

INTERVIEW with ARTHUR MARDER

September 28, 1973

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

MARDER: That's an easy one to answer. On the, shall we say, negative or pathological side, I was very unhappy where I was, at the University of Hawaii. I'd been there some 18 or 20 years and had got pretty tired of the institution and the way of life there, and, moreover, the department wasn't going anywhere. But if that were all there was to it, I think I'd probably still be there.

No, there is the other side of the coin--the constructive, positive side--the opportunity, the challenge, if you will, of helping to build a brand-new campus, one with unlimited horizons; at least as I viewed the matter at the time, it was an exciting challenge. And the best proof that I'm not making this up now, Sam, is that I bombarded poor Ivan with memoranda. Maybe you did see some of them yourself--

McCULLOCH: I did see some of them.

MARDER: --about this and that aspect of this new university of which I was to become an honorable part.

McCULLOCH: Of course, you'd already thought about leaving, because I know you had this wonderful opportunity at Duke, and we were lucky to get you to come to Irvine. The thought of leaving had obviously--

MARDER: Yes, the thought of leaving had obviously occurred, and, equally obviously, had there been no new campus at Irvine or Santa Cruz, where I did have an interest for a while, I would have gone to Duke and doubtless have finished my years there. There was a definite offer of a job there. So, in last analysis, the decisive factor was the kind of challenge

that a new campus would offer, which one wouldn't find in a long-established place like Duke.

McCULLOCH: Why don't you just take that in front of you, Arthur, and use it.

MARDER: Well, the next question is, could you give me some detailed impressions of the conferences we held in the late summer and early fall of '64 from which the Irvine Plan emerged?

McCULLOCH: You remember you were the sole academic on the--

MARDER: Well, I do remember that I've often referred to myself as the only Indian, surrounded by twenty, or a couple of dozen, chiefs--Deans and Chancellors and Vice Chancellors and department Chairmen. The impressions I have now aren't necessarily the same as those perhaps I had then, but all I can do is think back. One impression that has stuck with me over the years is that there was a good deal of, shall we say, ad hoc-ism about the whole business. I never had any strong feeling that the modus operandi had been clearly thought out, that we would go from A to B and B to C. I never knew just what was going to be the subject of the following meetings. Maybe I exaggerate this thing, but this is the way it looks now (what is it?) some ten years later.

McCULLOCH: Nine years.

MARDER: What? Nine years later. I certainly missed position papers at the time. There were some such, there were some such in advance of the meetings. I did have some notion as to what was coming up, but not in any detail. But frequently I had the feeling that it would be so nice to know the pros and cons of a particular proposal, a particular plan, that I had reason to believe was coming up at the next meeting. I remember specifically that Ralph Gerard had such papers, such position papers, on the Graduate School and which impressed me incidentally at the time, though I

was one of the few, I guess, who were impressed with Ralph's far-out ideas about the Graduate School. But there should have been a good deal more of that kind of thing so we could have thought through these problems, instead of simply reacting with just a few seconds of reflection. So I can sum it up by saying that I'm afraid there was a little bit more groping than perhaps there should have been.

McCULLOCH: Maybe it's as well, then, Arthur, that we didn't keep minutes. As a historian, I was horrified to go to the Archives about a year later and find that Florence Arnold, who was in the meetings, you recall, and supposed to be taking minutes--and there was practically no record of what we said at the time except the ultimate product, which was that purple book we sent around to all prospective faculty when we were recruiting--the Irvine Plan, 1965.

MARDER: I had the same feeling of shock afterwards, Sam. I thought notes were being kept, minutes were being kept, if only for good historical reasons, but there wasn't anything, as you've just said, and to some degree I think our work perhaps suffered from it.

One other impression about these meetings: From the very beginning, it was impressed upon me that the Chancellor considered that his position was one of being kind of an interested observer. Chancellor Dan deliberately did not attend quite a few of the meetings, a great many of the meetings, preferring that the administrators--the initial administrators and faculty--should be responsible for the plans, for the shape of this new institution. I thought that was a mistake at the time, because on the occasions when Dan did attend he had some very useful things to say, but, I repeat, it wasn't his idea, his practice, to attend, and, if Dan were involved in the founding of a new campus some way or other, I would hope that he wouldn't repeat that. Well, you can make what you want of that, and I don't want to be

*if another
new campus
same day*

critical of Dan, but, as I say, I think that, if he had involved himself more intimately from the very beginning and stayed with it, perhaps we would have come up with a somewhat better plan.

Nothing else comes to mind--yes, I keep thinking about this same business of plans. You may have something on this further on; in case you don't, Sam, the principal impression that I believe I carried away, which I recall now, is the enthusiasm, or perhaps a better word would be idealism. I think just about every person present, including various people from other campuses--the consultant on languages that we brought in from Riverside, for example, and that brilliant chap, the educator from UCLA--

McCULLOCH: John Goodlad.

MARDER: Goodlad. Everybody had a feeling of purpose, a feeling of effervescence--I think the word idealism perhaps sums it up best. We were walking on clouds, we thought we had this heaven-sent opportunity to make this campus to end all campuses. This is what I think sustained us through the whole period of incessant meetings for months on end.

