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April 23, 1974

McCULLOCH: Now, Jim, what attracted you about coming to Irvine?

McGAUGH: The strongest thing that attracted me was the invitation from Ed Steinhaus to come down here and build the Department of Psychobiology, which at that time was a completely new thing. Nobody had done anything like that at all. And Ed gave me the opportunity of building a new type of department in the midst of Biological Sciences, with very few strings attached. He said that since this had not been done before, he was going to take a five-year view toward it and see what happened at the end of five years. But there's no question that that was the overriding factor. Now, the interesting thing was that I was very well situated at Oregon and had no administrative interests at all, and that was not it. And I think I probably would have thought it through, though I probably would have been slightly more attracted just to come down here to such a department rather than to have to be its first Chairman, just the idea of doing that interdisciplinary thing.

The other big factor was that I am, after all, a Californian, and I grew up in the California system and went to a State College, and then I did my graduate study at Berkeley. And anyone who has ever been to Berkeley gets a pretty keen impression of what a great university can be, and I think there are a lot of universities that are pretty good that we could list that are in a class really with Berkeley as an institution. So the idea of building essentially a new Berkeley from scratch with what we thought then were all of the enormous resources of the University of California--the state of California--had to be a very attractive thing. These are the two major factors that were important.
McCULLOCH: The question I'd like to ask you in connection with this, Jim, is, did you have any say in the notion of having Psychobiology as a separate area?

McGAUGH: No. Well, at least not initially. When I first heard about the department here—about the University here, as a matter of fact—Psychobiology was listed in one of the very early small brochures. It didn't indicate on the brochure exactly where it was located, but it was the first time I had seen that name for a part of the University on anything. The term psychobiology is an old one—it's been around a long time—but no one really had ever developed a department of it. When Ed Steinhaus invited me down here, he was looking for someone to head up Psychobiology as a unit. Now, at that time, the plan was that it was to be just a division within, well, within the Division of Biological Sciences. It was to be a subunit, but it wasn't to be really a full department. It was going to be one School of Biological Sciences with these four areas, and Ed referred to it as the area of Psychobiology. I would just say parenthetically, later on after I arrived, that got changed to Department, simply because the Accounting and the Business and the Storehouse and so on didn't understand what an area was, and they couldn't give us account numbers. So, in a sense, it was almost a bureaucratic decision to make it a department. It wouldn't have made any difference, as far as our plans were concerned—it was to be a focus. At the graduate level, for example, we don't give a Ph.D. in Psychobiology, we give it in Biological Sciences—that's all it says. But everybody knows the area of concentration is Psychobiology, all right.

Now, after I was hired, but before I moved here, there was some serious rethinking about this. I know the School of Social Sciences was looking at some people who were essentially setting, as a condition for their coming, the moving Psychobiology back, as they put it, into the School of Social
Sciences in the Department of Psychology. And so I had to meet with one of these people. As a matter of fact, we had a long meeting at Palo Alto at Picketty, I remember, with one of the people who was involved in this, to see whether I was amenable to such a move. And then Hinderaker asked me to do this, so then I had to write a report to Ivan after I had the meeting, summarizing the meeting that we had and outlining my own assessment of this situation.

I wrote back and pointed out that there are lots of views about where something like this might be established, but my view was that Ed Steinhaus had made the right decision, and that there was a misunderstanding about what psychobiology was—-from some people's point of view it was simply physiological psychology by another name which belonged, I suppose, in psychology. But that wasn't what I had in mind at all; my idea was to develop a full spectrum of behavior in a biological context, including neuroanatomy, neurochemistry, neurophysiology, neuropharmacology, and so on and so on, with perhaps even a minimum number of people in the department who would have psychology as their union card. Well, that's quite different from the notion of psychobiology as being sort of biological psychology, you see, and Ed Steinhaus was right.

So I wrote my report to Hinderaker, and (of course) I was in no position to decide what was going to happen, but I did make my recommendation, and, according to Ed Steinhaus—he told me—the decision was made subsequently in a meeting that psychobiology was going to remain as a division within—-at that time—Division of Biological Sciences. So that's the only role that I had in it, I guess.

McCulloch: A very wise decision and very interesting. Now, I ask you secondly, Jim, could you give me some detailed impressions of the first conferences we had in the late summer and early fall of '64 from which that
Irvine plan emerged and that purple-covered brochure came out?

