

UC Santa Cruz

Institutional History of UCSC

Title

Dean E. McHenry: Volume II, The University of California, Santa Cruz: Its Origins, Architecture, Academic Planing, and Early Faculty Appointments, 1958-1968

Permalink

<https://escholarship.org/uc/item/3ws3p49b>

Authors

McHenry, Dean E
Regional History Project, UC Santa Cruz Library

Publication Date

1974

Supplemental Material

<https://escholarship.org/uc/item/3ws3p49b#supplemental>

University of California, Santa Cruz

Dean E. McHenry Library

DEAN E. MCHENRY

VOLUME II

THE UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA, SANTA CRUZ:
ITS ORIGINS, ARCHITECTURE, ACADEMIC
PLANNING AND EARLY FACULTY APPOINTMENTS
1958-1968

Interviewed and Edited by
Elizabeth Spedding Calciano

Santa Cruz
1974



Chancellor Dean E. McHenry
Seated at a desk on the UCSC campus meadows
March 2, 1962

All uses of this manuscript are covered by an agreement between the Regents of the University of California and Dean E. McHenry, dated February 20, 1971. The manuscript is thereby made available for research purposes upon his death unless he gives written permission to the Office of the University Librarian and/or the Office of the Regional History Project that the manuscript is to be available at an earlier date. With the exception of certain rights granted to Dean E. McHenry, all literary rights in the manuscript, including the right to publish, are reserved to The University Library of the University of California, Santa Cruz. No part of the manuscript may be quoted for publication without the written permission of the University Librarian of the University of California, Santa Cruz.

TABLE OF CONTENTS**Volume II**

INTRODUCTION	VII
APRIL 3, 1968 9:15 A.M.	1
<u>UC STATEWIDE</u>	1
<u>1957 All-University Faculty Conference</u>	1
<u>Clark Kerr, Berkeley Chancellor</u>	6
<u>Raymond Allen or Clark Kerr as UC President -- Factors Influencing the Regents' Choice</u>	11
<u>McHenry -- Academic Assistant to President Kerr</u>	22
<u>The Santa Barbara Problem</u>	25
<u>The University Calendar</u>	29
<u>THE MASTER PLAN FOR HIGHER EDUCATION IN CALIFORNIA Membership of the Master Plan Survey Team</u>	33
<u>The University and State Colleges Work Out a Compromise</u>	36
<u>The University's Political Power</u>	40
<u>Getting Approval for the New Campuses</u>	50
<u>THE SANTA CRUZ CAMPUS -- SITE SELECTION</u>	58
<u>Almaden vs. Santa Cruz</u>	58
APRIL 24, 1968 9:00 A.M.	60
<u>The Santa Cruz Proposal Takes Shape</u>	63
<u>Santa Cruz Wins</u>	68
<u>THE PLANNING BEGINS</u>	73
<u>The Decision to Build on the Middle of the Campus</u>	74
<u>Origins of the Residential College Concept</u>	77
<u>McHenry is Appointed Chancellor</u>	82
<u>Other UC Chancellorships</u>	85
<u>ATTITUDES OF REGENTS, POLITICIANS, AND OTHERS TOWARD UCSC</u>	91
<u>The Regents</u>	91
<u>Chancellor Murphy</u>	98
<u>Governors Brown and Reagan</u>	103
<u>President Hitch and the 28:1 Budget Formula</u>	106
<u>Jess Unruh, Max Rafferty, and Robert Finch</u>	110
MAY 8, 1968 9:15 A.M.	114
<u>UCSC ARCHITECTURE</u>	114
<u>The McHenry Philosophy</u>	114
<u>Selecting Architects for the Major Building Projects</u>	119
<u>Opening Up the Campus' West Side</u>	128
<u>The Long Range Development Plan</u>	130
<u>Ernest Kump, Consulting Architect</u>	141
<u>UCSC's Physical Planning Staff</u>	144
<u>Problems With the Cowell College Plans</u>	150
<u>The Campus Planning Committee</u>	158
<u>Parking</u>	161
MAY 29, 1968 9:15 A.M.	173
<u>LONG-RANGE PLANS FOR THE UNIVERSITY AND ITS ENVIRONS</u>	173
<u>Married-Student Housing</u>	173

<i>Regional Shopping Center</i>	180
<i>The Possibility of Purchasing Other Cowell Property</i>	183
<i>Commercial Enterprises on Campus Land</i>	197
<i>UCSC's Relations with the City and County Planning Staffs</i>	202
FUND-RAISING.....	205
<i>Cowell and Stevenson Colleges</i>	205
<i>Negotiations with the Sloan Foundation</i>	208
<i>The Merrill Trust</i>	211
<i>Naming the Colleges</i>	213
EARLY ACADEMIC PLANNING.....	216
<i>Kerr and McHenry Differ on Several Basic Concepts</i>	216
<i>The Tschirgi Committee</i>	229
<i>Academic Consultants, Summer of '62</i>	244
<i>Academic Consultants, 1963</i>	250
<i>The First Faculty/Staff Appointments</i>	253
JUNE 6, 1968 9:15A.M.	259
<i>Problems with Nomenclature</i>	259
1965-1968: PLANS BECOME REALITY.....	264
<i>Establishing Boards of Studies, not Departments</i>	264
<i>The Role of the Boards of Studies, the Colleges, and the Administration in Faculty Hiring</i>	270
<i>The Divisions of Natural Sciences, Social Sciences, and Humanities are Officially Formed</i>	280
<i>Recruiting the Academic Vice Chancellors</i>	283
<i>San Diego's Faculty Hiring Policies</i>	292
<i>The Pass-Fail Experiment</i>	295
REASONS FOR THE EARLIER-THAN-PLANNED START OF GRADUATE INSTRUCTION.....	298
<i>The History of Consciousness Program</i>	298
<i>UCSC's Unexpected Strength in the Sciences</i>	305
<i>The Effects of the 28:1 Formula</i>	312
GRADUATE STUDENTS AND THE COLLEGES.....	319
<i>Opposing Points of View Concerning the Nature of Graduate Life</i>	319
<i>Graduate Instruction</i>	330
<i>Allocation of Teaching Assistants</i>	334
JUNE 26, 1968 9:15 A.M.	336
UNDERGRADUATE ENROLLMENT.....	337
<i>Planning for Steady Growth</i>	337
<i>How UCSC's Yearly Quota of Students is Determined</i>	338
<i>The Minority Students Admission Program</i>	341
THE COLLEGES.....	349
<i>The Role of College "Sponsor" in Developing a College's Plans</i>	349
<i>Possible Emphases for Future Colleges</i>	354
<i>Recruiting Provosts for Stevenson, Merrill, and Five</i>	360
<i>Possible Emphases for Future Colleges, continued</i>	367
<i>Why Strong Provosts are Desirable</i>	374
<i>Replacing Retiring Provosts</i>	382
STUDENT BEHAVIOR.....	385
<i>College Discipline</i>	385
<i>UCSC's Relations with the City and County Police</i>	393
<i>The Campus Police</i>	402

ILLUSTRATIONS

Dean E. McHenry Seated at a desk on the UCSC campus meadows March 2, 1962	Frontispiece
Dedication of the UCSC Campus April 17, 1964	104
An Aerial View of the UCSC Campus June, 1967	172

INTRODUCTION

In 1967, the Regional History Project decided to devote part of its efforts to the history of the University of California's rapidly developing campus at Santa Cruz. Since no one had been more instrumental in formulating the plans for the new campus than Dean McHenry, and since he was the man responsible for overseeing the implementation of those plans, it was obvious that the cornerstone of our proposed University History Series would be interviews with Chancellor McHenry. Between November of 1967 and April, 1969, eighteen interviews were conducted with the Chancellor. The first six of these were edited and compiled into a volume entitled, Childhood, Education and Teaching Career, 1910-1958, which was completed in 1972. The introduction to that volume explains in greater detail the reasons for the entire series of interviews with the Chancellor and the circumstances surrounding the interview sessions.

The interviews in this volume were held between April 3 and June 26, 1968. They focused primarily on the University of California, Santa Cruz; however, they dealt not only with the campus itself, but also covered UCSC's relationship with the University-wide administration, the University Regents, and the California political scene in general.

This volume begins with a discussion of the University of California system as a whole during the late 1950s when

Chancellor McHenry was Academic Assistant to University President Clark Kerr and was also one of two University representatives on the survey team which wrote the Master Plan for Higher Education in California. The Chancellor discussed the philosophies, politics, and compromises involved in devising the Master Plan. He also described the reasons the state decided to add three new campuses to the UC system, and the specific events leading up to the selection of Santa Cruz as one of the new campus sites. The conversation then switched to the origins of the residential college concept, a concept which became a fundamental part of UCSC. Other topics covered in these interviews were: the distinctive architecture of the campus; some of the long-range plans that helped mold the physical development of the campus; the early decisions in the area of academic planning; and the modifications of the early planning that became necessary in the 1965-68 period when the plans were put into effect. Also discussed were some of the programs for graduate instruction, the relation of graduate students to the colleges, the early provosts of the colleges, possible emphases for future colleges, and the current UCSC undergraduate student body. Volume III will deal with faculty recruitment and promotion policies, boards of studies, the undergraduate students, the administrative staff, and special schools and programs that are either associated with UCSC or

proposed for UCSC. If the Chancellor is willing, a fourth volume will be produced which will contain a series of follow-up interviews to be held after he has retired.

On August 30, 1972, the edited transcript of the first half of this volume was given to the Chancellor, and in December, 1972, the second half was delivered. As was mentioned in the introduction to Volume I, the Chancellor was an exceptionally easy man to interview. He had an organized mind and seldom strayed from the line of questioning that was planned for each session. He was relaxed throughout the interviews and spoke quite effortlessly, although the resulting transcript showed that he chose his words with care. Sentences seldom trailed off, vague generalities rarely appeared, and pronouns usually had clear antecedents. Hence most of the editing of the manuscript was technical in nature -- inserting punctuation and checking the spelling of proper names -- although occasionally a sentence was clarified, a repetitious phrase eliminated, or a note inserted in the margin requesting the Chancellor to clear up an ambiguity.

A considerable amount of time elapsed between the dates the interviews were conducted and the date the Chancellor reviewed the edited copy. We were concerned that conditions might have changed in certain instances making some of the 1968 comments no longer accurate. We asked that in such

cases, the Chancellor make his corrections in the form of footnotes, so that the reader could see what the situation was both at the time of the interview and at the time of the editing.

The Chancellor returned the first portion of the manuscript in September, 1972, and the second part in early January, 1973. Although his changes and corrections were few in number, it was apparent that he had read the text carefully, and also that he had most graciously accepted our suggestion about footnotes. The Chancellor requested that the manuscript be sealed until his death unless he gave written permission to the office of the University Librarian and/or the office of the Regional History Project allowing it to be released at an earlier date.

When released, copies of the manuscript will be on deposit in the Bancroft Library, University of California, Berkeley; at the UCLA Research Library; and in the Special Collections Room of the Dean E. McHenry Library, University of California, Santa Cruz. This manuscript is a part of a collection of interviews on the history of the University of California, Santa Cruz, which have been conducted by the Regional History Project.

Elizabeth Spedding Calciano

June 26, 1974

Regional History Project
Dean E. McHenry Library
University of California, Santa Cruz

April 3, 1968 9:15 a.m.

UC STATEWIDE

1957 All-University Faculty Conference

Calciano: I thought we might talk today about Clark Kerr, because he certainly has had quite a bit to do with UCSC and its formation, but first I want to ask you about a committee you were on in the late fifties that recommended the establishment of some new UC campuses.

McHenry: Yes. The 1957 All-University Faculty Conference, which was held at Carmel Highlands at Highlands Inn, had as its general theme something about the future of the University; I'm not sure just how it was termed, but you could look at the report. We have a complete set in the Library. I was Chairman of Study Committee #1, which was given the assignment of size and number of campuses.

Calciano: And how was it that you were appointed to this?

McHenry: Well, the committee choices were, of course, made in the name of President Sproul, but there was a steering committee, and I think that the chairman of the steering committee (or was he a co-chairman?) who was one of the men at UCLA in agriculture, Sidney Cameron, knew of my special interest in this because we had worked together on the Committee on Educational

Policy, and I'm quite sure that he had most to do with this assignment.

Calciano: What did your committee recommend?

McHenry: We drew up a proposal for four new campuses of the University. It was a good committee. I was chairman; I had as a vice-chairman Frank Newman, who is professor of law at Berkeley and was subsequent to '57, for a period, Dean of the Law School at Berkeley, and quite a number of very able people from the various campuses. The committees coincided or paralleled to some extent the study that was being made by the Liaison Committee of the State Board of Education and the Regents on the need for additional campuses. That study was called, "The Additional Centers Report" and finally published, but after ours was. And they documented, they did the facts and figures work, the staff of the Liaison Committee did, on what the needs were going to be. In a nutshell, there had been a 1955 report called, "The Restudy of Higher Education in California" headed by Professor Thomas McConnell, whom I saw at Berkeley this week. And it rather lulled us into sleep, or to snooze a little while, about the growth of California and the need for higher educational facilities in California. The Restudy Report felt we could go on beyond the turn of the

decade, at least, without any new campuses, and/or any new state colleges.

Calciano: How many were there at that time?

McHenry: Well, in University campuses we had in operation, of course, Berkeley, UCLA, Davis, San Francisco, Santa Barbara, and Riverside had just come into operation -- 1954 was perhaps its first graduating class. And San Diego was still just Scripps Institution and certain other technical establishments. The need that was shown in the Additional Centers Report in '57, of which we had advanced copies for the report to the All-University Faculty Conference, concentrated in the San Diego metropolitan area, the southern Los Angeles metropolitan area, especially the Orange County area, and the San Francisco peninsula to Monterey area in the north, and the San Joaquin Valley. And our committee recommended four new campuses serving each of these areas. The All-University Faculty Conference that year at Carmel had as a special guest Regent Pauley, and up to then our understanding was Regent Pauley was opposed to any new campuses. He heard our report and listened very carefully, and the debate that followed, and by noon -- we gave it in the morning -- by noon he was saying, "Well, you tell us what the University needs, and it's our job as Regents

to get it." He invited us to lunch with him, and we talked further about it, and I always had the feeling that from about that noon on that the new campuses were a very real possibility.

Calciano: He was quite influential?

McHenry: Yes.

Calciano: As a Regent.

McHenry: Yes, he was. Perhaps he was the senior Regent, and he may have been at that time the Chairman of the Board; I think he was, and he was already well into his second term as Regent. And he's now served almost 30 years.

Calciano: What part of that proposal were contributions that could be attributed to you?

McHenry: Well, I really don't think that there was much that was original on the part of the committee or its chairman. We presented it in a brief form with what we thought were strong arguments. Arguments for placing an upper limit on the size to which campuses should be allowed to grow, and we came out with this figure of 27,500.

Calciano: Because Berkeley was near that, or did you have other reasons?

McHenry: Yes. Berkeley was approaching it, and all of us felt that we couldn't drive the numbers back down; it's

not, in short, an optimum, but a maximum that was set by the realistic conditions that existed at Berkeley and UCLA already having grown quite large. We bolstered this with a lot of arguments about servicing. I think we were all convinced that the University of California should remain a highly selective institution, but our part, our proportion of the young people of the State ought to remain about the same in the future. That is, we were drawing from something less than the top 15% of high school graduates in the State, and we thought that ought to continue, but that the University ought to build up enough facilities to take care of that proportion for the indefinite future. We also documented the rapid growth of the State which then, and even now, has been averaging about 500,000 per year net increase in California. That began about 1942, as I remember it.

Calciano: Well which report was it that said they felt no need for campuses? The one two years earlier?

McHenry: It was the one sometimes called, "The McConnell Report" or "The Restudy of the Needs of Higher Education in California" abbreviated, "The Restudy", and it found no need within the next half decade or more to make any new starts. But by '57 the same group, the Liaison Committee, but without Mr.

McConnell's role in it, had produced this further study which showed that the need was acute, and that there had to be new campuses and new state colleges.

Clark Kerr, Berkeley Chancellor

Calciano: The new campuses became a reality during Kerr's regime, and of course he played a fairly sizable role in UCSC's development, so perhaps a little background material would be in order. Briefly, how did he get to be Chancellor at Berkeley, and then in more detail, how did he get the Presidency?

McHenry: His Chancellorship at Berkeley really came out of the oath fight in the Regents. Kerr, during the crucial period in the oath controversy, was Chairman of the Committee on Privilege and Tenure, which is sort of the judicial body that the faculty uses. And he made a very successful, I think, personal appearance before the Regents. I'm not sure of that, but Verne Stadtman's manuscript on the history of the University, the chapter that's devoted largely to Kerr, does say that he made a personal appearance. And he was pretty impressive, and he had obvious qualities of leadership, but they had been exerted primarily up until this chairmanship of a Senate committee, Academic Senate committee, through his directorship of the Institute of Industrial Relations. You see he'd

come down from the University of Washington, if I remember correctly, in late '45 or early '46. His Ph.D. was from Berkeley; it was dated 1939. He took a good deal of time away. He entered graduate school at Berkeley the same time I did, which was the fall of '33. We both had Masters from Stanford already, but he left to work with the State Relief Administration with the self-help cooperatives, the job I'd ... do you remember I was with him during the summer of '34? But he stayed on, as did Catherine Spaulding, who is now Mrs. Kerr, and Jane Snyder, who is now Mrs. McHenry. They stayed on through the year, and I went back in August to Berkeley to get on with the degree. And then after the State Relief Administration thing sort of blew up, the Kerrs came to Europe for about a year. The McHenrys were in Europe '35-'36. The Kerrs came in '36 and stayed over into '37. And Clark was around the London School of Economics at that time. Then he taught a year at Antioch, and all this meant that the degree didn't come when it should have normally, perhaps '36, but instead in '39. And after that he taught at Stanford for a year or so and then went off to the University of Washington and was there during the War. So he rejoined the University at Berkeley in either late '45 or early '46. I know for a fact that

he was established in Berkeley in the fall of '46, because we stayed with them the night before we sailed for New Zealand in September, I should say. But it was his leadership in this oath thing that brought his availability to the attention of the Regents and of the faculty. And then he served as Chancellor from roughly '52 to '58. Yes, six years. And he was elected President on my birthday, October 18, 1958, at the Davis meeting. It was just the day before, on the 17th, that the Regents Committee finally decided to move for three new campuses, and the full Board confirmed that again on the 18th and elected him President on the 18th, two matters of very great interest to me. Well ... the Presidency: While he was Chancellor, he and Sproul were at odds over many, many things. Sproul was very reluctant about having him as Chancellor. He had it pretty much forced on him by Regental interest and faculty support.

Calciano: Was he reluctant about having Kerr as Chancellor or having anybody as a strong Chancellor?

McHenry: I think both. (Laughter) He had run the Berkeley campus in addition to his University-wide functions, and he didn't fancy having somebody with a title as elevated as chancellor sounded or with as much authority as the Regents felt that a Berkeley head

should have, and he resisted. I've gone through the Regents minutes; indeed I did a memorandum one time for Kerr after he became President which I called "The Genesis of the Chancellorship," and I went through all of the committee reports of the Regents and the Regents actions and then the correspondence in the President's office and traced this, the origin of the office of chancellor. And it was a very rocky beginning. Sproul wanted him as sort of a vice president in his outer office, and Kerr instead insisted on moving out of the building and eventually moved into Dwinelle Hall, which is a classroom building, and the Chancellor's office is still there*, even though the Berkeley campus controls Sproul Hall completely now. Sproul Hall was the University-wide headquarters. Kerr fought very hard on many issues. I remember his getting control of the police. He had to revert back to the argument that the Chancellor was responsible for student conduct and how could he, he argued, discharge that responsibility if he didn't have control of the police? So he got the police. He used to worry ... he had to wait **six** months to get an interview with the President. (Laughter) The Regents,

* The Chancellor's office is now in California Hall, where the President's office was located a half century ago. --
D.E.McHenry 8/31/72

when they created the Chancellorships at Berkeley and Los Angeles in late '51 or early '52, by standing order gave those Chancellors a right to attend Regents meetings, and that still reads that way, by the way, though while Kerr was President, he opened it up to all Chancellors. But the special prerogatives of Berkeley and Los Angeles were written in, so Kerr began to be at Regents meetings, but he found great difficulty getting appointments with President Sproul. And I'm told that he used to sit in his office -- he always had a round table that he used as a desk....

Calciano: Kerr?

McHenry: Yes, Kerr did. And indeed last Friday Kerr's presidential furniture was delivered to Santa Cruz as a very generous act on the part of Hitch. Knowing my connection with Kerr, he thought that I might be able to make some use of it.

Calciano: How nice.

McHenry: And that table that he used as President, that round table, arrived Friday, somewhat damaged in shipment, but we're going to use it someplace.* But he'd sit at this table (or an earlier version of it) and say to himself, when he finally got an appointment with Sproul, "I will not lose my temper; I will not lose my

* The table burned in the Central Services fire of 1971. --

temper." (Laughter) But those were very difficult days, and he had jurisdiction over only pieces of the Berkeley campus. On the academic side, the Chancellor's jurisdiction is well established, but he had no control, really, over architecture, or very little. The architects and engineers were under Statewide control.

Calciano: Was this true of the Chancellor at UCLA too?

McHenry: Yes it was. It was as if you were trying to do local functions with all kinds of federal authority reaching in from the outside. And those were very difficult days for him. But he did make a record at Berkeley that was remarkable in the six years. Amid this great difficulty, he carved out the prerogatives of the office and became an important national figure in higher education. And the Regents eventually turned to him.

Raymond Allen or Clark Kerr as UC President -- Factors
Influencing the Regents' Choice

Kerr's Academic Plan for Berkeley

McHenry: I've always felt that one of the key things, key episodes, in marking him as the number one candidate for the Presidency, occurred in the summer of 1957. President Sproul had agreed to a conference on

educational policy involving administration, Regents, and Senate leaders. I was asked to come and talk to them about new campuses, because I had been Chairman of this study committee of the All-University Faculty Conference during the spring of '57. And our report on the size and number of campuses was brief enough and clear enough and strong enough in its recommendations that it was very much in the Regents' minds at this time. Kerr was there, and he brought in the report of the Berkeley campus on an academic plan for Berkeley. Regent Carter had demanded these academic plans. The campuses, he felt, were relatively planless, just drifting, not growing, and not piloting, and not knowing where they were going. UCLA brought in a plan which was not a very good one. Lamar Johnson was the principal author, and the Chancellor at UCLA, Raymond Allen, made a kind of a flabby presentation. The Berkeley one was a magnificent job of bringing together all of the elements of planning and the Senate side and the administrative side and ... the Berkeley academic plan was by far the best, I suppose, that had ever been drawn up in an American university. Well the Regents recognized the difference at once, and indeed Regent Carter, who had originally asked for this at the Arrowhead meeting, made a statement (and

he often speaks very bluntly) that he was very discouraged that UCLA had not been able to produce something better than this. That it was full of cliches and ... well he really meant "educational jargon" I think, whereas the Berkeley plan was lean and well-expressed and obviously a consensus had been reached, and this was the very model of a proper academic plan. And I've always felt that that was the turning point. There were many people in the Regents, according to Verne Stadtman's chapter, who assumed that Allen would be the next President of the University. I've never had any evidence of this except Allen told me that he should be. (Laughter) We sat together on the plane going up to Davis for that fateful meeting on October 17 of '57, just 24 hours before the election of Kerr, and he still thought he had a chance. He also was still irked by what Carter had said at the Arrowhead meeting during the summer, and he muttered to me something about, "Someday I'm going to tell that Carter off." Well he (Allen) was told off, and Kerr was elected, and all the rest that has happened since you know.

UCLA's Handling of the 1956-57 Football Scandal

Calciano: I had understood that the football scandal at UCLA had some factor in this. He botched up the handling of

this, or is this....

McHenry: I don't remember the time schedule. I have an idea, I don't know when the Sanders' death occurred, but I think perhaps it might have. I remember taking Kerr to meetings of UCLA alumni when he was first President, and there was a big row on at the time. And it may be that Sanders did die in that period of '57; I don't know that I have any records.

Calciano: I did my research on this so long ago, but it seems that the bulk of the controversy occurred before the selection of the new president, if I recall.

McHenry: That may be so, and there's no doubt but what the Regents were terribly shocked at the circumstances of Sanders' death. And almost immediately after that, both Berkeley and UCLA were forced to move for the University itself to take over the management of athletics from the Associated Students.

Calciano: I don't know about Sanders' death itself. What....

McHenry: Oh! Well, I don't know whether you want this on the record, but ... Sanders was a magnificent coach; he got a tremendous amount out of athletic teams, and he reversed the whole trend at UCLA, and they began to win. And he died suddenly. He was in the hotel room of a woman who was not his wife and who had a reputation for a certain amount of near prostitution. He was

partially clothed, and there was great scandal about it. The Los Angeles sports pages hushed it up completely, and the San Francisco papers had a field day. This was the really big shocking thing.

Calciano: Oh, not the paying of scholarships or any....

McHenry: Well they ... all of the PCC institutions, I think, engaged in some way or another in cheating this way on the scholarship rules. UCLA, having a relatively young alumni and not so many well-to-do backers, had fewer private jobs to offer football players and tended to get smaller contributions and pool them, and the UCLA situation was probably not as bad as the USC situation, all told. And Berkeley and Stanford looked down their noses at them, but I think that there was no tremendous difference in morality. But it did lead to the breakup of the old Pacific Coast Conference as we knew it then. And these interrelationships with Kerr and the Presidency I really don't have any clear idea about. Kerr, as Chancellor at Berkeley, had a fine white knight on the athletic front in Glenn Seaborg, who already had won the Nobel prize and had taken quite a bit of interest in sports. And so Glenn was the spokesman, and he had enormous prestige because of his scientific achievements, and Glenn was an interesting appointment also because Glenn was an

undergraduate at UCLA. He was UCLA class of '34, two years after me. So he knew how the UCLA alums felt. And I think it was Glenn's presence in the picture then as athletic representative for Berkeley and then later as Kerr's successor as Chancellor that helped the reconciliation. There was a sort of family feeling that led to the reorganization of the conference that dropped out Montana and Idaho and started fresh with the California group and Washington and Washington State, perhaps, and gradually Oregon and Oregon State, who had played a part, I believe, in blowing the whistle on USC and UCLA, were let back into the group. But I didn't ... I don't have a clear idea of the sequence of events.

Calciano: I had thought that you had written a letter to the Regents, or maybe it was to Sproul and Kerr, since you were, I believe, quite upset over the fact that Allen had misrepresented the football issue to the faculty.

McHenry: Oh yes.

Calciano: This was where I was heading.

McHenry: Yes. I ... a letter was written that.... This is one of the first times that Page Smith and I did something together. There was a resolution brought in by the coaching staff, I believe, at UCLA in this period calling for the dissolution of the Pacific Coast

Conference when UCLA and USC were in the doghouse. And some of us who were opposed to big-time athletics fought it on the floor of the Senate. Page Smith ... I've forgotten who all; there were four or five of us ... and we fought it hard and lost. And we did put together a letter which I rather think went to Kerr, but I'm not sure, Kerr as Chancellor at Berkeley, pointing out that there was substantial sentiment, and also that we thought that the session of the Senate was illegal, that there hadn't been proper notice, and this matter hadn't been on the agenda. And we did get the Rules and Jurisdiction Committee to declare it illegal eventually, but it was quite a ... it was a time when those of us who were opposed to big-time athletics were fighting; we were in a minority in the UCLA Senate, and they could have beaten us, but we got them on a procedural irregularity.

Calciano: I know that you've carried out your feelings about no big-time athletics here at UCSC. How did you originally come to adopt this feeling?

McHenry: Well, I think it's too great a diversion from the educational purposes of the University. Actually, if I were Chancellor at UCLA, I would support big-time athletics I think. I would hope that you could do away with some of the terrible burdens that come with them

-- the diversion of so much student money to paying coaches who do nothing but recruit, or almost nothing else during the year, and probably the under-the-table payments, if you can regulate them, and all these other things -- but big-time athletics played a big part in the evolution of some educational institutions that have become pretty good. I think UCLA has become excellent. Michigan State has come up this way to some extent. Too, so many leading people of this country, most of them men, when they get a newspaper, open first at the sports pages. And to get respect, command respect and prestige and so on, if you haven't done something in sports, you can't really command that kind of a person and his attention. And UCLA's an upstart just 50 years old next year. It had to come up somehow to national recognition, and national recognition in sports is a very important way to do it. But I've always deplored the playing of games with other than your own boys, people who you attract naturally. I've felt that the ideal of sports we obtained during wartime when in the Navy program we took the trainees who were assigned to us by the Bureau of Naval Personnel, and we had a few 4-F's and a few seventeen-year-olds and that was all. But we had a wonderful good time playing football. We played USC

twice each season and Stanford twice and Berkeley twice, didn't travel much, and the practice sessions were necessarily restricted because of military and scholarly obligations of the students. But it was fun. And I've really got a set in my mind that if I ever had it to do myself, that I'd de-emphasize the big-time sports, and emphasize the so-called minor sports. I'm not really opposed to extramural, so-called intercollegiate athletics, except when they go to excess, such as flying across the country every other week and requiring all kinds of tutors to get the athletes through. We've got at Santa Cruz already a fair range of extramural athletics. And to show you the value I place on it, next week we are entertaining at dinner the rugby team; it's the football banquet of Santa Cruz, and it's going to be given here in the house. And the coach is Professor Ronald Ruby of physics. He volunteers his services; they play well; they're a nice bunch of boys, and they travel short distances -- Berkeley; Davis is the most distant place they've gone. They play well; they probably don't practice very much, so they may not be in as perfect condition as they should be. But this is lovely; our boys play well, and when one of them gets knocked out or the wind knocked out of him, why someone else who

has some wind yells, "Hey, Ruby!" and Professor Ruby goes in and plays that position, (laughter) till his recovery. And the attitude is so completely different from the big-time one of....

Calciano: Commercial.

McHenry: Yes. If you drop a pass in a UCLA-USC game, why it may cost you \$100,000 in your lifetime earnings, because the pros won't bid so much for you and so on. And I think that's terribly dreary. I'd much rather go see cub scouts play on the vacant lot.

Allen's Capabilities

Calciano: To return briefly to Allen before proceeding with Kerr ... one of the people that you put me in touch with commented that Allen had come to UCLA because he had a reputation of cleaning out "Commies" at Washington. That he was a "stuffed shirt," a "gutless wonder," and had the philosophy, "If you don't do anything, then later nothing will need to be done." Do you have any comments on this? (Laughter)

McHenry: Well, I think Raymond Allen was a good-hearted man, but he was essentially flabby. Flabby in physique and flabby in mind. I never knew him intimately at all. I strongly suspected that he would have made a very good small town doctor. He was a medical man. He married a

woman who pushed him. She pushed him terribly hard, and it led to tragedy. In the end, when he was dropped at UCLA, they stayed together a very short time. They had four children; he went overseas in Indonesia and she came back to the States, and I gather they're divorced or have been separated for many years now. But she just had this overweening ambition. She reminded me of Lady MacBeth. She'd just push, push, push. She had all these ambitions that you'd associate in our society with masculine ambitions, and she just used him as the vehicle through which they were to be achieved. And it was unfortunate for him, because I think basically he's a nice guy. I think he was a gentle soul and generous and pleasant, but he was terribly pushed. It was a tough thing that there were Red scares in the McCarthy era, and he got a certain brief period on the stage while he was President of the University of Washington, because two people who were allegedly Communist were fired from the faculty, two tenure people. And this led to people cheering all over the country. So he was appointed at UCLA for the wrong reasons.

Calciano: Well, apparently ... well the people I've talked to thought that he was rather inept, to say the least. Why did he have such strong backing in the Regents?

Why did it look for a while as though he might be successor to Sproul?

McHenry: Well, I think they felt that he was safe on the Red issue. That he was a symbol to the people of California; that the Regents were going to have their campuses led by somebody who was stalwart, 200% American, blue-blooded American, not red. (Laughter)

McHenry -- Academic Assistant to President Kerr

Calciano: Now Kerr became President July 1, 1958?

McHenry: Yes.

Calciano: And you were immediately appointed his Academic Assistant?

McHenry: Yes. He'd asked me during the spring, during the Easter holidays. We took a trip up to Northern California; one of the purposes was to see some Indian land we'd bought up in Round Valley of Mendocino County.

Calciano: We?

McHenry: My wife and I. And there were terrible ... it was a very rainy period, very heavy storms at Eastertime; things were washing away, and even Highway 101 was a difficult one to navigate between here and Los Angeles. And we were at Kerr's one night for dinner

before we went on north and found we couldn't get to our property because of the storm, and it was then that Kerr first asked me to make arrangements at UCLA to spend at least half time with him. And I did make arrangements; I taught a half schedule that year, and my title was Academic Assistant to the President. I came up by plane on June 30 and got settled in the Durant Hotel, and the next morning Kerr came to the office on crutches -- he'd broken his ankle playing soccer with his kids. He went around the building in Sproul Hall, said hello to everybody, and after he'd been into each office he sent for me and said, "Let's get going on some of these main things that need to be done." And one of the first things he did was to send me over to see Harry Wellman. He said, "Harry has agreed to serve as the number two man, Vice President of the University, and you find out what salary he thinks is appropriate, and how much he'd like for entertainment allowance and so on, and write it up, and we'll put the thing through the Regents at the July meeting." So I'd had no experience in this; I didn't even know what an entertainment fund was, or what the source was or anything, but I knew Harry Wellman pretty well; we'd been together on a General Electric seminar in '49 during the summer and had

spent two weeks together; much of the time we'd been roommates in hotels over the eastern part of the U.S., and so I had no difficulty in going over to Giannini and doing this, and then there were lots of little administrative things, though I was supposed to be in academic projects. I was used as, in many ways, a general assistant, sometimes on administrative negotiations, but the biggest part of my job, and there were really four of us that were quite close to Kerr personally who functioned in this: Gene Lee, who later, who is now Director of the Institute of Public Affairs at Berkeley, or whatever it's called, Governmental Affairs, but later was the Vice President under Kerr and for awhile under Hitch, or under Wellman, I should say, Gene Lee, whom I'd known as a student at UCLA; he was a student body president of about the 1945 period. Ed Barrett, who is now Dean of the Law School at Davis; and the three of us were in one office about the size of this room [McHenry's study at University House] and very close to each other. And we did our own, most of the memos we wrote to Kerr we did ourselves, we typed ourselves and sent them in as they came out of the typewriter. And we were joined a little later by Jack Oswald, who is now the President of the University of Kentucky. And Jack

was -- have you seen the Chronicle this morning?

Calciano: No.

McHenry: Jack* has accepted the post of Vice President of the University under Hitch.

Calciano: Oh!

McHenry: So all of us are still in the University, and all of us are still functioning in spots that we like and enjoy.

The Santa Barbara Problem

McHenry: But those were exciting days, because Sproul had been President, you see, for 20-odd years -- since 1930 actually; 28 years -- and Kerr was the new broom, and he had dozens and dozens of ideas and things he wanted done. They weren't the kind of thing that you could feed to vice presidents inherited from somebody else. He had to build a new team. And the four of us were Kerr men who were just given these assignments to "Work that out," "What'll we do about this?" and quite often it was, "Go through the files and see what you can find." And there were some of them very delicate matters. For example, that first summer he sent me down to Santa Barbara with the question, "What's wrong with Santa Barbara?" and he had me spend one long day

* Now President of Pennsylvania State University. -- D.E.McHenry

talking to the Regent from Santa Barbara and about seven members of the faculty, and then I worked the files over, and the memorandum was called, "The Santa Barbara Campus -- Fourteen Years of Neglect." And it reviewed each stage of the University taking over in '44, and everything we had on record. There'd been a spectacular episode there. Sproul had kept in Santa Barbara a very dry professor of education called J. Harold Williams as Acting Provost for year after year, and that was the head job. He never bothered to move to Santa Barbara; his wife stayed in Los Angeles and taught school, and mid-afternoon each Friday he'd beat it off for home and came back on Monday, and Santa Barbara had no social life, few ties to the community, and it was a terrible situation. Then he was pressed, Sproul was pressed to appoint somebody, and he finally chose a man called Clark Kuebler, I think it's K-u-e-b-l-e-r; I never met the man. He was there for about a year, a brilliant classicist and an articulate spokesman, and then came the dramatic news that a New York policeman had arrested him in a hotel room in New York for homosexual soliciting. And he never came back to Santa Barbara, and that poor campus has suffered terribly. Now Kerr then was proposing the possibility

of appointing Samuel Gould, who was the President of Antioch College, and I was given the job of finding out "Would Gould fit? Would the faculty accept him?" Sam Gould is now the Chancellor of the State University of New York with this vast system of his own. But Sam was not a success at Santa Barbara.

Calciano: He was appointed, but he....

McHenry: He was appointed. He was appointed and came in '59. The vote I got really was no consensus; it was ... some of the faculty had real doubt about him. He didn't have a Ph.D.; many of them without Ph.D.'s had been forced, since the University had taken over, to go away to graduate school and get their Ph.D.'s, and the symbolism was wrong. Here was a man who came from the communications industry and radio, really, and he'd been fair as President of Antioch, but not great, and Santa Barbara, which was a giant, a young giant stirring and needing a lot of intellectual leadership, got not an intellectual, but an administrator.

Calciano: Why did Kerr appoint him?

McHenry: Well, Antioch College was one of the models that Kerr thought of as an excellent liberal arts college; he'd himself taught there for a year in the late '30's, and Sam Gould has a lot of excellent qualities. But I don't think that Kerr evaluated properly, and perhaps

I didn't, the extent to which the faculty, with this stress now on research, would resent having somebody who was not of the type that the University said it wanted. At any rate, the Santa Barbara situation improved vastly under Gould's leadership. It was declared to be a general campus, and it was given a new charter, and then, of course, came the great leadership from Vernon Cheadle, the present Chancellor, who was brought down from Davis. But in this transition, both at Riverside and Santa Barbara, the campuses required this new mission to be defined, and defined by the President. And I drafted both those statements on one page. The new mission was a job of writing on a telegram blank what the new policy was. And of course Kerr marked it up with a lot of green ink and so on, but these were very creative days, very exciting days, because we were just taking a unit and starting off in a new direction. The most excitement of all, of course, came with the wholly new campuses where the whole situation was plastic, and those first three years of the Kerr administration, up to the point I was appointed Chancellor, why this was sort of the big beckoning thing on the horizon, that this was where the real record was going to be made, mainly at Irvine and Santa Cruz.

Calciano: Do you ... are there any other tasks that you had there that you feel should be mentioned?

McHenry: Well, I just did a little bit of everything. I don't know what else. A typical day, and mind you I was usually there three days a week; I intended to teach at Los Angeles on Mondays and Fridays during this period, then the first year I did teach each term, and I would ride the plane up -- usually Tuesday morning I'd catch a 6:00 a.m. plane, something like that, and stay Tuesday night and Wednesday night and go back Thursday evening after dark. That was the pattern the first year; the second year was the year of the Master Plan.

Calciano: Yes, I want to ask about that.

McHenry: And I took full leave from UCLA and worked full time for the President in that period. And the following year, that is '60-'61, I was back half time at UCLA at that time, and indeed I taught at UCLA part of '61-'62, after I was appointed Chancellor, because I was scheduled to teach.

Calciano: Yes, you had three jobs for a little bit there, didn't you?

McHenry: Yes, yes.

Calciano: You worked on a proposal for a new calendar for the University; was it during this period?

McHenry: Yes, but first I functioned as a member of the Academic Senate's Committee on Education Policy, and quite a few of the ideas that I later was able to do something about germinated in this period of working in the field of educational policy. I found that a very exciting assignment. We worked on a variety of problems.

Calciano: When was this?

McHenry: Oh, I think you'll have to look at the bio-bib to be sure. I would say in the '50's, early '50's perhaps. But I worked on the University calendar during that period; I was sort of a sub-committee to work on the problem. I drew up what I regard as a more rational calendar, which we almost got accepted, but eventually elements of it have gone into the calendar.

Calciano: Such as?

McHenry: Well, we were trying to get away from the lame-duck session of January and the semester system, and we were trying to minimize the number of holidays and to concentrate so that when you came to....

Calciano: Oh, such as quarter break and spring vacation being all one?

McHenry: Yes. And when you came to a term, you worked at it,

and you worked at it hard and intensely, and then you had longer periods in between when you were not in a term. Of course that is a feature of the present system, and it would have been a feature of the plan that I drew up and the Regents adopted but eventually was nullified for the quarter system, which was in the early '60's.

