

INTERVIEW with BERNARD GELBAUM

June 25, 1971

McCULLOCH: First, I want to say, Bernie, how much I appreciated your work and always have, and we're sorry to see you go. I'd like that to be on the record--it'll be taped.

GELBAUM: That's very kind of you. Thank you, Sam, I appreciate what you said.

McCULLOCH: The first question is, what attracted you about coming to Irvine?

GELBAUM: Well, you asked what attracted my coming to Irvine? I suppose the answer is that it was a combination of a radical change from an old and established institution like the University of Minnesota, where I had been for 16 years, to a fresh campus where the buildings weren't even up, an opportunity to try some ideas that couldn't readily be tried at Minnesota, to have a hand in constructing from the ground up a new and marvelous institution. And, I guess, California climate.

McCULLOCH: Yes, and I think that is certainly an advantage. Now, the second question--I guess we can just follow along on this, Bernie.

GELBAUM: Sure.

McCULLOCH: Could you give me some detailed impressions of that first conference we had in August of '64, from which the Irvine plan emerged?

GELBAUM: I wish I could, but I wasn't there. I wasn't at the August, '64, conference.

McCULLOCH: Which was the first one you attended?

GELBAUM: Well, I arrived here September 7, 1964, took up the cudgels, and the one that I recall most vividly was that big academic planning conference, or that sequence of days of conference that took place--it was

toward Christmas time or afterwards, I've forgotten. It was roughly in December of '64 or January of '65 when Jack brought his bell in, and we had that long table where we threshed out--

McCULLOCH: This is what I remember very vividly, and very unfortunately, Bernie, they didn't keep minutes of this, so I'm--

GELBAUM: Of the big academic planning session?

McCULLOCH: Of the big academic planning session, and, if they have, I haven't got them yet. But, you see, we wrote out what we thought was the Irvine plan, that purple bulletin which we used to send out for recruiting, and that was done in October or November--that was written out.

GELBAUM: Of '64?

McCULLOCH: Of '64. Then we really went to work on this big conference that you mentioned. We hammered out the 3-3-6 general requirement, et cetera.

GELBAUM: Yes, that's right.

McCULLOCH: Well, what are your recollections then of this planning conference which was either December of '64 or January of '65?

GELBAUM: We drew up the 3-3-6 requirement. My recollection of it [the conference] is that it was generally amicable. There were certain questions that had to be threshed out. Represented at that conference were views that were as extreme with respect to the structuring of the academic plan, let us say, as the Berkeley scheme, which is highly detailed and says to the student he must do this and that and the other thing, and the other extreme, which I suppose I, myself, represented, which said, "Students, you are invited to come to this marvelous banquet and partake." And the academic plan that evolved, of course, was a compromise between these two, the 3-3-6, which was a far cry from the Berkeley detailed structure, and, on the other hand, not exactly a completely free academic plan of the kind that I thought would be a good thing.

McCULLOCH: I always thought of you, Bernie, as a moderate because I felt that Jim March represented the really extreme position.

GELBAUM: Yes, he represented an extreme position in a different connection, with respect to how classes were run and how students might be educated in a variety of formats other than the classroom format. He also--and I admired him for this--had the notion that a lot of our education was tied up with accounting procedures that were irrelevant to education. That's why he was in favor of the business of credit by examination, having all students in a position where they could reject grades and so on.

McCULLOCH: Yes, he held to that position early, though Jack Peltason was always for credit by exam, I can remember that.

GELBAUM: Well, but the point is that Jim was in favor of having students in all courses enrolled in that scheme so that they could reject their grades.

McCULLOCH: That is true.

GELBAUM: Well, that's been debated recently and defeated, as you know, in our own division, but it was a novel idea to which I do not yet take too much exception. I feel that, if the student in fact can produce in the course of a reasonable length of time--in the length of time that will correspond to normal progress--a fat collection of A's and B's and maybe a few C's, then the fact that he occasionally stumbled and ran down an F or a D shouldn't be on his record. You've probably heard that metaphor that I used or that analogy that we're pleased to know of the sculpture of Michelangelo--we're not concerned about all the rocks that he ruined in the course of getting those fine pieces.