McGAUGH: Well, yes, my overall impression is that I never had so much fun nor was I ever so exhausted in my life as I was from those meetings. I don't think that many of us at the time recognized the enormous influence that we were having on this campus. It was just sort of another planning conference to do some things, but we set in motion the entire machinery--academic machinery of this campus--within a period of a few weeks. It was tremendously exciting, because everyone was represented—I mean everyone was there, so every part of the campus was represented. It was a free-for-all, a party; that is, it was a grand thing. But I can remember that some of those nights I was going to bed at eight o'clock, I was just so tired after eight hours of hammering away. I don't think that I ever felt frustrated by it; there was no point at which it wasn't even fun. Really, if I compare it with all the other meetings that I've been to on this campus, it had to be the most fun, because every time we made a little progress, a decision was made and we moved on. Part of this, I think, was the way that Jack Peltason ran it, because he kept his sense of humor, he made it clear that we were not solving the world's problems—we were just trying to set up the plans for the academic side of this institution. And Jack has a very low-key, pleasant style, which made it fun to participate.

I think the most interesting decision that we made in that meeting was the 6-3-3 academic plan, and I remember how very carefully one had to tread in discussing this because it was clear we were not only talking about academic planning but we were talking about the allocation of resources, also. Suppose we made a certain history course required for all of the students—that's going to generate a huge number of faculty for the History Department; if we didn't, that's setting the course of the History Department in another way; the same for the Biological Sciences, and so on.
And I think the 6-3-3 solved the breadth problem in two ways; one is, it was a formal agreement that we didn't have the wisdom to know what breadth was.

McCULLOCH: General education.

McGAUGH: Yes, we didn't know what general education was—we were not in a position to define that; we were simply in a position to say, "We think that students ought to sample some breadth on the campus," number one; and, number two, by the particular form of the 6-3-3, we didn't make it a decision to develop one unit of the campus at the expense of another; it was really a very balanced thing the way it worked out, with the student taking his major and then six courses in another area and three in each of two others. It also solved the problem of the sciences, for example; it wouldn't take a mathematician to discover that a student would have to have some science in that.

McCULLOCH: Yes, we purposely made that that way. I remember feeling strongly that they must have a science.

McGAUGH: But my impression was that it was an awful lot of work, but it was great fun, and we entered into it very enthusiastically. I would assume most people said just about what I said.

McCULLOCH: Exactly, exactly, and interesting, Jim, because Florence Arnold was supposed to be taking minutes and, for some reason, didn't, so we just have no record except for the actual plan that came out.

McGAUGH: Oh, is that right?

McCULLOCH: Yes, so I'm asking people, and some remember little tidbits; for example, the positions—you had a wide spectrum of positions from Jim March way over on the left, through the moderates—and I think you and I were sort of moderates—to, say, Bernie Gelbaum and Julian Feldman, who were on the right. And we always had to sort of come to a balance.

McGAUGH: You know, I felt that none of these views was crystallized,
although it is the case Jim March was on the left. He's a very political
man, and he would move around and shift his position, depending upon how
things were going. And I remember, when we finally put the 6-3-3 in, there
was no opposition to it that I knew of at the moment. I mean when it went
in it was almost like naming your presidential candidate at the convention,
you know, with tremendous enthusiasm for this. And I remember I had played
some role in; I don't know, maybe the last proposal of that or something. One
of those things had been my suggestion.

McCULLOCH: Really.

McGAUGH: And it was enormous fun to see this in action.

McCULLOCH: Very good. Next, Jim, when you were making your appoint-
ments in Psychobiology, did you find the Universitywide regulations reason-
able, helpful, or obstructive?

McGAUGH: Yes, they were all those. I was a very young, inexperienced
person when I came in. I was seven years out of my degree and had had no
administrative experience of any kind. So I came into the University of
California to build the department.

Now, first, the helpful side; the helpful side is the way that we have
to go about making appointments. You have to talk with people, and you have
to come back and check with the Dean; when I finally made a decision, I
could only tell the person it was a recommendation to the Chancellor and had
to go to the Budget Committee and so on. It really made me proceed with
enormous care. There can be no cronyism; there would have been no possi-
bility for me, had I wanted to, to bring in some of my buddies to get a
department going, the way you can in some institutions. It just meant that
I had carefully to justify each position.

