend and nothing to worry about and it'll come back, but there are a lot of women social scientists and women computer scientists who are worried about the role of women and think that there are some deeper things going on. But, so far, I think all people have done is sort of notice it, and nobody has really made a strong effort to try to find out the cause.

SM: They should.

JF: Are you ready to go to [question] five?

SM: Yes, to five now. What do you see down the pike, Julian?

JF: Well, I think it's a question of what's going to happen to the discipline and what's going to happen here on campus. Like I said, the political position of ICS here on the campus, I think, is not strong. I don't think that Peltason views ICS as one of the major programs to which he's prepared to devote a lot of resources and a lot of effort. And Tien came to a faculty meeting late last spring and Peltason was supposed to be there but he had a back problem, so I don't know how seriously we should take his absence. But he said, "Yes, yes, you're doing okay, and the CER grant is nice and all of that. But what we're really interested in . . ." He didn't put it quite this way, but almost this way, " . . . is hiring stars." And he pointed to the recent appointment in Colonial History and some other, you know, senior appointments, National Academy types on the campus. "And that's really what we're interested in and those are not the appointments you're making. Until you really make those kinds of appointments, we're not going to take you very seriously."

SM: No kidding?

JF: But despite all of the excitement about computer science in the rest of the world, I think that its position on campus is not very strong.

SM: How do you see it?

JF: And I don't think it's only my paranoia. I mean, you can check this with other people.

SM: How do you feel about Dennis Smith, then, our new Executive Vice Chancellor?

JF: Don't know him. I mean, I've met him once or twice, but I don't know. When he came on board, he joined the cabal of deans who were interested in getting a super-computer on the campus. But interest in computing is not necessarily interested in Computer Science. I mean, interest in a better library is not necessarily an interest in Humanities.

SM: Yes, that's right. Well, I'm kind of disappointed.

JF: Now, Parker has discussed with a number of people the possibility of making Information and Computing a major campus thing. And, so far, I don't think he's gotten people either in GSM or in ICS to get very excited about this. But I think that Parker was involved in getting this recommendation for a law school through, and now that he's done with that, I think that he's interested in looking for another major campus focal point. And so he's talked to a number of people about this. You know, the information age, the pervasive role of information and what should it be and what role should the university play in the research in this area. But no response that I know of from any of the faculty, like I say, in GSM or in ICS.

SM: That's a shame.

JF: Number six, are you ready for it?

SM: Yes, how well do you consider the campus has developed? This is just your experiences, coming at the very beginning, 1964. And the campus has developed up to 1974, when I talked to you about it. Now, where are our strong and weak points, do you think?

JF: I don't know. I guess, you know, in terms of things that most people measure, like research dollars, the campus has done pretty well. I'm not sure about the strategy of hiring superstars versus trying to develop people internally. But, obviously, that's something that Peltason and other people are interested in doing.

SM: Yes.

JF: Are there strong and weak spots? Certainly, yes. Some departments are stronger than others and some have improved more dramatically than others. Yes, ICS has made substantial improvements. I guess I know that. Social Sciences has made substantial improvement.

SM: How do your students do out in the world that have graduated?

JF: Financially, they do quite well. I don't know how the job market ran--it was supposed to be weakening--this past summer, but what the impact of [Iraqi invasion of] Kuwait and all of that is going to have on it. One of the major concerns that has been expressed by the faculty internally, and was expressed by an external review committee a couple of years ago, was the small percentage of ICS students who go on to

graduate school. For years, it has been the lowest percentage of students going on to graduate school on the whole campus.

SM: But what does that mean? They might prefer to go out into the world and go into business and so on.

JF: Yes. (inaudible) . . . initial salaries are high and there are opportunities there. There may also be some people, especially Asians, who have family responsibilities and have to help support the family rather than go on to graduate school, at least immediately. But it also points out some major holes in our institutional research, in that we don't follow up on people. Both the department and Career Planning and Placement ask them immediately after graduation what they're doing. Career Planning and Placement recently joined with some other campuses in revising their form, and they're asking people not only what are you doing next year, but what are your future plans? Do you think you'll go to graduate school during the next five years? And you get a more positive response from the ICS people there. What they actually do is not clear because ICS hasn't done the institutional research, nor has the campus. Now, Bob Daly's office this spring, I think, just sent out a . . .