Well, if you have no point to raise, Sam, I'd go on to Number Three: How well do you think we did in making our first appointments in History? Well, you're asking me for my opinion ^{I'll} now, not my opinion at the time? Do you want me to make a distinction? ~~I don't know.~~

McCULLOCH: Yes, yes, make a distinction.

MARDER: A distinction--well, at the time, I thought we were doing well--perhaps not very well. And I say it because in at least a couple of areas that come to my mind at once, we didn't get our first, or even our second, choice.

McCULLOCH: Yes, I'm thinking--I looked in that--Marvin Zanheiser whom we asked to come. He has now just been made a full Professor and Chairman at Ohio State.

MARDER: Yes, well, I'm purposely not mentioning names of individuals who did come here or individuals who did turn us down. That would give us a clue as to who wasn't our first choice, but I have at least two very distinct people in mind and perhaps a third of our initial faculty where we didn't get number one or, I think even number two, and in one of these cases I have in mind it may have been number four. It surprised me; I think it surprised you, Sam, at the time, because we reckoned that everybody in the country was itching to come to Irvine--California, its climate, the rest of it, a mighty university of great distinction, and a chance to help launch a new campus, and it was kind of shocking to find that, just the contrary, there were people who felt that it was kind of dicey, kind of iffy, coming here. There'd be many problems. They were more comfortable to accept a job at an established institution, or, where they already had a job, to stay put at such an institution. Making allowances for that unexpected factor--that X factor--I think we did reasonably well. At least, at the time, I thought we did reasonably well. If you ask me now--here we are in 1973, on the 28th of September, a lovely Friday midday--

McCULLOCH: There's a tree that's grown up now which started out below, and it's finally come up past your floor. Look at it out the window.

MARDER: Yes, so it has, and the department has grown that way in some respects. Doing it over again, where we couldn't get one of the top people we were after (this is what?--hindsight, obviously), I would have preferred to take the approach, well, leave this particular FTE fallow for the moment, or rather fill it with somebody in a different area, that perhaps we had thought of filling in year two or year three. In other words, I would have gone for the man, the quality of the man, looking at the man both as teacher and as scholar, and also, yes, a third point, very important, as a human being, as a mensch and not being so concerned about particular fields in

X

getting the best we could. But it's easy, I mean, to look back and to say, "This is what we should have done." It didn't occur to me at the time, I must confess. Well, this is my reaction to your question, how well do you think we did in making our first appointments in History? I say it looks a little bit differently now than it did at the time.

Your next question is, how well do you think we set up our UCI Senate? If by that you mean the Senate which consisted of every faculty member, it worked like a charm originally. I remember the informality of the debates; I remember the fact that they were pretty well attended the first few years; we could meet in small rooms with a rather cosy feeling; a great number of us spoke (even I, who normally am not given to oratory on a Senate floor, would say my piece in those early years).

McCULLOCH: I think everybody said their piece. The thing I liked about it, as I think back, is that the Assistant Professors were listened to as carefully as anybody else.

MARDER: Yes.

McCULLOCH: They served on committees.

MARDER: Well, we were a happy family then, if only because idealism was still rampant and because we were such a small body. But, again, you can be so much wiser after the event. We've become much too large for an effective meeting, especially a meeting with some very significant subject, and there's simply too many. When you add the students and other camp followers who come along, these meetings can frequently get out of hand. With hindsight, I would have preferred a situation which does exist on many campuses--I don't know about the UC system, but elsewhere--where each rank elects its own representatives (I don't know in what proportion, particularly--I haven't thought that one through), so it becomes a representative body, but, because of that, a smaller body, a more intimate body, a body

which, given the size of our campus and faculty today, would be infinitely more effective than we have today.

McCULLOCH: The UC system, Arthur, does include Assistant Professors and above, and therefore at Irvine we're automatically a young Senate now, because we have a preponderance of young people. We've only had one retirement since we started--that's Ralph Gerard.

MARDER: Well, but that isn't the issue I'm raising; the issue I'm raising is just sheer numbers. When you've got a faculty (what are we, 300 or 350?)--

McCULLOCH: More. With the Medical School, we're more than 350--about 400.

MARDER: Well, all right. It's already too large for effective business. I feel lost when I go to a meeting. I confess I haven't been going to all that many, but one reason is that it's just too damn big a body.

I would also express what may be the antediluvian position, a position which the Senate did maintain until the time of troubles, only inviting members of the student body, and I think there had to be somebody representing some student group officially and by invitation who would come to the meetings. I don't particularly relish the idea of anybody--virtually anybody can come in off the street and sit in on the meetings. Well, of course, there was a time when things were just a bit unruly. Well, we don't have that anymore. I don't think it helps the business of the Senate to have these extraneous groups; students, by all means, but they should be coming in as spokesmen of particular groups with a definite function to play. But my primary criticism, I say, is that I would much prefer to see a representative Senate, a smaller hard-hitting group, that would do a far better job than the Senate has been doing for some years now. But, again, this wasn't obvious to me when we opened shop; I thought we were getting along very

well. It's only now in retrospect, as we've become larger, that I see we might have gone a somewhat different route.

