

INTERVIEW with CLAYTON GARRISON

June 26, 1974

McCULLOCH: And I ask you, Clay, what attracted you about coming to Irvine?

GARRISON: I think foremost was the opportunity to initiate, in a new situation, a program that was different from any of the other programs in the area of fine arts on a University of California campus.

McCULLOCH: Could you expand on that a little?

GARRISON: Yes. It was clear that a new campus certainly could not compete with the research resources of Berkeley or UCLA or of Harvard or Yale or Columbia or any of the really major institutions--institutions which had extraordinary libraries. And it was also clear that not one of the campuses within the University of California system had committed itself to a performance- and studio-centered program. There were studio and performance courses on all of the campuses, of course, but no one was willing to say that at an undergraduate level this was the center of the program. For the most part, the arts seemed to be defended in terms of illuminating the humanities in one way or another. So it seemed to me that, if one could get a studio- and performance-centered program going at an undergraduate level, this would provide for the state of California a program that had not been available and obviously would not duplicate anything that had been done. And so the opportunity to initiate such a program was what really attracted me.

McCULLOCH: Very good. I know, Clay, you've done extraordinarily well in what you set out to do, and I have attended most every play and every dance recital and every choral work, and I think you've done a fine job. I know that somewhere along the line you're going to tell me that we never got

the resources we were originally promised, and you couldn't build what you wanted to build. But let's get back to the first conferences. I know you were at one, for example in August, 1963. You came down as a consultant, and I've got your picture with all the rest of them. What are your memories of those early conferences where we hammered out the Irvine plan?

GARRISON: I have a couple of responses to make. The response that really surges forth is a memory of having orally presented and to have written up for Vice Chancellor Hinderaker a 75-page report on what I thought should happen in the area of fine arts on the new campus.

McCULLOCH: Is this in the Archives?

GARRISON: Yes, this is in the Archives. I think you'll remember, Sam, that initially Fine Arts were in with Humanities and that there was no School of Fine Arts in the original organization of this campus. There were only the four major schools--Biological Sciences, Social Sciences, Humanities, and Physical Sciences--and I have argued in that document that there should be a School of Fine Arts if, indeed, the campus was going to grow to a campus of twelve to twenty-five thousand. So I remember quite clearly, in the beginning talking about the need for this kind of a program, and I remember the administration's search for a Dean, a search that was not fulfilled because there weren't the resources in order to start a school. The budget had already been committed to these other four schools, and each school, I think, forfeited one faculty member, and a contingency of one was taken from somewhere off of that initial faculty of something like 105, and so we started the school with a total of five FTE.

McCULLOCH: I remember that, Clay, and I was particularly unhappy that you didn't have more. The reason I was unhappy was that when Ivan came to me (he first approached me in August of '63) they had just made this decision to have the Fine Arts, with the Humanities separate, and I said, "Well,

I'm delighted," because as Dean of the College at San Francisco State I was used to handling what was called the Creative Arts Division, and it was a superb division, but it surely gave me headaches. And I said, "I'm very happy to have the Humanities, and this is an excellent decision, but I hope that there'll be adequate staffing." And he, at that time, felt that he could do it, but I suppose subsequently he didn't get what he wanted.

GARRISON: I think that no more faculty members were forthcoming, and the existing units, as I said earlier, needed to forfeit a position in order to get the program going, because there were so few positions and so little support that the first administration could not find anyone to serve as the Dean in the nationwide search. And it was then that they returned to me and said, "Well, you presented this idea about a School of Fine Arts, and we've gone on a search and we can find no one. Would you be interested?" And I thought that the possibility of starting a whole school involving art, dance, drama, music, and film with only five faculty members was a rare opportunity.

McCULLOCH: I heard things a little differently about the search, Clay. This is for your benefit. I heard that they'd gone around and they'd heard, "Well, why do you come to us? There's Clay Garrison out there at Riverside doing big things. Why don't you talk to him?" It reminds me of the presidency when Sproul resigned. They went all around and everybody said, "Why don't you pick Clark Kerr? He's sitting right in your back yard."

GARRISON: I didn't know that.

McCULLOCH: Yes. I know one thing for your information: You had done such a superb performance at a Regents' meeting. I have interviewed, I guess, one Regent. And when I was talking with Dan, he remembered coming around to see you because of this performance--what was it you did?

