UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA SAN DIEGO
25th ANNIVERSARY ORAL HISTORY PROJECT

Interview with Dr. John L. Stewart
July 24, 1984 — Dr. Stewart's office, Muir College, UCSD
Interviewer, Dr. Kathryn Ringrose

RINGROSE: I would like to begin this morning by talking about the college system and its development, and the kind of structure that was worked out here at UCSD, with the multi-college system, and its relationship to the administrative structure. We both know that has changed a lot over the years.

STEWART: Yes.

RINGROSE: I think the place to start, if you would, is to talk a little bit about your career before you came here. Tell us how you were recruited for this job, what you thought was going on here when you came, and what you found. You can give us a chronological overview of how things developed, and I will sit and listen.

STEWART: I took my PhD in contemporary American Literature at Ohio State in 1947, and I had my first appointment at UCLA, where I remained for two and a half years. I did not care for either the English Department there or for the city of Los Angeles itself and so, although I had been given a promotion—in those days they used the title Instructor—and, at the end of two years, I was promoted to Assistant Professor, which indicated approval of me. I nevertheless decided to get out and applied for a position at Dartmouth.

One of the reasons for going to Dartmouth was that I thought I would be much happier in an undergraduate liberal arts college than in a university such as UCLA. That is the kind of college my father taught in, the kind that I had attended, the kind my uncles taught in, and also, I was attracted there by the fact that there were a couple of men, one in the Philosophy Department and one in the English Department, who were leaders in the field that was called, in those days, the New Criticism.

This was an approach to literature that had been inaugurated mainly by a group of southerners about whom I had written my doctoral dissertation and about whom I would later write a big book that would make my reputation as a scholar. I was practicing that kind of criticism, which meant close analysis of poetic texts, and sometimes fiction, and writing for literary quarterlies such as the Kenyon Review, the Sewanee Review, which were very prestigious if people were interested in that sort of thing. But the English Department at UCLA wasn’t, and they wanted me to publish in more conventional scholarly journals in which I was not interested. Since there were people involved in the New Criticism at Dartmouth, I thought I would be very happy there, so I left UCLA in 1949 and joined the faculty at Dartmouth and felt almost immediately that I had found my spiritual home both in terms of the college and the town of Hanover.

While I was there, I began to take a much more lively interest in playing art music. I had been trained as a musician when I was young, and had once thought I might be a composer, so I studied music theory and composing very thoroughly and, in fact, had a double major in music and in English. But I found that I did not have the creative spark to make a career being a composer, and I certainly wasn't competent enough on an instrument to make a career being a player, although I could play jazz well enough to earn a living. On arrival at Dartmouth, I became involved in the Dartmouth orchestra. Prior to this I had played in the college orchestra as an undergraduate, and I had played in the Columbus Symphony, playing string bass at one point, and playing the trumpet—the trumpet being my instrument for jazz. I was originally trained on the piano.

RINGROSE: Your first instrument was piano. What is your main instrument?

STEWART: My first instrument was piano, then I took three years of organ, taught myself to play the trumpet in order to play in marching bands and play jazz, eventually played in the college orchestra, then moved over to the bass.

RINGROSE: You play sax too, don't you?

STEWART: I play a little of it, yes.

RINGROSE: I've seen you playing the trombone, right?

STEWART: Yes, but that is a valve trombone, not a slide trombone. The valve trombone plays exactly the same fingering as the trumpet. All you have is a slightly different embouchure. At any rate, at Dartmouth I started out playing the bass again in the orchestra and enjoyed it very much. But I disliked practicing. That is, I disliked practicing at home, and so I moved over to the oboe.

Within a short time, I was playing second oboe in the orchestra. They usually brought in a first chair and from these first chair visitors I learned a lot. One year, when I was on leave to work on this book about southern writers, I went down to Florida and played in the West Coast Symphony, which was filled with a lot of retired symphony players and the first chair had just retired from the Minneapolis Symphony, so my technique on the oboe underwent a quantum leap as a result of playing with that man for six months. So, I really was getting back into fairly serious involvement with music. I played in a number of New England orchestras, the Vermont Symphony, which is really a very fine one, the Pioneer Valley Symphony, which was also a very good orchestra, in Greenfield, Massachusetts, and the Dartmouth Orchestra, which wasn't quite so good in those days, although later it became very good.

The reason I am going into all this detail is that I was now becoming known on the Dartmouth campus as someone who was interested not only in literature, but also very, very much in music. I had formed friendships with a number of people involved in visual arts, particularly a very good painter, but not one who is a national figure, by any means, but a very skilled technician, a magnificently skilled technician, named Richard Wagner. Dick Wagner was a very good friend of mine and we talked a lot about visual techniques, which fascinated me.

But the big thing that led to my being here at UCSD, that led to the quite remarkable changes that took place in my life within a rather hurried time, began when I was asked to serve on the committee that was going to oversee the building and programs for a great new center for the fine arts at Dartmouth. After years of trying to raise money for this, they finally were given a large anonymous gift which made possible the building. It is no longer any secret, although it was at the time, though most people suspected where the money had come from, it was actually Nelson Rockefeller, a very loyal alumnus of Dartmouth, and a member of the Board of Trustees, who had given a very large sum of money that made the building of the Hopkins Center as it came to be called, possible.

When John Dickey, president of Dartmouth, asked me to be on this committee, the first thing I asked was, “Do we have a statement of the philosophy of the center and what it is supposed to be accomplishing at Dartmouth?" And it turned out there wasn't any. And I said, partly humorously, and partly in shock to President Dickey, whom I had come to know quite well, "Do you mean to tell me that you are going to put a fifteen million dollar fine arts building down in a tiny little town like this with a small college and don't know what you are doing it for, except that you think art is a good thing with a capital 'g' and a capital 't'?" He looked startled, and then he said, "Well, I guess that's true." And I said, 'This is going to have an enormous impact on the cultural life of this whole region, and on the character of this college, and on the priorities of educational values and the lives of the students, and you haven't got a statement of a philosophy?" Fifteen million dollars in those days, we're talking about the early sixties, would be the equivalent of thirty or forty million dollars today.

Well, Dickey was so taken aback by what I had said that he said, "Do you have any ideas about this?" "Of course, I have," I said. "I've got a lot of ideas about what the arts should do in a liberal arts college." He said, "Why don't you write out a statement."

So, I asked for the money to do it, went off to the country for a week, holed up in a motel, worked all day and then, late in the afternoon I would go out and ski for exercise, get a bite to eat, come back, and then go on working, and at the end of the week I produced a statement on the role of the fine arts in a liberal arts college. I still have that statement, and I am very proud of it. It think it makes a number of very telling points about the role of the arts, particularly in liberal arts education, not necessarily as a major, and I stressed that in a college like that the business should not be to try to train proto-professionals, but it should be to offer the students one more way to look at human experience and a way of learning skills to become members of the audience, so that they can be more appreciative, perceptive and understanding of the fine arts.

RINGROSE: Did you ever publish that statement?

STEWART: No. Wait a minute. It was printed in the Dartmouth alumni magazine.

RINGROSE: It would be very nice to have a copy of that for the archive.

STEWART: O.K. I have one copy left. I can dig it up and we can copy it.

RINGROSE: If you will lend it to us, we will copy it on acid-free paper.

STEWART: I went back with something that grew right out of my own experience. This is worth mentioning, because it is the core of the philosophy of the starting of the arts departments here at UCSD. I found that as a consequence of my training in theory and composition and my experience as a player, though I feel, actually, that my training in theory and composition was the more significant part of that, that I simply heard more in music than many of my friends who were very sensitive to music and listened to it very carefully and listened to a great deal of it and who knew, sometimes, a great deal more about music history than I did, could rattle off the names of composers and dates and works, but nonetheless, when we were listening to music, I heard things that they didn't hear. Furthermore, I listened to things in a way, for example, any work that had counterpoint in it—I could hear the counterpoint. To them it was just a different form of melody with an accompaniment, and they didn't pay attention to any more than the top voice, usually. There were some that were more sophisticated than that, but by and large they approached all music as homophonic music. I realized that my training in music, even though I had never used it, well, I used it for a while during the first part of graduate school to earn money, but thereafter I have only used it for recreation and as a hobby. But I realized that early training of that kind, in other words learning music from the inside out, has been an absolutely invaluable source of happiness to me and of understanding of the arts.

Well, I also went back to an experience I had in graduate school. I was approaching literature as we did in those days—largely in terms of literary history and biography and the editing of texts—that is working over texts to make sure you understood the language or whether there were any anomalies in the text. We did not, when I was in graduate school, ever study poetry in terms of the aesthetics of poetry, or the artistry of poetry. Oh, we would study rhyme schemes. We would study structures of that sort, but we wouldn't ever ask ourselves, "What does the effect of the dislocation of accents in a blank verse line have to do with the connotations and meaning of it?"

RINGROSE: Really? Today that is obviously how you go at poetry.

STEWART: Sure. We would not—. We would study very carefully the sources of Milton's imagery, for example, learning as much as we could about Milton's life to find out why he used certain kinds of images, and what were his favorite Latin authors—we did not, for example, study anything of the cumulative effect of interaction of images because they were all drawn from the same field of reference or because they clashed. That is why, when I discovered John Crowe Ransom and the New Criticism, I just went wild over it, I was so excited about it. And when I came back from the service to write my dissertation—I had been doing a standard dissertation when I left, and I was well into it—but when I came back, I was just bored with the idea of working on that and got permission to write about Ransom with whom I had studied in the summertime just before I went into the army, and that is what got me started on the New Criticism.

Well, while I was working on this, I read in the newspaper an odd little article in which somebody was taking exception to the snobbish attitudes of English professors toward poets who were not great masters from the past, and said that most professors, though they go on this way, couldn't write a decent Christmas card jingle. I thought to myself, well, I don't know about most of my

colleagues, but that is certainly true of me. Here I am, proposing to be a literary scholar, particularly of poetry, and I have never even written a poem. I don't know how to write a poem.

So, I set out to write a poem, and I eventually got to the point where a little of my poetry was published. I wrote a lot of it. This, coupled with the influence of Ransom and the New Criticism, taught me that so much of what I knew about literature came again from that experience of working with the art from the inside out, learning how its elements functioned together, learning all about its structures, their expressive functions, and so forth, learning about the qualities and relationships of the organization of the elements that gave aesthetic satisfaction, or how calculated ugliness could be used for purposes of emphasis, and so forth. In other words, I learned something about the art of poetry, not just the history of poetry.

Up until this point I had been learning the history of poetry, but I got that from the outside, not from my teachers from Ohio State, though, at the end, because I was a returning veteran and they were all feeling guilty for not having gone off to the service themselves, they let me write about what I pleased and I wrote about that sort of thing and got myself into a certain amount of trouble with the dissertation, but that's another story. At any rate, I had this attitude toward the arts. That is what I stressed in my statement for the Hopkins Center, that the center should give the Dartmouth students, as much as possible, the opportunity to experience the arts from the inside out.

RINGROSE: And this is an attitude that has been adopted in a rather general way in creative writing, and music.

STEWART: Well, yes, but not as much, perhaps, as you would think because so often, where it is followed, it is with the intention of training people professionally, not with training them to be members of the audience. You see, that was my idea, that the audience's understanding will be greatly increased by some experience in the practice of art. In the same way I feel that the non-scientist's understanding of and appreciation for science and all the effort that goes into it and the exhilaration of discovery is made possible by some laboratory experience. That's why I like to see, in general education science classes that are taken by people who are not going into science, that there be some laboratory experience. They actually have to solve problems. It is exactly the same principle—they have a much keener understanding of the nature of science and how the human imagination works in science by getting in there and working in the laboratory. The analogue, I felt, was that you will have a much keener appreciation of painting if you have actually had a brush in your hands, stood in front of an easel, and struggled with some of the problems there.

Dickey was so impressed by this that he asked me to become the associate director of the Hopkins Center, to be in charge of all of its educational activities, and to be a kind of *de facto* dean of the fine arts. In other words, I would have the departments of music and visual arts and drama under my wing. I would be sort of dean of the faculty for those three departments, though I wasn't formally called that, because those departments were going to be lodged in the Center. I would be in charge of all programming to insure the highest degree of integration of the programming with the work of the departments.

Now, these departments themselves were not particularly interested in the approach I was pushing. There were one or two people, Dick Wagner in visual arts, for example, was, but one of Dickey's long-range goals was to enlarge these departments, take advantage of upcoming retirements, and he wanted me to take the lead in recruiting the kinds of people who would be sympathetic to the philosophy I was pushing.

So, I was given some time off. The understanding was that when the man who was the director of the Center, the man who had for thirty years struggled to raise the money and had kept alive the vision, and had to be the head man—anything else was beyond consideration—his name was Warner Bentley, a remarkable man, and a wonderful manager—the idea was that first Warner would be the director and I would be the associate director and then, when Warner retired, my title would be changed to director but I would continue to have the same duties and the associate director would now become the administrative manager, which was what Warner was so good at. We needed somebody who could really run the operation, but I would be the person who, you might say, was the philosophical head of it all, and I would have this dean of the arts role.

Well, I took some time off to get my book wound up. I had worked on it for a long time. I had been delayed by illness from getting it done on schedule and I wanted to get it finished and I also wanted to train myself more. Among other things, I wanted to get some training in the visual arts.

So, I took a leave and went to Cambridge and worked there, because there was some material in the Harvard Library that I wanted to use, but also to be able to concentrate more on the book, and, while I was there, I signed up for night classes at Boston University in drawing and painting and had a very, very fine teacher. Again, my goal was to learn about art from the inside. And I did. I really did. Of course, we had the whole Boston Museum of Fine Arts there. We would struggle with some technique in class, glazing, and that sort of thing, and she, our teacher, would say, "Now before the next meeting of the class I want you all to go down and see how Renoir does this. Look at the handling of colors there." Or, for some other technique, "You go down and see how Monet did this," because there is a fabulous collection of Monet there. Exactly what I wanted was happening. I was learning to see, just as I had learned from my music lessons, I had learned to listen, now I was learning to see. So, this increasingly confirmed my ideas.

But when I got back to Hanover, and I began to talk about these things with the people with whom I was going to have to work, I ran into stony resistance. I was a rank outsider, an amateur, a professor of English daring to presume to tell these people about new directions in teaching, or at least what I thought were new directions in teaching. Furthermore, it became apparent that despite John Dickey's optimistic views, things were not going to change quite as fast as he thought.

But, nevertheless, the Center was built, and I started work and gave up my position in the English Department, made what was, for me, a difficult, but exciting choice. The understanding was that eventually when I really got things going in the Hopkins Center, I might come back and

teach an occasional course in the English Department, but by and large I had made the choice to become an administrator focused on the arts.

We put on some very interesting programs there. There was one week-long program on the relationship between religion and the arts. We brought in speakers from all over and had wonderful exhibits. The music was focused on religious music. There was a play put on—it wasn't *Murder in the Cathedral*, but it was something like it—it dealt with religious issues. I can't remember what it was just now. It wasn't very well done. I put on several of those.

Meanwhile, Roy Pearce and I had known each other since 1945 when I had come back to Ohio State and Roy had just joined the faculty there after getting his PhD at Johns Hopkins. We had been very good friends in those days and through the years we had kept up a correspondence, and he knew about my change and about my taking on this position at the Hopkins Center. I was very excited about it, and I wrote a number of letters setting forth my views. I think that I might have sent him a copy of that statement about the role of the arts in undergraduate education.

Roy had joined the faculty here in 1963, and he and Dick [Richard Henry] Popkin in Philosophy were supposed to be the leaders in getting the humanities going. In those days the arts were considered a branch of the humanities, at least they were lumped together. He and Dick and Herb York, who was the chancellor then, and Keith Brueckner, who had a dean's title then, I can't remember. just what it was, it was a sort of catchall title - were wondering how in the world they were going to build an arts faculty. Keith was, more than Herb, involved in most of the recruiting. He had recruited Roy. But let’s say the four of them were particularly concerned about this. Another person who was very interested in the matter was Martin Kamen, who was in the Chemistry Department, and who was an outstanding amateur musician who, at one point early in his career, had been forced to decide whether he was going to be a concert violinist or a chemist, and had chosen chemistry and subsequently moved from the violin to the viola. But he was a very fine musician, and a close friend of some of the most distinguished performers in the country—Isaac Stern and [Gregor] Piatigorsky and people like that. He was very concerned about this matter, how the arts were going to be started.