Calciano: What was your plan?

McHenry: My plan was to put a summer quarter in between the two semesters; to put a summer quarter during the summer and have two semesters and one quarter making a year-round operation, but without disrupting things as much as the quarter system has.

Calciano: Was it really three semesters then?

McHenry: No, no.

Calciano: The quarter didn't have the same academic weight?

McHenry: The quarter was ten weeks.

Calciano: Well how would that jibe with people taking sequence courses?

McHenry: Well, we always had this difficulty, whether you have a summer quarter with a semester system or a summer quarter otherwise. But we had it worked out with a different period, a different number of times of meeting with the courses of the same value. And the

sequence was not a prime problem in courses that are offered on each level every time anyway. The job was in the summer, as it is now, to have an offering hopefully for 40% of the normal number of students in the summer, on regular session, paid for by the State rather than by the students. And you just have to have as rich an offering as you can afford, and you can't always work the sequence. Usually it is somewhat out of step. As if on a semester system you have course A one semester and course B the other and that's the year course, what do you do with a summer in that course? Well, we may not be able to do anything, or you may be able to offer course A and the people who take it then are free to finish their language in the fall, and go into the B in the second semester.

Calciano: How did your two semesters and then a quarter avoid the lame-duck problem of three weeks after Christmas?

McHenry: Starting earlier. Starting September 1st and clearing out the semester in December, and then having a substantial holiday in January and starting the next semester about February 1st. And the January period was then free for an intersession of some kind -- a quick course or an institute or something of the kind.

Calciano: And you say this was adopted and then nullified?

McHenry: Yes.

Calciano: When was it adopted?

McHenry: Oh, about 1962, I should say, or '3.

Calciano: But never got close to being implemented because they just switched right on over to....

McHenry: Well, the campuses began to sabotage and demand faculty, more faculty and various other things, UCLA and Berkeley particularly. And Kerr as a tactical matter just shifted over to the quarter system. But it was accepted; the other plan was accepted quite generally. Indeed it had more acceptance than the quarter plan ultimately did. But Kerr figured that tactically the thing to do was to jump all the way to the quarter system. My plan was a kind of a compromise really. Characteristic of me. (Laughter)

THE MASTER PLAN FOR HIGHER EDUCATION IN CALIFORNIA

Membership of the Master Plan Survey Team

Calciano: Now on the Master Plan ... you were appointed as representative of the University, right?

McHenry: Yes, in 1959.

Calciano: Well what parts of the Master Plan -- I don't know whether you can separate it, but were there any specific parts that were your own ideas that got implemented, or was it all a committee-type thing all the way along?

McHenry: Well it was all committee-type. I think perhaps my

influence was strongest in the differentiation of functions that was worked out; what the state colleges should do, and what the University should do, mainly, and in the form that the Coordinating Council for Higher Education took, at least in the report. It's drifted some from that. I tried to institutionalize what really was the successful operation of this survey team. There were eight of us involved, two each from each of the systems; the private institutions had two, Coons and Wert. Coons was then president of Occidental; Wert was then at Stanford, is the new president of Mills, and will be our charter speaker May 10th here. Then the state colleges were represented by Dumke, who then was San Francisco State, but is now chancellor of their system, and a fellow who was on the staff of the State Board of Education, Art Browne, who is now deputy, I believe, of the coordinating council in Illinois. The Junior colleges were represented by Howard Champion, who was emeritus head of the junior college system of Los Angeles and a wonderful guy, and by Henry Tyler, who was executive secretary of the California Junior Colleges Association, and I was called University Representative, and the staff member who had done the work for the liaison committee, Tom Holy, who is now

retired in Iowa, was my colleague, and the two of us were responsible to the University. And this staff of eight worked together very well; we got to be quite close personally, and we had in mind that there would be a continuing body that would represent the segments equally, and that working together each would give, and there would be a consensus. When the plan was before the Legislature, there was criticism that arose in the Sacramento Bee editorially, but was really backed by a single individual at the start who was a professor of government at Sacramento State and who is now the director of the Illinois council.* He kept arguing that the public ought to be represented -- gubernatorial appointments; and eventually the bill was amended to include public representatives, I think three, and each of the segments had three. This was amended later in the Brown administration, the last year, to expand the public representation I think to six, as it is now.** This has given the Governor a chance to appoint henchmen on there and in my opinion has been a very disturbing influence; Reagan has tended to appoint people who are quite out of sympathy with higher education, and Reagan has also tended to

*Dr. Lyman Glenny is now Director of the Center for the Study of Higher Education, UC Berkeley. -- D.E.McHenry 8/31/72

**Subsequently the Governor's appointees were given a clear

appoint as representing the private colleges people who weren't even suggested by the independent institutions. The appointment of William Bark, the historian at Stanford, was never backed by the independent colleges, and the Governor was supposed to consult with them and get lists from them from which he would appoint, but he used his prerogative, which is I suppose possible, to overlook their nominations and go out on his own. So it hasn't worked very well, but in its original form I thought it was pretty good.

The University and State Colleges Work Out a Compromise

Calciano: You worked very hard to have the University assigned the role of Ph.D. training and the state colleges not. Two questions: 1. What were your reasons? and 2. Didn't Dumke and the other state college men chafe a bit over the relegation?

McHenry: Yes. The Ph.D., as Regent McLaughlin said, was the "golden fleece." It's the top in terms of prestige and in terms of cost. We argued that the cost of tooling up for a Ph.D. was so great that nineteen, or whatever there were going to be, state colleges couldn't possibly do it; that the University had already made a

start on this, and that after a temporary shortage, we could probably meet all the needs that there would be with the private colleges and with the importation of Ph.D.'s from other states. The state colleges wanted the Ph.D., and they wanted it very badly.

Calciano: Do they have it at any of their branches?

McHenry: No, they do not today except in terms of the compromise that we were able to offer. At one stage I was given the authority to sound out the state colleges, mostly Dumke, through Dumke, would you settle for a Doctor of Ed? And I think that we would have given on the Doctor of Ed, but Dumke....

Calciano: That's kind of the lowest on the totem pole, anyway.
(Laughter)

McHenry: Yes. But they might have said, "Well, that's the way to work up." And Dumke rejected it. Whether he ever consulted with his chief, who was Superintendent of Public Instruction, Roy Simpson, I don't know. But he rejected it. He was trying to change the image of the state college from something interested primarily in teacher training to the liberal arts and sciences and so on. It appeared in late November as if we were really just not going to make the great settlement. All this had started, I don't know whether you understood it, but the grand strategy of the thing I

laid down in memos to Kerr at the very start was that the state colleges wanted most of all -- well it's like negotiations with foreign countries: a treaty is some good if both parties get substantial things they want, what they want most. And I felt we could have a decade of peace or relative peace if we could give the state colleges what they wanted most, and they in turn would give what we wanted most, and so in the relative priorities they wanted independence in the management of their own affairs. They wanted the State to get off their backs; they wanted to get away from line-item budgets; they wanted a governing board of their own. And the grand strategy was that the University would back them to get constitutional status -- a Board of Trustees that was just about like the Regents in composition, numbers, everything, and they'd be freed from these arbitrary financial restrictions of the State, and in exchange the University would get a clear definition of function set in the Constitution. Now that was the original deal. Then the State Senate balked at putting it in the Constitution. And once that happened, there was a period, I don't know whether you and I have ever talked about it, but at which Kerr said, "Well then it's impossible; the whole thing's off. We can't afford to do this on a statutory

basis." He was just set on writing it in the Constitution, as I was. But the three Regents who were guiding this thing, Steinhart, McLaughlin, and Hagar, all of whom are recognized on this campus with roads named after them, the three Regents who were guiding it just said to Kerr, "You're dead wrong. Even if it's statutory, it's possible that it will endure for a long time, and something's better than nothing. We're going to go ahead." And Kerr went through a period of hours and days of desolation over this thing, but eventually, of course, agreed that something was better than nothing, and it was put in statutory form.

Calciano: Well the "nothing" meaning that everybody would have been jockeying for individual....

McHenry: Nothing at all would have left the status quo in which neither side was satisfied. The University would have been insecure on its functions. The University was a have-power. It had what it wanted. It had the prestige and the appropriations and the functions. The state colleges were a have-not power. They didn't have those things, and they didn't have the independence with which to achieve them. And so what we went into then was a kind of a halfway house in which they got the machinery of self-government, and a piece of it went into the Constitution, because the Trustees couldn't

have longer than four-year terms under the Constitution unless it was changed, and the Constitution was changed, and they got eight-year terms rather than sixteen as we had recommended so they'd be the exact duplicate of the Regents. Most of the things that would have been written into the Constitution in so far as possible were written into the statute, and the Legislature hasn't honored all of them, and the Department of Finance is still monkeying around with the state colleges on line-item budgets, but eventually the decision was made on both sides that doing the thing by statute was better than doing nothing.

The University's Political Power

Calciano: But the University was a have-power; why did they feel it was so necessary to get their positions delineated. Did they feel that they were going to be threatened in the near future?

McHenry: Yes. We felt, I felt strongly, and I'm sure that Kerr shared this, that we were on a toboggan. That it was only a matter of time with the increasing numbers of students involved in the state colleges, the increasing number of state colleges, up to eighteen authorized and so on, that they would have more political strength than we would. In those days we

talked in terms of, "They would control the Assembly," and "We would still have the Senate," because of our rural ramifications and agricultural extension. Of course what happened in the middle '60s or soon thereafter, indeed within three years, there were U.S. Supreme Court decisions that forced the state legislatures to reapportion on the basis of population in both houses, which has lost for the University its enormous strength in the Senate. But at the time of the Master Plan, we still had the veto power in effect, the University did, in the Senate. We had enough rural senators who were beholden to our agricultural extension and other services that almost any unpleasant bill we could kill in the last analysis. We'd never say this publicly, but we had this veto power very securely. And then the Supreme Court in its series of decisions in the '60s has pulled this rug from under the University. But we figured that the University was sort of at a pinnacle of political power that was going to be diminished, and therefore we wanted to write it into the Constitution and make it very hard to change.

Calciano: Well being statutory it can be changed by what, a majority vote of the Legislature?

McHenry: Yes. But the gubernatorial signature is required, and

we might still nip it through a referendum. That's all we have now. The University politically is weak, is weakened. We don't have nearly the preponderant power we had, and I'm sure Kerr saw this very clearly, and hence the great urge to go forward and get some settlements that would last.

Calciano: Well even the referendum type thing, with eighteen state colleges, they've got eighteen population centers; I presume it would be ...

McHenry: Yes, but....

Calciano: ... of course we've got ag-extension.

McHenry: Well we've got other things too, you see. Out of the Master Plan we had, previously we had all of the law schools under public jurisdiction, all of the medical schools, both of the medical schools then, but it's five now. We have dentistry as a monopoly; we have graduate architecture under the Master Plan as an exclusive jurisdiction of the University. Now what we did is just freeze the status quo; that is, we precluded the state colleges from going into those by law. Actually they probably could have not gone into them anyway without a positive act justifying it. But these areas were marked out, plus the doctoral degrees of all kinds were marked out as University jurisdiction, and in a way having them in the law the

way it is puts the burden of proof on them. And the University is not as weak as I indicated; perhaps I overstressed this growing weakness. We still have, among the alums, most of the publicly-educated-in-California lawyers, doctors, dentists, and so on. We still have the wealthier alums, and we still have access to channels of communication, great newspapers, the Los Angeles Times and its vast empire with a Regent on the Board from the Times family. The Hearst empire with a Regent on the Board from the Hearst family, and a lot of other assets in this picture. And so we're not completely without some power in the State. And in this state college versus the University fight, or smoldering enmity, that is inevitable, I think, we also have been strengthened more recently by the disorders in the state colleges. We were at a low ebb in the University after the December '64 troubles at Berkeley and subsequent troubles, mostly there, some now at other campuses. But there was a time when people said, "How come the state colleges are so well behaved and the University campuses are so turbulent?" That's somewhat equalized now. Not that we're glad trouble was caused at San Francisco State or San Jose State, but it's simply that they've had it, too, and maybe we'll have it at Santa Cruz someday and

elsewhere, and the public now doesn't regard either one as superior to the other in terms of student behavior.

Calciano: Now why ... why are the Universities so concerned with their power base? Is it because if the state colleges go into graduate programs and so forth, they get a bigger slice of the budget, or better.... I think I know the reasons, but state them.

McHenry: Well, the budget, yes. There's no doubt but what the budget of the University has to be larger per student than the state colleges because of this obligation we have to produce doctorates. The University also was declared under the Master Plan the State's chief academic agency for research. And a lot of the support that comes to the University in the form of grants and donations and gifts and even political support comes from interests that are helped by the University's research. You can take prosaic examples like a mechanical tomato picker that's developed at Davis, but medicine for example, an area you know well -- a great many wills are changed after a period of recovery in a hospital. The University draws very heavily, if you trace the whole pattern of gifts, the University draws very heavily from people who are emotionally involved in their own or a relative's

illness and some services the University provided. And we're trying to preserve our base, and we're trying to keep from having the resources of the State so dispersed that there would be at every wide place in the road not only a four-year college, but a four-year college offering doctorates galore; of cheap medical schools; of low-grade dentistry schools; of hole-in-the-wall schools of law and so on. And California has not yet, I think, diffused its resources. Some other states, Illinois, for example, is busy setting up doctoral programs in DeKalb and all kinds of strange places, and maybe they aren't as strange to Illinoisians as Santa Cruz is to Californians (laughter), but the graduate programs within the University of California have always gone through very rigorous analysis, and I don't believe very many doctoral programs have ever been launched in a University of California campus without a very careful appraisal of the laboratory and library resources before it was done. No such machinery exists in the state colleges, and we're just afraid that the dollar, the higher-educational dollar, will get spread on some equalitarian basis which will lead to a qualitative cutback.

Calciano: Well now in the Master Plan then, was there a law to get these prerogatives established, or....

McHenry: No.

Calciano: ... or did you have to compromise?

McHenry: Yes. You see the offering of status, of Trustees with sixteen-year terms, and then ... was so attractive to them, they were so anxious to get rid of many of these burdens of the past, to get free of the State Department of Education, to set up a central administration and so on, that they were willing to accept some of these other things, at least on a transitional basis until they got power to do these things. So it was ... they got what they wanted most, and they accepted the University's taking and reserving what it wanted most. But they didn't plan never to fight again, and almost immediately they began to agitate, and the proposals are ... I think the Assembly has passed this year already again, I think it passed last year, a proposal to change the name of the state college system to the state university system. And these things are going to come up, and I suspect someday they'll be passed.* I don't know. But I think it's our job to fight them as long as we can.

Calciano: In your Stadtman interview[†] you mentioned Fred Dutton

*Ed. note: On October 26, 1971, the Legislature voted that the state colleges be called state universities. The names were officially changed June 1, 1972.

** See footnote, Vol. 1, page 303.

and Bill Coblentz caused problems. Dutton would keep advising Brown. So this made me wonder how did Brown stand on all of this?

McHenry: Well Brown was a kind of a ... he's an interesting study. He was no great brain, and he was very proud of the good things that were done. Somebody convinced Brown quite early that the wave of the future was with the state colleges, and he was tending to think that ... he never put it this way, but Dutton was pretty frank with me ... that they were going to inherit the future. Though he himself was a Berkeley graduate, he hadn't ... apparently his experience at Berkeley wasn't as pleasant as his experience at Stanford Law School after the war. Yet when he had his choice of what role he was going to play after he pulled out of the most active role in the governor's office, he chose to be a Regent. But neither of these fellows was making any two-fisted fight for their alma mater.

Calciano: Who chose to be a Regent?

McHenry: Dutton.

Calciano: Oh! Okay. I thought maybe you were talking about Brown.

McHenry: Dutton is a Regent. Coblentz is a Regent also.

Calciano: Yes. Okay.

McHenry: Both of them were appointed before the Brown Administration ended. And we felt, many of us, that these guys, as alumni and as personal friends of many of us, ought to be watching out for the University's interest in the Governor's office. As a matter of fact, I don't think they were. And I think that they may have been much more looking out for the state college interests. Coblenz did go on the state college Trustees for awhile, and then he was promoted to the Regents. And that pecking order is not at all pleasing to the state college people.

Calciano: Well how did Brown act?

McHenry: Well Brown was very shaky in the beginning. It took a long time to convert him to the University's contribution and to be proud of the University; it took months of hard work. I was close to him. Gene Lee was close to him. We were close to Dutton. I wrote a couple of Brown's best campaign speeches in '58 before I went to Statewide -- the more conservative speeches he gave. (Laughter) And he appointed me on the sort of Little Hoover Commission to set up the reorganization of the State, and I did that all through 1958-'59, and indeed some of that work interfered with my work on the Master Plan in '59-'60. I was quite close in. We eventually got him, Clark Kerr got him to behaving

very well toward the University. And when he saw this dramatic business that the Master Plan thing was coming together, that the eight of us had drawn up a compromise that both Boards were going to accept, he presided over meetings of the joint Board; indeed he presided over the meetings in December of '59 at which the two Boards voting together unanimously endorsed the Master Plan. And it was a tremendous achievement. I don't know if anything like it ever happened. And most of the credit belongs to Arthur Coons, who brought all this together. And then Brown became quite enthusiastic about the Master Plan, and in the campaign of '62, he pointed to the Master Plan as one of the great achievements of his administration. Well, he'd been very little interested in it at the start. And as the years wore on, he became more and more proud of the University, because he went to Governors' conferences and Rockefeller and others were saying to him, "How did this University of California ever get so" and he said, "Well we did so and so" (Laughter). So at the time he finished his term, I think the state colleges thought that he was pretty much in our pocket. But it hadn't started that way, and the most dramatic conversion that I've ever seen of a public man occurred in public in the Governor's hearing room

in the outer office.

Getting Approval for the New Campuses

McHenry: After the Master Plan was through the Legislature, we kept getting resistance in the Department of Finance that despite the Master Plan recommendations, that they weren't ready to go with new campuses. Why not let Berkeley go to 40,000, and so on. This affected our building program and all the plans that were being made to launch new campuses. Now the date: approximately June 1960. The scene: the outer office of the Governor's office. Present: the Department of Finance senior officials, a fair share of our Regents, and a fair share of our vice presidents and administrative people.

Calciano: And you were there?

McHenry: I was there. We'd prepared very carefully, and there's one chart especially that I'm proud of because I think it was the most persuasive thing that we had, other than Clark Kerr, who fought brilliantly. We were in hearings in the morning and the afternoon, a total of about five hours, and the issue was, "Should the University of California new campus program go forward?" And we devised a diagram, which I'm sure I could find someplace in the Statewide academic plan, that ... it took weeks to figure this out, but it was

a kind of a graph and flow chart in which we had the years across the bottom, and we had the numbers, student numbers, going on the vertical. And we started out with, say, 1962, and we showed how many students there were at Berkeley as the base campus; how many students there were at Los Angeles, and then through the years up to the year 2000. And we plotted these based on Department of Finance statistics of population and ... indeed I guess we maybe went to 2020 in this thing ... and we showed Berkeley coming up and then when it hit its 27,500 leveling off; and Los Angeles coming up at 27,500 and leveling off; and then we showed Santa Barbara, which was small then, going very rapidly up and then hitting its limit, which was then, I think, about 15,000; and Davis, which was small, coming up and hitting its limit, which was about 15,000; and little Riverside achieving its 10 or whatever it was. And then the new campuses from their start at ... from nothing. San Diego, coming up and achieving its 27,500. And Irvine coming up and achieving its 27,500. And Santa Cruz coming up and achieving its 27,500. And then we showed up at the top the large number of students who wouldn't even be accommodated after that once these were topping out in 1990. Now we had all the facilities here completely

done, and we were going to need two more campuses before the turn of the century to get started to whittle away on that backlog above. But that diagram was ... I knew the Governor well enough so that when I brought it in, we had a big one, a big spread of it, and I propped it up right on the side of his desk so that he kept looking at this (laughter) and he sat a little diagonally, and he kept looking at that thing, and Kerr just drove home rebuttals to every Department of Finance argument. Almost every one Kerr answered personally. And it was really, I think, his finest hour. And in the end the Governor said, "Very well, we'll take it under advisement." In the next week we began to get statistics from the Department of Finance that said: ANC. And we had to call to ask what it meant. It meant, "assuming new campuses." (Laughter) And it was a very dramatic episode. And it was a great thing; you see, he'd just been President two years then, and the new campus program had no authorization at all. San Diego was beginning to build a little bit, but Irvine and Santa Cruz were not. And from that day, the obstacles in state government to building were gone.

Calciano: Well how did Kerr defeat the argument of, "Why not have 40,000?"

McHenry: Well, we had some pretty good ... we'd gotten a lot of agreement on various committees, the Master Plan, the two Boards, and so on, that you got diminishing returns when you got to colossal size. There were such arguments as I'd been presenting for several years that the new land that Berkeley was reclaiming south of the campus in the vicinity of the Durant Hotel, we were paying an average of \$50,000 an acre for, and it's probably 100 now. And you see we had to buy the improvements and raze them in order to build. This land [Santa Cruz] cost the University \$1000 an acre. And we had arguments of various kinds about impossibility of expanding in metropolitan areas; the desirability of going out and getting free land, as we did at Irvine and San Diego; both those sites were wholly free. And some statistics that seemed to indicate that the expansion of some kinds of higher education was really cheaper if, after you got to colossal size, if you went back and started a new one. The same kind of argument that argues for a branch store to serve customers better, or a branch manufacturing plant, or a branch library, of getting people closer. Now some of those arguments didn't apply very well once the Regents settled on Santa Cruz, but they hadn't settled on Santa Cruz then. The

image of a proper place for this campus was much more in the Santa Clara Valley at that time. And people were visualizing a campus in which people commuted for twenty miles and came in each day, as they do at Irvine or UCLA.

Calciano: What was the relationship between the University academic plan of '59 and the Master Plan? And in conjunction with this, didn't the University once say, "We need four campuses." What happened to the fourth?

McHenry: Well that was the San Joaquin Valley, and this report I've referred to of the All-University Faculty Conference of '57 advocated a campus in the San Joaquin Valley. The Regents in October of '57 decided to make it three, but to give very careful study to the needs of the Central Valley. They figured that four was too many to put over at once. There were some fears that the Central Valley was not a good place to build a large university because of the climatic conditions -- that students would prefer coastal areas, even those from the Central Valley would prefer coastal areas. And they've even more experience with this now. Riverside has not grown as they expected, and one of the main reasons is that it's bleak country, and it's hot country. Davis has grown despite this. But whether the University should have a base in

the San Joaquin was the big issue. And I think we missed our opportunity to do it back in World War II time. The original bill transferring the Santa Barbara campus to the Regents had two campuses, two state colleges in it, Fresno and Santa Barbara. And Fresno was dropped out.

Calciano: Why?

McHenry: Well, what the politics of it was, I just don't know. Hugh Burns, then an Assemblyman, had joined up with Assemblyman Robertson of Santa Barbara in it, and it may be that Sproul felt he couldn't assimilate two, I don't know. If we'd gone in then, if we'd ... Fresno is the obvious metropolis of the Valley, and if we'd gone in then and had taken over Fresno State, we'd have that strong political backing in there. And we'd also be of service; and now with air conditioning and the like, if we had Fresno, and there were no Fresno State, it would ... it's about the only way I can see our going into the Valley on a big scale, if we could take over Fresno State. And I don't see how that's possible now that the political power is distributed as it is.

Calciano: These new campuses were to be regional, and as you said, they even thought of them in terms of commuting. Well now Santa Cruz has drawn half its student body

from Southern California, roughly, has it not?

McHenry: Yes.

Calciano: It's from all over California. Has this kind of put a kink in the works? (Laughter)

McHenry: Well it shows that there is a pretty big demand for a residential arrangement, and that many students want to leave home to go to college. And the private institutions have been very worried about Santa Cruz and the kind of students it's drawing. There's just no doubt at all that Santa Cruz is drawing very heavily from private institutions all over the West and to some extent of the East too. Youngsters who would have gone, before Santa Cruz was established, to a private institution, often with high tuition, are coming here by choice. And this means that some of the private institutions are aiming their criticisms of the University of California more at Santa Cruz than any other part. Also we're increasing their jealousy of us by the successful money raising. A gift like the Merrill gift just shocks the private institutions, and yet I think it's quite possible that no one of these California institutions ever approached the Merrill Trust. I've never heard of anyone.

Calciano: Are we scrambling more than the private institutions?

McHenry: Well I don't know. I think the idea of the newness

here is attractive. And another thing is, and President Hitch mentioned this to me not long ago, the private institutions will say, "Well Santa Cruz names a whole college for a piddling gift of \$500,000, and we have to scratch to build two or three rooms for \$500,000. It's a way of organizing. The University of Pacific uses a very similar form that we do; they tend to get larger gifts for their colleges, or potentially larger gifts, through land and so on, but there's no doubt now that we're drawing very heavily from a clientele that would ordinarily in another generation have gone to a private institution. Gurden Mooser brought back a confidential sheet from Reed College not long ago that showed of all the students Reed admitted and went to some other institution, Santa Cruz had the most, and Stanford and Pomona and certain others were on the list, and Berkeley was on the list, but Santa Cruz by a narrow margin was number one, their number one competitor.

Calciano: A daughter of a faculty member at Ames was out here looking at UCSC last week and came to talk with me because the three schools she was really considering were Radcliffe, Stanford, and UCSC, typical of what you're saying.

McHenry: Well, we're making, shall we say, some special

problems for the University of California in dealing with the private institutions, and I don't know what's going to be the ultimate issue, and how it's going to be resolved. One of the suggestions that's been made by Allan Cartter who is Vice-chancellor of New York University, speaking to the Legislature some time ago, was simply that Santa Cruz charge tuition. That there's no reason why you have to have a uniform tuition throughout the system. And maybe Santa Cruz should charge tuition and some of the others not, and you can balance off the attractiveness this way.

Calciano: Of course that's kind of hard on the people who can't afford the tuition.

McHenry: Yes. But a good share of the families who have children here could afford the tuition. But we would need some source of meeting that tuition charge for underprivileged youngsters, and we're making a big push now. We're bringing in 30 who are going to take massive scholarship support next fall. Negroes, Mexicans, poor whites.

Calciano: Yes, I'll be asking about that later.

THE SANTA CRUZ CAMPUS -- SITE SELECTION

Almaden vs. Santa Cruz

Calciano: Chronologically your appointment as Dean of Statewide came before the site selection period I presume.

McHenry: Yes. Though I think that the study was going on by Warnecke. The Regents employed a planner, Larry Livingston, who is a lawyer, and John Carl Warnecke, architect, to study Northern California and look for sites; they had a similar study in Southern California by another architect, and they did ... have you ever seen these plates and so on? It's a vast study of ... they took the whole region, and they took aerial maps trying to find out where some buildable land was, a thousand acres together, and they narrowed it down eventually to a hundred sites. Then they narrowed it down eventually to seven or eight and made closer studies, came out of the airplane and went out along the ground, and then eventually it was narrowed down by the Regents to two: the Almaden Valley site and the Santa Cruz-Cowell site. And they virtually adopted the San Jose-Almaden Valley site, and then Santa Cruz began to fight back and eventually changed the decision to a decision in 1961 for this site.

Calciano: Were you at all involved in this site selection?

McHenry: Not much.

Calciano: Did you have a preference?

McHenry: Well I did, actually. In terms of beauty, there was no question but what this was the better one, but virtually all of us in University-wide, and we had a

little planning group that met about every two weeks or so that I called together from various offices, and we took a poll, and all of us, I think, except two felt that Almaden was the way to go because the population was there. And when the final vote came in the Regents -- and Kerr has chided me frequently about my feeling that it had to go to Almaden, because I was not involved in terms of any appointment at that time -- only Governor Brown and Lieutenant Governor Anderson voted against this site.

April 24, 1968 9:00 a.m.

Calciano: When we concluded last week we were just at the point where the site selection was going to be made, and I want first of all to get on record the story of the Santa Cruz upset. They had narrowed it to Almaden and Santa Cruz, and public opinion and Regents' opinion and everything was Almaden, right?

McHenry: Yes, I should think that was so.

Calciano: And you said that you thought Almaden was the best.

McHenry: Well I thought under the circumstances -- we'd justified the building of the campus to a large extent on the population which was concentrated in the peninsula -- that it was more or less inevitable that population had to be served.

Calciano: Okay. Now, can you give me the story of what caused

the great reversal?

McHenry: Well, I don't know in detail, because I was not intimately involved. It was quite peripheral to my job then in academic planning. The Almaden site was boosted by the city and county there -- the city of San Jose, and the county of Santa Clara, the Chamber of Commerce, the city manager, and the public officials generally of Santa Clara County were quite strong for it, and indeed had promised a fairly large amount of money from the city and county. I've forgotten whether it was two or four million -- I think it was four million dollars, two million each, I think, they promised -- to help buy the site. The site, however, was not free; indeed, it was going to cost perhaps more than four million. It was a nice site on the floor of the valley, but within seven to eleven miles of the downtown section. It was urbanized. The urbanization, subdivisions, had crept around the area pretty thoroughly, and it was under the ownership, as I remember it, of perhaps sixty different owners, and the biggest piece was perhaps 300 acres.

Calciano: What was the total size?

McHenry: One thousand, which was the minimum the Regents would accept. But with that many ownerships, you are bound

to have a half dozen who would hold out for more money, and therefore you'd have to go into eminent domain proceedings, condemnation, and it might have taken five, six years to clear this through the courts. In the meantime to have little pockets and islands that were privately owned inside the campus looked intolerable. But as the Regents faced up to problems like that, there was this beckoning call from Santa Cruz, which was really second in the order of priority, Almaden being first. And I suppose to equalize this thing a little bit between Almaden and Santa Cruz, and Livingston was very strong for Almaden by the way, the planners instead of taking the whole of the Cowell Ranch, or the main part of the Cowell Ranch, the planners instead projected a campus of the meadow part, from where we're sitting on south, and then they took on the other side of High Street, on the other side of Empire Grade, oh perhaps 50 individually owned plots of land. So one of the reasons....

Calciano: Now wait ... this is what they were saying....

McHenry: That's right. If you go back to the records of the planning group, the Warnecke-Livingston group, when they suggested the Santa Cruz site, they suggested only acquiring perhaps 600 acres of the top, from

about where University House sits south, perhaps a square mile from the Cowells, and then the rest of it consisted of another 400 acres on the other side, below, on the ocean side.

Calciano: Why on earth would they propose trying to wrestle with a bunch of individual owners?

McHenry: Well the only explanation I ever had, which is rather lame, is that this was the more level part of the Cowell Ranch, that the rest was awfully steep to build on. And the other explanation which I cooked up was that they were just trying to equalize the two.

Calciano: The difficulties of the two?

McHenry: Yes, yes. So that Santa Cruz would not appear to be so obviously the first choice.

The Santa Cruz Proposal Takes Shape

McHenry: At any rate, Scotchy Sinclair of the Sentinel, who was head of the Chamber of Commerce committee working on bringing the University, and he can tell you this, and you really ought to interview him sometime on it, because he remembers the details, and I was not involved, he then came up with the idea, working with the Cowell Trustees, that they would make available to the University the whole 1000 acres. Now they didn't want to give it away, because Internal Revenue

apparently was breathing down their necks as a Foundation, so they said that they'd sell it. Now who negotiated the details of the transaction and what they were, I don't know precisely, but Warren Hellman, who is a Trustee of the Cowell Foundation and was then, told me one time that his cousin he called him, I think they're second cousins, Ed Heller, had negotiated awfully hard on this. Heller was a Regent and is the late husband of the present Regent Elinor Heller. The Regents were willing to go through the motions of paying for the land, but they wanted to be sure, they wanted a guarantee they got the money back in some form. And eventually the oral agreement was the Foundation said, "We will return a substantial proportion of the money you pay for the land." This was terribly important to Santa Cruz campus as we know it today, because the return of the money paid to Cowell made it possible for us to put together the package of Cowell College. Eventually they gave \$920,000 for Cowell College. And then Clark Kerr and I had in our hands the break-through money to build the first college and show what could be done. And the Regents were encouraged by having the money in hand for this purpose. But Mr. Thelen let us specify what we needed most. And there were, among things discussed

in the early time: wouldn't you like a faculty club, and wouldn't you like this or that; wouldn't you like a health service; and we chose for the first, a college, and named it, of course, for the Cowells. And they were quite agreeable to whatever we said, and we said this, and that started the model, and we were able to interest other donors and convince the Regents that it was possible to get a certain amount of grant money in order to round out these colleges with the facilities that were needed.

Calciano: Well now on maps of the site about that time there's always three sections, A, B, and C.

McHenry: Yes.

Calciano: Did A come about as being the first 600 or what....

McHenry: I think we'd have to ask Bob Evans, the Vice President, Physical Planning and Construction, exactly how those came about. I think they were rooted perhaps on deeds that were on file. I think maybe the Cowell deed had these separate parcels. But I'm not so sure of that, that that was the whole factor, because you see while the University did acquire the central ranch, it shaved off both the Pogonip on the east and the area adjacent to the Wilder Ranch on the west at various points. I'm sure that there are records in University Hall on how this came about, but the

important decision that was made in addition to those that we've already covered is that the Regents asked that an appraisal of the property be done, be made, and a survey. And the appraisal was done by Noel Patterson, the local realtor and appraiser and our good friend now, and he obviously, I think, had instructions to evaluate the land on the basis of its then use. Instead of evaluating it in terms of the extra value that would come from having this developed, he evaluated it as undeveloped land. And his appraisal came out at about eleven hundred dollars an acre, which was pretty low even for that time; that is I should say it was a tame appraisal. Then that set the price for the plot, but it was so low that the Regents said, "We've never had enough land for any campus; we're always short. How much better it would have been at Berkeley and UCLA if we'd had enough. So let's for once have plenty." So they reopened negotiations and asked whether the Cowells would be willing to sell 2000. Now whether this decision to buy 2000 came before or after or during the appraisal, I don't know. But I know the survey wasn't finished, because the price was set for the whole thing before the survey was finished, and it was set on the basis of about 1950 acres, and the survey was made by Bowman

and Williams of which Tom Polk Williams, Jr., is the active engineer at the head of the company, an "old blue" from Berkeley. And when he'd finished, he had more than 50 acres additional inside the metes and bounds that were laid out. So the very first time I spoke in Santa Cruz to a service club, as I remember, to the Rotary Club, I bought a tin cup at Woolworth's, a five-cent tin cup that they now sell for a dime because of inflation, and presented it to him on behalf of his alma mater for getting us free that extra 50 or so acres. (Laughter) It finally turned out about 1995, and then we got into a little question; the title search showed that there was a little strip of land along the Empire Grade and High which didn't seem to belong to anybody. The Cowells had grazed some cattle on it, which you can still see it divided by fences, sometimes 50 feet apart, sometimes....

Calciano: That's the narrow part?

McHenry: Yes. And the title search showed two possible claimants with the County Bank of Santa Cruz: some estate a way back, I'm not just sure what, and the Cowell Company, the Cowell Foundation. And so we went to each one and got them to sign quit claims, and so the University got another three and one half acres off this somehow. And we got a little piece or two

when we built the East Peripheral Road, so it's rounded out at round about 2000 acres even.

Calciano: Fred Wagner tells the story about that little portion down there -- I can't remember it completely, but that Cowell got mad at people using a road that was on his property, and he just moved the fence over or locked the gate, so there's a very narrow place on Empire Grade with two fences to the right. He said a man named [John D.] Chace gave some of his land to build the present road.

McHenry: Very interesting.

Calciano: So that may have some bearing on how this was in dispute.

Santa Cruz Wins

Calciano: Turning to the subject at hand, I have heard that -- of course things get out of focus fast -- but I've heard that the turning point in this whole Almaden versus Santa Cruz thing occurred on a bus trip the Regents took to see both campuses, both sites on a hot day. Is this right?

McHenry: Yes. And I was along on that trip, several officers were brought along, and it was the first time I had ever seen this site, the Santa Cruz campus site. Scotchy Sinclair had prepared it. It seems to me that

it must have been in August or one of the summer months. I could probably reconstruct this, the exact dates; I'm sure they're on record, and I've always ... I keep my datebooks, and I might be able to find it, if it's important to you. At any rate, the Regents, a considerable number of Regents, I should think close to two-thirds of them in a bus, an air-conditioned bus, went from Berkeley down Highway 17 all the way to Santa Cruz first. It was a nice brisk day here with temperatures close to perfect, maybe 70 or so, and some sunshine as I remember it. Scotchy Sinclair had very carefully arranged everything so that the bus came in near the main campus entrance now, through the barnyard, and wandered up by the little roads that were then there.

Calciano: It didn't get stuck in the mud? (Laughter)

McHenry: No. No mud then, and actually he'd had it bladed so that it rode very smoothly over the hills, and we went up on one of the lower hills, up away just about off what is now Hagar Drive, and were able to survey the area, look back at the forest and look down at the bay, and Scotchy Sinclair, as I remember it, had a speaker of some kind; there was a speaker of some kind in the bus, so the people in great comfort saw the beauty of the place. And after various presentations

of this kind and looking it over and oohing and ahing at the forest and the sea, the bus went on back, again in air-conditioned comfort, and went into an area of wine grapes owned by one of the wineries, I would have thought Paul Masson probably, but I'm not sure of that, on a hillside, to look down at the Almaden Valley. The Chamber of Commerce in San Jose figured the big bus wouldn't make it up this sandy vineyard road, so people were transferred over into two little buses that were non-air-conditioned, and it was very hot, and men began to peel their coats off, and we finally got up on top of the hill and looked down, and it was sandy and very warm and wasn't particularly attractive, and from the vantage point they had chosen, you could see the subdivisions creeping up on this area. And then we went back, got in the comfortable bus, and there's a country club developed right alongside of the what was then considered the site, the Almaden Valley Club or something of the kind, and a very nice golf course, but the clubhouse was not air-conditioned, and it was pretty hot inside, and they had drinks laid on and all, but there wasn't enough ice on the bar to cool the place down. Then they got back in the bus, and going up Highway 17 I can still remember, I think it was Regent Chandler

saying to another Regent, "Why it'd cost us a fortune to air-condition a campus there." (Laughter) So Santa Cruz had real luck on the day that was chosen. If it had been thick fog down here and proper over there, it might have been another story. But gradually the Regents were won over. It took many months -- I should think six or eight months of indecision. I remember one major presentation at the Santa Barbara campus, maybe it was a February. At any rate, the Santa Cruz people came back strongly, and there was a lot of undercover work that was arranged by Scotchy Sinclair. He's told me that Carl Wente (not to be confused with his nephew who is Karl, and who was here last Saturday) Carl with a "C" was the Chairman of the Board of the Bank of America, and he'd been President of the State Chamber of Commerce and ... it's a Livermore family that originally made money in wines, but Carl became the banker of the family, President, Chairman of the Board of the Bank of America. He has a summer home to which he's very largely retired now, up San Lorenzo Valley. And the Santa Cruz people, especially Scotchy, enlisted his help at contacting on a high level, Regents, and talking them into this project in Santa Cruz. And the Assemblyman from this area, Glenn Coolidge, was very much, very influential.

And he had been year after year in legislative sessions the most effective compromiser on budget matters, an extremely effective, skillful man, and he was very good at getting things for his district. And when it came to something of this kind, he was very good at persuading key people. So Glenn Coolidge was quite influential in the decision. He died in '62, and one of the things that we are now proposing that hasn't been announced yet is that the East Peripheral Road be renamed the Glenn Coolidge Drive.

Calciano: Oh!

McHenry: And we've written to both the City and the County proposing this. If they agree, it'll be so named, and there's some thought that the same name might carry on down this new road, the parkway, all the way to Escalona, and there are others who feel that Bay Street has always been the connecting link between the Cowell Ranch and the wharf at Cowell Beach, and that it ought to remain even though rerouted somewhat by the new road. But Glenn Coolidge was also influential in this campus site selection.

Calciano: Which Regents were for Santa Cruz and which were not? And which one dreamed up getting 2000 instead of 1000?

