SM: Well, Howard, I'm happy to introduce you to our machine here where I'm tape recording about sixty-five or seventy-five important people at UCI. And today is March 9, 1989. So, the first question, Howard, what attracted you about UCI? Why did you come?

HL: Actually, I had not planned to come to UCI, but I was out here in 1967 to meet Dick Campbell and Grover Stevens to interview students for our NSF program that I was sponsoring in Hawaii; and, when I came out, they asked me to give a seminar, and apparently the seminar went very well. Then, when I was in Hawaii that summer, I got a letter... a call from Grover saying that they would like me to join the faculty.

SM: Who was that?

HL: Grover Stevens.

SM: Grover Stevens.

HL: And then, however, since I had just turned down a job at North Carolina and I was a little tired of all this job hunting, I was going on sabbatical or a leave of absence to the Weizmann Institute in Israel. And, before I went, I decided that I would come here. However, the conditions were as follows: I was very much interested in experimental marine biology and
I felt that UCI, being a campus close to the ocean, a new school, would be a unique opportunity to have a medical, biomedical, experimental marine biology program at a major university close to the ocean. And that was what I was essentially hired for, but since there was no program, Jim McGaugh brought me in as Associate Dean to replace Pat Healy who was going to go back to his research, and I would have that administrative role where I could do this.

However, Governor Reagan came in, all budgets were cut, and the Marine Biology program never materialized. Since I was Associate Dean of Bio Sci, we were developing our core program and I took a great interest in developing the undergraduate program there. So, my original interests were experimental marine biology, because having come from Miami I was doing similar things there. However, things changed rapidly due to the political situation (in California).

SM: I'm afraid that affected a lot of people, Howard, and I know I was Dean then. Which year did you come? In 1968?

HL: In July of 1969.

SM: July of 1969. Well, that was my last year as Dean and the budget really was one thing that decided me that I had better things to do than try to be a Dean and run things when you don't have enough money. But the Marine Biology ... A fellow by the name of Gilbert Bain--or some such name--started out with courses where he was teaching Marine Biology, I
thought; but he was not rehired, and I guess, as you say, the program didn't develop. Now, tell me about the undergraduate program that you were so interested in and how did it differ from the one that Dean Steinhaus started.

HL: Well, when I first came, I was made Associate Dean of Bio Sci, and responsible for the undergraduate program. As the way Bio Sci works, that's the Dean's prerogative, while the schools, they were in charge of more of the graduate programs. It's interesting that I came from a background of all research institutes -- the Howard Hughes Institute previously; before that the Carnegie Institution in Washington; the Loomis Institute -- and I had very little experience in undergraduate teaching.

And so I came very new to the whole idea and I was placed in charge of our core program, which was established a few years earlier by Dean Steinhaus. Dean Steinhaus died one month after we got there, in September, just before we started the program. And one of the things that I noticed very early was that the students, their first two years or so, saw only faculty in these large classrooms. So, Dean Steinhaus and Bob Warner and myself started the first freshman seminar programs, not only in Biology, but I think in any program in the UC system. And it was rather unique and Dean Steinhaus died just the day before he was to start, so I took over his classes as well as mine. And I'll just continue along that vein. And
this was so successful that Schneiderman, who became Dean at that time . . .

SM: Schneiderman?

HL: Yes, Dean Schneiderman. Yes. I'll explain how that happened, too, because it's rather interesting. He liked this and encouraged having the freshman seminar program, which expanded greatly and was quite successful and I think was the only one in the system for years; and I think now the so-called Smelser Report they say we all should have freshman seminar programs. But Bio Sci did this extremely well, but it degenerated in Bio Sci because we soon had too many post-doctorals teaching it and peer advisors and they lost the original intent which was to meet with the faculty. And we used to meet, my class for example, in my home. Every week we used to meet at my home which made it even more personal. But the (inaudible) it sort of complemented the large classrooms and all our freshmen especially were happy me a week. I don't know if that answers that question.

SM: Well, that's very important. And I take it, though, that you didn't really change the core that Dean Steinhaus had set up with his chairmen, yes?

HL: Let me answer that. Yes, we did change the core because there was always the problem of which courses should they order the courses. So we changed the order of the courses where they had Ecology first or last, or Microbiology first or last. And
we did add Molecular Biology, a seventh program, and we also noticed that there was an absence of anything dealing with plants and animals. We were so modern in our molecular and cell approach that we forgot that; so, within a few years afterwards, we established a course that still exists called Bio 90, which gave them the basic plant and animal orientation before they got deeply into the cell, which is more the modern approach.

