SM: This is an interview this morning with Chancellor Jack Peltason in HOB-360, Wednesday, August 9, 1989. And our first question, Jack, just tell us in your own words the differences you saw when you came back in 1984 from what you'd left in 1967.

JP: Well, the strange was the similarities. It was just the child grown up. And I always have said that I thought one of the amazing things about UCI is how it was so carefully planned in the early sixties, in academic terms and in terms of its physical plant. And then when you come back, we went and did what we said we were going to do. So, I didn't find it particularly changed, except it was the further implementation of what we'd said.

SM: Yes.

JP: Programs were essentially the same. There were just relatively few additions. Social Ecology was the only one.

SM: That's a very nice answer. Thank you, Jack. Now, what curriculum changes would you like to see as we move to the twenty-first century?

JP: I don't have anything specific. We need to flesh out what we said we were going to do in the sixties—certain obvious
expansions. We need to internationalize the curriculum more than we have. We need to accept and acknowledge the fact that what we have here, where we are geographically on the Pacific Rim, and the kind of the changing character of the demographics around us. But also, I don't really call them curriculum changes so much as additions to the program.

SM: Would you say law school is going to come here some way?

JP: Yes. I don't ... curriculum change, some additional programs.

SM: Yes.

JP: I think (inaudible) law school is not a professional school.

SM: That's right. Okay, well, I agree. I'm very interested in the Pacific Rim, since Australia and New Zealand are on the Pacific Rim. And I felt sad that San Diego jumped in and got that graduate school.

JP: Yes.

SM: And I begged Dan and others to do something on our campus. Now, how well do you think the Academic Senate--turning to the Senate now--how do you think the Senate is doing? Spence was, I think, the Chair when you arrived, was he not? Or was it Menton?


SM: (inaudible)

JP: I think a large part of the success of this campus, and what I would call a rather positive tone and ambience about it,
comes from the fact that the Academic Senate has been well led throughout its entire history, plays a major role, and participates in shared governance and has taken that as meaning to share the responsibility, not just to be a carping critic. And I think we've always had good, responsible leadership, and that's certainly been true when I was here before. It's true now. And if you look back over the history, they are all significant people who have taken their responsibilities very seriously and tried to solve problems. I think we have almost a model here of how shared governance is supposed to work.

SM: Well, I felt that way when I was Chair. And I got to sit down every once a month with Jim McGAugh. And then I knew the Medical School was a cause of his problems, so Ed Arquilla—you know, Dr. Ed Arquilla—I sat down with him once a month. So . . . and I think we have talked about these problems and so forth.

Now, I'd like to turn to the community, Jack, because you've had unusual success here. We're all delighted you persuaded Don Bren to give all that money for us. How did you manage that?

JP: Well, the university is an easy thing to sell. It's very important to the community. I always have felt—and Dan said that too—given the land grant tradition, the university is not to be an isolated institution and it doesn't . . . the
people who are here don't own it. We have it in trust from the people around us. And so, I think that's kind of been the approach.

And by the time I got here, the university was of sufficient size and complexity that it was a significant element in the eyes of the people of Orange County. So, my responsibility was to figure out how to let them get involved. So, I found the Orange County people very willing and anxious to. This is kind of a burgeoning, growing county. People take pride in the institution and it is a question of since our own graduates are only now beginning to mature and are not now in a position to make significant gifts, in order to get those additional private resources that we need to meet our aspirations, you have to reach out into the community.

I think it's very important for me to make this a matter of record: I'm convinced that, as I've said often, that the state of California will make us a good university, but we depend upon Orange County to make us a great university. And if you go back and ask what have been the things that are correlated or related to the ... really the growth of big public universities in the past. Why have some of them done better than others? Because the margin of excellence is private gifts. So, we need the community's private gifts.

And I think we also are a great benefit to them. We add to the ambience of the county. We add to the resources of the
county. And since Orange County is kind of a twenty-first
century county coming into being, where knowledge is going to
be the biggest commodity of wealth, here is the major
knowledge factory in Orange County at the university. So, I
went out to try to persuade them.

