

INTERVIEW with DONALD E. WALKER

October 8, 1974

McCULLOCH: Well, the first question, Don, what attracted you about coming to Irvine?

WALKER: Well, Sam, by the way, I hope that your indication in the letter that these answers could be held for 10 or 15 years is good, because I'd like to say some fairly frank things. I don't know--they're probably not explosive at all, but I'd rather just not be under the feeling that--

McCULLOCH: I'll respect the 10 years or 15, if you wish.

WALKER: Well, I think 10 would serve all practical purposes, and again I don't have anything terribly inflammatory to say.

Well, I first became attracted to Irvine when I was the President at Idaho State, and I read an article in Time magazine, and the conception of this place really attracted me. So one time, when we were down in southern California, we drove out here, and in those days the campus was located exclusively over in the building that, I guess, now handles Physical Plant or Physical Plant equipment.

McCULLOCH: That's where I started work, in January, 1964.

WALKER: Is that right? Well, I came in, and Dan wasn't there that day, but I talked to Ivan Hinderaker, and he was very friendly. He didn't know of anything specifically that might be available, but he was very friendly and encouraged my continuing interest, and then really I sort of forgot about it.

And then I decided that I had to punt at Idaho State, because, as you know, the board was preparing to fire a tenured man, and I felt I would be Captain of the dirigible, and so I punted and took the first thing that-- well, really accepted the job first as Dean of Students at Sonoma State and

figured I would write and lie on a lily pad. I had a little difficulty decompressing, the schedule was so leisurely up there and things were nonconsecutive.

Then Betty Abs--and I had worked with Betty back in San Fernando Valley days--and so I had been at Sonoma about a year and decided that it wasn't going to take and I really must look around. And she called me and indicated that they were hunting for a Vice Chancellor for Student Affairs and would I be interested? So I came down and, I believe, either wrote or called Dan Aldrich, or he wrote or called me--I think Betty had given my name to him and he wrote me. I wrote back and said that I would be interested and came down and talked with him and was very excited about the place. And he indicated at that time that he was really interested in a Dean of Students. He thought that they had a Vice Chancellor for Student Affairs, a man at UCLA who's still there and in administration of education--

McCULLOCH: Goodlad?

WALKER: Goodlad, John Goodlad. He indicated that they were considering John Goodlad, that John Goodlad was a great idea man and fitted in with sort of the ethos and the etherial heady atmosphere of the planning at Irvine. But he said he had waited for Goodlad, now, two or three months to make up his mind, but he hoped that he was going to decide to come. And then Dan and I had a good talk; we must have visited most of the afternoon.

Then when I got back up to Sonoma, in a week or two he called me up and said, well, he had thought about it more and more and he decided that Goodlad was a good theory man, but that he thought that some of their difficulties here at Irvine were that people were listening to etherial oracles and he felt they needed someone who had had line experience. So he said, "I will now interview you for the vice chancellorship." He said, "I threw

down on Goodlad and said, 'Fish or cut bait,' and he wobbled around hopelessly, so I told him, 'All right,'" I would just consider him no longer a candidate; and he agreed to that; so he said, "Now I want to interview you for the vice chancellorship."

So I came down, and he had me talk to a number of people. I think in those days it was before the rules on selection committees were clearly spelled out, and this was kind of an informal group to advise him of the selection of Vice Chancellor. I think I talked to Jim McGaugh, and I think I talked to Jim March.

McCULLOCH: By the way, Jim McGaugh is to be the new Vice Chancellor of Academic Affairs.

WALKER: Is he!

McCULLOCH: It hasn't been announced yet, but it will be soon.

WALKER: I was a little surprised that Hazard Adams decided to punt. I thought that would probably take, but it's one of those things.

Well, anyhow, I saw two or three members of the committees, and we got along pretty well, I thought. They didn't quite know what to do with me, but they didn't know quite what Dan had in mind, but indicated that they certainly weren't prepared to second-guess Dan on his choice, and I seemed reasonable, and it was that tonality at least that came out with the conversation with Jim McGaugh. I can't remember whether I was invited back a third time, but Dan called me and offered me the position, and we went through the usual amenities, and that was what attracted me to Irvine primarily.