Your next question, are there any bylaws you feel we should change in our UCI Senate? I can't answer that, Sam, without seeing the bylaws in front of me. Conceivably, the point I have just raised about figure and bylaws--

McCULLOCH: This is a statewide rule and regulation, and until they change the whole University of California--

MARDER: Which? The representative factor?

McCULLOCH: Yes.

MARDER: Well, one can always ask for a variance, and they're frequently granted.

McCULLOCH: We haven't had much luck. Well, they aren't--

MARDER: At any rate, I don't propose to go into this business about bylaws. I don't really know what the heck they are, which is perhaps just a reflection of my loss of interest in, and lack of faith in, the efficacy of the Senate, which only reinforces what I have said just a few minutes ago. If there is one institution which needs rejuvenation around here, it's the faculty Senate. But in the early years, let me say again, I think it was doing its job and doing it beautifully, certainly down to 1968 or '69.

McCULLOCH: The winter of '69, '68-'69, was when we had that polarization.

MARDER: Yes. Well, there was none in these early years.

McCULLOCH: That's right.

MARDER: In what areas do you think we have had the greatest successes at UCI? Presumably, you are talking about the situation as it is today, I mean in the 1973-74 academic year. Looking back, what have we done that looks particularly good? The thing I would take the greatest pride in,

without having any share in it, any direct role in it, is the astounding success of the School of Biological Sciences, which has earned national visibility--for all I know, international--based on recruitment of splendid personnel and based on a very imaginative curriculum. I suppose Ed Steinhaus, the old Dean, the founding Dean of the school (he was the first Dean, wasn't he, of Biological Sciences?)--

McCULLOCH: He was, indeed.

MARDER: --is the one who must still take the bow for it. I'm sure he's listening to me now. As I look around elsewhere, I am not quite sure what else I would point to as areas where we've had the greatest successes. I'm not thinking so much of comparative--just something really outstanding, away from biology--

McCULLOCH: For instance, University Studies or the Library?

MARDER: Well, all right, yes. Yes, you mention the Library. I think we have a marvelous Library nine or ten years after we opened shop. Certainly in the humanities generally, and, above all, in our own discipline of history, they've done a fantastic job. I give much of the credit to John Smith, who has been a very peppy, a very imaginative, Librarian, and of course that marvelous group, the Friends of the Library, probably the finest group of its kind anywhere in the country, I'd be prepared to say. We have a splendid Library, whether for undergraduate use or for most graduate programs. Of course, the help of the interlibrary loan system, particularly UCLA facilities, supplements very handsomely what we have going for us here.

Again, I would take a certain amount of pride--a great deal more until a few years ago--in our advising system. Here I would take a small bow. Do you want something here for the record? It's a matter of history, and chances are I shan't be around to read the printed version of whatever comes out of all these notes, so I don't mind saying this now. I remember

distinctly the planning session when we were talking about course loads, and we were thinking in terms of six courses, and I made the motion (you won't find it in the minutes--they weren't kept) that, in lieu of a sixth course, serious, conscientious, regular advising be the equivalent, and I was impressed by the fact that students from Berkeley, UCLA, and outside the UC system--one of the principal beefs about that time, everywhere almost, in the larger schools, was that you can't get to talk to anybody, somebody to give you a steer, somebody to give advice. I remember a UC/^{Berkeley} student saying in my presence that here he was a senior, he had never once seen his advisor, he never could get at him--the fellow kept hours, but there was generally a mob of people trying to see him. Though he left notes, "Get in touch with me when you can; I'll come whenever it's convenient for you," he never made contact with him, and this was a few months before his Commencement. This is the kind of thing that really disturbed me mightily, and this was my proposal, my particular contribution to doing something about it: Everybody would be an advisor and with students assigned to him who would stay with him, unless they shifted their interest; that is, we have a mix of advisees, but, as I recall (am I right, Sam?) wasn't the whole idea from the beginning to have students in the humanities go to humanities people, and so on?

MCCULLOCH: That's correct.

MARDER: Of course, today we've gone a step further; we try, where possible, to have majors or those who think they are going to be majors go to somebody in that particular discipline. It was a little bit broader then, but the principle was the important thing--that you had somebody who had a definite interest in you, who tried to know all about you. And in those days (I don't know why they can't do it anymore) we used to get the students' papers, their folders, from the Registrar's Office before we ever met them. We had a real line on them before we ever said, "Hello."

McCULLOCH: Well, they're a little late. I'm on the corps of advisors this year, and we won't get those sheets for a couple of weeks.

MARDER: Well, then it doesn't do you much good when you first meet these youngsters. It's not so important when you've had them for a quarter or for a year. The system worked beautifully in the first few years. I remember having my entire group over to the house one evening for coffee and dessert. I remember with much pleasure how they would come around to see me on academic and on personal problems. I had perhaps eighteen or twenty the first year or two, and the most of them came in to see me, well, perhaps twice or three times during the one year. I think hardly a person stayed away. I knew them; I knew them as individuals; I knew their faces; I knew their names. And that was the situation, I think, that existed from the time we opened our doors in '65 until the time of troubles. And though the system still exists and, indeed, has been improved in the School of Humanities, where we have the special corps of advisors for freshmen and sophomores, quite apart from the usual system which now applies to juniors and seniors, it just isn't working too well.