McHenry: Well I ... on the first it's very easy, because in the end all Regents except Governor Brown and Lieutenant

Governor Anderson voted for the Santa Cruz site. Those two felt that it ought to be nearer the population center, and they voted for Almaden. Some of the others were original supporters of Santa Cruz and some of them were hesitant. Gus Olson, who is now retired, was a farmer from up the Sacramento Valley way, Clarksburg, and who now lives in Carmel most of the time, was one of the early supporters of Santa Cruz. I think Donald McLaughlin was. He's the Chairman of the Board of Homestake Mining, and he's off the Board [of Regents] now; both of them are off the Board. And there were others who were originally in there. It may be that the Regents minutes could reveal this. A lot of these things were done in executive sessions, and I didn't attend Regents meetings on a regular basis then, so I'm not very good at pointing out just who did what. Now I think, and this is second-handed, and I got this impression from McLaughlin himself, that he was the one who said, "Let's get 2000 acres." But I'm not certain of that. That's the kind of thing that Pauley would have done, or Carter might have done, both of them who in their businesses make land deals and know the value of land.

The Decision to Build on the Middle of the Campus

Calciano: Well now once the site was selected, what happened next? I'm a little fuzzy on at what point you became connected with the campus, and what happened before you did become connected?

McHenry: Yes. Well the selection was pretty well settled at the time I was appointed. Indeed I think the campus was named the University of California, Santa Cruz, during the winter or early spring of 1961, and I was appointed in July of '61. It would have been about halfway through July, maybe around the 14th or 15th, if I remember correctly. And at that time the only plans that had been drawn up for the place were the physical ones that the City of Santa Cruz had drawn up. They had a model made of what the campus would be like. Have you ever seen it?

Calciano: No. I know it was on the lower half.

McHenry: It exists, and it was their first proposal. It was very white, lots of white buildings taking all the meadow area and building entirely out in the open. And if I remember correctly, it was done by Campbell and Wong, who are the architects for Merrill College. And we must acquire this model. It's stored someplace or other; what might have been. They had taken the lower end of the campus, but not the private property across

High, and had shown how the campus could fit into about a square mile in here, but staying out of the woods. And then after I was appointed, indeed at the September meeting, I think, of '61, maybe the October, but again in Santa Barbara, if I recall correctly, the presentation was made by various firms that wanted to do the master planning of the campus. Skidmore, Owings, and Merrill made a presentation, John Carl Warnecke, and various others, asking to be appointed the master-planning architects. In the end the decision was made, and I had some part in this, to set up a consortium consisting of the best of these excluding Skidmore, Owings, and Merrill, which wanted to do it alone perhaps, or not at all; they're a very big firm. So John Carl Warnecke was appointed sort of a chairman, and he associated himself with Anshen and Allen, who have since done the science buildings; Ernest Kump, who subsequently became our ongoing consulting architect, and who designed, of course, Central Services as well as Crown College; Theodore Bernardi of Wurster, Bernardi, and Emmons, who designed Cowell; and John Carl Warnecke, of course, who has since designed the Library; and then finally Thomas D. Church, the landscape architect, who became the consulting landscape architect, and who sites all

our buildings and so on. Now this group got to work in '62. The first times we were together on the campus I remember as sort of the winter, perhaps February or so, of '62. And we took long walks on the campus and talked about the physical plan; a good deal of sketching and mapping was done, and then we came to the Regents with the preliminary proposal that instead of building out in the open, that we'd move towards the center of the campus which was the prime land. Face the fact that roads were going to have to be built and bridges and so on, but use the best area of the campus so that it then could expand, have room for expansion, and not be built right down against the town, which would make some things easier in the early days, cutting down the amount of transport and having commercial services readily available, but to face the decade or two of relative remoteness from the town in order to have the ability to grow at least two directions; we said, "grow four directions," but the width of the campus we're going to use pretty well within the first ten years as it's turned out.

Calciano: Well was this the architects who decided, or you, or together?

McHenry: Well all of us together, and then we convinced the Regents.

Calciano: But did you take convincing, or were you for it right away?

McHenry: No, I liked the idea from the first time it was proposed, very much.

Calciano: But this was before there was any idea of colleges?

McHenry: No, no. I should have brought in the academic planning part. And this had something to do with my appointment I'm sure.

Calciano: Yes. I wanted to know which came first. (Laughter)

Origins of the Residential College Concept

McHenry: In April or May of '61, when it became clear that the Santa Cruz site was settled (we didn't get title to it until November, but it went into escrow pretty soon) but when the decision was made, and I rather think the decision might have been made at Santa Barbara in February, but my recollection could be wrong. At any rate, after the decision was made, then my imagination soared, and I began to get out little bits and pieces that I'd stored up over the years out of my mind and out of my files. There had been a persistent advocate of a large state university consisting organically of small colleges in President Emeritus Remsen Bird of Occidental College; he's 80 years old now; he lives in Carmel; I get a letter from him about once a week. But

he had an exchange of letters with Dyke Brown, then Vice President of the Ford Foundation.

Calciano: When was this?

McHenry: The exchange of letters may be back in the '50s sometime. But I knew of the existence of the Brown letter, and I have a copy someplace, I don't know where, but I'm sure I've got it in the campus files. Dyke Brown had said on this letterhead of the Ford Foundation (I'm sure that he'd been a Rhodes scholar, Berkeley man, Rhodes Scholar, and is now the head of the Athenian School in Danville, a private secondary school built on this same sort of decentralized principle) well this letter had said that a model state university of the future might well have this feeling of Oxford in small colleges and sense of belonging of its members and so on. Then there were these two studies I think you and I have talked about, at Berkeley made by faculty members -- do you recall anything like that, Elizabeth?

Calciano: Well you gave me ... you talked about the academic plan for Berkeley, and we've talked about the Master Plan for all of the campuses, but....

McHenry: Yes. Well in the '50s, after Kerr became Chancellor, following '52, '53, suddenly the Regents decided that building residential halls was not socialism. There'd

been a previous sentiment that it was socialistic to build halls of residence. (Chuckle) And this was the attitude of E. A. Dickson, who was sort of permanent Chairman of the Board and who had served....

Calciano: Hadn't other Universities been doing it for years?

McHenry: Yes, but it still was an interference with private enterprise.

Calciano: I see.

McHenry: So there came a change of feeling in the Board. And Berkeley, as usual, led. And they had plans made in the '50s to build some major dormitory units both at Berkeley and UCLA. And at Berkeley, in preparation for this, faculty groups were stimulated to make proposals, and this was part of Kerr's fine technique. They were self-starting groups, and there were two separate groups that met at lunchtime over a period of months at Berkeley that drew up plans to change the organization of instruction and residence in concert with this opportunity that came about through the building of residence halls. And one of these groups had two heads, really. It was convened by Jacobus Van..., oh my, the rest of it slips me, who died quite recently. He was a blind man; I knew him in graduate school many years ago, a lawyer, ten Broek (it's not

"van", it's "ten") or something like that, you can catch it in the University Directory. The last few years he was professor of political science, but for many years he was professor of public speaking at Berkeley. We called him "Chick", Chick ten Broek. And his co-chairman of this informal group was Nevitt Sanford, who is now professor of psychology at Stanford, who transferred later from Berkeley to Stanford. And the ten Broek-Sanford report, as they drew it up out of these informal conferences, called for an experimental college at Berkeley that, oh it bears some relationship perhaps to the Sussman Project of an experimental group^p program that's now in existence at Berkeley. But it was a single college. The other group, which was under the chairmanship of a great philosopher whom I'm visualizing now and whose name I'm having a little trouble with (laughter) ... but who was then the Mills Professor, Stephen Pepper is his name. He was the Mills Professor of -- it's an endowed chair with a very old-fashioned name -- of Intellectual and Moral Philosophy and Civil Polity, the Mills Professor.

Calciano: Wow! (Laughter)

McHenry: Stephen Pepper chaired a group that drew up a plan which he drafted that called for a series of

residential colleges operating within, I think, the framework of the Berkeley College of Letters and Science, or perhaps ultimately replacing it, these units to consist of student bodies of approximately 600. And I was very greatly influenced, especially by the second report, the Pepper report. Indeed I wouldn't have known of their existence except for Clark Kerr. The first time, sometime before this, and before ... perhaps as early as '58 or '59, the first year or two of his presidency ... one of the times when we were in his office, he said, "Let's get cracking on the new campuses." And he said then, "By the way," (they had been authorized, you will remember, the very day he was appointed in '57)...

Calciano: '58?

McHenry: He was appointed in '57, October '57.

Calciano: Oh, I see. I see. Took over in '58?

McHenry: Yes. But soon after he became President, within the year I think of his appointment, he said, "Let's get cracking on the new campuses." It could have been the first month he was President. And he said, "By the way, try to figure out some way to make them seem small as they grow large." I'd never heard him use that expression before, but it since has appeared in

the Harvard lectures and in the book of The Uses of the University in various forms. And when I looked puzzled over that he said, "The Berkeley Chancellor's office files have reports by Chick," (whom I'd known well) "Chick ten Broek and Nevitt Sanford, and there's another one by Stephen Pepper, and they'll give you some ideas and go on from there." So they came into the picture very early. Now, to skip up to '61, my imagination began to soar, and I began to think back to such things as the Bird-Brown, Dyke Brown, correspondence, and these two reports, and the little I knew about Oxford and Cambridge and the Australian Universities, and so on, and I did a memorandum which someday I'll find for you (I've located the early Santa Cruz files now. They're down in the barn, and they're going to be delivered to the study here) I did a memorandum which I think maybe was only one or two pages (Kerr liked things brief) suggesting that Santa Cruz be developed on a collegiate basis. And I think that I wrote that about in May. Then it was in June that Kerr first approached me about the Chancellorship. Have I told you that story?

Calciano: No.

McHenry is Appointed Chancellor

McHenry: Well, the Regents were meeting in Los Angeles, and I was still living in Los Angeles, though I commuted up to Berkeley three days a week typically, and I was at the house, our house on Holmby Avenue, which is near the campus, and I got a phone call from a girl who had been a ... her name was Jean Wall; she has a married name now, and I think she lives over in Carmel Valley in one of the retirement places, but Jean Wall phoned me, and she said, "I have a message from the President. It sounds very peculiar, but maybe you'll know what it means. He asked me to say that you should stay there at the house. He'll come over and have a sandwich and a glass of milk and go with you to the Pauley party." Regent Pauley had some kind of a party or reception on at the Beverly Hills Hilton, Beverly Hilton. And she said, "That sounds kind of funny, inviting himself to supper," and I said, "No, I understand and thanks very much." And then after the Regents' press conference, Kerr came over and sat down and over a turkey sandwich and a glass of milk said, "The Regents have authorized me to ask you whether you'd be interested in the Chancellorship at Santa Cruz." And I said something dignified like, "Boy, would I!" I'd told my wife, oh, not many days before, that of all the things in the University of California

to do, there's nothing I wanted to do more than Santa Cruz. And she had said, "Why don't you tell Clark?" We'd all been together since 1932. And I said, "I'm sure that if he wants me, he'll tell me." And he did. Within something like six days. Indeed I think I got the idea firmly set in my head that that was my ambition when speaking at the commencement, the first one on the new site, of Cabrillo College. The buildings weren't built yet, they were just graded, and it was a very dusty area, but I was asked to speak and afterwards invited to Keith Shaffer's to rest up a while, and then we all went to dinner at the Riverside Hotel with the Board of Cabrillo College and some of the community leaders that I met then for the first time. And it was after that experience in Santa Cruz, perhaps the Friday before the Friday that Kerr propositioned me that I got this firmly embedded in my head that this was the place I wanted to be. I was very well impressed with the community people I met at that time and of course with Bob Swenson. So then it was a matter of formality, and in the July meeting, '61, I was formally appointed and the press releases were all ready and I was photographed with Kerr and the Chairman of the Board, Don McLaughlin, and then the next day. I went off for three weeks in South

America.

Calciano: I presume Kerr suggested you to the Regents, right?

McHenry: Yes.

Calciano: Well does the University President usually select the Chancellors?

McHenry: Yes.

Calciano: Oh, that is....

McHenry: Well, the University President makes the nomination, and of course I'm sure there are times when he says, "Here are the three people that I think are best," and so on.

Other UC Chancellorships

Calciano: Well now you said something once about when the UCLA Chancellorship became vacant. I can't remember whether you said you wanted it, or you were considered, or....

McHenry: No. In 1960 when Murphy was appointed, there was some sentiment, I'm sure, in the Board and elsewhere that I should be offered it. I don't think it was ... I think it was a small minority. And you hear these things by the grapevine usually. But I'm sure that my name came up, and I'm also sure that the best possible appointment was made when Franklin Murphy was appointed. I had been politically active in

Los Angeles, and I was on the general side that would not have helped, I think, UCLA prosper in the business community and the like. I felt then that it was an impossibility, and I still feel so. Irvine was another thing. I don't know whether I ever got the story straight or not, but I think my name was -- there's a faculty search committee put out in each of these cases, as there usually is, and it works under wraps, and not many rumors came out. But I knew who was the chairman of each of these committees, and each of these chairmen told me privately years afterwards that my name was on their committee's list. Indeed my guess is that my name was at the head of the Santa Cruz list and was number two on the Irvine list, but I'm not sure of that. And number two after a man who later became, or just about that time, became President of the University of Chicago, George Beadle. Who all was on this list, I don't know.

Calciano: Well who was appointed first, the Irvine Chancellor or....

McHenry: Oh, I was!

Calciano: Before the Irvine Chancellorship?

McHenry: Yes.

Calciano: I see. Did you ... you didn't want Irvine particularly.

McHenry: No. In an early period I was quite interested in Irvine. The political climate of the county was something that I thought would be very hard to take. And I think that Aldrich is just about ideal for the role.

Calciano: Was he the first appointment there?

McHenry: Yes. And he's done it straight through. And he's a happy warrior. He's never been much involved in politics. He's a quiet Republican, and he's been able to walk the middle of the road remarkably well. But it's a difficult atmosphere in which to build a campus.

Calciano: Well during the past year, two Chancellors have resigned at other....

McHenry: Yes. There are vacancies several places -- San Diego is in the process of searching; San Francisco, because while Fleming is willing to carry on another year, he's increasingly having trouble getting around; he's seventyish and would like to be relieved of it. Davis is due for retirement, Mrak at Davis, June 30 of '69. And now UCLA has opened up. These are hard jobs to fill, and it's very difficult to get just the right person. And it's so crucial at a place like UCLA. Or the new campuses; they're crucial too.

Calciano: Why did Murphy resign?

McHenry: Well, I ... I don't know what all. He felt he needed a change, and he's taking over as Chairman of the Board and Chief Executive Officer of one of the really great publishing empires in the world.* Somebody was guessing what his new salary was going to be, and the guess was just about exactly four times what his present one is. And I think he feels he's done about all he can do for UCLA.

Calciano: Well San Diego ... I just wondered if it'd had two Chancellors?

McHenry: It's had two. This'll be the third coming in.

Calciano: In just a brief span of years?

McHenry: Yes. But that's a very turbulent situation. And the first appointee was a man who, Herb York, who had had a massive coronary at 39 or 38 while he was in Washington as Assistant Secretary of Defense for Science and Development or whatever it's called. And he was probably not in good enough health to take on an exacting job of that kind. But of course you know a lot about medical things. President Johnson had his troubles once in this, and President Hitch, even since he's been in Berkeley, and after the tempo should have cut down a little bit, has had some heart troubles too. But York also had other troubles down

* Ed. note: The Times Mirror Company

there. And Galbraith was appointed to clear up some of them, and I'm sure he's made substantial progress, but it's a most difficult job.

Calciano: Why?

McHenry: Well the faculty is quite elitest, and they want all the original appointments in every discipline to be full professors. They for a long time fought having undergraduates at all, though I think they're doing pretty well with those they have now. There's a great deal of emphasis on research, and that comes out in trying to organize a medical school. The biologists get hold of it, and they make it into kind of a research institute. And the Legislature got to the point where they just were giving orders to the University that San Diego Medical School had to open, and it had to have a minimum class of so-and-so or they weren't going to give any more money to it at all. They'd been under that kind of duress for a long time. And now Galbraith's got a real irritant in the Assemblyman from down there who writes poison-pen letters to everybody and demands his resignation and so on, and there's been a lot of psychological warfare going on. And Galbraith has tended to make some fairly extravagant demands at times, and it was ... it got to a point where he just felt he couldn't go on, and that

he didn't have the confidence sufficiently of the Regents or the administration. I don't know what all, but....

Calciano: Santa Cruz had a relatively smooth road then.

(Laughter)

McHenry: Well, we'll have our problems, I'm sure.

Calciano: All right. Well ... so Kerr wanted you for Santa Cruz, not for Irvine or any of the others?

McHenry: Yes.

Calciano: He picked you for Santa Cruz, and he had in mind this being experimental right from the very beginning?

McHenry: Yes. Right from the choice of the site at any rate.

Calciano: Well did the site inspire this, or was it all ... you could do it on a flat bunch of ground, I suppose.

McHenry: No, no. The big factor on the site was residential. Once the decision was made to come over the hill to Santa Cruz, we assumed that we had to house an extraordinarily high proportion of the student body. Of course we had ideas with the thoughts at the time that just didn't materialize. One of them was that there would be several hundred students commuting from the San Jose metropolitan area over the mountain. I don't know of one who does, not one. I know of two, three staff members who do, but I don't know of any student who commutes on a regular basis. Which

surprises us very much. No, the idea is that Santa Cruz is residential and over ... well 92% of the freshmen admittees ask for on-campus housing. And the ones who do not are married or have relatives here or live with their families or something. There's almost no commuting from around the Bay. There may be one or two people who come in from Monterey, but I don't know of any. So it's been much more residential, even, than we anticipated, but we said to ourselves, "Well now maybe 60% of the students will want to live on campus, and that will make it possible to have residential colleges." And the idea then developed from there.

ATTITUDES OF REGENTS, POLITICIANS, AND OTHERS TOWARD
UCSC

The Regents

Calciano: There are two ways of approaching this business of the UCSC idea -- one is the academic plan as far as, well, the academic ramifications, and the other is the architectural ramifications. I thought I'd start with that today and leave academic planning for another session, although I don't want to limit you, and the two are so intertwined it's almost impossible to avoid overlap. But first of all, did you encounter much (I think you did) opposition to this business of residential colleges in the Regents and the State

Finance and so forth?

McHenry: Well it was never a very substantial opposition. I got a couple of scares. But the first presentation I made was to the Regents Committee on Educational Policy in about February or March of 1962, but there had been a kind of a leak that was as much my fault, or my inexperience as fault. I hadn't a chance to present my ideas to the Committee on Educational Policy before this. There'd been a sort of a gap in the proceedings, maybe in January of '62, at San Francisco in the Regents meeting. And the Regents went into some kind of an emergency executive session or something, and the newspapermen were out, and the University's press officer said to me, "Why don't you tell these newspapermen your thinking about the Santa Cruz campus?" And I said, "Well, we're thinking about this and that and the other thing." And James Benet of the Chronicle wrote it up almost as if it was -- it was a little box in the paper, but there was no other news, I guess, at the Regents meeting -- that Santa Cruz was going to have this system. And it got back to Ed Carter, who was Chairman of the Committee on Educational Policy, Regent Carter, who'd incidentally been my classmate, class of '32, at UCLA, and he got quite prissy about it. Why this had not come before

the Regents, and that release wasn't proper, and so on and so on. Well Kerr made some explanations to him at a meeting of the Coordinating Council, one of its early meetings in Los Angeles, maybe in March or late February; I made some further explanations, and so he pulled in his horns on this, and we scheduled a presentation, and I made the presentation, if I remember it, in the University House at Berkeley. I can visualize ... it could have been a dinner meeting. And I talked about the collegiate idea, and what things we could draw from Oxford, Cambridge, Yale, Harvard, and how they might blend, and the financing - - I was asked, I remember very well, Ed Pauley said, "Well I hope you can raise the money to make this thing go." And I said, "May I rephrase that; I hope we can raise the money," or you and I can, or something like that. He's never put in a dime, but maybe he will someday. (Laughter) Carter felt then and at other times when it was discussed following that the money would be relatively, well, easy to raise. You had this leverage that Gurden Mooser talks about all the time - - a whole college named for a donor who may only put in 500 and 600 thousand dollars. Mrs. Chandler was helpful in this, because Carter was then raising the millions that went into the Art Center at Los Angeles,

and Mrs. Chandler was the head of the money-raising for the Music Center in Los Angeles, and they seemed to think that by judicious naming of things, that the money might come in. And then they got down to the operating costs ... "Well, is it going to cost more?" And on the capital front I made out that we'd raise the extra money privately. And while there's been some static from private institutions every time we get a gift, still, and there's some thought that it's unfair competition that we name a whole college for somebody who has given what they consider as relatively little, still, we think that side's been going fairly well, though we always have heart failure that the money's not going to come in. And ... but on the operating front, there has been this persistent feeling that it'll cost more, won't it? And the Governor I saw at the Picnic Day at Davis, maybe -- Governor Brown -- maybe '62 or '63, and he just said that to me. "How are things going in Santa Cruz?" and before I could answer, he says, "It's going to cost more, isn't it?" And I made the commitment that year that we would not ask the State for any more operating money than other campuses in our stage of development. And I think we've stood by this. I don't think we ever have; indeed I think we probably asked for too little money

in the first two or three years, and the Budget Office, University-wide upped it. In the capital outlay fund I think we have not asked for more, but we're a little bit embarrassed now, because some of the things that are in our capital outlay budget now, the other campuses long since have had, and the state colleges have had, and because of the shortage of money, Legislators are beginning to challenge things. For example, last Wednesday when I was at the Legislature, there was real consternation among our people, University of California people, because one of the Assemblymen had challenged our having an auditorium for dramatic productions in the performing arts. "Every one of these campuses is going to teach theater?" and so on. It came from a music teacher, too. A man who was a music teacher in private life, though he's an Assemblyman, Frank Lanterman of Pasadena. So we're getting a working over on this. But "Costs more?" we answer, "If you'll give us the modicum of what you give to other campuses, we'll just rearrange it and spend it differently and hope to do a better job."

Calciano: So then you really didn't have too many battles in this thing?

McHenry: Well I had some troubles over the next two years. One

of them had nothing to do with the academic plan, but was a row between the Governor and the Republicans. But....

Calciano: Black day at Santa Cruz? (Laughter)

McHenry: Yes. Black Sunday. (Laughter) The Governor just item-vetoed all the Santa Cruz projects out.

Calciano: Why did he pick Santa Cruz?

McHenry: I think ... well that was in '64.

Calciano: July '63. [Actually June 30, 1963 -- Ed.]

McHenry: '63.

Calciano: Because I started this job that day. (Laughter)

McHenry: '63. Yes, yes. '63. Well, we had some other black days. You see, we moved to Santa Cruz in '62, in July of '62. In June of '62 we lost the bond issue throughout the State, but we got it on the ballot again, and it passed in November of '62, so we were back on the tracks. Then in '63 the Governor item-vetoed our items out, then called the Legislature in special session and they were put back. This was a controversy between the Governor and Senator Grunsky.

Calciano: Oh! Is that why he picked Santa Cruz?

McHenry: Yes, yes.

Calciano: And did you know at the time that it was just a political thing, or were you really....

McHenry: No. I knew it was a political thing, and I knew the Governor wasn't really intending to harm Santa Cruz, but he figured he would endanger relatively little political support by this, and it would remind people who was Governor, I think. But we got those back in the budget, but that was insecure. And then there was quite a bit of sniping in the Regents. I thought at the time between '63 and '65, or '63, '64, especially, our most persistent critic was Regent Forbes, who kept saying, "How do we know it'll work?" And I remember, I think it was January '65, that we presented for final approval the academic plan and the physical plan. There were perhaps four votes against each of them in the Board, the strong majority in favor, but it wasn't a sort of a happy situation to have these people say, "How do we know it will work?" and Forbes even went to the extreme on the physical plan of demanding to know from me where two roads on the map intersected way up in Marshall Field on the top end. Above Cave Gulch there was shown a road crossing over the present Empire Grade, and he demanded to know whether that was a separated grade crossing or not. (Laughter) It was absolutely unreasonable and obviously anybody in his right mind would say, "Well it would all depend on who builds those roads, and what the population of that

area is, and this is twenty years off, and you can't decide those things now."

Chancellor Murphy

McHenry: But this thing worried me a good deal, and I had a feeling, and Kerr had the feeling very strongly, and I had it to some extent, that we were getting a lot of this static, that the basic cause was that we'd picked some key UCLA people, especially Page Smith, to come in the original cadre. And Murphy was very angry over this.

Calciano: He thought you were raiding his camp?

McHenry: Yes. And if I had it to do over again, I'd do it much more directly. I would tell him I was coming, then go down and sit down with him and say, "Look, here's what we plan to do." But I knew he didn't know these people, because I was a UCLA professor, you see, and he told me once, "Taking another of our men?" and so on and so on, meaning Hitchcock, and then he told me with his usual frankness, he said, "You know, before this came up, I didn't know who the hell Hitchcock was." (Laughter) But as soon as we....

Calciano: And they never promoted him, did they?

McHenry: Yes. He'd been eight or ten years at the same step of

the same rank, the most neglected associate professor ever; he'd been made associate professor and then just sat there.

Calciano: Why?

McHenry: He didn't write. But he was a great lecturer. And the minute we made arrangements for his inter-campus transfer, the students elected him "Teacher of the Year." They often do that you know. And then Murphy got all up in arms, "Why wasn't he told that that guy was such a good teacher, and he would have moved him along and so on."

Calciano: He's still an associate professor, though, isn't he?

McHenry: Yes he is. But you see he's been accelerated twice since he's been here.

Calciano: Oh!

McHenry: And now he's going on leave for a year to Ann Arbor, and whether he'll come back is a big question.

Calciano: Well, so that's what you meant when you referred to the fact that Murphy might have put Forbes up to all this static?

McHenry: Well Kerr thought that, and I'm not so sure. But we got quite a bit of static.

Calciano: Well how is your personal relationship with UCLA?

McHenry: Well, it's very good now. And Murphy has been very friendly the last two or three years. But at this

crucial time he was not. And part of our troubles centered on Kerr, and I've been quite outspoken in some sessions of the Chancellors, I was over a period of two years, in defense of Kerr and asking other Chancellors to stand up and support him. And once or twice I really took Murphy on, and this didn't help the relationship very much. But now that Murphy's leaving, I feel a tremendous gap in the whole organization. I feel much more insecure about personalities and issues and so on. Murphy was a very sure and articulate, perhaps over-spokesman for the Chancellor's point of view. We'll miss him. But he may come back on the Regents.

Calciano: That's very true. Tell me about some of the other ... well how has Buff Chandler reacted?

McHenry: Well I think she's been on the whole quite friendly with us. She did, I think, vote with Forbes against our physical plan on the grounds that he was Chairman; I think she said he was ... as Chairman of Grounds and Buildings she felt that the Chairman ought to be in a position to know. Those votes weren't recorded by name, and I had to just guess at who did the voting in the dark sometimes. I know Norton Simon voted against us on one issue, one of those approvals. But there were doubters. And I think they doubted, for one thing

they thought I was a prestidigitator thinking that you could accomplish some of these things -- improve the faculty-student relationships and so on; they felt that I might be overstating the possibility; I was always pretty careful, and I still get students, I had one this week, who transferred here from Davis, saying that there was misrepresentation in the University's publications that said there were going to be small classes and there weren't. And as usual I said, "If you'll bring me the publication and show me, I'll apologize for it." But we had a very careful cost analysis of this, and we didn't go into it blindly. That cost analysis was released in January of '65 at the time the academic plan was.

Calciano: Who did it for you?

McHenry: It was done by the University-wide Budget Office, Loren Furtado. It was a very careful study. No institution that I've ever heard of, existing or new, has ever had the cost analysis that this campus has had. San Diego, which also wanted a college plan, and its college plan, I think, is going to be much more expensive than ours, was supposed to be studied also, but it never was. No report ever came in on San Diego, and all the criticism focused on Santa Cruz. But this gal, back to this gal who had transferred from Davis

thinking all classes ... might have read it in the Sacramento Bee or some place. But we have never made statements about this. We've said, "We will try to provide on the average of one small class for each student in the early years," but we know from the cost analysis, that we probably can't guarantee that will continue in the future years; instead there might be one every other term or something of the kind. But the image is there.

Calciano: Yes, it's very much so. I noticed the publication this year, So You're Thinking of Coming to Santa Cruz. It's really kind of intriguing to see a college put out something like that, because you're so used to the advertising brochures that come from private institutions.

McHenry: But some people have said that's the slickest Madison Avenue job ever done because it makes people ... it disarms people. There's a certain English understatement in it.

Calciano: There's no author listed. Is it Peter Smith?

McHenry: Yes. Except for the little extracts from students, which is another device of sort of full revelation....

Calciano: Oh, I hadn't thought of those, yes.

McHenry: Yes, it's clever. But the doubters got off our backs pretty promptly in '64, '65 when we had so many

applications. And one of the surest ways of meeting criticism, besides keeping your house in order and not spending too much money and so on, is simply to look at the statistics. Now the Regents are beginning to; they look at these American Council on Education print-outs, and our students are at the top always of all the campuses, and they just are so pleased that we thought....

Calciano: That we thought of it. (Laughter)

McHenry: And I'm glad they do feel that way.

Governors Brown and Reagan

Calciano: Yes. Well now, since we seem to be in the Regents and politics range, I'll ask ... well what about Governor Brown? I mean there was Black Sunday, but how.... You'd known him; you'd worked on his campaign; was this a help or was it not a factor at all?

McHenry: Well I suppose it was a help, because we had to convert him from an original position of being very close to the state colleges, and it was some help knowing him. I don't believe it was a big factor, except I think perhaps our personal relations were such that it helped make this decision to have new campuses at all, the great decision that was made following the Master Plan and these hearings in the



Dedication of the UCSC Campus
April 17, 1964

The Ceremonies Were Held on the Future Site of Cowell College At the Speaker's stand in Governor Edmund F. Brown; seated behind him, from left to right, are Dr. Forrest Murdock, President of the UCSC Affiliates; Lieutenant Governor Glenn Anderson; State Senator Donald Grunsky; UCSC Chancellor Dean E. McHenry; UC President Clark Kerr; UC Regent Gerald H. Hagar; and Cowell College Provost Page Smith.

Governor's office I've told you about. I think my being Kerr's chief lieutenant in this matter, and my being the one who fed things to the Governor and handed them to him and so on, may have helped some. I couldn't have played a role like this with a Reagan as Governor. But I could take liberties with Pat Brown that others who hadn't known him previously couldn't have done. And in some cases I could do things that Kerr couldn't do, such as lobby his office staff and that sort of thing. But I don't think it was any great help or perhaps hindrance. I know that Lieutenant Governor Anderson, whom I'd known well previously, and indeed whom I'd had as a student the last course he took with the University, was always in there making sure that any criticism of me was answered.

Calciano: Well now, I've a double-barrelled question about Reagan. First of all, picturing the University as a whole, you mentioned that Brown started out pro college and was converted to the University. Do you think Reagan's going to undergo some conversion or not?

McHenry: Well I'm just at a loss to say. I'm such a cockeyed optimist that every month in 1967 I thought: Ah! At last he's learned his lesson. There'll be no more ... he's housebroken; there'll be no more wet spots on the

floor. (Laughter) And yet they do keep coming. And I think he feels that there's political appeal in the attacks on the University. And they continue.

President Hitch and the 28:1 Budget Formula

Calciano: Well the second part of the question is: How does Santa Cruz fare compared with the other nine campuses? Have we been singled out more, or have we been more immune, or....

McHenry: Well I don't know. Up until this current year, University-wide has taken very good care of us, and I think you know that while there are some line-items which can be vetoed by the Governor both on the administrative level and on the legislative level after the bill is passed, the Regents get their whole block of money in a package. And while that package -- there are a lot of agreements and deals that are discussed and worked out -- in general the Regents have quite a bit of discretion, and that except in capital outlay, the Governor's office and the Department of Finance are not so much involved with individual campuses unless they're wholly new projects. But the real power is in the hands of the President, who recommends to the Board and the Board allocates money among campuses. And our crisis at

Santa Cruz for '68-'69 comes as much or more from the formula used by the President in allocating money among the campuses as it does from the Governor's decision about what to give the University of California to operate as a whole.

Calciano: Has Hitch changed the formula?

McHenry: He has put into force a formula that's been long in discussion. The 28 to 1 formula, the so-called weighted formula, which gives credit of 1.0 for a freshman or a sophomore and 3.5 for a second-stage doctoral candidate. So a campus that had, say, all freshmen and sophomores, if you could imagine that, would have a million dollars to teach them, and a campus that had the same number of all second-stage doctoral would have three and a half million dollars, or three and a half million dollars for academic salary monies, and the faculty to teach the graduate students would be three and a half times as numerous.*

Calciano: This is because it is more costly to handle....

McHenry: Well, some element of differential cost is involved and then ... but he used it also for the allocation of full-time-equivalent faculty. And do you need three times, three and a half times as many teachers to handle a hundred graduate students, some of whom are

* Ed. note: In the formula, the "28" refers to the number of

even in absentia writing their dissertations, as you do for freshmen and sophomores?

Calciano: So this is set in favor of Berkeley?

McHenry: And UCLA.

Calciano: And San Diego.

McHenry: And San Diego. And it's tended to discriminate against Santa Cruz the most and Santa Barbara considerably. Davis has a big graduate component. But most of the money and teaching positions this last time went to Berkeley and UCLA. And they're justified on the basis of their graduate students plus what they're teaching in the summer session, summer quarters, which are now paid for by the State, or will be next summer, on both those campuses. So our big crisis of this coming year comes about from the allocation of money on this formula. And Kerr had always assured me, and Wellman assured me as I saw the formula developing, that it was a device for getting money out of Sacramento, but it need not, or would not be used within, in dividing the money among the campuses. And yet suddenly in January of '68, it became a device, a flat-out formula for allocating money among the campuses. And I have been raising hell up and down University Hall, and I

points necessary to justify one FTE faculty member.

think we're going to get some relief in the mail today. Indeed....

Calciano: From the President?

McHenry: Yes. The President whispered in my ear the extent of that relief at breakfast on Friday, last Friday.

Calciano: Could the Regents overturn this and give Santa Cruz more money than he wished, or are they pretty much bound by the President?

McHenry: They could, but you see if a Chancellor goes in and lobbies in opposition to the President, he really should present his resignation first.

Calciano: Why?

McHenry: I think to run an orderly show.

Calciano: Yes.

McHenry: You just have to have, the President has to have this role. If I were asked questions by the Regents about whether this was adequate, or what was doing and so on, I could answer them. But if I went very far in trying to overturn the President's recommendation, I really would have to resign, or give him my resignation, yes. Now in earlier years ... Kerr has always had the Budget Office and Vice President Wellman talk these things over with us. Anything that would be regarded as a blow or drastic, they'd take

the trouble to come to the campus or ask us to come up, and we'd sit and talk about it, and they'd prepare us and explain why this blow was necessary. But this time there was no discussion, no preliminary work at all, it was just [bang on the table] we got it. We got eleven new faculty members to teach 508 additional students, and that's the ratio of 46 to 1. Now granted we had some baby fat ... my concern is being forced from babyhood to adulthood without any adolescence.

Calciano: Yes. Is this why Merrill is going to open with half a staff?

McHenry: Yes, though we're able, under this whispered formula given me in the ear last Friday, we've authorized Merrill to go ahead with five more, so they'll go to 21 instead of 16.

Calciano: It's getting kind of late to recruit.

McHenry: It is. These have got to be very junior people, and in some cases the exploration has not been done. The Boards of Studies increasingly are coming in with very senior full professor nominations, and we can't finance them out of this kind of money.

Jess Unruh, Max Rafferty, and Robert Finch

Calciano: To finish up on the politics bit, what about Rafferty, what about Unruh?

McHenry: Well, I've known Jess Unruh for a long, long time ... since he used to get beaten every time he ran. And I don't feel close to him, and I do feel that at the Regents meeting last Friday, he was terribly a demagogue -- shaking hands with the crowd, being cheered by the students present, and they had some boos for the Governor a couple of times, and it's a ... Unruh's not an entirely admirable character. And I've never been close to him in outlook. I know him well, but it's a very standoffish sort of a posture that he takes in the Regents. I don't think he's done us any great harm as a campus, nor do I think he's any great help. He's really interested in the urban masses, and we'll hear his applause when we do something substantial for the minorities.

Calciano: And then speaking of the University as a whole, is he lining up with the pro-University fellows as a political thing, or because he's really pro-University?

McHenry: No, I don't ... I think he's probably, if he's got a bias in his mind, it's probably a pro-private-institution. He's a USC man. But I'm not sure that that's fair. I think it'll be more political, and I think that the junior colleges and the state colleges are closer to the people in the urban masses than we are,

and therefore when he's Governor, I wouldn't expect him to see any tremendous amount of enthusiastic support for the University as a whole or Santa Cruz campus, which is perhaps the most elitist in particular.

Calciano: Did I hear you say "when?"

McHenry: When.

Calciano: You think it's likely?

McHenry: Well, we rode in the plane one time to Sacramento, ten years ago, and I asked, "Jess, what are your plans for the future?" And he said, "Well, first I'm going to be Speaker, and then I'm going to be Governor." And he became Speaker not long after that, and I suspect that he's going to be a strong contender for the Governorship, if there is a Democratic Governor again in our time.

Calciano: What about Rafferty?

McHenry: Well Rafferty is a strange guy. Again I don't think there's anything special about Santa Cruz that he would like or dislike except perhaps our, he'd like our emphasis on teaching. He's never taken us on in any particular way. Indeed except for now and then a letter of endorsement for some child of some friend or financial supporter of his, we really don't hear from him directly. Finch I feel personally closer to than

Rafferty or Reagan, whom I'd never known personally before. I've known Finch since '52; we ran for Congress in different districts and representing different parties. And I have a good deal of respect for him. I think he's a good one. And his sister-in-law was ... who also graduated from Occidental, his wife's little sister ... was with us on the staff at UCLA, and his brother-in-law, her husband, was one of our Ph.D.'s, Ron McDonald, a Pomona man, and I've had various other connections with Finch, and if he becomes Governor, I think he'll ... he knows what higher education's about. He's been a Trustee of the state colleges, ex-officio, a Regent ex-officio, and he's also a member of the Occidental College Board, so he knows what colleges and universities are for.

Calciano: Do you think there's much chance that the Reagan administration will be able to cut the terms of the Regents down?

McHenry: No. I'm not sure that the Reagan administration is trying; it's the people in the Legislature are, and so far we've been able to nip these things in one house or the other. But this one, to get the terms of the Regents down to ten years, may go to the people, and if it does, it'll probably be adopted. What I'm worried about is what else is in that proposition.

They may take the autonomy of the University away, and that'd be a terrible thing, and we ought to fight that if it takes a million dollar campaign fund.

May 8, 1968 9:15 a.m.

UCSC ARCHITECTURE

The McHenry Philosophy

Calciano: Did you have quite a bit to do with the architecture of this campus?

McHenry: Yes.

Calciano: (Laughter) I feel rather silly asking that because of course I know the answer is yes. Have you been more closely involved with this than other Chancellors at other campuses or not?

McHenry: Yes, I think I have probably more than any other Chancellor. Partly it was the opportunity -- being here at the outset -- and partly the superlative qualities of the site are such that it needs special sensitive safeguarding. I don't claim to have any particular talent in this field. Like most laymen, what I like I like, and what I don't like I don't like. And I haven't really done very much to press my prejudices in design onto people, because my own have changed over the years, and therefore I think it'd be silly to insist that every building have tile roofs or

what other else. I have resisted going into high-rise in the early days, but leaving spaces in between buildings so that they could be alternated with high-rise later. I've felt that there ought to be a limit on height in the early years to get established a sort of a feeling of humanness of scale. I suppose another mark that I've made has been pretty insistent pressure that we have a great variety of architects. We have this blessing of a tree cover, and we therefore don't have to have a G.I. form of architecture that is identical. Well the Santa Barbara campus is an example of a campus that's been built in one idiom, or pretty largely -- the early buildings were. And with the diversity in thought that we want in the colleges in styles, I felt that we ought to have at least as much diversity in architecture. I've often said to the executive architects for the colleges, "We want as much diversity among the colleges as you'd find in a high quality residential district of a suburban area of a city." And that gives them much more latitude than normally where a campus has got a palette of materials that have to be used campus-wide because one might get on a hill and look at all the buildings at the same time, and that'll never be possible here unless redwood trees develop some kind of blight.

Calciano: Oh heavens! (Laughter) Well I seem to remember a phrase from somewhere that we are trying to concentrate on using concrete, redwood, copper, and so forth, repeatedly. Is this....