GARRISON: We did a performance of The Boy Friend at Riverside for The Regents.

McCULLOCH: The Regents were just delighted.

GARRISON: I think that particular performance came at a good time.

The Regents were divided over a certain issue, and there was a question over how well would the dinner go that night because of differences of opinion, and a late afternoon performance of The Boy Friend apparently took care of that and generated a certain spirit. My early conversations with the administration, then, dealt with the question, how do you get a whole school started with nearly no resources? That probably is the most prominent thing that comes to my mind.

The other thing that I remember with great warmth is the extraordinary exchange among the 24 or 25 people who sat around the table, as you know, two or three times a week or four times a week--certainly always once or twice a week--talking very openly, very freely, and in a very flexible manner, I thought, about what would be the best way to go in creating a new institution. Those open conversations generated an initial spirit which carried this campus through the first four or five years. The size of the campus, I think, inevitably precludes that kind of ease in discussion, but it is precisely what the campus needs now if there were some way to get to it. And those are very fond memories. I saw the two dozen people grow together, learn from one another, generate mutual respect and confidence, all of which was, of course, extraordinarily important to the first year, and on reflection I can think of no suspicions of any unit concerning another unit, of any person concerning another person, of no suspicions which inevitably arise, I suppose, as institutions begin to develop, and which probably necessarily arose when the resources became lean, as they did during our fifth and sixth years of operation.

McCULLOCH: Yes. Any other impressions? For example, Clay, I can remember in our discussions there was a more conservative group--that was

Bernie Gelbaum--and there was a middle group with myself in the middle, and Jim March was out here on the left.

GARRISON: Yes.

McCULLOCH: And what I always felt and cherished was the way that we could--I suppose Peltason had a lot to do with the way we resolved what we were saying and would get it down into our Irvine plan. Didn't you feel that Peltason was a very great mediating force?

GARRISON: I think he was an extraordinary mediator and a marvelous synthesizer. He had a style of making everyone think that he had his own way.

McCULLOCH: The reason I'm asking you these questions, Clay, is that Florence Arnold was supposed to have kept the minutes, but they never were kept. We didn't have a tape recorder going, and we have no record of those early meetings. Now, I've got everybody telling me what they recollect, but what we should have had was a tape recorder going and we could put the tapes in the Archives, but we never did that.

Well, going on to the next question, Clay, in making your appointments in the fine arts, did you find that the Universitywide administration regulations helped you? Of course, you came from Riverside and knew about ad hoc committees, review committees, and so on. Did you find those obstructive in the sense that you were really after people who didn't have PhDs--some of them who were superb artists, say, or dancers or whatever it was? Did you have any peculiar problems in your appointments, or didn't you?

GARRISON: I had no problems at all in making all of the appointments that I wanted to make initially. I say I had no problems at all--I'll come to a rather interesting one, and I think that probably it should go into the Archives. Happily, the Chancellor of this campus understood that people in the arts think in a different way, create in a different way, indeed work in

laboratories in part in the way that sometimes the scientist works in the laboratory and that this creative activity, which is peculiar to that kind of artistic activity, should be recognized instead of articles and books and publications. Also, happily, at the same time, Clark Kerr published his book called The Uses of the University in which he spoke of the need for the university to understand the peculiar problems of the creative performer or the creative studio artist, and there is quite an eloquent chapter in that book concerning the need for the structures like the universities to recognize the artist in the different way. I suspect it was the combination of Clark Kerr's thinking and the Chancellor's knowing that he had backing in the office of the President, the Chancellor's own openness to this, and not finally--probably foremost--an extraordinary group of initial appointments, all of whom understood this problem and supported it (by the initial appointments I mean people like you, people like Abe Melden, people like Hazard Adams, people like Ed Steinhaus--I could go on naming any number of people--Jim McGaugh). All these people were very sympathetic to the problems peculiar to the artist and were very aware of what advantage, in a way, institutions had taken of artists, or, put another way, how artists had not been able to progress up the academic ladder or be appointed. They're always the lowest paid, and within institutions I think that's probably still true. If you take a look at the average salary of people in fine arts on a campus, it will probably be at the bottom. Well, this combination, then, of my colleagues, of the administration (Hinderaker and Peltason and Aldrich) plus Clark Kerr's leadership made it possible to make these appointments with ease. I think that clearly the record demonstrates that they were first-rate people, and if they hadn't been, certainly the appointments wouldn't have gone through.