SM: Well, you persuaded Don Bren to give those fellowships and
also to waive, or rather to strike down, that clause which
said they couldn't put on our campus these (inaudible).

JP: Right.

SM: How did you manage to do that?

JP: Well, he . . . Again, I think we're very fortunate that the
neighboring land and the institution that gave us our land is
owned by one landlord. It makes it easier to plan and
cooperate. And that Mr. Bren is himself a person who is now
interested, I think, in making social contributions, what he
can do with this resource to make it into . . . along in the
future something that people come to. And I think he sees the
university as one of the projects he would like to make
successful.

SM: Correct.

JP: And it's a question of . . . I have worked with him ever
since I came. Before I got here, he invited me to have lunch
with him in Washington.

SM: (inaudible)
JP: And he and I talked about his ideas for the Irvine Company and mine for the university, and they seemed to mesh. And I think I was able to excite him and others in Orange County to kind of buy into the university.

SM: You certainly have, Jack. I just couldn't help noticing on Monday you had Segerstrom for lunch, because I was at the table next to you.

JP: Yes.

SM: He's a very interesting guy. I suppose one of his great interests is in music and art and that music center. It's called Segerstrom Hall, you know, the big hall in Costa Mesa.

JP: Well, Segerstrom has also been very helpful. He's been . . . and, of course, as the chief man behind the Performing Arts Center.

SM: Yes.

JP: He and I have cooperated in both these institutions adding to Orange County. There has been Mr. Bren and Mr. Segerstrom, but there are a host of others. I think this campus is going to raise about $38 million this year, which is one . . .

SM: Thirty-eight million?

JP: I don't have the precise figure and I don't . . . and I may be wrong. It may be . . .

SM: It may be $48 [million].

JP: Well, no, it's in excess of $30 [million], but I don't know. It depends on how you count. But when you think of a campus
that has no large alumni group in the fifties or sixties, and which is relatively new in Orange County, the generosity of Orange County is rather tremendous. We've put together a whole variety of things: the Chief Executive's Round Table, to getting Deans. I have told Deans that they have responsibility to . . . When I first came here, I said it used to be that Deans in public universities didn't have to engage in fund raising. Deans in private universities, that was one of their major responsibilities. I told the Deans, "That's now one of your major responsibilities." And I said, jokingly--I hope, jokingly--that they had to cut their hair, put on a coat and necktie and go downtown and help raise money.

SM: Yes.

JP: So, we've gotten the whole campus involved in . . . By the way, I think this is not only good for the university, not just in terms of the dollars they get. Some people are worried that we become too obsequious to the fund raising. I don't think that's any danger to the university community. The greater danger is if the university community becomes too isolated, too arrogant, too unwilling to talk to the people outside. So, I think it's good education. We learn from these people as well as . . .

SM: We certainly do.
JP: It's not merely just getting their money, but getting their ideas and involvement and keeping the university ... while always preserving our integrity and our independence, nobody can buy the university, and we have ample ways to be sure that those who give us the money, their views are sought. We try to please them but we don't compromise our integrity. So, I don't see any danger from that point of view, and I think we gain more.

SM: We started out, of course, there were so many Stanford and [U]SC people down here. That's where their loyalties were at first.

JP: Yes, that's right.

SM: Now, of course, they're changing. Let me just check this, please, Jack.

(tape is turned off)

I'm going to get this all fixed up when I ... We're going to France, you know, for a bus tour, you know, sixteen days.

JP: No, I didn't know that.

SM: The beginning of September.

JP: Oh, wonderful.

SM: And so, this will be checked over and the static will come out. (chuckle) I hope. Now, let's turn to the Medical School, which I know is a headache and has been to Dan. And I'd just like you to relate simply, Jack, from the time of
your arrival, what did you find and what has been done and what's going to happen.

JP: Well, it's difficult to do briefly because it's complex.

SM: Well, you've got lots of time.