And this isn't the fault of our planners or the system; it's the fault of the times. It's simply, since the time of troubles, become unfashionable, it's not the thing to do, for students to come to see faculty unless it's a matter of almost life and death. Last year, I think, was typical, with about eighteen or twenty juniors and seniors on my books; I don't think I saw more than three or four of them during the year, each one for one visit. In the case of the freshmen and sophomores on the Humanities special advisory corps, it was better there, but you wonder how much better, because they're forced to come in, they have to get your signature or they get into some kind of trouble with Cathy Smith over in the School of Humanities if they don't see us.

McCULLOCH: That's right.

MARDER: So there is that element of force, of sanctions, and so they do see us, but how wholeheartedly isn't entirely clear to me. So I'd sum up this thing by saying that the idea originally was marvelous; I think we were kind of doing something a little bit unusual to introduce this component as an integral component in our Academic Plan, and if it isn't working any better than it does, well, it's hardly our own fault. At that, it's probably a darned sight better than anything you'd find perhaps on any other UC campus. At least, we're here, and the kids know we're here at particular times and are interested in seeing them.

McCULLOCH: I've had quite a bit of luck with my juniors and seniors. They came around, and I've always enjoyed the advising, and I'm enjoying the freshmen and sophomores this year.

MARDER: Yes, yes. Well, if you talk about the advisory system, the pluses and minuses, but certainly the concept was a big fat plus, and even the practice is a small plus at the moment; the Library a big, fat plus; the School of Biology another one. They're the things that stand out in my mind, Sam, as the biggest successes. If something else that doesn't quite hit me at the moment--

McCULLOCH: Did you get involved in University Studies?

MARDER: Yes, I was involved in University Studies. I don't call that one of our great successes, Sam, for the simple reason that it really didn't quite get off the ground, through lack of support--I mean lack of financial support. The idea was sound; I think Hazard Adams had a marvelous idea; he had a great group of fellows of which, as you know, I was one, if you don't mind my saying so; the concept was great; the initial offerings of the first two or three years were great. But we were operating with no resources. You know as well as I how we practically had to club department Chairmen

into giving up any manpower, and the result is that it was a hand-to-mouth operation almost from the beginning.

McCULLOCH: Yes. I was personally sorry. I taught the year before last in it, and it was a great experience.

MARDER: The idea was great. Now, of course, this wasn't in the master planning way back. I think it came into being in about our third year, but then you must have some record of just when we started. Does it exist this year, or was it finally liquidated?

McCULLOCH: I think it's very small, very small.

MARDER: I'm not even sure it's on the books. You might want to look into that. If it exists, it just barely exists.

McCULLOCH: It barely exists.

MARDER: Which is a pity. The Administration Building, the Great White Father and his people, always said, I'm sure with reason on their side, that they just didn't have the resources. If we'd had six or eight FTE--if, for example, if you don't mind my saying so, Sam, if the FTE which are going to the students these days would have been used in a really constructive fashion and put into University Studies and a few more had been thrown in to beef that program up, we'd have something, we'd have something. But as it is, if it isn't dead, it's dying. It's just a dirty shame, it seems to me. So, potentially, this was, should be, one of our great successes. It ain't! So I don't include it with our catalog of our greatest successes at UCI. So I don't know as I missed that. It's a near hit, let's put it that way--an imaginative idea which is perhaps a bit before its time. Sooner or later, we may come back to it with a full-time person in charge. There's a challenge I would like, incidentally. I can say all these things frankly and freely now, since nobody will know what you and I are talking about, right, for many years to come, and I'll be retired by then. It's the kind of

challenge I would like, trying to find the money for it, trying to find the resources for it.

Well, as for the next question, in what areas do you think we've had the least successes, and why? Well, the thing that comes to mind, first of all, is the dear old School of Social Sciences. I think it has been an abomination and a disaster. I don't propose to go into all the reasons. I'm sure you've had people far more qualified than I who've spouted into this microphone and told you what's gone wrong. The fact is that it has been a disaster from every point of view; from the point of view of the students and their reaction to their programs; from a more, if you will, parochial point of view of the historian who finds very few people and very little in the way of program he can latch onto over there, and so we have, need I remind you, I say with tears in my eyes, minimal contacts, minimal relations with what should be our foremost allies, the social scientists. They go their way; the humanities go their way. And it's a crying shame.

McCULLOCH: Yes. We work individually. We know some people, we talk to them individually, and we're trying to work out some programs with them, but it's a purely hit-or-miss proposition.

MARDER: That to me has been our number one least success. A second area which I think has been one of our least successes, though now improving, is that until last year, with the beginnings with the Community Lecture Program, the campus had, if you except the last year and if you except that planning year, '64-'65, done virtually nothing for the community at large.

McCULLOCH: I see the Medical School is doing it this fall. Very interesting.