There is one appointment that I'd like to comment upon, because I think historically it's of valuable interest for the whole University. In the

area of dance, as you know, I sought out Eugene Loring, who historically will be considered one of the half-dozen foremost choreographers of this country in this century, and I proposed Eugene Loring's appointment, but in proposing the appointment I needed to solicit some records within the academy. Loring had made speeches throughout the country in a number of academies, but he had never taught formally--he was always busy running a professional school or choreographing for productions in New York or dancing in New York or doing films or television. And I thought, well, surely two or three people within the University know him, know his work, and perhaps I can get a letter of support on his behalf. I think it would be injudicious of me to mention any names; however, I can say that on two campuses on which there were dance programs I solicited letters of support, and tenured people in the area of dance on these campuses denied providing that support. They said that Mr. Loring did not have a degree, Mr. Loring did not have an academic background, Mr. Loring was fine for the professional world, but that kind of a world did not belong in a university and, beyond that, he was balletically oriented; that is, ballet was the center of his choreography, and they felt very strongly that ballet should not be involved in a program in dance in the University, that only modern dance or creative dance should be a part of the study or the studio program, and that they would not support him. And, indeed, they didn't.

McCULLOCH: That is very interesting!

GARRISON: Isn't that an interesting story? Now, Loring had superb letters of recommendation, of course, from people like Jerome Robbins, Balanchine--

McCULLOCH: You couldn't go higher than that.

GARRISON: No. And, in fact, some of these letters were, in a way, a kind of embarrassment to the University because the letters would begin

with, "Why do you ask me for a letter of recommendation on Eugene Loring's behalf?" Agnes de Mille's record on the behalf of Eugene Loring is a marvelous historical document. Well, with people like Robbins, Balanchine, de Mille writing letters of support, of course an intelligent faculty and administration is going to respond positively. Eugene Loring was appointed as Chairman of Dance; has developed an extraordinary program, as you know; introduced ballet as a study in the University of California curriculum; and since Irvine took the leadership in providing studio work in ballet, ballet is now accepted throughout the country. Before, there was only one institution in the country that offered studies in ballet.

McCULLOCH: Where was that?

GARRISON: Utah, and that was it. And one University of California institution, which had great suspicions of our program, subsequently introduced studies in ballet.

McCULLOCH: I congratulate you, Clay. I'm delighted to have this on the tape, and we'll transcribe this and put it in the Archives.

Going on to the next question, which therefore really doesn't pertain-- how would you like to see our appointment system changed? Well, maybe you do have some ideas about that. Do you feel you're still getting your appointments through the way you want them and the system is, on the whole, functioning well, or would you want to see some changes made?

GARRISON: I can recommend no changes. I would recommend changes only if the faculty did not seem to understand our problems. But I say again, the faculty initially understood the problems, and apparently now the faculty understands the problems, because we continue to make appointments of superb people, of course.

McCULLOCH: And also visiting appointments. I really congratulate you. I think Tudor coming out, Anthony Tudor--I've seen those recitals that he

gave last year and the year before. And also your man from London, your Shakespearean--

GARRISON: Brewster Mason.

McCULLOCH: Brewster Mason. Just delightful shows, really! A great idea, getting these people in for a quarter. The students, let alone the community, must really profit from having people like that.

GARRISON: Well, as you can imagine, it's an invaluable experience for the students because it does present another point of view. It presents an opportunity for very concentrated study. The reason for this is that someone like Tudor does not have his apartment or house to worry about. He is here for a period of time, and so for those ten weeks he's on campus sixty hours a week--he's working all the time. And the same way with Brewster Mason--Brewster Mason arrives on campus at nine in the morning and leaves about eleven at night, and so the students get--

McCULLOCH: I just loved that show he gave two or three weeks ago. I really enjoyed that.

Well, going on, Clay--on the way we set up our Academic Senate, I've got several questions which really say, how well do we set up our Academic Senate and are there any changes you'd like to see? That's roughly what I'm trying to drive at. We do have, for instance, more elected committees than any other campus; for example, at Riverside I think only your Committee on Committees is elected, and they appoint the other committees. Now, here we elect virtually all our committees. How do you feel?

GARRISON: I didn't know about that. I must confess I know probably not enough about the Academic Senate.