JP: Well, unfortunately, because of the problems of the Medical School, the hospital (inaudible) meetings. I would say that that's been the chief problem of this campus. It is that the hospital is not on the campus, and that the hospital that we were given--the former county hospital--has so many problems and is so difficult to operate fiscally that it has been a kind of a drag on everything we've done. And I mean to be optimistic about the ultimate solution, but it has been a major problem for both Dan and for me to integrate that hospital and to make it ... move it from being a former county hospital to a major academic health center for teaching and research purposes, to improve both its physical condition so it is a modern, state of the art facility for a rising medical school, and also that it's fiscally healthy.

And because of the nature of its patient mix, it has so many patients whose costs are covered by public agencies, and those public agencies reimburse you for considerably less than it costs to take care of those people, because you don't have the right patient mix you can't lay off those costs, that the university has been in financial difficulty ever since it came, and we're still working on that problem.
That should not obscure the fact that the Medical School is making considerable progress. As it grows, it's very strong in the basic sciences. We're now beginning to strengthen the clinical departments. But without a hospital, without having a hospital to start with and having a hospital twelve miles away, with having a hospital that hasn't been monitored, and having a hospital with financial problems, has made it difficult to build clinical programs. But we're doing that.

But it's a long, long story about the state of those negotiations and discussions about . . . When I first got here, I came in right after the great hospital wars of Orange County, where feelings were very intense about the battles over the location of the hospital, in which the Dean, Stanley van den Noort, was strongly supported by some people and strongly opposed by others in the community. The School was divided on that--alums and . . . So, it's been a major problem and a major preoccupation. Even, in fact, I have said that--only semi-jokingly--that if it weren't for the hospital, this job would be so easy and so much fun that you ought to . . . the incumbent ought to pay the people for the opportunity to be Chancellor. But because of the hospital and Medical School, he or she is underpaid by about five times.
SM: (laughter) Oh, gee! That's something. What about eventually? I mean, down the pike, surely there'll be some kind of a hospital on the campus?

JP: I think there'll be specialty clinics on campus. We've already made some. We've already got some outpatient clinics.

SM: Well, the Laser Clinic.

JP: Well, there's the Laser Clinic and there's a major outpatient clinic. And I think they will be coming--specialty facilities.

SM: Yes.

JP: But when you're saddled with trying to meet the bottom line of a hospital--and that becomes your preoccupation--it makes it harder to concentrate the time and attention upon the next step.

SM: Yes, right. Turning now, Jack, to architecture. When Bill Periera died, I wasn't clear as to whether UC--the University of California--still has a master architect for each campus. Now, we had Bill Periera here. Luckman did Santa Barbara, and so on. Now, do we have a master architect?

JP: Well, there's a consulting . . . After Bill Periera--he master-planned it--but then after that he became the consulting architect.

SM: Right.

JP: Yes, we have a consulting architect. Leason Pomeroy is now our consulting architect.
SM: How do you spell that?


SM: Yes, he's like the one at the Huntington Library (inaudible). So, how do you like these changes, Jack, you see? Back of the Engineering Building and so on?

JP: Well, deliberately a decision was made--which I support. It was made by Dan and I certainly confirm it. And it was made with Bill Periera's . . . with his . . . I don't think it was his suggestion, but he certainly enthusiastically supported it: That although the campus ring would continue to be built in the style and the vocabulary of the original buildings, to kind of maintain the coherence of those buildings, at the perimeter we would commission the world's most . . . the finest architects who could come, and that those architects use their imagination to build the kind of a building that wouldn't be confined by the vocabulary of the architects on the rim.

SM: The Science Library would be one example, wouldn't it?

JP: The Science Library, the Engineering Building, the Alumni Building, the Extension Center Building, as you go around the spokes. And as a result, it's kind of more adventuresome architecture, which I think is going to make the UC campus a celebrated campus, and people are going to come . . .

SM: Just to look at them, right.
JP: To look at the buildings. Now, that means that those buildings are not necessarily as mainstream and as pleasing to as large number of people. And there are some risks in that because it's like painting, you know. Differences in . . . If you don't like the painting, you can take it down, and you can't take the building down.

SM: (laughter)

JP: But I think it's going to make the campus very exciting. And I think that, as it gets put back together again, as the landscaping builds up, some of the buildings which look different and harsh and stand out will begin to soften up and fit in.

SM: Yes.