McHenry: Yes, there is a statement originally in the Long Range Development Plan that "early buildings would include such features as: vertical columns in central buildings, distinct vertical columns parallel to the redwood trees, and metal roofs, copper preferred." In the colleges we tended up to now to have tile roofs on them for warmth and various other reasons, and durability to be sure. Whether we're going to be able to afford this kind of roofing material.... Copper has gotten very expensive, though the market is improving now, and we've had, of course, to bear some extra cost in putting the reinforcements in the roofs for the colleges to bear material as heavy as tile, but so far that's come along. We've had a little bit of an architectural palette, but you take the buildings that were built originally. Natural Science I has the vertical columns and the copper roof. The Field House has not got the vertical columns, but has a lot of copper on the roof. And then the Library, the third of these so-called central buildings and designed by John Carl Warnecke, who was captain of the master planning

team that laid down these things, was built with perhaps some vertical columns but no copper roof and indeed no tile roof -- it's a flat roof, sort of a built-up roof it's called, with composition and gravel. So there isn't a campus-wide architectural palette that applies to all buildings under all circumstances. Instead there's diversity.

Calciano: Is your power in this situation the power of persuasion, or do you have the power to actually scrap a building if you don't like what you see developing?

McHenry: Well, I think it's both. The larger buildings are up for approval by the Regents. But I suppose if I wanted to exert it, I could prevent a design going to the Regents at all. And the Campus Planning Committee is advisory, and I've felt that the final decision concerning plans lies with the Chancellor. And then after that decision is made, the plans go to the Regents if it's a large building, and of course they can cancel anything that we on the campus have agreed on. But I'm sure that I've exerted more positive and negative pressure and influence over the physical program than perhaps any of my colleagues among the Chancellors, and quite frequently I hear complaints, especially by Mrak of Davis, "That building looks horrible; that's just awful, and why did they ever let

a thing like that get up?" And I sometimes say to him....

Calciano: Speaking of his own campus, you mean?

McHenry: Yes. And he's got a dormitory block up there which the students have nicknamed "Stonehenge" (laughter) and it really is pretty bad, and it stands out in the field without any trees yet and ... but I keep saying to him, "But Emil, you're Chairman of the Campus Planning Committee, and it's advisory to you." Then he says, in effect, "Well, they shouldn't have let it go."

(Laughter) But I've not been bashful about saying what I think, and sometimes it's contrary to the professional advice that we get, but normally we get agreement.

Calciano: Have there been any particular clashes?

McHenry: Well I held out for a long time, until it was changed, the idea of building a gymnasium on the west side astride what is Heller Drive near the cattle guard.

Calciano: Until what was changed?

McHenry: Until they moved it.

Calciano: Oh!

McHenry: I felt that for cars entering the west gate, people entering the west gate, their first impression of the University should not be a gymnasium. That the gymnasium ought to be subordinated and out of the way,

and that the first buildings they saw should be colleges.

Calciano: I seem to remember reading some proposals that the drive itself should be changed to allow playing fields there or something. That's why I said, "What was changed?"

McHenry: Well I think Heller will be rerouted. But in my opinion it should be rerouted to accommodate a college at the crest of the hill, not to accommodate a gymnasium, which at best is apt to be ugly, or it's certainly going to be massive. And sometimes they're ugly, though I think the Field House east is quite attractive, but it's a very small building, and it's set down in a hole so that you don't get the full size of the thing. And the one on the west side is going to be twice that large, so having it bulking up there on the horizon seemed to me much too much. Actually the professional advice was divided on this and what I did, as I remember it, was to delay until Ernest Kump, our consulting architect, could be present, and in the end we prevailed.

Selecting Architects for the Major Building Projects

Calciano: How are the architects selected for each building? The Regents do this somehow, don't they, or....

McHenry: Well it begins with the campus. The staff, headed by Jack Wagstaff, draws up a panel of architects, and in the Campus Planning Committee we review their work and occasionally interview them, the principals of the architectural firms. And over the period of years, we've become quite well acquainted with the major firms of at least Northern California. And then the Campus Planning Committee makes a recommendation, and that recommendation, if it's a large building, does go to the Regents; if it's a small building, it's final with our recommendation, or with our action, and we can appoint locally. I don't know what the breaking point is, but on this campus, anything that goes much above a half million dollars tends to go to the Regents. And the Regents' rule on this now, which is fairly new, is that they want to see large projects and projects that are apt to set an architectural style or pattern or something of the kind, so they do look at the big ones and each college is certainly looked at by the Regents.

Calciano: Which architectural firms have you been most pleased with?

McHenry: Well I think all that we've had have done good jobs. Cowell was done by Wurster, Bernardi and Emmons, and the longer we live with it, the more I like it. It's a

fairly conservative design. Stevenson was done by Joseph Esherick, and many of our architectural staff here feels that it's the most original design and the most interesting design. And partly I suppose because we were squeezed so badly on budget on Stevenson, I've never felt that it's as satisfactory, particularly the living quarters, as some of the others. But Esherick was certainly scholarly about going about it. Ernest Kump did Crown College. He's our ongoing consulting architect as well. I find the design quite pleasing. It's a traditional sort of thing. And I think the professional verdict is not as favorable perhaps as it is of Esherick's, but my own feeling is that it's a more satisfactory job by and large. But again, the budget had something to do with this; we weren't squeezed quite so badly then. It's hard to make a judgment about Campbell and Wong's Merrill College. While it's framed and up and the shape of it you're beginning to see, it's not possible to judge a lot of the things about it. But each one of these four, I think, has been very satisfactory. Now we already have the designs for Colleges Five and Six* pretty well along; both have been approved by the Regents, and we're almost ready to go out to bid for College Five.

* Ed. note: College Six was later named Kresge College.

For those two we went East, and we have Hugh Stubbins and Associates of Cambridge, Massachusetts (he used to be Dean of the School of Architecture at Harvard) for Five, and Charles Moore, who is Chairman of Architecture at Yale, is executive architect for College Six.

Calciano: Why did you go so far afield?

McHenry: Well we wanted something more than in-state architects. We felt that the University of California has been rather parochial. Indeed I think these, plus the performing arts appointment, which was made about the same time, these three represent the first time the University of California had gone out of state in a generation or two. And the University had more freedom than other State agencies, and so we were bringing architectural talent into the State that wasn't present otherwise, and we were recognizing that the plane has made the country a pretty small one, and that it's about as easy to get from Boston, under some circumstances, as it is to get from remote parts of California to Santa Cruz. At any rate we thought it would be good for architecture within the University, and within the State, to have these people from out of state. And Moore had been on the staff at Berkeley for many years, so he knew the situation well and still

has a Berkeley office. The third of these out-of-state people is Ralph Rapson of Minnesota. He comes ... his offices are in Minneapolis. He has designed one of the great theaters of the country, the Tyrone Guthrie Theater of Minneapolis, and he's doing the performing arts building here. And I don't think in theater design there are many people who could match him, so we were very pleased to have him undertake this. And the design is going to win a good deal of acclaim, I believe.

Calciano: I thought Turnbull or some local man had something to do with the sod-roof college.* Am I ... have I got names mixed up.

McHenry: Turnbull, yes, is associated with one of the principal architects. Moore and Turnbull, you see, is the firm.

Calciano: Oh, I see.

McHenry: And Turnbull I think lives in Berkeley, and so the firm, while its principal office is now New Haven, still operates in California. We're thinking about a fourth out-of-state architect as we lay the plans for College Seven. And indeed only Monday we reviewed the agenda for the next Campus Planning Committee which comes next Monday, the 13th, and the head name on the

* Ed. note: Preliminary plans for Kresge College showed some use of sod as a roofing material; the plans were later changed for

list in consideration for College Seven, though we probably won't take it up next Monday, is an out-of-state architect from New York. But there are still a good many architects in California, in Northern California, that we haven't used who probably could make significant contributions. Now you asked me which building or which architect I liked best. I'm really very pleased with all of them. Ernest Kump did the little Central Services Building, which for its purpose I think is a gem. And it was very inexpensive; construction cost on that was only about \$15 a square foot.

Calciano: Good heavens!

McHenry: Whereas typical office space in a higher rise situation would be close to double that. And I think it's a graceful building, nestled in, and it feels right to me; and no luxuries, very simple and straightforward, but very good design. The Library, which I was fearful would look like a prison, has turned out to be quite charming. I'm always afraid of normal concrete gray, the regular concrete, not whitened; you can get white concrete now, and I would have thought it'd been better to have used white concrete, and yet we've got an awful lot of whiteness,

reasons of economy.

especially in Stevenson College; I think it's too white. But it may mellow as the years go by and the weathering sets in. But I thought Warnecke's library came off very well. And compared with the Stanford undergraduate library, which he built about the same time, he designed it, it was constructed about the same time, we got, I think, an awfully good bargain. Something like half the cost, but without the luxuries that Stanford has of walnut paneling everywhere and so on. I think it's excellent. Another architectural gem is the central heating plant, which isn't often noticed, and it doesn't have a position from which you can get fine photographs of it. You need to be up in a helicopter, really, to do it well, but it's by Spencer, Lee, and Busse, the people who are the architects for the Santa Cruz Public Library which just opened.

Calciano: Which is also very good.

McHenry: Yes. And they also are the architects for the Communications Building alongside of it [the heating plant], which will be ready this fall. They have a sensitivity to the woods and all that is long built into the firm. They are the principal architects for the Curry Company in Yosemite. And many of the more recent developments at the Lodge and Yosemite Valley

are designed by Spencer, Lee, and Busse. We've got some others coming along, the Social Sciences Building is up for approval on next Monday. And the architect there is a man called Milono. And he's ... Germano Milono ... he runs a relatively small firm, but he has a great talent in design. We also have already approved the design by Marquis and Stoller of a small classroom building which is going to be located near the Kite* and the Redwood Shop, but on that hill bounded by Steinhart Way and the Miner's Village Road, which is what we call the path from the Amphitheater to Steinhart Way.

Calciano: Why do you want a separate classroom building?

McHenry: Well, we've found that we're so underbuilt in space, teaching spaces in the colleges. We couldn't justify an auditorium for any college. We've been having some large lecture classes in the dining rooms. It's a nuisance to get all the saltshakers and so on off the tables and get them cleaned, and then it's a nuisance to get people out in time for the next meal. And it hasn't been very satisfactory, so we wanted a proper auditorium that could be used in connection with college core courses. This has become, then, a project

*Ed. note: At the time of this interview, the small restaurant building located between Steinhart Way and the Upper Quarry was known as the Kite; the Redwood Shop, located in the same building, sold sundries.

that's what we would call a cluster facility. It'll serve primarily the four east colleges. We have need for that much more classroom space, and it's a more efficient way of handling it than putting it in any given college. And it's located in such a way that people can stop en route to the Library and quite convenient to facilities and the coffee shop, and it'll be a very important addition to the campus for public lectures. We now are limited, as you know, to 250 in Natural Science III, and this will give us a lecture theatre for 400 with excellent projecting equipment and so on. And in just such an area as something for young people to do on the weekend. The motion picture programs that are put on by our two cinema societies, one on Saturday night and one on Sunday night, have to run double; they have to show them twice each Saturday and each Sunday night because the auditorium seats only the 250, and a great many people who come to the first one can't get in and therefore they have to go do something and then come back two hours later. It'll add a great deal to the convenience and the possibility for paid events of having a gate that's big enough to pay the performer and so on.

Calciano: Are you planning to do something similar with Colleges

Five, Six, Seven, Eight, or will you put an auditorium into one of those colleges?

McHenry: Well we ... they'll be fairly close to the Performing Arts complex which will have two sizable auditoriums in it. Performing Arts is just across Heller Drive from Five and will not be too far from Colleges Six, Seven, and Eight. So I think they can probably use Performing Arts satisfactorily, and also there will be some classroom and lab space in the Social Sciences Building. So I think the west campus won't be as poverty-stricken for classroom space as the east campus if all the building program goes on.

Opening Up the Campus' West Side

Calciano: Why did you decide to start with College Five over on the west side?

McHenry: Well, we felt that otherwise there would be a lopsided development of facilities. My directions or instructions from the Regents were: "prepare a campus for 27,500." And if we develop all on the east side, we have a lopsidedness that could be accentuated. Take physical education facilities for example. The State is getting awfully prissy about what they'll provide and what they won't provide. More and more they're squeezing down on physical education. We disguise them

by calling them multi-purpose structures and various other things, but we do have that little thing called the Field House on the east side. Now if the Colleges Five, Six, Seven, and Eight were built on the east side, we would then have spent any remaining entitlement we had for physical education on the east side, if the Department of Finance holds firm, and it probably would, and never have an entitlement on the west side. Then, of course, the science facilities are starting a little more west than east, and we felt that in order to get a balanced campus, and to avoid a lot of early congestion on the east side, that we ought to get a start on the west if we possibly could. Now I fully expected the State to intervene and say "NO. Those utility runs are too long. We can save a million dollars," or something of the kind, "in roads and utility lines by simply concentrating things closer in." But no objections were raised, and so we proceeded, and so far everything's going well. Another reason we wanted to get things going in the west was that this seemed to be the best place to put married-student housing, and we needed utility runs for them. And you really couldn't do anything until, say, the first college was built in the west; you couldn't develop other facilities. And this will mean that we

will be spread when this is done (we're really started over here with multi-purpose west, [physical education], married student housing, College Five, and then College Six coming along) we'll have a sizable enterprise over here and be able to have a coffee shop and maybe a branch of the Redwood or the bookstore over here on the west side. And it'll be very much like having, five, six years from now, having two clusters of colleges. About twenty-four hundred on one side and about twenty-five, twenty-six hundred on the other side. A nice balance and a feeling in each one of an institution no bigger than Oberlin or Dartmouth. So it's a sort of a cluster concept in the physical planning that has emerged as we've moved along. Now ultimately the east side and the west side will be united by a chain of colleges like an inverted horseshoe just going over and around at the top stretching up to what is called the high meadow area. And it's possible that this ring of colleges, perhaps 25 or more, will be in this inverted horseshoe and leaving the bottom open with an access towards the sea that's uncluttered by building, we hope forever.

Calciano: Very good.

The Long Range Development Plan

Calciano: How effective was the consortium of Warnecke, and....

McHenry: Yes. Warnecke; Anshen and Allen ... and by the way, I failed to mention the work of Anshen and Allen in Natural Science I and Natural Science II, and they have been designing a Natural Science III which we're shifting around a good deal and combining with IV, and I'm not sure whether they'll be paid off and somebody else will pick it up, or they'll do this combined one. But Anshen and Allen are good designers, and Natural Science I did manage to earn an award for one of the best classroom buildings built with federal aid during 1966 by the American Institute of Architects. And Natural Science I provided almost all our classroom and office facilities for the first year, as you will remember. Anshen and Allen, the partnership, participated, Ernest Rump participated, and Thomas Church was the landscape architect who participated, and Theodore Bernardi for Wurster, Bernardi and Emmons. Well it was not a wholly satisfactory operation, but I've never seen one that was. They're awfully good people as individuals, and in a way we just sort of compromised by bringing them together. Several of them individually had made presentations and had indicated their willingness to be master planners, their own firms to be the master planner. And in the end the decision was made to make Warnecke the contracting

agent and the others to be associated with him in a sort of a joint enterprise. It probably was not as good a planning job, or as detailed a planning job, as William Pereira did at Irvine. Possibly not as good as Bob Alexander did at San Diego. But I would have regretted to have had one big firm be master of this whole thing. In both those cases, Irvine and San Diego, you had this visual problem of being able to see the whole thing at once without going up in an airplane, and so the relationships had to be worked out very carefully, and it was probably better that they be worked out by one person. In our case, however, since we really started with the idea of virtue in diversity, and we had this magnificent green umbrella over what we were going to do, it just seemed that not to have one person dominate it was important.

Calciano: Who decided this? You?

McHenry: Well ... Wagstaff and I had a good deal to do with shaping it. We were around each of these firms; we were talking, getting advice, discussing, and in the end we made a recommendation to the Regents and the Regents decided. An example of what we might have had was a very big organization, Skidmore, Owings, and Merrill, who made an excellent presentation; Nat Owings has his home in Big Sur and his main office in

San Francisco; this is an international, huge organization, and they had their own landscape, their own engineers, everything in an integrated firm. And they wanted the whole thing, and they'd do the whole thing. Well I was frightened of them; they have some good designers, but they did the Air Force Academy, the mammoth big buildings that ... and it is so monolithic and so centralized that I had real doubts about whether they could do something sensitively here. Now I've seen buildings that they've built that do have these humanness of scale and other factors and features that we wanted, but they were building things like the Crown Zellerbach Building in those days, and I was concerned about it, and I did what I could to make sure that some of the smaller firms and the gentle hand of Tommy Church were involved. And we couldn't have had both Church and Skidmore, Owings, and Merrill. And yet Church, probably more than any other single person off campus, has guided this campus in the way it's going and the use of land and the siting of buildings and all, and he's one of the authentic geniuses, and to have him available throughout all this has been great.

Calciano: How did you get him?

McHenry: Well, he's of course been associated with the Univer-

sity of California for 40-45 years. And you have to persuade him to take a job. He was, has been for all these years, the more recent years, a consulting architect on the Berkeley campus and the Stanford campus; and if you know him or are very persuasive or he likes you, he'll take on a few executive jobs as well. And he was interested in this landscape. He got his start as a landscape architect in Santa Cruz in Pasatiempo, and some day you ought to record him because the story ... have you ever done anything on the story of Marion Hollins?

Calciano: I've had references to her, but nothing really specific.

McHenry: Well it's ... I won't take up your tape time to tell you now, but she was a New York sportswoman who came out here and worked for Samuel F. B. Morse in Pebble Beach and Del Monte Estates and so on.

Calciano: She was a golfer, too.

McHenry: She was a great golfer and polo player, and her great opponent was the present Mrs. Forbes Wilson, and they had rival women's polo teams, and they just smacked the devil out of each other. (Laughter) And they hated each other. You ought to interview Dorothy Wilson sometime before it's too late, because of all these sportswomen's organizations that these two women set

up. Well the point about Marion Hollins is that she struck it rich in Kettleman Hills, came into a substantial sum of money, bought the Pasatiempo region, subdivided it, and then went bankrupt in the Depression. But in those days of the '30s, when there weren't many landscaping and architectural commissions, she built a house for Tommy and Betsy Church on Hollins Drive, and Tommy laid out the gardens of twenty or more of the houses that were built in the area, and William Wurster of Wurster, Bernardi, and Emmons, and longtime Dean at Berkeley, Dean of Architecture and then of the College of Environmental Sciences, Bill designed eleven of the houses in the Pasatiempo area, including Darrow Palmer's. Tommy Church once made a little map for me of Pasatiempo and marked on it which were Bill Wurster's houses. Tommy Church has a house, a weekend and summer house, in Scotts Valley. And he is attached to this area. And we arrange our Campus Planning Committee meetings on Mondays so that if he comes down for the weekend, he can come directly from the house. And he likes this country and has a strong connection here. We feel that having this internationally recognized leader has been a great help. And every building on the campus he has shoehorned in, it's his

advice, including University House. He chooses these magnificent sites and sees things that a layman couldn't possibly or many experienced architects couldn't see.

Calciano: Well about the consortium ... what were its weaknesses?

McHenry: Well I suppose its weaknesses were that you had to spend a lot more time in talking, and each person had to make a little speech and ride his hobby a bit, and so you didn't get a singleness of purpose that you might have if a single firm or somebody is definitely recognized as the boss man. Actually I think on balance it was better to have this diversity given this site. Oh, and then of course when you came to editing and ... if you've looked at the Long Range Development Plan, it's just full of typographical errors, and it was just a sloppy job -- beautifully done on fine paper and great printing and then all these typographical errors and other things that marred it. And I think we spent enough money to get a good plan, a more detailed plan than we got. Instead we got a lot of vague generalities about the sensitiveness of the site and the fragile redwoods and this and that, but we didn't get a firm outline of where the roads should be, and there were a lot of

scattered reports that were not really tied together. For example, the geological and the soils and the other ... there were studies made ... but the whole thing wasn't tied together, and I think as a result we've gone on to today with a kind of vague Long Range Development Plan that has to be filled in by the staff as we go along.

Calciano: By Wagstaff?

McHenry: Yes. And especially by Peterson, Richard Peterson, who is the community planner.

Calciano: Community meaning the University community?

McHenry: Yes.

Calciano: When did he come?

McHenry: About two years ago. And he's had a lot of planning and architectural experience and has been on the faculty of architecture at the University of Minnesota, so he's an experienced planner. The master-plan map with the Long Range Development Plan shows colleges spotted around various places; well some of them are in impossible places, and we knew it when it was approved, but we had a feeling that until we had lived with this and built a few colleges and got the feel of it and the circulation and there were so many imponderables -- parking, use of cars, would there be a transit system, all these things that were really

not settled when the Long Range Development Plan was laid on. But I think that this isn't really too bad, because you have technological changes, and you have psychological changes, and when you see your own students and what they are ... just the ... take a factor like the automobile. One of the things that I've hung tough on from the very beginning was opposition to unlimited use of cars and possession of cars by students. I felt that cars should not be convenient for a residential group of students. That you'd just destroy the landscape if you tried to provide a parking place outside of a college for everyone who lived in the college. There'd be a great assault on the forest, and you'd have to take almost double the land, and then land's very precious close in. Now if we had come up, as it well might have happened, with too few students rather than too many, we might have had to give in on this; that is if people said, "Those damn people at Santa Cruz trying to take our wheels away from us, and so we won't go." But instead we had four times as many freshman applications as we could admit, and so we just were able to hang tough on this and still are, at least so far as new students are concerned who ... for practical purposes freshmen can't have cars if they

live on the campus, and those who are not freshmen can have them, but they are parked in fairly remote places. And there's a lot of bitching about it. But I think as long as I'm around we'll just keep this. Now whether we could have kept it couldn't have been decided when they were drawing up the Long Range Development Plan before we had a single student or a single faculty member. So questions will be asked. I remember one Regent ... in January '65, when the Long Range Development Plan and the Academic Plan were up for approval, one Regent who is still on the Board tried to get out of me an answer whether someplace way up above Cave Gulch where two roads were shown as intersecting, whether there was going to be an elevated crossing of one. And my attitude was this is an area that probably won't be developed for twenty years, and there'll be a very different set of people running the County government and the City government, and they'd be involved in it, and they can't make plans that far ahead, and we could only guess at how much the development's going to be. Just the sale of the Wilder Ranch and its subdivision would ... you'd have to know whether there was going to be a sale before you could make a "guesstimate" of what the traffic problems would be. It'd be ridiculous for a

hundred cars a day to build something that cost two million dollars. What he was talking about was something like the new interchange at Rio Del Mar at Deer Park Inn. Well you can't build something like that except with a very heavy traffic and population demand. So maybe it is better that we didn't try to settle all these details. But as I look at it now, and of course I'm biased, I don't see any major planning errors. There is a minor one in the location of the electric substation on the hill near the garden project, on the shoulder of the hill near Merrill. I'm sorry it's there. It was put there in good faith because PG & E said they'd bring the electricity at that spot overhead from the Pogonip area. The Regents decided, and I'm glad they did, that we would have no overhead lines serving the campus. Instead they said put it underground. And this has meant that that station could have been elsewhere where it would have been less obvious. But I think we can learn to live with it.

Calciano: Plant some big trees around it. (Laughter)

McHenry: Well we had big trees, and they were cut down because they were afraid these old fir trees would fall on the substation and black us out. What I think we'll need to do is to put vines on the fences and in other ways

try to cut down on it.

Ernest Kump, Consulting Architect

Calciano: Now what is Ernest Kump's role?

McHenry: Well, as consulting architect he provides the external professional advice, and he plays a big part in the selecting of architects, advising on who works well and whose design. For example for College Eight, this New York architect is his idea mainly. He's backing it strongly, and he's worked with the man and knows his work and points out that he has a California office and license and that he has a sensitivity to the western environment that most of the Easterners do not have and so on. And he generally oversees this development, and he's very effective at presentations to the Regents. So when we have a new college or a big project, he does come to the Regents, often makes the presentation and sells the Regents. He's a very fast-talking effective salesman.

Calciano: Who picked him?

McHenry: Well I suppose that we could say that many of us had a hand in it. The Campus Planning Committee ultimately recommended him, and the question was mainly, "Should John Carl Warnecke proceed with it, or should we shift over to someone else." And we weighed these things very carefully and thought a good deal about them.

Theodore Bernardi is a nice guy, and he's a good designer, but he's inarticulate and tongue-tied before the Regents; he can't explain anything, and that seemed to be impossible. Wurster himself was 70 years old and was already the consulting architect for Berkeley, and they were just about to get rid of him because of his age, and so that wasn't a possibility. We looked at Anshen and Allen, but they were sort of then almost Siamese twins. Anshen has since died. And that didn't seem possible. Kump, available at Palo Alto, good designer, good contacts, not running too big a firm himself, was willing to take it and was willing, which is quite unusual, not to ask for further commissions. Most of these consulting architects such as, well we've had quite a time with this in the University system. If somebody becomes the consulting architect, for example, Luckman at Santa Barbara, he tends to recommend himself for about half the buildings, and the real money -- they don't make anything to speak of on a consulting basis; it's like a doctor doing a little work on a salary at the student health service; it's semi-charitable contribution; we don't pay them enough to make it worthwhile. But when they build a big building, the architectural commission may run in the hundreds of

thousands of dollars, and it's well worthwhile. So we've been paying at UCLA, Santa Barbara, and various ... at Irvine we've been paying out very large amounts of money to consulting architects in their capacity as executive architects designing the building, and they carry their firms on this and so on. Now Kump was the first, was willing to say voluntarily that he wouldn't expect to do further design beyond the two he already had which was College Three, now Crown, and the Central Services Building, if he were consulting architect. And that appealed very strongly to several of us.

Calciano: Does he ... well he feels the prestige of being the consulting architect ...

McHenry: Yes, I think he does.

Calciano: ... will bring business into his firm?

McHenry: Well, I think it gives him a certain amount of prominence in the architectural community. He persists in not wanting too much business. He went through this before. He's a man of about, well in his upper fifties; he's about fifty-seven, as I am ... he graduated in the class of '32 at Berkeley and did some graduate work at Harvard. And he went through the period, well in the forties and early fifties, in which he had the biggest firm in San Francisco, and he

worked himself into ill health, suffers from ulcers and so on. And he deliberately took a year off, went to Europe and came back, and when he resumed practice, he was determined to have a limited sized firm and not to run a factory again. And he's held to this pretty well. But his health is still not terribly good. The ulcers keep coming back. He carries on, but he's not in as vigorous good health as he'd like and we'd like.

UCSC's Physical Planning Staff

Calciano: How do you evaluate our own campus planning department?

McHenry: Well I think we've got some very able people... We're lucky to have Jack Wagstaff. He's a sweet guy. He's not a great administrator, but that is supplemented by men such as Lou Fackler, who has a real sense of order and administration. Jack is, among the campus architects in the University now, one of the senior ones, if not the senior one, and extremely able, sensitive, gifted, nice personality, gentle. The staff that he has beyond Fackler and Peterson, and of course Shaw is technically down there, though his responsibilities lie heavily in space and under various other people in other areas, under Vice

Chancellor Calkins, who's chairman of the space and building needs and Vice Chancellor Hyde and the overseeing the general planning of the campus, but....

Calciano: You think Shaw's good then?

McHenry: Shaw's excellent.

Calciano: Yes.

McHenry: Yes. He's tops. I don't think there's another space analyst in the University system that's as good as George is. He's an architect as well; he's the only one in the State, I think, who is an architect as well as a statistician and planner. I think our project architects on the whole are not as good and experienced as we'd like. But here again you have this problem that's a professional problem, that's very similar to the one in medicine. It's hard for Kaiser, the Kaiser Health people, to get a medical person to work on salary, even if the salaries are generous, when there is private practice outside that's available and in which people feel much more like their own bosses. So in architecture, not nearly so affluent a profession as medicine, but in architecture you get this constant feeling that, well ... architectural schools are putting out more architects than there is work, at least the way business and

society are organized; an awful lot of building is being done on designs not by architects. And we tend to draw in to the project architect roles, people with special circumstances who have never quite been able to get going on their own. And I think some of them are good, but I don't think that they're ... the very nature of the role is that of sort of a liaison person and mild critic and prodder. And I don't see any solution for it. They're spread pretty thinly, and then beyond them there are inspectors who are working on the job, and they're working as our inspectors, enforcing specifications and so on. In general I persist in my stubborn attitude that we're somewhat overstaffed in the whole architectural area -- our own staff plus the executive architect staff. We're somewhat overstaffed, but I can't prove that, and I just don't know who could. We pay architectural commissions to these executive architects, and then we have our own people checking up on them, and I suspect that if you could really get a comparison between, say, what Bank of America has to pay for architectural services in the aggregate and what the University of California pays for architectural services, I suspect we pay more.

Calciano: Because of the double role all along the line?

McHenry: Yes. It's more complicated, in a way, because you have a lot of faculty people or librarians in every project who have to review it and think about it, and it takes a project architect with the patience of Job to go all through this. I've tried to protect ours from this by not having so-called building committees. All the other campuses have a building committee, and if there's a social science building, why then they put on one political scientist, one economist, one sociologist, one anthropologist and so on, and I've been members of these, and the worst building in many ways at UCLA is the social science building; the Waffle it's called down there; it's the brooding omnipresence over the north campus; skyscraper, eleven stories high. I was chairman of that committee in the early years and a member of it for some more. We tried in every way we could to avoid that being high rise and in the form it took, and we had not enough influence. But the wasted man-weeks and -months, and the frustration of being fitted into something that had been preordained was such that it was a killer. And also, faculty committees often interfere on small things that they just want tailor-made for their own use, and they retire in four years, and then everyone else is stuck with them after that. So I've urged, or

told Wagstaff, I just didn't want an army of people serving on these committees, and we finally compromised by having a project sponsor. For example, the social science building here, we have Mannie Shaffer of geography, since geographers are going to have cartography labs and certain other things, and since he has a very good sense of order and planning. He's the liaison person whenever any question comes up of, "Should we have a dean's office or something in the building?" why he can go talk to Mr. Calkins about it, and "How much archaeological space are the people of anthropology going to need?" and he can go talk to the anthro people. But we don't have them all sitting around a table once a week going over every detail. Now I'm not sure that our system saves in the long pull, but the faculty here in the early years has been so harassed with getting rules and regulations, organizing the Senate, getting colleges going, that I was anxious not to have this diverting feature.

Calciano: You said you and Wagstaff compromised. Why did Wagstaff want to....

McHenry: He'd always worked with this system at San Francisco, and he feels that the architects buy a certain amount of protection from criticism by saying, "Well, we didn't decide that; the faculty committee did."

Calciano: Oh! Because I was thinking it could also be asking for a lot of harassment....

McHenry: Under ideal circumstances, the provost of the college would be here early enough to play a part in most every stage of college planning. So far that's happened only, I think, in Thimann's case with us, and even then it would have been better if he had been brought into the picture sooner.

Calciano: How did we ... Wagstaff was actually appointed before you were.

McHenry: Yes he was. He'd been campus architect at San Francisco for a good many years and he had earlier than that worked in the firm of Wurster, Bernardi, and Emmons. His appointment was quite thoroughly discussed with me before I was appointed. By that time it appeared very likely that I'd be offered it, or maybe it was in that month between June and July of '61, I'm not just sure. At any rate, I was consulted ostensibly as University Dean of Academic Planning by Elmo Morgan, Vice President Morgan, about the appointment of the first planning business officer on both Irvine and Santa Cruz. And L. E. Cox, who'd just retired from the Army Corps of Engineers, was appointed at Irvine, and I certainly approved of that, and Wagstaff here, and I certainly approved of that. And then Jack began

to assemble a small staff; Sally Hegland come on as administrative assistant; John Hornback as a project architect initially and then Lou Fackler and so on. I think both Hornback and Sally were members of our staff when we were still in University Hall, Berkeley, during the year '61-62. And Barbara Sheriff came up about mid-academic year, maybe in January. And we gradually got going. And then ... I'm not sure about John Hornback, but I moved here in July of '62, as you have on record someplace. And Wagstaff, while he worked here full time '62-63, didn't move until '63. He had his term on the school board at San Anselmo to finish, and they were a little reluctant to move the boys at the particular time in school, so they took a year to get down here and he commuted.

Problems With the Cowell College Plans

Calciano: Cowell College was, of course, one of the first big planning projects that had to be tackled. You commented last week that having the money in hand from the Cowell Foundation was tremendously important psychologically and physically and everything ... but as I understand it, there really wasn't a good guideline for what this college was to be, and the first plan came back with 20 acres used up in space or

some such thing.

McHenry: I'd forgotten that. It's pretty spready as it is. I think the outer limits are about eleven acres now. And my recollection is that Stevenson covers only about eight, and it's a larger college. But I think that's probably about what one needs is about an acre per hundred students. We're going to be somewhat more concentrated in College Five. We're going up to a more uniform three stories on quite a number of things, and it's pretty close together. And College Six is a pretty tight organization too. If we're going to have so many and have them work well and have a sense of community, there's some pretty good arguments for being drawn together. I think I'm probably more of a spreader, or I would be except that I have expert advice from the planners who keep watching the densities and thinking of circulation and what it's going to be like at the turn of the century if we go on building in the given pattern.

Calciano: Well now the Regents rejected Cowell's plans two or three times, didn't they?

McHenry: Well, the Regents were a little skittish about the whole thing, that's true. And the big blow was when they were finally approved and we went out to bid and they came in, oh it seems to me the better part of a

million dollars over budget, a substantial amount over budget. We had an emergency meeting of the Campus Planning Committee, at Stanford curiously, in the Alumni House at Stanford as kind of a halfway point for the people who were most involved; we discussed what to do, decided to go into redesign and simplify things. In the very early first plans that Theodore Bernardi and Emmons produced, the College was even more decentralized than it is today. Faculty studies were on a one-story basis. Indeed it was very like -- we still have the drawings around someplace -- it was a mock-up of the Behavioral Center at Stanford which Bernardi had designed. And we praised these studies, one-story studies at Stanford, so much that he produced the similar ones here. But we felt that we just couldn't take that much land area; we had to stack these studies, and we did, and the results, I think, are not nearly as good as they would have been had we been able to hold on to the one-story arrangements. The big problem, however, was overdesign; we were too expensive, and so they had to go back and be redone, and this of course was a tremendously important decision. Should we postpone an opening until '66....

Calciano: Is that where the debate started in....

McHenry: Well the debate, there was an earlier debate; I think I told you that in '63, in June of '63, I missed a meeting of the Regents. I'd said to Kerr before I went, "Now I'll be in Cambridge, Massachusetts, but if you need me and anything on Santa Cruz comes up, I'll fly back." It was a Presidents' Institute of newly elected heads of institutions, Chancellors and Presidents, at Harvard Business School. And there was nothing on Santa Cruz in the Regents' agenda. After I got back I discovered that Santa Cruz had come up for discussion in a super executive meeting of the Board, and they had decided in 63 not to open Santa Cruz until '66.

Calciano: Why?

McHenry: Well it mostly came from the physical planning people, Elmo Morgan and Bob Evans, and these fellows felt they were being too rushed; that they couldn't get both Irvine and Santa Cruz ready in '65. And I came back, and when I found out about it, which was a couple of weeks later, I was alarmed, felt terribly let down and depressed, and resolved to reverse the decision. And it really wasn't firmly reversed for about eighteen months. One of the factors in this, of course, had been that the Governor had vetoed the capital outlay items, and you remember the date.

Calciano: It was July 1st or 2nd of '63. [June 30 - Ed.]

McHenry: '63. So this was a very dark period really. And I always connected the Governor's action with something he had noted or his staff had in the Regents executive session meetings ... "Well I won't set them back, because they've already been set back a year."

Calciano: Oh!

McHenry: At any rate, the Legislature was reconvened, as we've talked about before, and the funds were restored. And of course I was operating on every level I knew how to operate on to get Cowell College on the line so we could open. And then when the bids came in over budget, it looked impossible. We then decided to try to see what we could do with temporary housing. And we went on with the trailer business and got a deal and eventually got the Regents approval to open on schedule. Indeed we weren't absolutely certain we'd be allowed to even as late as '64. But eventually it came through.

Calciano: Well, it sort of surprises me that the Regents would make that major a decision without consulting the Chancellor of the campus.

McHenry: Well I thought so too. And I've never known how much of the initiative on it came from the floor from an individual Regent, and I've never known whether Kerr

had any advance information the item was coming up. But I felt that it was not the proper way to do business in any case. I would have thought that the President might have said, "Now look, we can't make that decision without at least giving a hearing," but I don't have any inside information on how it happened.

Calciano: I seem to have heard that in formally agreeing ... I don't know whether it's connected with opening in '65, or whether it was connected with something else, but there was some sort of bargain made that the Regents said if we'd take an extra hundred students, they'd do something or other.

McHenry: Yes. Well, when the academic plan was approved, Kerr thought that it would make everybody feel that we were starting in a more substantial way if they modified the academic plan, which said "start with 500," to "start with 600," which was the Cowell College quota. And I had always favored starting with somewhat fewer than the quota so that you could have a higher proportion living in and so on. But this was one of the little baits he put on the hook to get the Regents to approve the academic plan in January of '65.

Calciano: I see.

McHenry: We actually opened with more than 600; I think it was

633 or something of the kind in October of '65.

Calciano: Now even as late as the Crown College plans, apparently the Regents were still asking that they be flexible so that they could be converted to a regular straightforward University. Is this right?

McHenry: Well, I don't believe this was so with respect to the Crown plans, but it was still a factor in the mind of Regent Heller in the siting of Crown College. The staff had recommended, indeed I guess the Campus Planning Committee had recommended, that Crown be sited about opposite the new Student Health Service site. Do you know where that is?

Calciano: No.

McHenry: Well the Student Health Service site is on the highlands on the bank behind the quarry, on the north side of the quarry.

Calciano: Oh!

McHenry: If you go from the present colleges towards the Science Building, you can see ribbons on your left....

Calciano: Well I'll watch for it today.

McHenry: And John Funk is designing it, and it's the gift of the Cowell Foundation. And it's a discreet site that we think will be big enough for the ultimate development and will not be much seen from the quarry,

from the seating in the quarry. But it'll be interesting to have a sick bay that will be within listening of noon concerts in the quarry and things of that kind. I think it was a very good use of site, of the land. Well directly opposite, on the right as you take that same drive, there is a block of land that's sloping down toward McLaughlin, that lies north of McLaughlin, that's big enough, we think, for three colleges, particularly if one or two of them are high rise. And the Campus Planning Committee, I'm sure now, did recommend a site there. Utility runs would be simpler, it'd be near the sciences, and this was to be a science-emphasis college, and so on. We had as an alternate the present Crown site, and Regent Heller was very sensitive ... she's very protective of Santa Cruz, but she's very sensitive of criticisms of Santa Cruz. She thought at that stage, see this was '64 or '65 that this was happening, the siting, she felt that she'd be better able to defend Santa Cruz as planned in the Regents if the site were not in there (which might be used for central buildings, if we became a conventional campus) but out on the periphery.

Calciano: I see.

McHenry: And so the site was chosen. And it was Regent Heller in league with President Kerr, so that the President's

recommendation came into the Regents not for the Campus Planning Committee's first site, but for the alternate site. And I think we were prepared to accept this as a sort of a step in expediency. We had to get it through the Board, and Mrs. Heller knew the sentiments in the Board better than we did. Well once that limited site, and it's a tough one if you walk up to lunch or something there, was chosen, then it was almost inevitable the fourth college would be linked to it, and I think it's all right. It's less convenient perhaps, but on the other hand, we'd have to use it someday if the college plan succeeds. And maybe it's all right to keep that other site clear for a while.

The Campus Planning Committee

Calciano: We keep mentioning the Campus Planning Committee. Who is it composed of?

McHenry: Well, the membership is defined somewhat in Regents Bylaws or a Presidential directive, I'm not sure which. It consists ex-officio of the Chancellor as chairman, the consulting architect, Mr. Kump, the consulting landscape architect, Mr. Church, the campus architect, Wagstaff. (Pause) I'm not sure there are any other ex-officio; the rest are appointed by the

Chancellor. Oh! One representative of the Vice President, Physical Planning and Construction; that'd be Mr. Evans now, and he doesn't come himself, but he almost invariably sends a planner on his staff called Al Wagner. And then the rest are appointed by the Chancellor, and at the present time they are Don Clark, who has been on from the beginning; Terrell Hill of Chemistry, who is new and sort of faculty representative; Admiral Wheelock, who was number two man at San Diego for many years and is himself a Naval architect and engineer. I think that's the lot. And Barbara Sheriff has been sort of ex-officio secretary from the beginning, but actually the staff work is handled largely by Richard Peterson who works up the agenda and handles these things, and Barbara does take notes and hands them over to him, but she's there partly for sentimental reasons; she did that at the beginning before there was a staff, and also she takes good care of Regent Heller who comes to, oh, at least half the meetings.

