

FINAL
DRAFT

INTERVIEWEE: GORDON "PETE" FIELDING
Professor and Director of the
Institute of Transportation Studies

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

DATE: May 12, 1989

SM: This is an interview with Professor Gordon "Pete" Fielding who is the Director of the Institute of Transportation Studies. It's in my office, HOB 360, at 2:30 p.m. on May 12, 1989.

And, Pete, I'm very pleased that you're here and I'm looking forward to this interview. You as a New Zealander and I as an Australian, that will hold up the down under area.

GF: Maybe they'll be able to understand the accents, whoever has to transcribe this?

SM: You know who is taking these? The Oral History Project at Fullerton.

GF: Cal State Fullerton.

SM: Cal State Fullerton's got the best oral project in the state system, and Jack Peltason would like to use this Oral History Program. They've got the Nixon interviews and all that, a whole slew. So, then, I send the tapes over there and they type them up and then I correct them and send them back to be re-typed.

GF: Good.

SM: And I've been over there and I'll be over there, no doubt, several more times. They've come over here.

Well, first question, Pete, you came in 1965 as we opened, as an Assistant Professor of Geography. Now, what did you teach and in what Research Cluster did you belong?

GF: Well, the first year, we taught very little, in terms of our original disciplines. We taught primarily Social Science classes. And I taught in the Introduction to Social Science, that was Social Science 1, where all the faculty in Social Science used to be involved in it. And it was a great challenge to us because they forced us to confront areas of knowledge outside our own discipline and to be responsible for both teaching and the handling of discussion sessions about them. I think it was a rather creative idea of Jim March because all of us learned a lot during that period. It was part of his organizational design to make us interdisciplinary.

SM: That's very interesting. I remember he, himself, lectured.

GF: Yes.

SM: I can recall some of his students talking to me and said he was a very good teacher.

GF: A very good teacher and challenging topics: diffusion; structure; ~~the kind of~~ (inaudible) learning theory; exchange; the kind of thing that many of us knew something about but never thought about in that way before.

SM: Yes. Now, when did you move into teaching Geography?

GF: That started in the second year. And then I taught the introductory sequence in Geography and also I taught a sequence in what we called Urban Studies in those days, which was a combination of Urban Geography and Urban Economics. It's course we team-taught as a . . . There was an Economist and myself [who] taught that course.

SM: Was Charlie Lave a teacher?

GF: No. A fellow by the name of John Weiker, who later then went to Ohio State University.

SM: I remember, yes. That's W-Y-K-E-R, wasn't it?

GF: No, W-E-I[-K-E-R].

SM: W-E-I. Yes, I remember him. Now, the next question, Pete, you became Director of Transportation for the whole of Orange County, and all of us at Irvine were pleased, that a person like yourself would be in charge. Could you tell me some of the things you planned and the problems you ran into and so forth?

GF: Let's go back a little in it, because it really was a UCI project. It started as part of "Project 21."

SM: Yes, I was going to ask you that.

GF: Which came up subsequently, which was a program that Dan Aldrich and Dick Baisden began in the . . . oh, maybe 1965, 1966, in order to get people organized.

SM: Yes. Let me just quickly explain on the tape that Dick Baisden is the Dean of Extension, and I'll be . . . and

doing a very good job of organizing Extension courses for Orange County. And I'll be interviewing him pretty shortly.

GF: They put together a group of leading citizens and faculty to consider issues for the twenty-first century. I was involved in two of those groups, one on open space. And, really, the base recommendation for that was that we should seek some way of merging the Harbor Department with their fund-raising capacity, with the Parks Department, and use the funds to ~~create~~ . . . purchase open space. And, if you look around Orange County now, Featherly Park in Anaheim, the other park--I've forgotten its name in Brea--the Mile Square was purchased that way, with those funds, the Caspers Park on Ortega Highway. Several of these areas, which were fairly substantial in terms of open space, were purchased and were preserved. So, I think that was a very significant contribution from this.

Now, let me get away from that and talk about Transportation. One of the other programs was Transportation, and the recommendation at that time was that we should seek to establish a transit district in Orange County. Mary Evelyn Bryden was a part of that committee.

SM: How do you spell Bryden?

GF: B-R-Y-D-E-N. Plus, other members of the staff, or Dick Baisden's staff, who worked on this. Mary Evelyn carried this idea forward in 1969 and 1970 and they held an election in Orange County and on a motion by the Board of

Supervisors, they created a separate countywide transit district. And that was formed in 1970 and began in operation in 1971.