McCULLOCH: Yes, I recall that phrase of yours--it was a telling one. Are there any other impressions you have of that planning session?

GELBAUM: It was good-humored. I think the thing that struck me was

that the attitude among the professors on the Irvine campus, especially those who had come from other campuses of the University of California, was that the work load should be much lower than the work load to which I had been accustomed before I came to California. I think that this has been an unfortunate subject, an unfortunate attitude, because it led to setting a work load that was lower than had previously been acceptable. And subsequent to that, that work load hasn't been met, in fact, by and large. In the School of Humanities, I know it has been met; in the School of Fine Arts, it has been met. But in a number of other schools, it has not been met. It is not only the case that the work load is low--and that's a bald fact--but there is an implication from that. The implication is that, when work loads are low and student populations are high, classes become large and crowded, and that's poor education, and the effort to provide students with education that they can appreciate and take away with them is one that should be made, and if it happens to cost the faculty time, that's what they're here for.

McCULLOCH: Well, I would agree with you. Let me ask you, then, the third question I have here, Bernie: When making your appointments in mathematics (you were appointed Chairman), did you find the Universitywide administrative regulations reasonable, helpful, or obstructive; in other words, when committees were formed (I'm thinking there more of tenured appointments), we had to use committees from off campus; how did you find that worked with mathematics?

GELBAUM: By and large, they were not troublesome. They made at least one very serious error in refusing to approve an appointment that I recommended. The man in question has since gone on to great glory. He is essentially inaccessible to us now. And that's just one case where their judgment prevailed over mine, and mine was better than theirs. I initially

responded somewhat poorly to the rather stringent and rigid methods that were used to evaluate appointments and to approve them. But as I have got used to the system I see its merits, I see how it has produced great faculties, such as the Berkeley faculty. And I feel that, if it is properly handled, it's a good thing. For example, I am inclined now to take that with me and to suggest how it might be used elsewhere.

McCULLOCH: That's quite a compliment, Bernie. I remember Jack's saying that if you made 10 tenured appointments and if you got eight of them approved, nine questioned but got that approved, and you lost one, that was quite a good batting average. That was his point. Know whether mathematics ran about that speed?

GELBAUM: Oh, we didn't have too much trouble. It's just that that one lingers in my memory, because it could have been such a good one, and we just didn't get it.

McCULLOCH: The next question--have you any suggestions as to how this can be changed? Now, of course, everything works on our campus. We do occasionally use somebody on our committees from other campuses, but generally everything is run off our campus. Do you have any suggestions to make?

GELBAUM: Well, my criticism at this stage seems to be with the delays that are occasioned, not by the committee work, but by the bureaucracy that either precedes the committee work or follows it. Papers end up getting shuffled from desk to desk before the committees see them or after the committees see them, and my experience has been that that is where the great delays are. It's not with the committees themselves. Now this might just be a question of understaffing or an organization that could be tuned more finely--that's the problem.

McCULLOCH: Yes. Do you worry much about confidentiality leaks by the review committees?

GELBAUM: No.

McCULLOCH: Now let's turn to the academic senate. This is the fifth question. How well do you think we set up our UCI senate?

GELBAUM: I think it was a good system, because the bylaws have been flexible enough not to prevent the kind of amendment and revision that they have experienced, and they haven't caused any difficulties. In two years as Chairman of the Irvine division, I didn't find that the bylaws were something we had to contend with at all. But we simply operated, and, when the bylaws seemed to be inflexible or whatever, we went ahead and amended them without much difficulty.

McCULLOCH: Yes, that's right, we did. That was due--I can't recall who was on the committee. Creel Froman, I think, was the Chairman of that committee.

GELBAUM: Creel and Abe Melden and maybe Jim McGaugh--I think it was Jim McGaugh.