Calciano: Does Regent Heller have official capacity?

McHenry: Well....

Calciano: Or is it good politics to have a Regent there to....

McHenry: The decision was made some time ago to invite Regents who were interested to participate, but not to call

them members on the grounds that Regent McLaughlin had dominated too much the proceedings at Berkeley. And so we've just ... she's great, she's very good at this; she's an excellent Regent. She'll voice what she thinks, but usually in a subdued form; she'll tell us whether she thinks the thing can be gotten through Regental committee or not, and she's a good influence, a benign influence generally. And the one instance of interference that there is on the record was that early one about the siting of Crown College. We've had other Regents at times ... Regent Roth in the early days was fairly regular, but he's been busy as ambassador in charge of this Kennedy round of tariff decreases, and so he hasn't been to Campus Planning for three years or more. And while he was the alumni representative on the Board, the former vice president of Kaiser, for whose name I'm fumbling, asked to be sort of affiliated with the Campus Planning Committee ... Norris Nash is his name ... and after he finished his term on the Board of Regents as alumni representative (it was only one year) he expressed an interest to continue, and he did attend a little, a meeting or two after that. But after his retirement from Kaiser, he took an assignment raising money for Mills College, and since then he has never attended.

We'd like to have Regent Roth come back into the picture.

Calciano: Are there any Regents currently who are continually stumbling blocks?

McHenry: No, I shouldn't say so. Regent Forbes is the one who raised these questions, and part of it is unquestionably his own personality and his own innate conservatism for doing anything any differently. He's the one who raised the divided roadway question and so on. And he's given me a bad time on several occasions, and I noticed at a recent meeting of the Board that the Santa Cruz students who were there for one of the newspapers, or I guess both the newspapers, were sort of huddling with him talking about parking, and I expect to have some very pregnant questions raised about parking in the Board before too long.

Parking

Calciano: Well now that was my question after next. What are you going to be doing about parking for staff and faculty?

McHenry: Well, we're going to have to go into structures eventually. And the big deterrent, of course, is cost. The surface parking area costs about one tenth, if you own the land, of a structure built by the conventional methods of building structures. But there are some new prefab sorts now that are coming on the market that

may be able to reduce this to a quarter, four times as much for the structure. Of course once we start building structures, we're going to have to increase two or three times over, depending on the relationship of number of surface spaces to number of structure spaces, the parking fee. It's going to \$30 next year, but if we have any substantial proportion in parking structures built by this \$2000-a-car formula, then we'll have a \$60 a year fee, something like that. So we've got structures in mind in various places ... are you interested in the detail?

Calciano: Yes, because there's so much controversy right now, unrest.

McHenry: I'd like to put a roof over the top of the so-called quarry lot where I think you park occasionally.

Calciano: Occasionally, if I find a spot. (Laughter)

McHenry: Yes. Indeed I'd like to put two floors; one above the present level for cars and then a third at the top for garden. I think that's one of the ugliest things on the campus to come around through this beauty and then see those cars down there. I think the approach to the quarry is very unfortunate. Since we will have an auditorium there close by, we need a place, a safe place, for people who come to lectures to park at night; and well lighted, that would guide them into

the auditorium. And I think our public relations, our Extension work and so on, would be very much better if we had this, even if we had to charge people in the evening 50 to park. At least they wouldn't be falling down, breaking legs, and walking over cattle crossings and ... were you there the night we had the first occasion at the Field House in September of '65?

Calciano: I was not there; I think I know what you're....

McHenry: An older man who was much interested in the University suffered a heart attack and died after walking up from that lower parking area. And the ground's rough and quite a few people fall down, and it's not good. Well, that's one location. And another possibility that appeals strongly to me is to, if we can do it cheaply, would be to put a second deck on the Stevenson parking areas down low. We're greatly over subscribed, and one of the reasons for the pressure of the quarry lot is that the commuter students who really belong to Stevenson or Cowell just don't have enough space there. That, however, would show those cars much more from McLaughlin at the turn there at the East Peripheral Road. But again there could be some plantings, as there should be in the quarry lot, so that the upper deck of cars, if there is one, would be pretty much obscured by some planting of pine trees or something so that you wouldn't see the cars. Then there's the next unit of the Library. We do intend to build a structure into it somehow. That's not been fully worked out, but Warnecke soon will be working on it. And it probably would be approached through one of the canyons so that cars would get in the structure and hardly be seen. If they came up the main Jordan

Gulch, you could have one side coming up and one side going down. There are several ideas about this.

Calciano: Well I'm wondering ... as you must know, there's an awful lot of staff unrest and faculty unrest about the tightness of parking. Why haven't you put out a position paper or some such thing declaring those intentions? Because it tends to focus on you ... that you don't want cars and therefore you aren't providing parking, and yet you are obviously very well aware that this situation exists.

McHenry: Well the situation is not particularly tight for people who are willing to walk. I had Hyde take a census of cars or count the open spaces in various lots, and the number of times in which all of the lots in the east side were full were typically only about one hour a day. And the basic problem is that commuter students who are attached to Crown do not park at Crown, but they park down in the quarry lot. And there are almost always spaces around the Field House, all times of the day. And we've taken a few steps; one of them is to require Crown commuters to park in Crown facilities. We proposed to take another step, and that was to keep "C" cars out of the quarry lot, and there was a great hue and cry about this. And you may remember some of the editorials and letters to the

editors about it. They said the "bureaucrats," meaning people such as you and me, who have regular hours could use public transportation, and students should have the preference in parking since they don't have such regular hours. Well, I think this is about as specious as the argument that everybody should have his name on a spot, and it should remain vacant when he wasn't there. It's all a matter of space and economics. And if you're willing to stand for the assault on the forest, more places can be built. It'll cost more money, and if you have an equal number of spaces, of parking places, and permits out, one space for each permit, then the price has simply got to go up. Instead of \$24, it's going to be something like \$36 or something. It's a very simple problem in arithmetic. But every campus I've ever known has got a parking problem. Every city I've ever known has. And I don't think it's going to be solved in the long pull on this campus or anyplace else that's big without some strenuous efforts being made to get some kind of a transit system. And that's not going to allow people, such as those who work in the Library, to park just outside the door. You hear the staff bitching; I hear more student bitching. And it's continuous. And I've gotten partially deaf from it, because I'm sure

that there'll be some people who would quit working for the University because of inconvenience, some marginal perhaps, and I've invited more than one student to take an intercampus transfer form if he doesn't like it.

Calciano: But the question I started out with, though, is why do you choose not to make a statement on the parking that these are the situations: this is what we're faced with, and this is what we're going to do? Do you think it would help or would not help?

McHenry: Well, I don't want to be pushed into any premature commitments regarding structures when it hasn't gone to the Regents yet. With the \$30 fee this fall we may have a statement.

Calciano: Now you want to terminate this [the interview session]....

McHenry: In five minutes.

Calciano: Right. Let's see if I have ... well, one more question along this grievance line. Some of the faculty have commented that the same mistakes seem to get repeated in college after college, and there is no vehicle for communicating with campus planning. Now of course you've just given your reasons for no building committees, but I don't think this is what they want either. They just, I suppose they want a complaint

bureau (laughter) or some such thing, because....

McHenry: Well anybody who wants to write a letter will always have it answered. And a good many of the bitches just want to bitch. And I could spend twice twenty-four hours every day listening to....

Calciano: Well this wasn't directed at you; it's more a feeling the planning office seems to be remote from the needs of the faculty and this kind of thing. Are there any, plans to open up lines of communication, or are they as open as they can be?

McHenry: Well, I think probably they're as open as they should be. Anybody who feels strongly about anything could write it down, but these oral yaps aren't really very helpful. They may relieve the person of a certain amount of frustration by getting it off his chest, but a lot of them are very ill-informed. For example, we've just had a questionnaire inviting people to comment on various things about the forest and the physical setting and the use of insecticides and so on. And I'd like to see the four people who say you should never use herbicides and insecticides under any circumstances. Surely one of the four catches poison oak. And the only way we can approach the curtailment of poison oak in habitated areas is by spraying them with some variation of 24D. And I can't believe these

were informed verdicts. I mean they're people who were simply not informed, and I don't think it's possible to go around and say, "Now you've got to read this report and that monograph before you're allowed to vote." People like to shoot off their mouths without knowing. Now the parking thing could be an awful ... I'm sorry the staff people who commute from given places in town have not been willing to ride the public transport that we subsidize. I think it's unfortunate, and the more convenient you make parking the less likely anybody is going to do this. But my attitude, which you may regard as callous, is "let 'em howl."

Calciano: When you commented that people if they're willing to walk can find a spot, I don't ... I think that the pressure is that people who are on fixed, for instance, 12 to 1 lunch hours, they come back, they don't have time to circle five parking lots and then walk the ten minutes.

McHenry: No. But of course there's no guarantee in their employment that they have the constitutional privilege of going home to lunch and coming back. The one o'clock hour is a very tight hour. And commuter students tend to roll in while there are parking places that people who go home to lunch ... and I hear

it from Barbara [Sheriff] and a lot of other people, but they're people who want to go off campus to lunch, and who have a tough time on the way back. But I don't see any solution without knocking down all the trees.

Calciano: All the trees. Well, yes, this is the other problem; how do you keep from paving the whole campus.

(Laughter)

McHenry: Yes, I really think that people have to make a judgment about whether they really want to.... It's like commuting downtown to a big city. It's marginal. It's so much trouble, that maybe you'd rather not work or rather try to find a job in some other setting or something of the kind. But the easier you make it, the more cars you're going to have. And there's just.... I think we have very good traffic people and that eventually this loop service, and people getting their expectations adjusted properly, these two are going to be about as near a solution as we have. By the way, one more thing about parking structures -- for the first time, in College Six, we're building in some parking, 60 places, underneath one of the buildings, but it's costly, and that's the reason for having to start upping the price from \$24 to \$30 this next

year.*

Calciano: Even though it's going in the College structure, it still is....

McHenry: It has to be financed, be self-supporting. Yes. All parking has to be self-supporting, except there is a handful of original places that the State allowed, maybe 50 cars or something like that, to start you off and then from then on you borrow the money and amortize.

* The planned parking under College Six (Kresge) was eliminated as an economy measure prior to construction. -- D.E.McHenry
8/31/72



An Aerial View of the UCSC Campus, June, 1967

- | | |
|--|--|
| A) Natural Sciences I | F) A-Frames and log cabins that were built on weekends by staff and students for student lounges and recreation buildings; they have since been moved to other locations on campus |
| B) University Library | G) Heating Plant |
| C) Central Services | H) Upper Quarry |
| D) Field House | I) Cowell College |
| E) Some of the trailers that were used as housing for the students in '65-'66 and as supplemental housing in '66-'67 | J) Cowell College Provost's House |
| K) Athletic Fields | L) Crown college |
| M) Merrill College Site | N) Stevenson College |
| O) East Peripheral Road (Glenn Coolidge Drive) | |

May 29, 1968 9:15 a.m.

LONG-RANGE PLANS FOR THE UNIVERSITY AND ITS ENVIRONS
Married-Student Housing

Calciano: start here I have a few more questions on architecture -- long-range questions. In the planning papers that I went through doing research for these interviews, I found a number of things that were proposed or perhaps planned. One of the proposals was that we develop non-University sponsored housing on University land, such as graduate housing or apartments, this type of thing, over on some corner of the campus. Are we ever going to get into this type of thing in the future?

McHenry: Well I think it depends a lot on the way financing is available. Generally speaking, the insurance company construction on the University land in institutions across the country has run into a good many problems. They can't very well make a capital gain by selling; they don't own the land, and their flexibility is cut down a good deal; usually they try to get the University to give them some kind of assurance that there won't be competitive facilities built unless theirs are full all the time. But I think in general in the last five years universities have become somewhat disenchanted with this, and I think perhaps the larger financial firms also have become

disenchanted. There's still some advertising in the business officers' journals saying, "If you need dormitories fast, just call us and we'll provide them," and there are various kinds of designs that are available, but you see the advantages to University construction are very considerable: total University ownership of land and of the improvements, and money that sometimes can be obtained at 3% from the Federal Government.

Calciano: Heavens!

McHenry: Whereas the open market now is more like 6%, and no property taxes, whereas if these private buildings were built on public land, there would be a property tax at least on the improvements. All in all, the University's in a better situation to operate the housing, in my opinion, rather than private enterprise, and some of our conviction on this of the last couple of years has come about from the extraordinarily high interest rates and on the other hand the exceptionally low ones available on loans from the Federal Government. Only perhaps two years ago, just about when interest began to get up, Congress set this mandatory 3% limit on the loans to colleges and universities for student housing.

Calciano: How lovely. (Laughter)

McHenry: The trouble is that it's so low and so much below market that there are about three times as many applications as can be granted. And occasionally we have to go out to the open market to get money because the federal money isn't available. Stevenson was built on open-market money, and College Five may have to be.

Calciano: Can you later refinance via federal or not?

McHenry: Well in some cases we might refinance if the interest rate drops. But in the case of Stevenson, we perhaps paid 1% higher, but we were freed from a good many restrictions that the Federal Government puts down, so that it wasn't that much more as a result of the interest being 25% higher. There were various other features in form of construction and the like that gave the University perhaps more flexibility, so that instead of 25%, it may have been 10 or 15% more costly. Then there's a further federal restriction that you can only have \$3,000,000 per year per campus.

Calciano: Three?

McHenry: Three million, yes. And we've been trying to space our colleges at one a year, and the year we don't have a college, 1970, we hope to have married-student housing that year. But we've just gotten within the last week a schedule from Vice President Evans in which they're

trying to push our married-student housing back to 1971 for various reasons. And if they do that, we then will have two more-than-\$3,000,000 projects in 1971, and both of them couldn't possibly be financed by the Federal Government if the present loan restrictions continue.

Calciano: Where will the married-student housing go?

McHenry: On the west side adjoining Empire Grade and that fringe of trees that begins not far above the turnoff of Heller Drive from Empire Grade. They'll occupy the extreme west portion of the campus and be strung along the hillside. We have 220 units in the schematics being planned, and we had our first look at the design just about ten days ago.

Calciano: How many acres will be eventually devoted to that?

McHenry: Well I don't know ... it's very difficult to estimate acreages. We've just been looking at revisions of the Long Range Development Plan this week. On Monday we looked at them and there were two other sizable areas colored in orange (the color used for this by Richard Peterson in planning), and they would look to be a little larger than this one, though this one is probably capable of expanding by, well it could even be doubled if necessary. So I should think that we might eventually have, at full development of this

campus of 27,500, married-student accommodations for as many as a thousand families, a thousand young faculty and graduate student families.

Calciano: Now single graduate students will be housed elsewhere.

McHenry: Or they could occupy bachelor apartments here. It would depend upon their choice, and of course there is a considerable amount of disagreement and discussion about the accommodation of graduate students on the campus. Most of the provosts are very anxious to attract graduate students into active membership in the colleges, and this is a matter on which most of the provosts and I have agreed to disagree. I'm glad to see the younger graduate students take part in the colleges; on the other hand I think that perhaps a majority of the mature graduate students will be married, will have their social interests elsewhere, and I'm concerned that there be, there might be, if they remain on in the colleges, particularly if they've been undergraduates here, a kind of a delayed adolescence in which they stay on year after year and don't make new contacts. Most of them will be married, and those who will live in family housing will tend, I think, to diminish the intensity of their connection with colleges. Their interests will center around their spouses and their

children, and I think *we can make* some distinctive contributions to graduate life quite apart from the colleges. I'm especially interested in good creche and nursery school facilities for children and also an educational program for spouses. This is something that's neglected everywhere. I don't know of a good program in the country where a definite attempt is made to keep a spouse, a wife of a graduate student, especially one with small children, up intellectually, so that she can do the job she'll have to do someday as a faculty wife. So many of the girls who marry in this period and have so little money and their husbands are so busy, they degenerate very promptly to conversation topics so elegant as "What's on special at the A & P this week?" or "Wasn't that funny about Dean Martin on TV last night?" And yet these girls often are brighter than their husbands, about 50% of the time I'd judge, and it's a shame to see them go to seed and stop reading, stop thinking. And also they need things to do with their husbands. You perhaps have gone through this as a medical wife. The husband is, for example, a scientist, as often would be the case at Santa Cruz, and the wife majored someplace in the humanities. The two of them have a built-in gap of the two cultures anyway, and how to overcome this is a

very difficult problem, and my hope is that we could have a very lively Extension course, program, going on recent American novels or something of the kind, involving especially active participation of the graduate student wives, and the children properly cared for, but always arranged so that the husband and wife enrolled and took the work together and read the novels together and participated in the discussion rather than one baby-sitting and the other doing it. If we could work out something of this format I think it would be a noble experiment. But I'm very anxious to try, and this is one of the reasons why, as we look at the physical layout of married-student housing, I'm so anxious to say, "Well now let's leave room here for this and that, that we hope to get out of gift funds." I want, for example, a master's house, something like a provost for the graduate students in reach of these housing units, areas; maybe the 200 would have one master and have him performing some of the social functions for the graduate students that a provost does for undergraduate students; part of his job would be to see that these Extension courses were there and look out for the welfare of the graduate student family and so on.

Calciano: Very interesting. I have a whole section of questions

dealing with education. I think I'll continue right now with architecture, but I am intrigued because we've all heard so much about our great plans for undergraduates, and one almost wonders if any thought has been given to graduate students. But we'll get to that later. Are we planning eventually to lease land for faculty homes the way Stanford has done on its back acres?

McHenry: Yes. No definite plans have been made really. We've got about 350 acres available for 700 homesites in the north. We have no venture capital to build roads and streets and bring utilities in. We wouldn't want to demoralize the real estate market anymore than it is in the area by doing it now. But I think of this as something in reserve perhaps for ten years from now.

Calciano: Will this be at the very top of our campus?

McHenry: Yes. The present plan is the northernmost 350 acres.

Calciano: Marshall Field?

McHenry: Marshall Field area and on north and east.

Regional Shopping Center

Calciano: One of the early planning papers also commented that there ought to be a shopping center on campus. Will there be?

McHenry: Well ... I think yes. The answer's yes. The real question is the scale and how many of them. The

environs plan that was agreed to by the City, County, and University calls for a regional shopping center in the Cave Gulch area.

Calciano: Where the houses are? Or on our land?

McHenry: On our land and in the southernmost part of the Cave Gulch private enclave.

Calciano: That's all steep banks down to the creek, isn't it?

McHenry: No. Our idea was that it would be on private land just where you leave University land and enter into the Cave Gulch, Thurber's tract, going up the hill now as you go, say on Empire Grade, up beyond Heller Drive and proceed up across the bridge at the bottom and then move on up ... you have University land beyond the bridge on both sides of the road. Then when you come out on plateau above, you then leave University land and you enter into the Cave Gulch-Thurber's tract area with the small homesteads --Jim Dagle on the left and so on.

Calciano: And the Lazarottis....

McHenry: Yes, and so on. Yes. Lazarottis and Harrises at the top and Dagle, and behind Dagle the Clausers at the bottom. Now the plan was, in the environs plan, to make this a regional shopping center, mainly on private territory, but the design of the thing is such that it fudges over onto University land. And our

thought has always been that there would be a major bridge there connecting University related things and maybe some land of the University leased for certain purposes. For example, a theater, motion picture house, or a bank, or something of the kind, connected across the bridge with other kinds of business developments in the area. And some of us could see even small department stores and a very considerable University village there. And the speculation that has taken place in land in the area, mainly through a local man called Bob Smith, has all pointed to the development of that as a business property, and the prices being paid are such that it probably could not economically be used for housing, at least all of it. That was a bubble that sort of burst. Like the subdivision of the land, the former Lazarotti property, just north of the Marshall Field area. Bob Smith got control of this, perhaps ownership. He took equipment in and cleaned up all the debris and marked out lots and was all ready to subdivide but couldn't get access from the Cowell Foundation. He needed only about a hundred yards of road to get in there, and they wouldn't sell it to him. And he's always blamed us for blocking it, but when we've been asked by the planning people, I think our answer has been that we

don't foresee the need for a subdivision in that area at this time. That the problems of getting water and sewage disposal and the rest look very difficult to us, and we don't expect to develop the north end of the campus for many years, and consequently it would make more sense to do whatever subdivisions there are in lower areas.

Calciano: Well did you in a sense block it via the Cowell Company, or did they block it on their own?

McHenry: Well I don't believe they ever asked us formally our opinion, but I think they understand that if we were interested in having the area developed or the University needed it, that we would speak up.

Calciano: I see. (Laughter)

The Possibility of Purchasing Other Cowell Property

Calciano: I hear from many people, but none of them would have any reason to know, that the University is going to eventually take over the other 6000 acres of the Cowell Ranch. Well I think that's a little grandiose, but I wondered are we going to be taking over, or buying, other significant sections of it? Is this in the works? I know one parcel is.

McHenry: Well ... I'll tell you my preferences. If the Cowell Trustees would give the University an option to buy it

within three years or five years or something of the kind....

Calciano: You're talking about the whole 6000?

McHenry: Yes, or any part of it, I think the University should accept it. There are many problems connected with this. A businesslike way to do it would be to negotiate a price. If you did negotiate a price, it would become public, the option would become public, and the tax assessor would undoubtedly reassess the value of the land. The Cowell assessments are extremely low. Someday you might just stop at the assessor's office and make a note of them. I happen to know, for example, what the assessment of Cowell land in the Bonny Doon area is. It's some of the richest land in limestone deposits in this State and has magnificent redwood trees on it, and it's assessed at an unbelievably low rate.

Calciano: How has this come about?

McHenry: I don't know. I trust it's come about from the fact that the Cowell Foundation has been very generous to the County and to the school districts and so on and the State in providing land for public uses. I don't know whether they sold the Westlake school site or gave it. When they cut through a right-of-way to widen a road or to do something or other, I imagine Cowell

land is provided virtually free, if not entirely free, and this is a working relationship that.... Their income is very small from their holdings. The only income I know of that they have from all their holdings in the County is this joint grazing lease that the University and the Cowell Foundation have, and that's a few thousand dollars a year, not nearly enough, I think, to pay their low taxes.

Calciano: This intrigues me, because George Cardiff commented that Cowell was always taxed so much higher than anybody else. When he went down and looked in the parcel plots, that all the assessments on a certain area had been raised and then they'd all been lowered down again except Cowell's, and he got that one lowered and so forth. He was fighting for the company, but....

McHenry: Well this may have taken place in one....

Calciano: Yes, perhaps one isolated incident.

McHenry: Maybe it was while it still was a company. But the great increases in property values that have come about since the University came here have, I suspect, not been reflected in their assessments and, for example, and this is quite confidential, our attorney, Steve Wyckoff, provided me with the assessment in taxes on the Cowell property adjacent to the property

that Clark Kerr, Kenneth Thimann, and I own privately in Bonny Doon. We bought nine acres from the Cowell Foundation in order to get access to our larger property of about 250 acres. And the nine acres is just a very steep dropping off into a creek and usable for nothing except a road on the side; I think our taxes on it are more than the entire Cowell plot of perhaps 300 acres adjoining it.

Calciano: Oh my heavens! (Laughter)

McHenry: But of course if we went in to the Board of Supervisors in an equalization effort, we wouldn't get any reduction, but they would have a tremendous increase. And we couldn't afford to do that.

Calciano: No..

McHenry: But if we were not who we are, if it were bought by a speculator, he would go in immediately.

Calciano: He'd balk.

McHenry: Yes.

Calciano: Well to get back to where we digressed ... you said that if the University were to be given an option, the Cowells would have to put a value on the land and this would cause problems because....

McHenry: Well, I'm reasoning this out knowing very little about the law and procedures, but if they did place a value

on it, then I think they'd be dead with the assessor. And I've always entertained this faint hope that the Cowell's, particularly while Max Thelen, Sr., is living, might just give the University an option to buy within five years at a mutually acceptable price.

Calciano: Confidential price?

McHenry: No, not stated. No, just one to be negotiated at the time the option is exercised. And if I had my way, we would acquire Pogonip very quickly.

Calciano: Oh wouldn't that be nice.

McHenry: I think it'd be a great thing. And then we could use the land for the purposes we wanted. For example, I would like to have four or five theological seminaries around us. I think it'd be a very good thing to have them; not part of the University, but cooperating with the University. Berkeley has such a relatively happy situation. The UC Berkeley Library is used intensively by these people. The University is an important center of intellectual life and people are trained for the ministry, the ministries of their religious organizations, in this setting of social activity and turmoil and discussion of ideas and the like; even the Jesuits are moving their Presentation College now from Alma to Berkeley for this very reason.

Calciano: I didn't know that. Well now, we have entered into sort of feeling-out negotiations on some natural resources property....

McHenry: Well the Fall Creek area we've been wanting to get, and eventually the University may make the Cowell Foundation an offer for it. The Foundation, you know, has not been giving away land ... at least to the University; it's been always in terms of a sale. And it may be that we'll have to make an offer to get the Fall Creek drainage area.

Calciano: Well now if the Cowell Foundation did decide to sell to us, would we be able to use funds from the Regents, or would we have to scrounge around and get private money?

McHenry: Well, I've discussed this with the investment committee of the Regents, and I think their feeling would be that it would be a very good use of endowment money.

Calciano: Endowment money?

McHenry: Yes.

Calciano: From University-wide?

McHenry: Yes. The Regents committee on investments every month is buying and selling lands and properties and oil leases....

Calciano: Speculating, in a sense.

McHenry: Well, it's building up their endowment. And they will sell 10,000 shares of IBM and buy 10,000 shares of Xerox and so on. It's portfolio management, and land could play an important part in it. And in a case like this, it would be land in which they'd be gambling on themselves and their own development here.

Calciano: Well now when we get into this business of leasing land to seminaries and so forth, Stanford of course can do what it wants on leasing to light industry or whatever, but aren't we as a State institution bound in more tightly? For instance, we aren't allowed to have anything to do with religion. Do' we get into snags here?

McHenry: Not if the price of leases or sales are economic ... that is if land would be available to others in a comparable category. If we favored the Catholics and disfavored the Episcopalians, we could be in trouble. But if we're evenhanded about it, as I understand the legal situation, we'd be all right. And indeed the Regents would have even more freedom than the Stanford trustees in that the trustees at Stanford cannot sell any of the 8,000 acres. That's in their charter.

Calciano: Oh.

McHenry: The Regents can sell anything on this campus; this property is freehold.

Calciano: Even our 2000?

McHenry: That's right.

Calciano: Oh help! (Laughter)

McHenry: And if we got into real financial trouble, we could do as Berkeley did in its early days of the '70's and '80's. You couldn't meet a payment for a janitor, they gave him an acre of land for a month's wages. Incidentally, the University's been buying back all that land at the average rate of about \$100,000 an acre south of the Berkeley campus.

Calciano: Well now I am right that we could never have a religious center right on campus, or am I not?

McHenry: No, we could. I think we could; we've got some legal opinions on it and their attitude, the General Counsel's attitude, is somewhat hostile and stand-offish, arm's length, but I think there's no doubt but what the Regents could sell land or give land, not give land, but could sell land or could lease land for religious purposes.

Calciano: Right adjacent to Cowell College if you wanted?

McHenry: Yes. Well indeed we've had under negotiation now for two years a little strip of land that lies on the east side of the East Peripheral Road;* the University owns

* Ed. note: The East Peripheral Road is now known as Glenn Coolidge Drive.

a little plot in there of three or more acres that by following somewhat the contour the East Peripheral Road cut off; it's on the Cowell-Pogonip side of the road, and it's been offered to the University Religious Center at the appraised value. And it's only that the Religious Center is balking at the price that it hasn't been sold. Development cost will be high, because electricity isn't available there and telephone service and certain other things that would be difficult to work out.

Calciano: Hasn't the University already run into trouble with the American Civil Liberties Union about having some religious or semi-religious convocation on campus?

McHenry: Well the only trouble is a kind of a snotty letter now and then from Ernie Besig, a man I've known for 30-35 years. He always writes one of these letters wanting to know all about it, and the general posture of the ACLU is: the University and religion -- never the twain shall meet. But most of us here don't believe in it. We think religion is an important part of life and society and thought, and we see no reason so long as there's no attempt to propagate religion on the campus or to convert people on the campus, why religious representatives shouldn't circulate freely and speak freely.

Calciano: Well I would certainly agree with this, but I was just wondering if you envisioned any lawsuits or real snaggles if you get into this? You don't think they'd be forthcoming?

McHenry: Well I should think that it's quite possible they might sue some day, but my point of view is "let them." What better publicity could the University have than it went too far, or allegedly went too far, in trying to do something about the moral and ethical standards of its students?

Calciano: (Laughter)

McHenry: And I in effect feel like daring them to sue.

(Laughter) I think it'd be a great public relations thing for the campus if we were sued for cooperating too much.

Calciano: That would be different. (Laughter) Are we considering leasing land to light industry or think-tank kind of industry along the pattern of the Stanford Research Institute and that whole area?

McHenry: We don't have any proposals for it, concrete proposals. I think if somebody came along and said, for instance if Educational Testing Service said, "We would like to have a regional office, and we need ten acres of land. Would you lease it to us for 50 years?" or 49 or whatever it is, I think that we'd consider it

seriously. Two thousand acres is probably more than we need for our own purposes unless this is to become a campus larger than 27,500. I'm sure the Regents would want to think long and hard, and one of the reasons why it might be -- and I'm sure I could tell you in confidence -- is that the Committee on Investments was favorably disposed towards getting an option on the Cowell land. That's just a year ago now, a year ago next month that they met in Los Angeles and took this action. The situation in the Cowell Board, however, is such that it's very difficult to get any decisions now. Mr. Thelen and Mr. Hellman are serving alone; the third place is vacant. The two are not likely, I gather, to agree on a successor for Mr. Connick. And it's now probably only a matter of waiting until Mr. Thelen is gone and Mr. Hellman'll take over. And Mr. Hellman represents the Wells Fargo Bank.

Calciano: He had no particular ties with the Cowell. Company other than ... or did he?

McHenry: Well he may have as a banker; I'm not sure.

Calciano: But he doesn't have this spirit of....

McHenry: Well he's different in that in a way he's more modern. If the Foundation falls under his control, as it might. if he outlives Mr. Thelen, and the demographic tables would indicate that he probably will -- Mr.

Thelen's is in his 80s and Mr. Hellman is in his 60s -- then I would expect the Foundation to blossom out with a proper office, and to have perhaps a staff member paid a decent salary, and to accept applications on a somewhat wider basis, and to be much less personalized and homespun than it is now. I would expect it to invest its resources in perhaps more diverse form, so I'm not sure. Perhaps moving out of land and into securities somewhat more than it is, though its security holdings are enormous.

Calciano: I've heard the worth of the Foundation is assessed at \$14,000,000 or so, and that it's probably underassessed.

McHenry: Well the Foundation ... it isn't a question of assessment; the Foundation reported its assets either to Internal Revenue or to the Foundation Directory, and it was published this way as of about ten years ago as \$14 or \$15 million. In any case, since that time my guess is that they've given away more than that in the ten years, and that I don't think they've given away much more than income. And one of the "guesstimates" I've heard is at least \$45,000,000, which makes it a fairly big foundation. One time I was in Warren Hellman's office, and he pulled out a looseleaf binder that must have been three inches thick and flipped

through the pages of it and said, "These are the securities the Cowell Foundation holds." And I have no way of estimating their value, but it must have been a thing of 200 pages.

Calciano: Probably not penny-ante stuff either. (Laughter)

McHenry: And the land holdings are still spread I think now to maybe fifteen counties. They sold out lock, stock, and barrel in San Mateo County, you will remember, about three years ago, and it was a sale that involved \$3,000,000 or so. It was widely published, I would think. It may have been before you came to work with us. But it was a complete sell, every acre, and I think when the sale is made, if they ever dispose of the Santa Cruz County holdings, that it'll be one fell swoop, everything at once.

Calciano: Oh really?

McHenry: Yes. Otherwise they'll be eaten up by the assessor again.

Calciano: True. Well on this light industry business, there's no plan say in the next three years to lease a parcel to such and so or anything?

McHenry: No. Here again we want private investors to make attractive offers to private industry, private holders of land. There's a good deal of land available in tracts that are quite large enough and with utilities

already laid on and the University, I think, probably should not use much, if any, of its basic 2000 acres for this purpose. If we could acquire Pogonip and some other lands, we'd be very much interested. And we had a committee that worked a good deal on this. It was headed by former Regent Hagar, and up to the time of his death, we did a good deal of thinking about how the Pogonip might develop and might serve the campus. We even dreamed of such things as a funicular ... oh, a cable car or funicular overhead transit system connecting the plateau of Pogonip to the Stevenson-Cowell area. And many ideas we had about a limited housing development and a good deal of industry in the Pogonip region, a very brain power industry. And there was no doubt but what it would be an extremely attractive place to some of the companies that might come if they had this connection with the campus, or even through the fishhook road which is ... the County agreed to build for us, but which we've never forced them to construct.

Calciano: Where is that?

McHenry: This would wind through the Pogonip and come up and join the East Peripheral Road about a third of the way up from the bend on the East Peripheral Road.

Calciano: So that we'd no longer have to make this great loop....

McHenry: Yes.

Calciano: It's so frustrating when I come in the morning to get to River Street and see "there's the University" and I still have 14 more minutes of driving to get on.*

McHenry: Under this plan you'd exit at River Street.

Calciano: And go right up.

McHenry: Yes.

Commercial Enterprises on Campus Land

Calciano: I've been kind of intrigued about this leasing business. What about the Kite and the Redwood Shop. How do they fit into the leasing, non-leasing, private, public.... McHenry: Well in the first place, they were built with University funds. The construction cost was covered by incidental fee capital outlay.

Calciano: So it's student funds, in a sense?

McHenry: Well they are, yes, not our student funds because the Regents gave each of the three new campuses a sum of around \$400,000; perhaps it's been augmented since

then, but \$400,000 or more to get underway with certain student facilities. And these were some accumulated surpluses that the Regents had banked away from the old days, maybe even back to the time when I was a student when they put all the incidental fees in a single kitty from all campuses and then handed them back, budgeted them back to them. Now in the last five or six years, these fees have been collected by campus, and virtually all of it retained on the campus. Before that, before Chancellor Murphy came to UCLA, Berkeley was spending about twice as much per student on health services as UCLA was. But UCLA students were paying the same fees. And Murphy got going on this and in no time it was changed. So some of these old funds were allocated, and many of the things we've done, the renovation of the amphitheater, of the Barn Theatre at the entrance, and the building of the gazebos and so on, and the construction of the building in which the Kite is located, and all these were financed out of these funds. Now the building was built out of incidental fee money with one proviso, and that is that the commercial parts or tenants of it were to pay enough rent to amortize the cost of the building; that is, it was money that had to be repaid

* Ed. note: Actually about six minutes.

to the Regents or to the incidental fee capital outlay account. I think I asked for thirty years at no interest. And I don't know whether the Redwood Shop is paying a rental or not. It should be, but the bookstore generally has not gotten up to the point of making any money, and so I'm not sure whether this is being paid. But the Kite is about to go broke, you know. It's closing in a week. And we're on the search now for another tenant to provide some kind of service that would be somewhat more viable economically.

Calciano: This would be an outside concern that wanted to run a delicatessen, or....

McHenry: Or it's possible that the delicatessen pattern is not a good one; that the student demand is much more for less expensive things and more conventional to the teen group -- a milk shake, maybe a hamburger, or something of the kind. The thing that hungry teenagers go for, and the Kite is much more an adult, sophisticated thing that would appeal to a little more professional people....

Calciano: Yes. I thought it was great. (Laughter)

McHenry: And who don't mind spending a dollar or more for lunch. But the students would like something where they can go talk for an hour and spend fifty cents. And it's pretty hard to do that there. Also it's been

rather badly managed, the Kite. has, in my opinion. I've been a little worried about the standards of cleanliness, and some of the strange people who hang around there probably haven't induced others of us to go as often as we might. But you are interested in the lease. Hal Hyde signed, under powers delegated to him, oh, kind of a service agreement with the Kite. They'd provide certain services, and they were required to pay some percentage of their gross, I think it's two, three percent of the gross. And in the early months they were owing the University (and I think most of it's been collected) as much as \$150 a month for the use of the space and the utilities and so on. And we could have amortized that building fairly quickly in a period maybe of eight or ten years if that much income could have been steady. Whether we will' be able to amortize it -- I'm sure we can amortize it over thirty years -- but that quickly is in doubt now, because we've got to have another tenant. The students in an economics class of Robert Adams made a study during the year of the economic feasibility of still another facility. They favored someplace near the Library that would serve things that the students really want: hamburgers and hot dogs and milk shakes and things of that kind. I suppose sort of an A & W root beer type

of thing. And they found, according to their studies, that there was plenty of student demand, even granted the Kite with its current patronage, to support another eatery, but more of a conventional type. And the Redwood Shop is part of the University book enterprise which is managed under the Library and the Librarian. And the rest of the building is occupied by the Committee on Arts and Lectures and certain student activities that Dottie Kimble runs; tours and cultural affairs.

Calciano: Who designed that building?

McHenry: I think Theresa Yuen of our architectural staff did it herself. Does it seem awkward to you?

Calciano: Yes. I don't care for it and it's ... you know, one person's opinion isn't that valid, but it just seems to me that it doesn't particularly nestle in to where it's sitting, and it doesn't quite fit in with the more sturdy type of construction we have elsewhere. I think you could do a wood place that would be in harmony, but it just always looks a little bit junky or as an afterthought, that it just grew like topsy. But then I'm supposed to be the questioner not the answerer here.* (Laughter)

* Ed. note: The exterior has since been remodeled and seems quite pleasing now, to this viewer.

McHenry: I thought the design of it was pretty good. It was an expensive building; it cost a lot of money; about \$55,000.

UCSC's Relations with the City and County Planning Staffs

Calciano: There's been a lot of things written, at least in the earlier years, about the development of the University environs, such as we don't want dirty industry right outside our front gate and so forth. How much control or influence of the development of the environs does the University really have, and how does it go about exercising this control?

McHenry: Well I suppose all we have is the power of argument. We do have a written agreement with the City and a written agreement with the County, and these state certain principles and some specific things about what roads the County will build for us and the City will furnish us with water at no worse than the prevailing rates of similar users of similar volume and with police protection, with fire protection, and that sort of thing. And I think there are some principles of good planning involved; I don't think they're enforceable probably. But the ... we'll have to rest upon such argument as we can make, the power of persuasion, with the County planning people and the

City planning people. We keep pretty close to the professional staffs, and I don't think we often disagree with them. With the commissions, it's another matter. And I think that we're still in substantial agreement, but when you come down to the ultimate appeal to the Board of Supervisors or the City Council, I think we're relatively weak in planning matters. The reason being the commercial interests of people who want to spot zone for a gas station where it shouldn't be or something of that sort. I don't think we have any power at all when we come in conflict on land use with one of the aggregate groups, one of the sand and gravel people. The Granite Rock, for example, which has a seemingly humane and enlightened president, whom you know, Bruce Woolpert, can get almost anything it wants anywhere, anytime.

Calciano: Now you're referring to the controversy of the Bonny Doon quarry, or....

McHenry: No, I was thinking more of the controversy over the use of the Wilder Ranch as a source for sand which took place a year ago.

Calciano: Yes.

McHenry: They went in and got this permit, and about all we could do is to say, "Well could there be some trees masking it, and couldn't this and that?" But when a

major economic interest is involved, it's virtually impossible, at least on the County Supervisors level, for us to succeed in blocking something, and in that case I felt we ought not to try; that it was just too ... well, it's usually better not to commit your forces if you know you're going to be licked.

Otherwise your lack of muscle is demonstrated so that somebody else will be tempted to take you on. This [the quarry] is a little bit outside of our immediate environs. It isn't annexed to the city yet; consequently, Jack Wagstaff, who is Chairman of the City Planning Commission, couldn't exert very much in the way of influence. Donald Younger, who owns the land just this side of the Wilder Ranch in that area, was very agitated about it and felt we ought to go in with both fists flying. But in the end they got about what they wanted, and it was modified a little bit with masking tree plantings and certain restrictions on the amount of runoff of sand in the streams and so on, but the excavation of sand is going to proceed. I don't think we have any big weapon against dirty industry except perhaps the lessons that have been taught elsewhere. The Chamber of Commerce isn't interested in having dirty industries here. They would like clean ones, and I think it would be good for us

to have an influx of electronics and similar firms.