McCULLOCH: Well, I'll put the question another way. Are you satisfied with the way they have granted your requests for courses to be offered? Are you satisfied with the committees which pass on your appointments and promotions and accelerations and so on?

GARRISON: From my point of view, the machinery must be 90 percent efficient, and I think that would be extraordinarily high. We have not had major problems. The Committee on Educational Policy has always understood any changes that we wanted to make. Appointments Committees, the Budget Committees have understood promotions.

McCULLOCH: I'm delighted to have your answer, which incidentally, Clay, has been pretty much the reaction of almost everyone. Jack Holland, for example (I went down to San Diego to tape him), says he absolutely stands by the UC system. He feels that, on the whole, it produces first-rate people, and, so long as the committees are first-rate, then you're going to get first-rate appointments.

GARRISON: Yes. Sometimes it seems awkward, and sometimes it's irritating.

McCULLOCH: Slow, slow.

GARRISON: And it's extraordinarily slow. But I think that, in terms of 10-, 15-, 20-, 25-year commitments to programs, to people, it's as effective as any piece of machinery probably could be. And it has the advantage, obviously, of the conversation of a great number of people, the recommendations of a great number of people for administrators to respond to.

McCULLOCH: I'm glad you say that. In what areas do you think you have had the greatest successes here at UCI? What would you like to point to? And the other one is, what are the least successes, or where did things not go the way you wanted them to go? I'll put those two questions together.

GARRISON: Next year is our tenth year. By the end of next year, I feel that I will have accomplished as much as I'd ever hoped to accomplish in a ten-year period of time.

McCULLOCH: Wonderful!

GARRISON: I'm almost there. Within these ten years, the performing aspects of the school have achieved international visibility. Our studio

art people are known throughout the country; our program in dance clearly has international visibility; the program in drama has international visibility, in part generated by the quality of the permanent people here and in part by the visiting people who come and go; and the program in music has at its center some of the finest musicologists in the country, indeed they rank among the top one or two people within their particular areas of specialization. Not that visibility is all that important, but I think it's unusual for an institution in ten years to say that it has achieved that kind of visibility in its performance and studio program. It's nearly achieved it in its history and theory and criticism aspects of its program, and that's why I asked for next year.

By the end of next year, with the appointment of two more fine young art historians we will have a faculty of six in the area of art history, all of them with strong publication records already under way and with book commitments, and that will then provide a more traditional support to the program that we haven't had. I knew that we couldn't do everything in the beginning, and that's why I opted for the studio- and performance-centered aspects of the program. And this meant that the history and theory aspects of the program were probably going to trail a bit, and they have. But we now have on our faculty a superb dance historian, Olga Maynard.

McCULLOCH: Yes, I love her. She's great!

GARRISON: Yes, she's absolutely first-rate. We have these art historians that I've already referred to; people like Colin Slim and Bill Holmes in the area of musicology have enormous reputations; and people in drama, people like Bob Cohen who has a fine national reputation in terms of his scholarship. And my own reputation is emerging internationally as a specialist in staging 18th-century opera.

McCULLOCH: You are doing one this year.

GARRISON: I've become a specialist in a period and have a contract for a book that needs to be written.

McCULLOCH: Do me a favor, Clay. I'd love to see you do a Mozart opera. Mozart is my favorite composer, and I hope that one day you're going to do one. For instance, Stanford did Don Giovanni this year. Of course, that's a little ambitious, but certainly Figaro--I heard Figaro done at Michigan awfully well, when I taught at the University of Michigan.

GARRISON: Don Giovanni this year, yes, that's right. I'd love to do The Marriage of Figaro. We did Così here, you'll remember.

McCULLOCH: Oh, I loved that, oh yes! Yes, that was great! With Popper.

GARRISON: We did Così with Jan Popper, right, of UCLA.

McCULLOCH: That was great!

GARRISON: I'm looking forward to our doing Mozart.

McCULLOCH: Do a Mozart, and I'll go to all three performances. Well, going on, Clay, is there any area in which you thought things didn't work out, short of not getting the staffing you wanted? That was a great disappointment, wasn't it?

GARRISON: Well, the great disappointments were not getting the staffing I had hoped for, not getting the resources to support the school, having to support a school from the box office (it's not a pleasant way to do business within a university structure, but it is an absolutely essential way--for a number of years, the box office provided half of our supplies and expenses and support). Those were disappointments, and those were things that didn't go the way that one would hope for.