But one thing we did do, and I think which is very important, if I look back and say, why is Biology still known as one of the better programs? In addition to our core program, the freshman seminar was unique but we also had a regular 199 program for research; but we did something very different, and this was based upon the experience I had in Hawaii before I came here. Not only would the students do their research, but we required of them to present at the end of the year a paper in different sessions in front of the faculty and the other students. And we cancelled all classes that day so people would attend these things and then we started an Undergraduate Journal in Biological Research, which is still--it's now in its nineteenth year--it's the only one still in the world that I know of where original research is published on a regular basis by our undergraduates. And I would say at least one-half to two-thirds are later published in major journals elsewhere, and I would say virtually all of
these students go on towards research or medical or professional school afterwards. So, it was . . . it's one thing that makes UCI Biology unique to any school in the country, and it started then and it's continued since.

SM: So I assume, Howard, that your main job as Associate Dean of Bio Sci was to put these courses in action and see that they were properly taught and monitored them and so forth? Or did you have other duties, too?

HL: Yes, actually, I attended every single lecture by every faculty member of the core and I could see who was doing a good job, who wasn't, and what was wrong with it. So, the second year, we changed it greatly. We just . . . Certain faculty should not have been teaching. Other ones we helped develop them into good teachers and it was a very active role. My whole approach to academia is I feel all things are important; but you can't do them all at one time, so I spent those two years concentrating greatly on that. That was my major goal, to develop and make sure that it would carry on afterwards.

Also, by the way, another thing we did which was rather unique and was successful but does not continue, is we developed the first MAT program in the system; and it was a program where we would bring high school teachers in and bring them up to date in modern biology. And then we had a program that lasted two years. I think thirty-two out of thirty-four
teachers got their masters degree and they are still teaching today. And it developed a corps of friends who would send their students to Irvine afterwards, and they were our representatives afterwards. It was an extremely successful program. We were really trying to reach out into the community. We did a great deal to work with the community colleges where we would bring their professors and their faculty in to see, say we teach this here but you don't teach that. So they would modify their courses to fit in with ours so the transfer process would work very smoothly. So, it was a major effort. I mean, that was where our energies went and ended, not because it wasn't working, because then I was elevated, or de-elevated, to the Dean of the Graduate Division, based on those successes.

SM: Well, I'm delighted to hear that. I didn't know about it and I have felt all along that we should do more in working with the junior colleges. And, when I was Dean, I used to go around speaking and so on, but the courses to dove-tail them, that's very good. And an MAT . . . you'd be amused to know, that we developed a History MAT, Master of Arts in Teaching, about 1967. And it was very carefully worked out. And it went on up to the Course of Study Committee, whatever the Senate Committee was, and they came and met with Henry Meyer and myself--he was Chair of the History, I was Dean--and it was Sherry Roland and it was Martin Shapiro--a very brilliant
man from Political Science. And he said roughly this: That you've got such a good program it's going to affect your Ph.D. program and we don't want to see . . . we want to work very hard and see that the Ph.D. program is developed. Well, we didn't buy this, but they would not accept our program. So, that MAT is an important thing, I think. Now, please, you say you were elevated or de-elevated, but I think it's an important job. What did you do as . . . What did you achieve as Dean of the Graduate Division? You came directly after Dean Gerard, did you?

HL: In between, I think, for a year acting was Keith Justice.

SM: Yes, that's right. He was acting, yes.

HL: He had served . . . So, actually, the way it happened is I was on the Graduate Council and as we were deciding the kind of candidate we wanted, the Graduate Council said, "Lenhoff, you fit the bill." And so the Graduate Council essentially selected me and so, after years of Associate Dean, I became Dean of the Graduate Division. I must say it is a very difficult position, based upon the way UC Irvine is built. The academic deans had most of the power and the funding, and the graduate deans, especially after Ralph Gerard left, did not have the funding and the power. And really was thought of more of a dean of admissions for graduate studies, rather than a true dean. And I felt I was dean of all of the people, as Lyndon Johnson was President then, president of all the
people." However, we started some very interesting things. That was the year our first black Ph.D. graduated, Sam Schacks of Bio Sci worked ... got his degree with Mary Granger, and we started developing a number of plans and I'll come back to that one exactly . . .

But the way we did this, first, is that every Friday I would have lunch with graduate students from every different unit. I just constantly wanted to get my ideas from the graduate students to see what their concerns and their problems were. So, after this, and then meeting with the faculty and then meeting with the minority faculty, we came up with a number of plans. And the one that did go through is we felt, at that time, that Contracts and Grants really should be in Academic Affairs. So we proposed that Contracts and Grants, which was then under Mr. Cox, and he agreed with us, and I found him a very honorable person. I never agreed all the time with him, but our views were very clearly and honestly spoken out, and he felt that I was right and so that was facilitated and it happened a year later, to do this. So that was, I think, a major accomplishment to have that as part of the Graduate Division.