So, Roy, attracted by my ideas, suggested that they invite me out to draw up a plan for the development of the fine arts. It didn't necessarily mean they were going to follow my plan, but at least it would give them something to base their thinking on. So, they asked me to come out, and I came out during the Christmas break in December 1963. At that point there was just one building on the campus. Bonner Hall was being erected, but the only big building was Urey Hall. Everything was in it, faculty offices, administrative offices, classrooms, laboratories, the library, even a cafeteria.

RINGROSE: There were still no undergraduates.

STEWART: No. This was 1963. The first ones turned up in the fall of 1964. I came out and I spent a week here, stayed at the La Valencia, and I talked to a lot of people around the town as well because I was so imbued with this idea of arts on a campus as being an influence within an

entire community. I also thought that there could be a high degree of interaction, which would enable both sides to get more for their money.

This was the time when the Civic Center was being built downtown, and I talked with the people who were making the plans for Golden Hall and for the Civic Theater, where the opera is done and symphony concerts, went over their plans with them, both their programming plans and plans for the buildings themselves. I talked at rather considerable length with Craig Noel, who was then and still is the head of the Old Globe Theater, about his program and how the University and the Globe Theater might serve one another, and I talked to Marian Longstreth, who was the head of the Theatre and Arts Foundation of San Diego County, as it was then called. This was a group that I want to come back to later. For years they had been trying to build a theatre in conjunction with UCSD and, frankly, I was not at all impressed with their plans. It sounded to me as if they wanted to have a year-round summer theater, a straw-hat circuit theater, doing pallid copies of Broadway hits, with an occasional bit of Shakespeare for culture. I thought it was a very Mickey Mouse operation.

At any rate, I drew up the plan. I didn't keep a copy of that plan. I don't know where it might be, but it must be around somewhere. But I drew up a plan for the development of the arts in relation to the future twelve college campus that was then in the planning.

RINGROSE: I will have to look for that.

STEWART: Yes. They already had the idea of the clusters of colleges, that the twelve should be grouped into three clusters. So, I said O.K., the first cluster we should work on these things, and the second group these other things. It embraced a plan not only for the three basic departments we have now, visual arts, drama and music, but also dance, film as a separate department, and also the music department was going to be divided so that applied music, or, if you want to call it that, a more conservatory approach, particularly to opera and things like that, would come at a later stage in one of the later clusters. It was a pretty thorough plan, and it also took into account our relations with the community. It also stressed the elements that should go into whatever kind of art center we should build, and they were already talking vaguely about something of that sort, and I mentioned, for example—I think it was in that early plan - it is somewhere in my early writings—the very great importance of having the building constructed so that it would be possible to introduce later maximum recording and even broadcasting facilities. There should be the right kind of conduits for cables, and all that sort of thing throughout the building.

RINGROSE: Who did you do this for? Whose files might it have landed in?

STEWART: It would have ended up in the chancellor's files because it was sent to Herb York.

RINGROSE: O.K. I haven't seen anything like that in the archive, but there isn't much from Herb York's papers in the archive.

STEWART: Well, I know the reason I am here is that Herb read it and liked it and suggested they get me to put my own plan into effect. And so, oh, long about in February of 1964, when I

was back in Hanover at the Hopkins Center, I began to receive phone calls and letters from Roy. Would I be interested? Two things were important in interesting me. One was the fact that things were going to be moving pretty slowly at Dartmouth. The other was that my first marriage had broken up and I wanted to marry Ruth and it seemed as if it would be very difficult to do that in a small town like Hanover where my first wife was still living. Also, Hanover was associated with the death of Ruth's first husband, which was why she had left Hanover and was living in Boston. She was pursuing a very promising career there. She, of course, wanted to marry me, too, but the thought of coming back to live in Hanover—. We talked about what other communities nearby we could live in, but none of them were very attractive. Ruth had grown up in Boston and is essentially a big-city girl. She was restless in Hanover. Think how restless she would be in a small Vermont community further away. So, the possibility of a job here looked like a very nice solution to our personal problem. Then, when I learned that if I were appointed, I would have carte blanche to do—in those days there was lots and lots of money. And that I would be going out, of course with a committee to monitor my activities, so I didn't just go recklessly out and do odd things. I would be able to hire people, oversee planning of buildings, develop the curriculum, the works. It was fantastic.

RINGROSE: It was three years before there was any real budget crunch.

STEWART: Yes, those were the days of Pat Brown and Clark Kerr.

RINGROSE: That would be very exciting. You could really build something here, from the ground up.

STEWART: So, I was offered the position in April and accepted it. Fortunately, I had finished the book, the big book on the fugitives and agrarians, as they were called. It was called *The Burden of Time* and was published by the Princeton University Press. It was in-press and the people who had read it for the Princeton Press and the press itself were quite amenable to their critiques being submitted for my appointment here, since, being at Dartmouth, I hadn't published a great deal. I had just put all my efforts into doing this one big book and had published comparatively few articles along the way, since there was no requirement that you do that at Dartmouth. Their comments on the book, and fortunately they were very distinguished people, were so positive that I was given an appointment at the full professor level. I had been a full professor at Dartmouth. So, I came and, fortunately, when the book appeared the following summer, in 1965, it got extravagantly positive reviews in the Times Literary Supplement and the New York Times Book Review even put it, and this is very unusual for a scholarly book, especially one about literary figures, on their first page as their cover story. It was the Sunday book review.

RINGROSE: That must feel good!

STEWART: I came down from a backpacking trip in the Sierras with Ruthie and our two boys to the San Francisco airport to meet my daughter who was coming out to stay with us, and her first remark was, "Hey Dad, did you know that your book is reviewed on the front page of the New York Times Sunday Book Review?" And I said, "Oh, you've got to be kidding!" And she

said, 'Here it is!" She had a copy and I sat down in the San Francisco airport and read it, and I couldn't believe my eyes, for not only was it reviewed there, but it was reviewed so positively! Well, that established for the people here that yes, I was a genuine scholar as well as a guy who could do planning in the arts. It was just as well I was established in that way, for by then I was also working on the second college as well as with the arts. But let's stay with the arts.

The first thing I had to do was really interesting. My first assignment was to draw up mock curricula for the departments in order that we might be able to estimate the number of faculty we would have to recruit. They were already busy designing buildings and would have to know how much space would be needed for faculty offices. There were critical questions of that kind.

So, for example, I sat down and within the space of a couple of weeks drew up a curriculum for a music department, graduate and undergraduate, the whole works, and on the basis of that said, "We are going to need a music department of so many FTE." At the moment I can't remember how many that was. That was the kind of planning I did. Later on, when Will Ogden came, I dug this out and showed it to him and he looked it over and said with a grin, 'That is a great curriculum. It's really remarkable. It goes together just marvelously. It is exactly what everybody was doing back in 1935." That was exactly when I was studying music. It was a great curriculum for 1935, but the fact that the courses have changed so much didn't change the fundamental thing which I had done and done well, which was to indicate that whether you call it this, or you call it that, this is what you are going to have to have in terms of numbers of people and amount of space.

Also, I knew enough to emphasize the tremendous role that electronics were going to play in a modern music department. There would have to be ample space for all kinds of work with electronic equipment and the dollars per FTE, the support dollars, would have to be on the order of the support dollars for the engineering department. These were particularly important decisions. Again, that came from my having had the insider's experience. I didn't do quite such an elaborate curriculum for the visual arts, but I tried to do something comparable and also for drama.

By this time, I had convinced everybody here that even as a part of general education, even as a part of the elective program here, the arts should be approached for the general student, as much as possible, from the inside. For my scientist friends, like Martin Kamen, I kept using the analogy with their experience as scientists, and they understood it and grasped the field. Of course, Martin, having been such a fine performer, also appreciated this in relation to music. So that became a cardinal principle.

Now, one place where the approach to music differed from what it is now was that we were going to have very little emphasis on graduate studies because, we said, we didn't want to be in the business of training people for jobs that did not exist. I pointed out that the Department of Labor statistics in those days showed that people in drama had the highest incidence of unemployment of any profession in our country, and it ran as high as forty percent as a regular thing, and I also pointed out that on the island of Manhattan there were 6,000 members of the local musicians union struggling for 2,000 jobs, and that took in everything from people playing

rock and playing piano in a tavern in Brooklyn to singers in the Met. There were exactly 2,000 jobs in the recording industry, the serious music industry, pop music industry, jazz, nightclub work and 6,000 members of that union struggling for them. I said, and I also noted that the University of Indiana, which had the most elaborate music program of any university in the country, the one at Michigan approached it, but, for example, Indiana had three manual practice organs, not recital organs, just practice organs. They could put on a new opera every week of the year, they had so many people studying opera.

RINGROSE: They are still the best, or at least the biggest music department in the country, and have the best string program in the country.

STEWART: Yes. They offer graduate seminars on how to play tuba parts on the bass trombone. You could take a whole seminar on that subject, or you could back then. I pointed out that they turn out about one hundred very competent young people who aspire to become concert pianists—one department alone—a hundred a year and the concert world of music could absorb only six new concert pianists a year, which meant that even if Indiana could supply all six, which, of course wasn't the case, since they were coming from all over the world, but even if Indiana supplied all six, there would be 94 who would end up as disappointed piano teachers or public school music teachers or people who are soured on the profession, meanwhile having given up such an enormous amount of their lives to have reached the level of competence that they had, and they had sacrificed learning so many other things, including a lot of social skills. We didn't want to get in the business of doing that.

RINGROSE: It is interesting, John, that this was before the late sixties when the student ethos developed that you can be what you want to be, and you shouldn't have to worry about whether there is a market for your skills. I think that later universities had to begin to cater to this to some extent and make places available, even though we knew that many of these students would never be placed.

STEWART: Yes. So, we had this odd, and seemingly contradictory pair of assumptions: first that we were going to start the arts departments around the makers. We were going to start with composers. We were going to start with painters. We were going to start with people who had actually been on the stage and acted and directed professionally, and then later we would add the musicologists, the art historians, and we would get the kind who were comfortable living in the same department with active, creative people. For I had seen, over and over again around the country, that when the creators were brought into the department in response to student demand for studio courses, that the historians were leery of really powerfully creative people and always got tame cats who were housebroken, people who showed in vanity galleries, if they had a show at all, people who had to pay to have a show, just the way creative writers would pay to have their volumes of poetry published.

RINGROSE: They would also tend to select people who would be comfortable colleagues, who know how to play the academic game.

STEWART: Right.

RINGROSE: Your truly creative people are just simply not like that. They are going to be odd birds, but there is excitement in having them around.

STEWART: Exactly. We were going to get people of that kind. They would teach the arts from the inside out, or at least there would be a heavy emphasis on that, as well as on the other. I'm not saying the other isn't very, very important, but so often it excludes the approach from the inside out. We were going to have them, and at the same time we were going to play down the approach to the arts as pre-professional training and emphasize the role of the arts in liberal education and consequently in undergraduate education, not at the graduate level.

RINGROSE: Now, this must take a very special kind of individual. You want someone who is very creative at a high level in a particular area, and yet is going to be content to teach undergraduates without a bevy of graduate students to help him, because you aren't going to have graduate students, and he is going to have to teach at a pretty low level.

STEWART: Well, as it turned out, we weren't able to do it that way. We were able to have the creative people, but two factors entered in. They had to have graduate students to supply T.A.s, because we were not able to preserve the student/faculty ratios that we envisioned at the outset. We envisioned them as being very low because of the nature of the material being taught, and subsequent budgeting for the university simply drove us to having large classes, and that meant T.A.s. But even if we hadn't been forced to have T.A.s, and therefore graduate programs for them, these artists wanted so much to talk to young people who were more advanced than the undergraduates.

And so, let's take the music department, they developed a PhD program, and they train people who aspire to a professional career in music. Now, they have kept the numbers down fairly low, but, on the other hand, the people they have them so well trained that by and large they go out and get jobs almost right away. In fact, one of the problems in the music department for quite a while was that so many of their people didn't finish getting their PhDs because they were getting jobs before they finished the degree. A good example of that is Jack Logan who was being sought after all the time and was finally on the faculty of San Diego State before he finished up his work. Well, this was the story again and again.

[END OF PART ONE, BEGIN PART TWO]

STEWART: The big point that I was trying to make before we started the next tape, is that the philosophy that I was pressing during the early planning for the arts here, and the philosophy which I got my colleagues to agree to, because it was part of the original plan in the first place, is something that goes back through my experiences at the Hopkins Center, through my experiences in music and in trying to write poetry, and added to that later was the experience of studying the visual arts. Now, I don't want to suggest that my study of the visual arts went very far. It didn't. In a year's time, how much can you learn? But it did serve to give additional emphasis to my belief in the rightness of this approach to the arts. So, and that, as I say, goes back, ultimately, to my experience in music and my aspirations to be a composer, my study as an undergraduate.

But also, it has been reinforced, and this is worth mentioning too, I think, it has been reinforced during my experiences in the army, when I got really very extraordinary training in electronics and in certain aspects of modern physics that relate to electronics. I was very fortunate in having had some experience as a radio amateur as a boy, coupled with enough math courses that I was able to enlist and pick my branch of the service in order to get into that kind of work, and then was given just about a year's training, much of it not in uniform. There were 2,000 of us that started off together in this program and 75 of us finished. They would give you examinations every six weeks and if you didn't pass the examination at a certain level, they would take you out at that level of what you had learned and put you into some role in the signal corps or the air corps or something like that, and, as I say, 75 of us finished and then we went on to do really quite extraordinary work.

My training was actually so good that when I got back to Ohio State, where, incidentally, I had been sent for some of that training, I went over to the electrical engineering department to tell them about what I had been doing, and they offered me a job in the department. I said that I wanted to get my PhD in English. That is what I had come back for, and they said, "We'll see to it that you have the time to get your degree, and once you have gotten your PhD nobody will know it is not in electronics." Roy Pearce is one of those who talked me out of it, although I really wasn't all that much attracted by it. But, again, I had had that experience of seeing engineering and some of modern physics from the inside and in university administration that has been an enormous asset to me, because I could talk with my friends in engineering and science. Of course, I haven't kept up these things. I tried for a little while after I got out. I was in one of the professional societies for people in electronics, and I used to read the papers and go to the meetings, but it got to be too much. The residue from all this that has been so valuable has been a fellow feeling for their point of view and to have analyzed some extraordinarily complicated circuit in very elaborate radar and just gasped at the ingenuity with which some particularly intricate problem was solved makes you realize what it is like when these people go into the laboratory and do something marvelously ingenious, how it is every bit as thrilling to them as the thrill of doing something quite wonderful in the arts. It is really very, very much the same thing. I just am so grateful for that experience, and so that further underlines what my point has been about the arts. Well, so we set out to get the people to put this into effect. I started out on the road in the fall of 1964 with nine FTEs, and while I could not make formal offers, I could do everything but. The idea was I had three full professorships, three associate professorships, and three assistant professorships. I was assured that if I found, say four, really remarkable people for the full professorships, that I could go ahead and all but make offers to them, because when I got back, they would put enough money into the other FTEs. In fact, I was told, "If you can find nine people of the kind, we want out there, go ahead and go all the way on the commitment. If you find another one, go ahead on that person, too." It was incredible. I spent six weeks and I didn't find anybody.

RINGROSE: Where were you looking?

STEWART: Well, I was looking in New York City, I was looking in Boston, I was looking at the University of Michigan, I was looking mainly around the New York area, because that is where so many professionals are. Now, for example, I talked to people at the Yale art and music

departments, at the Harvard and Princeton music departments, all very distinguished departments. Princeton particularly was close to some of the things we wanted to do. But the major thing I was doing right, I realized later, was that I was talking to a number of professional painters, for example. Well, actually, I went back a second time on that one. But I wasn't finding the kind of people I wanted. I did find somebody in music, and I did get him out here, but we couldn't move him. His name is Allan Sapp, and he became the head of the music program at the University of Buffalo, and for a while had people like Lukas Foss at Buffalo. For a while the State University, for Buffalo had been absorbed into that system, was doing very well in support of the arts. Allan just, well, he eventually became Dean of the Arts there and it looked like he had a marvelous thing going. I couldn't persuade him to come. He recommended a man who was at the Binghamton campus of the State University who was very close to Allan's way of thinking, but he turned out to be too narrowly oriented toward choral music, although he was a very able man and we decided we didn't really want him.