McCULLOCH: I want to talk to those three about it to see what their reactions were at the time, and so on. Well, you've really answered the next question: Are there any bylaws you feel we should change?

GELBAUM: At this time I haven't been aware of any, but I'm sure that ideas will come up, and I'm sure that if they're valid and well presented they'll result in bylaw changes.

McCULLOCH: In what areas do you think you have had the greatest success? I'm thinking now really in terms of your work in the Mathematics Department, and then I'll discuss the other.

GELBAUM: I would think as a teacher and in research. I've been very fortunate in having been able to experiment with two different courses, each one lasting two years--freshman-sophomore courses--and each one of which, I think, has set a pattern that has been modified in the course of

time, but it has set a new direction that possibly is even spreading around the country.

McCULLOCH: I didn't realize that, Bernie. Is this the course in which the students gave you a bicycle because they liked it so much?

GELBAUM: Yes. Mathematics for the social sciences course. The last two years I've been giving a somewhat different (I would call it radically different) freshman-sophomore sequence for regular math majors or math students in the physical sciences and the biological sciences. I think it's obvious in the student evaluation I've been reading that it's a very rewarding thing for the students, and it's a real thrill for me.

McCULLOCH: Well, I know, Bernie, what a great teacher you are, and I know the students voted you that. I can recall their voting to have you give the first commencement address and so on. And I marvel at the fact that you can do this and your administrative work, because you built the Mathematics Department, then you became Associate Dean. Do you want to comment a little on the Math Department as a whole or how you feel things went, there?

GELBAUM: Well, I think it's a very viable department. It has a large number of very active mathematicians in it. It was put together (if that's the jargon word for it) at a time when recruiting was very, very difficult; that is, Irvine couldn't have chosen a poorer time to begin than 1964, when the academic marketplace was tight--it was tight against recruitment. If, by chance, we were organizing now, in 1971, rather than in '64, with the loose market that we have that is favorable to recruitment, I think we would have a much easier time and would have much less difficulty in acquiring the kind of quality we acquired.

McCULLOCH: The assumption being that we would have an adequate budget to do the recruiting. We did have a fairly good budget then, which I'm afraid we wouldn't have now.

GELBAUM: That's right, yes. Well, the whole thing is depressed. But I think it was an extremely difficult time. There was a rash at that time of new campuses developing all over the country, not only in California, and whenever you went to a professional society meeting you found yourself in a rat race with other chairmen who were trying to snaffle their candidates.

McCULLOCH: Thirdly, on the question of successes in your work as an Associate Dean, you were appointed, I think--was it in '67 you became--

GELBAUM: I think it was February, 1968.

McCULLOCH: Briefly, what are your assigned duties as Associate Dean?

GELBAUM: It's about everything, I would say. Fred (Reines) and I act really as associates--I mean, he has the final word in many of the things, but I think the students deal exclusively with me in all matters of appeals, petitions, changes of program, ironing out of difficulties and the like, a fair amount of planning of academic programs, of suggesting new curricula within the School of Physical Sciences--interdepartmental efforts are my responsibilities.

McCULLOCH: Who is in charge of the graduate work, in seeing graduate students and arranging their programs?

GELBAUM: Graduate students come to see me, too; that is, if graduate students need something more than a departmental conference, they very often come to me. Students just walk in this door.

McCULLOCH: Yes, I've always understood you've been very accessible and they come often.

GELBAUM: I must say that I have had a great deal of good luck in research since coming to Irvine.

McCULLOCH: Let's comment on your research, now.

GELBAUM: Well, I think that in the time I came to Irvine and that

I've been here at Irvine, my research rate of production has probably doubled or tripled in that period.

McCULLOCH: I certainly admire you for that, Bernie.