FUND-RAISING

Cowell and Stevenson Colleges

Calciano: Shifting gears slightly over to money raising and so forth; the whole idea here [at UCSC] is so dependent on private funds. I've wondered, did you come into this Chancellorship with knowledge of fund raising, or did you have to do a lot of learning by doing, and....

McHenry: Well I'm still learning. I had no real experience with fund raising previously, and I don't know very much about it yet. We had it ready-made in the first Cowell grant since there was a virtual agreement, as I've told you, and you know anyway, between individual Regents on the one side and Trustees of the Cowell Foundation on the other, that they'd give back a substantial proportion of the purchase price, which was approximately \$2,000,000, and so this gave us the handhold to get started on them, by building a model college on the collegiate plan. So Clark Kerr and I submitted to the Trustees, I think in '62, the first year that we were planning the campus, a proposal for \$800,000 to buy extra amenities for Cowell College, and they granted it quite promptly. When we had a bid that was well above budget, we had to go back to redesign and to get more finances, and they upped it

\$120,000 more, so we got \$920,000. And then we started working on the second college, and the financing was very difficult. I went to Sweden in January, '65, hoping to loosen up some money. I was working on Countess Bernadotte, the widow of the man who was assassinated in the Palestine controversy. She's a Manville of Johns-Manville, and her brother put me up to it. The two of them together out of the Manville Trust gave \$500,000 to Berkeley for the Law Center, and there's a Manville Hall over there. So I went to Stockholm and made my presentation, and months later she told me that she couldn't do it.

Calciano: That was your sole purpose for going there?

McHenry: Yes. In England I talked to J. Paul Getty, the so-called richest man in the world, tried to persuade him, and he said "No" then, and I've tried once since then by mail and got another "No" out of him. And we've tried various other ways to finance what is now Stevenson College, and in the end we've had to settle for relatively small gifts; the largest one is \$50,000 from an anonymous source. And the rest of them are little amounts from \$1 to \$15,000.

Calciano: The \$50,000 went for the....

McHenry: Well, the donor was more interested in the library

than anything else, but understood my argument that we had to. have a house for the Provost to live in and allowed us to use it for the house while we raised money for other things, and I think when we allocate - the library's under construction now, as you may know -and when we allocate these sources out, we'll probably show that the \$50,000 is in the library rather than in the house. But....

Calciano: When it becomes unanonymus, will the name get tagged onto the library, or not?

McHenry: I rather doubt it.

Calciano: You have to buy a whole college to get your name on it?

McHenry: No, no. We'd be glad to. It's just simply that the donor prefers to remain anonymous, and we must respect such wishes. The money raising for Stevenson's been a terrible job. It's cost almost as much for bait as the value of the fish. And the expenditure in staff time has just been tremendous. Gurden Mooser and I have borne the brunt of it, and I'm inclined now not to butt my head against that stone wall much more. And I've been trying to persuade Provost Willson that he has to take on more responsibility for their.... It's a tough spot. Once you name a college, especially for somebody who is dead, you have great difficulty

getting people fired up about it.

Calciano: You had thought that a lot of Stevenson friends and admirers might come through?

McHenry: Yes. And those who could easily give fifty or a hundred thousand dollars bought me off with one thousand each. And it's just a great disappointment. Almost everything possible has gone wrong. The Stevenson family gave its permission, then just after we named it, they decided they were going to launch a Stevenson Institute in Chicago, and they were immediately, especially Adlai III*, very jealous of our raising money any place, especially outside of California. And that's been a very great barrier. Another one has been the slump of the building and loan industry. Several people in building and loan we had anticipated would give substantial sums, ranging up to \$100,000. Men like Bart Lytton, who should have made a big contribution, gave nothing, and we haven't been able to loosen up any of the others. So it's been difficult.

Negotiations with the Sloan Foundation

McHenry: We'd always planned the third college for Sloan Foundation, which is General Motors money, and we worked this very carefully. We've had three of their

staff members -- the president, two of the vice presidents -- at different times out for one or more visits, and the thing was quite well set up, thanks to the President of the Sloan Foundation, Everett Case[†], who used to be President of Colgate University. And he was working very hard to get Mr. Sloan, who was in his eighties then, interested, if not as a Foundation project as a personal benefaction outside of the Foundation. And then Sloan died suddenly, and we were left without any plan for financing the third college.

Calciano: When did this happen?

McHenry: This happened, I think his death was in January or February of 1966.

Calciano: Just when you were about to go into the bids, I suppose?

McHenry: Yes, yes. That's right. And then one of those bright little rays of sunshine came out of the dark clouds -- the President of Crown-Zellerbach Foundation rang through to Gurden Mooser and said, "Could you and Chancellor McHenry arrange to come to see us sometime during the week?" And we went up, and we were braced for it, but fortunately we were sitting down, and then the officers of the Foundation gathered around, they

* Now U. S. Senator from Illinois. -- D.E.McHenry 1/3/73

† Now retired. -- D.E.McHenry 1/3/73

popped the question, "Would you be interested in \$500,000 for a college, preferably with a science emphasis?" And we did accept, and that's how Crown College came to be so named.

Calciano: You had done no soliciting for it?

McHenry: Well, they knew what we were doing; Gurden Mooser had made a call there, had explained the leverage, and had been in touch with them. But it was pretty much unexpected; we didn't have them warmed up.

Calciano: Do you ever expect to get money from the Sloan Foundation, or is that....

McHenry: Well as a matter of fact, I got up this morning at 5:30 to go through yesterday's mail, and one of the questions that was in the mail was, "What to do about the Sloan Foundation?" and I.... They've got a new president, and it's possible that we could start all over again. But we shifted from College Three to College Six and called College Six Sloan. But Everett Case told me the last time I went to see him in New York three or four months ago that it was hopeless, and that he didn't think there was any way possible to get it through the Board, given the way things have stood, and he was a lame duck. And so I don't see any way to do it, but we'll keep trying. We'll make the acquaintance; we know the staff well, and we'll make

the acquaintance of the new president and see. But their preoccupation has been with other things. There is a strong bias against public institutions in it, and I don't see much hope of breaking through.

The Merrill Trust

McHenry: Merrill was carefully cultivated by many of us. I had some old ties in the Merrill Lynch organization from a small account I opened 20 years ago in the Westwood Village Branch, and the man who was manager then, Ed McMillan, moved on up in the organization and became an executive vice president. And while he was not a member of the Merrill Trust Board, his fellow executive vice president, Donald T. Regan, was a member, and McMillan knew the trustees, and he helped us a good deal to get in. The key thing in the whole was, however, Charles Merrill, Jr., who is Headmaster of The Commonwealth School in Boston. He's tweedy and leather patches on the elbows and a typical "Mr. Chips" type. He is preoccupied with minorities and their problems, Chairman of the Board of Morehouse College, Atlanta, from which Martin Luther King, Jr. graduated, and balances the Commonwealth student body with a third rich kids who pay enough tuition that he can bring in a third kids out of the slums and another

third from university and middle-class people, and he's done quite a job. And this was a natural for him, and Provost Bell's plans fitted in very well. They came out here in February in two detachments in successive days, and within three hours of the time they left here, Merrill called me back from San Francisco and said, "You asked for \$500,000?" I said, "Yes." "We decided to make it \$650,000." (Laughter) But each one of these is a cliff-hanger, just as the physical construction is a cliff-hanger and isn't quite done by the time you start. And Merrill was already well under construction before the gift money came. And for various reasons, the gift money wasn't there in time for Crown to build all the thing at once, and so a separate contractor built the library, faculty commons, and so on, high rise. Have you been in it?

Calciano: No.

McHenry: There's a penthouse deck with a magnificent view of the bay. That college doesn't have very many good views of the bay, but that's an excellent one from the third story. And now we're working on various other things for Five, but we don't really have it lined up.

We had hoped that Samuel F. B. Morse* of Pebble Beach would contribute the money to Five. We even tried to get his wife, who is independently wealthy, to do it as a sort of a birthday gift to him, but that failed.

Calciano: Well now, when you don't have the money in hand....

McHenry: We go ahead with the loan money and the State money that we have, build the plant, and have the gift items independent standing, freestanding, so that they can be developed at the proper time when the money's in hand. And this has been true of everything since Cowell, as we've had separate contracts and additional things coming along.

Naming the Colleges

Calciano: Now you said you aren't going to butt your head against the wall as you did on Stevenson. If the money isn't forthcoming on College Five, will you have to go ahead and name it something? It can't continue as Number Five, or will it?

McHenry: No. We'll keep it Five even to the point of opening if we have to, because once the name is assigned, your money raising, your bargaining position is pretty well lost.

Calciano: You had thought for a while of naming Stevenson

*Mr. Morse died not long after this interview. -- D.E.McHenry 1/3/73

Kennedy College, hadn't you?

McHenry: Well, I didn't take that very seriously. I suppose if somebody had offered us some money, we would have, but the Kennedy family was relatively aloof, and people were preempting the John F. Kennedy name everywhere, and there is a John F. Kennedy University in the Vallejo area.

Calciano: Oh, there is?

McHenry: Well, I don't know whether they had preempted it by the time we were ... but they did pick it out. And the Kennedy family had given very little permission; I think they gave permission in New York City for the airport and for the Arts Center in Washington and for the Library and School of Public Affairs at Harvard. I think that's all the permission they'd given. All these other namings have been unauthorized, and, I think, immoral. Well I was not as much an admirer of Kennedy as I was of Stevenson. Stevenson's death in line of duty was much less dramatic than Kennedy's martyrdom, but I don't think we ever took very seriously the idea of Kennedy. Files show that various people sent the name in, but it was.... There are several things that focused on Stevenson: one was my own admiration; another was that San Diego proposed that what they now call Muir College might be

Stevenson, and Clark Kerr urged me to move quickly if we were going to move on it. And then the Governor, Governor Brown, proposed it, so.... And then I had contacts with a good many of the wealthy people who had financed Stevenson's campaigns and made the guess, and I proved to be wrong, that we could get substantial funds from them. So we moved and took the drastic step, which I have sometimes regretted.

Calciano: I remember about the time I came to the University in '63, there were half-joking, and yet it really wasn't, names for all the colleges after famous people or something. Was this seriously considered at that point, and it was only later that you realized that that was the money-raising bait, or was this completely tongue-in-cheek? It seemed to me that some of them were pretty serious. "Let's have a college with such and so as the emphasis and name it so and so after that great man in that field."

McHenry: No, those came more from the discussions that we had with Karl Lamb and Neill Megaw as consultants in the summer of '62. And they were intended to be jokes. For example, College Four, which in its earlier stages was more on languages and linguistics than the present turn, Neill Megaw nicknamed Kim College because there was a chap of Chinese ancestry who's a major in the

Army, and he was a Deputy Commandant of the Army Language School in Monterey called Major Kim.

Calciano: There was Susan B. Anthony College, too. (Laughter)

McHenry: Yes there was. And the oldsters' college was called George Bernard Shaw, and it eventually became the Methuselah program. But I don't think any of us took these very seriously. There was one in there called Heller College, and it was the idea of a memorial to Edward Heller who had just died. Of course, that'll come into being some day, I'm sure. I wouldn't dare let it get out to Mrs. Heller or her sons that we were carrying it on the books as early as '62, but I think the time will come, perhaps on Mrs. Heller's death or her retirement from the Regents, in which case we then can go after that very vigorously, but we're in no position to do so now. And she's our chief supporter in the Regents.

EARLY ACADEMIC PLANNING

Kerr and McHenry Differ on Several Basic Concepts

Calciano: I'm ready to start now on the academic plan and a lot of the developments of it and the carrying out of it which ... I don't want to start if you want to close in ten minutes. How is your time?

McHenry: I'm in pretty good shape.

Calciano: Can we start a second tape when this one runs out?

McHenry: Yes. I can stay a half hour more.

Calciano: Okay. We discussed to a certain extent the germination of the UCSC idea -- Kerr asking you to go through the files for some papers that had been done on small colleges and such. You mentioned to me once that Kerr felt that each college should have a specific charter so to speak. Was that the origin of the idea that each college will have an emphasis, be it the humanities or sciences or fine arts or what not?

McHenry: Yes. I think that we probably in any case would have had some angle or problem just by the varied interests of the faculty and particularly of the head of the college. We originally called the headship, "the Deanship", but we changed it to Provostship to give it a little more standing. But Kerr was on the side of wanting things spelled out more, wanting a charter for each college drawn up, a basic statement of what it was going to do, and where it was going to go. Kerr felt that they would, if you didn't direct them, become peas in a pod; they'd become very much alike, so you needed to give them a charter to start with, and hold them to that charter, and not let them change the charter. I felt that they all ought to emphasize liberal arts; that their style would come from the personality of the provost, the disposition of the

faculty and so on. And in effect I think we compromised somewhat. But the first three did have this utilitarian feature of rounding out the faculty of humanities emphasis, social sciences emphasis, and science emphasis. But I think the biggest compromise was over science. That was one of our big disagreements. Kerr took the position that these colleges ought to be as autonomous as possible, and that students in a college should not have to go for freshman chemistry to a distant place. I argued that science was so expensive anyway, that it had to be centralized, that every little college couldn't have an electron microscope, that every little college couldn't have a safety officer and a storeroom for volatile chemicals, and that it was very difficult to combine the living in colleges with the smells of chemical laboratories, even freshmen labs, and the deliveries and noise and busyness and heavy equipment that would be required. I felt the only way we were going to have good science was to look carefully at the way Cambridge and Oxford had emerged. In the early days at Oxford, several of the colleges had labs, and in one or two cases, chemistry was joint or cooperative. I think Balliol and Brasenose had a common chem lab someplace down in the bowels of the

earth, and it has always seemed to me that Oxford fell behind in modern science because it clung to this. And it eventually had to abandon the notion of laboratories in the colleges. Cambridge went earlier into centralized facilities, and you have these great complexes like the Cavendish Laboratory at Cambridge. If you're going to have real science, it is sensible to have centralized facilities so that even a freshman student can be rubbing elbows with perhaps a member of the National Academy. And so we argued about this for some time in the 1961 and '62 period. And there was one other point. I suppose I should have said that my views were that science had to be centralized, and as I traveled in Britain and over the United States, I couldn't find any scientists who felt that we could have first-class science if it were not centralized. Eventually our compromise was simply that I withdrew my objections to a science emphasis college if he would withdraw his objections to a science center. And we proceeded on this basis.

Calciano: Wasn't there also something about libraries?

McHenry: Well there was some disagreement over the years, and perhaps they still exist. I felt strongly originally (and when Don Clark came into the picture in '62, I was reinforced in my determination) not to have the

Library resources spread over the campus and frittered away in little branches. And Kerr and Regent Heller, who has been a big factor in all this, and a good factor, felt that the college library is so important that if the gift funds weren't forthcoming right away, that we ought to take entitlements out of the University Library or mortgage the University Library's future by putting a piece of the Library in each college. Now Don Clark and I have held firm on this, and I've said to them over and over again, "If we fail utterly to raise the money for a college library, but you've got to give us a little time even after the college is open, but if we fail utterly, we'll consider raiding the University Library in time, but if we can raise the money, let's try that first, and let's do everything we can." Well now we've got four college libraries assured out of gift funds. Stevenson was awful. And someday I'll tell you who gave that, the base money that made it possible. But it was just a terrible job, raising the money. But we've done it so far. And I think maybe things will come easier in the future [knocks on wood] I hope. (Laughter) But I feel, I still feel I was right from the beginning on all these points -- a stubborn old man. (Laughter)

Calciano: Well, it seems to be working out. The colleges are not peas in a pod.

McHenry: But there still isn't as much difference in the style of student as I'd like to see. I'd like to see one college where the men shaved and the women took better care of their hair. (Laughter) But we'll get this someday I think.

Calciano: Then you'll be saying you wish there was one where they had a beard or two. (Laughter)

McHenry: Well, they'll go through cycles, but I suspect when I see the pictures of the students demonstrating at Stanford, that they look just like our students. Moustaches on the men and unkempt clothing and so on. So I suppose it's the generation that we're worried about. Sometimes I think nostalgically that we should have projected one of these colleges to be a military college. The Citadel of Santa Cruz. (Laughter)

Calciano: It would certainly be a focus for reaction. (Laughter)

McHenry: Every young man in the ROTC, and every young lady in whatever they have as a moral equivalent. (Chuckle)

Calciano: Didn't Kerr also want the enrollment limit on the colleges to be considerably larger than what you envisioned?

McHenry: Well I'm not sure that that was ever a studied position on his part. He may have done it as a debater

argues a point. But there was a time when he was raising these rather fundamental questions, perhaps to test my conviction, in which he was saying, "Why not have a college of 1500 or 2000?" And I've forgotten whether he did this in writing or orally. But I remember responding and saying, "You've got us mixed up with San Diego. You've got an experiment going on down there with the larger unit, and why not let them experiment with that and let us experiment with something of the Haverford or Mills size, and then you'll have some results that have been proven one way or the other by test. But if you make us like San Diego, then you won't have the benefits of an experiment with a smaller unit." It's a curious thing that after that episode, and he watched very carefully on the building program the development of what was a logical outcome of our ultimate decision to have this 600 unit, 600 student unit, as the average, and caught right away the first time we proposed a classroom building to serve the cluster of first four colleges, questioned it, and had the physical planning people, Vice President Morgan's staff, question it: Wasn't this a violation of the collegiate idea? And actually it was an extension of the collegiate idea; you couldn't build a 400 student lecture hall economically

for any one college, but for four colleges you could. And then they kept persisting the last year Kerr was President, asking these questions, physical planning people mostly, "Well, are you modifying the college plan by having some cluster facilities?" Well my answer was, "No. You try to be practical. You can't build that auditorium anyplace else, and yet the auditorium's needed. So you put it in a place, you site it so that the four can use it sensibly and efficiently." The Kite* and these little facilities that are going to be built on the Miner's Village Road are cluster facilities; they serve the whole campus at the moment. But when College Five is established, they won't be handy for College Five, and we'll have to have a dry cleaning agency and a place, maybe even a branch of a grocery store so the kids can buy soaps for the laundromats over in College Five or on this side someplace.

Calciano: When the plans were just being formulated, these splits that appeared between you and Kerr on science laboratories, big libraries or lots of little ones, and size of the college and so forth. Did it ... were there times when it really was quite a strain on you and on the relationship? ... I mean were you really

* Now the Whole Earth Restaurant. -- D.E.McHenry 1/3/73

just at it, or....

McHenry: Oh I think there were ... the two times that bothered me most were times when we crossed swords publicly in front of others on the physical planning. And in general I, because I had participated in it, was defensive of what the planners were doing. And he would tend to come up partly to test the extent of their conviction, with some rather sweeping criticism of what the planners were doing. And I maintained, perhaps not always, with ... well not always in a way to ease his feelings or soothe his feelings, that he was ... it wasn't fair to the planners to add to the program or come up with bright new ideas after they'd invested weeks of work ... and some of his criticisms were such as: well, parking. Warnecke put a mass of surface parking in far places in the north, for example, and Kerr made some sweeping criticism of acres of parking. And probably, if I remember correctly, inferred that it would be better to distribute it around the campus more evenly and get people a little nearer where they were going. And various other kinds of sweeping criticisms that I thought were probably unfair to the planners, who had themselves worked very hard at it. And well, there were two occasions in which we quarreled rather publicly about

it. ... Well this was, along about May, June of '62, and we moved to Santa Cruz the first week or so of July, and it was just after the bond issue had been defeated in June, and I wasn't at all sure I should move, but we were pretty well committed by that time. For one thing, the bond issue had been defeated, and we didn't know whether we were going to have any capital outlay money. And for another one, my relations with Kerr were at a low ebb, and I came up here in kind of a depressed mood, not knowing whether there was going to be a Santa Cruz campus, and not knowing whether I wanted to go on working with Kerr. I don't think I've ever said it in quite this way, but it was a good....

Calciano: There was a low ebb over what now?

McHenry: Well over the relations generally. There was one episode in which Kerr had Oswald*, who was one of his vice presidents, and who is coming back now as Executive Vice President, talk very sternly to me about lobbying Regents. He thought that something Ellie Heller had said indicated that I had lobbied her for my point of view on something or other, I've forgotten what it was. And so he sent his bird dog to

* Now President of the Pennsylvania State University. --
D.E.McHenry 1/3/73

me to ... and I told Oswald that he was quite wrong about it, and if Kerr really were serious in believing that I had done so, that I really thought he ought to start looking for a new Chancellor. And after that, Kerr never sent the bird dog to me. This is the kind of a technique he used with Franklin Murphy. He'd send Oswald, who was the most persistent ... I called him the running guard. We were very close personally now, mind you, Oswald and I; not as close as Kerr and I had been, but ... I didn't like this, this technique. If Kerr had something to say to me, I didn't see why he didn't say it to me directly. It was a very tense period in along about '62, '63, '64. Not always tense, but occasionally there were these episodes that were troublesome, and I am sure I was too sensitive. And I had a feeling that Kerr and I really didn't disagree, that fundamentally we were right on the same line. There might be just ways of his doing things and saying things that tended to irritate the people who were working for us, and not know where they stood. I remember very well Ernest Kump one time, he was just a member of this team, the planning team, who said, not, I believe, to my face, but at a time when I was out of the room, "Well, now that the President has shot the Chancellor down in flames, what'll we do?" That was

not easy to take.

Calciano: No. Where have these public confrontations taken place? In the Regents, or....

McHenry: No. Never in Regents; only in, I guess, our Campus Planning. Committee with assorted architects present.

Calciano: Well during this six years where Kerr was President and you were Chancellor, did the old friendship really kind of have to be set aside, or did it still function on a social level?

McHenry: No, no, I think it still functioned, and you see I'd had a very close relationship with him on virtually every policy matter from '58 to '61. And once I became a Chancellor, I continued for a year as University Dean of Academic Planning. Indeed I did some of this University-wide work even after I moved to Santa Cruz. So I was associated with him from July of '61 in two different ways for a period of twelve to eighteen months. I was, as a staff member of his, still University Dean of Academic Planning, and I was still in Berkeley three days a week at any rate. I was teaching a little at UCLA that year. And I was also laying the basis for the Santa Cruz campus, and our headquarters for the Santa Cruz campus was on the seventh floor of University Hall. And he was still consulting me about the most delicate matters of

relations with the Regents and with state colleges, and you see this was just after the Master Plan had been finished and I was representing the University in terms of staff at the Coordinating Council for Higher Education. I was doing a lot of staff work, and was a member of both of his Cabinet and his Council of Chancellors. So I had a dual sort of an arrangement. But as Santa Cruz took more and more of my time, there was less of that private conference and memo writing on the most critical problems over which I had ranged very widely during those years from 1958 on. Anytime I had an idea on any subject in anybody's jurisdiction, I didn't hesitate to write the President about it and I would say that, perhaps immodestly, that many of the ideas that were put into practice that changed things in the University may have originated with memos I wrote in areas that were really not directly part of my assignment as University Dean. The notions of tie lines among the campuses I put forward in a memorandum perhaps the first year he was President, and it was subsequently implemented. Some of these, the jitney bus idea, were things we talked about quite early, and he then looked for ways of putting them into effect or financing them. Now a lot of that, that old free-wheeling business, which largely was done by memos,

one-page memos of ideas, a lot of that terminated as I became Chancellor. I probably am oversensitive about a lot of things that I didn't anticipate; I wasn't used to the notion that he and I would differ in public, and it bothered me quite a while.

The Tschirgi Committee

McHenry: And then there was this prodding. He was very much afraid that we weren't moving fast enough to bring in personnel, and particularly to write out the academic program for Cowell College. And he appointed, really without my consent, or maybe with my forbearance, a special committee, I think I told you about.

Calciano: No, you haven't, but I have a bunch of questions about it. It's the Educational Committee on Academic....

McHenry: No, it was....

Calciano: Tschirgi's Committee.

McHenry: It was Tschirgi's Committee.

Calciano: Academic Advisory Committee?

McHenry: Well the Academic Advisory Committee was the one headed by Gordon MacKinney, and this, the special Advisory Committee, Tschirgi's Committee, was a kind of a subcommittee with two co-opted members plus MacKinney of the Academic Advisory Committee. In

talking to Dr. Roy* on Monday I sent for the file about this strange plan that they drew up, and I furnished Dr. Roy, on a confidential basis, a copy of my letter to Kerr analyzing the plan and rejecting most of it. It is very hard to think of some things we agreed on, and the things we disagreed on.

Calciano: The Tschirgi Report was really quite hostile to a lot of the concepts that you felt were fundamental to Santa Cruz.

McHenry: Yes. It's hard to characterize, and I haven't had time to reread it. I'm afraid I sent it back to the files without rereading it. But I do remember that they wanted a faculty on a very different basis from the University of California standards. They wanted a faculty that would teach exceptionally heavy loads and would not do research or be expected to do it. And to me this inferred a faculty that was recruited and promoted by other than the University of California standards.

Calciano: They as much as said that you would be able to find such people and they listed a few. Places that weren't the Harvards and Yales, but....

McHenry: No, no. But it was harking back to the old idea that's

*Ed. note: In May, 1968, Dr. Edgar L. Roy, Jr., of College of our Lady of Mercy, Burlingame, interviewed several UCSC people in connection with an American Council on Education project

existed before -- that you could have an enclave within the University of California that was a deviation from the standards of the University of California. I don't mean deviation in the ways of doing things, but ... you see, I'd seen it fail twice before; when Santa Barbara was taken over in 1944, Robert Gordon Sproul made speeches down there and said, "We'll make this the Williams of the West" was one of his expressions. "Williams of the West. We'll make it a model small college." Then 'he said we'd make it a "model state college." And I don't know what business the University has running a state college. Then he said we'd "build Santa Barbara on the basis of the strengths that are already there," which were home economics and physical education. You see, there was all this confusion about what the University should do and shouldn't do. Now Kerr saw these things very clearly, and when he sent me to Santa Barbara within a month of the time he became President, I think in August of '58, we didn't have any differences at all. This stuff that Sproul had expounded was absolutely impossible, and Santa Barbara had to become a large general campus. And we were perfectly agreed on this; that it couldn't become a small college. But the big

test was Riverside. Riverside had been established, you see, in the early '50s, and it had a trickle of graduates as early as '54. It was to be the Swarthmore. It was to be a liberal arts college. It had fine leadership in Gordon Watkins, who'd been my teacher in economics. It drew a good faculty. And what happened at Riverside is extremely instructive, I think, for all of us who are trying to establish institutions within the University of California. It was no time before the pressure for research grants, for graduate work, and other things began to develop. And as soon as Kerr came in, Riverside was at this terrible juncture of not having the college ideal very clearly and not knowing what role it was going to play in the University, and here again we drew up, I was the author, a one-page interim academic plan for Riverside. We drew up one for Santa Barbara and one for Riverside. And it tried to state in semieloquent terms that ... well, for Santa Barbara I used something like, "A new mission," a new something or other, "and a new leader, Sam Gould," but in one page just summarized the new mission, which put aside all this other.

Calciano: You keep mentioning one page; is it double space or single? (Laughter)

McHenry: Single. (Laughter) But I found that these 25-page reports are hardly ever read.

Calciano: Never get read, right.

McHenry: And somehow somebody had to put this thing down in summary form, and you could write the 25-page report later. But this was the essence. Now I've learned from this that an attempt to do things differently within the University of California and use different standards of promotion -- Santa Barbara for years was not under the Academic Senate. It had a kind of a liaison committee, and the Senate people who supervised looked at them and said, "You're colonials, and maybe you'll become an independent nation, and maybe you won't." And they had different standards of appointment and promotion. And that didn't work. And Riverside came into the Senate, and because there were a lot of UCLA people on the committees and so on, they began to drop assistant professors right and left. They spent all their time teaching and going to committee meetings and didn't do any research. Now I learned from that that you're not likely to have a single isolated small college with different standards. That you had to, it seemed to me, if you're going to live in the University of California system, with the power of the Senate, and all the rules and

regulations the Presidents have put out, that you had to have a University-quality faculty, and you really couldn't ask them to do much more formal teaching than the people on other campuses. And so we were laid out from the beginning in terms of eight-hour teaching loads, which is about the norm for the University as a whole. And all our calculations were based on that, and they were based also on people having 40% time for what the faculty people called their own work -- getting on with research in the labs and the libraries and so on. And I wasn't about to be the head of any enterprise that I felt would be foredoomed to failure because it did not fit into the University of California context. And those were really fundamental issues. And I don't believe Kerr and I disagreed a bit on them. When he saw them in writing, I'm sure he felt this won't do. He probably, if you interviewed him, would say, "Well, I used that to prod those Santa Cruz people into making up their minds about things."

Calciano: Do you think that was the whole purpose for instituting the Tschirgi Committee then?

McHenry: I think that he was profoundly disturbed about ... this was a new thing. The Regents were on his neck quite a bit about, "Are you sure it's going to work?" and he wanted to be able to say, "Yes, here's the

charter for Cowell College, and yes this and that."
But I was more inclined to say, "We've got a good
Provost. He's choosing good people; we don't want to
freeze all these things, and we don't want to let the
concrete get hard before they even get in; a faculty
ought to decide a lot of these things, not
administrators. And I think that some of the Regents,
and perhaps Kerr, felt that I was just too indecisive
about them.

Calciano: Did the Tschirgi Report ... it never got to the
Regents then? It stopped at Kerr's office.

McHenry: It just ... there was a dull thud, and that was all.
But how well I remember the day it arrived. Page Smith
and I were at Harvard recruiting in June, maybe it was
early June, or the last days of May of 1964, and we
got this darn thing special delivery, and we looked at
it, and we were just sick. And I had to find some way
for Kerr to save face and yet rebut the thing. And you
do have access to files, don't you?

Calciano: Shirley sent over the Tschirgi Report. The reason I
wanted it was that Karl Lamb had shown me his
criticisms of it, and I kept seeing "Line nineteen is
nonsense" and what not. I know they wanted students to
take five academic subjects each quarter instead of
three. It just was completely as though they hadn't

listened to any of the things that had been planned. Well now, another thing that Kerr did that I have a feeling was not too well received by you (and I may be wrong), he had a firm of efficiency experts, Cresap, McCormick and Paget, analyze our plans. Now when was that, and why, and what happened?

McHenry: Well the administrative organization was going to be different here, and this was the firm that was retained by the Regents to advise on administrative organization generally. And I forget a lot of the details. They did come down, and this was part of a pushing into decision. They spent a little time....

Calciano: When about was this?

McHenry: I would say '63, '64. They spent a few hours in Santa Cruz and then went on. I can't even think of the name of the man who was representing them. And Kerr said, "I want an analysis of how they're doing and what decisions have been made," or something of the kind, I'm just not sure, but it's on file. And they came up with a kind of a ... "well here are all the things we'd have to have before we can analyze the thing financially," (it may have been '64) "and we don't know who's going to teach this, and what, and all these details," and so on. It was a whole skeleton, almost, questionnaire that could only be filled out

after you're operating, it seemed to me. At any rate, there was quite a bit of harassment in this. They wanted to know what was going to be taught for the next five years, how many units, and how many course offerings there would be, and how many students were going to be enrolled in each course, and so on for the next five years.

Calciano: You didn't even know it. (Laughter)

McHenry: And my wife and I sat up and made out schedules and guesstimates, course this, course that, and it was an awful waste of time.

Calciano: You and she did the bulk of it then?

McHenry: Oh yes. We had no one else in those days. And eventually Kerr pulled Cresap, McCormick and Paget off, and the cost feasibility study was made not by them, but by Loren Furtado in the budget office. And they did a very good job of it, and it resulted in the preparation of a mimeographed report called, A Cost Feasibility Study of Santa Cruz. And for the first time, then, they put on record their conviction that much of what we had planned to do was within the realm of the financial perimeters that had been set; that is, that Santa Cruz should cost no more than other campuses of the State money. But University-wide was on our backs to a remarkable extent. Nobody ever asked

Irvine for anything.

Calciano: Why do you think that is?

McHenry: Well, there were more doubts about it; this sounded more revolutionary I suppose. And actually men like Warren Bryan Martin of the Center for Study of Higher Education [at Berkeley]* regards us as not even experimental. We've accepted the same goals, the usual goals of the University of California. San Diego certainly should have had a cost study. They were much more expensive than our plans already. And somehow they maneuvered it so that they never had a cost study, and they're fabulously expensive, by far the most deluxe campus in the University.

Calciano: In buildings, or cost per student, or....

McHenry: Well I don't know about the capital fund, but I should say in operating costs. I thought we were being picked on unduly. If San Diego had gone through the same spanking machine, it would have been much better for the University, because they might have saved millions of dollars.

Calciano: Oh! Is the situation at San Diego such that Hitch will maybe revamp it, or is its pattern set?

McHenry: Well, they've been trying to get them weaned off

* Now known as Center for Research and Development in Higher Education. -- D.E.McHenry 1/3/73

champagne for some little time. Kerr tried it; Wellman tried it; and the succession of Chancellors ... we're going to have a new one again, now, if we can find someone who'll take it ... but this comes about in part from these demands of the faculty that was hired at over-scale salaries for deluxe services, and they want to perpetuate themselves by hiring more deluxe faculty, and yet the authorizations are for assistant professors, but to a surprising extent they succeeded in getting them upgraded. Even to the last year or so of the Kerr regime.

Calciano: (Pause) Now you said that the Educational Policy Academic Advisory Committee was different than the Tschirgi Committee?

McHenry: No. Let's be straight about the organizations that we're talking about. The Academic Senate on each campus has a Committee on Educational Policy. Santa Cruz' not having a Senate in those days, in the early '60s, had no such body. And we didn't have a Budget Committee either, which is a common feature of every campus. So the President, at my suggestion, set up what was called an Academic Advisory Committee for Santa Cruz, and another one, an Academic Advisory Committee for Irvine. And these served as interim Academic Senates. They reviewed the proposals for

appointments, and they reviewed the educational plans. The one in the north was the MacKinney Committee throughout the period, and the one in the south was originally the Galbraith Committee for Irvine, and when Galbraith accepted a sort of Acting-Vice Chancellor's role in San Diego, then it was taken over by a man called Swedenberg, who was in the English department at UCLA, as chairman. Now I met with the MacKinney Committee each month. Puknat was appointed to the committee, representing the Davis campus. Leslie Bennett, who is now Vice Chancellor at San Francisco, represented the San Francisco campus throughout. And the Berkeley people were MacKinney, Gordon MacKinney, who is the nutrition man; Malcolm Davisson, who's professor of economics; in the beginning, George Guttridge, now retired, of history; and Richard Powell of chemistry. I think that's all the Berkeley people, and Dan Crowley of Davis came on ... oh, and William Van O'Connor of Davis was an original member, and after his death, Dan Crowley of Davis came on. I think that's everybody. I met with them once a month and brought to them, with documentation, the proposals for appointments beginning with Page Smith's appointment and Kenneth Thimann's appointment and all the rest. They didn't

look at assistant professors. We did that locally, administratively, and a lot of first assistant professors that were hired, Roger Keesing and so on, I just signed the paper. Charles Daniel ... I can remember these young people coming in to be interviewed, and we had the letters on them. If we liked them, we just said, "Can you wait fifteen minutes?" and we had the girls type up the forms and signed them and the whole thing was settled. It was quite simple in those days, and some of the very best people we got and have on the campus we got that way. After our Senate was established, more and more they wanted to see more papers and ... but we can weekly service some assistant professors, and it's not too bad. So now that accounts for the Academic Advisory Committee for Santa Cruz, and I think the name that Kerr gave this three-man committee, the Tschirgi Committee, was Special Committee. Maybe it was linked to the Academic Advisory Committee for Santa Cruz. At any rate, two or three things happened that I didn't like. One is I wasn't enthused about the appointment of a committee because I felt that this was a campus function, not a University-wide function. I thought it was undermining Page Smith's authority to draw up the college plan as he felt was best. Another thing that

Kerr did without consulting me, he paid two of the members of the committee; he gave them money to release them from teaching, to spend a semester at this. I thought this was unfortunate if they were doing it as ... that they really should be in the role of reviewing what Page Smith wrote about the college, not writing it themselves. And the release of time caused them to meddle a good deal. The third member of the committee, whose name I can't recall Murray something-or-other ... was a Berkeley professor who'd been a Rhodes scholar 30 or 40 years before. He was in Sanskrit or something of that kind, some very distant esoteric sort of subject, and he had a fix in his mind that everything had to be done exactly as it was done at Oxford when he was a student there. And he wanted one-to-one tutorials, which are fabulously expensive, and he wanted the faculty here to overwork as the teaching faculty is overworked at Oxford. An Oxford Don may teach 20 or more contact hours just on these one-to-one tutorials alone. And we couldn't have that; we couldn't in American academic life get a handful of good people that would do that. Well it was an unfortunate episode, but we lived through it, and the whole thing was dropped almost immediately after my rebuttal there.

Calciano: What a waste of time and effort.

McHenry: Yes.

Calciano: Did anything productive come out of it?

McHenry: Not really, I think. That wouldn't have come by the normal processes of having Page Smith and his cadre do the job. Incidentally, I believe in the idea of a charter. I think it's a good idea to write out where you're going and then change it every once in a while. But I became so allergic to this process of outside interference that I've probably been too permissive with the new colleges coining on the line. I never did get a written charter out of Charles Page for Stevenson. And Kenneth Thimann's never had a formal one. Bell is much more apt to commit things to writing and to work from them. But in each case they quite legitimately have said, "Many of these decisions ought to be made by a faculty. I don't want to make them alone." And consequently the faculty comes and gets very busy with things, and they make many of the decisions ad hoc.

Calciano: Well now to a certain extent the faculty you choose would have to be dependent on which way you wanted your college to head.

McHenry: Yes. Well in most cases they had a pretty clear idea

in their heads. But if they committed it to writing ... for example, if Page Smith had written down that one of the tests of faculty membership is that they have to be existentialists or phenomenologists, you could have gone on for years debating what an existentialist is and what a phenomenologist is. There are so many different interpretations in different countries and different disciplines. And he knew by feel the kind of person he wanted, and he just by instinct, almost, would talk to a man an hour and he'd say, "He won't do." And I'd say, "Why?" And he'd say, "Well, it doesn't feel right." And he usually was right that the guy wouldn't have fitted in his college. He might fit in some other college. But I thought that was very important, and I didn't argue with him. When he blackballed a man that looked very good on the record or that I was enthused about, I either put him in Stevenson or dropped him, one or the other.

Academic Consultants, Summer of '62

Calciano: Now I can go on for a long time, but you have to decide when you want to quit.

McHenry: Yes. Well if you want to go on another fifteen minutes it'll work on my schedule all right.

Calciano: Okay. You had several consultants in 1962, the summer of '62. How did you pick them?

McHenry: Well Karl Lamb I had met only once, in September of '61. I was introduced by Steve Bailey, who is now the Dean of the Maxwell School at Syracuse. Steve had been a Rhodes scholar; he's a man more nearly my age than Karl's; Karl Lamb had been an English major at Yale, and he'd gone to Oxford as a Rhodes scholar, and he stayed three years and got his D.Phil. rather than coming back for his degree. Got it in political science. And Rhodes scholars that do this tend to come back without American contacts, and he had shifted fields from English to political science, so he knew practically no political scientists in the country. And so he contacted some ex-Rhodes scholars and asked for their help and eventually was placed as an assistant professor at Michigan. And he also, and his wife Sally, had taught in California. They're both Pueblo, Colorado kids. But she'd taught while Karl was a Rhodes scholar and had a brief service in the army as well. She'd taught in California, and she wanted to live in California, and so Karl had ... Dean Bailey introduced him to me. And I liked him. And then I got the notion that coming to Santa Cruz all alone without any other academic people, that I ought to have

somebody in the summer, and so we decided to pay them what they would have earned in summer sessions someplace plus some money to travel. And Karl Lamb was one I thought of who had lived in both at Yale and at Brasenose and had an unusual grasp of what a residential college involved. And then I'd had my first teaching job a quarter of a century ago at Williams, and about 1961 I noticed that a young man at Williams had won a prize in New England for drawing up plans for a model college, and his name was Neill Megaw.* So I corresponded with my friends at Williams, and they said, "Yes, indeed, he is a fine young man," and this was an imaginative thing; it was published in the AAUP bulletin, oh, maybe December of '61 or January '62, and somebody at Williams sent it to me. I think James Phinney Baxter, the President, had sent it to me. At any rate, I read it then, and then I reread it, and I thought, "That's the kind of guy we need to advise us in the humani ties." So never having met him, I corresponded with him and asked him whether he could spare the summer, and he said, "Yes" and came. And he turned out to be a very good man for this purpose. He's very imaginative, thinks easily about

* Now Chairman, Department of English, University of Texas, Austin. D.E.McHenry 1/3/73

how to arrange things. There aren't very many academic people interested in academic planning, and he loves to tinker and arrange this course that way. So the two came out with their families', and we worked the summer sitting around our dining room table most of the time and shooting the breeze and then writing memoranda. It turned out to be quite a file before it was over; very well worthwhile, and many of the ideas that got incorporated in the academic plan, ultimately, came from these discussions of what it would be like to have Susan B. Anthony and George Bernard Shaw and Kim College and so on. And I'd forgotten a lot about these until the College Five provostship ... we'd been hung up on it for months. I'd been unable to get a consensus. We brought about eight people here at least one time, often with spouses, had them looked over, given innumerable receptions and dinners and lunches to introduce them to the staff, and I still haven't got forty percent of the people to be consulted agreed on any one person. In desperation I sent for Neill Megaw weekend before last.