We were having comparable difficulties with people in the visual arts. Now, for a while I thought I had somebody there, too. I had a man from M.I.T. and he was interesting because the arts departments at M.I.T., which are very good, though quite limited, are there for exactly the purpose that we had in mind here, to give the students at M.I.T. who are going into science and engineering, some experience with the arts. What could be more natural than that they should emphasize the studio approach, since everything else there is the laboratory approach, the analogue held very well. We had this man out who had been involved there and he struck us as having the right kind of ideas, though he was a kind of second-class intellect. He was a lightweight. We felt that he just couldn't hold his own on a campus like this, even though he had the right kind of ideas and had a lot of administrative experience. In the end, reluctantly, we gave up on him.

I tried very hard to persuade a man named John Finch who was at Dartmouth to come and be the head of drama. John had written some plays himself. He was a spectacularly fine teacher and a man of vision. He just wowed everybody when he came here. Oh, they thought he was so wonderful. We tried very hard to pry him loose, and he turned us down. Well, we kept looking for more people in drama, and we kept coming back and saying, "Oh, they are not like Finch." 'They are not as good as Finch." Finally, we said, "Let's try again." '"Well, how are we going to do this?" Well, we decided to have a conference on the role of the arts in higher education and bring in people from all around. It would also give us a chance to look over some of the other people in other fields that we had in mind. It would be a way of getting John Finch here. We were going to have people read papers on drama—papers in the morning and general discussion in the afternoon. We would go through successive arts. It would be three days, and then, on the fourth day there would be a big wrap-up. John was to lead the discussion of drama. We had enough money that we could not only bring these people here, but we could bring their wives and we thought, by golly, we will work on John's wife. Well, we got him out here and Madeline wanted very, very much to come, but, in the end, he went back to Dartmouth, and there we were. We still hadn't gotten anybody. We had some temporary people, for example, we hired Dan Lewis, the conductor in music, and Dan took this job with the understanding that he might not be kept on, and that he might not want to stay. He was at loose ends. He needed a job.

RINGROSE: He is local, isn't he?

STEWART: Yes. So, we agreed. We said, "Come on, Dan, and help us get some music courses started and maybe a few little performance groups, and we will wait and see what the incoming chairman decides." Dan didn't want to be chairman. He was clear about that. Dan thought that'll be fine. So, we had Dan there. I brought a friend of mine from Florida, a man named Max Bernd-Cohen who was a very skillful teacher and a pretty good painter, and again it was the same thing. Max understood it was a strictly temporary thing, although in the end Max liked it here so much that he hoped he would be appointed, but he was too far along in years to be considered. But Max came in and taught some courses in visual arts and we just didn't try to do anything at this point with drama. We did have music and visual arts going with these people. So, we had our big conference and nobody that we wanted came out of that. We were not finding the people we wanted. We were getting college art association historians and people like that, but not the people we wanted.

RINGROSE: Do you think you looked too isolated out here?

STEWART: Yes. We seemed to be too far away from the action, for one thing. Well, in those days a very, very fine art magazine, Art Forum, was being edited here on the west coast. It later moved to New York City. So, I went up to Los Angeles and talked to the editors of that magazine and they were absolutely dumbfounded that a university administrator had ever even heard of them, and I said, 'The kind of people that write in your magazine, the kind of artists you write about, are the kind of people I am interested in. Now, whom should I talk to?" They gave me a list of names. It included Max Kozloff, who has been here sometimes as a visiting teacher in our Visual Arts department. Max was a very promising young critic. They thought that Max was probably too young to be the chair of the department, but they said that Max knew everybody and could give me some great ideas.

They suggested Robert Motherwell, the painter, and his wife Helen Frankenthaler. They said that they probably wouldn't be interested in the job but would know people and would be interested in my approach. They told me to talk to Motherwell, that he was a very intellectual guy. They suggested Allan Kaprow and so I went to New York City and looked up these people. Motherwell was particularly excited by this whole idea or concept, but, finally, he said, "I would love to come out some time as a visiting professor, but I can't think of anybody of the kind that you want that would leave New York."

Then I talked to Max Kozloff. We both realized that he was too young for this job. But he said, "You know, there are a couple of guys in this city who are very interested in art education, and you ought to try one of them, or try them both." One of them was Allan Kaprow, but of course I already had Allan's name. The other was a man named Paul Brach. Brach's name didn't mean anything to me, but Allan Kaprow I had been hearing about for some time. You know, he was one of the originators of "happenings", and they were being written up constantly in Art Forum.

I got in touch with Allan Kaprow, and he was very attracted by the idea and the philosophy and thought we were absolutely dead-right. But he had just received a huge grant—he was at

Stonybrook, by the way, teaching at Stonybrook—to further a project he had which was to take major artists into the grade schools to teach art. He had people like Claes Oldenberg, the painter and sculptor, mainly a sculptor, who used to make huge limp ironing boards. At any rate, he had people like Motherwell going down and teaching sixth graders and, again, there was this idea of getting the people who work in the field–

RINGROSE: It is the same idea you had.

STEWART: Yes, the same idea. He had just gotten this big grant, and he didn't think he could run this program. He had made all his contacts with the local schools to do this, and he didn't see how he could transplant this to the west coast. For one thing, he didn't think he could get enough artists to come out here to do this. He wanted to stay with it. He said, "You know, when this is all through, I may be interested, if you haven't found anybody. Why don't you try my friend Paul Brach?"

I made arrangements to meet Paul Brach, and I can remember going down to the lobby, and here were all these grey-flannel junior executives, and there was no doubt about who in that lobby was Paul Brach. Paul, in those days, affected dressing like a zoot-suit gangster type. Paul is a consummate actor, and he is always dressing some little part that amuses him, and that was what was amusing him then. Paul and I hit it off right from the beginning. I was enchanted with him. He was so articulate, so well-informed, and he really was turned on by the idea of coming out here and starting from the ground up. But the real thing was what about his wife? Miriam Shapiro was now emerging as one of the major women artists and was getting remarkable attention. One of the attractions was the presence of Art Forum, which was still out here, and not only was Art Forum in Los Angeles, but there were a number of important west coast galleries, so that showing in those galleries was as good as showing in a New York gallery.

We don't have any such galleries any more in Los Angeles, but they did have some then, two or three. There were some important artists here on the west coast. So, Mimi decided that they ought to give it a try and so they came out.

Paul became the first chair of the art department, and he turned out to be a wonderfully eloquent spokesman for the arts on the campus. Everyone was taken by him, not only his remarkable personality, but also the sheer power he had over language and in explaining ideas was awesome, and, furthermore, he is a polymath as far as knowledge is concerned. He ranges way beyond the arts. He knows lots about science and is also very, very witty. He was talking with a physicist who would say, "I have always liked art, but I can't stand this kind of stuff you are doing, going down to junk yards and getting up a whole lot of rusty things and putting them together and calling it a work of art." And Paul would listen to this, and he would grin, and he would come back with some very witty remark that grew out of an insider's knowledge of this guy's work in physics. He would say, "Well, you know, it is like what you are doing with such and such," and mention something, and the guy would look at him, you know, and Paul would have scored his point. He did that over and over again, and simply seduced the opposition, so that he was a wonderful spokesman for the arts.

Well, his first recruiting, in addition to his wife—in those days they had these very strict nepotism rules, so we couldn't give her any kind of tenure—so she was a lecturer he recruited Harold Cohen and he recruited Newton Harrison, and then later on he went on to recruit David Antin. There were other people along the way, but he got the visual arts department off to a terrific beginning.

Then he was lured away by the opportunity to head a much more vigorous program at the California Institute of the Arts north of Los Angeles. Originally it was located in Los Angeles in temporary quarters until they could move up there. There was so much money being dumped on them by the Disney family that Paul was lured away and took with him people like Donald Louthian who did this painting here. He was one of the first appointees here. He also took away several other fine artists, and then the Disney people cut way back and Paul and Mimi went back to New York, where Mimi's career has just blossomed. Paul's career has been slower. This painting here is the kind of thing he does—very minimalist, and so it hasn't been as popular. But Paul is still a very respected figure.

RINGROSE: Is he still involved with the academic life?

STEWART: Yes, he teaches some courses at Hunter, but he doesn't have to teach a great deal because his paintings are now selling very well. He is going to have a big one-man retrospective show soon in which this painting will be shown. At any rate, that is how the visual arts department got started. But there again, they wanted advanced students, so they developed eventually an MFA program, and then they began to get in just the kind of people whom we had said ought to come into a department founded around a studio group. In other words, we got David Antin, one of the leading art critics of the country. We got Moira Roth, who writes so skillfully about the most contemporary sorts of things, particularly performance art. We got Sheldon Nodelman, who, although he is a very fine historian of Renaissance art, is totally at ease and sympathetic to the contemporary people. These were people who wanted to be around living, practicing, working major artists.

Another person whom Paul got that I forgot to mention was Allan Kaprow. No, he got Allan for Cal Arts, and then when that program began to be cut back so far because the Disney people had lost a bundle on their Florida operation—now it is a great moneymaker, but at first it was losing money like mad, so they had to cut back on their support for Cal Arts—but also they had been made very uneasy, well, for instance by the efforts of some of these people to hire Herbert Marcuse for their faculty. As if Marcuse would have anything to say! It was obviously a gesture designed just to annoy them. Some man came in to give testimony before the Board of Trustees on something at one point, and to emphasize his point dropped his pants, and that came to be their view of these crazy artists and they wanted to get them out and get the kind of people that would train people for the Disney studios. So, they didn't succeed in cutting back as far as they would have liked to, because some good people stayed on, but Allan Kaprow saw the handwriting on the wall, and when he was offered a position down here, he came down here. It was Paul Brach who pried him out of New York City to begin with and brought him west.

So, that is how we got our Visual Arts Department, and they went on to offer a Master of Fine Arts degree in order to have graduate students, and again the story is an interesting one. Their people are so well trained that they tend to get positions. Another person who is, by the way, interesting is a Muir student named Carrie Rickey who was an undergraduate. She didn't do graduate work here, but she was a rather skillful writer, and she did a Muir special project, one of these things where you design your own major, on film criticism, and for years she has been the film critic for the Village Voice and is one of the most influential critics in the country. Her stuff gets published and reprinted all over the place. She is a product of this department, but not at the graduate level. There are lots of others who have gone on to do quite remarkable things. especially since they got in at a later date, Manny Farber, Pat Patterson. (These are newer members of the visual arts faculty) I think Paul actually recruited Manny, but I'm not so sure about that. If you study the dates, you can find out. Anyway, Paul put his mark on the Visual Arts Department.

RINGROSE: Now, do their graduate students go out to academic jobs or do they go to work in the art business, or do they go out and paint?

STEWART: Both. Most of them. You'll have to ask people like Moira whether they have produced anyone who has become an art historian, that is has finished a PhD and then become a rather conventional academic of that kind.

RINGROSE: I haven't heard of anybody like that.

STEWART: I think that most of the graduate students are studio people and I think they are aiming at supporting themselves with their painting, and some of them do. I was talking with Pat Baxter, who used to be in the department. I was talking with her in New York city recently when I was there, and she was telling me about one of our recent graduates of the art department here whose canvases are now getting $10,000. He has only been out about three or four years, so some of them are making it big, some of them are not. Leonore Goldberg, for example, one of whose works we have in our conference room, is still struggling, and supporting herself mainly by her writing as an art critic, but she hopes to make it in the studio. So, there are some who are not succeeding, and I do not know what has become of some of them. Others have succeeded very well.

RINGROSE: How has the department developed in terms of its orientation toward undergraduates? After all, your original concept was that this would broaden the lives of undergraduates.

STEWART: This is a sore point. It has been a constant point of tension. They have not been so sympathetic toward bringing into a studio experience, students who are not going to be art majors and aim at professional careers. There is a very good reason for this. Quite apart from their feelings on the matter, we just never got the studio space, and we are so desperately short of space. By now we thought we would have enough space to do that. The way they have gotten at that, and I think it has been very successful within a limited range. is through photography and video, where you don't need anything like such a large amount of space and

students can have a lot of that kind of experience without having to master difficult easel technique and so forth. I would say that we have been partially successful, but not to the degree that I had hoped. But that is owing, to a very considerable measure, to the fact that these high-powered super-professionals get bored with teaching drawing to freshmen and things of that sort.

RINGROSE: You can't blame them. It's a vicious circle, and many of the disciplines are faced with this problem. You don't want to expand your graduate program because you feel that you shouldn't have more students than you can place, and yet, if you are going to teach large numbers of undergraduates, you need graduate students. Practically every department that I know of on campus has this problem.

STEWART: Right. Now, you see my original vision was too idealistic to work without a lot of compromise, and the compromises have taken place. It was too idealistic in terms of the cost of it all, and it was too idealistic in terms of finding people who were accomplished artists who were also interested in teaching undergraduates who were not (the undergraduates) proto-professionals. Those are very rare birds indeed, very rare, and we just happened to have found enough of them to staff our arts departments here. But you see I had seen major artists come up from New York City. We got Leo Castelli, who was, still is, but in those days particularly, was *the in* man. All the aspiring hot young artists, especially those on the farthest reaches of the avant-garde wanted to have their things shown by Castelli's gallery. He had his contacts out all over the art world. He would get us these people to come up to Dartmouth as visiting artists, and they would spend a term there, or perhaps two terms, and they would have a ball teaching all about the new things to these eager young undergraduates. Then they would go back to New York City. That wasn't like staying on the faculty year after year after year.

RINGROSE: There is an isolation problem that is very serious out here.

STEWART: That is what I didn't sufficiently appreciate. I watched them interacting with these students and saw how much pleasure they got out of it and how wonderful it was for the students and said, "Boy, that's what we want for UCSD." Or rather first I said, "That's what we want for Dartmouth." Later I said, 'That's what we want for UCSD." I didn't realize that if these people stayed on for a couple of years they would have been bored, talking about getting graduate students, or getting out.

RINGROSE: Possibly if the university had fulfilled the original plan with the twelve colleges, we would have built enough of an intellectual base here in the arts so that it would have been self-sustaining, and perhaps it would have built more community art activity. But it is very hard. Los Angeles has enough problems, and San Diego is even smaller.

STEWART: There has been some contact in the visual arts with the community, but there hasn't been much between our music department and music in the community. Rands's (Bernard Rands) connection with Atherton (David Atherton, music director of the San Diego Symphony) begins to show signs of more of that, but I think it is lamentable that a conductor of opera, and he is very good at opera, as fine as Tom Nee, has never been invited to conduct

downtown. He is much better than some of the people they have had down there. But that is partly owing to the isolation of our entire department from the community. Another place where there is a lot of outreach to the community going on is through the Cheathams (James and Jeannie), and through Cecil Lytle, but mainly through the Cheathams in the area of jazz and popular music, but it is coming about very slowly. But one place, and now we come to drama—that is quite a story, so let's make sure we have plenty of tape! You know the story of the music department and how it got started?

RINGROSE: No, we need to talk about the music department and how it got started.

STEWART: O.K. Let's take the music department next. I told you about visual arts and how Paul Brach got that started. Well, we weren't getting the right kind of people for the music department. We didn't get Allan Sapp. We didn't want the man from Binghamton. And at that point, I went to talk to Ernst Krenek.

RINGROSE: He was living out here already?

STEWART: Yes. Ernst had been living here in southern California since 1947. I had met him in 1949, a few months before I left for Dartmouth. We had hit it off very, very well indeed. He was just about starving to death, and I had an older woman in a class I was teaching on southern literature at UCLA named Ethel Fahnstock and she came up after class one day and said, "You know, some of the things you have been saying in class sound as if you are interested in modern music." And I replied, am." And she said, "Did you ever hear of a composer named Ernst Krenek?" And I said, 'My God, yes. Why?" And she said, "Well, he and his wife are living in my home." Ethel had recently been divorced from a high-ranking publisher and he had gone back East, and she had this big home in Beverly Hills, her son had gone off to Stanford, and she was rattling around in this big house, when some people who knew about the Kreneks and what a terrible time they were having suggested that she let them live in her house, and they were living in a wing of her house.