I was then continued as part representing the university on a committee to consider how should we formulate that. And, one day when we were sitting in the office, we were going around thinking of who would be the general manager of starting up, one of the supervisors turned to me and said, "Well, Pete, will you take the job? We need someone like you that can plan it and get it underway." I said, "Yes, I'll take it, if you can get me leave from the university." It was a kind of an extension of something that started inside the university, to going to do that, and I . . . I think at the end of working with it, at the end of . . . Actually, in January 1971, I left the university and took an extended leave, in order to help them set this up.

SM: How long were you . . . did you do it?

GF: I was there almost four years. Part of it was coupled with some teaching, half-time teaching, at either end. I had two years full-time in leave and two years of part-time leave staggered through it to enable me to do it. But it was a really exciting experience. And, when you look at it, in many ways it was applied social science in work.

SM: Say, a quick question that long has puzzled me. Now, you had a important, a lot of important influence. Now, you

didn't . . . Buses were used for transport. What did you have to say about . . . in terms of rapid transit, a train of some kind?

GF: Well, the train, you see, they improved Amtrak service that ran from San Diego to Los Angeles. That was part of our strategy and we put together a consortium from . . . a supervisor from San Diego, a supervisor from Orange County, who was Supervisor Ralph Clark.

SM: Yes, I remember him.

GF: And he and Supervisor Baxter Ward from Los Angeles.

SM: Oh, yes, from L. A., yes.

GF: L. A. and it was really the . . . Orange County being the central group, we were the driving force. And we were able to, I think, in the first place, save Amtrak service on that line and to gradually to improve it with state subsidies.

SM: What about some thought of a train or tram running north and south?

GF: Well, that was part of our plan, and it was voted ^{up}. We adopted a totally integrated rapid transit plan in 1974--voted on it in 1974--to provide a one-cent sales tax, but that failed. Really, that was our basis of taking the old Red Car track for the main part of that from Santa Ana up through Garden Grove, Westminster, to Stanton, and then continuing it on either as part of the Century Freeway or right through to connect with the line that they're building to Long Beach. That probably will happen eventually because

the Transit District purchased that right-of-way. They purchased it from Santa Ana to Stanton and that was with money that was set aside on that ^{for} (inaudible). ^{purpose} L

SM: Now, my feeling about it, Pete, is that we're getting this gridlock and the time has just got to come when we'll get a train or a tram.

GF: Well, I think you're right. And this was clearly in our minds, if you go back to the mid-sixties. We could see then, looking to the twenty-first century, that things were going to happen in Orange County. We were less than a million population at that time when we started. We could see us going to three million population by the twenty-first century, and that was what these key ideas were looking for. The key people in the county knew what was going to happen but it was very difficult to get a consensus of support.

I look at the Transit District and everybody criticized that for years about, well, it just didn't have enough riders. Well, it takes time to get something into place. It's like, look at this university. Sure, it took us twenty years to get enough students to make it feel like a university, but it's the same with the Transit District. The early 1990s and it will come into its own and people will recognize it.

But, if you go back to the idea of the bus system--and you heard me say it was pure social science, or an application--it was built upon the central place model in

Orange County. And, really, what we did is as we connected the major centers together and primarily the major shopping centers and a few other destinations like downtown Santa Ana and the university here, and other places like that, and then made those the major coordinates of the system for the fixed route, and then we designed the small buses that go to the houses to pick people up--Dial-a-Ride--to provide local service into that center. And we're even ahead of the Reagan administration in that way, in that each one of those small modules, using small buses, was operated by private enterprise.

SM: Yes. I use the word "mini bus," to pick up the people. But you call it Dial-a-Ride. Did it work out well?

GF: It works very well. If you just call in and place an appointment, and it costs a lot more and it's very difficult to get in, but if you don't have an automobile--say, your automobile is in the shop that day or something--you call them the day before. You can be picked up. You can drop your automobile off, take you to the regular bus system. It works very well for elderly people who have to go to hospital appointments, doctors appointments, or to senior citizens functions. They usually know a day or two in advance and they can call in and they're not so tightly scheduled.

SM: Tied to a schedule, yes. No, that's right.

GF: It really works well. The other people it works well for are those people going to private schools. In the south county, it's frequently used in that regard.

SM: Oh, really?