McCULLOCH: Well, the second question then, Don, is, what specific plan had you worked out for the student affairs area? Did you have it in mind, when you were being interviewed by Dan, or did it sort of develop over a period of time?

WALKER: Quite honestly, it would be very easy and tempting for me to go back and indicate that I had a lofty vision right from the first and that all I had to do was come down and persuade unwilling rascals that my pristine vision of Camelot was what they ought to buy, but it really didn't work that way.

Dan Aldrich, it seemed to me, had an intuition that things were not quite well under the surface in Student Affairs, had the feeling that a lot of the wind work had been done and that somehow the basic conception that I think Dick Balch had laid down was appealing to him, but he sensed somehow that it hadn't worked and that he was vulnerable on his flank. And I think that he wanted it to work.

He believed deeply in the core ideas of the faculty being involved in the Student Affairs. He believed in the citizenship of students at a very early time before the battering of the '60s got everyone's attention and really gave that kind of an ugly flavor on occasion--the Mob and the Clod is the voice of God.

He had this vision (today it would be sort of a McGregor view) that students are human beings, that in the right structure can be trusted to do their best and to reflect credit on the University. Without being consciously aware of it, he was moving away from the in loco parentis philosophy to a view of the University interacting with students on a much more adult basis, treating them as though they were responsible.

In the early days, many of the faculty regarded this as sort of his Eagle Scout orientation, that all students are basically Explorer Scouts and that, if you treat them right, they will say, "Yes, sir," and, unless their calves are too fat, they'll click their heels.

Now, this was not his orientation, but that was how it was kind of perceived. He really had a much more fundamental orientation toward the

student as a human being. His instincts were totally sound, but he sensed that it wasn't working.

So really my charge, I think, when I came here was to straighten it out without destroying the philosophy, to build some structure, to build some consecutive machinery, to get things in working order really, and I think that was my agenda. And then as I came on and over the years, it seemed to me that I came in an interesting time at Irvine. By the way, every administrator tends to see his role as heroic and as singularly determining events. I don't share that view; I think that administrators have an influence, but it's very, very difficult at this stage of the art to identify what that influence is. It's like the difference between a football coach that wins the league year after year and the one that never quite wins. There is a difference, and practiced people looking at it can tell you there's a difference, but they can't tell you what it is. I think the same applies to administrators. They're very much like football coaches--they have an influence, but no one knows quite the nature of it, and they probably exaggerate it.

So I would say that my personal influence, if I had one, was that I was a good catalyst of the practical and the theoretical at a time when the University really needed to make that transition. And I think I was a part and Dan the larger part, but I think I was a part of a psychology, and, by the way, Spence Olin was a part of this, that dragged our feet--I think in the view sometimes of central headquarters outrageously--at moving into a constabulary relationship with students. And I think it was this intuitive feeling that we should not succumb to the view that the universities really ought to be a branch of the Department of Corrections that kept the University of California, Irvine, upright in the water in the battered times and left them with a better taste for students than was true of some of the more battered campuses that more gaudily surrendered to the avalanche.

McCULLOCH: Well, then, the third question, Don--we indicated you might talk about planning closer ties with the faculty to the point of having yourself on the staff, and I recall that you were a Senior Lecturer or some such title with the Graduate School of Administration.

WALKER: Yes, right.

McCULLOCH: Did you actually give the teaching courses? How did that work out?

WALKER: Well, I think, along with Hazard Adams I was one of the supporting tacticians and interference runners for the University College, which was an experimental operation that really sort of fell between the chairs.

McCULLOCH: University Studies, wasn't it?

WALKER: Well, they called it in those days University College, and then they had to change the title.

McCULLOCH: Ah, I didn't realize that.

WALKER: And this was where faculty members who could get enough students would offer a course of their own choosing.

McCULLOCH: Precisely.