Ernst had given up his teaching job at Hamline College, where he had taught among the people who had studied with him there were Bob [Robert] Erickson and Will Ogdon and Tom Nee and quite a number of other people who had gone on to be prominent figures in the music world, especially on the west coast—Glen Glasgow, and others of that kind. Well, he had given it up because he had thought he could support himself on his compositions alone, and he wasn't able to do that. He taught for a while for UCLA Extension, for City College, but then he didn't have a teacher's certificate, and in any case the people who were interested in studying with him had all taken the courses and there weren't any more coming along, so he lost that job, and he was really having a desperate time.

Ethel invited me to come over to a party and Joanne and myself—my first wife was a very, very fine singer, very well trained in music, too—and at any rate we were there and the composer, George Antheil, was there that night and I remember George Antheil and Krenek doing some very amusing things on the piano. Krenek likes to let on that he doesn't know very much about jazz, but he and Antheil sat at the piano playing hits of the day together, four hands, making it

up as they went along, saying, "Let's play it the way Wayne King would do it," or "Let's play it the way Benny Goodman would play it." It was really remarkable the way they captured the quality of the idioms of these various bands. Although Ernst was in a deep depression at this point, nonetheless, he and I had fun talking to each other. So, Ethel had us over a couple of more times before I left for the East, and Ernst went off to a job in Chicago that didn't last very long and then he returned to California.

Now, he was living in Palm Springs where he bought a little house back in the '60s. He had always wanted to live in the desert, ever since he was a little boy he had wanted to live in the desert, and that is why he was so attracted to southern California. Now he had managed to get this little house and he was, at long last, making enough money from his music, mostly from his early music, but enough was coming in. In 1960 the Austrian and German governments made a big thing of his sixtieth year—he was born in 1900 and this helped bring him very much more to the attention of people in Europe, so now the music that was put on in those days continued to be performed a lot and he got opera commissions. So, he was making enough so that they could get by living there.

I talked to Ernst. I didn't know at that time that ever since the thirties he had been writing essays and giving talks—in Europe mostly—about the importance of teaching people to understand and like music by having them have some experience in actually making music. He had pressed this idea when he had taught at Vassar and when he had taught at Hamline. I went to see him and told him about my troubles in finding the right kind of people and told him that that was our philosophy and he said, "Well, then you should go after Will Ogdon or Bob Erickson to be your first chairmen. They will be very sympathetic to this idea and are both very, very fine composers, just the kind of people you want." Erickson was teaching at the San Francisco Conservatory and occasionally teaching over at Berkeley on a visiting basis, and I went up to see him.

He agreed to see this administrator from UCSD more out of curiosity than anything else, to hear what I had to say about our ideas down here. Bob is writing his autobiography, and I have read the chapter that covers my appearance there. It is very amusing. I remember it very well. They had a little house in South San Francisco, and I walked in and the first thing I noticed, on the coffee table, was Joyce's *Finnegans Wake* and not only that, but it was perfectly obvious that this book was being hard used.

Our conversation began after introductions with my making some kind of remark like, "How are you getting along with *Finnegans Wake*?" Well, it turned out that Bob has a real passion for the writings of James Joyce. He has used some of Joyce's things, in fact, he has used a section of *Finnegans Wake* in music compositions. We talked for a long time about *Finnegans Wake* and Joyce and all that sort of thing, and Bob was really surprised that a university administrator knew anything about James Joyce, let alone about *Finnegans Wake*, from the inside. I had read it, and so we got on very well. Then I began to expostulate on my ideas about the music department, and Bob was immediately attracted to it. He thought it was terrific. He was very reluctant to think of himself as being involved in this. For one thing, although he and Leonore had had a desperate struggle, financially, in this tiny little San Francisco conservatory, they

were getting along, and he had complete freedom to do what he pleased and he was doing very experimental things, particularly with timbres, creating all kinds of instruments.

RINGROSE: I love his compositions.

STEWART: Yes, aren't they beautiful. His things are so gorgeous.

RINGROSE: We did his new work for violin a couple of years ago, and I was fortunate to be able to play in the orchestra. Playing that ranks as one of the best musical experiences I have had, playing that with Negyesy (Janos Negyesy).

STEWART: Yes, isn't it elegant. I have never heard anything of Bob's that I didn't think was just absolutely first-rate. I have heard some minor things like *General Speaks*, but even those are so witty and clever. Well, he was attracted enough and agreed to come down. So, he came down and liked the people he met, and said, "If I were to be chair, the first person I would hire is a fellow named Will Ogdon, who is out at Illinois Wesleyan." Finally, he decided that we were really—we were greatly taken with Bob. He was like Paul Brach. He was so articulate about the arts, and he knew so much besides his own field, and could talk so intelligently and eloquently to other people. By the way, I think these things antedate my talking to Brach, so I wasn't making a comparison there. At any rate, he was the same kind of person. We wanted him. But he turned us down.

So, remembering what he had said about Will and what Ernst had said, we invited Will Ogdon out. One of the things Bob had said is, "I don't have any skill at administration and that sort of thing, but Ogdon does. He has a lot of ideas, and he will plan a really good department for you." So, we got Will out and listened to his ideas, and agreed with Bob. Will was brought in as our first chair. He and Dan Lewis hit it off very well. You will remember I mentioned that Dan Lewis was teaching for us. Will was more than happy to think of Dan as a permanent member of the department. But then Dan began to get some real breaks in his conducting, and he realized that if he went to Fullerton, he would have even more of a conservatory environment. He would have a lot of really skilled performers that he could work with right away.

RINGROSE: I have played with him occasionally, and he strikes me as someone who is much happier working with professional players or high-level conservatory students.

STEWART: That's right, and that is what he got up there.

RINGROSE: He is at USC now, isn't he?

STEWART: I believe so. And then, of course, he has had the Pasadena Symphony and has guest conducted all over. He really didn't see the kinds of things he wanted to do being done here at UCSD, so, when the opportunity came to go to Fullerton, he left with everybody's good will.

RINGROSE: Does he compose?

STEWART: No. He is just a conductor.

RINGROSE: I would think that you would have needed someone who had some other dimensions for this department.

STEWART: Yes. Well, we took him on mainly because he was at loose ends. He was a local boy, and everybody liked him who knew him, and he agreed to come just to teach a few classes and get some musical activity going. He brought in people like Earl Schuster (a professional musician retired in the area) and others and they did things.

The other person who was a member of the department was Rosalyn Tureck. Now Rosalyn only gave a few lectures here and, in the summer, once ran a Bach workshop using studio musicians whom she thought she could get free, they would be so eager to study with her, and was horrified to discover that she was going to have to pay union wages. (laughter) She had dreams of a great Bach institute, but she was very rarely here, and she was kept on for a while as an adjunct professor. Finally, she resigned, to everyone's great satisfaction, with the exception of a few people with whom she had managed not to quarrel. They were shocked that we allowed her to get away and felt that UCSD had treated her abominably because we didn't give her a five-million-dollar Bach Institute located on the cliff above Scripps. So, Will came and he hired Bob and then together they started building the department. They brought in Tom Nee, John Silber, these were the earliest members, and actually things built up from there. Oh, Ken Gaburo, who is quite an important composer, was here for a while and then Pauline Oliveros was here for quite a long while. Pauline had been at the San Francisco Conservatory with Bob, and she was their electronics specialist. They also brought in Jim Campbell to oversee all the recording and acquisition of all the equipment and things of that kind. So, the department got off to a really solid beginning. That's how music got started. Now drama.

[END OF PART TWO, BEGIN PART THREE]

STEWART: Well, that was something! You remember that when I was telling you about my first visit out here doing research to write that plan, I had met Marian Longstreth, head of the Theatre and Arts Foundation, and I had been very, very unimpressed. Now, there is a little history of the foundation that is in order here. It was started back in the mid-fifties, by Gregory Peck, Jose Ferrer, Dorothy McGuire and Joseph Cotton. He was involved, too. Gregory Peck grew up in San Diego, went to San Diego State, and moved later to Berkeley. At San Diego State he was a close friend of and associate of Bob Peterson and Sol Price of the Price Club, and of Lionel Van Deerlin. These four were just roughly classmates and knew each other at San Diego State and had known each other in high school. (Sol Price did not attend high school or college in San Diego.) Gregory Peck liked to come back here and do summer stock to get in front of a live audience, and so did his friends, and they used to put on their plays in La Jolla High School.

The idea came to them that they should have their own theater. So, they started this foundation, the Theatre and Arts Foundation. It was called Theatre and Arts because they had some idea of supporting the other arts, but the main thrust of it was for the theater and the question was

where to put the theater. They raised some money over the years, not a very large sum, and they had pledges for more. I believe that it was Roger Revelle that they persuaded, because as a member of the community he had been interested in their activities, that the Theatre and Arts Foundation theater should be built on land that is across from where the Weiss Theatre is now—where that playing field is (on the northwest corner of Torrey Pines and North Torrey Pines Road).

RINGROSE: There was talk of putting it up the road (Torrey Pines Road) a bit, too, at one point. (On the Black Farms property.)

STEWART: They were going to build on the university's land and the city agreed to turn over its land there to be used in conjunction with this for parking space and so on. Not only that, but Marian Longstreth and her associates on the board of directors had persuaded Herb York of the importance of this and Herb and Roger and others working on it had obtained from the regents a pledge of $125,000 in addition to the promise of the land, which, in those days, was a heck of a lot of money. However, there was an agreement that if they did not raise enough money to get the theater started by July of 1965, then the regents were withdrawing their pledge, both of the land and the money.

Well, when I came out to start the arts, the idea was simply that we would be able to use the theater sometimes, and I had seen the drawings for it, and it was a very conventional proscenium arch theater and, in those days, theater design emphasized thrust and much more flexible design. You could do everything from Greek drama down to later things. I also looked at the programs they had put on in the past, and I told Herb, as chancellor—he was only chancellor for a short time, before John Galbraith came in and then I told John the same thing—"Listen, they will never raise the additional money if we don't help them with it with a big push. And we don't want that theater and that crowd and that site. It is not going to be a cultural asset. If we just lie low, it will all die and go away, and we won't have hurt anybody's' feelings."

RINGROSE: You could start over.

STEWART: "But," I said, "if we try to work in cooperation with them, it is going to be so limited—" So, that was the understanding, we thought. But Gregory Peck had other ideas. He decided that, by golly, they were going to have to do something big to get this thing going. He was sick and tired. He had been waiting, now, for ten years.

He wrote to Tyrone Guthrie who was leaving the Guthrie Theatre and asked him if he would come out here and take charge of building the theater and developing the company and everything else. And Guthrie wrote back and said no. He didn't want to do that. He wanted to go back to the British Isles, which he did. He settled in Ireland. But, he said, he had a friend who was a very, very fine director who might be interested in something of this kind because he was becoming restless where he was. He name was Michael Langham.

Now Michael had built up that great program at Stratford Ontario, made it what it was. So, Peck got in touch with Michael and asked him to come out. Michael came out thinking he would just

advise them. I was included in all this stuff along with the Theatre and Arts Foundation people because I was the liaison to the university. We still hadn't indicated that we were not going to support them. Michael was just like Paul Brach. He wowed everybody because he knew everything.

RINGROSE: People still say that half the ladies in La Jolla are in love with him.

STEWART: Oh, he was such a charming man, and his wife was too. God she was a lovely woman. Not only that, but he knew, to the dollar, just exactly what you charged for the seats, what size of house you had to have to make it self-sustaining, how many programs you had to put on, what you had to charge for the tickets, he knew the works. Stratford Ontario was a railroad roundhouse town where they repaired the engines of the Canadian Pacific and sold things to the farmers who came in on Saturday night, and he turned that town into the cultural center of the Midwest, and he knew, he really knew all of these things. It was just extraordinary.

I had been up talking to some people even before Michael turned up, people at, say the Guthrie Theatre, and realized, when I talked to these people, that he knew everything they knew, and was a great director too. Of course, everybody wanted to have Michael Langham come. In one of my conversations with him he brought up the fact that whoever took this job was going to have one great asset in the university, and I said, "What do you mean?" And he said, "Look at the way I have used the University of Toronto and McMaster." "I organized these seminars on Shakespeare and on the plays, we are going to do and bring out faculty members to participate in them and the audience can go to them. It is wonderful for them, and it is wonderful for us." He used them for lecturing to visiting schools–whole schools would be bused in and listen to these people and listen to Michael and his actors and see the plays. He said, "You know it is a wonderful asset and I used to use some of the faculty members to train my people in Elizabethan history and literature. So, it is really going to be a great asset for somebody." But he was saying, no, no, he was glad to advise but wasn’t interested in being the head man.

Well, on his last morning here, he had been staying down at the La Jolla Beach and Tennis Club, I was to have breakfast with him and Gregory Peck. This was supposed to be just a farewell courtesy sort of thing. The night before, I woke up in the middle of the night with a wonderful idea, which was to get Michael to be the head of our drama department and use his professionals of the theater for our faculty. But all the faculty appointments that they got would be temporary and contingent upon their keeping their places in his company. The only person holding a position on our faculty would be Michael, unless he needed a few more to help him, but that was the idea. The bulk of them would be lecturers. So, I told him about it at this breakfast and he listened, and he got more and more excited, and he looked at Peck and he looked at me and he said, "If you fellows can put that over, I’ll come."

So, we put it over. I met with Dorothy Chandler and a subgroup of the regents responsible for fine arts development on the campuses. She had just finished all of the overseeing of the performing arts center in downtown Los Angeles, the Dorothy Chandler Pavilion, and she was very high on the arts, and she loved the idea. There was another regent, an elderly man, who was retiring soon. He had been the president of Western Airlines, made his money that way and

loved it too, (here he is probably referring to Donald McLaughlin) and Carter, who was on the board. Carter was slow in coming around, but Dorothy Chandler talked him into it. They said, yes, they would work on the regents to get a binding agreement with the Theatre Arts Foundation that we would jointly build a theater to be used by the university during the school year and by Michael Langham's company the summer.

Another reason Michael was attracted by this was that he was going to have a professional drama school that would not be a part of UCSD and young people who came there would come on salary. They would be part of the total company, learning whatever areas they were concerned with. But they would then be able to take, through University Extension, courses in the university that he wanted them to have as part of their university training program.

Meanwhile, his professionals, the graduate students, these people that everybody wants, they, on campus, would teach the undergraduates. And it looked as if we were going to have the best of all possible worlds. We would have a major, world-famous director, we were going to have the great actors, set designers and costume makers, and, well—. He was going to have to be buzzing all over the world, among other things studying theaters to get ideas about the kind of theater we should have.

RINGROSE: And you got C.A.P. (Committee on Academic Personnel) to buy this?

STEWART: Oh, sure. In those days we had a sympathetic C.A.P. Michael's appointment went through just like nothing. So, he needed somebody from his company to mind the store here, so he hired Eric Christmas.

RINGROSE: O.K. That's how he got started here.

STEWART: That's how Eric came. He was Michael Langham's man on the campus. Eric had done a little teaching up at Santa Cruz and he loved it. He was a natural. He had been one of Michael's best supporting actors, and I can remember seeing Eric in a production of *Richard III* up there at Stratford when I was up there negotiating with Michael.

So, then Michael persuaded the Foundation to take on as the architect Bertrand Goldberg to draw up an entirely new kind of theater. Goldberg designed the Marina Towers in Chicago, he did some buildings for the Harvard Medical School, he did a number of things around New York. He was the kind of man about whom French students wrote doctoral dissertations. But he had one flaw. He did spectacularly wonderful buildings, but only about half of them ever got built because they were too expensive. Anyhow, Michael said this was the man he wanted, and Bertrand Goldberg was another one of these guys who just seduced everybody. I mean they were wild about him. I'm telling you; this place was heady.

