SM: All right, this is an interview with Lewis Bird, Jr., April 14, 1989 at my office, HOB 360. And the first question, Lew, is what did you know about the structure of the University of California administration before you came as an intern in administration in 1972-73?

LB: Nothing. (chuckle)

SM: Nothing? Nothing, totally?

LB: No. As a matter of fact, I didn't even know about UC Irvine until I had been selected to become an ACE Fellow and I was in Washington talking with the staff there about various potential candidates for campuses to reside on.

SM: Just let me check to see if this is going.

(tape is turned off)

So you were in Washington and then what?

LB: We just talked about various candidate campuses and they suggested UCI. I said, "UCI?" I hadn't even, frankly, heard about it. And as we talked more about it and the experience that they had had with UCI with interns in the past, they thought it would be a good choice. So, I made some phone calls and I flew out and I talked with several people here, Hazard Adams among them, and decided that this
would be a good campus and I eventually came that summer for a year.

SM: Tell me, you know we have had very good fortune with our interns right from the very beginning, back in 1965, so you were in a proud tradition. But in what position were you at the time?

LB: At the time I came here, I was on the faculty of the Air Command and Staff College, in a division that—not to use their vernacular—but ours was in sort of like the political science department, and teaching there.

SM: What did you teach there?

LB: Political science subjects. My specialty, oddly enough, was sub-Saharan Africa because I had spent . . . I had gone through a number of Defense Department institutes. I had spent two years in central Africa in the attache business and, after I returned from a tour in Vietnam, I was assigned to the Air Command Staff College and I was concluding a three-year tour.

SM: Is that located up in Colorado?

LB: No, that's part of their university and it's located in Montgomery, Alabama, Maxwell Air Force Base.

SM: Oh, yes.

LB: With the Air War College.

SM: All right. Now, when you came here, Lew, what assignments did they give you here?
LB: Well, I was fortunate in the sense that this important reorganization was at hand. I had no sooner arrived . . . I'll answer your question directly. The two major assignments that I had were to monitor and record and even assess faculty opinion on the Hazard Adams proposal for the organization. I made that the subject of a paper I wrote, which was the paper for the ACE that I turned into Washington at the end of my . . .

SM: And is that in the archives?
LB: It should be. I gave a copy to them.
SM: And, if it isn't--I haven't read that one--but is it confidential?
LB: Well, it was at the time.
SM: Yes.
LB: Naturally, since the . . . This was 1973 and here we are in 1989. It's sort of old news. It does talk about people's opinions of one another and so forth, or people's opinions, so I think it has to be handled with appropriate care. But I would consider it now probably open for general use.
SM: Well, what I'll do when I get around to writing it, Lew, is if when I come around to your part of our report, of what I'm supposed to report, I'll ask permission for the file.
LB: It's, I think, a good review of the proposal that Hazard made and the faculty's reaction to it. The first sections of it review how the campus came to be organized in the way it was, and it goes department by department. I interviewed
the--see, at that time, most of the original founders of the various disciplines were here.

SM: That's right, of course.

LB: Saunders was here in Engineering. March had gone, but Creel Froman was here.

SM: (inaudible)

LB: Most of the originals--of course, Steinhaus had died--but most of the original people were still here, so I had . . . Hinderaker had moved on, but I went down to his home in . . .

SM: Corona del Mar.

LB: In Corona del Mar, and I talked with him at length.

SM: Very good.

LB: And I talked with Peltason on the phone. He was at Illinois at the time. He'd left here and gone to Illinois. And, of course, at length with Dan Aldrich. But that, of course, was information. You're going to go back to primary sources on that and I would be second and this paper would be a secondary source.

SM: It will be important, too, because the next question is my judgement--I think you came and talked to me as the founding Dean of Humanities--that he didn't consult enough.

LB: Oh, you mean for the reorganization proposal?

SM: Hazard didn't consult enough. Usually, if you have a bright idea, you try to have someone else originate it so you don't . . . so you say what a great idea you have, and all that,
but you literally go around and talk. And that's the way you bring changes about. Now, once you get in and once it's set, you're going to have your opponents; but, on the other hand, you've already consulted the key people. I mean, you've got them on your side. Now, if you can't get the key people on your side, forget it. You're never going to make it.

LB: Well, yes. You know, I had my own ideas on it and he decided to take the issue head-on. And he may have done a lot more in the margins before he announced it, but it wasn't visible to the naked eye. He had certain conversations, no doubt, beforehand. He had the Chancellors' support, and he no doubt had talked to certain people beforehand, but there wasn't a general feeling of acceptance when it was distributed, when the plan was distributed.