GF: So, it's a very popular system. And it provides the local basis, the local feeder, and then you've got the large buses connecting the major points, which we call the central place theory. So, it really fits very nicely into a theoretical principle in social science.

SM: Very good. Well, I was always interested in it and, of course, I've ridden the buses and so forth. And, as far as I'm concerned, which is the back part of Newport Beach on the west side, a bus comes, oh, not far, on University Avenue in Irvine.

GF: Yes.

SM: A bus can be picked up there and you can get on out to the university from there.

GF: You can get on there, but the real advantage for people living in that area, people going to and from South Coast Plaza.

SM: Yes.

GF: A lot of the people in there who work in South Coast Plaza don't take their car because parking is difficult, especially in the peak seasons and the summer. And that's where the bus system comes into play.

SM: Yes. And you can get over. If you go down to Westcliff, you can go over to Fashion Island.

GF: Yes. In some ways, buses work fairly well for people that don't have to make too long of a trip, and they work best for those people who have to go on a regular schedule. They're not too good for other people who have to work late and things like that, but the key issue in the bus system to remember is that you're not trying to get everybody. If you can just get 10 percent of the population, or probably a bit more, say, 20 percent, are either riding the bus or sharing a car ride or ride-sharing, you can accommodate the traffic increase that we're looking for in the twenty-first century. It doesn't accommodate everybody because, for most people, an automobile is what they need.

SM: Yes.

GF: But it's just taking the peak hour or the one that causes the congestion, the one that causes a need to build more freeways and all of those kinds of things.

SM: Did the Irvine Company have representatives on your board or whatever you call it?

GF: No, no, but the Irvine Company was very active in "Project 21."

SM: Yes.

GF: In the early stages of it. So, they contributed in a major fashion to the beginnings of augmenting the ^{options} (inaudible), so they didn't have an active participation. The board was

made up of representatives from the Board of Supervisors and city representatives.

SM: Yes, Baxter Ward and . . . Now, number four we've talked about. Did you think of the idea or who had this idea of the Dial-a-Ride? I know who was very interested was Professor Boughey and I interviewed him back in 1972. I interviewed the first twenty-seven, the people who, like Clark Kerr all on down through Dean McHenry who is the Dean of Campus Planning, to Aldrich to Peltason, Hinderaker, and then Peltason, and then the Deans and then the Chairman. And Boughey came in as a Chairman and he was giving me a marvelous description of your mini buses and the whole thing. It was very exciting. Was he involved with you in any way?

GF: No, no, but just interested, I think. For an Ecologist, he could see then what we were trying to do, because he could see building a hierarchy. Just like a school system, you have an elementary school, a junior high school and a high school, a community college and universities in a structure. What I was trying to build in the transit system was a structure. I started lowest with the mini buses and moved up to the fixed route buses and then eventually to the rapid rail systems. Now, we've got the Amtrak service. I hope one day we'll get enough money to have the high-speed rail on that old Pacific Electric Line.

SM: Yes. Have you written all this up, Pete?

GF: I wrote a book. Well, really, I wrote it at various times. The theory behind it is communication theory. It's written up in some of the articles I did in the mid-seventies. Last year I published a book on managing public transit strategically.

SM: Oh, that would be great.

GF: And I tried to put a lot of these ideas together and show that, with good application of good concepts here or the application of good concepts, you could develop a much better system.

SM: Do you have a copy of that book?

GF: Yes.

SM: I'll swap you. I'll give you a copy of my book on Australian river boats.

GF: All right. That's a fair exchange, Sam.

SM: (laughter) Now, that's just fascinating. And this is going to . . . of course, is why I'm writing this history. It's going to run about 300 to 400 pages, maybe more. It's fascinating. Of course, I've got my title: The Instant University.

GF: Yes.

SM: We started out with A.B., Ph.D., M.A. Ph.D. Now, next question, number five. When did you return? You say roughly four years ^{from} (inaudible) 1971 to 1975?

GF: Roughly, I returned really . . . 1975, essentially. Again, I returned.

SM: And did you return to this . . . Did they set up this Institute of Transportation Studies?

GF: No, I just returned as a professor of Social Science. I was an associate professor by then.

SM: Yes.

GF: And I returned to my regular position and, subsequently, they created ^{ITS} . . . The Institute was at UCLA and they agreed, with Dan's help, to transfer it to Irvine. And I was appointed later that year--I think it was in 1976 before I was appointed Director at Irvine. They had a normal recruiting ^{process} around and ended up with appointing me as their ^{current} Director at Irvine.