One night I was at a party at the Bali H'ai that John Galbraith was putting on for the community, a Chancellor's Associates sort of thing, and I was sitting next to a man I didn't know, and he said, "What do you do at the university?" And I said, "Well I'm starting one of the colleges, but my main job is starting the fine arts." And he said, "What do you mean, arts. What do you want art in a university for, anyway?" So, I started talking about the arts. We were in the early stages

of our work with Michael Langham and were all carried away with this. He asked a lot of questions. And finally, out of politeness, I asked him, "What do you do?" He said, "I'm a fry cook. Well," he said, "I started out as a fry cook. My name is Peterson and I own Jack-in-the-Box." Nobody had ever approached Bob Peterson or Dick Silberman about contributing to the Theatre and Arts Foundation. He was so interested when I told him about Michael Langham that he said that he would like to meet this guy. So, since he and Dick were going to go to New York, we worked up a plan where Roberta Silberman, his then wife—I see he just married the Golding girl—the Golding woman—interesting a Democrat who identified with Jerry Brown marrying a Republican, but anyhow—Dick and Roberta were together then and Bob and Betty Peterson, the violinist, were together, and Ruthie and I, and the six of us went to Stratford together. They went on to New York, but Ruthie and I just went to Stratford and then went home. It was really fascinating to watch Dick and Bob Peterson and Michael Langham meet each other for the first time. They met in the dining room of the little Queens Hotel, a little hotel that goes way, way back.

Michael came in late and immediately it was as if there were two tigers that had met each other in the jungle. They started sort of prowling around, feeling each other out, these two intensely dynamic men. Within twenty minutes, they had stopped all that macho behavior and had really taken to each other. Bob was greatly impressed with Michael's practicality, his shrewd intelligence on the business side, and Michael was very impressed with Bob's obvious dynamism.

He arranged for us to see the play the next day, which was *Richard III*, a remarkable production, and then afterwards he took us backstage and took us through the whole thing, showed us the costume making departments, the incredible production of costumes, all these other things, and talked about how he was going to be able to draw on all these costumes for the Theatre and Arts Foundation theater until it got going and had all these things for itself, and he went on about his plans. Bob Peterson had hardly ever been in a theater and this production of *Richard III* was awesome, it was so good. He was tremendously moved by it, and then to be taken backstage and see all this—he was like a little boy in a candy store. Six weeks later he was the president of the Theatre and Arts Foundation. He had moved that fast. There were some of his friends like Sol Price and others who were involved with it and he got himself—

RINGROSE: It sounds like a very different group of people was brought into the Foundation. My sense of the early Theatre and Arts Foundation here was that it was very much a La Jolla in-group social—we don't let the San Diego people in—

STEWART: And we don't let in Jews like Silberman and we don't let brusque, fast-talking fry cooks like Bob Peterson in. But there he was, and Marian Longstreth was—well, her nose was terribly out of joint—and Bob set out to do the Goldberg theater. He and Langham and Goldberg were great. Bob was striving so hard.

And meanwhile Goldberg had taken over the old Goodman Theatre in Chicago and had built a full-scale version of the kind of stage that he wanted to have out here, and he and Michael would get actors in and run through scenes and see how they worked on that stage. They

traveled all over the world looking at theaters. Meanwhile, the Theatre and Arts Foundation was paying for all of this and it was blotting up all the ready cash that was left.

And then an organization called the Children's Foundation or something like that. The Children's Aid Foundation of Southern California was taken over by the Attorney General and its assets were seized because it was a phony foundation set up as a tax dodge. And among its assets was the Rancho Bizarro Property which is now Fairbanks Ranch or whatever they call it out there now. But the Rancho Bizarro land was theirs and some land around in and around San Diego some down in National City or Imperial Beach or some down there. Not a very big piece, but the main property, the main assets were this land.

And Dick and Bob wanted that land very badly so they made a deal with the attorney general that it be turned over to the Theater and Arts Foundation on the grounds that the Theater and Arts Foundation by virtue of putting on programs such as Michael had put on in Stratford for children would be aiding children, so this was a proper use of these assets.

So, all these seized assets were now assigned to the Theater and Arts foundation and one of the things that Bob Peterson did to help persuade them was that he promised that he would put up matching funds for the value of this property. He and Dick would match it with cash. Now that was further amusement to do it this way, but the theater had to be built within a certain time.

Then having acquired it for the Theater and Arts Foundation, Bob got the Board of Directors of the Theater and Arts Foundation to go along with selling it to him. So, he and Dick acquired this land. And the Theater and Arts Foundation now had the cash, but at that point Goldberg submitted his plans. Now, taking everything together, pledges, the money from this foundation, and everything else, it was estimated that the Theatre and Arts Foundation had about 3.5 million dollars. Goldberg's people estimated that the theater would cost about 4 million or a little bit more to build.

Our people on the campus and the Architects and Engineers were headed by a man named Mac Cason, and Mac was a very smart guy, very tough minded. He also got some advice, and they estimated that it would cost somewhere between seven and nine million. Seven as a minimum. That's twice what the Theatre and Arts Foundation had in its rosiest estimates of its assets.

So, Bob Peterson set out to raise the money. He thought he could raise it in the East—he had some people he was going to visit there whom he thought would supply the money—either give it outright or on some kind of favorable terms. Among the people that he wanted to, and did approach was Sarnoff of RCA. He got turned down cold everywhere, everywhere. He didn't raise a nickel. He came back so disappointed and so angry about this that very shortly after this he resigned from the Theatre and Arts Foundation. He got out altogether. His relations with some of the old-timers had never been good, and he was now very much absorbed in—he and Dick [Silberman] had sold their interest in Jack-in-the-Box to Ralston Purina and with that money had acquired control of the California First National Bank. That created further tension because that had been a kind of a local thing too, with the right people running it. Andy

Borthwick who was a much beloved figure in the community, a great golfer, not a very good banker—and they threw him out. So that led to a lot of hard feelings because some of these same people were on the board of directors of the Theatre and Arts Foundation. So, there was quarreling back and forth—acrimony—and Bob and Dick got out. When Michael Langham saw his theater wasn't going to be built, he resigned. He had an appointment here as an adjunct professor for a couple of years, but he never came back to the campus.

RINGROSE: Now, what year was that? Do you recall? Who was chancellor?

STEWART: I think Bill (McGill) was. I am fairly certain he was. It would be around 1970.

RINGROSE: He and I have talked briefly about this a couple of times, and he has always taken the position that the whole theater thing was a casualty of the disruption of his administration. It was a store he couldn't tend.

STEWART: No. No. It really foundered on Langham and Goldberg's extravagant dreams which were not extravagant back in the days when we first attracted Michael Langham and the money from the university was so great, but also there were long delays in thrashing out the contractual arrangements over the use and management of the theater. Then, too, a lot of ardor for Goldberg cooled when the plans were actually shown. It was thought to be a very kooky looking thing. You can find pictures of it, by the way.

RINGROSE: I have seen pictures of it.

STEWART: It appeared in the Tulane Drama Review, now called the Drama Review, in old issues of that and Theatre Arts magazine. You can find photographs of the model. It horrified the community because it was a very modernistic building.

RINGROSE: How did people in the trade feel about it?

STEWART: They thought it was magnificent. The articles about it in the professional theater magazines were just rhapsodic because it was so functionally wonderful.

RINGROSE: Was it still tentatively located in the same place?

STEWART: Yes.

RINGROSE: On this corner (the corner of North Torrey Pines Road and Torrey Pines Road). Bill (McGill) has commented that there was a lot of flak from the neighbors. They didn't want it, in fact, a lot of the same kind of flak that we are now getting over Blackhorse Farms.

STEWART: There was talk once upon a time of putting it over in the Black Farms area, in the stables area.

RINGROSE: I had thought he told me that there was talk of putting it there during his administration.

STEWART: Yes, there was talk of that, and that was going on when he was chancellor and there was a lot of hard feelings over that. But originally it was going to be over here and was designed for this site. (The corner of North Torrey Pines Road and Torrey Pines Road.)

RINGROSE: Right. Why did they talk about moving it? Did you lose the property, the commitment from the city?

STEWART: No, I don't think it was so much—. It might have been that. Bill may remember why it was. (The problem was lack of parking when the city gift was withdrawn.) I think it was probably because we were being forced to use that land anyway and it seemed like a good way to use it. I am not really sure.

RINGROSE: He has said that they got into all kinds of hassles. There were access problems and a busy street to cross.

STEWART: I know that Michael Langham liked that site (the stables area) very much. He liked both sites but talked up the Farms site. Well, Michael resigned, even as an adjunct professor, and went back to England.

RINGROSE: He is now at Juilliard. That is fairly recent.

STEWART: He and his wife broke up shortly after he gave up— He went to the Guthrie Theatre for a while and then went back to England. He and his wife had—. She had given up her career except for minor parts, she was a very fine Shakespearean actress, until their son was launched, and then, when he went to the university, she took up her career again and the two careers just didn't mesh, and he took up with a much younger woman. She went after him. Women were always going after Michael. She went after him determinedly and got him.

RINGROSE: Well, that might explain his coming back to the United States, then. This is a fairly recent thing.

STEWART: She is either a young American or a Canadian woman.

RINGROSE: I recently put together a tentative list of people to do a public lecture for the new Bronowski series and he was one of the people we were thinking about asking, so I was dredging around trying to locate him. We are getting somebody else. But I still think he would have been a good draw for a public lecture.

STEWART: Well, there is an aftermath to this that is kind of interesting and has bearing on all this. Everybody was despairing. It seemed to me that perhaps we could take what little was left of the assets and have a very modest theater. Gus Kinzel was very interested in that, and he had a young Egyptian architect that he was interested in. This Egyptian architect did some very handsome drawings of a modest theater.

I went to Bob Peterson to explain what I was up to and thought I had his blessing, but when he got involved—eventually he decided that somehow—oh, I was briefly on the board of directors

myself—then I got off because I thought it was a conflict of interest—I was on for about six months. While I was on something very important took place which I will tell you about in a moment. At any rate, Bob Peterson decided somehow that I had become the enemy and that somehow, I was seeking to either discredit him or undermine him or something. At any rate, he would scarcely speak to me the few times we met. I would write to him or try to get an appointment to talk with him, and he would refuse to see me altogether.

But also, one of the things I was interested in was this pledge that he and Dick had made. I think that may have contributed to it because we were having a very glum meeting of the Board of Directors with the representative of the Attorney General's office who had come down to tell us they were going to have to take back the assets. And since the land itself had been sold, he was going to take the money or what was left of it. The Theater and Arts foundation hadn't done anything with the assets. We talked and talked, and he finally agreed to extend it a little while because they were saying, "Well, it's going to be rather small, but we think that at long last we're going to be able to do it." And just as he was leaving, he reached into his briefcase and said, "By the way what are you going to do about this?" and pulled out—. And they said, "What's this?" "Well, it's the pledge of a million dollars."

RINGROSE: The matching funds.

STEWART: Yeah. What do you mean a pledge of a million dollars? Well, here it is. It was a handwritten note on Tom Hamilton's office stationery. Tom Hamilton was then Bob Peterson's attorney for pledging this money. No record of it had ever gone into the Theater and Arts Foundations files. This was the first that anybody heard of it, including a man named Leon Scales, who had been the attorney of the Foundation for years. The first time anybody had ever heard of it. Hubert Goodman was the president in those days. He had been involved with his father. He had been involved since year one. He hadn't heard of it. Nobody had heard anything about this. So, then they tried to collect from Dick, and he just laughed at them. He said I'm not going to pay that. I could put that in the Bank and on the interest from it, I could hire a set of attorneys and keep that tied up in the courts for twenty years. I'm not going to pay that.

RINGROSE: "They" is the Attorney General or was the Foundation trying to collect on it?

STEWART: The Foundation was trying to collect on the pledge. And Dick said he just wasn't going to pay.

Then Bob, who had always been interested in Scripps, got more and more interested. He and Bill McElroy began to see a lot of each other and hit it off pretty well. And toward the end of Bill's tenure as Chancellor, Bob agreed to honor some portion, maybe all, I don't know, because Bob had taken this dislike to me. Oh, by the way, once we got the drama department going, I just pulled back on it all. I'd had it and I was so sick and tired of the whole thing. I didn't want to have anything more to do with the Theater and Arts foundation. I wished them well, but I wasn't going to have one more thing to do with them. Furthermore, what they were talking about was going back to the original thing and which I had said we didn't want. They were going to revive the old

plans. I just got the heck out of there, so I really don't know the inside story of this. Bill McElroy maybe can tell it to you.

But Bob Peterson did agree to honor some part of that money and the idea of a theater came alive again. And then Sol Price drew Mandell Weiss into it and Weiss gave enough and so now we have a theater.

RINGROSE: Can we assume that if Peterson honored the pledge that some of his money must be in there.

STEWART: Some of Bob Peterson's money must be in there if Peterson really honored the pledge.

RINGROSE: It is this Peterson that Peterson Hall is named after, right?

STEWART: Yes.

RINGROSE: And yet he didn’t give the money for Peterson Hall

STEWART: No, no. He has been the biggest donor to UCSD in its history. Bigger than Mandeville. He’s given a great deal to Scripps.

RINGROSE: I just wondered if perhaps he had put a fair chunk into Mandel Weis but that building had to be named for Mandell Weiss and this is the next art building.

STEWART: No, no. Any money he gave was not given to UCSD. It was a pledge to the Theater and Arts Foundation. It would eventually end up at UCSD, but in all the talk, and Bob wanted to play it down, but in the talk about all the reasons for naming Peterson Hall that contribution was never mentioned. And the reason I know that for sure is that I’m chairman of the names committee and we had to take up in our committee whether we would agree to have that, and it wasn’t an easy thing because he’s a very controversial figure.

Incidentally, I met Bob Peterson at the opening of Peterson Hall, and I pulled him aside, and I said, "Bob, you and I have had our differences, but I just want to tell you how glad I am and how much we appreciate all the things you have done for this campus. I'm sorry we have been on the outs and haven't seen much of one another." And he said, "Aw, forget it. I don't give a damn about it. You know how I am. Just forget it." So, we shook hands and that was that. But, at any rate the collapse of the Langham thing left us having to start all over again as far as our Drama Department was concerned. So, we started looking. Meanwhile, there had been some funny things happening along the way. A group of students had started something called the Anomaly Factory. Was that going when you came here?

RINGROSE: No, I have never heard of it. What about that? When would that have been?

STEWART: They fixed up an old building on the Matthews Campus. It is no longer there. They started their own little drama group. There was a graduate student in physics who was

very interested in drama and who was a wild man with lights and sounds and computers and god-knows what, really a wild man. He started the Anomaly Factory and began doing very far-out things—the newest avant-garde plays, things of Leroi Jones and things they had written themselves. People swarmed to see these things because, among other things, they did so much lightshow stuff with strobe lights and paint that glowed in the dark and just all kinds of things like that.

Then one day John Galbraith called me and said, "Oh, you and your arts people!" I said, "What's wrong?" He said, "I have just had a report that they have got nudity in the show at the Anomaly Factory. I want you to go down there and check on it." (laughter) A guy who worked over in the business office had gone with his wife the night before and was shocked by the fact that there was a nude male in the show.

RINGROSE: This was then what year?

STEWART: About 1967. Things were just getting cranked up among the students here. Well, it was a very satirical show they had written themselves, and I went to see it. And, sure enough, there was one sequence, where a male dancer danced in the nude and his body was covered with paint, luminescent paint that glowed under a special kind of light. But the lights in the place were entirely out and only momentarily, for the briefest second, could you catch the hint that, yes, he might not have any clothes on. That was the extent of the nudity. Meanwhile, one of the features of this thing was that the actors, during this scene when the lights were off, went out into the audience and sort of caressed the various members of the audience to get them in the mood. They had spotted me there and they knew why I was there, and they worked me over! (laughter) It was fantastic. One very attractive girl really worked me over.

Then I was invited to a party afterwards and I went. There was nudity at that one. They got to smoking pot pretty hard, and this one girl in particular, a brilliant math major and Muir student who was incidentally on our search committee for the new head of drama, and she, it was a hot night, decided she had had enough of wearing clothes, and so she took her clothes off, and pretty soon other people began to take their clothes off and about then I decided to leave. The Anomaly Factory was constantly being badgered by the Architects and Engineers office because of the wiring in the place. They were running too much current through and were going to burn everything down. It was a constant bickering back and forth. Meanwhile, the kids who were involved in this were just having a wonderful time. They were some of the brightest kids on campus.