SM: Who is Bob Daly?

JF: Bob Daly, I think, works for Sue Frisch. Have you got a phone book? We'll see what his title is.

SM: There you are.

JF: So what we don't have is good information about what these people do afterwards, which would be helpful not only in terms of . . .

SM: Here it is. D-A-L-Y, Robert F., Director, Analytical Studies.

JF: Yes. So that may provide some more information on what ICS students do afterwards. And I think that would be helpful, in terms of curriculum development. There's been a lot of talk in the field about the undergraduate curriculum and what's appropriate, and some people arguing for more fundamentals and being less trendy.

SM: Yes, the Dean of Undergraduates, whom I interviewed, Meredith Lee, because she's in between Sircello and the present one, who's very good.

JF: Mike Butler.

SM: Yes, Mike Butler. And they're very interested in undergraduate curriculum and interdisciplinary studies.

JF: But they don't have any clout. I mean, they don't have any money and they don't have any clout, so it's all moral suasion, yes.

SM: They don't have the budget, do they? Now, I'd like to know how your research is going.

JF: Not very well. My major effort since I left the position as Assistant Chancellor for Computing, I served a few stints as Department Chair during the last thirteen or fourteen years, but I've been working on a book about the management of

computing resources, based mainly on my experiences as Assistant Chancellor for Computing and some other stuff that I did for ICS, in terms of similar things. And I was having trouble figuring out how to put this together, and finally got to a format which I like a good deal, which consisted of a set of memoranda between Dan Aldrich and myself. While this had a certain appeal to me and some interest to certain people, we couldn't find a publisher.

SM: I'd like to see that. That's a good way to do it.

JF: Yes. We couldn't find a publisher so we're working on revising that into a more . . . well, general form. The problem was that it was too university-specific. People were afraid about the market. And also, it was too dated, in terms of describing what the situation was like in managing computing in the early seventies. So we're going to try to generalize it, both bring it up to the . . .

SM: We, meaning you editorially?

JF: No, Chuck Mosmann, who worked with me when I was Assistant Chancellor for Computing and now is at Fullerton. He's Chair of the Computer Science Department at Fullerton.

SM: Just an interested question, and I think the UCI oral history should know this. How do the programs match in, say, his work at Fullerton? What sort of a program do they have there?

JF: I don't know too much about that program. It's inside of the School of Engineering, a lot of bodies. They had a lot of the

same problems recruiting that we did. But I really haven't talked to him very much about that program.

SM: For example, you'd be very interested that the Oral History Program at Fullerton is the best in the state university system.

JF: Yes.

SM: And Jack wanted me to use them and I was glad to do it. He's paying the bill, you know, for having this typed--and done very well, an excellent job by . . . her name is Gary Long. And I'm impressed. I enjoyed going over because they have all the Nixon interviews, you know, all the way around their bookshelves. And they have done a lot of work on Orange County, these oral histories, and we're glad to have this being done by them.

JF: Yes.

SM: So this is now being redone, your manuscript?

JF: Yes, we're revising this manuscript. We have some publishers' comments and some friends' comments, and we're trying to put this material together in a form that we can get it published in.

SM: Good, good. Now how is the research record of your ICS program? This is the last question.

JF: I think it's quite good. The references that I made to this Coordinated Experimental Research grant, I think, is indicative of that, and there has been other funding, some

DOD [Department of Defense] and some more NSF funding. The major funding has been in three areas: in software, in artificial intelligence and in computer architecture. But, yes, I think the research record and research funding is quite respectable.

SM: Very good. That's very good.

JF: Yes.

SM: Any suggestions for me in my work as UCI Historian? That is usually the last question. I forgot to put it in.

JF: How much of this material that you're collecting, you know, has been written up and how much of it is public? Maybe in my dotage I'd like to take a look at some of the stuff.

SM: Well, this is what has happened. I completed twenty-eight interviews between 1965 and 1974.

JF: Yes.

SM: And they are in the library. There was restrictions on only two. One was Clark Kerr, [who] asked his to be restricted for ten years. But since I interviewed him in 1967, that's open now.