MARDER: Yes, the Medical School is doing these lectures. Sure, the University Extension and the remarkable Dick Baisden have always had a splendid program, but you have to pay, and you pay through the nose. And,

to be sure, you can go to individual lectures, but not many people are disposed to pay (what is it, \$5.50 now?) and have trouble with parking on top of everything else. After all, taxpayers in the community have every right to share in the goodies that we have to offer here. That was the case at the University of Hawaii, a much poorer university than our own. All sorts of things going on for which the public never had to pay a nickel, in the way of symposia, in the way of colloquia, lectures, you name it. Of course, there were many other things where they had to pay--they'd bring in some famous ballet group or something of that sort. I'm not talking about them; I'm talking about the things that stimulate the mind, and there's been very, very little of that. An occasional lecturer that student funds would pay for, so that last year was, I really think, the first year we've attempted to do it in a kind of regular way, an ongoing way, and, as you know, the Biology series in the fall was a great success. The series in the winter, the Humanities and the Comparative Culture, had weather trouble. It was a great success perhaps as regards concept and the number of the individual lectures, including your own and mine. The program in the spring was much better attended, almost as well attended as the Biology lectures--perhaps, if you average out the attendance, as well as the program given by Fine Arts. Now this fall we've got the Medical School series, which I trust will continue that fine tradition. It makes ^{friends} funds for the University.

McCULLOCH: It's excellent, and I intended to go, but it's on Wednesday nights and I have a class.

MARDER: On Wednesday you have a class, yes. You asked me what had been the least successes. Well, as of, say, a year ago today that was one of the least successes, but it's in process of correction, let's put it that way.

Another least success, and this is a hard one to talk about with any

great perception. I've thought about this a great deal, I've had a number of theories about what the difficulty is, what might be done, but let me tell you what it is, anyway. The spirit, the student outlook, the student Weltanschauung, if you will, is bad on this campus. It probably wasn't so in the first or second years, maybe in the first two or three years, when the campus was so new, when there was still a lot of idealism, new ideas, new people, a lot of people thinking about how we could make this the great university of the land, and the students felt they were a part of this interesting venture. But certainly after the initial years the situation is true. What I've described is true today. There is a bad morale here. Too many of the youngsters leave us after a year, as you know. We have a tremendous attrition rate--after one year, after two years, they go elsewhere. It happens everywhere, but I think our rate is particularly bad. The student griping, even more than you'd find on most campuses, about this, that, and everything. Generally, they talk about the campus being dead, has no spirit, no life. Well, the poor student body officials have been doing what they can in recent years; there are more movies in the evening, there are more dances, they bring in more lecturers. They are trying to do all kinds of things, and yet I don't think it's paid off in terms of an improved student morale.

McCULLOCH: Well, I think, Arthur, until they get a Student Union this will probably remain the same, because we have now three quarters of our students who are commuters, and Riverside had the same problem until they built that beautiful Union building.

MARDER: Well, I don't doubt and never have doubted that that is part of it. We're not going to have the Student Union for how many years?

McCULLOCH: There probably won't be one in several years now. They're

going to vote again on one pretty soon.

MARDER: Well, all right, if it passes, then we may have it by 1977 or '78 or something of that sort, which is a long, long period--well, since 1965 when the first students came here. It'll be a twelve-year desert period, if you want to skip the first year or two, when there was pretty good morale. I've tended to be very critical of some of our administrators of the past about not putting their thinking caps on and saying, "Now, look, we've got this situation. We know there's not going to be a Student Union building for the foreseeable future. What can we do to improve morale? What can the administration do?" I don't have any ready answers, but I'm not at all aware that there's been any brainstorming session over the various years when we've had a succession of Vice Chancellors of Student Affairs. We've had, what, three or four people in that slot, beginning with Dick Balch?

McCULLOCH: Balch, one; Walker, two; and now Hoy.

MARDER: Yes. And the reason I say I don't think they've done very much, at least the first three years, is that I've talked to each of those three when they've been in that slot. In the case of Don Walker, I remember sending him at least one memorandum on the subject, and, oh sure, he was going to phone me, we'd get together and talk about it. I can get nobody over there to show any interest in even discussing what could be done. Perhaps nothing could be done, but I'm not aware that they ever sat down, any of them, certainly with faculty, really to think deeply about this student malaise--that's what it was and is--and what could be done about it.

Frankly, the only thing I could have contributed at the time and could contribute today is an idea I have tossed out here and there that would make for a much closer out-of-class relationship between faculty, many faculty,

and students. Most specifically, I feel that we've missed a bet by not having arrangements that would bring faculty regularly into the student residence halls. Now, I know that now and again you hear of the faculty going over to talk to some group. What I had in mind was a program as regular as I trust this Community Lecture Series is going to be or promises to be, where each (what do you call them, RAs over there, what does that stand for?)--

McCULLOCH: Resident Administrator.

MARDER: Resident Administrator--they're young instructors or young Assistant Professors or graduate students or something?

McCULLOCH: They're often even undergraduate students.

MARDER: Yes. Well, I could see an administrative body consisting of RAs plus one student representative, president of a particular residence hall, if they have such a person, forming kind of a residence hall council and annually organizing an exciting, a stimulating, program, not of formal lectures, but a situation where, perhaps built around a particular theme each quarter, you'd have various faculty people coming in for maybe an informal 20- or 25-minute talk, and then the thing thrown open for give and take for another 30 or 60 minutes and some light refreshments. That kind of a situation is something that isn't being done; at least, it isn't being done on a regular and broad scale. I more than once have said, "By God, I'd be one of the very first ones to be affiliated with that kind of a program, if they wanted my services, or, if they didn't, at least I'd like to help them set this kind of thing up." And this is the kind of thing I would have done something about introducing, had Dick Balch and his successors shown any particular interest in it.