RINGROSE: They weren't doing anything that wasn't going on in New York at that point.

STEWART: Well, this graduate student in physics left without taking his degree. I wish I could remember his name. I think it was Cunningham. Anyway, if you look back through the old newspapers, the Triton Times and so on, you will find plenty about the Anomaly Factory. It was wonderful, one of the most ebullient, creative things that ever hit this campus. They were just a great gang of kids, always in trouble with me. Every time anything would go wrong in the arts. Every time the visual arts department or the music department would make some new

outrageous demand that wasn't justified by the number of students and all that sort of thing, everybody would come to me and say, "You and your arts!"

RINGROSE: They would promptly remember that you were dean!

STEWART: And you know, they still are. At any rate, there we were. We tried to get a guy named Dick Schechner who was one of the founders of the Tulane Drama Review, a brilliant group there, but we couldn't move him. He would have been—. Oh, well. We had all the trouble we could take for that period. He was one of the ones that became very active in demonstrations. He organized a pee-in at the Pentagon. A lot of people went out and peed all over the building. (laughter) That attracted a lot of attention. Dick was quite a guy—still is for that matter. We didn't get him.

There is a man named Monroe Lippman who was teaching at Riverside, and Monroe had been a part of that group. He had been the chair of that department when they organized this brilliant group that became the Tulane Drama Review and then moved to New York and became the Drama Review. He recommended that we go after Arthur Wagner who had been there too, and he was also trying for Arthur. We agreed to follow the University of California rules very strictly which is, when two campuses are going after the same person, they must keep each other informed. The chancellors must keep each other informed. Before we could go after him, our chancellor had to speak to the chancellor there and inform him that we were going to try this. It is not nearly as elaborate as a situation in which you try to recruit somebody from another campus. You have to get written permission to do that. At any rate, Monroe and I played it very straight because we were good friends and we got Arthur.

By the way, Eric had been here all along, and Eric was the acting chair during some of that time and was a member of the search committee, but he really disliked—. I was acting chair for some of the time. I have been acting chair for six different departments during my time here, and once chair of two different departments at once, but he (Eric Christmas) didn't play any significant role in this (being department chairman). He had tried his hand at a little bit of the administration of the department, and found it was an awful chore. When we got Arthur, I was able to pull back. I was the acting chair of Drama for about two years. So, that's the story of the Drama Department.

I would say that we came very close to realizing our vision in respect to the arts during the early stages, and what we have now is as good as it is because of that original vision, though that vision has been very greatly compromised by the graduate programs, which probably, when you realize this was a practical adjustment. If we were going to attract and keep outstanding figures, we were going to have to have more than just undergraduates to work with. For example, there wouldn't be any SONAR group if we didn't have graduate students and depended just on undergraduate performers, for instance. So, that was a compromise that had to be made, like so many others.

Again, I think the vision of these major artists teaching only undergraduates and especially spending a lot of time teaching them how to make the art in order to train their vision or hearing,

when they have so little talent. That was an impossible vision, an impossible ideal, and yet we do have the creation-oriented departments that we have, which I think makes them very distinguished and unusual. There is not anything quite like them to be found anywhere in the country, really. I think it has contributed very much to fine undergraduate programs. They don't fulfill my vision, but, nevertheless, are very fine indeed. And there is—. When Bernard Rands conducts the undergraduate original compositions during the undergraduate arts festival, you get somewhere in the range of my vision, and when he does that just after it has been announced that he won the Pulitzer Prize, there is a lot of the vision there. Some of it works by indirection rather than formal organization, but there is a lot of it there.

Probably there is less of it in the Drama Department than anywhere else, and for a very good reason. The artist works with a canvas. He is in complete control. Some of our composers work with tape. They are in complete control. When they are not in complete control, if they are working with SONAR, they are working with competent performers. Or they may be performers directly themselves and able to do their own thing. But when you take people in drama, they are being measured by the quality of performance, and if they have only undergraduates to work with how are they going to realize the full—? It isn't like having the canvas, where it is up to you. But when you have these kids, you have got such a terrible limitation. So, what they naturally do, is they tend to put an inordinate amount of time—it has been ameliorated in recent years—but an inordinate amount of time and attention on their graduate students and a few gifted undergraduates and neglect the rest.

Until Michael Addison came along, in the latter part of his chairmanship, and began to encourage more undergraduate activities, having now established these other things, I used to get a lot of complaints from undergraduates about how nobody paid any attention to them—the ones that wanted to be in plays and things—they were just slave labor around the place. That is probably exaggerated, but there was a lot of truth in it, and I can remember how, before we had graduate students, the remarkable work that Eric Christmas was able to get out of undergraduates—really extraordinarily good work—so it doesn't mean that they can't do damn good things, but you can understand why a number of other people who aren't quite like Eric and whose directing of plays is going to be reviewed in connection with their files… So, we come back to that problem.

At any rate, I got money from an anonymous donor to fund an undergraduate drama festival that has now grown into an undergraduate arts festival. They have money that brings in about $2,500 a year here, just to put on an undergraduate arts festival and that has changed things a lot. There is much more attention being paid to them and, I think, some of the people they have recruited in recent years are more interested in undergraduates. The drama people have been the least in line with the original conception.

RINGROSE: It is very hard to know to what extent the problem is that these departments are not receptive to undergraduates or whether our undergraduates are becoming so oriented toward professional careers, and they are letting these things slide.

STEWART: Oh, there is plenty of that. You don't see any undergraduates doing anything like the Anomaly Factory.

RINGROSE: No.

STEWART: And our undergraduate literary magazine, things like that, are so tame!

RINGROSE: When you look at the La Jolla Civic/University orchestra, it is a shame how few undergraduates are interested in playing or have the necessary skill.

[END OF PART THREE, BEGIN PART FOUR]

RINGROSE: We should talk about the development of the college structure.

STEWART: Right. I was not brought here to be a provost. There was not a provost, the name wasn't used. There wasn't even a master on the campus. Revelle College had been planned by the CEP (Committee on Educational Policy) in those times, and the chair of the CEP was a man named Ed Goldberg, and they had done a very good job. I remember participating in the final planning of their general education program and getting a requirement for at least one course in the arts included. I don't know how John Galbraith came to have the idea of naming me provost. I met him first when he and Laura invited Ruthie and me to have an informal dinner with them down at their apartment near the La Jolla Beach and Tennis Club. We talked a good deal that evening, and then, shortly afterwards, just before the Thanksgiving vacation, we were at some gathering or other and John asked me if I would be the master of the second college and head its planning. Now, I think I am right about this. I believe he asked me to be master at that affair at their house that night and, well, it was twenty years ago. This was the fall of 1964. I may be mixed up. I may be confusing two things that happened at the same time. Anyway, he asked me, and I said that I wanted the weekend to think about it. Ruthie and I were going to go away for the weekend. So, we went out of town and talked a little bit about it.

We got back and Sunday evening John couldn't even wait for me to get in touch with him. He said, "Well, have you decided yet?" 'No," I said, Í haven't." Well, I guess by the next morning, or within a day or so, I had decided that I would take the job. He was very pleased and said, "Now, the first thing I want you to do is come back in a couple of weeks with a list of the departments for your college." That's how things were done then. Can you imagine? Come back with a list of departments in the college.

So, I took a look at the list of departments that were already existing in Revelle. There were several pledges that had been made. First of all, a pledge had been made to start a psychology department and put it in the second college, in the buildings of the second college. That also meant that you would be affiliated with the second college, and that is a point I want to come back to. It is very important. So, there was a psychology department, and George Mandler had been appointed to be its first chair, or he was shortly after. I think he was appointed during that fall. There was a commitment there. Leonard Newmark was already here and was chair of linguistics, and it was understood that the linguistics department would be situated in the second college, so that was a given.

The mathematics people had succeeded in doing something that no other department had succeeded in doing, that is, no other large department, it didn't matter with small departments. They had gotten a promise that all the mathematicians would be together. That was one of the conditions that Steve Warschawski came under, and he had used that in recruiting others. They argued that mathematics was so special they had to absolutely be able to talk to one another, that they couldn't work unless they could talk to other mathematicians. And so that was a given. It was committed that they would be in the building that they are in now and that building was then in the planning stages, with Bob Mosher. Then there was APIS, what used to be called APIS, the Applied Physics and Information Sciences. Henry Booker had been engaged for that and brought Ken Bowles with him. They were the first two members of that department, and they had been promised a place in the second college. When John asked me to be master of the second college, I had said, 'But what about the arts. I was brought here to start the arts. That's what I want to do." And John said, "Well, that's simple. Just put them in your college." So, there were three more departments.

We started off. My list had eleven departments: APIS, math, linguistics, and psychology. I was going to have to at least house mathematics, and we had agreed that mathematics, since it would serve so many students, would be a department that would have half of its members in Revelle and half of its members in Muir, as far as affiliation was concerned, but all of them would be living in Muir. Then they were going to have visual arts, drama, seven of the departments.

Then, I wanted very much to have a portion of the literature department here. Since we had brought together departments that would normally be separate departments (French, Spanish literature, etc.) on other campuses, there would be plenty of people from literature to make a division—perhaps based on types of literature. In fact, Revelle would have all the people in Spanish, I would have all the people in French. Revelle would have all the people in German, I would have all the people in Italian. We would split the Americans and English. They would take the English; I would take the Americans. So, I would have eight departments.

Then I was very keen on anthropology and sociology and history. I felt that we had to have that. So, we had anthropology, sociology and history. Those were the departments we started out with. I beg your pardon, that doesn't fully account for it. We had biology, or at least a part of it. Anyway, it adds up to eleven. We only had a very small biology department. We didn't realize then that everybody was going to end up in biology. We thought of our sciences as being mainly APIS. For a while there was an effort to get APIS, though housed here, into Revelle. It seemed more appropriate. That didn't go anywhere. I came back to John and said, "Here is my list." He said, "O.K., they will be your departments." Can you imagine doing a thing like that now?

RINGROSE: I can't. No.

STEWART: And so, we announced to the chairmen that it was confirmed, they would be in the second college, and now we were going to go after these various other people. Now, there were two very important features to this. The early plan had emphasized specialization in the

colleges, as it is in Santa Cruz. But the building of Revelle, in order to have a balanced curriculum to offer the first students, had resulted in their assembling a group of departments of all sorts because there wasn't anyone else for them to be affiliated with. It wasn't called Revelle, of course, just the first college, but all of them were affiliated with what came to be called Revelle. I think Revelle was named in 1965. What you had there was a liberal arts college.

When Muir came along, what were we looking for? We were looking for adding the departments that this campus would need to have as an educational institution, and these were going to have to go into the second college. The trick was to assemble them so they could make up another liberal arts college with a different constitution as far as departments were concerned, some overlap in the case of big departments, such as literature, biology and math, but with different specialties among their members. From the beginning, the way things practically worked out, and then it was confirmed in the establishing of Muir, the idea of specialization in the college was dropped and in its place was put the idea of semi-autonomous departments in a liberal arts college whose students, if they wished, could take their entire education within that college, and still have a representation of the various divisions of learning as part of their experience.

RINGROSE: Is what you are telling me that there really wasn't any larger long-range plan beyond starting one college after another every third year, and just simply building a college and letting it develop as needed?

STEWART: Yes. But the idea was that there would be a sufficient balance of the disciplines so that students would take anywhere from two-thirds to three-fourths of their courses within their own college, because they would choose their college on the basis of the department in which they wanted to major. Since all the anthropologists were in Muir, if you wanted to be an anthropology major, you signed up for Muir. If you wanted to major in French, you went to Muir. If you wanted to major in Spanish, you went to Revelle. That was the distinction among the colleges, not the things that distinguish them now. Those came about as secondary effects and turned out to be the things that lasted.

RINGROSE: And you didn't have, then, the massive cross-listing of courses, either.

STEWART: No. It was understood that students in one college could take courses in the other colleges, electives, and then, if they wanted to major, they could transfer. That meant that when we got to designing the general education program of Muir, the departments, the chairmen of the departments that were going to be housed in Muir and totally affiliated with Muir, in the case of the small ones, or the leaders of the Muir group of departments, and such were identified, they were sort of sub-chairs, and they took a tremendous interest in the general education program because that was where all their majors were going to be, and they worked very closely with the provost.

The chancellor’s cabinet, the main administrative decision makers, consisted of the two provosts, the chancellor, the head of the medical school, the head of Scripps, who played a very small role in this, very small. It wasn't until Bill Nierenberg moved in and turned it into a big job that it became significant in the affairs of the upper campus. Scripps is off by itself and does its

own thing. The vice chancellor of academic affairs job was so comparatively insignificant that Bill McGill appointed Sol Penner as his vice chancellor as a half-time job because the chancellor handled much of what the vice chancellor does with regard to academic appointments. Bob Biron, we talked of him before and of that curious anomaly of my being put up for chancellor, was a vice chancellor, but he saw himself as simply there to carry out the chancellor's policies, and he did not participate. He just said, we can pay for it, or we can't.

Policies were made mainly by the chancellor, the two provosts and the head of the medical school. The provost's job was a very high-ranking job, and the vice chancellor for academic affairs was a kind of executive job. Bob Tschirgi was there to see that the decisions John made were, with the help of the provosts, carried out. The vice chancellor for academic affairs job became significant when Paul Saltman became vice chancellor, and it came about as a result of two things, well, a number of things. One, we were bigger. Bill McElroy did not want to be nearly so involved in these things as Bill McGill had been forced to be because of the activism on the campus, and Paul was so ambitious. He just grabbed all the power he could and concentrated it on himself, and Bill McElroy, as he later regretted when they came into conflict with one another, allowed this to happen. He saw it as relieving him of a lot of chores he wasn't interested in performing. Paul Saltman built that job up into a most powerful thing the second most powerful job on the campus. It wasn't that way at the outset. With that, the provosts' positions inevitably became greatly diminished. But one of the things that led to the most powerful job on the campus. It wasn't that way at the outset. With that, the provosts' positions inevitably became greatly diminished. But one of the things that led to the diminution of the provosts' role was the direct result of the radical change in the college. system that came about as the result of the establishment of Third College.

RINGROSE: I had expected that.

STEWART: It happened this way. It might have happened whether Third had taken the political and social bent that it took or not. It could very well have happened under Armin (Armin Rappaport) even if it had been a conventional college. It probably would have. Here is what happened. When Third College's second curriculum was adopted, it was obvious that they were going to have to have a lot of people who were in sociology, anthropology, and certain aspects of history to teach it, and literature, too, but especially those first three that I mentioned. There wasn’t the head count on the campus, during what had now become very lean days to justify the growth of sociology and anthropology while still leaving in place the number of people that were planned for the place and for which we had the office space in the tower here and all those things. We couldn't add more social scientists over there. We simply didn't have the FTE.

So, they said, alright, send us over some of your people; Joyce Justus, for example, who was early on affiliated with Third College because of her interests, being black and all these other things that naturally tend to draw her to that college. The talk was of sending two, three, perhaps four anthropologists, for it was only a department of 13, to Third. Well, of course, as soon as they heard, the idea of leaving their colleagues, and giving up their quarters—. This building was just finished however badly, as a building, compared to living in a tent or

something. They said, "No way!", they aren't going to do that, and the sociologists said much the same thing.

So, then the compromise was reached. You live in Muir, but you are affiliated with Third and participate in all the activities of Third College. When that happened, Paul (Saltman) was still provost of Revelle. He said, "By golly, if Third College can have sociologists, I have got to have sociologists." And that is where it all began. Pretty soon, over a period of about three years, the identification of a department, or a large section of a department with a college where it lived and where it taught its majors and with whose provost it worked very, very closely on appointments, all sorts of things having to do with its own undergraduate programs—not the graduate programs, that never was part of it—all that gave way to the departments being, for the undergraduates what they had been for the graduate students, campus wide, perhaps living in one place, but with affiliations all over the place. That, then, did many things to the colleges. First of all, it diminished the provost's role and greatly enhanced the role of the chairs, as a consequence.