SM: Good. You certainly deserve that. But you're quite right. They have to do the search.

GF: Yes.

SM: And now, does this work involve mostly administration? Are you doing some teaching or anything?

GF: Well, no. It's a half-time appointment. It's like most other administrators, so I continue to teach three courses, two or three courses in Social Science.

SM: Do you teach Geography?

GF: I still keep the one Geography class each year--the Human Geography class--going. Then I teach courses in either, more recently Urban Economics, because Economics is in tremendous demand and I teach Urban and Transportation Economics now.

SM: Oh, right.

GF: We don't have a Geography program.

SM: Now, I know that.

GF: So, that part of my work . . . But then, in 1983, I was then appointed system-wide Director, so I'm not only responsible for what happens at Irvine, but the one at Berkeley and some other research at Davis and UCLA.

SM: Oh! So, therefore, you're telling me that you're sitting on a statewide group that involves UCI, UCLA, Berkeley and Davis?

GF: Yes.

SM: Any others?

GF: No, they're the major ones. And so, I went from 1983 . . . In 1983, I gave up my Irvine directorship and then became the statewide Director, or system-wide director.

SM: So, I should really say you're system-wide Director of Transportation?

GF: Yes. You know, it goes back to the old days when we had system-wide directors in several areas.

SM: You bet, of course.

GF: I think it's an idea now that probably has outlived its usefulness, except in agriculture.

SM: Let me just make one check.

(tape is turned off)

Well, that's very, very interesting. And you're publishing a book and so forth and some articles. That's great.

Now, I'd like to return here to Jim March's original plan which, of course, you've got in that . . . sort of in that purple book, but was spelled out in the first catalogue, which I have up there.

GF: Yes.

SM: And every catalogue since we started. And what was your opinion of that highly structured, ultra-mathematical, ultra-quantitative, ultra-model building system?

GF: Well, I think I'd qualify a couple of the ultras there.

SM: (laughter)

GF: I think it was highly a theoretical view of human behavior, but I don't think it was that highly mathematical. I think there was a mathematical base in it.

SM: (inaudible) and the students had to have two years of math, you know.

GF: Yes, but that wasn't highly mathematical, in terms of that.

SM: Wasn't it?

GF: Given the fact, with the students coming through increasingly, they've caught up to that very quickly. I think March was interested in relatively simple models of human behavior and really very simple mathematics. And much of his mathematics was more statistics, which really you needed in Social Science. I think he was in the front of the wave, in terms of that, and it seemed that way, certainly, in 1965. But by 1970, most other places had caught up. He had that ability to be able to see where

knowledge was going to be in the future. But as a result, all our graduates did very well, initially.

Now, the idea, the thesis behind it, was that human behavior is a body of knowledge and it shouldn't be broken down rigidly into Economics and Political Science and Geography and Anthropology. But the interesting areas were where the two meet together, like Political Science and Public Choice. In my area, in Geography and Economics, which comes into planning and public policy, those are the interesting areas when you bring two fields together, and that's what he could see was an advantage at Irvine. I think it was a great idea, but it outlived its usefulness.

SM: How much (inaudible).

GF: Now, it's outlived its usefulness. The problem with it was that it worked very well while we were relatively small and cohesive and that we could meet together and people would interact. But when our faculty started to get up over forty people, we never, we had no basis for natural coherence. Now, the disciplines, whether we like them or what we think of them, the disciplines give you a body of knowledge, a set of journals, a set of procedures that one uses to analyze and look at human behavior. An historian looks at the same concepts as a political scientist or an economist, but they look at it from a different point of view.

Now, what happened to us in Social Sciences is that there was no coherence about a body of knowledge as Social

Science. We never created a unique body of knowledge. And so, too many faculty just took it for granted, would take no responsibility, and the school didn't function very well. And so, we had a sequence of deans after March that really couldn't do anything with the faculty. And that's where it lost out on. And so, now we've gone back eventually to departmental.

SM: You departmentalized, yes.

GF: Now, the unfortunate thing, Sam, was that I know you did this when you came in as Dean of the Humanities and we probably said to you, "Well, that's ultra-conservative," like you said, that ours was ultra, ultra-statistical and mathematical.

SM: Statistical and mathematical and model building.