Now, I think that the added guidance that I had was from Ed Steinhaus.
He was watching my appointments very, very, very carefully (there was no
question about that), and he counseled me on them. He was not making them for me, but he was doing no recruiting of any kind. But when I would come up with a candidate, I'd have long talks with him about the role that this person might play, and he'd interrogate me with sort of a little humor in his voice. He was always a very calm, kind person, and he would always chide me a bit and make sure that I was doing my thinking, and that kept me from making appointments out of my hip pocket.

All right. Now, on the obstructive side, these appointments, after all, take a long time, and it's very hard to capitalize on the moment. Suppose you really have somebody who is prepared to move, they're fed up, they had a fight with the Chairman, and you'd say, "Well, come on, we've got a good place out there." You can't sign them up like that. They have, at the very least, two months to think it over, and ye lose impulse buyers. Now, maybe that's good, but it's kind of obstructive. I know that, particularly, when I was Dean, I found that there were several times when, if I had had the position wholly in my pocket, I could have really made a couple of superb appointments. But the people thought about it later, and they got cold feet, and then they saw the University as being slow-moving and bureaucratic, and they sort of backed down a little bit. But overall, I very strongly support our hiring bureaucracy on the balance—I wouldn't change it in any way, even though as an administrator I found it really a pain sometimes.

McCulloch: You'll be interested, Jim, that almost everyone has answered the way you have, and in Biological Sciences, particularly, they would refer to Ed Steinhaus's assistance.

McGaughey: Yes.

McCulloch: Working with a guy who thoroughly knew this system.

McGaughey: That's right.

McCulloch: Who had been in the system for so long and knew every nuance of it.
McGAUGH: Yes. Well, he helped us write our letters of recommendation for appointments, for example, and I think--I can't document this, but I think that he returned my first two or three to me with suggestions that didn't let them go forward. Now, they were perfectly satisfactory, but they didn't have all of the things that he felt would make it okay, so he essentially taught us how to write these, and my impression is that it's been extremely helpful to the School of Biological Sciences to have that kind of tutelage. We have done reasonably well in our relations with the Chancellor and the Budget Committee on these matters. Ed's importance in this whole thing cannot be overestimated.

McCULLOCH: That's exactly what the others have said, Jim. I'm very interested, of course, and pleased that you say so, because he was my best friend.

McGAUGH: Yes, he was just enormously important.

McCULLOCH: The next question maybe needn't be answered. The question is, how possibly should some of these appointment regulations be changed?

McGAUGH: I wouldn't change them, frankly. Maybe it's because I've been here ten years and have learned to live with them, but, while as Dean, I said frequently that I wish I could have one appointment a year out of my vest pocket. You know, at that time we were having, let's say, three to four appointments a year becoming available to us, and I was saying half-jokingly that it would be fun to have one of those where I could just go out and say, "Charlie, how'd you like to come to Irvine?" And I think that I could have used it effectively. I have no evidence that I would have, and I'm also worried about the other guy.

Well, I would have used it effectively; everybody else would have used it poorly, you see! So I wouldn't change it, I wouldn't change it at all.

McCULLOCH: Now, next, Jim, how well do you think we set up our UCI
Academic Senate? Were you on that Drafting Committee or not?

McGAUGH: No.

McCULLOCH: I'm wrong, then.

McGAUGH: No, I was not on the Drafting Committee. I guess the question is, compared to what? I don't really know how our Senate differs from the other Senates. I know that we have some elected officers, where others are appointed and so on.

McCULLOCH: Just the differences. For example, more elections than the others.

McGAUGH: Yes, that's okay. I don't have any serious objection--I've served on the Committee on Committees that sets up the slate and so on, but I rather like it because it gives some committee the job of setting up people who can be voted on. But anyone can get (what is it?) twenty signatures or something and put up somebody else, and, gee, I've put up somebody, whatever it is. I've done it several times.

McCULLOCH: Less. Must less. Four or five.

McGAUGH: I've done it several times, and in every case, I think, except one, the person that I put up actually was elected to the office that I proposed him for.

McCULLOCH: I believe it's five signatures.

McGAUGH: I don't see that there's any problem. Now, the voting does tend to frighten us from time to time where you get people with slates, and we have some subgroups on the campus that are voting a slate, but, if it wasn't that, the subgroup would be working with the Committee on Committees to get them to appoint certain people. I'd say it's fairly open. It's a problem that we have with our Academic Senate, and I'm sure it's a problem everywhere. Behind the scenes, it works very well; publicly, it only works well when we have a crisis, because when we don't have a crisis,
nobody goes to the meetings and we have trouble getting a quorum. I don't think that there can be anything done to change the Bylaws of our Senate which is going to change that problem. And also I've never heard of anyone criticizing the way we've set up the Academic Senate--it's not a topic of discussion.