GELBAUM: Well, it was just good luck. The stimulus created by the balance of teaching and administration left less time for research, and therefore made the time available for research more fruitful. When you have long stretches available for research in mathematics, it turns out to be not a very successful thing. Some of the greatest mathematicians in the history of modern mathematics--one of the great English mathematicians, G. H. Hardy, said that no mathematician can spend more than a few hours a day on his research, it just doesn't work out. And so, if I didn't have something else to preoccupy me, such as administration and such as teaching, work with students, and so on, I would find the day a little bit empty.

McCULLOCH: How are you going to be able to continue with teaching and research at SUNY, Buffalo? Are you going to do teaching and research?

GELBAUM: Well, I'm going to take a little bit of time to get my feet wet, and I presume that might be at least a year. But my appointment at Buffalo is both as a full Professor in the Department of Mathematics and as the Academic Vice President. As soon as I see that there is any time in which I can spend some teaching effort, I'll try to do it because I thoroughly enjoy teaching. This is an anecdote item you may wish to have: Within the last 18 months, I began to receive communications from a young man in Nigeria who has been reading in the University of Ile Ife, I believe. He had been reading the literature of mathematics, and he happens to be in the field that I do research in, the field of topological algebra, Banach algebra, functional analysis, that sort of stuff, and he has stumbled across my papers and found them interesting enough to cause him to do some research in the same direction. And out of the blue he sent me some drafts

of research that he had been carrying on and asked me to comment on them, and I was happy to do so. He was very original and had new ideas, and we corresponded for the better part of the last 18 months. Finally he said he would like to come to Irvine to study with me for a Ph.D., and I said, "Fine." We went through the procedures of arranging his admission here. He doesn't have a Ph.D. yet, obviously. And then, of course, this Buffalo development took place, and so as soon as it became evident, I wrote to him and told him how things have changed and said that there was a fine group of functional analysts in the Department of Mathematics at Irvine, and, even if I weren't here, he could profit greatly from the experience of coming to Irvine and working with others. Or, if he so chose, he could switch his interest to come and work with me at Buffalo, and he wrote back and said that he wished to come to Buffalo. So it now turns out that, if I'll not be involved in classroom teaching, I shall be guiding at least one Ph.D. student in the fall when we get to Buffalo.

McCULLOCH: I think that's a real compliment to you, Bernie, and this is what happens, that a good faculty member often takes some of his students with him, like a football coach taking his talent with him when he moves to a new job. Is this person you speak of a Black?

GELBAUM: I would presume so. His name is Ade Okuneye. I would imagine he is a Black and a native of Nigeria.

McCULLOCH: Where did he get his undergraduate degree?

GELBAUM: I don't know. I don't have much information about him. It's so evident he has mathematical background and skill that I didn't ask any further questions.

McCULLOCH: Well, then, going on, in what areas do you feel you had the least successes and why?

GELBAUM: I would say that the two big failures--well, there were

three big failures on the Irvine campus, three. One, in my view (I hope this will be taken in the proper spirit--I am not angry about it, I am concerned to see that it improves), I think there has been less than a complete commitment on the part of the faculty to teaching. Second, I think that the original plan in which there would be milder teaching loads, to be compensated by heavier commitments in the domain of advising, has not worked out; advising, I think, is still far from an ideal situation on the Irvine campus, and the students are hurting as a result. And I guess the third is that I had hoped to see the development of a number of interdisciplinary courses in the School of Physical Sciences--and elsewhere as well--and my efforts to achieve that have been unsuccessful.

McCULLOCH: Well, I'll comment on the third one because I felt the same thing when I left the deanship. I even wrote a report, and in the report to the faculty and to Dan I said that I had tried to develop interdisciplinary courses, but we hadn't really done enough--we needed to do more. Now, of course, Jay Martin's Comparative Culture (Program) has come along, which is interdisciplinary. Now, I'm just hoping that they will be able to merge with Humanities, if it's possible, and bring that element in there.

GELBAUM: You see, what I had in my mind, I mentioned earlier the interdisciplinary deal, was that there was a large fraction of this campus--roughly 80 percent of it or more--that really isn't in the physical sciences, and I think that people in those categories would probably find it very rewarding and worthwhile to be given some interdisciplinary course in the physical sciences with a closely knit theme that involves mathematics, chemistry, and physics, let's say, and I was unsuccessful in persuading those who might have led to such a creation to get it going.

