

INTERVIEW with JOHN GALBRAITH

March 17, 1973

McCULLOCH: Which of these questions can you answer, John?

GALBRAITH: Well, the questions I can answer really relate primarily to the general operation of the committee. I can't answer questions with regard to what happened on a precise date or precisely when the committee was appointed, although I'd think there must be records to that effect in the files of the committee or the files of the administration.

McCULLOCH: There are records.

GALBRAITH: But the committee was appointed sometime in early 1963--- maybe April was the date---certainly early in '63, and, of course, long before classes were held on the campus, when there were Dan Aldrich, Ivan Hinderaker (when was Ivan Hinderaker appointed?). It was shortly after his appointment, as I remember, that the committee was formed.

McCULLOCH: Was there one at Santa Cruz at the same time?

GALBRAITH: There was a parallel committee at Santa Cruz, which had a chairman at Berkeley, and which operated, as I recall, very differently from this committee. This committee was supposed to act as a kind of senate and a senate budget committee and to some extent educational policy, but the educational policy really wasn't being set by the committee. That was being developed by Ivan and Dan, and this committee really had very little to do with the characteristics of the Irvine campus. Whatever contributions it made were certainly not much in the realm of basic policy recommendations, except for the general framework that these people, Dan and Ivan, had proposed to develop.

The influence of the committee was largely in terms of the evaluation of personnel---who were to be brought in as the key personnel for the development of the campus---so that the budget-committee function became the big

function of the committee, and it was imperative that the committee operate not only with a high degree of rigorousness, but also operate fairly rapidly. What we did was to send out copies of the dossier to every member of the committee, and I would be on the telephone to members of the committee to ask for their evaluation. There have been many instances--some instances, at least--when we acted as a review committee as well as the budget committee. In most instances, we put the screws on people from the southern campuses to serve on review committees and got from them cooperation far greater than budget committees at UCLA and elsewhere were getting from people on their campuses; that is, we were getting very fast responses, but good responses. We were getting very good people. The average time, as I remember, from the time the administration submitted the case to the time that we got an answer back to the administration was probably about a week, something like that.

McCULLOCH: That's excellent.

GALBRAITH: This has never been paralleled in the history of the University. And that didn't betoken just a casual response. We did make a very good, I think, effort to give the administration the kind of strong academic input which they needed. Now the appointment of the dean of humanities actually was one, as you may remember, in which Ivan and I consulted, but so far as the other deanships were concerned the initiative was Ivan's. Of course, the initiative was Ivan's, too, for the dean of humanities, but there wasn't that degree of consultation. There were occasions when I disagreed with Ivan as to his judgment as to the appointments. Perhaps I should indicate--

McCULLOCH: If you want to indicate, John, I simply put a 10-year restriction, or a 15-year restriction, on this interview.

GALBRAITH: I would say that, with regard to that particular thing, I

disagreed with him on the appointment in social sciences.

McCULLOCH: Well, I think you were correct.

GALBRAITH: But I disagreed with him on the appointment in engineering.

McCULLOCH: But, again, you know what happened there. He didn't make the review committee, the five-year review committee.

GALBRAITH: So those were the two that I remember where we had a serious disagreement. But in any disagreement, of course, we recognized that, after all, we weren't the people who were going to have to live with the consequences.

McCULLOCH: No.

GALBRAITH: We'd give the best advice we could for the administration, but if they didn't choose to follow it, obviously that was their privilege. So essentially it did act as the senate budget committee, and in most cases it also appointed review committees, which is what budget committees essentially do. We did have a part in the appointment of Ed Steinhaus in terms of approval of the appointment. We had no part, whatsoever, in the appointment of John Smith, and my recollection is that we had no part in the appointment of Jack Peltason--I don't remember that we did.

McCULLOCH: That was a very key appointment.

GALBRAITH: Yes, but in administrative appointments of that sort we did make judgments about the person's academic qualifications, generally. I can't say for certain that we didn't have anything to do with Peltason--there would certainly be something in the records there. What concerned me was that the decisions were essentially being made by Ivan and Dan, with whatever advice they chose to take from the committee.