The other proposals and things we developed were that I said I could see already the problems we had in getting minority faculty; and the problem was to me, as it is today, the pool was small and I felt that UC Irvine should be the
campus which is the one that should go out and make special efforts to recruit, using Sam Schacks and others from the better Southern schools and other schools, the minority students, and have Irvine be the training program. But, because of my short tenure, that never developed and I think we're still talking about it today but we've lost seventeen very costly years in this.

You have a question of why did I give up the Graduate Division, and that was a very difficult time for me, perhaps my most difficult time here. Just as I was learning the job, been in the job only six months or so and got all these innovative changes— I could see them happening—we had a new Vice Chancellor come in, Mr. Adams—Hazard Adams. And, for some reason, the first thing he said is, "Mr. Lenhoff, I think you should no longer be Graduate Dean." And so this took Aldrich and myself by surprise and they let me stay on to finish certain work I started until the end of the quarter, so I was terminated. I was fired in this.

So, we just did not agree at all. He does not like my style, which was very energetic, and I think certain deans felt I was reaching out. For example, we started a program where we were training graduate students on how to teach, and I brought in a psychologist who was trained in this and we had sessions on this and I offered awards, special awards for those who would be involved in teaching. But the dean said,
"No, we want that to go to our regular research funds." And I think I antagonized the powers, and their word was to Mr. Adams that I should leave. So, it's just a . . . And I sympathize with other people who have been in the Graduate Dean job. It's a very difficult job the way it's constructed. It is not the place for creative individuals.

SM: Well, (inaudible) Of course, the basic problem is that the Graduate Dean's Office doesn't have a decent budget. If you don't have a budget, you don't have any power in the university, I'm afraid. And that's a problem all the time. With all the Graduate deans, when I was Chair of the Academic Senate--and you are, too--you will be listening to your Graduate deans and your Graduate Council chairmen who will probably come to Council meetings, and they want to run the show. They--the Graduate Council--want to run the show. They don't give the Dean much of a chance. Now, I'd like to turn to something which I know you're very good at because I've talked to students and had students who have been in your classes. What are your main recollections of your work as a teacher?

HL: Well, I take my teaching very seriously and I've always been involved in two kinds of classes. I already mentioned the freshman seminars, which I really enjoy because I really get to know the students and they know you, and the preparation for these classes is really my previous experience as a
professor. So, I just walk in class and then where they want, we can expound and we have a great time. I've also worked a great deal with the students in my laboratory to prepare them for research careers. And I constantly now see their names in papers and, in fact, my first research student in the laboratory was Danny Stokals, and he was a high school student, who is now Director of a program in Social Ecology. So, I've been working . . . I've always done this all my life, had young people in my laboratory.

But, however, I put great effort on the hardest kind of teaching, which is the large classroom teaching. And I always believe that the best teachers are among the best teachers are those who are involved in research, for two reasons. One, they will not only be up-to-date with the material, which isn't that important actually for the students, but they bring an excitement for one. Then, and then the other thing is, if they apply the same creativity they do to their research to their teaching, they can really affect teaching in a great way. And I am very proud of . . . I still try to bring in various types of innovations to large teaching. I figure large classroom teaching is a challenge and it is important and can be very personal. So, I try to make large classroom teaching personal and non-threatening and make the students like to come to class and do this. And I've done
this a number of ways. If you want, I can just tell you some of the ways I've done this.

SM: Yes, why don't you.

HL: Well, for example, when sometimes I speak rapidly or if I am not clear on something, students are very afraid to ask questions because they feel embarrassed and they are in front of their colleagues, they're slowing down class, or they're interfering. And I say that there's a very simple way of doing this. All you have to do is look at me and smile, take your notes and make a little hiss sound. I hear two or three of these, I know you're doing it for me and so I don't mind it. But if I hear one-third of the class doing it, I know something is wrong. And at that time I stop and say, "Okay, now you've shown your sign of affection for me as a teacher, what's wrong?" And then I'll start asking people and then we will go over things and this works well. Also, the students, I want them to feel that I know them. And such little simple things as I indicate to them I can tell my students, which I call my Bio students--there have been other classes I've taught, too--but my . . .

SM: How big are these classes?