WALKER: It was an exciting idea. Although I really think that Dick Balch was the one that had the parent idea that Student Affairs was to be a group of secretaries and a couple of professionals and then the faculty ought to be the Student Affairs people. Well, now, in the real world that doesn't work, and an experienced Student Affairs person could have told him that and could have told Dan that; it wasn't going to work. It's like you don't have to tell an undertaker that a plan to bury them all standing up isn't going to work. He doesn't know why, but, even though it'll save money, he knows it isn't going to work for a variety of cultural and mechanical reasons. So one of the jobs in the early days was to repair Dan on the notion that the faculty ever would or could or wanted to or should take a

significant portion of their research and teaching time to do the real housekeeping chores and be custodians of the philosophy of Student Affairs. They regarded that as sweeping up after the elephant.

But the seminal idea there had something in it that was sound. Now, Jack Peltason, who was the Vice Chancellor in those days, and I had signed a treaty. He said that, in his view, Student Affairs ought to be much closer to Student Affairs, and, of course, we agreed on this--

McCULLOCH: You mean, to Academic Affairs?

WALKER: Excuse me, to Academic Affairs, and we agreed on this, and actually Jack worked a little bit; for example, when he could not be present at meetings of some of the academic people, he had me chair a time or two because he said, "I want them to feel that we are both Vice Chancellors for the University and in that sense interchangeable parts." So Jack also had this philosophy, but I'd have to give Balch and Jack Peltason the major credit, I think, for carrying the torch there. I had the vision also, but they were the people who were in a position to carry the torch a little higher. So I did have hopes and deep feelings that the faculty ought not to be separated from Student Affairs, and personally I still was proud of my academic credentials and wanted to be involved.

McCULLOCH: You did have good credentials, and of course you showed them by going on to San Diego State as the Academic Vice President.

WALKER: Right.

McCULLOCH: So you certainly proved it. But now, the fourth question then: I actually mean academic advising--the typist missed the word there--how well did the plan work out for having a faculty member direct academic advising out of your office? I think Spence Olin was the man who was the academician. The word is academic advising.

WALKER: Yes. Spence had a good charisma. (I understand that later he became the head of Olin's Raiders who kind of battered the administration a

little bit.) In those days, Spence made very, very good chemistry with the faculty and with the administration. He had been Acting Vice Chancellor for about seven or eight months. During that period not too much consecutive had happened, and Spence viewed himself as a custodian in an intermediate position. In fact, he was the first one who gave me messages of alarm when I arrived that Dan had not yet perceived the fact that things were not as well ordered in Student Affairs as the rhetoric that he was using would indicate that they were and that he felt that part of my job was to break the news to Dan gradually and part of it was to keep the news from him. I mean I think he felt that Dan would be intemperately disturbed because his view was, "My theories are perfect, something must be wrong with your practice if it isn't going right."

But Spence was very good, and I think he got as much support as could be gotten for that advising program because of his relationship to it, and I think that in those days the institution was small and informal and ties between faculty and students were close. I think that was largely due to Spence--and to Dan. Dan had a good influence there.

McCULLOCH: Well, that takes me to the next question, number five. Is my impression correct or would you give me the correct picture of what you wished to build? Was it a reasonably small bureaucracy? It certainly wasn't the type of empire that the present Vice Chancellor has built which is enormous. But you, I take it, wanted to have something in between what Balch wanted and what Hoy has just achieved recently.

WALKER: I think that's a fair description. I think I really wanted enough people to do the job as I saw it, and I think that you describe it well. It was not the large convoluted type of bureaucratic structure that exists in many universities these days; not that I think that is necessarily corrupt at all, but the honest answer is, I had something more modest in mind. Maybe that was a limitation in me.



McCULLOCH: No, no, to the contrary. We agreed with you. I know, as a Dean. I sat in the Deans' meetings regularly, and you came to them sometimes, and there wasn't one of them who didn't agree with what you were trying to do, which was not to build an enormous empire, but (word indecipherable) for instance, bringing Bob Lawrence on board, for example, and doing other things in which you have to take care of Student Affairs because the faculty just couldn't.