SM: Yes, well, Lew, I remember, very vividly, it being distributed and the new Chairman Arthur Slaven—we're now in 1970 . . . He was only here in 1973, and he said, "This is a very well-thought out, interesting, approach, and he just . . . This was his introduction. Well, I can't remember what happened. You see, you mentioned, as I recall, that you recommended the merging or (inaudible) of Physical Sciences and Engineering. Now, here we are in the Humanities—we don't know how—I haven't read it, so . . .
LB: Yes, this is his actual paper. This is a copy of his actual paper. Go ahead, I'm sorry.

SM: Yes, well, he thought it out well--it was well written.

LB: Oh, yes.

SM: And, to us, it made sort of sense, but I understand both Engineering and Physical Sciences didn't buy it.

LB: Well, there were a lot of objections. And I think the most coherent review of the reaction of the faculty is really here. I think probably we could use the time most effectively were you just to draw on this one chapter, because here it goes through, question by question, the reaction of the faculty to the various . . .

SM: Wonderful. (inaudible) list the page number?

LB: Oh, sure. Well, I would just say this chapter. Here's the proposal. Let's see, the chapter, naturally I can't get it. The page number for the faculty, I believe, was page sixty-six.

SM: Good. See, there will come the tape now, and I'll . . .

LB: But I think the whole chapter goes through a question-by-question review of what the faculty's reaction to it was.

SM: Well, that's very well done. But my question five, did he consult all units carefully? That's really a question you have answered, that he did consult some.

LB: Well, after the proposal was officially . . .

SM: On the table.
LB: On the table, he set up certain working groups to study all parts of it. He actually began the process when he tabled the proposal. The process was to begin with the formation of study groups which were to report their reaction to it. So, it wasn't that when he announced he was saying, "It's in effect immediately." It really began the study process. The unfortunate result was that the reaction came back . . .

SM: Negative.

LB: Fairly uniformly negative. The only thing that survived from it, really, was the creation of the Dean of Special Programs, which evolved into the present-day Dean of Undergraduate Studies.

SM: I was interested in that deanship, you know, of special programs. I know a lot about Phys[ical] Ed[ucation] and I know a lot about Teacher Education and so on, but Clayton Garrison headed the search committee and I didn't even get an interview.

Now, why, in your opinion, were the plans ultimately rejected? Now, you've answered that some were implemented. You said that they implemented the Dean of Special Programs, and that set up a program over Teacher Education, Physical Education, and I think the outside programs, such as the program, at the time, Information and Computer Science was separate, and so was Social Ecology separate. As I remember, maybe Social Ecology hadn't appeared. I'll have to look it up. But you laid it out as to what the Dean of
Special Programs would do and Keith Justice did really well, actually. And then they, as you say, it was really changed to Dean of Undergraduates.

LB: Well, the Dean of Special Programs, as he envisioned it, was to include, according to--these are actual pages from his memorandum--was to include, as he envisioned it, Extended University, which has since gone out of existence.

SM: Oh, (inaudible). That's gone, but it's too bad.

LB: Yes, it lasted a few years.

SM: Yes, but I'm very strong on that.

LB: It may come back.

SM: What?

LB: It may come back. There's a certain important logic to it.

SM: I'll tell you what, you go down to Australia and watch how their--it's called Externals, or an Externals Program, and it's just exactly what he's suggesting. And I personally think well of it.

LB: Well, Extended University was to be part of the domain of the Dean of Special Programs. Undergraduate Education, University Studies, Physical Education . . .

SM: (inaudible), that's right.

LB: Teacher Education.

SM: Yes, Teacher Education.

LB: Interdisciplinary Studies and Instructional Media Services. Now, as I understand it, the Dean of Special Programs that was actually created, did not include the academic units.
It did not include PE. It did not include Teacher Education. It included the other elements.

SM: I'll talk to Keith Justice. He's retired, you know, and lives in Arizona.

LB: Well, yes. Yes, well, you know, he had another incarnation after this. When I came back in 1977, I came back to work for him.

SM: Yes.

LB: And he had just been appointed as the Dean of Professional and Interdisciplinary Studies, which was an organization, an administrative structure, created by Executive Vice Chancellor McGAugh to address the same problem that the Hazard Adams plan was aimed at addressing, namely the problem of too many people reporting to the Vice Chancellor, Academic Vice Chancellor.

SM: Academic, yes.