HL: I like to have around 400. I squeeze 400 into 350 spaces. Last year I turned away almost 600 from my class and I still had 400. But the students feel as if they know me. And I don't know them. I can't recognize them, there's so many of
them. But I say, look, when I see a student, I walk by on the campus and I pass a student. If they keep walking and talking, they're not my students. But if they turn their head down when they go by me, I know they're my students. I say don't do that. Just raise your hand and make a D symbol like this here. I say, that's our class sign. And I can tell you, to this day, I go to the movies, I go to the store, driving, I get that "hi" sign because students feel very free to talk to me, from five years past, fifth-year students. And it just creates an atmosphere that I'm concerned about them.

In addition, I feel students should not take so much time writing all the notes you have, so I prepare for all my students an outline, a syllabus, around 200 pages, including last year's exams, so they know there's no tricks. They know what kind of tests I give. They also can follow along with the key points and just write in the new interesting material that I give. So, I mean, the old days, you were a "reader." You would read your notes. I feel they should have that material for them and help them gain. I require homework. Not required, but if they do homework they get extra credit for it. And it's on material that were covered in that day's lectures. They read the material beforehand, they pass their homework in, and it helps make the lectures go easier.
I have stopped this, but I used to give for my Bio students--I teach now mostly non-Bio students--I would give them "magic" exams where they have a test for every lecture that they do at home before they come in, and they use a "magic" pen and the answers would be coded in there and they would test themselves. I didn't care what they got. As long as they did it, they would know where they were weak in. And they would see some of the same questions. I would ask them, "How did you do in the test? Did you get 100 percent?" And if they say, "Yes," okay, let's go over some of those questions. So, don't tell me. If your thing says seventy percent, tell me which ones you did get. And I would check a lot of people. These are just a number of things. There are probably many, many more, but I every day try to . . . For example, every single class I teach, every single class I pass out evaluation sheets. If I have 400 students, I pass out twenty-five evaluation sheets, get twenty back, I know every day what I have done wrong or right, and what they want to know or I should cover again in the next lecture.

And the fact that these might be little tricks and gimmicks, but it relates to the student that I really give a damn about them and I really give a damn about teaching. And this affects them. They study more for my classes than any other class. I know they do because I know they study because they do so well. And if I give the same test to my graduate
students, they don't do as well as my undergraduates do, who are non-Bio majors. So, these are things. I do this because I'm a researcher. A researcher tries to figure new ways to do things and, if I wasn't a researcher, I don't think I would do these kinds of things.

SM: That's absolutely fascinating because I love to teach. That's the thing I like most. And I have used... I like the idea of having them put a little report in at the end of a lecture because I have to wait until the end of the quarter when they fill out their evaluation sheets, and I've been kind of lucky. They [the Department] made a very systematic study of all our teachers in the History Department about five years ago, and it was... they got about $500 to help score it right and all this jazz and so on. And compress what was said, and I was very lucky. I came out second in the department. But I like the students and they know when you like them, and I get to know them in two weeks. But, you know, my memory isn't quite what it was so I have an idea. I'm going to get up and take a photograph of the class because they do sit in their seats and I do have the chart against them and I usually...

HL: You have smaller classes, though.

SM: Oh, yes, oh, yes. But you're doing incredibly well. So, I think this idea of them acknowledging you, because I know their faces, I know them, but if I should miss it, that's a
good idea. I like that. And I had an experience that should amuse you. A fellow came up to me at . . . in 1962 at the San Francisco Opera. I was Dean of San Francisco State and the fellow says I bet I don't know who you are. And that, you know, infuriates me. I never assume . . . You know, I say, "My name is Sam McCulloch," you know, always, "I'm Sam McCulloch." I never assume they know me. But this guy says, "I'll bet you don't know me." Well, you know, I said, "You're Walter Sekila. You took my course at Rutgers University in English Constitutional and Legal History in 1951-52. You got a B in the first semester and an A in the second semester." And he said, "Oh!" But he'd gone to law school and was practicing as an attorney in San Francisco. But he was a nice chap and I liked him, but I hate to be challenged that way. Now, if you think of any more of your schemes, I think that notion of their letting you know what you might have missed or if you . . . you know, at the end of each lecture.

SM: Yes, right, right.

HL: Well, it's non-threatening because the form, when they see it, it's something just . . . their message to me of what they want, what they need.

HL: Yes.

SM: Now, well, I'm now turning to your research which you say, and I agree with you, that you've got to do research in order to be a good teacher. There's no dichotomy between the two.
Your research has obviously been . . . had gone well for you. We all know about your work with the hydra and so on. Have you felt satisfied at Irvine that they've provided you with the right equipment and the right support and so forth?