WALKER: Right. And, in my view, really couldn't be expected to and shouldn't have been expected to in the sense that it was originally conceived, but I wanted people to compensate my weaknesses. I felt that I provided excellent envoy with the office of the Chancellor. Dan and I have always been fast friends and got along like a couple of burglars, and I felt that our philosophies were very much the same in administration, and our views of Student Affairs came to be very much the same. I learned from Dan in that regard. I think I tutored his vision, and he informed my experience. I think we made a very good team. And then I felt that I provided good liaison with other administrators and with faculty leadership, and I think that was the compass of the job that I saw. So what I wanted to do was add professionals to handle the pick and shovel work that I did not have time or expertise to handle.

McCULLOCH: What's very well stated. Well, let's move into the sixth question, Don. What part did you play in the student housing; for example, the graduate students' housing? Was that all fixed in and locked in before you came, or did you have some influence on the way it was worked out, a very, very attractive sort of setup for the graduate students' housing?

WALKER: I'll have to be vague here, Sam. I don't honestly remember. I think (and I think I'm being fair here) that the original vision on housing here had already been sketched out by Dan and Dick Balch, the notion of

the suites, rather than the bowling-alley kind of dorms, which served a basic philosophy and I think was very, very good and very far-sighted. Then Bob Lawrence had a very keen feel for housing and its problems and was really quite an expert in this area. And, as I recall, Bob was the one who picked up the ball on housing, on graduate housing, and who carried it very, very well and added his very great experience with students in all kinds of settings and pushed the housing, which of course I agreed with and Dan agreed with, but I think Bob Lawrence carried the ball.

McCULLOCH: You'd be interested that the third unit has just opened the week before last. The third unit of undergraduate single housing is back of the Social Science Building.

WALKER: Is that right!

McCULLOCH: Yes. They are units of 50, or approximately. They started with the notion of a monolithic big building, and they shelved it and went back to the type that you have over at Mesa Court, and they have their own eating place and so on. You might have a chance to look at it, possibly as you drive your car around and look at it on your way out and drive down to San Diego.

WALKER: As I think about it, Sam, there's another footnote there. It may have been the student government in those days (soon after we arrived, you know, the Students for a Democratic Society captured the government), and they were not unreasonable rascals, just abrasive, and I think one of the planks in their platform was more housing for graduate students. And not that any of us objected, but I think that their fulminating discontent was the fuel that drove the engine in that direction.

McCULLOCH: Very good, very good. Well, then, the seventh question, how well do you think you succeeded in carrying out your plans? What you've really said is that Bob Lawrence took the ball and did the job.

WALKER: Yes, he did, and in terms of my private agenda, which was to build an administrative team, I would say, which goes back to my philosophy of administration and to see a philosophy of students as human beings rather than as immature people; in other words using the insights, if you will, of industry, supplying personnel services to them, but not on an in loco parentis basis. It's difficult to say when you've succeeded in something like that, but I had the feeling that I had achieved at least a 75 percent level of success.

McCULLOCH: Well, more than that, I'd say.

WALKER: Well, that's kind.

McCULLOCH: I really was disappointed when you left, and sad, and I think that, off the record, which is being kept for 10 years, I think that they could have really handled it better so that you could have stayed. I just think it was one of those muddles that shouldn't have occurred.

WALKER: Well, again, I think one of the things that was very important to me was to get academic rank.

McCULLOCH: Right.

WALKER: Because in those days I saw the battered '60s coming, and I felt that Student Affairs positions were high risk positions and they ought to be; in other words, no Student Affairs administrator ought to be standing around in his shorts. I felt quite strongly that a Student Affairs administrator should have a retreat position, and somehow they just never could work out academic rank. I was appointed Senior Lecturer in the Graduate School of Administration, but I had been encouraged to hope, when I arrived, that the matter of getting a professorship in the School of Administration with tenure was just a matter of time and arranged circumstance, but it never really came, and I think part of it was because Dan didn't have his mind on it.

McCULLOCH: Too bad.

WALKER: And so when San Diego offered me among other things instant tenure and full professor's rank in two departments, why, it was a temptation I really didn't feel I could pass up.

McCULLOCH: No. Well, we could have answered with a professorship here, and that would have been a solution.