Now you asked the question here, later on in the game, about the location of the library. Our position, certainly my position, was that it was being put in the wrong place. I have an old-fashioned idea about the

library being in a central position. It ought to be related to the academic people, with as little distance as possible for everybody concerned. But Pereira had decided that the planning required the library be on the periphery, rather than in the center. As I remember, he had planned for a lake or something like that--

McCULLOCH: He did, yes.

GALBRAITH: Instead of a library. Whether that decision is right or wrong, I don't have any idea at this point--he may have been right, putting it where he did, but it wasn't done on an academic consideration.

McCULLOCH: Well, that's an important point to know, because we already have branch libraries, little ones, in the Physical Science Building and in the Biological Science Building and in the Engineering Building.

GALBRAITH: We were concerned that we not have branch libraries. We felt that if it were in the middle there would be less pressure, for instance. Now, at San Diego, of course, we had the same architect for the library, but there--I was involved in that decision, too, of course. We moved the library from the periphery into the center.

McCULLOCH: Very good.

GALBRAITH: It's at about the central point of where that campus eventually will be. Of course, it's sitting on the edge right now.

McCULLOCH: Right. It's up in the woods.

GALBRAITH: But Pereira didn't argue that one on the same basis. Now, it may have been something about the nature of the land or something of that sort. I'm not quite clear why the decision was made the way it was, but I got the impression that it was a closed issue. We obviously didn't have any influence in that regard.

You say in Question 14: Are there any experiences in your year and a quarter on the advisory council that we have missed? I don't know what you've missed.

McCULLOCH: Well, now that you have explained, John, what the function of the committee was, I understood wrongly that they had more to say on the academic planning. You were just on personnel, like a budget committee and occasionally--

GALBRAITH: No, we reviewed the plans that were being drawn up--academic plans--and we did have meetings on this, but my recollection is that the plan that came out wasn't really shaped to any great extent by what the committee had to say.

McCULLOCH: That's what I want, that's a good statement.

GALBRAITH: The committee didn't meet very often as a committee. It was very difficult to meet, of course, because they were scattered around Santa Barbara, Riverside, San Diego, and UCLA.

McCULLOCH: Well, how often would it meet--once in two months, would you say?

GALBRAITH: No. I really don't remember how often that was. My recollection is that it was supposed to be about once a month.

McCULLOCH: But you never quite made that?

GALBRAITH: I'm not sure we did.

McCULLOCH: Well, that's really what I wanted to get into this history--your recollection of the workings of this committee. I'm going to go up and tape Swedenberg and talk with him about what he remembers, because I worked with him pretty closely on my appointments in the humanities. When you left the committee, I had appointed Hazard Adams, and I had appointed Abe Melden, but I still had a foreign language chairman, and I still had a History Department chairman to appoint, and it was Swedenberg's job to conclude that.

GALBRAITH: Yes. You ask also here somewhere, did I personally want history in the social sciences or in the humanities. My feeling was, under all the circumstances, that history ought to be in the humanities.

McCULLOCH: I quite agree with you, and there is a big argument, of course, going on about it.

GALBRAITH: Certainly, given the kind of social sciences you have at Irvine, it would have been a mistake to put this in social sciences.

McCULLOCH: Well, we could not have survived, literally. And right now there is a big push on to try to have the social scientists really give introductory courses that students can understand. This mathematical component is too much for them. They just simply come over to the humanities and to history, so we get a lot of majors at Irvine that we might not usually have. They'd be in political science, economics, anthropology, geography, sociology, psychology, etc.

GALBRAITH: I think it operated very well within the framework that Dan and Ivan wanted it to operate, and it performed as a senate budget committee primarily--as a senate budget committee very well. I don't think there has ever been a senate budget committee as good as that one was.

McCULLOCH: Well, I must confess you certainly moved rapidly--that I must say.

GALBRAITH: And there were good people appointed--with a couple of exceptions.

McCULLOCH: Okay, John. Thank you very much, John.