HL: I just feel I ought to explain my research a little bit, without going into the details of it, because I study biology, I think, very differently than my colleagues do. Because the practice in biology is, and because I think it's an age of overspecialization—which is, I think, a real threat to biology—yet, it's our greatest period ever. It's a contradictory statement, but the paradox there is that most scientists will pick an organism . . . they have a subject they want to study, whether it be how the gene works or how the muscle contracts or whatever it may be, how an ecological niche is filled, and they pick organisms to help . . .

SM: What was that again? How an ecological . . .

HL: How an ecological niche is filled. I mean . . .

SM: Niche, oh, yes.

HL: Yes, a little . . . So, they will pick the organisms to help them solve their program, and they don't care what the organism is. Many people use hydra because it's good for developmental biology studies. My approach was that way at first because that's the way we're trained. But then I really realized that there's so much to learn about one animal that you can't study, say, the physiology without knowing the
You can't study genetics without knowing its behavior. I mean, you can't study the chemistry without knowing this and that. And so, my approach has been to study a single organism, whether it be hydra—and I use other animals at different times—and let the animal indicate to you the kind of problem that they can answer better. You have to understand the animal's language, which you learn through your analytical tools. So, I've been trying very hard to look at new kinds of problems that one normally wouldn't study because that animal used to be good for it, while other studies it's just not good for, and then integrate all these together. So, at various periods of my life, I would use... I would study completely different fields, from behavior to transmitters, to neurotoxins, to...  

SM: Is that T-O-X-I-N-S?  
HL: Toxins, yes. They have these little capsules, they inject these toxins. And how these toxins act, the chemistry of their... the capsules, the things that hold the cells together, some genetic mutants. When you work with the animal for twenty-five years, you can discover many things. But I don't focus on one subject, which is the way research is really done today. And, at the same time, I would go to my original field, which is Biochemistry, and I could see I could take something from what I've learned of the animal to apply it to some... in a practical field.
And I've even gotten involved in the field of biomedical work and have published extensively in that area, even though it's out of my line of research. People don't know that hat of mine, to the point where I even have a biotech company, which I helped start here. So, that's another whole hat which I do. So, my research . . . You see, this can only be done at a university which gives you tenure. And, as long as you're doing something constructive in research, I think that's what my colleagues care about. You know, they would rather see me do things along their lines to strengthen their programs.

For example, my current work with my wife on the history of the science, it's really considered some of the best now on eighteenth century biology. But it was . . . This came because of my interest of the animal which started this work and the people that started this work in the eighteenth century, so I've spent a good number of my years just studying the history of biology. And my next two symposiums in England this summer is in the history of eighteenth century biology, which is related to hydra and some not related to hydra. But this came as an off-shoot, I mean, but I still come back to my main theme now and then.

So, my approach is not the typical approach, but I think the university allows you to do this. But the question . . . Well, I think that's enough said, unless you have questions. About that.
See, I came here for this marine work and it just never has worked. Because, as you say, like Gil Bain... Gil Bain was a marine biologist, but what I'm talking about is a hybrid between the experimental biochemist-physiologist, and the marine biologist--one who is equally at home in the field of experimental biology and biochemistry, and equally at home with the naturalists. And those are rare people and those are the ones who are going to carry the next generation further. And I think Irvine is missing out by neglecting that area. But we tend to work for the future, for the grant, for where the funding is, and that vision, I think, is lacking here.

SM: That's kind of sad to hear, frankly. Now, going on to question seven, you have been going through... We all have been going through some interesting changes between 1980 and 1989 and it's hard to believe that we're spending over $400 million on construction, already started and going to start, and I notice your Bio Sci II is being built. Is that going to... Well, firstly, would you like to comment on the changes and, secondly, I'd like to know how Bio Sci II is going to change or what will it do to your Bio Sci program?

HL: Let me answer the easy question, which is the second one, first, because I can do that right away. I think it's going to help greatly because right now, for example, for the past nineteen years I've been in the North Campus with many fine faculty, and the other half of our department is in Steinhaus
Hall. Then there are many Biologists who are over in the Engineering Building, and, many of our colleagues are in the Medical Center . . . Medical School here in Biochemistry and Physiology. And what we have to have is us closer together. And I think this interaction will be much easier for seminars, for discussions, and what will really tie us together is the most exciting thing, I think, on this campus ever, is our new science library which will be bridging the scientists and the medical scientists together right there.

SM: It's right next door to you.