McCULLOCH: That's right. Exactly. Well, the sixth question possibly is unnecessary, then--are there any Bylaws you feel we should change in our UCI Senate?

McGAUGH: Well, you know, if I had it here and I read it all, I might come up with a suggestion or two, but I certainly don't come here prepared to say, "Yes, you know everything is going to be all right with this campus if only we could change Bylaw 32."

McCULLOCH: Yes.

McGAUGH: Probably the people who set it up or the people who served as officers of the Senate are in a better position--you see, I've never served as an officer of the Senate, so I've never had to deal with those Bylaws.

McCULLOCH: Well, it's interesting. They are for the most part, Jim, satisfactory and acceptable. For instance, when I interviewed Abe Melden, who was on the committee--

McGAUGH: Yes, he'd know more--

McCULLOCH: And, too, he was our first Chairman--he felt that we'd done pretty well.

McGAUGH: Yes. Well, Abe would be someone who would be in a much better position to judge.

McCULLOCH: Well, he judged it to be very successful. Now, the next question refers to your chairmanship of Psychobiology and really also to your deanship, though--I am tending to ask these questions in terms of the very beginning. In what areas do you think you have had the greatest
successes here? I really would like to confine this to your chairmanship of Psychobiology.

McGAUGH: All right. In the chairmanship of Psychobiology, I think the greatest success is in the recruiting. We—and I mean every time I recruited somebody, the department then also came under the management of the new recruitee. We have recruited a truly outstanding group of people, there is no question about it. The faculty which constitute the Department of Psychobiology have to be one of the very top faculties of any institution in the country, and I don't care what the list is—we're in the top ten. And my own faculty get very angry if somebody places them less than one or two.

McCULLOCH: For your information, Jim, I'm sure you'll be pleased to hear this, that wherever I go Psychobiology is the number one department, they feel. And they feel that, of the four departments that were put together, yours is the best. That's the outsiders' assessment.

McGAUGH: Well, we don't say that simply because we're chauvinists (as a matter of fact, we happen to be—we get that way, you know. We beat our drum over there so much that we're caught up with our own spirit.) But the recruiting really went well, you know, and these are matters of accident as well as judgment. It just isn't a matter of somebody having good intent and then, as a consequence, everything flowing from that, because you can have good intent and bad luck.

McCULLOCH: I wouldn't say accident, I'd say chance or luck, because you've got to have a bit of luck. Luck went your way. For example, in one of the departments I had bad luck that dogged us for quite a while. We just missed on an appointment, just missed—we had everything sewed up, and the guy went somewhere else.

McGAUGH: Well, you know, I think we missed and did well. There are several people we invited who did go elsewhere, and I think that we came out better as a consequence.
McCULLOCH: That's luck.

McGAUGH: Now, there are two faculty members at **extremely** distinguished institutions in this country who decided to go there rather than to come here at that time, and we ended up by making better appointments as a consequence, taking lesser-known people who have turned out now to be better than those people were, and I did you net! For example, we were going after one person and thought we had him pretty close, and that person turned us down. And so we looked around and then we hired Gary Lynch, using that slot, and Gary Lynch has lived to see the day when he had a drink with this person over at a meeting recently--one of our national meetings--and this guy was moaning into his bourbon that he has made only one major mistake in his life and that was when he turned down Irvine, and Gary said, "Thank you for your mistake!" So, you know, it was--you're right--luck or accident, whatever you want to call it.

We recruited very carefully, and Ed Steinhaus made sure that we did. We chose superb people, and then some people turned us down, which was also good luck for us. Maybe some of those people would have even made us more distinguished than we hope we are now.

You know that, since 1964, when we first started, we lost only one faculty member that we recruited, and that's Dick Thompson, and Dick Thompson was recruited to Harvard. Now, we kept him from going to Harvard for three years, but he finally decided to go. He was there one year and he decided to come back.

McCULLOCH: Is he coming back? How marvelous!

McGAUGH: Yes. Dick Thompson will be back in September.

McCULLOCH: In September? Isn't that something!