Calciano: To be ... advising or Provost?

McHenry: No. To consider him for Provost. And he wouldn't do; it was obvious to all of us when we had him here,

though it was interesting to see him again, and he had a much clearer recollection of what went on that summer than Karl and I had, because our memories had been modified by having been in practice. And in preparation for his coming, I got out the file and read all this stuff that he had written. He's the kind of man that the Tschirgi Committee would have said "perfect." He has a University of Chicago background; he loves to teach; he's never gotten around to writing anything. How he spends full time with a six-hour load or something at Williams running his classes and preparing for them, I don't know. But it seems to me that he ought to have a big block of time, and that he would write his book on Shakespeare that he's been trying to get at for sixteen years and ... but he hasn't. That's a tip-off of a certain lack of self-discipline, I think, on his part, or inferiority complex, maybe, doesn't want to face a critical editor; I don't know. But I can't believe that he's a better man than somebody who also likes to teach, but who also has the urge to see what he thinks in print someplace so that it can go on to a wider audience. At any rate, we looked him over, and I wrote him afterwards and said we haven't settled the provostship, but we've got a consensus that we won't

make an attempt to move you from Williamstown. Actually he has some brittle streaks in him, and he holds on very stubbornly. His wife teaches mathematics in a community college, and even that summer out here the model college had to have, we were working on Cowell mostly, had to have a calculus requirement for all students. Well that's one of the ways San Diego's killed itself in the early days. You can't get very many girls to go to an institution that requires a year of calculus.

Calciano: I've had calculus and that's no picnic. (Laughter)

McHenry: My wife says it's easy, but I'd flunk sure. We did compromise by putting a mathematics requirement in, that everybody had to take something in mathematics, and then we devised this course called The Nature of Mathematics that Youngs* teaches, which is a way to get quantitative senses without taking mathematics, or you could offer students statistics, or you could take one of the regular calculus courses. But after one year the math faculty came to the Senate and asked that the requirement be abolished and it was, so that's one change in the original layout that no longer exists.

* Professor Youngs died in 1970. -- D.E.McHenry 1/3/73

Academic Consultants, 1963

Calciano: You also had Stanley Cain, Will Dennes, and somebody Pitts.

McHenry: Jim Pitts. I think they came in '63, but you've probably looked at the records.

Calciano: Sorry, I don't know. I've listed these as "early consultants," but I don't have the year.

McHenry: The reason I know that Dennes was a different year is that Dennes lived in the same house that we got for Megaw the year before.

Calciano: I know Cain was here when I came in '63.

McHenry: Yes, yes. Well, Will Dennes had been the head of the Academic Senate University-wide. He's a philosopher and one of the very earliest D.Phil's ever awarded at Oxford. He was a Rhodes scholar, about 1920-22, along in there. It was right at retirement. He's a wise counselor, knows lots of people. It turned out he knew the older generation a lot better than he knew the young philosophers, but he came and reviewed a lot of biogs and thought a good deal about people and corresponded and phoned, and I don't think it was as productive as I expected, and I hadn't realized to what extent that in the years he had been Dean of Graduate Division and so on at Berkeley that he'd lost

touch with philosophy and to some extent with literature and so on. But he knew a lot of people, and he was very helpful. Stanley Cain's another man in his '60s; he's now the Assistant Secretary of the Interior for Fish and Wildlife.* He was professor of natural resources at Ann Arbor, Michigan. And he came out to work on a program of what we were to do in natural resources, and he drew up a report which was not definitive in whether we should have a school or just a research program or institute or a center or what. But he explored various possibilities, and it was helpful in bringing our thinking along in this area. Who was the third one?

Calciano: Pitts.

McHenry: Oh. Well we needed somebody to plan science facilities. Jim Pitts of Riverside, who is a UCLA-trained man and a pretty good chemist, inorganic chemist I think it's called, had had a year at Oxford on leave from River side and was very much interested in the collegiate organization and was willing to take an appointment here as a consultant. And we really were thinking he was thinking, and we were thinking -- that he might become professor of chemistry and

* Professor Cain returned to UCSC in 1971 on his retirement from the University of Michigan. -- D.E.McHenry 1/3/73

possibly what we then called Dean of the Natural Sciences. He didn't give us as much attention as I thought he should. We paid half of his salary for about a year. He came for meetings of the Campus Planning Committee, but he really didn't get down to the job of where we could pick up the scientists we needed to lead physics and so on. I think he was pretty good at the design of Natural Science I, although there are some people who complain about the lack of windows on the lab floor and a few other things; there's too much window on the top floor. But he was on our payroll fifty percent of the time for a year, and before the year was over, he and I agreed to disagree, and I made it clear that I wasn't considering him for the Deanship. I thought he was too parochial in pushing chemistry along conventional lines, and that he was really preoccupied with the graduate rather than the undergraduate. And he's a good undergraduate teacher. And his personality was a little jarring on some of us. He was undoubtedly a very conceited and able young man. But in the end we parted company, and I suppose I ought to do something to thank him for what he did for us, but I had a feeling we overpaid him. And one of the real differences between us was that he didn't work at it

very much. He stayed in Riverside nearly all the time, and he came only when we called him and said we're having a meeting and we want you here. So....

Calciano: I've gotten the impression he was rather a disaster, but maybe that's a little bit too strong.

McHenry: Well I think it's probably too strong. He was no success. (Laughter)

Calciano: Well in picking these consultants, you were trying to round out, on the latter three, to round out areas that you weren't particularly well versed in....

McHenry: Yes.

Calciano: On the earlier two, it was the molding of the whole concept.

McHenry: Yes. There's a strong element in here of people who had been connected in their experience with the residential college notion -- Oxford, Yale, and so on. And I think that I was trying to buy experience in consultants that I hadn't had myself.

The First Faculty/Staff Appointments

Calciano: During these early stages your planning staff was very small, and yet you were facing crisis after crisis. Who did you share your problems with? Mainly your wife, or were there certain people in the University?

McHenry: Yes. Once Francis Clauser came, January of '65 I think

it was; (pause) Glenn Willson came in January '65;
Page Smith came, moved up here in, I think, the summer
of '64; Byron Stookey came in....

Calciano: November, '63.

McHenry: Right.

Calciano: I remember that one. (Laughter)

McHenry: Right. That's easy for me to remember, because he arrived while I was in Australia. Well there was a growing staff. Byron was a very important part of it, extremely important. I've thought a lot about Byron lately, because he is leaving on July 1st, and you start adding up the things that he's accomplished, and then of course there are the deficiencies that he has too. The assets far outweigh the liabilities, but he has ways of doing things that often get you in trouble. He's such a nice guy; it's awfully hard to be mad at him for very long. But sometimes things are a little devious, and he's stubborn as the devil about his ideas; he acts so tentatively and, "Of course I don't know anything about this, but...." (Laughter) But he's had a lot to do with this place and how it's going to be, and I would think that the big figures in the '63-'64-'65 period were Page Smith and Byron Stookey. Peter Smith didn't come in until the summer of '65. Sig Puknat came in, I think, in the summer of

'64 full time, and so a lot of the advice on the humanities and some language developments and so on came from him. Ted Youngs came in and had a year '64-'65. So we had a growing staff. But a lot of these things had to be handled without a lot of internal advice.

Calciano: You kept your staff very small during all those early periods. The State always had more money ready for you than you filled. Was it because you felt it was easier to work with a small staff, or was it because you weren't going to hire anybody unless he was absolutely right?

McHenry: Both. (Chuckle) Well I think if I had to do over again, I would build up a little faster. But I didn't want to take people on unless I was fairly sure that I wanted them, that I wanted to associate with them the rest of my days at Santa Cruz. And I spent a good deal of time traveling around, meeting people, and thinking about who would fit where. And as I look back over the lists of those people I had in mind in the earlier days -- it is a little like looking back over the old girlfriends before you got married (laughter) -- and I averted disaster on various fronts by trial marriages such as Pitts, and who replaced Pitts in the planning of the science establishment? Thimann and Clauser, who

were top men in their fields. My sights were too low. Now Irvine to a large extent settled for men like Pitts; men they knew at Riverside or transferred from Berkeley and so on. We didn't settle for that kind of people. And in the end I think it's paid off better, as I think we have a degree of quality above them. And I think we have not sacrificed interest in undergraduate teaching by doing it yet. We may in the end. I'm obviously rationalizing for my relative slowness to act. But I am a Scotsman. Unless there was a crying need to fill a spot, I preferred to leave it vacant. And I'm still that way.

Calciano: Have there been a few appointments that in retrospect you wish you hadn't made?

McHenry: Yes, one or two who came here for the wrong reasons. I think I made a mistake on Charles Page. I got in too big a hurry, and I relied too much on one or two people who vouched for him. I think if I'd investigated more thoroughly and checked a wider range of people, I would not have made that mistake. I think that he was, by experience and temperamentally, unsuited to the provostship. But I got a little desperate and jumped; I felt something had to be done; the time was short. And I think some of the problems of Stevenson arise from acting too quickly in that

instance. But most of the staff I'd be glad to live with indefinitely, ninety-five percent of them.

Calciano: Which is quite a nice thing to be able to say.

McHenry: Don Clark came in '62. He was one of the very early appointments. And he was a tower of strength from the very beginning -- good contacts, and remembers lots of people. You could ask him on almost any front, money raising or any other, "Have you got any contacts to so and so?" and he'll say, "I met a guy at HBS*," and in no time he's got it down. And Hal Hyde was involved with us quite early as, first as the south-county co-chairman of the bond issue campaign of November '62. And he was giving us a good deal of business advice even before he came into the picture as a staff member. And on the architect's front, we were staffed up quite rapidly. Indeed I've always felt that architects and engineers, and now physical planning and construction, is slightly overstaffed. I think that's true throughout the University system. I don't mean that they aren't busy; I mean simply that there must be some way to organize that establishment in order to not do so many things twice. We pay quite high architectural commissions to outside architects, and then we have the big overhead, almost as big, of

our own staff watching them and inspecting the work that's done. And I think that we're paying out too much. I don't know how to get at it.

Calciano: It follows the Statewide pattern; it's almost something that you can't....

McHenry: Yes. Well I've kept them tight on money and each time the staff was increased made Wagstaff show beyond a shadow of a doubt that people are fully occupied and so on. I think one of the difficulties Jack has had with me is that I feel that, well I and the incoming Provost each year work at feverish pace; we never pay any attention to the clock, and we just do the job, and when people say, "Well, I've worked my eight hours, and I'm going home," we think of this as a little bit subversive. (Laughter) We think that they aren't really interested in their jobs. And I suppose that this is the grounds for a lot of misunderstanding. But most of the people we've had, at least in the professional spots, and I think some of the architects and engineers are paid on the quite high professional level, I think they ought not to keep track of the hours; they ought to do their job.

Calciano: More like the faculty, really, which doesn't go 8 to 5.

McHenry: Uh-hmmm. They go ... some of them go 10 to 3.

(Laughter)

Calciano: That's true. I'm used to my father who does administration during the day and then does research every night.

McHenry: Well I think our faculty is a very hard-working faculty, and I think we'd average more hours than is typical in the University of California, counting all the informal things that are done -- big college evenings, and the advising and the entertaining of students, and so on. I think a good job is being done by them. And I suppose that it's too much to expect that this kind of drive and eagerness and so on would wear off and be shared, say, by a staff electrical engineer who works in an office and has certain projects to do and whose wife expects him to be in at 5:15 in the afternoon.

June 6, 1968 9:15a.m.

Problems with Nomenclature

Calciano: When I was asking Karl Lamb for hints and so forth on things that I might bring up about the very early planning period, he said, "Why don't you ask about how the nomenclature was arrived at?" because apparently there were a lot of discussions on who should be

called what -- provosts, housemothers.... (Laughter)

McHenry: Well to the best of my recollection -- Karl may remember more clearly than I do -- most of our problems centered around what we'd call a head of college. And in the first version of the academic plan, we called this office "Dean," but no one was satisfied with "Dean" at that time. Dean of a college was an established office in the University; this was something quite different, and we began to look for others, and we wrote down synonyms, and we used the thesaurus, and we got all kinds of notions, and many of them are already in use elsewhere. The master thing was ruled out on the grounds of the jokes about "Master" with a capital "M"; "Warden" seemed hardly consistent. (Laughter) The State has a civil service classification called "Warden" that has a slightly different meaning. And "Principal" is pretty well used up in high schools. And after all was said and done, the term "Provost" appealed to us strongly. The barrier to using "Provost" ... I guess there were two main barriers. One is that in academic life generally in the United States, "Provost" is used for a second-in command on a campus, especially a kind of an academic vice president or academic vice chancellor. It's a very high office at Stanford, for example, and

there's only one of them, and we were a little reluctant to use it for a role that was going to be repeated again and again. The other was that the University of California had a special use for this title. It had been the original title used for the head of a campus, was used at UCLA first; later on Monroe Deutsch had it at Berkeley; it had been used at Santa Barbara, and in an early period....

Calciano: And still is in use.

McHenry: No.

Calciano: It was still in use at that time.

McHenry: It was still in use at that time, yes. But when in '64 we were searching for a proper title, I discussed this many times with Clark Kerr, and eventually he said, "Let's use 'Provost'." And he wanted to change the title at San Francisco, which was the only campus without a Chancellor anyway, and this would be a good occasion and a good argument to vacate the title so that it could be used at Santa Cruz. And then San Diego picked it up directly afterwards, so the only use of "Provost" within the University of California now is for a college of a residential type. And we now have four provosts, of course, in Page Smith, Glenn Willson, Kenneth Thimann, and Phil Bell. San Diego has

three, but one of them is a college that won't be operating for another year or two. But when we get ten or fifteen or twenty, there will be a, oh, what might be called a debasing of the title, some people would say, by having so many. And they'll suggest, I'm sure, a college of provosts like the college of cardinals.

(Laughter)

Calciano: "Preceptor" was another one that you had a little bit of go around on I think.

McHenry: Yes. It always sounded good to me. That word has a nice ring. The only use that I've ever seen of it, I think, in a university in this country is at Princeton. And a "precept" is really a small course taught by a regular member of the faculty. But there are phrases such as "by precept and example" and so on; the dictionary definition fitted: "a counselor, guide, master teacher sort of role". And here again we didn't want to call the deputy to a provost an "Assistant Dean," though that's the payroll title, by the way.

Calciano: Oh!

McHenry: We wanted something that conveyed the idea of an extraordinarily close relationship with students. And so we then worked and worked at it until we came up

with this notion of calling the deputy to the provost, the second person -- we really originally envisioned two such officers, one a man and one a woman....

Calciano: Which you did in Cowell College.

McHenry: Well we've tried, but we've never had the number of faculty women. We visualized this as a say, an associate professor, a woman associate professor, and we've never had them in sufficient number to do this, so we modified it in various ways; different colleges have taken different forms. But the notion of senior preceptor and having two of them was the original one. And then the faculty member who lives in is called a "Resident Preceptor". And that really, formally, involves no appointment papers at all. The provost just appoints or designates somebody. We do have to make some note of the housing perquisite being furnished, and we are still carrying on a battle with University-wide about trying to put a price on the value of the apartment that's furnished to the resident preceptor. And then the provosts have appointed preceptors for non-resident students, and they've used the term in various ways, but always signifying a little closer relationship to the administration of the college and perhaps to the counseling of students than the ordinary fellow of the

college has.

Calciano: Does the University want you to put a lower or a higher valuation on the apartment?

McHenry: Well the University says it wants a "realistic" evaluation. And if we're going to have to declare a value, then I suspect that for those who are occupying apartments inside of the student houses, that we may end up by saying, "The value is nil," because the noise and difficulties and problems that come about from livin^g in such a place make the whole thing marginal, and it is with many people who occupy them just a little bit could tilt it either way. And we're somewhat afraid that if we put a money value of \$75 or \$100 a month on one of those apartments, that eventually Internal Revenue might start taxing them on that as income. And even the threat of that by Internal Revenue would cause many of them to resign, because it's marginal about the loss of privacy and the loss of peace and quiet.

Calciano: Right.

McHenry: Women's houses are reasonably quiet, but the men's houses are often pretty noisy.

1965-1968: PLANS BECOME REALITY

Establishing Boards of Studies, not Departments

Calciano: Early on in the planning you decided not to have departments.

McHenry: Yes.

Calciano: Now was this a personal thing of yours not to have departments, or did all planners immediately say, "Hey, no departments"?

McHenry: Well I don't know of anybody in the early period who argued for them, and I only heard really one person who's on the faculty now who favors going to a departmental system. Clark Kerr and I both felt strongly that one of the reforms needed was to get away from discipline-dominated undergraduate education. The mathematician who looks nationally and owes no allegiance to the institution locally. And this has been a development in American higher education that has been accentuated since the jet plane, and so easy to go to national meetings, and so easy to get money to go, that many of us think of ourselves, my case for example, as a political scientist first, and as a University of California man second. And we thought that we could set up an organization in which the loyalty to the college, to the campus, and to the University ranked up with all this. And so we felt our way into a substitute for the department, and the nearest thing we have to it is the

board of studies. And that terminology came from Britain. Some of the new universities in Britain are calling their disciplinary organizations boards of studies. It seems to convey the idea and to give us a measure of flexibility that we couldn't have otherwise. If we called the disciplinary groupings "departments," then there's a whole raft of legislation and customs and traditions that would then govern us and hobble us. And one of the key things making these different is not to let the boards set up a bureaucracy of their own, a large secretariat and so on, and not to let them dominate at various points in the appointment process, at personnel transactions generally, and in services. And so here you'll find we have a Board of Studies in Literature, for example, and a Chairman of that Board of Studies. It consists at the moment, this Board, of all of the Academic Senate members who have appointments in Literature from all colleges. They do come together and discuss appointments and so on. But the Board of Studies has no budget except some money made available to them by the Division of Humanities. If the chairman wishes to travel to the Modern Language Association meeting, he must draw the funds out of Administrative Travel by permission of the Vice Chairman, Division of

Humanities. He can't just take the departmental account and sign for it. And if there's an appointment of a new assistant professor in Literature, while they may well originate it or put up a panel of names in the Santa Cruz situation, they're not the dominant force in this, usually. The greater influence over the appointment is in the hands of the provost of the college for which the appointment is being proposed. And part of my job has been to strengthen the hand of the provost, not to the point where he could get appointed an assistant professor of Literature who is unqualified, or was unsuited to the needs of Literature, but to make sure that his special needs, and the special style of the college, such as College Four, Merrill College, is met by the appointment.

Calciano: I've gotten the impression that because the chairman of a board of studies has a lot of administrative headaches and personnel searching and does not have any budget control, that these positions are rather hard to fill and people don't like to stay in them very long. Am I right?

McHenry: Well, people don't like to stay in department chairmanships very long either. I don't know which is the least desirable. Those of us who have served as chairmen of departments have found that it's a big

responsibility, and up until now, the last year, no payment was made. Department chairmen were, in the University of California for large departments, sometimes given eleven months appointments instead of nine months in order to compensate them in part for the loss, but the chairmanship of a large department of the University of California almost inevitably leads to a decline in research production and a falling behind in the field. And most of us take our turn at it in the UC system because, well, it's a duty you have to fill for two, three, four years sometime or another in your career. And in many fields people do this, expect to do it; they plan their research work in such a way that they have a lull and go do it. Now here the chairmanship of the board of studies is certainly not as onerous as a department chairmanship even in an institution of similar size.

Calciano: Why?

McHenry: Because they have no budgets to work with; they need to prepare no budgets; they need to administer no budgets. This is all done in the divisional offices. Chairmen play a lesser role in the recruiting of personnel, and on any other campus of the University of California, a department has almost absolute control over the initiation of personnel suggestions.

The boards of studies here often don't do the documentation of getting the background papers on people. And the role is less than half the role of a department chairman.

Calciano: But haven't we had a rather rapid turnover of the people in these positions?

McHenry: Yes.

Calciano: I mean not the two-three-four year....

McHenry: Well, go down the line of those who have been in it and ask, "Why?" In the first place, we've tried to appoint only people with tenure. And in many cases -- take Government, my own field. Those of us in Government who have tenure are all involved in administrative roles. And Glenn Willson filled the role of Chairman (or Convener) and Senior Preceptor of Stevenson College; when he became Provost it had to go to the next tenure person, who was Karl Lamb. If this had been a department, it would have been probably the same thing. The head of a college would not have continued as chairman. And in the other instances, Bernard Haley in economics was the original Convener in Economics here. When he dropped down to half time and was preparing to retire, as he is (we have the retirement dinner tonight) obviously we had to go to someone else, and the next person, other than Vice

Chancellor Calkins, who was probably ineligible for it, was David Kaun, and he's not a very good chairman, but he's all we've got in the tenure group. And you could go on through the list, but in each case, there's been a substantial reason for making the shift. And of course one of those reasons is that when chairmen were appointed a year ago, everybody in the board of studies was polled on who he wanted, and I think in all cases the person designated as chairman was the person that most people wanted. So you could say that maybe getting it on a popular vote basis, consultation basis, was the reason for the shifts that there were. I think every shift was made on the basis of a leave of absence or the assumption of a senior administrative assignment or some such reason.

Calciano: As our pool of tenured faculty grows, you think this will be much less of a problem, apparently?

McHenry: Well I don't think these are going to be popular roles no matter how large the faculty is. Chairmanships are not popular elsewhere in the University of California system. You take it as a duty, and it's very rare that you find anybody who really seeks it.

The Role of the Boards of Studies, the Colleges, and the Administration in Faculty Hiring

Calciano: You mentioned that new faculty appointments have to please both the college and the board of studies. What happens if they can't agree on someone?

McHenry: Unfortunately there are conflicts, and sometimes I have to resolve the conflicts by deciding in favor of the board or in favor of the college. But generally speaking, we've assumed that nobody to whom the proposed appointment was repulsive, either a college or a board of studies, had to accept it. We'd leave the post vacant rather than get somebody who was absolutely repulsive to one or the other. And so far they've been able to agree on virtually everyone.

Calciano: Do you envision that when we're up to twenty colleges, the Chancellor will still be the final decider?

McHenry: Yes.

Calciano: There won't be that many problem cases, or.... It could be a terrific work load.

McHenry: Well we ... the way we've got it scheduled, the growth, almost all the appointments are in the new college coming on, and so I would expect whoever's here twenty years from now, I certainly won't be, that the Chancellor would be concentrating a large share of his attention on the staffing of a new college, and that his work load wouldn't be any greater each year for that than mine has been for the staffing of

Cowell, or Stevenson, or the rest of the colleges each year. Now he'll have relatively more to do about promotions, because a lot more people will be coming up as the faculty grows. I would expect that the vice chancellors, we have three academic vice chancellors, who are on half-time administrative half-time professorial appointments, would play a larger and larger role and the Chancellor might not know in detail all of these personnel actions. But up to now, I've insisted on interviewing during the negotiations everybody who was seriously being considered for a regular academic post. And *if* someone is scheduled to come out at our expense to be looked over and to give a seminar here with a view to appointments, I've been very stubborn about insisting that he spend a half hour with me so that I can talk to him. And I think this has been a deterrent against boards of studies proposing people who were simply good in the discipline, but lacked the personality or interest to be a good teacher. And they've tended to bring people that they think would be acceptable to me to see me, and in some cases I've expressed doubts after having seen people, and they go on and say, "Well let's put out the money for travel to bring the other man. We thought this one was a little better, but maybe we'd

better look at the other one." So I don't think I pack an absolute veto in this thing. But I do make, by asking questions, people be very sure that they think they're right about an appointment, and I think by and large we haven't made very many mistakes.

Calciano: Have there been any instances where your doubts have gone ... where both the college and the board of studies have been in favor of someone that you had doubts about?

McHenry: I'm trying to think. I think in all cases in which there's been agreement by the other two that I've given in. No, I can think of at least one case in economics in which there was agreement on all hands except the Vice Chancellor and I, and we felt that the man was not up to the standards we should require. It was a full professor in economics, and the college was willing to accept him, and the board of studies was pushing for his appointment, and we objected. I don't think I've ever stood absolutely alone without at least a vice chancellor supporting my position.

Calciano: Well now in that instance, why would the board of studies be so much in favor of a man if you felt he wasn't up to our standards?

McHenry: Well you can always ... you have instances in which we have to take the psychology of the individual's

concern, the breadth of their understanding on campus of the field and so on. In this case they had fingered for a full professorship a man who had not ever achieved anything very great in economics, hadn't published anything of note. He'd been at a liberal arts college, a good liberal arts college, but he was very definitely not as good as the other full professors at the college. He had a history of jet-setting and wandering overseas assignments of various kinds. He had ... a minor factor in it was that he was greatly preoccupied with controversial politics and couldn't keep his mouth shut about, in this case, Vietnam. That preoccupied his thoughts and so on; dominated them. And I judged, and Vice Chancellor Calkins judged too, that he was not in the front rank of American economists, and we felt we could get somebody in the front rank if we didn't rush it. We felt that a thorough canvass of the field hadn't been made, and that we'd rather leave the thing vacant, or have a visiting professor for a time, until we could get a first-grade economist. Now there may be others that I don't think of readily, but this was a very important one. Usually the offer is made and is not accepted because we haven't been willing to meet the salary demands. We've had a good many people for whom

we said, "Okay, we'll go to Professor Three, but no higher." And the person has held out for a larger, higher salary and eventually has decided not to come. We have one of those pending right now of a person in the biological sciences who demands an overscale salary, above the fixed scale. And the Budget Committee and the review committees feel that he's not qualified for it, and the Board of Studies keeps pressing and wants it, and the college keeps pressing and wants it.

Calciano: Well is the situation of saying, "We'll go to Professor Three, no higher," is that an administrative technique of putting a damper on the appointment, or is it because you've only got so much money and you are trying to get the most for your dollars?

McHenry: It could be either, yes. And it's a question of spoiling the market, of offering.... While we have authority to do these things on the campus within scale, the overscale salaries do have to go to the Regents. And the Regents, the President and the Regents, will not accept an overscale recommendation unless it's agreed to all along the line. So in the case of the biologist that we're currently hassling over, there is an adverse recommendation on overscale by both the ad hoc committee and the Budget Committee;

under these circumstances, I've never heard of a President overruling them and granting it. In many instances, I'm sorry to say, academic people play with you. They pretend they're interested; they get invited out, and they get an offer from you, and then they show it to their own institutions, and the institution then is given an opportunity to match it. And there are people playing work-up all over the country by this technique. And many of our people, the chairmen of boards of studies and even provosts, are not very sophisticated about this; they can't smell one of these when it's coming along. And one of the best ways to guard against it is to make sure that your offer bears a reasonable relationship to their existing salary. In a surprising number of cases, people either refuse to give their existing salary, or they give it with something else in it; that is, they put their summer earnings in with it and give you a flat sum. And it's very difficult to be absolutely sure. And sometimes I get on the phone and call the president of the institution and say, "Look, we're going to make a pass at so and so, and as I understand it his salary is \$19,000, is that about right?" And he says, "I'll call you back," or something of the kind. But we have to police this thing pretty carefully. And then

there's a postaudit afterwards each year of how much premium each campus offered on the average to people coming in. Now quite a few people....

Calciano: By premium, what do you mean?

McHenry: If the present salary is \$15,000, and we offer \$18,000, there's a \$3,000 premium.

Calciano: Taking the guy's word that it's \$15,000?

McHenry: Yes. Because he signs a form, and we sometimes write back and say, "Now this is a nine-months appointment and so on" and we sometimes get it. This is a kind of a loose end that you can't always be sure of unless you know with whom you're dealing, or we have a fair idea of what the salary scales are at various places.

Calciano: Now I somewhat interrupted you. You were starting to say there is always a year-end audit on how much premium has been....

McHenry: Well University-wide tabulates each year what each campus has done. And these extraordinary premiums, such as San Diego was offering for some years, bring criticism from all kinds of quarters. For example, there was a time that San Diego made a ridiculous offer to a young geologist at Cal Tech, and he went, and he turned out to be an ass too. (Laughter) But it was an associate professor, and they offered him something like \$5,000 more than he was making at Cal

Tech. Lee DuBridge was so angry he called Governor Brown on the phone and chewed him for a half an hour. And that kind of thing has happened often at San Diego in the early days. But in the long pull, a campus is going to be cut down to size if it does that. And it gets a very bad reputation across the country as being an unfair competitor, or of having to offer money, premium money, in order to get people to come to it.

Calciano: Well now, playing around with this offer and counter-offer on this biologist, you say that, of course, you can't go overscale without Statewide approving it, but you would be free, if you so desired, to offer Professor Four, Professor Five.

McHenry: Yes.

Calciano: If you felt, and the board and everybody felt it was worth it.

McHenry: Yes. So that you'd understand the situation ... this man* makes \$30,000 a year at Purdue, and our top salary on the scale, Professor Five, is \$21,800, and it'll go to \$22,800 when the Legislature passes the salary increase. So we're that much apart. And the maximum offer that I'm authorized to put forward is

* This man was Professor Harry Beevers, who subsequently was appointed. Before he arrived at UCSC he was elected to the National Academy. He is one of our top scientists. --
D.E.McHenry 1/3/73

the \$22,600, and he's had that offer for months. And he's trying to get us to increase it, and the Board of Studies is trying to get us to increase it, and the college is, but I feel bound by the evaluation of his work and where he'd be if he were at Berkeley that's furnished by this ad hoc review committee, which is a secret body, but which the Chancellor appoints from a panel of names of scholars in the field suggested by the Budget Committee.

Calciano: Not of our campus?

McHenry: Some of them were our own campus; in this case the majority was at Berkeley.

Calciano: Now I got the impression that the boards of studies concept was never really quite planned on; it just sort of "became" in 1965. Is this true?

McHenry: Well, we knew that there would be some kind of a disciplinary organization or council, and Clark Kerr once said to me, "Let's never have departments at Santa Cruz," and I answered something of the kind, "never is a long time." That is, I realized there'd have to be some way of cross-campus inter-college, a board or committee or council or something or other, in the discipline. And the naming of it remained, and the precise form it would take, and what its head was to be called. These things were left in abeyance until

the Senate organized. And so we really didn't get these going until the Spring of '66. There was a committee headed by Thimann, and it recommended that the head be called "convener," and we did call it "convener" for eighteen months, I guess, for a period of months, and just a year ago we went on the basis of "chairman." Eventually these will be made, I think, into representative bodies. When Literature has a 100 people, and it may well have within ten, fifteen years, I would expect it to be a representative body; that perhaps ten might be chosen from the hundred to constitute the Board of Studies. And they might have a series of committees of the Board that would deal with particular matters and advise the Board.

The Divisions of Natural Sciences, Social Sciences, and Humanities are Officially Formed

Calciano: The actual divisions were really not created until rather late in the game, the vice chancellors of the three divisions. Why weren't they created until last year? And do you wish they'd been created sooner or not?

McHenry: Well, they weren't created because we wanted to give the colleges a head start, which was quite deliberate. I think if I had it to do over again, I'd try to find more senior leadership earlier. We concentrated

heavily on getting the colleges going. The slogan in my mind was, "First the colleges." I still have a feeling that if allowed to develop too much muscle, the disciplines will dominate this place just as they do virtually every other institution in the country. And to develop countervailing power first, before they had a chance to get too powerful, was a main objective. The divisions actually existed from the very first; they were in the Academic Plan from the start. We weren't sure what they'd be called; the Academic Plan suggests three possibilities. They might be called "faculties" of the social sciences, humanities, natural sciences, or "divisions of," or "schools of" ... and actually if I'd had a free choice at the outset, I think I would have called them "schools" and let the colleges take the responsibility for most of the lower division work, and then the schools pick up and do the upper division and graduate.

Calciano: Why didn't you have a free choice?

McHenry: Well, it was difficult to get a raft of deans of schools appointed when we had such a slender establishment and starting with so few students. And it was pretentious to call them schools. The name "school" has normally been bestowed in the University of Cali-

fornia only when you have a considerable faculty, and it's an upgrade from some departmental or previous college existence or a split-off of some kind. And at any rate, the word "faculty" was confusing and rejected in turn because it was greatly confused with the official organization of a faculty of a school or of a college. And we were going to have as an important unit in the Academic Senate the faculty of each of the colleges. And "division" is a kind of a neutral sort of thing, and so we, in the first two years, thought in terms of divisions, and we had divisions from the start; they tended to have acting heads, and Thimann acted as head of Natural Sciences, acting dean; Hard of Humanities, and the Social Sciences, Glenn Willson.

Calciano: But they were all under a vice chancellor, right?

McHenry: Yes.

Calciano: Instead of being vice chancellors.

McHenry: We had one academic vice chancellor and the three deans, or acting deans. Now as Clark Kerr and I discussed this we found ... for example, I had negotiated with top people in each of these areas with the idea of coming here, I should say at least a half a dozen in each category, and had not been successful in

attracting them. I was convinced that the title was a barrier. Deans aren't popular in the academic world anymore. And it was very difficult to define the job. We've a college there, what does a dean of a division do? And deans are traditionally, in the University of California, produced internally. Except for professional schools, you rarely go out and fan over the country and choose the best person to be dean. You normally grow your own, except in professional schools. But we didn't have any homespun products of our own. The title "Vice Chancellor" has a substantially stronger appeal. And Clark Kerr and I talked about this over a period of about, well years, really, and it was with his approval and partly on his suggestion that we began to restructure this thing, and instead of having a single academic vice chancellor, the notion of one and one half vice chancellors ... and we've been able to get outstanding people in these areas.

Recruiting the Academic Vice Chancellors

McHenry: We tried hard to get some of the great social scientists in the country in the role for Social Sciences when we were using "Dean" as a title, and we had turn downs, as is not surprising, because we were gunning for the very best, the pinnacle of the country. We had

the good luck to have Dr. Calkins of Brookings Institution willing to retire a year early from the Presidency and wanting to settle in an academic institution and preferably on the West Coast. He had been top man at Berkeley, Chairman of Economics, Dean of what is now the School of Business, and left suddenly in 1940 to take up the Deanship of the Graduate School of Business at Columbia, and then had gone into philanthropy, and then spent the last fifteen or so years as President of Brookings Institution in Washington. He was an economist of good reputation, though not an extensive research reputation, well known, very skilled administrator, and he was willing to take on this assignment for a few years. He's 65 now, and we can keep him on till 70, probably, but he's in position where he says, "Well anytime we can recruit somebody to take this over, why I can do something else." And it's been a great thing having him. Clauser* is top rank. He's just leaving the vice chancellorship. He's been the vice chancellor here since we had one, from the beginning, from '65 or early '66; '65 I guess. At any rate, he came here to organize engineering, and he's one of the great

* Clauser left Santa Cruz for Cal Tech in 1969, where he heads the Division of Engineering. -- D.E.McHenry 1/3/73

engineering educators in the country, and a first-rate scientist, and a fine gentleman. I got him here by stages, first as a consultant to come out and lay out a program for six months, and then he liked it here and eventually accepted an appointment as a professor, and then eventually we got him to serve as vice chancellor. He has resigned as vice chancellor as of the end of June, and his place is being taken by Terrell Hill, the professor of chemistry who came here only last July 1st. Hill's* a member of the National Academy of Sciences and came here from Oregon, though his Bachelors and Doctors are from Berkeley. We're told he's one of the two or three top theoretical physical chemists in America. He's a wonderful colleague; the best all-around faculty athlete (at age 50!) and he's done many responsible jobs during this year. He's currently a member of the Budget Committee, and a member of the Campus Planning Committee, Chairman of Athletic Policy Committee, and many other responsibilities which are unusual for a freshman professor here. He, too, as Clauser, didn't want to make a commitment for more than a year at a time, and it may be that a year from now we'll have yet another vice chancellor.

* Hill left UCSC on leave for the National Institute of Health

Calciano: Clauser's staying with us though?

McHenry: He is, as professor.

Calciano: With the engineering school, or....

McHenry: Well, engineering is sort of on ice for the time being. There are a number of barriers to its implementation, and we have four tenure appointments in the area. Three of them are in information and computer sciences. And we're going to set that up as a board of studies. But Clauser is kind of isolated and alone in the development so far. He's in mechanics, or fluid mechanics, and as you know his great reputation is in aeronautics. And the President and the Regents have concluded that until we can get straightened out with the Coordinating Council and squared away with a report that was filed by Provost Terman --Provost Emeritus Terman of Stanford has filed a report with the Coordinating Council which suggests very strongly that there are too many public institutions in California launching engineering programs. And so we've been given instructions not to proceed any further.

Calciano: Instructions by....

McHenry: By Hitch. And Hitch has set up a blue-ribbon committee

including Dean Baker of Harvard to examine this whole thing, and so we won't know until October where we're going.

Calciano: Well from very early in the game we were planning on engineering being one of our first schools.

McHenry: Oh yes.

Calciano: How was that decided? You felt it was logical?

McHenry: Well ... yes, it was decided by very careful study of engineering needs in the State and what it required for a balanced student body on a particular campus. The decision was made as early as 1960-61 that engineering should be a feature of every large general campus. And the hold on further developments so far has applied only to Riverside and Santa Cruz. Irvine was far enough along; they had no more appointments, but they had a bigger investment in money than we did. And apparently they're being allowed to go ahead, at least for this year.

Calciano: Is this a case of Hitch shifting ... I mean because Hitch is in, or would Kerr have done the same thing to you?

McHenry: Well I think Kerr probably would have counterattacked on the Terman Report with more assurance. Hitch is new, and he's seen the Terman Report, and he doesn't

feel capable of challenging its assumptions. And he instead has to set up a committee to think about it. But all of the reports that have been made previously, there are at least three main ones I know of, have shown the need for engineering in the State on the part of each of the general campuses.

Calciano: About the divisional deans or vice chancellors, someone made the comment that he thought you maybe wished that the positions had been created sooner to provide more checks and balances. Yet from what you've been saying, it seems to me that you're more worried about the fact that divisions and boards of studies are going to get too strong instead of....

McHenry: Yes, I think on balance that that's my view. It would have been nice to have had benign important leaders as the heads of each of these divisions from the start. And had we been able to persuade ... the hardest one, by the way, is Humanities, and we haven't talked about that; we recruited in the Humanities field, we went across the country and found the people that really had ideas and contacts and spark and interest: for example, Lumiansky of Tulane, who is now at the University of Pennsylvania. Bob Lumiansky was, everybody thought, going to be the President of Tulane University, and he was passed over. And I went after

him hammer and tongs trying to persuade him to come here, starting out as a consultant for a week, tried everything I knew how. In the end he said he wouldn't leave the South, and then in the end (laughter) he did go to the University of Pennsylvania as Chairman of English. There were others -- Wayne Booth of Chicago, who is Dean of the College now, but we started after him before he was Dean of the College. And most recently our big pitch was to William Arrowsmith of Texas, who is a classicist and is a real gadfly in the humanities area, critical of the learned societies and giving hell to people in various categories and a dynamo ex-Rhodes scholar, and Bill we recruited and brought him to the Regents and got approval of the Regents, and then month after month went by with an offer on his desk and couldn't decide ... his daughter is here as a freshman, and only about last Christmas did he, no, after Christmas, did he finally make up his mind that he wouldn't come. He held an offer from, for about six months, maybe eight.

Calciano: Why did he decide not to?