LB: So, what McGAugh had done is he had just collected them together in a different way, and he'd managed to carry it off. He collected together five units: the School of Engineering; the Graduate School of, then, Administration, now Management; ICS; Teacher Education; and Social Ecology. He had collected them together into this so-called Professional and Interdisciplinary Studies and put Keith Justice in charge. And, when I came back, I worked for him.

SM: And then what happened?
LB: See, that wasn't part of the Hazard Adams plan. It was a different plan.

SM: Yes, I know that. I got it (inaudible).

LB: That lasted until, from 1977 until 1981, when various accreditation reports--the one I remember in particular was the one from Engineering--that started to . . . the structure and the separateness of the Dean of Engineering from the central administration, that extra distance created by the interposition of this Dean of Professional and Interdisciplinary Studies, they began--the outside reviews--began claiming that this was beginning to undermine the role of Engineering on the campus and the resources that could be flowing to it. I think that was one of the principle reasons, together with other general complaints, why McGaugh felt it was wise to do away with that--or the Chancellor and McGaugh. I don't know, somewhere, the central campus authorities decided it was wise to do away with Professional and Interdisciplinary Studies.

SM: So, therefore, Lew, (inaudible) that decision around 1982, Keith went back to teaching.

LB: Yes.

SM: And you were moved to where?

LB: Just by chance, Russ Riley retired and I got his job.

SM: Oh, that is an important job.

LB: And I moved across to his job.

SM: Yes, well, that's very (inaudible).
LB: So, they've all wrestled with the same problem--the problem that Hazard Adams articulates so well here--of having too many people reporting to the Academic Vice Chancellor and people representing various levels of concern, people ranging from like the Dean of the College of Medicine--a major academic unit with major resources--to an office of Teacher Education, with a very small faculty and a departmental outlook rather than a college outlook. So, they've all wrestled with that, since the early decision was made not to fill the position of the Dean of College of Arts, Letters and Sciences.

SM: Thank you. That's very well-said. So, question seven, what recommendations did you make upon your departure? In other words, did you leave some recommendations for Jim McGaugh? Or was he there? No, he wasn't. Was Hazard Adams still Vice Chancellor?

LB: Hazard was.

SM: Yes.

LB: I just left my findings in the form of this paper.

SM: Well, that's important. So, you're telling me that the findings of the paper are here to recommend it.

LB: But not recommendations. They were just findings of what the faculty reaction was to the proposal.

SM: Do you say anything in it as to which, in your opinion, are better administered. Some areas are better administered and
some ought to be--I'd say, given a boost--but, I mean, what did you find? You really weren't looking for that.

LB: Well, I'm just looking now at the summary outcome of the questionnaire. In summary, the questionnaire seemed to indicate that the faculty agreed with the Vice Chancellor. One, that the campus had problems important enough to justify a serious search for organizational alternatives. Two, that his perception of the problems was essentially correct. Three, that the notion of bringing together the theoretical and applied aspects of given fields is a reasonable intellectual basis on which to organize. And, four, that his views on the intellectual emphasis of each unit were about right. Now, this table describes what each of them in the faculty indicated where they felt these units . . .

SM: That's on that same page (inaudible)?

LB: Yes. And those who disagreed, and they were not an insignificant (inaudible) at all, often challenged his methods and motivations. Many charged him with heavy-handedness, rebelling against his tight schedules, and a lack of direct consultation with the faculty. While agreeing with his perception of the problems and their seriousness, they quarreled—quite paradoxically—with his motives.

SM: Please excuse me.
(interview is interrupted and tape is turned off) (A non-reading of English janitor entered by pass key.)

Questioned his motives.

LB: . . . quite paradoxically with his motives, saying that he was inspired more by a desire to correct the administrative deficiencies than to right educational wrongs. Most opposition came from the faculty of the smaller units who feared for the vitality and viability of their programs, if forced to conform to alien goals and values. But I think, actually, the most efficient way to review how this went is, frankly, for you to review this; because it was fresh in my mind when I wrote this and I had evaluated the questionnaire. Right now, it's what, sixteen years later, and I'm reviewing some of this like, "My goodness! Oh, wow!" myself.

SM: Tell me, though, you didn't there for awhile I was looking for in question eight, did you come across some areas that were badly administered--or poorly, I should say--and some that were really good?

LB: I don't think the . . .

SM: You weren't looking for that, though.

LB: That isn't what I was looking for. Actually, we were looking for . . .