McGAUGH: That's right. Now, the only other person we lost we did not recruit, and that was Robert Russell. Roger Russell came here as the Vice
Chancellor, and then after he came, or later in the proceedings, it was decided that his home would be in our department, but that was not our recruiting effort, so I exclude that from this generalization. So that means we still have every member that we hired.

Now, the other thing in connection with this is, the recruiting was not just good researchers, but we think that they are good teachers, and certainly we've developed an outstanding graduate program. And I would say that, if you had to list the things that are good about our department, I would place our graduate program as sort of at the top of the list of the things that we think we've accomplished—not just the research, but I mean the fact that the research is done in this really organized setting. It was, for example, the first department that ever received an interdisciplinary training grant from NIMH; their criteria are, you must have several departments collaborating. They felt our single department was good enough to get an interdisciplinary training grant.

**McCULLOCH:** That's nice!

**McGAUGH:** Those are what I think are our greatest successes.

**McCULLOCH:** I'm glad to hear that. Well, in what areas do you think you had the least successes and why?

**McGAUGH:** Oh, I had one other success and that was getting Howard Schneiderman to come here, when I was Dean, to become Chairman and ultimately replace me, and I regard that as one of the best contributions I ever made to Irvine.

**McCULLOCH:** A mighty good appointment.

**McGAUGH:** The least successes? Well, I think they have to do with the period when I was Dean. I don't think that we were, or are yet, successful in incorporating the Medical School on this campus. I don't think we've figured out the formula yet. There's still bickering between the School of
There's an unclear understanding between the two schools about the nature of graduate education. There has been a change of Deans in both schools, and maybe eventually things will get sorted out, but I see that as a lingering and very serious problem. Now, it's not so serious for Biological Sciences, because we can go on doing what we're doing. But it's very serious for the Medical School because they have really to come to understand how they're going to relate to this campus.

Now, one Dean that we had, Bostick, would have been very happy, I think, if they had put a 40-foot moat around that Medical School, because that was his view of the relation to the campus—a big moat, and it was just acreage out here—it was an accident that they happened to be here rather than some place else. The new Dean, van den Noort, has a somewhat different view. He feels that the relations with the campus are much more important, but I don't think that anyone has figured out exactly how the relations are to take place. It's a lingering disappointment, particularly when the Medical School has an awful lot of building to do.

It didn't have the class that the rest of the campus had when it came, in my view. It was a not-very-well-functioning Medical School in downtown LA when it came out here, and the recruiting basis had been different, the history was different, and so on. It was a forced marriage. It also resulted in the loss of my strongest colleague outside of my own department, John Holland. He and I were extremely close, and Holland left primarily because of the Medical School coming. So it was an early sign that things were not well.

But I don't think they've done much better over the seven-year period of time. The problems are largely dormant, but they're still there. There've been no fundamental solutions to any of the major problems of
integrating the Medical School with the campus. I think what we haven't decided as a campus is whether to have a Medical School on the campus--sufficient to have it occupy the territory--as opposed to having it become intellectually involved, as the rest of us are all involved, in the management of the entire campus as a whole. That's my view of our greatest failure, in which I've had the least success, because, after all, I tried very hard to do things to make the Medical School integrated with the campus, and I'm afraid I didn't succeed very well.

McCULLOCH: Well, Jim, thank you. What problems do you think are unique to Irvine because it's new or because it's a particular campus? Could you identify some of those?

McGAUGH: Well, there are some that are unique to a new campus. It's a very serious problem the University hadn't faced before and that is building all at one time the laboratory and the library resources, things of this kind. This, after all, is an enormously expensive undertaking.

Let's take Biological Sciences. Many schools just grow their laboratories' facilities by accretion—they just add on this onto this. We had to have, in a one- or two-year period of time, not only laboratories for everybody, but we had to have the media kitchen for the making of all the micro-biological stuff. We had to have shops. We had to have animal care-taking facilities. We had to have very expensive pieces of equipment—centrifuges, scintillation counters, and things of that kind.

McCULLOCH: How do you spell scintillation?

McGAUGH: S-c-i-n-t-i-l-l-a-t-i-o-n. Things of that kind. They just had to be right there. You can't do science without having those things—electron microscopes and so on. Well, that really stretched the resources of everybody to build from scratch. If you're established and you only have to add on something, then you can do it, but to have this all at once—that
turned out to be a very difficult thing to do. And we really went to every resource we could—NSF and the state and our own grants and everything.

But since you're in humanities, I just want to stress this for a moment. It may not be apparent to the campus the stress that we underwent in trying really to become fully equipped over there.