HL: Yes, it's right next door. That, to me, when we have that, I will finally feel we are the complete campus, and that is what I'm looking forward to the most, to that library. But as far as the main changes in UCI in 1980 and 1989, I don't have anything specific to say, just the fact that we've increased our faculty so much in those years with so many good, young faculty who have really brought us up to the modern periods of biology. And when I get a thrill is when I go to meetings or I'm involved in system-wide committees and I just see that UCI faculty are up there, and so I just feel it's brought in new ideas and new blood, and I think the leadership has been very good in recent years. So, I am pleased with it, even though I'm still concerned about their specialized approach to biological research. What I could say is that there are more and more people working in fewer and fewer areas of problems, and I think
Biology is too vast. But I think our merit system, which rewards for what you yourself do, our granting system is going to really hurt American biological science, and they just are not looking broad enough.

SM: Howard, would that be true also for the physical sciences, their projects and so on?

HL: As far as physical sciences, I don't know the areas of the future there. But I worry about overspecialization in that it is good, but we're developing narrow scientists. They don't have the breadth to make the cross changes. I know in Bio Sci the big advances occur is when the chemists and the physicists enter biology. After World War II, when many of the physicists who were disillusioned with the atomic bomb and who knew about radioisotopes, when they came into biology, biology made a gigantic step forward. When the biologists, the biochemists went into genetics and been able to, in extracts make DNA and RNA--these were all done by biochemists--genetics took its big leap. But you've got to have that outlook; and, if we develop people who are narrower and narrower, they lose that outlook, and I'm finding that very, very disturbing.

SM: Thank you. Thank you, Howard. And that's really very helpful to me. Now, let's turn to the Academic Senate and your work as the . . . you were elected Chairman and started your work this September, and you've been at it roughly six months. How are things going and what do you find are your major problems?
HL: I'd rather start out in telling what the major advantage of the Senate is, and, as you know, as being one of our more distinguished Chairs and who I think was the first to start the communication between the Senate and the faculty, which I am trying to continue in that the Senate... See, I became Chair of the Senate immediately after returning from Oxford University, which I loved because being a member of Jesus College, I would go to High Table and the Commons lunch and meeting faculty from all kinds of areas other than Bio Sci. And I really got to feel what a university is, where you're all one, which is what a university means.

And I immediately found that the only places that I could get this feeling in the UC system is in the Senate. And more, and being Chair, participating in many committees, I met some very exciting faculty. But I found that many of them, I didn't know what they were doing. So, we started something this year is where every committee has, at least in the fall and some are going right now, at least one breakfast or one lunch together where we talk about our research to each other, rather than Senate business.

And they are extremely successful and what we're trying to do now is to by various ways--including the University Forum and other ways we do it, which you are so much involved in--is to increase the collegiality of this, and we're looking for more and more ideas. And last year Spencer Olin started
the forums in the evening, which he's still continuing. I'm trying to continue with those which my predecessors started, so that to me is very exciting. What I find the ... And also the other thing about it is that I work with, as you know, one of the best staffs on the campus, who really run the university, I think. That staff is so knowledgeable and so committed and so hard-working.

So, one of the major problems we've had is that they are so committed and they work so hard, and with our school growing so fast, we have to relieve their workload. So, we are now going in the process where the whole Senate office is being computerized. This started last year when Rob Kling was Chair of the CAP, where now the whole CAP files are now on a data base, where the workload is cut down, I think, seventy-five percent for Marilyn Soley to get all those papers done and know who has done this and who has done what.

And now we are preparing a similar data base for the Committee of Committees, so we'll know every faculty member, where they serve, what they serve, every committee, who served in the past, what kind of work there is, and this will all be done by computer by just pressing with the mouse the name, and then it will be shown up on the screens. The whole committee can view it at one time, rather than go through all those books, which as you know was just such a horrible job to do.
And then this will be modified next year, so complete records of committee service will be available to CAP, just by asking the Committee of Committees what other people served and done. So, this will help us with the CAP process.

SM: Great.

HL: And, in the following year, we're going to try and do something with the overall records, so that they all cross-index so that we'll have them for the future. Because there's so much that depends upon precedent, what's done in the past, and we have to know all these things. But the major problem is trying to get the faculty more involved in Senate activities. And, as you know, only about fifteen percent even respond that are willing to serve, and I'd like to increase and trying to indicate as to their best . . . and this is very difficult. So, for that reason, I'm trying very hard to continue what you were doing in this communication and I've started this little newspaper. And now I ask them for responses and responses have come in quite regularly.

SM: They're coming in?

HL: Coming in very nicely.

SM: Good.