Don, the eighth question, about the University Hall. I'm absolutely in the dark as to how things went between you and them. I know, of course, that ultimately Lyle Gainsley went up there as one of their members, but in your relationship did they tend to give problems? I can recall Balch having difficulties about a registration situation with them; they wanted one thing, and he wanted another. Well, how did things go during your tenure here?

WALKER: My memory may be imperfect here, Sam, but my memory is that I didn't have a great deal of difficulty with them. They had the problems of every bureaucracy--they were arthritic and removed from the circumstances. However, as compared for example with the bureaucracy of the then California State College, the University seemed to me to be flexible and reasonable, and issues negotiable. And they were not slave woppers in the University of California, so I found that I could really negotiate my way through most difficulties.

I found that I went up there a few times to talk our way through some kind of a tangle, and there was always a little bit of a confrontational posture. I found that the lawyers that they assigned to us were reasonable and tutored men, but hard-line. I hesitated to call them for advice if we were having a demonstration (we hadn't had any sit-ins in that time, but a demonstration that was a little gaudy when The Regents were here or something of the sort). And when I would call them for advice, I had the

feeling that I consulted an unsteady oracle. They nearly always took the hard line, so I stopped calling them unless I had to, because they were unreal, they weren't close to it. But they recognized that to a degree, so I would say that I didn't have much difficulty with central headquarters--just the usual problems with the Wilsonian high, steep view of the Pyramids.

McCULLOCH: Very well stated. Now, going to the student newspaper. Just a minute--I'll check the sound here.

WALKER: Yes.

McCULLOCH: Now, turning to the student newspaper, Don, could you fill me in on your role with that and your impressions and so forth?

WALKER: Well, my view--and I can't tell you how much has developed since then, but certainly it was in the egg, at least, at that time--was that a major problem on university campuses is communication, because for administrators to get out a newsletter is viewed as a company rag and is usually poorly received by faculty and students alike, so what happens is that you are in the clutches of a rumor process and a campus newspaper that has little sense of responsibility or checks and balances in the way that the public press does. There is no publisher to zing them, and very seldom are they sued for libel, so what you have is potentially a problem, and most campuses, even the big campuses, now are recognizing this and trying to improve communication in all sorts of ways, which we don't need to go into. But in those days it was quite apparent to me that the student newspaper is vital to the morale and feeling on a campus, the ethos on a campus, and that it is potentially a problem--not because the students are willing rascals or that anyone is a willing scoundrel, but simply because communication on a campus and the processes of communication are so spastic by definition.

And so it was my view that the student newspaper needed a lot of massaging simply to make them willing to consult other orientations than the

adrenalin addicts who perpetually assaulted them with the truth. And so I would meet with the editor of the newspaper usually once or twice a week and try to have a good relationship so that, if some highly impressionistic views of campus incidents were circulating, at least he would ask me for my view, whether he accepted it or not. So I felt that a newspaper was necessary. I'm sure it was already established before I arrived, but I did look at it with a bit of a squint.

McCULLOCH: Well, there were several actually that had gone. They tried first with no subsidy at all, and I can recall that you and Bob Lawrence felt that some subsidy was necessary to make it stable.

WALKER: That's right, that's right.

McCULLOCH: And after your arrival the newspaper stabilized, but of course as often happens the best organized people get control of it, and the SDS people were the best organized and they got control of it.

WALKER: That's right. You know, I think Bob Lawrence deserves a lot of credit, too. He felt very strongly that a good single-voiced, continuing student newspaper was necessary, and he felt that it might get hiccups in a particular year and over a period of time, and I shared that view, I think, 80 percent that a student newspaper was necessary and in the absence of other vehicles absolutely essential. But he was the one who had the deep confidence that over a period of time its influence would be salubrious, and I shared that, but he was the one that carried the spirit.

McCULLOCH: That's interesting. Well, the next question, Don, is what part did you play in having students actively participate in the administrative and Senate committees which, by the way, is still going on? They are still very much represented on all Senate committees, they are on department meetings and department committees. Now, what part did you play there?