JP: And kind of an integrity will be . . . People will be able to see. It's kind of hard for some people . . . It's like seeing a building half-finished, and you're seeing the campus kind of just half-finished now.

SM: Yes, that's a good way to look at it, Jack. Now in questions eight and nine, really, I'd like you to tell me what you think . . . how you have made the successes so far. And maybe there are some of them . . . some things have been disappointing. I suppose the Medical School would be a disappointment.

JP: Well, I think the incumbent is the last one who should appropriately evaluate his accomplishments, or non-accomplishments. That's for other people. So, I don't know
that I call them my successes. I think what I would say is
during my time here, what I have been pleased to see is what
I think is the maturing of the campus. And not many . . .

When I first came, I was told the major constraint upon
the growth of this campus is space, that we can't build and
that the quality of our programs was being jeopardized. And
we made a major breakthrough in that. We still are. We are
now beginning to put in place the space that we should have
had in the seventies. So, that is an accomplishment. But I
don't . . .

That's only a first step in getting your program, because
now what do you do with the space? Because unless you expand
in service or improve in quality, then you're just bigger, not
better. But I think that we are now really maturing there and
you're beginning to see us attract graduate students. Along
with the very best universities in the United States, we have
been recruiting faculty young and old, and we've been
persuading them to come here. And these are men and women who
have got options to go anywhere in the world, practically,
they wished. The quality of our undergraduate programs, I
think, has improved. The amount of support that we're getting
in the community has gone way up. And so, I think it's the
. . . You know, I think UCI is now emerging in the
international consciousness as a world class university. And
I think that there has been a kind of re-invigoration of our aspirations.

In the sixties, we probably assumed it would be easier to do than in fact it turned out to be. But there was a kind of a feeling when we got started that we were going to be just so good so fast. Then the seventies came along and, because of the constraint upon resources, there was a kind of a lowering of aspirations, you know. But I think there is now a feeling around here that we can be world class.

SM: Well, you just echoed what most everyone I've interviewed—and you are number thirty-four that I've interviewed. And they all say that we're really going to pick up and we're going to be able to do this by the year 2000. And most of the people I've interviewed will be around—actually active—or will have just retired. But most of them will be active and they all have this enthusiasm. And it's really very exciting.

Now, Jack, well, you're, should I say, major disappointments. You don't . . . When I said to Dan—and by the way, look, (inaudible) and then all this is Dan Aldrich I'm checking.

JP: (inaudible)

SM: That's Dan. And when I asked Dan, what are your high points and what are the low points? He said, "Well, I never think I'm at a low point." He says, "I'm always at a point when I'm looking both ways." (chuckle)
JP: Dan doesn't have any low points.
SM: He has no low points.
JP: I don't have any major disappointments. As you say, things which we'd like to have done that we haven't seen being done. As I said earlier, a major problem I would say, a challenge to the campus, is the integration of the Medical School and this hospital problem. That's kind of a major preoccupation. And I'm disappointed that I haven't been able to make more progress on that and it's taken so much of my time. Because it's not just that the hospital is a problem, but it's a (inaudible) whether you can't do the other things that you've got to be doing. Well, that's the problem, and we haven't gotten that so that's being handled routinely and not always on my desk.
SM: So, turning now to a more happy subject. When is the next edition of Burns and Peltason coming up?
JP: Next October.
SM: Wonderful. What number is it?
JP: (inaudible)
SM: What number is that?
JP: The fourteenth.
SM: Fourteenth. And therefore, you began it, what, in the early fifties?
JP: The first edition was in 1952.
SM: Nineteen fifty-two and now we're up to this. And would it be safe to say that about 30 percent of all freshman university students in America taking a basic political science course have had Burns and Peltason?

JP: Over the last some odd years? I really don't know, Sam. It's been a leading book all these years.

SM: Yes, right.

JP: But to what percentage, I don't think that any book dominates the field the way some did ten or fifteen years ago. There may be 100 to 150 books.

SM: Yes.


SM: I was (inaudible). One of your friends (inaudible).

JP: Yes, right.

SM: Yes. He said, "No, Burns and Peltason must have 30 percent." What else are you doing, Jack? Are you going to write another book? Reminiscences of A Chancellor, how's that?