HL: And they are unanimous and everyone who's responded, of, say of sixty people want to have this new Graduate Task Force, which the Senate just approved. And so these are. I
find the job very exciting and I think this is the best thing that's every happened to me.

SM: Really?

HL: And I don't know if you know, but I entered as a write-in candidate. I think I was...

SM: I didn't know that.

HL: Yes, because I just felt, after having served as Chair of UCE, that I sort of knew what the Senate could do and I really wanted to try this. And I think I've made more friends than enemies. And there's so much more that I hope will be accomplished. is not history now, so I won't talk about it, but in the next year you'll see, I think, a lot of changes that will occur positively. And the changes that are occurring right now, like we're passing this new breadth requirements, the unanimity and the spirit, it's just very nice to see.

SM: Well, I'm very excited to hear that, Howard, and I certainly did not realize that you were a write-in candidate. I think your opportunity is really great because everything is moving forward, there are buildings being built and faculty coming in. I was at a time when, from 1978 to 1980, we were fighting very hard just to stay on an even keel. We were getting no money for construction, nothing at all. Brown said you can send them all to Riverside, he was not going to build another building. And it was really discouraging. Jarvis, you remember, Jarvis II.
HL: Yes.
SM: It really perturbed the Council. Saxon took numerous hours with us on it and it was finally beaten, but that... Well, I'm very excited to hear what you're doing, which leads me to my ninth question and I'm sure that I have other questions I might have asked you, and if you would like to think... pose them and then answer them, it'll certainly help me.

HL: These are so-called unrecorded important events. I think the most interesting thing that occurs are the personal interactions and how they can affect the lives of many people. I just want to tell you one funny story is that I met Howard Schneiderman in 1956 or so when I was in the service at Wood's Hole. We became very close friends and we did research together, we published together. And, when I accepted this job, I went to Israel before I even came here to work at the Weizmann Institute because of a commitment I had at the Weizmann Institute. And I got a letter saying that Grover Stevens was going to step down as chair of the department. And I said... I wrote back and said you ought to invite Howard Schneiderman and people said no, he won't take it.

I said I know he wants to leave Western Reserve, and I'm pretty sure you'll get him. And even Howard was unsure of the job, but his secretary said, "Look, you promised Lenhoff you'll go. Just go and be gentlemanly." But he liked the job and I think he was an amazing dean. He brought with
him. Peter Bryant, Susan Bryant, and a number of people who have really added to the campus. You just see... you fan out from these people and Howard to see their influences.

I felt that that one little thing influenced the campus in more ways than one, and I think constantly there are these little personal things where you influence a person in one way or another, or make a right choice in a faculty selection that just has great impact, that just cascades. And that was just one that I was extremely, extremely fond of.

And another, for example, I was at a meeting and I met Grover Stevens and I said, "I want you to meet this very bright young man who used to work in hydra and his name is Richard Campbell." Within two weeks, he offered him a job here and Dick Campbell gave the first lecture in the Biology School. But, again, just because I knew Grover and I was very close with Richard Campbell who I had met at a marine station, so impressed with his work, and Grover starting... So, all these little things have influenced the campus, because what they have done afterwards, it just spreads.

But another thing I think is rather interesting is happening now is, as you see, I'm a great believer in interdisciplinary programs, and I have always been concerned that we've never had too much going in the History and Philosophy of Science. And I've been working very closely with Karl [Hufbauer] and with Brian Skyrms now and we have a
grant that has brought in major speakers. We've got Stephen Gould coming. This April we had Gerald Holton coming, and there seems to be a growing interest in this, and I enjoy very much interacting with other units. I really . . . Before I came here, I was offered jobs in the Pharmacology Department, in the Anatomy Department, in the Biochemistry Department, and the Zoology Department, but I wanted to be at a university, not at a medical school. I really cared about the interactions, and that to me is the key feature a lot, and I think UCI does this.

And I remember talking to some people from San Diego and I just said, "Can we compare to your Chemistry Department?" and she said, "I'll be honest with you," she says, "I think that Irvine and San Diego's Chemistry Department are both pretty much the same level. They're both very, very good." And I just enjoy hearing from other campuses, who have nothing to gain by saying so, that Irvine really is up there. And I see this happening in many places, so it's an exciting time, especially as I said in my paper, the smell of sawdust and wet paint, things growing . . . This is . . . Actually, the reason why I came here is Dick Campbell said, "Howard," he said, "anything you want to do, you can do at Irvine because it is growing and they want new ideas." Which wasn't always true, but it works.
SM: Yes. Well, that is exciting, Howard, and I'm finding I'm sorry I'm Emeritus that I am teaching one course and doing this history of UCI. I have sensed this excitement, and when you think of all the building that's going on--and I particularly agree with you, being a library man myself and keen about the library--that they're going to build that new science medical library right next to you, you'll really have it made. You really will.