WALKER: It's hard to separate it out, Sam. I think that Dan felt very keenly about this, as did Spence Olin, that students ought to be involved. I felt so, too. I think my agenda was more a human relations rather than a political agenda. I felt that there was apt to be less misunderstanding, less mistrust, and less faculty isolation if students were available for counsel. I had imperfectly developed ideas about to what extent they ought to be voting and how many ought to be on committees. I just felt the influence and the representation ought to be there and that the political process would sort out over a period of time on a homeostatic basis the best arrangement for this University, so I had no plan, just a feeling that students should be in the councils on some basis and that this would help keep the lines between faculty and students short, and I think it did.

McCULLOCH: It did, no question about that. I felt that was good. I remember that was a big thing.

Now, going on to the next page, I'm very ignorant about how the Commons was planned, and I know that they wanted to either put more rooms in it for the students or certainly when we--

We still have not got around to a Student Union--we're about to make it, I think, here--but in the meantime the Commons sort of functioned as a Student Union.

WALKER: Yes.

McCULLOCH: And did you have any specific ideas or plans for that building?

WALKER: No specific plans, no. The general feeling was that we needed student offices, that we needed some place where students could headquarter, that we needed a surrogate campus center. I really preferred the notion of a campus center rather than a student center, a place where the University could gather informally and enjoyably. I think, again, Bob Lawrence

deserves a lot of credit for pushing the mechanics on this specifically, and then I think the way things developed, it took two or three half-turns along the road, and I don't know what the present state of affairs is.

McCULLOCH: The present state of affairs is, they finally voted for a Student Union, and although they're still squabbling because the students don't see why they should tax themselves so much, right now I can't tell you the exact as-of-the-moment situation, but they're supposed to be going ahead with a building, and Bob Lawrence is in charge of the arrangements.

WALKER: I see.

McCULLOCH: In fact, I believe I was put on the committee. I'm interested. I volunteered to be on a committee. When I was Dean at San Francisco State, I served on the committee for a Student Union there.

WALKER: Oh, marvelous!

McCULLOCH: Now, in what areas, Don, do you think you had the greatest successes when you were at UCI?

WALKER: I don't know that I really know that, Sam. I would say time will judge, I suppose, the detritus that's been deposited on the stalagmite of institutional development. Personally, I felt that I contributed a good deal in terms of being the catalyst, pulling together another man's team that had been established under a different philosophy and bringing in Bob Lawrence and one or two other people who were good star individual performers--not particularly good team people--and serving as the catalyst to make a good team out of that (it was beginning to sink, it seemed to me, in the chemistry of the University), to bring it back up to a professional level, to establish good relationships with the Chancellor's Office and with the Office of Academic Affairs.

At a critical time in its development when it could have slid, I guess I was the hedge against disaster and a change of direction. I think my



greatest contribution was perhaps to repair and hold the line, to bring things back to a reasonable level, so it was kind of a negative influence as I see it, staving off disaster and pulling things together at a critical time.

McCULLOCH: I often think though, Don, that this is what administrators do, and it's always quiet; in other words, when things are quiet, that's when an administrator is doing his job. He's pulling the thing together, he's preventing things from breaking out, he's putting fires out. Yes, he's putting fires out there. And the faculty, I don't think, appreciate the fact that the quietness is an indication of success.

WALKER: Yes.

McCULLOCH: And you know when you're not doing well, because there's some frightful uproar.

WALKER: I think that's right. I've always tried to serve the philosophy that there's no limit to what you can get done if it doesn't matter who gets the credit, and I think the best administration is very frequently pretty low profile and even invisible.

McCULLOCH: Just as I was saying.

WALKER: Yes, I agree.

McCULLOCH: Yes. Well, the next question is really not the kind to put you on the spot, but do you often wonder where you had the least successes? So if you'd like to comment on that, I'd like to hear what you have to say.

WALKER: Well, in a way, I came at a fortunate time, Sam. There was a lot of sweeping up to do and a lot of problems to handle: getting the students themselves to build structures in which they were willing to live, building an administrative team, joining Student Affairs back to the University. I don't know, and I hope I'm not just being defensive here, but I really wasn't aware of any failures or any great frustrations.

It seemed to me that in the time that was here there wasn't anything that I look back on and regret. I think that we could not at that time-- did not--anticipate the Chicano wave and the wave of the Black-student consciousness. And perhaps, had I been a little brighter, I might have seen that coming.