SM: I'm asking for yourself, whether you had any impressions (inaudible).
LB: Oh, certainly, you know. Any organization that's administered by people, and an organization is just a collection of people. And some have efficiently dealt with their rules and methods of behavior, and some more efficiently and some less efficiently. And this organization, as any group, reflects the same range of effectiveness as any organization would. In other words, yes.

SM: Do you feel that the sciences as a whole are better administered than the social sciences and humanities?

LB: Now or then?

SM: Then, then.

LB: Oh, I think they were all very well administered. I think they were all . . . I have to think across who there were in each organization. I don't think it was necessarily a problem of quality of administration, necessarily. There were a variety of factors and Hazard enumerates them here in detail. And, if that was an issue, it was a second order or a third order issue, the quality of the administration. It was that there were just too many to deal with, to pay proper attention, for there to be solid planning.

SM: I think he once said, Hazard said, that he had so much, so many people responding or reporting to him, that the most he could give [was] fifteen to twenty minutes to a problem. That's really something.
LB: Well, he has a list of all the administrators who reported directly to him; and, on this list are, let's see, one, two, three, four, five, six, seven, eight, nine, ten, eleven, twelve, thirteen, fourteen, fifteen, sixteen, seventeen, eighteen, nineteen. Now, these are nineteen major units. And these are academic units, not administrators or administrative units.

SM: And, you know, the reverse happened when Clark Kerr was trying to do what we did, by a separate school—we'll call it a school. By (inaudible) about half of those in science, and he said, and I wish I could remember. He said either sixty-four or one hundred and sixty-four people reported. . . . Sproul found this out. Sproul found this for the dean of Arts and Sciences [UCB].

LB: Yes. Well, the president's problem, I think, is a different one. Any one of these campuses can stand alone administratively. The president's office provides mainly a communications chain and a coordinating function, but it doesn't administer students. Each one of these campuses could stand alone on the same basis that any other major university campus could. It would need, naturally, if it were standing absolutely alone, it would need to scale out certain of its administrative functions that now can be done by a central office, such as Legislative Liaison and so forth. But the problems on the campus are not reduced, in my opinion, significantly by the existence of a president's
office. And the problems of a president are different than the problems of a chancellor.

SM: I understand perfectly, yes. Now, to what position did you return? Did you go back to Alabama?

LB: Oh, yes, I went back to Alabama and I was there in the office of the Reserve Officer Training Corps, headquarters for that. And I was only back there six months or less, four months, when I was transferred to Washington into an entirely different job, spending half of each year in Vienna and the other half in Washington on international negotiations.

SM: Is that the War College?

LB: No. You mean when I went to Washington?

SM: When you went to Washington.

LB: No, no. No, I was with the office of the Secretary of Defense and we were negotiating with the Soviets on force levels in Europe—a totally different job.

SM: How did you like it?

LB: Oh, I loved it. I did that for about four years before I retired.

SM: Yes.

LB: And so it was out of education entirely, into the world of international negotiations.

SM: God, that's interesting. I'll have to have lunch with you sometime and talk about that.
LB: And then retired and came back to this position I described, working for Keith Justice.

SM: And we're glad to have you. We're glad to have you. I know many were who knew you, were very pleased you were coming back. And it's nice to have someone who's really, you know, had a real exposure to our administration.

LB: Right.

SM: Now, I'd like to come up to date a bit, Lew, and finish this interview by a discussion of your assignments today and what you look forward to in the future, in your office and your position, or if you're promoted or what else. But I'm just talking about your position now. You're now dealing with budget.

LB: Right. I'm Assistant Vice Chancellor in Academic Affairs for budget.

SM: Well, that's a very important position. As Dean, I know that well--a very important position. I hope you'll put it positively. How are things going? (chuckle)

LB: Very well, actually. We are dealing with the right kinds of problems, in the sense that we have...they're the problems of a growing campus. The problems of...See, resources follow enrollments. We get the enrollment, which serves as the justification for getting the additional money, but there's a lag time.

SM: You bet. I had a great interview with Leon Schwartz just a (inaudible) and he made that exact point. You're always
behind, because once . . . You're enrollment-driven. Once you get your enrollment, then you get your building. Think of the difference it's going to make when Physical Sciences comes along with its classrooms and the other, but we're always behind.

LB: Exactly. And we're the most behind with space because the lag time from the time you decide that you're going to have to have, let's say, a Physical Sciences II Building, and the time it's available for occupancy is a decade. A decade! Now, there's an automatic delay from the time that the circumstances exist where you need something and you acknowledge their existence. We often aren't always way out ahead of the problem. Sometimes we are oftentimes reacting to it, or barely ahead of them. But if you add to that a ten-year built-in delay time, we are always behind in the space issues. And we're dealing with, like we have been for some years now, conducting a lot of our classes in a local movie house.