And I've enjoyed this interview and, if you have any other ideas that I might have missed or that you want to talk about some more, I think I'd like to have... We could have lunch sometime and I'd like to talk to Sylvia. I'm going to interview Sylvia. She doesn't know it, but I'm going to ask her, because I'm trying to stretch out a little and take some of the people on the staff, particularly in Relations with Schools. This was one of my big things. And the other big thing I liked, and I'm glad you like it, is interdisciplinary programs. Now, we had a hard time getting that off the ground because there never was--they'd say--not enough money. Now, when we got our interdisciplinary core course, you know, that we give, which I myself TA'd in about half a dozen years ago. It was very good. And if we could just do a lot of those and go to Social Sciences, go over to the Sciences, and go to the Fine Arts...
LENHOFF

HL: (inaudible) Okay? I (inaudible) remember, this will just take a short time. When I came here, I was appalled that the Bio Sci students didn't have an English requirement. So I said, "Howard, we've got to require English." He went and talked to Hazard Adams and that's how the core was started. That's how it was started because Bio Sci wanted it. And I think they did too much for them, but still it was a great idea and it started with that. I also saw that the Bio Sci students didn't know enough chemistry and I felt that they were discouraged from learning the most important chemistry course called Physical Chemistry. So, I just wrote in the catalog that if you take Physical Chemistry, you're excused from Advanced Biology courses, and it's still in the catalog. I mean, you could do these things and these had great impact on students. So, these simple things that we could do, in this somewhat undemocratic fashion, yet it did last and it is very helpful. So, I think back to those early years how we just got certain things done. We just did it.

SM: Yes, right.

HL: In fact, Howard Schneiderman says, "Lenhoff," he says, "I'll take care of foreign affairs," meaning the battles with the Medical School and the Physical Sciences, "you take care of internal affairs." And it worked out great. We were really a good team.

SM: Yes, I agree with you. I hope Howard will be back soon.
HL: He will.

SM: I keep seeing him every summer. I say, "It's time you came back, Howard." (inaudible) I think he's coming next year, I hope.

HL: I think so.

SM: That's great. Well, Howard, this has been a very exciting interview. And if you have any more thoughts, let's have lunch soon with you and Sylvia. And I'm going to put Sylvia on because I think that work of hers with this Relations with Schools is so fundamental.

HL: (inaudible)

SM: Oh, I can reverse it.

HL: No, no, this is fine. Are we just finishing up now? Is this the end of the tape now? Yes, this is just something about Sylvia. Beside Relations with Schools, Sylvia has done some amazing things for this campus, and one which is not being part . . . like the Women's Opportunity Center. That was Sylvia's idea with Lou Anderson's. Now, they have their own building and they just got a grant for quarter of a million dollars. From a desk in the hallway at Crawford Hall, it has influenced more women in this community.

SM: What did you call that?

HL: The Women's Opportunity Center. This is for women who have been divorced or they're older and they want to get back in the work force, how to get started. It's really a . . . It
was the first in the state, I think. The first debate team started in Sylvia's office. All these programs for the kids who, pre-high school, all these programs, Pegasus, and now a new one at John Hopkins, that was started in Sylvia's office. Her office has gotten involved with the Indian program, with the Indians at Sherman School, the Principal's Conference, the only one in the country, her office started it.

She really has brought so much creativity and has done things that... some of which should be done by academic units. The Women in Mathematics Program, she started that. Now, Women in Science, finally Bio Sci has took that over. So many things, she just had a feeling what the university-community link was needed, and started things that really... some have been actually fully incorporated. So, I think you'll find... if you probe her, you'll find some very interesting contributions.

SM: I will be very glad to... I'll wait for awhile until this is transcribed and I get it back. It takes a little time. But I think that really is exciting. And I'm interested that you mentioned Lou Anderson because I know she was interested in certain things and I worked with her in Extension and I certainly... I think that will be very interesting and I'll get... As I say, this will take a little time to be transcribed and corrected and so on. They're doing a good job at Cal State Fullerton, their Oral History Program. I mail
the tapes. They type them. Jack Peltason wanted it done that way. They're very ... They're the best in the whole state system, the State University system. And they type them. I get the typescript back, then I correct it, send it back to them for final typing, then I make one more xerox and send everything to the archives, because I have a sense of mortality these days.

END OF INTERVIEW