But the thing that always kept my spirit going was the enormous freedom which the University provided to me and to the school, for my colleagues in the school, to develop as we saw fit and the trust that the University had

in that. As a result, in addition to these fine appointments and superior programs which are internationally respected now, we generated an interdisciplinary program that I think really is an interdisciplinary program; that is, we have no departments, as you probably know--we have only areas--and we fund ideas and programs and performances, rather than funding departments, and this has provided enormous freedom, and I'm happy to have that a part of the record, because it's one of the means by which we've been able to do as much as we have been able to do. If we decide we're going to do an opera, whenever we decide to do our next Mozart, we do not have to hassle among departments for released time or money; the school decides it will do an opera, and the resources go there.

McCULLOCH: That's great!

GARRISON: It's the only way, I think, to run a performing school, and growth has not in any way complicated this approach to budgeting.

McCULLOCH: A question that I didn't ask you, but I'd like to: In terms of planning your Fine Arts Village, did you get what you wanted? After all, you planned that physical plan.

GARRISON: Yes. Given the enormous complications of getting anything built within a state institution--that is, having to deal with the architect, the University local architect, the University statewide architects, the appropriate bodies at Sacramento--I think we came out extraordinarily well. We came out extraordinarily well in that we got good, clean, open space, which is of first importance, I think, for a program in performing arts; we have two fine halls, a fine little concert hall and a fine small theater; finally, much of the ornamentation was discarded, and I think that was a happy situation because, although the buildings may strike some people as a bit severe, the scale is a human scale and we wanted that, and they operate in a very functional, very practical kind of way, and they've provided minimal problems of maintenance and upkeep.

McCULLOCH: I'm very happy to have that answer. Well, going on to the questions that I did send you, what problems are unique to Irvine (I mean, because it's new or because it's a particular campus)? You, having been at Riverside and coming from the Riverside campus, what do you feel is unique? In a way, you've really answered the question, but any extra thoughts you might have now? You talked about how you had a chance to set up a program with a conservatory orientation, with a performance orientation, that you got the backing of everybody, the Deans, the various Senate committees. Is there anything else you want to comment on?

GARRISON: Well, the uniqueness of the separate undergraduate/graduate schools has, I think, presented some problems in undergraduate studies. Because of the understandably necessary competition among the schools for resources at a time when the state was reducing its funding--or seemed to be reducing its funding--schools, I think, began to compete. And they compete, again understandably, in terms of their majors (a school has a responsibility to its major) with the result that the campus has not attended, although it hopes to attend, with the appointment of a Dean of Special Programs and with an increasing number of conversations concerning this problem initiated by Hazard Adams. I think the campus is more sensitive to the undergraduate nonmajor needs now--the general education needs--than it was. But the highly professional competitive nature of the separate schools initially set up this problem.

Another problem that has emerged that I think no one really anticipated is that this campus has become a commuter campus, and that presents other kinds of problems in connection with atmosphere. Initially, the first two or three years, there was an on-campus atmosphere--

McCULLOCH: One-third on campus.

GARRISON: Yes, an at-home kind of atmosphere. Conversations came about rather easily among students and faculty because people seemed more

than not, to live here; now people seem more not to live here than to live here.

McCULLOCH: Do you think a good Student Union will help this problem?

GARRISON: No, I don't think a student Union has anything to do with the problem; I think the problem has to do with the organization of activities which are appropriately related to an academy. I think we have marvelous success with this particular problem because our students are involved in playing in an orchestra, singing in a chorus, performing in a play, doing dance concerts; our graduate students are involved with other students because they direct their plays, they choreograph their projects, and so our students are interacting constantly from early in the morning until late at night because that is their discipline. I think that's what generates a spirit. This is more difficult in other areas--it's extraordinarily difficult. I suspect it's quite difficult in your area of specialization. And I don't think a Student Union does it; I don't think football teams do it; I don't think certain other projects that have come forth--

McCULLOCH: You've thought this out. The way I look at a Student Union, though, Clay, I felt that when the one was built at Riverside it made a difference. The commuter student didn't just come onto campus, take his courses, and dash off the campus; he had a place to go to, and furthermore he made friends, and then he would eat there, and certainly when it's raining, for God's sake, he had a place to go, and so on.