RINGROSE: It must have brought about the creation of the council of provosts, because you would all have to deal with these chairs as a group.

STEWART: Right. It gave us more clout. That really began with Paul (Saltman). We began it by just having weekly conferences when there were only two of us. The reduction of the provost's role and growth in the vice chancellor's role would probably have come about anyway as we grew. The vice chancellor was now the place where these things were concentrated. It also meant that the faculty ceased to take anything like the interest in the undergraduates that it used to take. That was also likely to come about as we recruited people who had not participated in the designing of these colleges and did not feel any particular interest in them.

RINGROSE: The scattering effect has also created that more than anything else, too.

STEWART: Yes. They cease to have any sense of belonging. It really undermined the community of the colleges, which was very strong at the outset. I mean Mel [Melford] Spiro felt he was a member of Muir College for good or ill, but, by God, that was his college, and he was going to see to it that this place was run right. Revelle is all right, but Muir is our college. All the anthropologists in the early days felt that way, as did the sociologists and a large segment of the history department.

Then another thing that undermined the colleges was that we had set out to build this campus, to have sixty-five percent of the students housed on the campus, and we were going to have 1700 undergraduates and 800 graduate students. Well, we never got the graduate students and just at the time we were seeking to justify building more housing on the campus two things happened: costs skyrocketed, and students stopped wanting to live on campus. It became the thing everywhere across the country to live off campus to have more independence. You could s till get cheap housing and gas was cheap. We were worried desperately about filling the space we had, and we couldn't get the money to build any more, and there we were. So, we now house roughly 33 or 34 percent of our undergraduates on the campus, and while we are

building more housing, we are barely managing to keep pace with that percentage by building more housing. We aren't increasing the percentage. So, you see, we have become primarily a commuter college and most of the students in our residence halls are freshmen. Our apartments are upperclassmen, men and women, but the residence halls are mostly freshmen, whereas originally, they were a good mix.

That, too, cuts down on community because after the freshman year they leave the campus though some of them remain very closely involved with it. I would say that so much of what we hoped to realize here by having something of the ambience of a small liberal arts college planted within the body of a university has been lost through these things. And yet, we could not have done it otherwise. We could not afford to keep that going. I participated in all these decisions, and while I hated to see them made, I could see that there was no alternative, absolutely no alternative at all.

And so, what does that leave for the provosts to do? That is, a provost who hasn't started the college. I had plenty to do starting the place, but one who comes in after that. Well, there is the matter of maintaining the quality of the undergraduate education. There is the constantly challenging job of keeping vital and viable the general education program by keeping up an element of innovation and creativity that keeps the faculty involved. The only way you can keep the faculty interested in the colleges now is through something that bears on academic life. They are not interested. They don't live close enough to the campus to participate in the life of the college, let alone have a faculty club. But you can keep them interested, especially the younger ones, who didn't come into this when all these other changes were taking place, if you can get them interested in the general education program of the college as a place where there can be innovation, where "now we can do things right." That is something you can do through the college system, whereas it would be very hard to do in a monolithic system. You can keep the general education program lively and interesting, and I think that the college system, under the leadership of the provosts, has helped maintain a high level of undergraduate instruction on this campus. That is a very, very valuable asset.

Consider the fact that you can have various styles of education within the college system. This challenges your priority of values by constantly raising questions about the nature of undergraduate education. We can't be complacent and sit back about this, because just as soon as you start something in one college another comes up with a great idea and suddenly you ask, "Shouldn't we be doing that too?" There is a good rivalry among the colleges in that respect. Muir's special project type of individualized study substituted for an ordinary major has been taken up by two of the other colleges, and the third one will soon probably also be embracing it because it was such a good idea to respond to the strongly self-motivated and creative young people, we have in our student body and accommodate them.

The provost has an opportunity, through different mechanisms, in the different colleges, for me it is through the Muir Interdisciplinary Studies Program, to be constantly generating new interdisciplinary courses which serve new needs of the undergraduates and new needs for American society. Some of these come and stay for a while and then go. Others, like the Wilderness and Human Values course—the title is misleading because it embraces far more

than that—what it really does is use the debates that are constantly going on in our society over the role of the natural world and the wilderness. It really is a course in which students examine, they work in the history of ideas, looking at where our conflicting values come from. It considers two views of nature: Mother Nature who binds up your wounds and soothes you and Nature the wild animal that must be tamed with four-wheeled drive vehicles and macho images and all that sort of thing. We entertain these ideas. When we go backpacking, we are exploring both contradictory values. We want the challenge of overcoming nature and then we also want to be out there in a benign place, away from the rush and noise of the city.

RINGROSE: There is also the advantage that these kinds of programs are very flexible. They can come and they can go. If you get locked into these kinds of offerings in the context of formal departments, you can end up with lots of programs and people that are outdated, yet under the UC system you are going to have them forever.

STEWART: That's right. And these people have a vested interest in keeping these programs alive. We have had lots of different courses in the Muir Interdisciplinary Programs, especially in the Contemporary Issues category, that have come and gone over the years. Other things have been started there and have grown into things absorbed by the departments, though originally planted in the Muir Program. In some cases, this was because the department didn't exist, in other cases a department wasn't large enough to take them on. So, there is another great resource. Having four places where you can do this, and four people who are looking at it is a tremendous asset to the campus. Then, for many of the students, the college really does mean something, especially because we are able to give such individualized attention to their academic counseling, their programs, keep an eye on their progress.

RINGROSE: It must be reassuring for parents. Speaking as a parent with a son about to go to college, I think that having to launch a child into what would be a total university context without the college focus would be very disturbing for a parent.

STEWART: You might want to talk to some of the Muir parents, but I judge from the correspondence I get, and from what they say when they come back to the campus, that my newsletters to them are very, very important things for them. I make a special point of writing about the kinds of things on the campus that the students are not likely to tell them much about or will give them only partial information about—not like you read in the paper. They find it very, very interesting and valuable. There is just all manner of things that the provost's office does.

RINGROSE: You are accessible in a way that the chancellor just can't be.

STEWART: That's right. They can pick up the phone and call me. They know me. They have met me. Then, a very important thing is being highly visible to the students on a number of occasions. You don't have to be on the campus all the time. I don't like to eat lunch, though I realize that I ought to eat lunch over in the cafeteria more, but I practically never do. I like to eat a very light lunch and to use the time to go on working because time is so very hard to come by around here, especially time you can call your own, although more and more committee meetings take place during the noon hour now. But being visible to the students has a lot to do

with their attitude toward me. For example, playing in this jazz group called the Mouldy Figs with Jimmy Cheatham and his wife is very important. The kids remember that. It is interesting. After one of those concerts has taken place there is a period when a lot of students come in to see me because they want to say, in one way or another, "you know, I have wanted to come in and talk to you for a long time, but I was scared. But I figure anybody who will get out there and play jazz for us that way must be somebody I can talk to, so, here I am." It is very important. Different provosts do it in different ways, but it is very important.

RINGROSE: Do you still play in the jazz band with the students?

STEWART: Yes.

RINGROSE: I thought so. Did you play the Brant piece last spring? That was the crazy concert with the two orchestras, jazz bands and choruses.

STEWART: No. This year I only played in the final concert. I was too busy. I play a couple of concerts a year out on the plaza here, and then for five years I played in the big band for all its concerts, but this past year I just couldn't. I probably won't during the coming year, either, though I will get in on the last concert.

RINGROSE: You're right. It's important.

STEWART: Oh Lord, yes, and the things that I learn when I am out backpacking with them. I go on a couple of trips during the year with the ones I am training for the wilderness class, and then I go out with part of the class at the end. And the things that I learn from the students then are just amazing, the way they act in such a totally different environment. When you are out in a situation where everybody is totally dependent on everybody else, you are all equal. I may know a little bit more about some things than they do, but, on the other hand, they are stronger than I am, so it all balances out. We have to function as a team. Our survival isn't a stake. We aren't in that kind of country, but things would be very, very hard if we didn't operate as a smoothly integrated team. We quickly fall into that, and we quickly figure out whose skills are what, and it all balances out and we are all colleagues, and then they talk. They open up about their anxieties, their attitudes about the institution, and it is just amazing. That's important too.

We have talked about the Vice Chancellor's job and how that has changed. The coming of the Vice Chancellor for Student Affairs, as the office was called under George Murphy, was fairly critical. Of course, originally, he was called Dean of Students. He was not called Vice Chancellor. He was also called Dean of Undergraduates since each college had a college dean. It was not such an eminent job as several people tried to make it, or that chancellors who were not very friendly to the college system tried to make it in order to diminish the role of the college. George was brought in because there were all kinds of campus-wide activities, particularly of the negative sort demonstrations and all that kind of thing—that he could handle so well, and then he began to build the job. He did this at the expense of the college deans.

Now, Joe Watson, (current Vice Chancellor for Undergraduate Affairs) having been a provost, and having experienced this from the other side, is trying very hard to protect the power of the

provosts and not to encroach on it and to find things that he does campus-wide in a cooperative way with us. One of the things that he did was, while the deans are paid out of registration fee money that he controls, he has them reporting entirely to the provost except on certain things where he wants them to consult with him for his own benefit, for his information. It is known that if a campus-wide situation arises where he needs them, he has the right to claim them at once, but in the day-to-day operation, they belong, now, totally to the colleges. That was something that George Murphy did not want to have happen. He tried very, very hard to limit the role of the deans within the colleges and the extent to which they were affiliated with the colleges.

RINGROSE: I sensed, when we first came here and George Murphy was still here, that, where these deaning positions were concerned, there was a lot of pulling and hauling between his office and the college offices. There seemed to be problems over what the dean's affiliation was, who he worked for, and a certain amount of unhappiness.

STEWART: Yes. There was. There was indeed and, of course, all this was exacerbated by the pressures these people were under with campus activism. It was just ferocious. the pressures they lived under, which made it more and more—. You know, they were just tired and irritable as a result of doing business that way day after day after day. I think we have worked out a very comfortable arrangement now, but it depends a great deal on the personalities. We have got a good mix of people, a very good mix, but I'll tell you the provosts—.

Now, the department chairs tend to find the provosts an irritant, and I can understand that. If I were a department chair, I would probably feel the same way. They (the provosts) are constantly nagging you, calling you up and telling you that so and so is doing a wretched job teaching or demanding a conference with you to tell you about reports about some outrageous thing—and some outrageous things happen on this campus now and then in undergraduate instruction. You wouldn't believe that an institution like this would allow such things to happen.

RINGROSE: I have a classroom next door to my office, and I know exactly what you are talking about.

STEWART: I mean you cannot believe what goes on.

RINGROSE: There are days when I chain myself into my chair just so I don't go in there and punch somebody in the nose! (laughter)

STEWART: Some of these things get back to us, and we (the Council of Provosts) take them up with the department chair. Sometimes they are really bad, and we want immediate drastic action and so we take them up as a council. Other times we will talk it all over, share information, then say, "You handle this one. You know him better than we do." We divide up the chores. And then there is the matter of the fact that it is so easy to document the research accomplishments of the faculty, but difficult to gather information about teaching effectiveness since faculty members will not go out and gather the information, they are all scared to, in fact they are scared to gather information in this regard since they are worried about their own situation.

RINGROSE: On this campus, especially for younger people, good teaching is not rewarded and if you are a new faculty person and you are under the gun to produce in a matter of, say, two or three years, in a very tight market, and you have any brains, you are going to put your chips on doing just as much research as you possibly can, even if you don't write very good lectures at first.

STEWART: That is absolutely right. And yet, more and more, and this has especially been the case since Harold (Harold Ticho, Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs) came in, but over the years it has been somewhat this way, that people would submit a file with very little information about teaching. Now, under Harold, back will come the file and who sent it back? The provosts. They know damn well that it isn't the CAP acting on that, demanding more information about teaching effectiveness. We are getting solid backing from Harold these days on this. We do hold up promotions and merit increases and things like that on the grounds that either there isn't enough teaching evidence or that the person isn't a good enough teacher.

RINGROSE: When did the CAPE evaluations start? That was going on when we came.

STEWART: Oh, I don't know.

RINGROSE: The faculty complain about it, but I think it is a marvelous idea. It is good to have good teaching documented.

STEWART: Well, it is really funny. I, of course, read all the files on the Muir faculty, and department chairs will tell you that CAPES are just worthless, because how can undergraduates presume to evaluate an expert who has been evaluated by his fellow experts. That is when the CAPE reports are negative. When the CAPE reports are positive, "Oh, my this is a marvelous teacher as borne out by the enclosed CAPE evaluations you can see that the students, etc." It all depends on what the students say about the faculty member. If they have negative things to say, then, of course, the chairs try to down-play it. I agree with you. I think they are very, very valuable.

RINGROSE: It is also interesting that, as far as I can tell, we do almost nothing to help our junior faculty become better teachers, and very little for our graduate students. Where secondary teachers are concerned, you put a lot of time and thought into helping them to be better teachers, but there just isn't much of that that I see going on here.

STEWART: No. There is very little. You know, at Dartmouth, the only way you could stay, and I was told when I arrived that they only kept one in five, was if you were an excellent teacher. They said that they would visit your classroom and look over your lecture notes and study your examination questions to see how well phrased they were and whether they were good questions, study the comments on the papers you graded to see that they were helpful to students. and they did. After I got tenure, I said that this was a brutal and inefficient system. I said, "Why don't we train our new young people, most of whom have just come out of graduate school, where, though they have been teaching assistants, they still haven't done the kinds of things we are asking them to do?" So, they organized what they called a mentor system. Each

new faculty member was given a tenured person who was known to be a very good teacher as his, well, it was his in those days because Dartmouth hadn't gone co-ed yet, his mentor. This was a person who was your friend. You could be scared to death about something, and you didn't have to cover up or hide it from him. You went and talked to this person. When this person visited your classroom, it was so that after class you could sit down, as buddies, and talk about how to improve things, because this person was never going to participate in evaluating your work.

RINGROSE: That is an excellent idea.

STEWART: Maybe after you got tenure, he might evaluate your work, but not as long as you were in that mentor relationship. Boy, did it work. It worked like a charm. And when the mentor said, "Now you can come in and observe," then the others could come in. Obviously, if it didn't come soon then they would know that something was seriously wrong. We need something like that here. We desperately need it here.

Well, what about my coming here to be a provost. I was the first provost. After I was appointed, they asked Ed Goldberg to be provost of Revelle. He lasted only a year because he really didn't like it, so he went back to Scripps where he was happy. I did not come here to be provost, and I, to this day, do not know why John Galbraith did ask me. At the time he asked me I believe I am right in saying—I know I am right in saying—I was the only person on the entire faculty who had ever taught in a liberal arts college, and yet that was what we were trying to call ourselves. The next person who arrived here who had ever had that experience was Gabe Jackson.

RINGROSE: But you had also had a lot of administrative experience at Dartmouth.

STEWART: Yes, but within a narrow range, and just with the arts.

RINGROSE: But perhaps more than anybody else around.

STEWART: Well, maybe. Also, I had done all that planning. I was turning out whole curricula for the music department, so, you might ask John (Galbraith) why he made that choice. It was really fascinating. I would sit in on cabinet meetings and things like that and just have to tell people, "It just isn't like that. Undergraduates are not like that." Very few of the original people here had taught undergraduates in recent years, and some of them had never taught. undergraduates, and some had been brought with the promise that they would never have to teach undergraduates.

RINGROSE: I have found that interesting. Bill McGill confessed to me that when he came here it was with the promise that he would never have to teach undergraduates. That is why he does penance teaching undergraduates now, every year.

STEWART: And he does it so well. That is another reason for the comparative neglect—. There are so many of those things, you can't put them into words. You have got to have lived in that world. There is a certain feel for how things are in that world, for how undergraduates feel about things and how they perceive their experience, that you get—. With me it goes back to my

childhood because my father started as a minister and then left the ministry to become a professor of religion at a small liberal arts college.

RINGROSE: Where was that?