McCULLOCH: Is there any way that you could recruit a faculty member who is that experienced?

GELBAUM: I would never do that. I think that those people are hybrids. I think they're less likely to be successful than professional physicists, etc.

McCULLOCH: Would you like to have, say, three people--one physicist, one chemist, and one mathematician--to work the course up?

GELBAUM: Something like that. Yes, I think so.

McCULLOCH: Well, I appreciate those three points you made. The next question, Bernie: What problems are unique to Irvine, because it's new or because it's a particular campus? What do you feel was unique or new?

GELBAUM: Well, obviously, the problem that people didn't know each other and they came from disparate backgrounds and therefore took some time to learn the procedures that other people were accustomed to. There was a lot of groping in the beginning, we didn't know every answer, we didn't know everything, and in the course of groping, by virtue of our newness, we made mistakes, we wasted time, we had to back and fill now and again to compensate for our mistakes. But I don't think that was a great tragedy. I think we learned a great deal, and we probably came out, in the long run, with some improvements over what might have been, if we had just been an old institution and kept going.

McCULLOCH: Do you feel that, because we're new and because people live various distances from the campus and because our Faculty Club hasn't developed as rapidly as it might, we lack a certain esprit as a group?

GELBAUM: Well, I think that whatever esprit there is on this campus is the result of its age distribution among the faculty. We are a young faculty. I mean people like you and me are the old codgers.

McCULLOCH: Yes, this is right.

GELBAUM: And we are relatively rare birds on this campus. You don't find many people retired--nobody has retired from the campus except one,

Ralph Gerard. And only one, so far as I know, has died--that's Ed Steinhaus. And the others are young people, and these young people, who constitute really a majority, have given the faculty a particular flavor that the faculty in an established institution does not have. They're young, they're willing to try new things; they're also impatient, which is typical of the younger people. They are a little bit direct and precipitate in their expressions and in their moves to accomplish things.

McCULLOCH: Do you think that this polarization they talk about between the younger and older members is a fact still?

GELBAUM: Oh, yes; oh, yes. And it is a fact that in some sense it is being encouraged by some of the older ones who feel that they're radical. An older member of the Irvine campus is a man past 40, and there are some past 40 who identify with the ideas of the young, and they even try to identify with them in dress and in tonsorial style and everything else like that.

McCULLOCH: I take it that throughout the country there's pretty much this polarization.

GELBAUM: I suppose. I recall having been a young Turk once upon a time in the University of Minnesota; but, when I was a young Turk, the Old Guard were really old Old Guard. They were men well past the middle 50s and sometimes well into their 60s, whereas the Old Guard around here are men well past the middle 40s by and large, the people who are the Old Guard.

McCULLOCH: In your recruiting, were you successful--I think you were--in getting a proper age span, and span of academic ranks in your Math Department?

GELBAUM: We've a fairly large spread from--I guess our oldest mathematician and one of our best is Professor Kalisch, who is 56, almost 57. Our youngest, of course, are quite young, in their late 20s or middle 20s, and we have them all ages in between.

McCULLOCH: Yes, you do.

GELBAUM: Oh, yes.

McCULLOCH: If you had to do it all over again, Bernie, what would you do differently?

GELBAUM: I guess I would have pushed harder for a college.

McCULLOCH: A College of Arts and Sciences?

GELBAUM: Yes, some cohesive undergraduate unit that is larger than the schools.

McCULLOCH: How does SUNY operate?

GELBAUM: They have a college. I shouldn't say that, really--SUNY has a two-dimensional structure, I guess that's a way of describing it.

McCULLOCH: This is Buffalo?