JP: Well, probably not. I'm working professionally on a variety of things. I have another book, Understanding the Constitution, which I revised. And then I'm doing some encyclopedia articles for an Oxford encyclopedia and I'm going to go to Political Science meetings and give papers and participate in round tables. (telephone rings)

SM: Excuse me.
This *Understanding the Constitution*, is that also published by Prentice Hall?

JP: No, I wish it were. It's published by Holt.

SM: Holt, Reinhart and Winston?

JP: Yes.

SM: Well, it's a fine company.

JP: Well, I won't get into my problems with Holt, Reinhart and Winston.

SM: All right. That's all right.

JP: It's recorded for history that I'm not happy with them.

SM: So, now, how do you know of any events that have not been recorded? Do you recall when you and I talked together at the very beginning, you said see if you can't find out something that's just not recorded. So, I'm asking you. Do you know ... Since you've been here now for ... this is your sixth year, isn't it?

JP: One thing that I never know as to what extent it is worthwhile to get the accurate inside history of events that take place in a university. You know, in Political History that they kind of ... What the newspapers say went on and what kind of surface as major events is only part of it. And we have memoirs and diaries and reminiscences and inside books and "kiss and tell" books, and so we really finally know how a particular decision was made. We don't have that about
institutions. I'm not sure we'd ever devote the time and effort to get it, but . . . and they tend to be centered around controversy and decisions. So, again, I don't know.

But any kind of any major event that takes place at the university, such as a new school, a new gift, the hiring of a new professor, or the opening of a new curriculum, these can be kind of chronologically recorded and they need to be chronologically recorded. But what went on and how it happened and what the compromise is and which professor said what, how we got the curriculum . . . Each one are such long stories that I'm not sure they're worth the time and the effort. And I don't know what significance they'll have ten years from now. But how Comparative Cultures came, and problems, and how all those things . . . And this last year we just had curriculum change, which Howard Lenhoff spent two years engineering through. It wasn't controversial, therefore, it didn't get lots of things.

SM: Yes, I saw that. I know what you're talking about. In fact, I watched the school with which that was done. I had to some things when I was Chair (inaudible).

JP: I think one of the stories of the campus, of all campuses, and I don't know quite how recorded are they: growing tensions among different ethnic groups over admissions policies, over (inaudible) campus environment. I think this is a part of the social history of our times.
SM: And in terms of an appointment of a person, as you say, you don't put . . . This is not recorded. And we're in high hopes of getting a very brilliant fellow professor because he's getting a divorce. And he just wants to get the hell out of Johns Hopkins.

JP: Oh, listen, I've frequently said that I thought we ought to put an ad in the newspapers: "Distinguished professors who wish a new change of life because they've got a new wife and want to move . . ." because there is a large number of people who move because of personal reasons.

SM: Hayden White, you know, the great intellectual European historian and metahistory and all that. He left UCLA and went East (inaudible) and then he's back now at Santa Cruz. He likes California. But he (inaudible) had a new wife and was divorced and all . . .

JP: A lot of people move for personal reasons. And then today with our recruiting people, the whole problem of start-up costs and of finding . . . and the spouse problem, finding a job for the spouse. These are all part of the routine of the campus.

SM: Yes.

JP: They give texture and dimension to the story, I think. Otherwise . . . but I'm not sure . . . I wouldn't call these . . . I mean, these are things that precede an event—-that happens or doesn't happen.
SM: That's right. That's right. Are there any suggestions for me as the UCI Historian? And let me tell you, I'm going to give you a written report, send it to you in about a month. It says that I'm half-way through, that I have checked the budget and we're going to make it for sixty-five interviews. I believe we've got the money. Cal State Fullerton is just super. They have really done a job for me. And I thought what I might do . . . Well, I think I'll tell you this off the tape.

Is there anything more you have to say, Jack?

JP: No.

SM: This has been a very fine, very brief . . . I expected a longer one.

JP: Well, ask me back again, Sam. You'll have to.

SM: Well, I'll be glad to. I'll be glad to.

JP: Yes.

END OF INTERVIEW