McCULLOCH: Well, I think, too, in fairness to the Student Affairs

side, they are making efforts, they are concerned apparently. Vice Chancellor Hoy last year addressed the Deans' meeting in very strong words and said he felt that the faculty was not interested enough in the students and they were responsible for--

MARDER: Oh, that's rubbish, Sam! The fact is we've never had the opportunity.

McCULLOCH: The point was that the Deans got awfully mad, because they felt they were not responsible for this.

MARDER: So nobody assumes the real responsibility for it, but it still comes back to the situation, and this, as I say, is one of the least successes we've had, wherever you want to pin the responsibility for it, upon very low student morale. Individual students probably don't feel that way, they're excited about their instructors, and they don't much care about the rest of it. But I'm speaking about the student body at large. It's too much of a commuter campus--perhaps that, again, is another reason for it. There's too much of this business of the kids racing through classes and getting the hell home as quickly as they can and leaving without any feeling of what the Hawaiians would call the feeling of aloha for the Irvine campus. Well, I think that is perhaps as far as I care to go with these least successes of your question.

You next raise the question, what problems were unique (you originally had are unique--you've changed it at my suggestion to were unique) to Irvine (a) because it's new, (b) because it's a particular campus? I don't know how to answer that; perhaps, in a way, I've covered that in some of the remarks I've already made.

McCULLOCH: I think you have covered it. We try to do certain things differently in a unique way. We've succeeded in some, and in others we haven't, the advising system--

MARDER: There's something coming up on liberal arts organization I would have put in here, but that comes in a question in a moment. I'd let your eighth question go and cover it more or less by what I've said, or it will be covered by what I'm going to say.

So the next point is, what would you do differently, if you had to do it all over again? Well, this is a game anybody can play. It's cheap. It costs nothing to enter this particular club. I've indicated already a number of things that I would do differently. I would certainly have the planning sessions structured a little bit more intelligently, shall we say, than we did, with regular ^{printed} agendas and position papers. I would certainly have--indeed, insist upon--the Chancellor, as well as the Deans, attending every blessed session. I would insist upon minutes. All these things. I would insist upon a greater rapport between faculty and students along lines mentioned just a moment ago. I would certainly go, in the case of my own department, that I know most about, for the man and not for the field, in the initial recruiting, and indeed for some years after the initial recruiting. And there are other things, but I think they've been adequately covered in what I have said.

Do you like the liberal arts and sciences organized into schools, or would you prefer a College of Arts, Letters, and Sciences? You know, I'd like to have it both ways, if that's possible. I like the idea of the school, because the students have a ready means of identification with a reasonably small--as it still is--unit.

McCULLOCH: That's the rationale.

MARDER: That's the rationale for it. When we're four times larger in 1990, I don't know--it may have to be split into smaller units then, who knows? There's a lot to be said for that. The students have learned to

think of themselves as Humanities students or students of the Fine Arts and so on. I think that's very good. It's bad from this point of view, and this must be obvious to all of us by now (it was obvious to all of us pretty early in the game) that from the beginning there was this tendency of the schools, each to go its own way with a minimum of consultation, a minimum of mutual planning, and a minimum of mutual exchange of thoughts. To be sure, there's a--is it called Council of Deans, or it used to be called a Council of Deans--it still is?

McCULLOCH: Yes.

MARDER: Well, it never amounted to very much. You had various very strong Deans--do I need mention names? Well, I'm thinking of fellows like Ralph Gerard of the Graduate School; Clay Garrison, another one, of Fine Arts; Jim March of Social Sciences--there are three good examples, prima donnas and very strong characters, who were each determined to make his own particular operation an outstanding one, and, well, to hell with the others, or perhaps that's too strong a term, but they weren't very much concerned with the good and welfare of the campus at large. Now, if we'd had a Dean of something called the College of Arts, Letters, and Sciences, our original plan (and wasn't Peltason brought in for that job?), I think we would have had the best of the organization by schools, but with this umbrella arrangement of a Dean with supervisory, as well as administrative, authority over the various schools. Well, you know what happened, of course, but, for the record through, it has probably been mentioned twenty times by now, Peltason stepped into Ivan's shoes as Vice Chancellor of Academic Affairs in the summer of '64, was it? Yes, and they never did fill that deanship.

McCULLOCH: No.

MARDER: It was allowed to lapse.

McCULLOCH: This is correct.

MARDER: Was the faculty ever asked to express an opinion?

McCULLOCH: Yes, the Deans--

MARDER: Oh, yes, I do remember.

McCULLOCH: The Deans in the first place, myself included, approved of it, because--

MARDER: Approved of what?

McCULLOCH: Approved of the notion of having these separate schools or colleges and no College of Arts, Letters, and Sciences, and Kerr very much agreed. In fact, Kerr came down here, you remember, and was speaking to the faculty and wanted us to because--. That was one of the first important issues the Senate came to vote on, and you recall it was quite a close vote. And the vote was to have schools and colleges, but there was a substantial group of faculty, many of them coming from the humanities, who wanted an old College of Arts, Letters, and Sciences.