GELBAUM: Yes, at Buffalo. They have had at Buffalo (they're thinking about reorganizing it) seven things that they call faculties, such as a Faculty of Health Sciences, a Faculty of Law, a Faculty of Natural Sciences and Mathematics, Social Sciences, seven such, and these faculties are in some respects like our schools in the sense that they are both undergraduate and graduate. Of course, health sciences are not undergraduate, but by and large you have the full spectrum of levels of college education in these faculties. And then, running across them, there is a kind of graduate thing--I don't know what the exact title for it is, but there is a Dean of Graduate Studies, and there is a Dean of Undergraduate Studies, and he cuts across all these faculties and in that sense tries to bring something cohesive among them. I don't know how successful it has been. I'll have to explore it when I get there. There is a third stripe that runs across all these that's called the Division of Continuing Education.

McCULLOCH: Then, in a sense, it's something like our organization.

GELBAUM: The vertical lines of these faculties are essentially disciplinary in nature, but there is at least an attempt to coordinate them.

McCULLOCH: Who coordinates them?

GELBAUM: Well, as I say, there is a Dean of Undergraduate Studies, and there is a Dean of Graduate Studies. These men, as you might expect, do not have much budgetary control, because the budgetary control comes within the faculty. There is a Provost or a Vice President in charge of each of these faculties, and he is the fellow who assigns things out. These are things that I really haven't explored yet because I haven't got there, but I have spoken to ~~them~~, and I more than a little admire them. Their job is a job of persuasion rather than of budgetary control.

McCULLOCH: Let me get this straight again. At SUNY, Buffalo, you have a Faculty of Sciences?

GELBAUM: Well, there's a Faculty of Natural Sciences and Mathematics, that's one; there's a Faculty of Law, of Medicine, of Social Sciences, of Administration, of Education.

McCULLOCH: What about humanities and fine arts?

GELBAUM: Letters and Sciences, or Arts and Letters, I believe--one of those standard--yes, Arts and Letters I think it's called.

McCULLOCH: That's interesting, isn't it? Arts and Letters?

GELBAUM: I believe so. I haven't memorized it.

McCULLOCH: Which would be equivalent to humanities and fine arts here.

GELBAUM: That's correct.

McCULLOCH: I see. Now, do you think that, if we at Irvine introduced a Dean of Undergraduate Studies (we have a Dean of Graduate Studies), it would (we did talk about a Dean of Undergraduate Studies, in fact)--

GELBAUM: We had a battle about that, but lost--at least I lost (I thought we should have one).

McCULLOCH: I was with you there--I think we should have had one; it didn't work out. Well, you've really answered the next question, which is: Do you think we ought to have a College of Arts and Sciences?

GELBAUM: Well, as you know, our not having a Dean was almost an accident.

McCULLOCH: It was.

GELBAUM: But, as a matter of fact, when Jack Peltason came here, he came here as a Dean.

McCULLOCH: He was a Dean.

GELBAUM: And by virtue of Ivan Hinderaker's appointment to the chancellorship at Riverside, all of a sudden the situation became so changed that Jack Peltason, within a few months, became a Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs.

McCULLOCH: He did, and at that point I remember even Clark Kerr said, "Don't set up a Liberal Arts College, it gets too large." (At that point we were battling this matter out, whether we should have an Arts and Science College, or should we continue with these five divisions, soon to be called schools or colleges?) And Clark spoke quite eloquently against our having a College of Arts and Sciences, because he maintained that, as it grew, it would become too large and unwieldy.

GELBAUM: Well, the fact is, you see, that an undergraduate student today has to deal with several Deans, as a result of this.

McCULLOCH: This is right.

GELBAUM: If he is a major in the School of Humanities and he has to worry about filling out his breadth requirements in the 6-3-3, more than occasionally he has to deal with the Deans of the schools where his 6-3-3 are being taken. Well, I don't think that's a tragedy, but I think it is an awkwardness that could be avoided.

McCULLOCH: Well, there's where a Dean of Undergraduate Studies would be your answer, because I was on the side of not wanting a Liberal Arts College, simply because I felt that it would grow so large as time went on.