McCULLOCH: The reason I know is because I was a very good friend of Ed Steinhaus, and I used to talk with him a lot. At one point he didn't get the number of pipettes—you have to have X number, and they couldn't even supply these at one point.

McGAUGH: Yes, yes.

McCULLOCH: He was worrying about little things like that.

McGAUGH: Yes, yes. Well, you can imagine what it is. We hoped that we'd be able to have a minimum of $20,000 per faculty member to set them up in research laboratories. At that time, that was peanuts. I would imagine it cost $100,000 to set up Holland. Now, if he gets $100,000, that means there are three people that are going to get nothing—or four people that are going to get nothing, if the average if $20,000—if you see what I mean.

McCULLOCH: I see what you mean.

McGAUGH: We were under stress all the time, and I don't think there was appreciation of this. I'll tell you one thing that angered me continuously, and that is that the sciences here—the physical aspects—were set up with the advice of (what's his name, who came from Riverside?)—

McCULLOCH: Conway Pierce.

McGAUGH: Conway Pierce. And we felt that, for the first five years around here, we ate off the trough of the physicists, because they got everything. They had much more space than we had in Steinhaus Hall, even though that was to become a biological science building. When it was built, it was built as a physical science building, even though it was known it was
to become biological sciences. The day we opened, we realized—and we had
to make the Chancellor realize this (he came over and had to tour the labs)—
that we had to remodel the laboratories immediately, so there had to be a
huge grant—I mean money obtained from Berkeley—to remodel the teaching
laboratories in Biological Sciences, because they had one sink in them, for
example. There was one sink in every teaching lab in biology, and his view
of a biology lab was that you could build it just like a physics lab or
maybe it spreads—

McCULLOCH: Chemistry—he was a chemist.

McGAUGH: Well, he was a chemist, but he really built it much more with
physics in mind. But even the wet labs were built as chem labs, however,
not as biology labs, and we still have some of those old doors over there,
badly designed. So we were really handicapped. We didn't have the right
kind of physical facilities. They were designed by a—he was a physical
chemist, though—

McCULLOCH: Yes.

McGAUGH: Designed by a physical chemist for biological sciences. And
then Physics pulls out—Physical Sciences—and gets that huge, big palace
over there, and we’re left with this dog of a building. And really it’s a
supreme insult that we named it Steinhaus Hall. If Ed was looking down on
us, he’d be laughing.

McCULLOCH: He is looking down on us.

McGAUGH: And he is laughing at what irony it is that that building
that he grew to hate is named after him.

McCULLOCH: And what are your chances—this is off the record—

McGAUGH: I know.

McCULLOCH: This is off the record, but this is an additional question.
What are your chances of getting the next biological science building, which
is so beautifully planned?
McGAUGH: Well, I don't know when we're going to get that. The problem is that the University has taken the stand, that we can all appreciate, that they won't build any more buildings in biological sciences on any campus, other than Riverside, until Riverside fills up its undergraduate students in biological sciences. But we know that students don't go that route; they don't say, "Where has biology some empty slots? I'll go to that campus." They choose a campus of the University; if they don't like that, they go to Stanford or go some place else. And so we are stuck with the fact that Riverside was just successful in getting its new biology resources, and they are not filled, and we are just expanded all out of proportion. We've practically taken over the Engineering Building to get teaching--

McCULLOCH: So Riverside has unfilled spots, does it?

McGAUGH: Oh, yes. Lots of space over there. And we don't have the research space for the faculty; we don't have teaching space; we don't have office space.

If you'd ask me what one of my biggest annoyances is, it's that Biological Sciences was not given full appreciation in the early days, and the Physical Sciences was really given much better facilities than we were, much better support.

McCULLOCH: It's an irony, because Ed was the Dean, and we didn't get a Dean of Physical Sciences for about a year and a half.

McGAUGH: Oh, he had to bend over backwards to keep from becoming territorial at that time, but remember Ed didn't have a say in the design of the building--that was Conway Pierce's design, and Ed was enormously frustrated over these things.

McCULLOCH: I hadn't realized to what extent that was true. Next question, Jim, what would you do differently, if you had to do it all over again? Here you are, ten years down the pike.
McGAUGH: Well, I don't know. It's so hard to say. I imagine what I would have done would be to work harder to recruit a Dean so I wouldn't have been Dean. You know, Jack Peltason asked me to be Acting Dean when Ed took his sabbatical. Ed resigned while I was Acting Dean, and then it became almost a fait accompli that I would become the next Dean. That was probably the wrong stage of my career to be doing something like that, so I probably would have worked harder to recruit a Dean to relieve me without having that responsibility. It drained a lot out of me at a time when I should have been doing research and teaching and things of that kind.