GF: But, over a period of time, you were right. Over a period, for the advancement of knowledge, Jim March was probably right. For the structure of building viable universities, Sam McCulloch was correct in this area. Because you could see over a period of time that you had to have some coherence, you had to have a structure, and that's what you did. The School of Social Science failed to provide structure. They tried many different things and nobody would take it seriously.

SM: You know, that was an interesting thing, Pete. I interviewed Jim around 1972 and I said, "Now, you're a specialist in organization. You're an organizational . . .

Now, how come you have this anarchic organization and nobody could decide anything after you left?" And I said, "Did you really try to do this?" And he just laughed.

GF: Yes.

SM: He just laughed. So, I think he used to play games a bit and I think he was amusing. But he did something I wanted to do. I liked your interdisciplinary work.

GF: Yes.

SM: You really had it. We tried and I had to really almost hit the department heads on the head in order to have interdisciplinary courses and programs. And the core course finally came up, but it wasn't until 1970. Hazard Adams was the Dean. That was his great achievement.

GF: Yes.

SM: Still going, by the way, still very successful. I, myself, just attended all lectures and took a quiz section, corrected all their papers.

GF: Yes.

SM: It was great.

GF: Well, see, that proves what Jim March was trying to do in 1965. His Social Science I was that which brought everybody together.

SM: Yes, great, great.

GF: But the only problem was he should have seen that you needed some structure as well. I think where it could have gone, probably what we should have had is we should have had the

interdisciplinary structure at the undergraduate level and the structured degree programs at the graduate level. And that would have given the faculty enough coherence, enough feeling together in this area where you had to educate someone in a discipline that they could have been contributed to things, so, I think we've learned something from it.

SM: Yes. Certainly, I think, as I look at your departments now, the Anthropology--I've already talked to Kim [Romney], interviewed Kim--but I haven't (inaudible) but the Chairman is Mike Burton. I understand that the Anthropology is doing well. Political Science, of course, that's, I suppose mainly Willie, Willie Schoenfeld's work, and organizing that and a very successful group of people that's now a department. And, as you look, therefore, could you comment on question number eight, what is the future as you see it for the Social Sciences?

GF: Well, I see it going more to the departmental level. I think the real strength in the next decade will come from those interstitial areas. I think Political Economy . . . It won't be Political Science, as we know it, it will be Political Economy, or Public Choice is another name they call it. I think another one is the area of Mathematical Social Science, is another interesting area where Duncan Luce's group is bringing in people from other areas and

causing a cluster. I think those will be the exciting programs for the next ten years.

SM: Yes.

GF: And you can see it's still interdisciplinary. Our programs are still within their discipline area, like Anthropology or Sociology. I think we've got . . . It's going to take time to develop those.

SM: Yes. Now, tell me about Duncan Luce again. He's a member of the National Academy, is he not?

GF: Yes.

SM: And where did he come from?

GF: Well, he was here for a number of years in the mid-seventies, and then he left here and went back to Harvard again.

SM: Oh, did he?

GF: And then chose, when the opportunity came, to have an Irvine interdisciplinary program in Mathematical Social Sciences. That attracted him back.

SM: Now, tell me, when he was here in the early seventies, was he involved with the Graduate School of Administration?

GF: No, he was in Social Sciences.

SM: He was always in Social Sciences? Okay. I may possibly . . . I don't know him, but I thought I might interview him because he really has a lot of clout.

GF: Yes.

SM: And, apparently, he's doing things in terms of the future. It looks very promising.

GF: Well, I think this, in the area of Social Sciences, it matches a little bit with what Murray Krieger has done here in Critical Theory.

SM: Yes.

GF: But I don't think that we've got the programs. And our problem is that we don't have the departments to build with the form like you have in Humanities. So, that's a weakness.

But one of your other questions, Sam, I'd like to comment on is: "What do you think of the future of UCI?"

SM: That's the next one. That's the last one.

GF: Let me comment a little bit on this. I see the UCI model is the UCLA model and that we're in a process of very rapid growth, and not very distinguished. We have little bits, like Critical Theory, Mathematical Social Science, a small group in Biology. They're very good people--I'm not saying they're not--and the faculty is good, but we're not by any means prestigious where we might have been. We know that we're not anywhere near where San Diego is, as an overall campus, and we're about the same age. I think we're better than Santa Cruz. We're not nearly as good in some areas as where we might have been.