SM: Are they actually using the new lecture[s] now?

LB: Oh, yes, it just opened.

SM: How are they? Have you been up there?

LB: Excellent, excellent. There's some glitches, like there always are, but just excellent. There's some glitches that you can't imagine how that could have occurred.

SM: Well, the great glitch when we started was that the science
lecture hall had no toilets. We had to go across to Steinhaus Hall to go to the toilet.

LB: Yes.

SM: And Pereira said, "I just forgot." That was Pereira's building. But, tell me, so you really feel optimistic and things are moving. We're going to get the Library Building, I understand.

LB: Yes.

SM: Science Library.

LB: Oh, yes, yes.

SM: That's really needed, you know.

LB: Well, the good news is we have grown a lot, we are growing a lot, and all you had to do was walk around the campus to see all the construction that's underway and all the ways in which we're addressing the problem; but, that's the good news. The bad news is we still are working on gaps in the future. We have capital programs underway, up to a certain point, but we have to push that horizon out further because our enrollments are continuing to climb, and we still need the space and don't have the space and are dealing with temporary alternatives.

SM: Right.

LB: And a lot more work needs to be done on the buildings that follow those, that now have been approved. But, by and large, we're keeping up with it. We have the support of the president's office. We have the support of the community.
Thank the Lord for that movie house locally and Jim Edwards' support for allowing us to use that.

SM: And I did. I read my interview with Bill Parker and, oh, it's funny, his story how he went down and talked with the Edwards.

LB: Yes, right.

SM: What's funny is the old fellow is just an incredible man, but it's the son who does the whole thing.

LB: Yes, yes.

SM: Well, I got a great kick out of that.

LB: Yes.

SM: Therefore, your office is what now? Fourth floor?

LB: Fifth floor.

SM: Fifth floor. And you're constantly pretty much really attached to Dr. Tien?

LB: Well, I have two jobs. One job is the Assistant Vice Chancellor for Academic Budget. The other one is I'm the Executive Assistant to Vice Chancellor Tien, so I handle other things related to his support as well.

SM: That's quite a heavy job you've got.

LB: Well, it keeps me off the street and out of pool rooms. (laughter) But he is an inspirational person. I don't know whether you've had a chance to meet.

SM: Oh, yes, I've met him, and he's just a delightful guy. You know, I asked him to talk to the Forum last quarter. I arranged that whole program. I'm moderator, and so Marian
Mendenhall has done most of it this quarter, but I did that and I got him. He was very pleased to do it and then I studied up on his C.V. and it was so interesting. And so I gave a little longer introduction than usual. Then he comes on and he comes on, you know, like gangbusters.

LB: I know.

SM: He was very good. And he had that whole audience--he was talking about excellence and how we've got to do this and that to the university, to have a quality of excellence. He was in the larger room of the University Club. He's a most interesting guy.

LB: Yes.

SM: And I feel we're very fortunate and I think things are really moving along.

LB: Well, he's working well with the Chancellor. They're wrestling with a lot of issues. One is, how can the land that we have, which is one of our major resources, be used appropriately to advance our research and teaching enterprise. I mean, that's one of the major resources.

SM: How can the land?

LB: The inclusion area.

SM: Yes, well, isn't that the big breakthrough. Really, is it not, that Bren has given a million and a half toward the Bren professorships to bring in high tech people and that we can now build on our campus some high tech . . .
LB: Well, not only that, but the work that Catalano and the campus has been able to do with the city, because they could interpose a very serious objection to the nature of our growth. Whenever we grow here, we affect the city of Irvine and Newport Beach. It's really a three-way partnership: a partnership among the campus, the local community, and the business community. We all affect one another here and we now have the basis for a coherent arrangement among those three groups. Bren's participation in the campus bespeaks the business community's understanding and agreement with our relationship and our role. The fact that we haven't had any major problems arise with the various environmental impact reports that we've had bespeaks the fact that the city of Irvine is understanding of, and the very successful creation of this Irvine Theater. A very unusual project of both the city and the university.

SM: Yes, I was about to mention that.