MARDER: Well, the point is, Sam, it was regarded, I'm afraid, as an either/or proposition.

McCULLOCH: Yes, I'm not saying--

MARDER: And I never thought it was that--

McCULLOCH: In fairness, I think the Deans of the Deans' Council worked fairly well together. I think we worked pretty well together.

MARDER: All routine matters, routine matters. Sam, I remember very specifically (this perhaps brings me back to detailed impressions of conferences way back at the second question that you raised here)--I remember very distinctly, as though it happened only yesterday, my coming in with a scheme about making our orientation program for new students--above all, of course, the freshmen--a rich experience quite unlike those that were being held on

most campuses that I knew anything about. And I worked out a scheme which may have had some merit. It probably had a lot of bugs--it certainly was capable of improvement, I am sure. It got Jack Peltason's approval, it got Dan's approval, but it came to the Council of Deans, and they picked it apart, and in the end nothing emerged from it. Instead of saying, "Now, look, the idea of doing something exciting with these kids when we get them here the first week is such we shouldn't miss the opportunity. Can't we agree on something, some pilot program? We can improve it." They couldn't reach agreement on anything there. The result is that each school went its own way, and, if I'm not mistaken, Sam, only the School of Humanities attempted anything.

McCULLOCH: Yes, we attempted it, and we took Alfred North Whitehead's book--

MARDER: Yes, well, it wasn't too successful for a number of reasons--I won't go into that. But, at least, it was a step in the right direction. But, more important, I'm trying to establish the fact here that, even in the planning year, the Deans weren't working together on anything that I would regard as terribly important and affecting the good and welfare of the University. There was still too much thought of, "What is good for my school?" (What is good for my school is good for General Motors, you know--or for the country, I should say.)

McCULLOCH: What I miss--and a College of Arts, Letters, and Sciences would give it to me--would be my meeting more often with other disciplines. Now, at the beginning, we would often be talking to Steinhaus and chatting with the biologists in the first two or three years, but right now the only time I have to meet people in other disciplines is over at the University Club, and I sit down to lunch with a whole varied group of people. In other

words, what we are lacking is community, a community of scholars, and an Arts, Letters, and Science College--

MARDER: Well, I'm glad you mentioned that point, Sam, because I'm afraid I've got to go back to question seven, in what areas to you think we've had the least successes, and why? I'm afraid this lack of (what do you call it?) community in the faculty--that's the obverse of that medal, the front side of which is that low student morale we talked about--I think we, in all fairness, should point out that in part a reflection of this organization by schools with no umbrella organization that we originally planned to have--I think this would explain it, as well. And, even if you belong to the Faculty Club, which regrettably I don't, we still don't have anything approaching this community that we ought to have. To some extent, we had it at the beginning because of the small, cozy Senate. That was good for a few years only.

McCULLOCH: Well, that was the point, Arthur. The Senate was supposed to provide us with this sense of community, and we took up problems like the athletic problem, problems like fraternities and sororities, the question of Arts, Letters, and Sciences. We had the Medical School--we had a terrific debate on the Medical School. It was a beaut!

MARDER: Yes. Marvelous debate on that Medical School. Sure, sure. Yes, yes. That was a substitute, that was a substitute for this umbrella organization I talk about, but it worked for the first years, before we had student troubles and before we had the very large, growing faculty we do now.

Your last question: Are there any experiences in the early years that we have missed and that you would like to comment on? I really think I've done the whole business. I'll just make a few off-the-top-of-my-head remarks to close--just some general reflections. I may have touched on them

in some other context. I told Hazard Adams when he became Vice Chancellor of Academic Affairs (well, darn it, my memory is slipping--it may have been when he succeeded you as Dean, on one occasion or the other), I made the remark that I, for one, would judge the success of his administration by his success in restoring a measure, anyway, of the initial élan, the initial esprit, of the faculty, and I was thinking of '64 to '66 or '67.

McCULLOCH: I think it was when he was Vice Chancellor, because you were away at Oxford when he became Dean.

MARDER: Yes, but I wrote him from Oxford, and I guess it had to do with the deanship. Well, he was only in the job, what, less than two years or so?

McCULLOCH: Two years.

MARDER: In somewhat more concrete terms, we must get back to what was habit, what was the custom, initially--certainly in the planning year--of thinking imaginatively, of thinking big. We were given a mission by Clark Kerr of being the innovative campus. Down at San Diego they were going to be the big school in science, a campus devoted to science, to give Cal Tech a run for its money.

McCULLOCH: That's when John Galbraith was brought down there to bring it around and introduce more humanities and social sciences.

MARDER: That was later, that was later, that was later. Santa Cruz, we know, was to be a kind of an Oxford-in-California on a smaller scale, but my understanding was that Clark Kerr wanted us to really come up with new ideas. We have done more with computer-assisted instruction, perhaps, than any other campus around here and so on, and certainly biology has been very innovative and so on. And there've been a number of things that different departments have done and that I wish our PR people had told the community about--they've just not done the job there at all. There's hardly a

department on the campus that hasn't done at least one thing a little out of the ordinary, and the community at large simply doesn't know about it. But to come back to my original point: There are so many things, so many ideas, that individual members of the faculty have--perhaps departments do. If we could only begin to think more--well, not so much to think more, but to do more--to actually try to execute some of these ideas--let them be far-out. Call them pilot projects, if you will. Let's get back to this pioneering spirit, is what I say. Many of them won't cost us a nickel.