McCULLOCH: For example, take the Medical School—is there anything that could have been done there differently that would have overcome this moat you mentioned that was built round the Medical School?

McGAUGH: I think I probably would have been more arrogant than I was and demanded and pleaded and worked with our administration to take certain steps. I don't think I was tough enough. I was regarded as a bastard in some quarters because I was tough enough to try to push through certain things. I don't think I pushed through things that were strong enough; I just didn't demand enough. But, you know, you get worn out after a while, demanding and pleading, and I just don't think I was tough enough.

Now, part of my problem was that my boss was Roger Russell, who was in my department and also in my field, very closely related to the work I do, and it was very hard to be tough with Roger, you know. Roger and I were on very friendly terms, and it was very difficult to keep the administrative and the friendship separated. I just feel I wasn't tough enough in trying to bring about the thing that needed to be done at that time.

Could I go back to something up here?

McCULLOCH: Yes.

McGAUGH: What else is unique to Irvine? I think there are problems
that come from being organized as schools that we haven't dealt with, and I don't know what the solution is, but I feel that the undergraduate student who is not committed to a course of study is not given enough attention on this campus. We don't have enough opportunity for the student who says, "I just want to go to the University for a couple of years, then I'll find out what I'm interested in." We force them into choosing a school. Now, on the whole I'm happy with our school organization, and I wouldn't change that, so I'm not saying that that's a disaster--I think that's a good thing. But we dropped the other problem or we quit paying attention to the other problem; we need to reattend to it at some time. What do we do really to pay attention to the breadth of undergraduate education at a major University? We're a little bit too professional in our orientation.

McCULLOCH: Well, I think that really leads into the next question I have here concerning the liberal arts.

McGAUGH: Oh, I didn't--I'm sorry. Yes.

McCULLOCH: Yes, that leads into that question, do you like liberal arts and sciences organized into schools, or would you prefer a College of Arts, Letters, and Sciences? Because what you're saying is that, since we organized as schools, we tend to become a little professional.

McGAUGH: Yes.

McCULLOCH: And of course the question is, would a College of Arts, Letters, and Sciences stop professionalization? It's a hard question to answer.

McGAUGH: It's hard to answer. I certainly wouldn't destroy the school organization. It has enabled Biological Sciences here to be a very effective organization. It really is--it's a good school.

McCULLOCH: Well, I think you would always have remained as a division underneath a college.
McGAUGH: No, I wouldn't want that. I want the Dean of Biological Sciences at the same level as the Dean of the Medical School and the Dean of Engineering and so on. That's why we did it. I don't want the Dean of the College of Arts, Letters, and Sciences to go into a meeting with the Vice Chancellor, and the other people are there--the Dean of Engineering, the Dean of Administration, the Dean of the Medical School--and you know they're all speaking for a relatively small clientele, and then this huge thing has one Dean speaking for it. And that's one reason that I fought so hard to develop the schools, because we could see that coming. All right. Now--

McCULLOCH: Well, I'm with you. I still think the schools are the answer, because as we get bigger I think it's a viable kind of organization.

McGAUGH: Sure. And there's another way to do it, though. You see, at the undergraduate level in Biological Sciences, we have just one major. All right. And they say, "They've got four departments--how do they cooperate? Isn't there too much professionalism?" And the answer is, "No, because these courses are run by the school, and the Dean rakes off money from every department budget to support these courses." So that, when I was Dean, I used to tax the departments--I didn't bother taxing them, I just took it out of their budgets ahead of time to have undergraduate courses in Biological Sciences. And I would figure out the contribution of each department to that, and I would just withdraw those funds from each budget, and, through the force of money, would make sure that there was an organization.

The Associate Dean of the school was responsible for the running of those undergraduate courses. There was no discussion of it; there was no quarreling about it of any kind. The four departments did cooperate. The funds were there to cooperate, you see. The one way that this could be done would be to have a Dean of Undergraduate Studies, for example, who would have a portion of the budget of each of the schools set aside. All right.
McCULLOCH: Of course, budget means power.