McCULLOCH: We reacted very quickly. I think, more than most universities, we took care of that situation.

WALKER: That's right.

McCULLOCH: And the very skillful way Jay Martin set up a program in which Black Studies and Chicano Studies were part of American Studies.

WALKER: That's right.

McCULLOCH: I take it you must have drawn in on all this?

WALKER: In the very early stages. It was just pecking at the shell, just pecking at the shell. Yes, I think that one of the things that I tried to do, that all Student Affairs people in the practice try to do, is to have a high antenna and to pick up the signal very early and react earlier than perhaps most of the University community. But in all fairness, I don't think any of us saw the impact on higher education and the society in general that the neo-Jacksonian revolution would have, the move of the dispossessed to be recognized. Perhaps we should have been more alert.

McCULLOCH: That's a very good answer. The next question is, what would you do differently if you had to do it over again? Well, I ask this of everyone, and I get the most interesting answers. I can assure you.

WALKER: Well, I'm not even sure my answer will be interesting, because I tend to be a pragmatist, Sam. I regard a lot of the high-velocity, convoluted rhetoric that accompanies maneuvers in the academy as organic fertilizer, and I tend to regard the job as a workaday job. You listen to voices in the upper air, but that is really a compass direction, and so I think in

the view of the circumstances we had, the personalities we had to work with, the stage of the University at that time, the state of the art, the state of the nation, I don't look back with any feelings of great hernias in execution or planning. I think that on balance we did pretty well.

McCULLOCH: Well, I'll ask a question that isn't here, but did you like certain parts of your work better than other parts? What's the most appealing part of that job?

WALKER: It's hard to say, Sam, but I would say that, one, the University of California, Irvine, came through to me as a first team. It came through as a group of pros, that somehow I had joined the Green Bay Packers unaware that they suffered a little bit from what Chopin referred to as Englishmen's disease--they played the good notes with indifference and the bad notes with great feeling. But even so, I sensed that here was a first-rate operation in every sense, that this was a University to be contended with. It just showed. And I enjoyed that.

I enjoyed the association, I enjoyed working with highly able, highly cerebral people who, by and large, with a few excursions into the extraordinary, were not petty and were not limited. Each pursued his own particular vision, but did it in a very lofty professional fashion. I enjoyed that association. I enjoyed working with Dan Aldrich. Dan still is one of my heroes. I think that intuitively in the days when I knew him he was still relatively unpractised, but intuitively had a keen sense of the kind of administrative values that I regard as important. I enjoyed that, I enjoyed the climate and the headiness of the new experiment, and then, of course, the setting was beautiful, so all these things were rewarding.

McCULLOCH: Well, the final question, Don, are there any experiences that we've left out, anything that you'd like to comment on that I haven't covered in these questions?

WALKER: No. I think there are a number of things that I do remember that I remember rather intensely.

McCULLOCH: I'd like to hear them, I'd like to hear them.

WALKER: Well, I can remember particular experiences that were interesting. I remember in those days the public was quite exercised about student behavior and what was going on on the campuses. I remember carrying the message to the community that the students were not as bad as they were presented and that unreasonable demands were really being made on the University in service of the in loco parentis philosophy. I remember a few fragrant incidents where I was able to throw the challenge back to the community. But let's see, I had an idea there, Sam, that I thought you might be interested in, and the circuit has dropped out. Perhaps it'll--

McCULLOCH: Well, in your public relations there, did you talk a lot to the community? And how was the feedback there? You say some of them were sort of annoyed with us for not adopting the attitude of in loco parentis.

WALKER: I would say the experience with the community in those days was bimodal. There were a great number of ordinary people who wanted to feel that the world was not going to hell with the midwives being the student generation, and they were very susceptible to more favorable interpretation of student actions, which was my message.

There was a group of the landed gentry in Orange County that received that kind of a message very hostilely because they had their minds made up, and I do recall one incident at a luncheon where a man who was a dentist sitting next to me (we were having a little difficulty on campus) told of how these events ought to be handled. He said, "You know, my wife and I were in Madrid, Spain," I believe he said, "and we went to dinner, and my wife left her mink in the car, and we both forgot to lock the car. When we remembered it at dinner we rushed out, and the mink was still there.