STEWART: Denison, in Granville, Ohio. So, I grew up in that kind of world and delivered papers to the other faculty members and knew them all from the time I was a little boy, and then one of his brothers was a professor at Bucknell, another became, after having been in the ministry for many years, a professor and dean at McMaster University, which is really a small college, although it has some graduate work, in Hamilton Ontario, and yet another one had a college affiliation that I don't know too much about. At any rate, it was just all a part of the world I lived in all my life. I went to that kind of school. I had the experience of Ohio State as a graduate student and UCLA on my first job and then fifteen years at Dartmouth. Among other things I am very much aware of how distant our college system is from what we thought of, and yet, I would insist that, like the compromises that were made in the original vision of the arts, what we have here, because we set out with these visions, is something very superior and it is what we can afford. I am very proud of it. I wish there were others. I wish we could have afforded the other things. In fact, now, I didn't come here because I was attracted by the idea of a college system. That was a real plus. I came because of the arts. But then, after I got here and became so involved in the college system, well, for many years since the arts have been well launched it (the college system) has been paramount in my concerns.

Looking back now. I think that if I were at another school like Dartmouth and were asked to come, not to start the arts but to be a provost here and we are no longer looking for provosts on a nationwide basis, I wouldn't take the job. This is not my world. I am very happy here; I am happy living in San Diego. I am very happy about the arts. I am very happy about Muir and I know I will spend the rest of my life here, but, if I were in mid-stream, or in the early stages of my career, this is not the kind of institution I would want to be associated with. Undergraduate education doesn't count for enough here, and that's my life. It always has been. I think that is why I have been a good provost. But they wouldn't have been able to recruit me if I had known what kind of a job it was going to end up being. But it wasn't that way for the first ten years.

RINGROSE: I can see that. When you look at the accounts of how things were. Of course, David and I measure this sort of thing by what it was like at Carleton when we were there and even at Rutgers, because old Rutgers College still had a strong entity, there was a lot of the kind of close atmosphere we are talking about. There are a lot of things we miss. It goes both ways. I can remember when we first arrived here Lea Rudee (then provost of Warren College) asked each faculty family to entertain a group of students at home. We said, fine, and got out the beer and pizza and invited our list of students, and none of them came. (laughter)

STEWART: I know. Isn't it awful? They are just terrible.

RINGROSE: I was just, well, stopped by this and I started looking into it, and indeed it was because many of them lived very far away from where we lived. I think it would have been better

had we lived right on the campus. I think that the scattering of the faculty has created real problems in this regard.

STEWART: Yes. That has had a lot to do with it.

RINGROSE: As a faculty wife I spent much more time on the Rutgers campus because there were facilities for faculty and wives and children were welcome. You did things on campus and saw students and did things with students in that context. There is nothing on this campus to attract wives and children to the campus unless. as I do, they work on the campus.

STEWART: Ruthie plays tennis over here. But that is just about all. But, in the early days, when we were recruiting, she was much more involved.

RINGROSE: But again, she lived close. The families that live far from the campus—.

STEWART: But there is one other thing. I should modify what I said. I wouldn't have been recruited to this institution, and yet that is because I was thinking of professional concerns, and yet when I meet some of my friends from Dartmouth and compare the way I live with theirs, there is no doubt about it, to just lay it on the line, I am far, far more alive at my age than they are. They are worn out, tired people living in a small town where not much happens.

RINGROSE: The other thing is that I can talk about Rutgers College, but when I talk to friends who are still there, much of all that caring about students is gone. It is developing in many ways as UCSD has in response to a different kind of student body, to different faculty, to a much more mobile society.

STEWART: These are changes that are taking place in American society. It isn't just here.

RINGROSE: Students look at education very differently from the way we did. I suspect there are very few bastions of liberal education, of the kind we are talking about, left.

STEWART: There are some: Williams, Swarthmore, and some of the better women's schools. Well, let's see how I have covered your questions. You wondered about the environmental thing (how did Muir College get its environmental orientation). It is simple enough. Ruthie and I were hiking on the John Muir Trail about the time we were thinking about a name for the college, and I don't know which one of us said it first, "Let's name it after John Muir." We didn't realize then that so many things in California are named after John Muir. We came back and tried it out on John Galbraith, and he said, "Fine, we will call it John Muir." And I said, "You realize we are going to have to consult the faculty." And he said, 'Well, you can take care of that, can't you?" So, we did.

[END OF PART FOUR, BEGIN PART FIVE]

RINGROSE: Let's get back to the naming of second college.

STEWART: We were thrashing around about what to name it. Ruthie and I were hiking on the John Muir Trail, not far from the Tuolumne Meadows, up in Yosemite and one or the other of us suggested this. It grew out of that. Ruth has always been interested in the out-of-doors. Her father was the president of the Appalachian Mountain Club for many years, and I have always been interested in spending a lot of time in the outdoors in Canada, and so that was one of the things that brought us together. We remembered that Muir had been interested in arts and letters, and, for his time, was a pretty good scientist, and just a very interesting human being and a California figure. There were lots of reasons that seemed to make sense. Then, when it came to naming the residence halls, since they were going to be so tall, (laughter) we named them after a couple of sites in Yosemite—Tioga after Tioga Pass, Tenaya after Lake Tenaya on the mountain beside it.

RINGROSE: So, this all happened before the environmental movement became a big thing in the sixties. I think that is interesting.

STEWART: Well, I think it was beginning to be, but the choice was a direct reflection of personal taste. Then Muir got to be more identified with the college because of the establishment of the Wilderness and Human Values class. It was first called the Wilderness and Modern Man or something like that. The class grew out of a conference with a student in 1971. We were sitting in the rathskeller over here, my mother-in-law, who was a great mountaineer, and I and a student named Jeff Unsicker and Jeff said, "I can't figure out why a college named after John Muir doesn't have any courses about the out-of-doors," and my mother-in-law fixed me with her beady eye and said, "Yes, John, why don't you have any courses on the out-of-doors?" And they teased me, but they were pretty serious and so I turned to Jeff and said, "If you can get me some students who will help me organize it, I will organize it." So, we got four faculty members, Don Wesling, Lola Ross, who was then the head of our contemporary issues program, and a man who was a member of the biology department and is no longer here. We were the faculty contingent, and we got ten students and they got academic credit for this. It was a 196 course, a group study thing, and we put the course together. It has been a very popular course from the very beginning. What I find so interesting and it continues to astonish successive waves of the CEP, is that it is a very intellectually challenging course. The students often say things like, 'This is the first course that ever made me think." (laughter) What they really mean is it is the first course in which they have been challenged to take abstract ideas from a book and put them in action in their own lives.

RINGROSE: With no ready answers in the book, and that is what they need.

STEWART: So, that is our environmental thing. You asked me to discuss the best size for an undergraduate college. I would say 1500. I would say for our colleges the outside limits should probably be about 2200.

RINGROSE: How large is Muir College now?

STEWART: We are at 3400, just double what we planned Muir to be. That is why we have so many small classrooms.

You asked whether it is possible to have a high-level research faculty and also a faculty that is tuned in to undergraduate needs. It is very, very difficult, especially on a campus that puts such a high premium on research, but it is not impossible. You are never going to have a faculty at a place like this that is 100% interested in undergraduates. What you are going to have are people who are distinguished in research and turn out to have a real flair for undergraduate teaching and have a great interest in young people of that age. They set the standards, and there isn't a faculty member on this campus who doesn't want to do well and who wouldn't like to be thought highly of by the undergraduates. They may put their efforts elsewhere because they know that is where the goodies come from. They may even treat the students with indifference, or even downright hostility, because the students are keeping them from their research, but nonetheless, when they are standing up in front of a classroom, they would like to have those young people think highly of them and like them. So, they tend to follow the example of the people who are respected that way. I think that with outstanding teacher awards, with the kind of prizes that are given, with the letters of commendation that provosts write—I hope the others do, I certainly do, I faithfully write faculty members when I hear something encouraging about them from an undergraduate or when they get an advancement of any kind. With that kind of thing constantly there, you are going to keep a lot of emphasis on undergraduate education, and you are going to get quality undergraduate education that is superior to what would normally be expected in a research-oriented public university. It isn't going to be as good as it is at a school like Dartmouth which tells. you flatly when you arrive that the only way you are going to stay here is on the quality of your teaching, it isn't going to be like that.

On the other hand, my daughter went to Swarthmore, my older daughter, and she made a very shrewd observation once. Swarthmore had a reputation for a long time for being the best undergraduate institution in the country. One of the things that attracted Clark Kerr to the college system here was his recollections of his undergraduate days at Swarthmore. "But," Leslie said, "Swarthmore is wonderful in the humanities." And she was a member of one of four string quartets on the campus, with an undergraduate student body of 1200, there were four string quartets, she just barely got into one. I remember hearing the orchestra there and it didn't have faculty in it. It was all undergraduates and they played Stravinsky's *Symphony of the Psalms* and the Berg violin concerto. They had a visitor for that, for the violin solo. Can you imagine that? Undergraduates! The Berg violin concerto! Well, they are wonderful in the arts and wonderful in the humanities. "But," Leslie said, "Always remember, Dad, in our biology class the professors are telling us what the professors at UCSD are doing."

RINGROSE: That's right.

STEWART: And these fine small schools simply cannot support science faculties of the quality of ours because they haven't got the labs, they haven't got the facilities. If they are old enough to have a fine library, they will have fine people in the humanities program, and they have to be pretty old for that. So, there again, maybe they (the UCSD science faculty) don't have all the blandishments and skills and charisma, but what they are saying is that the subject matter is the latest, the best that they know of. We must always keep that in mind when we talk about the "good teaching" that goes on in a place like this.

RINGROSE: Are there any places that have succeeded in developing both a fine research university and quality undergraduate institution? One thinks, perhaps, of Stanford or Yale in this regard.

STEWART: The place that I know that has managed to do both without dividing the faculty the way they did at Chicago, the place that comes nearest to that ideal, is Princeton. I think they really have it there in many departments. I also know people there, who are lousy undergraduate teachers. Also, some of the women's colleges, like Smith, have some very distinguished scholars on the faculty, very distinguished people, and do a bang-up job of undergraduate teaching. That is because, I think, so many of their teachers are women. They just care more about their students, take more human interest in them.

RINGROSE: Well, it was long one of the few places where an intellectual woman could teach and so places like Smith got the cream of the crop.

STEWART: Wellesley was that way, too. Now, another question you asked was what sort of a person ought to be a provost. Somebody just like me. (laughter) In the sense of somebody who comes out of the undergraduate world and the liberal arts college but is enough of a scholar to be respected as a scholar on our campus and those people are extremely rare.

RINGROSE: You are right. The other thing that strikes me about you in the course of our conversation this morning is that you are what one of my friends once referred to as a polyphasic person. You have a good deal of intellectual depth in a number of very different areas, and you realize, intellectually, what a kick that is (laughter) and you would like to see young people have that background also. I think you have to have experienced that yourself to understand how important it is to you as a person as you mature and grow. That is really what all this is all about.

STEWART: Yes. Take that happenstance of my knowing quite a bit about electrical engineering. That was a lucky break.

RINGROSE: It broadens you and spills over into the other parts of your life. I think all of us who have dabbled in a lot of things hope, ultimately, to try and integrate the various things we do.

STEWART: And a college is one place you can do that, especially in the provost's job. Well, the danger is that, in a job like this, especially when it no longer involves actually starting a college, you will get people who are failures, not failures exactly, but whose careers are not as rewarding as they dreamed of their being as scholars.

RINGROSE: Or you get people who have three kids in college and need the additional income. You see that frequently where these kinds of jobs are concerned. They don't really want the administrative part of it, but there aren't many ways that you can move ahead, financially.

STEWART: In all three instances of my getting involved in administration—the Hopkins Center, in coming here to start the arts, and then in becoming provost, every one of those instances involved a chance to start something. People were saying, "Put your ideas to work for us." That is amazing, but I don't know. I have given a lot of thought to this. It is going to be very, very hard to find provosts. I am afraid it may decline into a kind of super-chairmanship, where people take it on for maybe five years from our faculty. I think two things. First, it is going to be very, very hard to attract our best people to do that, because they aren't going to want to give up doing what they are doing now, so well, and they wouldn't be here if they weren't doing what they do well. So, I'm afraid that we may get mediocre people in the job. Second, whether they are good or mediocre, if they know they are going back to the faculty, you see, it is no longer a career job as it was. I was appointed to this as a career job, and as long as I was doing a satisfactory job or, unless I moved up or on to something else, I was in. So, I wasn't constantly worried about keeping up publication because eventually I was going to go back to the faculty and would have lost time. I do it (research) when I have time to because I love it. But I don't have to do it. But the man or woman who is going back to being a faculty member is going to see other people of his or her generation in that department moving ahead of him in rank because, you see, as a provost, you can go up one step, but you can't go up a promotion. That, by the way, wasn't true in my case. I went up three steps, because, originally, that (the one step only rule) was not enforced. So, you see it is going to be very, very hard to attract people out of our own group. Nationally, looking for people like me with a respectable scholarly background and that undergraduate experience that I think is so critically important will be even more difficult because there are damned few of them.

RINGROSE: It also must be difficult when you have provosts who don't live right on top of the campus. I finally met Provost Bond (the acting provost of Revelle college) the other day, and he made the comment that he lives in Encinitas, and I remember thinking, how do you deal with this job? It is an all day, all night, weekend on-call kind of job, isn't it?

STEWART: Well, it used to be. It is not so much now. When you have got a staff as good as my staff, you don't have to be around for these things on the weekends. I used to have to come over to the campus a lot during the period of student activism. On weekends and other times, I would get calls and have to come over and deal with something, but not now. It is nice to be so close, it is nice to be seen constantly by the students, walking home. Any time I walk home when school is in session I must stop and talk with half a dozen students just casually on the way. They greet me and we stop and chat, for a few minutes. Then I go on and somebody else greets me, or calls out the window at me, or whatever. That is nice, a real plus. They all know where I live, and that I am there, and if I were needed, I would be here in a couple of minutes. It is like that lifesaver on the wall. Knowing it is there is what is important, whether you ever use it or not.

RINGROSE: We are going to have to get you to your one o'clock appointment. You will end up without any lunch at all at this rate!

STEWART: I think we have covered practically all of the really critically important things, but I am always glad to talk about it some more. After you have talked to a lot of other people, you may want to come back and have me fill in some blanks.

RINGROSE: I would appreciate that. I'm trying to keep a door open for myself for a few minutes later on. I want to thank you. This has been marvelous.

STEWART: You know, we have been at it for nearly four hours!

RINGROSE: I know. (laughter)

[END OF PART FIVE, END OF INTERVIEW]

Questions for John Stewart:

1. John Stewart came in 1964. So did Herbert Marcuse.
2. First undergraduates admitted in 1964.
3. Who recruited Stewart and how? What did he expect to find here?
4. How much autonomy was promised him? Was he given a coherent structure for the administration of the colleges?
5. 1965 - a student named Martin Roysher from Berkeley gave a talk to a packed house at UCSD in which he said that attendance at UC was a right, not a privilege and that students and faculty, not administrators must run the university.
6. Fights with San Diego Union have begun; issue of the use of state facilities for "political purposes." Did this shape the colleges?
7. Jan Dieperslot.
8. Resignation of Galbraith and Biron.
9. Co-habitation in the dorms
10. 1966 - James Arnolds remark "Good students can handle this curriculum, but they had better be male."
11. 1967 - the budget crunch
12. Kerr fired.
13. 1967 - Construction started on Muir College.
14. Drug raid on college dormitories.
15. Colleges create new aid packages for the disadvantaged.
16. What is the role of the provost?
17. Is there tension between the provosts and departments?
18. What effect did the hiring of George Murphy (66/67) have on the structure?
19. How did university hope to get over "bigness" problem?
20. What about the faculty? How receptive were/are they to the needs of undergraduates?

21. Do you think that it is possible to have a high-level research faculty and also a faculty that is tuned in to undergraduate needs?

22. How much did the provost's have to say about the quality of teaching of the faculty?

23. Why was the Muir college "environment" orientation selected?

24. In what ways did the development of the VC Academic Affairs and the VC Undergraduate Affairs effect the position of the provost?

25. What is the best size for an undergraduate college?

26. What sort of person ought to be a provost?

27. What was the impact of Third College? Its planning was very different from that of the first two colleges—or was it. Did it change the college pattern?

28. UCSD is no longer a residential college. Does this make any difference?