GARRISON: Yes, I agree with you absolutely. I suppose the reason I reacted with some reservation immediately was I'm not certain the Student Union is the place. I don't think it has to be one monument on the campus; I think separate monuments could probably be more effective, more local monuments with the same kind of money. Now, maybe you want a central spot where they can participate in table tennis or bowling or--

McCULLOCH: Well, believe it or not, I voted for satellite Union buildings, and I'm still not convinced that one monolithic building is possibly going to be the answer, but I sure want a Union of some kind.

GARRISON: I think you make a very good point for the commuting student having a place to go to sit, to eat, to be indoors when it's windy or raining.

McCULLOCH: Well, going on, Clay, what would you do differently if you had it to do all over again?

GARRISON: Well, I certainly would not want the comment to sound as if it comes from enormous conceit, but, if I had it to do all over again, I would do exactly what I did.

McCULLOCH: Well, it's not conceited. I asked the same question of Jack Peltason (I've asked it of other people), and Jack said, "I wouldn't have done one thing differently."

GARRISON: I can't think of anything that I would have changed. Maybe I would have done a bit more with studies in film or television initially, but I'm not certain of that, and, not being certain, I can't say that I would have done it. I think what my colleagues who came here initially did was to build a very solid academically oriented core for history and theory and criticism and a superb performance-centered program, and that's what we intended to do. And these ten years have demonstrated, I think, that we have done it. And when one considers that our funding over these past ten years has been from 25 to 40 percent per student below the national average, I think we've done an astounding job.

McCULLOCH: Oh, there's no question, Clay. It's been a great job. But getting back to that question of film, I suspect you probably had people saying, "Well, look at UCLA, forty miles away. They've got all this money put into films and so on. Why should you duplicate?" And they probably discouraged you.

GARRISON: Yes, we were discouraged initially, and indeed the fact that UCLA has a superb series of laboratories, that USC, very near by, has a splendid film program, it just seemed to me that it would be a bit ridiculous to compete or to attempt to duplicate. We tried not to duplicate, wherever we could.

McCULLOCH: I remember talking to you about this question, and I said, "I'm not going to have Speech; I just don't feel we should have Speech; you've got Fullerton, excellent; UCLA, excellent."

GARRISON: Precisely.

McCULLOCH: But going on to the next question, do you prefer the present school structure, or would you, on thinking back now, prefer a College of Arts, Letters, and Sciences? Now, I know you and I sat down with the others, and we wanted the schools or colleges, and we felt, as we grew, that we were right in opting for it. Now we're ten years out, and how do you feel about it?

GARRISON: I still feel that we were right in opting for the separate schools, and I feel that the problems that have been generated by these separate schools are problems that can be solved more easily than problems that I saw at Riverside, where there was a very strong College of Arts, Letters, and Sciences.

McCULLOCH: In fact, Ivan had quite a problem getting an administrative change there. Well, the last and final question, Clay, are there any experiences in the early years that we've missed or that you'd like to comment on, that came to your mind as we've been talking?

GARRISON: No, I think you've asked fine questions, and the questions have afforded me the opportunity to say, as I went along, things that I would want to say about the beginnings.

McCULLOCH: Well, I would like to put on the record, then, that I'm enormously impressed with what you've done, and I felt that when I was Dean

we worked very well together. We had you teaching Shakespeare, and I felt that our links with Fine Arts were very close--and still are. And I think that the job you've done is marvelous. The only thing I feel a little sad about is that it takes us a little longer to walk over to the Village. When you were up on the fourth floor, we were constantly up there; whereas, to go over now when I want to talk to some of your people, I think in some ways the distance has cut down that closeness that we had.

GARRISON: The distance has cut down the closeness; however, we're moving back into Humanities Office Building next year.

McCULLOCH: Is that right? Glad to hear it.

GARRISON: We'll be moving some faculty members over here, and I think that's going to help the situation again. I'm pleased that you comment on the happy collaboration between the schools of Humanities and Fine Arts initially and the continuing collaboration, because that has been of enormous importance to us to have the support of the humanists, and we have, as you know. The people in English and the people in Drama have interchanged course offerings; many of our courses are cross-listed with Classics.

McCULLOCH: You had a joint appointment last year.

GARRISON: We've had joint appointments, and without that support we just wouldn't have moved ahead in the way we did, so I'm grateful to all that you did for us initially in energy and in understanding.

McCULLOCH: Well, I was delighted. Thank you very much, Clay. I've appreciated this.