LB: Very unusual for two quite different organizations to come together in a cultural enterprise such as that, bespeaks the nature of the relationship between the university and the other leg of this partnership. So, I think one of the crucial things that isn't readily noticed is the excellent relationship that's been created between these three parties, which allows UCI to grow. There are a lot of understandings on traffic flow and a number of other things that flow from a basic understanding among those three
parties. The research park, you've no doubt talked about what the general long-range development plan has for the use of that inclusion area. That would not be possible were there not agreement with these other parties.

SM: Did you see some parallel, Lew, in all those high tech places of industry south of Stanford? They're not on the campus, but they're just off the campus south of Stanford. Now, I understand we're going to have some of that high tech on the campus in the inclusion area. Is that right?

LB: Yes, but I'm not going to be your expert on that one.

SM: No, no, that's all right. Who is the expert?

LB: Ray Catalano.

SM: I've got him down. I'm interviewing him fairly soon.

LB: He's crucial to answering questions like that. He's your main man on that.

SM: Yes, that's correct, yes, because I'm interviewing him.

LB: Bill Parker, you know, handled that sort of thing until fairly recently, and then, with all the other things that Bill's doing, Ray picked it up. And thank the Lord because Ray was . . .

SM: He was a councilman, I know.

LB: Well, he was a city councilman and he was head of the planning commission before that.

SM: Yes, that's a good situation. Well, this has been a very fine, interesting interview. Do you have anything else that
you'd like to say about your present job and your views of the future?

LB: Well, I think this is one of the most exciting campuses in the nine-campus system, there's no doubt about. This is where the future of the university is.

SM: Yes, I was saying and I've always said--and so has Clark Kerr, by the way--I've always said we're going to be one of the very best. Clark Kerr went on, within two years, he said, Irvine has the most chance by the twenty-first century to be in the first twenty universities, better than the other two campuses. In other words, Santa Cruz has got their problems. We were up there the week before last for a history meeting, and they've got problems. And then San Diego. San Diego has got a (inaudible).

LB: The key is the people you select.

SM: What?

LB: The key is the people you select. It isn't the buildings. It isn't the land. It isn't any . . . It's the people you select. They're the ones that make the institution. Look at the quality of the faculty coming to UCI. Look at some of the key people coming on board now--Francisco Ayala, Hillis Miller--all around, the new generation of quality faculty. I mean, that's where the future lies.

SM: The future and I've said this, I've said if you get your housing going, your faculty housing, they'll come. If you don't get your faculty housing done, they won't come. And
the three distinguished professors back before I left for Australia, that's December 1985--now those three only came because they could build a house.

LB: Yes. See, we have the land. That was one of the wonderful resources that we had.

SM: Oh, yes.

LB: We had the land in order to do that.

SM: Yes, and I think there's a turning around of the Irvine Company, really. I hope that there is. They're really interested in education and I did my little bit to help Jack Peltason--for nothing, of course. I served on a selection committee for the Spectrum Leadership Scholarship. They give a certain number in all the area which Irvine impacts on, which goes as far as Anaheim and to Villa Park and so on, and to Corona del Mar and so on. But the beginning group gets a $1,000 scholarship. The next group goes into the finals, yes, the finals. They get $2,000. And maybe there's three and four. Maybe there's finals, semi-finals, and then the last one. But, you know, they were such good quality. There wasn't one student--well, there was only one--that wasn't second in his or her class. And the one guy was a rather remarkable fellow who was twelfth. And I spent a whole day this Tuesday, and the Irvine Company agreed to put that money in.

LB: Yes.
SM: They're willing to bring in the people who did the judging. John Whitely is actually involved. He asked me to do it because he had to go to New York, so I took his place. Well, now, I've offered to do it again next year. But, really, if the Irvine Company can get on the ball and do these things, you know, I feel kind of happy about it. I never thought they were. I thought it was all a very strict business deal, the gift of the campus and then the purchase of the inclusion areas.

LB: Well, that's been the secret from the beginning. We had that land. It gave us opportunities that other campuses haven't had.

SM: Oh, yes. Oh, yes, right.

LB: And, of course, we're in the middle of a very growing community. The Orange County community is growing so rapidly.

SM: Oh, that was my point and Clark Kerr's point, too. And we're just near enough to Los Angeles, fifty minutes, fifty-five minutes somewhere. You see, we're just hooked in now. San Diego's a long way away. Santa Cruz is only, what? Santa Cruz is at least sixty, seventy--sixty-nine miles from San Francisco.

LB: Yes.

SM: It's a little too much. And they're up there in the beautiful redwoods. They're great, you know, (inaudible).

LB: Yes.
SM: Well, Lew, is there anything else you'd like to say?
LB: No.

END OF INTERVIEW