I went up to a policeman, and I asked him," (I'm just recounting from the memory of an event many years old, Sam, but as I recall, the outline of it is substantially correct.) He said, "We rushed up to a policeman and asked him how that was possible, to leave a five-thousand-dollar coat in an expensive car and have it untouched, and the policeman said, 'Well, in this country when we find a man who steals, the first time we warn him; the second time he's shot resisting arrest.'" And his implication to me was that, if we adopted a similar tactic, we'd have fewer student radicals, and I said, "Well, Doctor, the problem with a system that's that tightly controlled is that the first time a dentist charges more than two dollars for a filling, he's warned," and I hit it right on the head, because apparently he had stopped in and talked to a dentist and found out fillings were two dollars, so he just turned red as a beet, and the rest of the meeting was cool. But I find that incident in retrospect fragrant because there were a great many of the hard-liners in the county who wished to churn the little bastards into rectitude. When their own kids were involved or when they were pushed to some reality in the circumstances, they took quite a different view, but in the abstract I'm sure were infinite mischief to the University by taking this hard, unrealistic, brittle line as though all the students were criminals and the best argument available for capital punishment.

McCULLOCH: That's a great story. Any other reminiscences you have that illustrate either your work with the community or some of your experiences with the students themselves or memories of some of the best students you had working with you? Is there anything that would help in writing the history of Irvine? Did you have any special students that you were particularly impressed with?

WALKER: Yes. I have a little difficulty with names on occasion, but I remember Mike Krisman, our student body President, who subsequently went on

to law school and was a member of the SDS, was a little bit of a problem in the early days, but he grew tremendously and I think made some real contributions to the University.

They had a girl named Dia Dorsey.

McCULLOCH: She's still with us. She's head of our alumni.

WALKER: Is that right?

McCULLOCH: Yes.

WALKER: Well, Dia was one of the head residents in the dorms at that time, and I can remember that The Regents met on one occasion and were prepared to really come down on what they'd heard about the residence halls, which in their view were quite unbuttoned by their standards of how residence halls ought to be conducted--at least that was the rumor we received--that we were to be questioned, and Dan was to be battered very sharply and consecutively about the residence halls.

So I asked Dia and a big football-looking all-American-type male who was one of the residents, the two of them, to report on events in the residence hall, and, oh, they did such a superb job, particularly Dia. She just explained things in such a low-key, reasonable fashion that my impression was that The Regents were just enchanted, and the attack that we were supposed to receive (that may have just been rumor, but, in any event, that we were preparing for) never materialized.

McCULLOCH: Well, Dia is head of the alumni, and in fact we may well see her at lunch today at the University Club. She eats there a lot because we're in a trailer right across from Dia. The Alumni Office is just down about four trailers, so she often comes over for lunch. We might see her.

WALKER: That'll be good. I remember I brought Jack Little down, and he was our Ombudsman, and I think Jack took a subsequent battering because he is kind of a nonconsecutive guy and a guy who relates pretty well to the

marginal fringe of students, but in the days when he was first here--the first couple of years--he had such currency with the student radical groups, and his influence was really so sound. I think the University owes him a debt that hasn't been recognized. Now, when the University became more consecutive and things became calmer, Jack's own lack of organizational concern and his own sort of outré interests, I think, caught up with him and became something of an embarrassment. And I think he's happy. But at the time he came, I think Jack Little made a real contribution.

McCULLOCH: - Where is he now?

WALKER: I think he's at one of the state hospitals. He's a psychologist and had an interesting career. I understood that, before he changed direction in his early life, he was head of all the psychological units on the West Coast after World War II when the GIs were coming back, and then there was some kind of a personal change in direction. But I think at the time he was here he made a good contribution.

McCULLOCH: Well, thank you very much, Don, and unless you have any other thoughts, which I'd love to hear, we'll go over to lunch.

WALKER: Thank you, Sam.

McCULLOCH: Thank you very much, Don.