McGAUGH: Budget means power, I don't care what you say. Personality means power, too, but it's a different kind. You could find a person who could be Dean of Undergraduate Studies who could do it without the budget, but then when he was replaced you'd be back to the ground zero again.

McCULLOCH: Individual skill is a different matter.

McGAUGH: That's right. Okay. Now, there's another way to do it. Well, let's say in the School of Biological Sciences we've had lots of Associate Deans, but our undergraduate program has never faltered, because we've had it right at the budget level. Nobody can decide, for example, that he's going to take those funds and put them on graduate education instead, because he doesn't have those funds. Those funds belong to the office of the Dean, and they're earmarked for undergraduate studies.

The same thing could be done on the campus, I think: that every school has got a budget for undergraduate studies, and this undergraduate studies ________ is going to let that budget out to the schools, then, as they use it appropriately. All right. And if they begin to veer too far from that, then they could have some discussions, and I think it could be worked out. But I very strongly feel that continuity of integrated activity at the undergraduate level would require a budget to go with it, and that problem hasn't been solved.

McCULLOCH: Thank you for that information. That's very good. Well, the last question, Jim, are there any experiences in the early years that we've missed or that you'd like to comment on or have anything elaborated?

McGAUGH: Well, I'd like to add a little bit more--more personally--what I think some people have contributed.

McCULLOCH: I'd like to hear that.

McGAUGH: I'll just keep it in Biological Sciences, in my discussion of
Ed Steinhaus here, by saying that I think that he was singly one of the most important influences that this campus ever had. He had an interesting, unique style, which had a profound influence on our thinking and our planning, and, while he is not directly responsible for things as they exist right now, he certainly must bear a lot of the responsibility for setting things in motion. Particularly, some of the good things that have happened, I think, are really due to his light touch, how things have developed. I know that I personally appreciated the way that he would give me strong direction and then sort of back off, you know, almost like teaching a kid how to drive—you've got to let 'em steer. He really did well. He also caused us to focus, in our recruiting, on looking for the very young people who might be hotshots in the future. He kept reminding us of that, and I think that has paid off in the case of the department.

The other is that I had a lot of trouble relating to Ralph Gerard, and a lot of us had trouble relating to Ralph Gerard, and he and I had lots of discussions about this. He would have liked to have an influence in the development of my department, and he didn't. I just wouldn't allow that to happen. On the other hand, I did appreciate the counsel that I got from him. It was often abrasive, and he was hard on me lots of times, but he had a point of view that you could not afford to ignore. And I think that, as we continue to develop, we're going to appreciate more and more the influences that Ralph Gerard had, also, because he could be so personally abusive and abrasive when he wanted to, that that often was our dominant reaction, but there was a lot of wisdom there. Ralph Gerard was a very, very smart guy, there's no question about it. And I think we're going to come to appreciate more and more some of his thinking as it had an impact on the campus.

I have one other observation, and I don't want this to sound arrogant,
so take it in the context of my having been invited to comment. I have a
disappointment that I want to express, and that is that there aren't as many
units on this campus that are as good as they ought to be, and I don't
understand that. I think we're a pretty good campus, mind you—I'm not say-
ing that we are a bad campus, but I just think there are some units on the
campus that have not succeeded. I won't say they've failed, but they've not
succeeded. And they appear to have been given the same franchise that the
other units were given. I don't know whether it's a matter of leadership or
a matter of timing or a matter of personality or what.

McCULLOCH: It's a combination of all of them.

McGAUGH: But it's very disappointing to me to have a campus which has
such variegation in its quality. That's a sad note, but, on a happy note,
maybe given the fact that we really are a product of Ronald Reagan, we're
lucky to have anything that's any good. And I think, on the balance, that
it's a pretty exciting campus.

McCULLOCH: I think that what speaks well for it is, number one, what
you said, Jim, that practically your entire group are with you. And the
fact that Thompson is coming back from Harvard speaks for itself. And, sec-
dond, the fact that generally on this campus there have been fewer people to
leave than I thought would happen when the Reagan crunch was on.

McGAUGH: Yes.

McCULLOCH: So I think that's a positive side to stress.

McGAUGH: We've lost a lot of good people, though, particularly in
Social Sciences, you know. It's just not--

McCULLOCH: Well, that was an area that had the most troubles, and I
think their shifting personnel reflects this trouble.

Well, thank you, Jim.

McGAUGH: Okay.

McCULLOCH: I really appreciated this very much. Thank you.