I had this idea, for example, of an honor society of ^{history majors} historians. Well, it's full of bugs, Sam, but it's the sort of thing that never got off the ground because we've stopped thinking imaginatively except for some individuals here and there, and I think this would do as much to improve esprit as anything. Of course, you can easily argue just the other way around, that the fact that the faculty won't do these things, are no longer doing them, is a reason for the lack of esprit. But I prefer to put what I think is the horse before the cart and say one thing that would restore that esprit is to get some kind of lead from on high to begin thinking that way, to begin doing these things. I've always assumed that Hazard Adams's becoming number two over there would be the beginning of what I'm talking about. I'm still waiting. Perhaps when he's got his desk cleared a bit more we'll be getting into this situation.

McCULLOCH: He had some very good ideas for administrative reorganization, and they've all been shot down.

MARDER: Well, administrative reorganization isn't what I'm talking about. There are more efficient ways of running this campus, God alone knows! That's one thing. I'm not talking about that. I'm talking now about just a feeling of excitement in the air, because we're kind of out on the frontiers. If he were, for example, to get out a strong, exciting

one-page memo to the faculty, backed up with a personal appeal at a faculty meeting and then backed up further by attending department or school meetings, to get us all brainstorming, you know, to thinking of new and interesting, or potentially interesting and exciting, ways of teaching, and if they involved money, so what, he'd do the best he could, and if they didn't involve money, so what. But they're not doing it, Sam, we're not doing it, and this, to me, is a real failure, and this is one of the experiences, now, that I want to comment upon.

It's not so much in the early years, but over the whole of the past nine or ten years we've been in business that, since the year two or three, this has been a downhill proposition. Even in our own department, how often does anybody think big anymore? And when somebody comes up with an interesting idea--and I'd like to think that on occasion I've come up with them--I find that there's very, very little support for it. Don't rock the boat, is the attitude.

McCULLOCH: Well, no. The Graduate Program certainly struck out in a new direction. I'm not entirely in agreement with all of it. We certainly changed the undergraduate curriculum last year.

MARDER: I have my serious "doots" about that. But, at least I will agree that it is new, it is imaginative. I prefer to think of it in terms of its being a pilot program. Maybe it'll pay off. All right.

But on the undergraduate level we've done a lot of renaming of courses and so on. Essentially, Sam, we're not doing anything terribly different. There are so many ways. I've discussed them with you at one time or another, where history can almost be a standard-bearer for doing exciting things, because ours is an exciting discipline. That Great Issues course, that only historians can really put across--the thing that Dartmouth once did and did very well, that we could do so much better, I'm convinced. This

is the sort of thing I put before the lads, and a few of them say, "Great idea!" and it lies there, it lies there. Maybe this is the year--I don't know. But, you know, this sort of thing, Sam. And probably most people in our department could have, if stimulated sufficiently, could come up with ideas as good or better, but then comes the trick of doing something about them.

Well, it would be so much easier if the boys in the big building were to light fires under all the schools and departments. By God, give prizes of one sort or another, if need be--one of Hazard's latest novels, perhaps--to those who come up with some exciting idea, especially if it doesn't involve any outlays, you know. And this is the thing, frankly, that would make my last, presumably, four years on this campus as happy as my initial years, if we recaptured some of that initial flame and enthusiasm. And if we don't get any lead from the big building, By God, we can do it ourselves. But we will!

I guess that's about all I really want to say, Sam.

McCULLOCH: Well, I really appreciate that, Arthur. Thank you very much, indeed.

All right. Now, what's this post script you would like to add?

MARDER: Yes, a post script. You had mentioned Ralph Gerard a few times. It occurs to me that in our planning days in '64-'65 Ralph brought in some pretty exciting ideas about graduate study. I was one of the very few who had any sympathy with these ideas. I remember Ralph was crestfallen; he didn't think he had had his day in court--people didn't really think seriously about these notions. I imagine these memoranda are around there on file in the Graduate Office, and, By Heavens, if I were Graduate Dean, I know I could do a lot worse than to hunt them up--perhaps that day has come for some of these notions. I do remember one right now. Ralph felt that,

in addition to teaching a body of knowledge, whether in biology, history, or what have you, there were certain skills, certain aptitudes, that we could teach our students, and he had various ones in mind. One among them (it's one of the more obvious ones, perhaps) was writing skill. Now, we all try to do something about that in our seminars, et cetera, but Ralph would have made this a very definite clear-cut objective of the Graduate Program, for which the Dean and people around in the Graduate School would be responsible, that there would be an integral part of the whole graduate show in each department that the students improve their writing skills and reach a certain level of excellence. It wouldn't be the hit-and-miss sort of thing that it comes to be. I'm reasonably sure that this was rather spelled out along with similar considerations in these exciting memoranda. And now I really have had my last word.

McCULLOCH: Well, I know, Arthur, that most of these memoranda are stored in the Archives, so they are available. That's an interesting thought. Thank you.