Now our time is going to be slowed down; we aren't going to get as large as we thought we were, as quickly as we thought we were, so maybe we could have had a College of Arts, Letters and Sciences in the beginning. That was my argument, but I did agree with the notion of an Undergraduate Dean who would try to coordinate this. And maybe we still will have to have one. I rather think we're going to have to come to something like this to coordinate this.

GELBAUM: The only catch with an Undergraduate Dean who will coordinate and isn't a line administrator is that his coordination must depend greatly upon his magical powers of persuasion.

McCULLOCH: Because he doesn't have a budget!

GELBAUM: Yes, that's a problem.

McCULLOCH: And there I put in a catch sort of a question at the end, Bernie. Are there any experiences in the early years that we've missed or that you'd like to comment on about Irvine?

GELBAUM: Well, I have found it a tremendous excitement. It's just been a real bully thing for me from the time that I came here. The first year was a year that I'll never forget. We all worked like Trojans, and I did not feel it; I would work Saturdays and Sundays and dawn to dusk and just exulted in it all the time.

McCULLOCH: Yes, I think we all did. I don't think I've ever worked harder in my life, but it was exciting.

GELBAUM: Yes. I suppose that, in the best of all possible worlds, a lot of things that happened might have been avoided and they shouldn't happen again. I suppose the thing that I most regret is the occasional falling-out among the faculty--I guess that's a real tragedy. That is, it's the academic equivalent of war which is a much worse tragedy because it involves human life and the destruction of it, but the fact that our

faculty really got disorganized and broken into at least two camps (when was that, in 1967, I suppose, or something like that?)--

McCULLOCH: In '68.

GELBAUM: In '68--was a tragedy, and I think that that tragedy has not yet been--I mean the marks of it have not yet been erased.

McCULLOCH: I completely agree with you, and I was--it's strong to say broken-hearted, but I was close to being that, as a result of that split.

GELBAUM: Well, there were two motives; that is, in the two camps, there were two--well, there were really three camps. There were those who were clinging to the academic structure, the senate, and are trying to make it a going concern and are not doing badly, if I may say so. There is a second group who were alienated and won't touch it, and that second group is broken into two subgroups, one of which is the group of the rather younger radicals who feel that the academic senate is a sand box, and they won't touch it for that reason. And the other is the older people who have some respect for the academic senate, but feel that it is now ineffective because of this first group that has splintered away from it.

McCULLOCH: What do you think the solution will be?

GELBAUM: Time, because if you check the academic senate meetings the attendance has been going up.

McCULLOCH: Yes, it has.

GELBAUM: And I think that in the course of time it'll go up more. What we try to do to encourage that is to cancel meetings where the topics to be covered seem to make up a thin list and to get meetings up in which there are rather crucial issues that would stimulate people to come and speak their pieces.

McCULLOCH: That was wise. One other question, the question of student participation, which I know you are very interested in.

GELBAUM: Yes.

McCULLOCH: How do you think that's going?

GELBAUM: It's going infinitely better on this campus than it's doing anywhere in the system. And the students, although they are not completely content, are much happier on this campus than they are anywhere else. On other campuses there are senators and, let's say, faculty members and administrators who really are terribly unsympathetic to the whole notion.

McCULLOCH: Do you think that is why The Regents finally defeated the move that the students wished to serve in the departments as voting members?

GELBAUM: I don't know why The Regents did it. I happened to serve on the academic council subcommittee that drafted the final suggestion about student participation in departments. I voted with the group for the recommendation they made, and that recommendation was against the student vote. And the reason I voted with the group was that I felt that to vote against it would, at that point, have been quixotic--I was the only person who had reservations about that--I was in favor of any kind of mechanism that would get students into the departments, into the senate, into the committees, in anywhere, so they could be heard. And I don't think it's so absolutely sacrosanct--the vote is so sacrosanct--that they should be denied it. We're not going to have thousands of students sitting in department meetings and voting; we're going to have student representatives. And if people say, "Well, they're not really representative," okay, they're not representative, but nobody is representative. My Representatives in Congress are not representative, either, of me, but they vote. I think that that would not do any harm.