I see us now adopt a model, and you look around campus, all the buildings and all the students, we've taken the

position we're going grow like UCLA grew. And UCLA grew very rapidly in the late fifties, really, the early sixties. They added a lot of faculty. Faculty were clearly eligible, all of whom published, you know. They were very difficult. If they weren't publishing, they were let go, but they never built many distinguished areas.

UCLA wasn't known for anything very much until about the mid-seventies. What happened in the mid-seventies and the late seventies [was] that UCLA has had the large faculties, many of whom started to retire. Then they started then to apply careful selection of Deans and Chairmen, started to recruit some very good faculty, usually from the associate professor on or full professor on, and coupled with the amount of money that the Chancellor had from private sources, was able to attract and fund really good faculty.

I think this is Irvine's model. While we talk about all these other things that we're going to maybe be distinguished in ten years, but there's not a hope in hell when you look at some of the programs on campus. English has done a great job on this campus. But you look at some other areas, and we don't need to name them, they're good departments, good faculty, do a great job at the undergraduate level, but they really have not got it together in terms of a cluster for graduate education.

SM: That's why I think Ed Steinhaus and that biological group, particularly Psychobiology, Jim McGaugh and those people.

GF: Yes.

SM: Brilliant work, yes.

GF: Brilliant work, but they've got a cluster of faculty, some kind of redundancy in faculty. Several faculty working together have been able to pull it off. Now, in other areas of the campus, we've had individually brilliant people who have made some great ^{contributions} . . . but they've not had a cluster around them, so if that person left or retired, we've got no continuity. There's no ongoing body of students going on, so the school or the university gets a name for it. And I see that happening in the twenty-first century at Irvine. By that time, we'll have more than 20,000 students. We'll have a community around us which is probably generating \$50 or \$60 million dollars a year of outside funds. You can't do it . . . We can't do it like Dan Aldrich was trying to do it on state funds. You've got to do it with some other funds. You can't compete any longer.

SM: Yes, I know that. I know that.

GF: And look at . . . See, graduate students, you see this in. If you're a graduate student, you're coming to California or you're in California. You know, you've got good grades. You apply to Berkeley, UCLA and Irvine. Well, maybe you like Irvine and they've got some good things going in Irvine, and we say to them, "Well, we'd love to have you but

we can't be too sure of what kind of support." I know what they can do at Berkeley. Berkeley says, "Yes, we'll have you and we'll guarantee you your support for the first two years." Every faculty member up there has a number of research grants or funds from the university. They have twice as much state funding for research as we have at Irvine. UCLA has more money for research than we have at Irvine. And, until we have that money, we can't compete. Otherwise, why would a student come here? And that's . . . Great universities are made by distinguished graduates.

SM: Well, that's true. And, of course, an undergraduate is not aware of that. And I think there are a lot of external things that make Irvine attractive: its campus, its location near the, you know, the ocean, and so forth. But you're right about trying to get graduate students.

GF: And so that's where . . . And so we've just got to bide our time a little bit. And I think the real thing comes when they replace faculty like me who started as an assistant professor here. I'll retire in 1999, somewhere about there. So, it will be then [that] there's a whole slew of faculty that will retire about that period in there.

SM: That's true. Yes, we were a young campus when we started.

GF: Very young.

SM: As you say, roughly the year 2000 or 1999, a lot of people are retiring.

GF: Yes, because, see, for many of us who came here as original professors, we didn't have much support. We've really carved out our own niches of research, and have done . . . Most of us have done reasonably well out of them. Now, we have a list of publications, we get grants, we get awards, our articles are published. We may be in the top twenty in our individual fields, ten or twenty, but to say that we've got a body of distinguished graduate students going through, I don't see it, Sam.

SM: You've got a very good (inaudible) and certainly this is true in history. Yes, definitely. Well, now, Pete, this has been a very fine, and it's interesting . . .

GF: Well, we missed one part there.

SM: What was that?

GF: You talked about somewhere, oh, accomplishments as Director of Transportation.

SM: Yes.

GF: Well, really, in Irvine, let me put in . . . say something about Transportation Research at Irvine.