JF: That should be up, yes.

SM: And the other one was Ralph Gerard, who I caught, luckily, just after he had left the deanship but before he died.

JF: Yes.

SM: And he was so annoyed at so many things, he said so many things about people that I just restricted it for fifteen

years. But that's open now. (chuckling) And now I'm completing this group, which will be seventy, and I'll have them finished in about a month. And of those seventy, only two are restricted. One is restricted for fifteen years because he felt he'd libeled his dean. But I said there's nothing like it. He hasn't said anything libelous. So that was fifteen years. I said okay because I wanted to have that interview on the record. And they're all stored over in the Archives. I've asked that they . . . I would like to have them kept . . . you know, not many people see them, until I've written the book. I'll start to write next February, and I'll get it done by the nine months. And then, if you wanted to, they're all open, except the ones I've mentioned. One was five and . . . Oh, no. One is fifteen--this is seventy people, no less. One is five, or three, and I don't know why that was, and then the other one was five. And I think there's no real reason . . .

(End of Side 1)

SM: And this is how it happened, Julian. All during last year, they ran a seminar at Berkeley about writing a history of a university, having in mind doing one at Berkeley.

JF: Yes.

SM: I was invited up--and, indeed, they paid my way. I went to five meetings. I couldn't go to all of them because I had an operation. Then, secondly . . . And that's going to continue

this coming year, and I shall try to go to at least four of them. Now, as a result of that, they had a program on new campuses.

JF: Yes, right.

SM: Having in mind the one that probably will be near Fresno.

JF: Yes, right.

SM: Now this is what happened. Dean McHenry was there, Clark Kerr was there, the Chancellor at Santa Cruz for a very short time was there, who went back to Berkeley--I can't think of his name at the moment, I'm blocking on it--and I was there and Hinderaker was there. And I talked about the early program in Humanities and how we set the curriculum up and so on. Now that was purely a discussion. And Gardner was there, as I recollect.

JF: Is there any record of that? Were there any proceedings of it?

SM: Yes, and I'll tell you something interesting.

JF: Okay.

SM: They literally made a TV . . . what's it called?

JF: Documentary?

SM: Documentary. They had just one machine and it was run over and run back and did very well.

JF: So do we have a copy of that here on the campus?

SM: I can ask for it. I'm sure I can get it.

JF: Yes, I'd like to look at that.

SM: Yes, well, it's interesting because Dean McHenry was very interesting. He pleaded for . . . If you're going to put it in the Central Valley, which appears that they will, to please put it up just on the side of the hill going towards Yosemite, because he said the tule fogs are just really a problem in the Central Valley. It was a very happy . . . There were, I'd say, as many as 100, maybe more, maybe a couple of hundred people there. And the experiences that you and I and the others had is interesting. The office of Gardner, he's got a person who is a vice president--and I can't think of his name--who is going around and getting information.

JF: What, for the new campus?

SM: For a new campus, yes.

JF: Yes, they're a whole panel. They're called faculty consultants and then they're administrative people.

SM: Yes, right.

JF: There are just lots of people involved in this whole thing.

SM: Well, that's being done by Gardner and Gardner is really on top of that.

JF: Yes.

SM: He was interested in the idea that we had of the new campuses having committees advising them from the old, like John Galbraith, you remember, was chairman of ours?

JF: Yes.

SM: We had Gleckner from Riverside or (inaudible).

JF: Well, there was an interesting proposal. I was at a meeting of the Academic Senate Statewide Planning and Budget Committee, and there was some discussion there. Alex Maradudin is the Chair of that committee and I was the UCI representative for this one meeting a couple of months ago. One of the proposals that came up there was hiring some people who are near retirement or just retired to do some initial administrative stuff for these new campuses because of the effect of the heavy administrative load on the careers of the people at . . .

SM: A new campus.

JF: A new campus. Yes, I think a lot of people got consumed.

SM: Oh, yes, indeed. In fact, I, as Dean, had to say, "Well, look we don't . . . There's no dichotomy between teaching and research. You must do your research." They felt they had just put in too much time [in administration, Senate committees, etc].

JF: Yes.

SM: Well, thank you very much for a very good interview.

JF: Okay, Sam.

END OF INTERVIEW