McCULLOCH: Is the matter dead at the moment, or is it being set aside for a while?

GELBAUM: Oh, I'm sure it'll be revived.

McCULLOCH: It will be revived?

GELBAUM: Oh, I think so.

McCULLOCH: What about SUNY, Buffalo? Do they have students serving on faculties there?

GELBAUM: I don't think so.

McCULLOCH: Excuse me--on committees?

GELBAUM: I don't think so. This is a wave throughout the country--the desire to involve students. Each campus is coping with it in its own way or trying to arrange it in its own way.

McCULLOCH: I'm sure you were interviewed for the position. When you went there to be interviewed for the position, were there any students on the selection committee?

GELBAUM: Oh, indeed, there were students on the selection committee, and then there were other students to whom I was introduced and with whom I had lunch, student leaders of the student government. As a matter of fact, that issue of student participation came up in some of the interviews that I went through with the search committee. They said, "We needn't reveal a confidence, but you should know that a number of the people who have been reporting about you to us have made it clear to us that you stand very strongly in favor of student participation, or would you explain yourself?" And I did.

McCULLOCH: Yes.

GELBAUM: And I gathered the explanation wasn't too disappointing, but it's an issue, and I think that the students--I feel very sorry for them. They're young, and they're being battered by old men with old ideas that haven't really kept up with the times. I don't think I have kept up with the times. I have four young men of my own, my sons, and I see that the way they look at the world is, in many respects, better and certainly

different. And it's better than, and different from, the way I look at it. It isn't fair for me to assume that, just because I have reached this age and I've reached a certain position, my way is right. And they should have a chance to argue their points and make their points to us.

McCULLOCH: How old are your children?

GELBAUM: Well, let's say, starting in November and going through March of the period coming up, they will be respectively 19, 21, 23, and 25.

McCULLOCH: Then you certainly understand the generation gap.

GELBAUM: I wish I understood it better, but I certainly recognize that the old-fashioned attitudes of the University, which said, "The students will now come in, and we'll do the following things," just don't make sense. The students know more, and they've been exposed for years to television and to much more information--they've just been crammed full of facts and phenomena and observation, and they've been watching a war in their living rooms or their dining rooms for years now. You can't talk to students who are that close to reality and to some of the horrors of which our generation has been capable the way you would talk to children.

McCULLOCH: No, that's an extremely good point, and I quite agree. Well, I want to thank you, Bernie. This has been a very pleasant talk. Eventually this will be typed up--we don't have funds for it at the moment. And then you will be able to remove anything that you wish, and then it will be put in the Archives. It won't be put in the Archives right away, but it will be put in eventually. The typed transcript sometime will get to you and then will be put into the Archives.

GELBAUM: Well, that's very kind of you, Sam.

McCULLOCH: That's how oral history works, you know. Allan Nevins began it in 1948 at Columbia, and he decided that all the important statesmen, politicians, artists, painters--you name it--should be interviewed and their important reminiscences and recollections recorded. Then they worked

out a methodology in which, after the interview, if the person wanted to say something confidential, he would ask that the tape be stopped, and the tape would be stopped. But, when he finally sees the typed transcript, he is allowed to cut out certain questions if he feels like it. Then it is typed finally, he signs the statement that he approves of it, and it is then put in the Archives. Columbia has built up an enormous Archives. It has spread, and other universities do it. I've already talked to Clark Kerr, and I've talked to Dean McHenry, Jack Peltason, and so on--I haven't done as much as I should have, I have been too busy. I very sadly missed Ed Steinhaus--I was going to do it very shortly, and I missed him, and that was really very sad.

GELBAUM: That's too bad.

McCULLOCH: Well, I'll stop it now and thank you very much, Bernie.

GELBAUM: Well, you're most welcome, Sam. I appreciate your having come over to talk like this.