SM: Yes, please do. (inaudible)

GF: You know, the Institute of Transportation Studies started here, as I say, I think it was 1975 it came to the campus - and I became Director--maybe 1974. In 1976, I became the Director at Irvine. What we've been able to create is an institute for Social Scientists, people from the Graduate School Administration, some people ^{from Social Ecology,} . . . a large group of

people from Engineering, which I think has created a distinctive group of study. They are clearly probably one of the one or two top Institutes of Transportation Research in the nation. And I think that's the kind of thing that I think we've missed out on here. We haven't done enough of bringing people together in this way. It's a success. We've got a volume of publications coming out of there. We've got two presidential, young investigative^{or} scholars, associated with it. We've recruited some good young faculty in both in Engineering and GSM. It's helped us with recruiting in Social Science to bring in people and it's helping us in graduate students. So, that's what I think I'm pleased to see here. Now, it's a small area, but it's something that people turn around and say, "What's Irvine known for?" And the people in Engineering and in Economics, well, they've got a good program in Transportation Engineering and Transportation Economics. *l.c.* *of*

SM: That's really interesting. I'm glad to know that, Pete, and I shall tuck it away in my memory. But, you know, I'm interested, for instance, in Social Ecology. I've talked to Arnie Binder and I will be talking to Ellen Greenberger next Friday. But there was somebody else and I'll think of it in a minute, but the point there was they're going to introduce a program in Planning.

GF: Yes.

SM: And that, of course, will be interdisciplinary. It will be very good. And I think that's been a successful program, by the nature of this interdisciplinary work. And Binder is a distinguished psychologist himself and he's sort of old-fashioned, you know, he holds them up and you've got to write a term paper and, by god, if you're on a field study, you make a report.

GF: Yes.

SM: So, the whole program has a kind of standard, which it might not . . . might have happened. I used to kid him. You know, I used to get a lot . . . I'm Emeritus now and I teach one course a year. And maybe soon they won't have any money and I'll not be teaching any, but I'd love to go on teaching. And I used to teach Constitutional and Legal History of England, and I'll work with pre-law students, with about twenty-five or thirty in the class. And Social Ecology has a program in law, so they would come over to take it, and I said, "Well, you know why they're not History majors, Arnie. They don't want to take the foreign language requirement and learn French or German or Spanish." (chuckle) But, don't you think that . . . Do you have any contacts with Social Ecology?

GF: Oh, yes, yes. And, in fact, there again, we've just helped Joe Di Mento get a fairly large grant to study transportation, the legal aspects of transportation.

SM: Yes, because he's got a law degree.

GF: Yes. Well, see, the old transportation planning scenario always proceeded from . . . through a whole series of steps from data analysis to development of alternatives and things like that. Now, the single largest project in southern California, the Century Freeway that runs from Norwalk to . . . or the Orange County line to LAX, that whole freeway is being built under court order. So, all the old procedures of engineering and planning are gone and you've got a judge signing off on everything.

SM: Is that right?

GF: And so, we've got . . . Di Mento has got a fairly large grant and may be close to a quarter of a million dollars to study this. And this is the way, how the Institute has been able to help. It helped Stokols who is now Director of the Program.

SM: Yes, he's the Director.

GF: And Novaco and others in that program to fund their research. Well, I think that Irvine has been remiss in not doing enough of this kind of thing, because that's what's made San Diego good.

SM: You know, we ought to . . . I've got to think about this because I want . . . This is the sort of information . . . See, I won't get to writing this thing for a couple of years, and it will take me about a year to write it. And I'd like this information to get out though, because this

will all come out in the book. Because we do have these little areas, little pockets of excellence.

GF: Yes.

SM: But, as you say, if we're going to follow a model of UCLA, we aren't going to be distinguished for awhile.

GF: No, it's going to be another ten to fifteen years.

SM: Yes, that's right. (inaudible)

GF: My view is that in Social Science I see this . . . that the idea that you need the structure departments for what we needed. We needed these areas where we bring people together, because this is where we had a comparative advantage at Irvine. We don't have a comparative advantage in Macro-Economics or Econometrics and we don't have it in most areas of History. We don't have it in Colonial History. You'd be the first one to admit that. Well, we've got yourself and other people have worked on this a little. But we don't have enough, compared with what they have, say, at Duke or other places around the country. And it's only by bringing together somewhere clusters in this area. And I certainly don't have it in Geography either.

SM: Well, we're (inaudible) reminds me of Jim March and his (inaudible).

GF: Yes. See, there's something in it, but how do you make it work? How do you make it work administratively?

SM: Administratively, when you've got about 20,000 or between 15,000 and 20,000 students.

GF: Yes.

SM: We've got 16,000 students now. Well, this has been a great,
great talk.

GF: Thank you, Sam.

SM: That's great.

END OF INTERVIEW