McHenry: I don't know. I think he was chicken. We said to him in effect, "We like your ideas. Now come put them into effect." And I think that he simply was not ready to settle down and see if the notions he was talking

about, brilliant speeches, could be implemented. This is the only explanation I have of it. But in the meantime Puknat had been acting, and I didn't have the nerve to ask him to act another year, and I couldn't possibly have anyway, and since we didn't have any bright lights in the national scene who were good possibilities; we've asked him to accept, and he's going to be Vice Chancellor without the "acting" in front of it beginning July 1st. He does internal things well. He's not known nationally, and we really don't have anybody in the humanities who is going knocking at doors at the Arts and Humanities Council and Foundation, and going to the Foundations and doing that kind of thing. Calkins can pick up the phone and call a key man at Ford who was his protege and get right through and find out immediately, if you've got a problem, "How're we going to get some money to do this?" and Calkins can settle the whole thing in one phone call. And nobody's doing this in the humanities. We're isolated and remote and it's a very different league. In the sciences we can go right down the main center, and it's a great disappointment to me, and I don't think we're going to be able to change Puknat very much. And I don't know what the future'll hold, except that I'm hoping we can get a dynamic Provost

of. the Fifth College who might supplement this somehow. But it's a difficult problem.

Calciano: Your failures at getting these people are because you've been shooting so high? This is part of it, do you think?

McHenry: I think so. And the fact that a lot of Santa Cruz's promise is for the future. But I'd rather not bring in somebody of the caliber of some of the leadership at some of the other campuses. I'd rather leave these vacant, or make do for a while, until we can get the top person. This means that you spin your wheels a lot more, and you make offers that aren't accepted. And it's conspicuous. When you have to go back to the Regents a couple of times because the guy you appointed to some key spot, or cleared with them for appointment to some key spot, doesn't accept, it's a little embarrassing. And they rightfully ask: "Is Santa Cruz setting its sights too high?" just as you did. And I don't think so. Because after all, we have gotten a lot of the top people that we went after. Maybe a third of them, a fourth of them. But we've sometimes in trying to recruit others developed important contacts that have helped us recruit others. People who have turned us down have felt obliged to tip us off about somebody when there might possibly

... "The President of Union College is tired being President; I think you could get him for a provost" ... this is the kind of a tip you get ... "I talked to him the other day in the University Club in New York, and he's so and so" ... so it's a good league in which to circulate.

San Diego's Faculty Hiring Policies

Calciano: You've mentioned a couple of times San Diego's going after premium salaries. On the whole, have the faculty and administration that they've pulled in been of a higher a caliber than ours, or not?

McHenry: Well, San Diego has more people of distinction in the sciences than we have. Most of them they got right at the outset, before they were really a general campus, while they were still in this science and technology era. And they got a raft of premium salaries through by prestidigitation. 'The General Dynamics Corporation promised the University a million dollars to help develop the San Diego campus. I don't know how much of it's ever been paid, but I doubt if more than a third of it. When I was at University Hall as Academic Planning Dean, I used to draft the letters to General Dynamics reminding them that they still had unpaid pledges. And we got some money now and then out of

them. But I think they reneged on most of it. But it was very cleverly used by the campus down there. They'd take a FTE for an assistant professor and a salary of \$10,000 and then take \$20,000 or \$15,000 out of the General Dynamics money and put it in for one year and get him on the payroll, and then the State picked up the rest. There were very many tricks they used to do this, so they got a lot of money, and they went out and bought themselves a good faculty. And they created an atmosphere into which scientists liked to come. And once you get this critical mass, others wanted to come. And they did some good recruiting on the sciences; there's no doubt of it. Some of them are prima donnas. And then they started out into other fields to do the same kind of thing, but it's been a very clever operation, especially on the scientific side. They would take a man, for example, they brought a Nobel Prize winner from Chicago at age 65, and as the years have gone by, he's about 75 now, and he's emeritus from San Diego, but he's more identified with San Diego than he was with all those years in Chicago. And they brought Maria Mayer in physics and her husband, too, and not long afterwards for work she'd done earlier, Maria got a piece of the Nobel Prize in Physics. So they've done exceedingly well, and I don't

want to say anything derogatory about them. But they're having their troubles in the social sciences and in the humanities, and they put all their big money into the sciences, and now they're having a terrible time matching the sciences with people in other fields. In philosophy, for example, we have the daughter of one of the philosophers down there, Popkin. They brought in Marcuse, this man who is, he's 70 now, he's German, and he is perhaps, many people would regard the high priest of the New Left. Herbert Marcuse. He'd like to come here, by the way. And Popkin and a couple of other guys, as full professors. They were starting philosophy the same way they started physics and chemistry and the other thing. And they brought these senior guys in. They're pretty much prima donnas. If they aren't fighting among themselves, they're out organizing the student body to protest against Vietnam or something. And there are certain areas that are completely blank. I don't think they have a historian other than the Chancellor, Galbraith, who is leaving. And they haven't any political scientists. They've made a start in literature and linguistics, a pretty good one, but it's a very spotty sort of development. But it's on the whole a good one; I think the organization is

probably faulty; I think they've gotten quite good leadership for their colleges. I think Irvine has been in much more of a hurry, and has settled for second and third best in many cases. I think where we've gotten less distinguished people in the field, it's often been because we were anxious to bring promising young people who were really interested in students, and we've been hoarding some senior appointments for later colleges, whereas both San Diego and Irvine have shot their whole bolt in their early appointments. They've appointed all the senior. people they can. And we've held back so that we bring somebody of the distinction of Norman O. Brown at the beginning of the fourth year, and we have reserves of salary monies that we've been spending for visiting appointees, through which we can say to the Provost of Five and the Provost of Six, "Here are some senior appointments for you to get started so you can have a balanced faculty group."

The Pass-Fail Experiment

Calciano: I understand that in the planning stages, you and the other people involved were somewhat cautious about some experimental things such as pass-fail and so forth, because you really weren't sure whether this whole idea of residential colleges was going to go

over with faculty and students, and you didn't want to be experimental on everything. Is this right?

McHenry: Well I think that my inclination on the grading was to be more cautious than the faculty wanted to be. And also there was a matter of civil liberties involved. Some of the faculty didn't believe in pass-fail grading, and I thought that they ought to have some discretion; that is, if there were 30% of them that didn't want to do pass-fail grading, I felt under the regulations of the Senate, they should not be forced to do it. I'm rather glad that the decision was made as it was: to try a large-scale experiment on pass-fail and to make it the rule rather than the exception. That is, I think that the faculty was right, and if I'd been deciding it -- and this was a faculty matter, you understand -- if I'd been deciding it, I would have said, "Let's have pass-fail in some sector or in some colleges or in something less than the whole, so that we'll have an experiment, and we'll see how differently people act, or try to measure the results against the letter grade made in another category." One would then have all lower division courses pass-fail, all upper division with letter grades, or some such arrangement. But the decision eventually was made, as you know, to have universal

pass-fail except for required courses in a major if the board of studies specified that they must be letter grades. And of the transcripts I see in the general flow of things, of honors and disciplinary cases and so on through the year, it's very rare that I ever see a letter grade, very rare. I saw one this week for the first time in several weeks. Now all the rest are P's and F's except for those that come by transfer from other institutions.

Calciano: Well the sciences are doing grades in their major.

McHenry: Not all. Biology is, and Mathematics is; I think the others are on P/F.

Calciano: Well now, it was the Cowell faculty, essentially, and a few from Stevenson who voted this, and in effect they were voting it for Crown, Merrill, Five, Six, weren't they?

McHenry: Yes. Yes, they had the power to do it in the Senate, and they chose to do it, and on the whole I'm rather glad they did. We've reviewed the results before the Committee on Educational Policy, University-wide, of the Senate which met in Santa Cruz a couple months ago. They were quite pleased with how we'd placed our graduates in graduate schools and professional schools and voted to recommend to the State-wide general body, the Assembly, that authorization be given for a second

five years of Santa Cruz pass-fail.

REASONS FOR THE EARLIER-THAN-PLANNED START OF GRADUATE
INSTRUCTION

The History of Consciousness Program

McHenry: The other thing that was forced through at an early time, I'm not so keen about, and that is the History of Consciousness graduate program. It seems to be in deep trouble. They almost wholly bypassed the Chancellor in establishing, indeed the only way the Chancellor even sees one of these proposed new graduate programs is to transmit the estimated financial costs to the President. It's an unfortunate delegation, over-delegation, from the Regents.

Calciano: What, the Academic Senate has the whole....

McHenry: Yes. The Graduate Council works for the Academic Senate, which has the authority. The only way a Chancellor or a President can stop it would to be by just saying, "We will not appropriate one cent for this purpose." But even then it's very difficult to stop, because they put it through the first year here, the History of Consciousness graduate program, without even submitting it for financial review.

Calciano: Now who's the "they" -- the Graduate Council or certain people?

McHenry: Well, the Graduate Council... certain people working

through the Graduate Council.

Calciano: Who were the ones?

McHenry: Well they were primarily the group of Bert Kaplan and Page Smith and Maurice Natanson and some younger chaps. And on the Graduate Council at the time, I remember most clearly Charles Page, who I think didn't care much about the program, but who certainly didn't respect my point of view either.

Calciano: And you had no way of influencing except a strict budget yes or no?

McHenry: Yes. And they arranged the budgeting part by saying that it would cost nothing, because the people were already here to run it, and that they'd just take this on as part of their duties. And now I have shrieks for relief. "We're overworked." "We can't carry it." "We've got all these graduate students, and we've got to have major appointments in History of Consciousness," and I have on my desk a report from the Graduate Council, it set up a special committee, and it's a very good report, and it shows all the difficulties, many of which we pointed out.

Calciano: Such as?

McHenry: Well, they have not enough time to devote to it. They need at least one, and perhaps several, appointments

in the area to give attention to it. This can't be done as a part-time thing on the part of people who are busy in their colleges and in their disciplines. The follow-through with the students hasn't been very great, very good. There's a lot of disaffection in the ranks.

Calciano: Of the students?

McHenry: Yes. There's a lot of apprehension about where they're going to place these students. This is one of the big arguments I raised at the time, "Who wants to hire somebody who has got a degree in the History of Consciousness, whatever the hell that is?" And their first graduate, Harvey Rabbin, has not finished his dissertation yet. And there's tremendous pressure on me to appoint him an assistant professor here and keep him on, and I've been holding out. I've agreed just yesterday to his appointment as an acting instructor until he finishes his degree. But the whole thing is, they were just full of enthusiasm, and I think the plain fact is that men like Bert Kaplan are not implementers; they get these ideas, and then they don't have the drive to stay with something and do the dirty jobs of getting it on the road. Bert Kaplan's Chairman of the Board of Studies in History of Consciousness ... just when this crisis was blowing

up, what was he doing? He was starting an undergraduate seminar in the film about which he knows nothing. I take it this is going to be locked up for twenty years?

Calciano: Locked up for however many years you want to specify. I was chatting with Kaplan at a dinner party about a month ago, and knowing that I'd be wanting to ask you about this, I was kind of talking about the History of Consciousness and saying, "Well, are you going to have any problems placing these students with this rather vague title?" He didn't seem to feel there would be any problem. Was he just putting on a good front, or does he really feel there's no problem?

McHenry: Well, he may *feel* there is no problem, and it's conceivable that some of them might be very well placed in a small college that didn't care so much about strict disciplinary lines. But the whole thing has looked kind of messy to me from the beginning, and I still think that it should have been thought through much more carefully; that it should have not been launched the first year or two, and it should have had a more realistic budget.

Calciano: Well when you say they're in deep trouble now, you're talking about they need more people, more staff?

McHenry: Yes. They have very good applicants; the program has

drawn excellent students I understand; people who'd be a credit to the best graduate schools in the country, many of whom are one-time losers in the sense that they went to a graduate school at Yale or someplace and didn't like it and felt that the discipline was too narrow or something of the kind. And then they've come here, and they can split disciplines, and they do like the split, but I think they feel they're not getting a fair amount of faculty time, because the faculty is so spread over so many other things. And now we're starting a graduate program in literature, which means that Berger and certain others who have been helping out in History of Consciousness are being pulled off. Psychology is itching to start a Ph.D. program and may within another year, and then what'll happen to Kaplan and his relationship to it? Now partly to relieve this situation, and partly to please Page Smith, who I think has done an outstanding job as Provost of Cowell, I supported the appointment of Norman O. Brown as a Professor of Humanities in Cowell. But most of the guys in History of Consciousness think that this isn't going to be a great help to them, because Brown is sort of diminishing his interest in neo-Freudianism; after he read the reviews of Love's Body, I'm not surprised.

Have you read Love's Body?

Calciano: No I haven't.

McHenry: Well he did Life Against Death and Love's Body; earlier than that he did Hermes the Thief, which was related to folklore and classics. And now he's going back to classics, and he's doing some archeological work in Greece, and he's planning to spend the spring term there. But he's an amazing man and has quite a reputation and took an enormous salary loss to come here from Rochester as Professor Five rather than overscale. It's been very interesting; he was willing to do so, and I think that he will strengthen this group, though they're apprehensive less that he shun them.

Calciano: Why did he decide to come here?

McHenry: Well, he thinks this is an exciting place, and he's much taken with Page Smith, and he feels at home here, and I think he wanted a change. At any rate, the main question was whether he'd take this big salary loss; I've forgotten what it is, but it's about \$5,000. He had a guaranteed research grant every year and all kinds of help that we're not able to assure.

Calciano: Well do you think History of Consciousness may dissolve as a program, or....

McHenry: I don't know. I can't see diverting to them an FTE solely for History of Consciousness, because I think the very shakiness of the program is an argument against bringing on somebody who wouldn't be useful elsewhere.

Calciano: How is the program viewed by other universities across the country? Is it causing much interest or speculation?

McHenry: Well, I think it raises the eyebrows. I really don't know. I'm afraid to bring it up because people ask me what it is, and I can't explain. (Laughter)

Calciano: Early in the planning stages you apparently made a statement to some people that you felt that this campus could not keep up the quality of the faculty it was recruiting if it had to expand at more than 500 students a year, and yet we've been forced to, or we happened to have expanded more than that each year until this current year.

McHenry: Well I don't know that I ever froze on the figure of 500. I had felt that we could expand by an undergraduate college a year plus graduate students, and if you go through the tables in the academic plan, you will see that as the graduate students creep up, say ten years out, 1975, our expansion is markedly more than 500. I think 600 was the average figure we

usually used, 600 undergraduates.

UCSC's Unexpected Strength in the Sciences

Calciano: We keep coming up around this thing of graduate study; I think I'll just skip right on to it and start asking some of my questions about it. Now there are 27,500 we're eventually going to have. How many will be undergraduate?

McHenry: About 40% graduate and about 60% undergraduate; we might go as high as 45% graduate.

Calciano: Now originally you did not plan to have graduate students until '68.

McHenry: Yes, I think that's correct.

Calciano: I think I know some of the reasons why this was changed, but I'd like you to state them.

McHenry: Well in the sciences, of course, there were the demands. The scientists needed laboratory assistants, and most of the senior scientists, even the assistant professors, rely on graduate students to join them in their research work. And so to get on with research work in Chemistry, Physics and certain other fields, there was a need for having graduate students.

Calciano: Did you think that you were going to be able to get top scientists without letting them have graduate students?

McHenry: Well I think I should say frankly that when we

started, I put getting top scientists at a fairly low priority. That is, I was more interested in getting the top people in the humanities, relatively. And then the big breakthrough came with getting Thimann. And then we were able to attract a different caliber of scientist than we'd expected. That made it quite different. There have been several sort of accidents in this thing. One is that we latched onto Thimann early, and that brought Santa Cruz to the attention of a quite a wide group of people in the sciences. He's very prominent in international and national biological circles, and in the National Academy. And immediately Santa Cruz had an acceptance in these top circles. And then it was Thimann more than anyone else who spotted and recruited Bunnett, who in chemistry has not reached the highest Valhalla yet, but will, I think, and who is a small college man, essentially, by his feeling for Reed and other small places. Bunnett is in organic chemistry and the editor of the American Chemical Society's new journal, and then he in turn has a lot of contacts in chemistry and found out that Terrell Hill was movable from Oregon, and so chemistry, which is a discipline that I hadn't expected to develop early, now had two full professors and has tremendous pressure on, is bringing in the

finest young candidates, and is going great guns, and knows where it wants to go. Now we haven't done as well in physics, and yet I think I had at the beginning relatively more interest in physics, but we've not been able to break through with anybody with the caliber of Hill in physics. But I think we will eventually, and we're going to keep trying, but we've made a good start in solid state [physics]. Well I started out to say that I really didn't expect to have stars in the sciences, and this is one of the big surprises that we've been able to break through as much as we have. Geology is another one. Aaron Waters. Geology is a field that we hadn't intended to develop in the early years. It's a relatively expensive field, and there's been a low student demand in recent years, because oil explorations in this country have declined. And a good share of the students in geology in established institutions tend to be foreign students. But Aaron Waters, who is one of the great men of geology in the country, was at Santa Barbara, and he'd come from Johns Hopkins; he was essentially rejected by Santa Barbara; he was chairman of the department and got into a terrible row because some of the old-timers down there didn't want their leisure time disturbed by demands for research, and he was

therefore willing to leave, even though he was sixty years old, and come here. And so we brought him here, and this has led to a tremendous amount of excitement in the earth sciences. We have Seilacher as a visitor from Tübingen, Germany, this quarter. One of the great paleontologists of the world, and he may come back and be here permanently. So we've had this chain; now we wouldn't have gotten connected with Aaron Waters except that Francis Clauser had been his colleague at Hopkins and knew what was happening at Santa Barbara and the conditions which existed under which we could attract him here. So a lot of this has been more or less accidental. But when you're winning on a front, then you play from strength and win more.

Calciano: Why had you put a low priority on scientists?

McHenry: Because Berkeley and Davis are already so distinguished in science, and I felt we were going to be under the shadow of Berkeley in the sciences, and therefore we ought to be, well ... Clark Kerr and I used to say sometimes, "Let's make Santa Cruz the social sciences and humanities campus, more like Yale, say, than like Berkeley." And we really started out in earnest to do this, and yet we've been unable to attract the stars in humanities or in social sciences

that we've been able to attract in science.

Calciano: Why?

McHenry: Well, part of it rests on the fact that scientists know who's good; there's general agreement among them ... there are marks, visible marks, such as election to the National Academy and various kinds of honors. In the arts and humanities, there's almost no agreement on who's really good; they cut each other into little pieces, and it's so difficult to break through under these circumstances. 'We've tried, and to date we haven't got the really big people that we think are the tops.

Calciano: How did you happen to get Thimann? You said it was almost accidental.

McHenry: Well, I heard about him, and people would say, "The best man to do that is a fellow called Thimann at Harvard, but you can't get him." Among the accidents, he had taught in California, at Cal Tech, when he first came from England. He'd spent his summers across the bay at the Hopkins Marine Station. Cornelis van Niel and Lawrence Blinks were two of his closest friends. And when I went to see him and first made contact and got him to agree to come out and look, he was at a stage in his early sixties in which he, I think, felt he'd gone about as far as he could go at

Harvard. He'd been Master at East House, Radcliffe, and he liked the residential college idea. There were changes in biology, I don't know much about this, but Blinks tells me that there were shifts inside of biology at Harvard, that there were the people advocating molecular and other approaches to the exclusion of some of the traditional ways of going about things, and something I didn't know until two years after he'd come here, and Clauser didn't know until I told him yesterday, was that Harvard granted him emeritus status when he left. So he's still Higgins Professor of Biology, Emeritus, Harvard University. So he has in effect two chairs. And he wanted to do it, and it was challenging, and he came. And he's a great man; he's not always easy to get along with; he wants his way, and even if everybody else is on the other side, he just explains it by saying, "They don't know as much about it as I do." (Laughter) And sometimes he's a cross to bear, but it's a cross I bear willingly because of his high quality.

Calciano: So, returning to the graduate students in this, you hadn't felt that you were going to be put under the pressure of getting top scientists who wanted their graduate students in the first two or three years?

McHenry: I knew there'd be pressure, even from the junior people, but I was prepared to resist it, and I thought of things such as we would borrow graduate students from Berkeley and Stanford to teach our lab sections, or we'd try to get non-commissioned officers comparable to the language associates to do the labs full time, acting instructors and that sort of thing. But I hadn't expected the sciences to be the big thing that they're turning out to be. So we thought we could resist this on the sciences, and if you resist it on the sciences, then you could go at least three years without graduate students. But then the history of consciousness thing came, and it was only then I discovered that a Chancellor really hasn't power over these things. I realized that the judgments about what you were most prepared to go into ought to be Senate judgments, but I hadn't realized that they had themselves almost absolute power.

Calciano: The Regents couldn't....

McHenry: Well, the Regents don't review them unless it's a new degree, if it were a doctor of engineering or something, but the Regents just gave the campus the authority in graduate matters to issue the degrees. It'd be a graduate division with authority to recommend for the degrees, M.A., M.S. and Ph.D. And

once that was in the standing order of the Regents, then the Senate could move right in and did.

Calciano: So the Senate could start a graduate program in tree climbing if they were so inclined?

McHenry: Well except that it has to be reviewed by other Senate bodies, and there's a Coordinating Committee on Graduate Affairs which represents all of the Senates, all nine of the Senate divisions, and the graduate deans of other campuses are there, and they scrutinized this thing and eventually said, "Well, that's an interesting experiment. Go ahead."

Calciano: "It's your neck." (Laughter)

The Effects of the 28:1 Formula

Calciano: Well so the whole thing of graduate students had to be revised then?

McHenry: Well it didn't have to be, but it was, due in part to the pressures, and in part to my judgment of the political climate and the physical climate. As we had been organizing in '64, '65, '66, along in there, University-wide was coming along with the so-called 28 to 1 formula which counts a freshman and sophomore as 1.0 and a second-stage doctoral student as 3.5. This formula was cooking, and I'd been apprehensive about it from the beginning, because I think University of California over the years has failed rather

spectacularly to give enough attention to undergraduates, and a formula like this in effect says to the public, "Advanced graduate students are three and a half times as important to us as freshmen and sophomores." But I worried about it, talked to Kerr. about it, and Wellman, a good deal as it was being evolved and said, "Do you realize that you can't have a campus specializing in undergraduates if you have a formula like that that's imposed as a universal thing?" And they said to me in effect ... I'm repeating now what I said in the budget hearings two days ago at Berkeley ... in effect they said to me, "This is a device for getting money from Sacramento to University Hall. It's a device that helps point up the differences in these instructional loads carried by the University as against the state colleges. But," they said, "it need not be adhered to in dividing the resources the University gets among the campuses." The Department of Finance about two years ago figured out by accepting the formula as a basis for allocating money to the University, they would save some money in a given year, that year, and they were very anxious to do it. I think it was the first year of the Reagan regime, or the last year of the Brown regime. So they accepted it as the basis. This was, I guess, the year Wellman was

Acting-President, and the allocation of funds among campuses was done very carefully and gently as Wellman always does things, so that when we eventually got our quotas, we were able to start off the year with the new Crown College with about the same number of people that we had hoped for, and some of it was the Regents' money to be sure, but it came along pretty well. And then last year, the next year, I mean in February of 1968, when we got the Governor's budget....

Calciano: Four months ago?

McHenry: Four months ago. We got the Governor's budget. The Regents' budget had asked for 46 new faculty FTE for Santa Cruz, and that would have been quite adequate to start Merrill College, College Four, as it was then known, and also to do the planning work for College Five. But the Governor's budget was very meager, and eventually there were only something like 120 positions allowed by the Governor's budget, and Santa Cruz got only 11 of those instead of 46 or so. We were asked to take 508 additional students, and for this we were going to have 11 faculty members additional. And of course we have a special circumstance in that there are internal rigidities with starting out with a college at a time. They'd say, "Well, obviously out of the 11 you can't expect to appoint somebody in both

French and German, but just have your German person in Crown spend half-time in Merrill and so on. It just was a desperate thing and has been ever since February, and Hitch allocated this money without conferring with us, and he made the decision, and I'm sure the Vice Presidents were in on it, but they're pretty much oriented to the big campuses, except Wellman, and they made the decision that they couldn't go over 28 to 1 (weighted basis) on Berkeley and Los Angeles campuses no matter what it did to the little campuses. So our big brothers had their full quota of spending money, and the little campuses were put in the position of having to move from babyhood to adulthood without any adolescence. Well Dan Aldrich at Irvine was very belligerent and inclined to fight about this, and then when it was explained what was happening and so on, he decided not to make a public scene of it, and I had pretty well assumed that we'd work it out, that we'd have at least some undercover guarantees. But they were very long in coming, and it wasn't until the April meeting of the Regents, just before the April meeting, that I began to get hints that the President would assure us of some more appointments, and the President whispered in my ear the morning of the April meeting, the Friday at Davis,

that the number would be ten. So....

Calciano: Additional?

McHenry: Ten additional. So we have eleven plus ten, 21 FTE instead of the 46 that we thought we should have had by all of the plans that had been made previously. But the extra ten comes from University sources. It's still not been made public. And there's still some hope that in the Legislature, in the conference committee or something, when the budget will probably be settled in the next two weeks, that there'll be some mild relaxation of the severe Governor's budget, and that those ten positions will be covered there. If they're not, they'll be underwritten by Regents' funds.

Calciano: But are you already able to fill them?

McHenry: Well we're authorized to fill them, yes, and we have filled some. But they came so late in the season that the chances of using them for other than, oh, visiting appointments or one-year spots, are not very good.

Calciano: Well this weighted formula ... has this been a factor in your plans for going into graduate study?

McHenry: Well it has, yes, because I've had a fear that at some stage the weighted formula will be brought front and center and applied to Santa Cruz. And particularly ever since the Kerr dismissal in January '67, I've

been apprehensive lest the facts and figures boys in University Hall predominate and we get allocated money by some formula that didn't take into account our stage of development. So I had anticipated the danger of this thing even while Kerr was President. But one of the first, after recovering from the initial shock of "Black Friday" when he was removed, my mind got immediately on this question of what's going to happen to the small campuses during their infancy if we're budgeted on formula. And then I had a period of some ... well I put it in the back of my mind for a while because the gentle hand of Harry Wellman eased this thing, and he had a special feeling for looking after the new campuses. But we've felt the harsh winds in 1968, and I have a good deal of apprehension about the future. At Charter Day, the dinner of Charter Day at Santa Cruz, sitting with President Hitch, he said to me at one stage, "A great many people would be a lot happier if at Santa Cruz you'd really just concentrate on the undergraduate side." And my answer (of course I couldn't give it very well in that setting, but I've started a draft of a letter to him, and I've been able to tell this to every one of the Vice Presidents individually) is that no campus in the University of California can afford to be an undergraduate school

campus if these formulas are going to be applied blindly.

Calciano: Do you think that, of course he's a management-oriented type person, typical of a....

McHenry: But also an ex-Oxford Don.

Calciano: Right. But I gather you don't think he's got the feeling for Santa Cruz or the concern for the small campuses.

McHenry: No, I'm apprehensive about it. There are several bits of evidence in this, speeches he's made, statements he's made, that make me worry lest he have no respect for the academic planning that was done before he became President. As a matter of fact, under Kerr the University of California was by far the most advanced institution in the world that I've heard of in academic planning and in costing out what things were going to be five years hence. No campus that was ever established, to my knowledge, at least no University campus, ever had the careful scrutiny about what the costs were going to be like five, ten, and fifteen years ahead that Santa Cruz had. So I think it's a certain amount of disrespect to speak of the Kerr era not having careful planning. There's one phrase that stuck in my craw particularly ... in one talk he gave, which was published as a Congressional document, he

said, "When I joined the University of California, I found academic planning in disarray." Well it may have been in disarray relatively speaking, but it was in the best array of any higher educational institution probably in history.

Calciano: Do you think Irvine and San Diego are going to be in exactly the same boat as Santa Cruz, or is one or another of the three of you going to come out better under Hitch?

McHenry: I think that San Diego and Irvine may come out better, partly because they have quite large graduate components. The smallest graduate components, if you look at the projections ahead, are Santa Cruz and Santa Barbara. The proportion of graduate students is very high at Davis; it's already well above 25% and will go to 40 in no time. And the proportion at Riverside, surprisingly, is, my guess is, 20 or more. But Santa Barbara is still maybe under 10% and we, of course, are just a very small fraction, 65 [students] or so this last year out of 1900.

GRADUATE STUDENTS AND THE COLLEGES

Opposing Points of View Concerning the Nature of Graduate Life

Calciano: A great deal of time and effort was put into develop-

ing the academic plan for the undergraduates here. One sees very little printed about planning for graduate instruction. Are we going to be pioneering things? Are we going to be inventive, or traditional, or have we done much planning at all?

McHenry: Well there are a few mimeographed reports. You've probably seen the one by the special committee on graduate life.

Calciano: No, I haven't.

McHenry: No. Well there is such a report. Thimann was an important member of the committee, and I think that we haven't.... There's been a general assumption here that graduate instruction would be similar to that at other places. That the graduate seminar and the graduate class and the prelim exams and the dissertation and the language requirement would be similar, and nobody's suggested anything very drastic in the way of change. Most of the thinking has been around graduate life, and how the graduate out of his laboratory, or out of the library, or out of his seminar room, would be handled, and how he'd live, and what he'd do. And there developed two main schools of thought on this. There are lots of variations in between. One point of view, which is represented by Thimann, and to a lesser extent by some of the

provosts and some of the early college people, especially at Cowell, was that as graduate work comes, the graduate student should be incorporated to a large extent in the life of the college, that each graduate student should choose or be assigned to a college, that he should find a good deal of his cultural and social life there, that special accommodations should be provided so that he can live there if he wanted to (and this in tangible form comes in the demand for a middle common room it's called, so they didn't mingle with the undergraduates and didn't mingle with the faculty, but they had a place where there was Jim Crow for graduate students) and that this would be a maturing influence on the college and help to offset the predominance of freshmen and sophomores, and that they'd play an important part in the life of the undergraduate by being there. The Thimann-provost school has also wanted other graduate facilities built, especially seminar rooms in the colleges. Another point of view, the one with which I have identified myself, perhaps been the chief spokesman for, and a few others, especially in the sciences, are inclined to join, is that 50% of the graduate students will be married, that it isn't possible to have family apartments in the colleges (the physical crowding is

too great), that we inevitably are going to have to go to married-student housing (we call it graduate-student housing in our program), that this will tend to be the center of graduate life, and that we ought to embellish it by developing many of the amenities of the college in this sector.

Calciano: You mentioned some of this, the plans for married-student housing, last week, but I wonder about other physical facilities. In your type of thinking, would you maybe use the Soc Sci building as the headquarters for social science graduate students, or....

McHenry: Yes. And I think that we're going to build some carrels for them. And this issue points up in terms more now of physical facilities for the future, though we're really talking program, because the physical facilities are going to influence the program.

Calciano: Going to commit you in a sense?

McHenry: Yes, yes. Now Byron Stookey has been working on the plans for College Seven. He's the sponsor of College Seven, and of course he's leaving soon, and he's rushing out things. But when he drew up the College Seven particulars, he wanted, oh, practically family housing apartments for graduate students, and lots of study carrels and seminar rooms for graduate students, and a great deal of amenities, so that this was like a

little university in miniature, you see, for 800 students. Two hundred of them would be graduate students, and 50 of those would live in -- well eventually he cut it down to 50, but ... and it's still in the plan that way. This was College Seven, the college dealing with, say, urban problems, largely, as Seven would, social problems. Seven is over here [the west side of the campus], and Social Sciences is up there [in the central core] ... I think those carrels ought to be built in Social Sciences near the Library. I think the seminar rooms for graduate students ought to be primarily there.

[ED. Note: The following four pages on graduate life were actually spoken during the June 26th interview, but were moved to this spot in the manuscript for the sake of continuity.]

McHenry: My opposition [to the Thimann-provost plan] has been to requiring all graduate students to affiliate with the colleges, because I think many of them have interests elsewhere. And for some of them this is not a ... well, it's Mickey Mouse, some of the things the colleges do. And I think we can't be a first-rate graduate institution if everybody is cast into the college mold. On the other hand, I think the college

mold offers quite a ready-made social and cultural life to a young graduate student who is unmarried and making his contacts here for the first time. My objection has always been to the compulsion and for putting a very heavy investment of scarce dollars into facilities in the colleges which are already crowded. Now some of the things I'm death on -- for example, Byron Stookey has always wanted to have a nursery school in a college, or a crèche, or something of the kind. And he sees the kind of situation in which ... (this is quite, quite in keeping with his personality). He thinks in terms of a college having some old people and some young people, and being almost a cross section of a community, and that the students of normal age would see children, they could stop and play with them, and old-timers, they could sit while they whittled, and it's a concept that I think in the end wouldn't work out. And the physical layout of colleges -- we have no college and no siting (one of the most generously sited ones is Cowell College) in which the screams of little children or yells or happy yells of little children would fit what's going on in the classrooms and in the dining hall. So I think that's one extreme, the idea of spending scarce money building a thing of this kind.

Then each of the colleges have said, "We want a middle common room." But now mind you, these things turn almost entirely on facilities. Well a middle common room, which is kind of a semi-faculty quad, could cost anything from ten to thirty, forty thousand dollars a college, and my attitude is that I'm not going to raise this money; that it's a big strain that we've had; we've been netting close on the average to a million dollars a year in gift money, and I'm not going to strain myself to raise money for something that, if the colleges want, they might raise for themselves. I'm not at all sure it'll be used, or used very much, and it seems to me that presence of graduate students in great numbers in the colleges will tend to monopolize faculty time. We'll have the same situation we do in the monolithic universities where the graduate students have access to faculty, sometimes ... at any rate, closer and more access to faculty than undergraduates do. And we'll just have those big university problems on a miniature scale in a college. And there've been some very serious divisions of opinion on this. Thimann flared once to the extent of writing me an extremely hot letter because the graduate student housing was not taken out of the building program, and he wanted to incorporate the

graduate students in the college. And it was the most dramatic scene I've ever had with Thimann. When he came in to see me, I handed him the letter and said, "I want you to take this back, because so long as it's on file, it'll poison our relationship." He used very intemperate language, and I explained to him that he was Chairman of a Special Committee of the Academic Senate which did not have jurisdiction over academic planning; I had not requested the committee, and I had not approved its report, and the Senate could set up all the committees it liked; it could appoint him chairman if it liked, but that doesn't mean that its recommendations were automatically accepted as campus-wide policy. So he took the letter back, and it never came up in that form again. I think I've met those who are advocates of incorporating students in the college halfway by saying, "Okay, you raise the money for it." And there's no reason why any graduate student can't be rushed and lured and persuaded to come in and take part. And now we are assigning teaching assistants to do their teaching inside the colleges, and we've got a \$200,000 grant from the Danforth Foundation, precisely a \$194,000 or something, which calls for graduate students teaching within colleges in college core courses. And I think this is a good deal of support

for the idea. But I still resist the notion that colleges are going to have a monopoly on the graduate students. It's the Boards of Studies who are directing graduate students and their work. The colleges may have some role in the life of the graduate student, the single graduate student, especially the first-year graduate student.

[The June 6 interview resumes at this point.]

McHenry: I'm very much afraid of, I think I used these words to you before, delayed adolescence on the part of especially our own students who stay here for graduate work, and who might have eight years straight in a single college, and limited contact, and living in a world of "good enough," and not being challenged by new relationships and changes. Now I think, as I said before, we [the provosts and the Chancellor] probably agreed to disagree, but I'm using such influence as I have to make sure that I'm not put in a position of raising money to support their ideas.

Calciano: Well isn't the decision going to have to be made one way or the other?

McHenry: No. I think that a decision one way or the other would be a great mistake, because nobody can be absolutely sure he's right. And I think what they have in mind is probably right for a considerable number of new

graduate students who are young and unmarried, especially when they come from elsewhere, to be associated with the college. But I want to keep it on a voluntary basis, not a compulsory basis. And I think the interests I have are going to serve the students best who are the more mature, who are married and maybe even up to their middle twenties in age, some of whom will have children. And I want to see this concentration on the whole family unit, of having the wife and husband grow together intellectually, and freeing them occasionally to do things together rather than being tied down to small babies. And I think that both are legitimate programs, and what the boundary line is between them is going to be determined, I think, in practice by, just by doing.

Calciano: Do you think the physical facilities are going to be flexible enough to do it?

McHenry: I think so. We've got a separate unit coming later, housing unit, in College Four in which 50 graduate students could be housed.

Calciano: You're not planning at this point that they will be housed there, but it could be used?

McHenry: Yes. It's entirely up to Provost Bell whether he wants to reserve those or give priority for graduate students. And if there is a demand for graduate

student housing in the colleges, these are going to be relatively bigger rooms and better amenities. There is such a unit in College Five also. One wing, or piece of it, is capable of having graduate students. And the rules regarding, for example', the use of alcoholic beverages, could be different in this area. Or you might have some older undergraduates mingled there too. So there are some physical facilities coming along; there is a middle common room being built into Five, is designed right into Five, and we'll be able to see whether this is a good device or not. But what I don't want is each of the provosts in each of the colleges demanding that I go out and raise money for them, \$40,000 each, to build them a middle common room until we see how badly they want it and whether they're willing to participate in raising the money. And this has been an issue in which I've had to be quite explicit with physical planning and construction and with Gurden Mooser, who is working out the foundation contacts for gifts and all. And my contention to whoever advocates them simply is, "You back up your ideas by using such resources as you can get your hands on" (and each college each year has a few thousand dollars for renovation of space and so on) "and you can use those resources to build up

facilities for graduate students if you want to. But don't expect me to go out and raise the money for it, because I don't think that's as important as getting the proper amenities out in graduate-student housing. And I'll work on that, you work on yours, and we'll see how they come out."

Graduate Instruction

Calciano: There's also been sort of a proposal that perhaps the first four colleges be used as a base for graduate students, that they take their course work with the faculty attached to these four and Colleges Five through Eight would be another cluster. Is this being seriously considered?

McHenry: No. Well I don't think it was ever seriously considered by anybody except Byron Stookey and a fellow called Martin Friedheim, who was out here incidentally the other day. He was Richard Peterson's predecessor in the planning role. He was out with the Kennedy group. He works for New York City now. And they, in secret, drew up this plan over a matter of months and then sprung it, all done. I was wondering why we weren't getting any work out of either of them for a long time. (Laughter) And then they sprung it. I just rejected it out of hand. It would be a little graduate school about the equivalent of Claremont Graduate

School which has been a disappointment. It's very seldom that you ever get a first-class person with a Ph.D. from Claremont, and these kinds of degrees we, I think, don't want.

Calciano: How is the instruction going to be handled when a graduate student comes in and wants to take a Ph.D. in English Literature?

McHenry: Well the Board of Studies of Literature would make the assignments and set the thing. It would be partly the student's own choice and partly the Board of Studies' judgment on who was available and the work load that was there and so on. But it's primarily a Board of Studies decision. And I think that while the professors would keep their offices out there [in the colleges], I think it's quite possible that each of the boards of studies in the social sciences and humanities after the Social Sciences Building is finished would have a board of studies office over on the main campus. Or there may be Library space available for the humanities to do that. But eventually there'll be a Humanities Building that will lie off Steinhart, south of Steinhart and quite close to the Library, in that grove of oaks up there. And when that's done, then I would expect each board of studies would have an office in the campus core, and that when

a professor who was Chairman of Literature was going to do board of studies work, he would gravitate to the area near the Library and do it there. And that seminars in literature would ordinarily be offered in that building, or in the Library, or in Social Sciences rather than out in one of the colleges that is far off, because....

Calciano: So in College Seven, even though they're going to have some graduate housing, perhaps they would not have seminar rooms specifically for graduate seminars?

McHenry: That's right. College Seven has some seminar rooms, but they're no more than enough to take care of the normal teaching needs of a college. And there's no reason why a seminar shouldn't be held there, but I would think that in economics, the seminar would tend to be near the console (it's hooked to the computer), near the places where the charts and graphs and so on of business cycles are located, and it would be easier to do it in the economic suite of the Social Science Building. But it's wherever there's a room available. But I don't want to seem to force it on the colleges, because I don't think the atmosphere with so many young people around is quite the mature atmosphere that graduate students ought to have.

Calciano: I also noticed in the early position papers some

discussion over whether some faculty would be appointed strictly for graduate instruction.

McHenry: Yes. Well that comes up again now with the proposal that the History of Consciousness have a professor or two. And they are arguing, which is quite contrary to a position taken by the same people a few years ago, they're arguing that a graduate program like this is so all-encompassing that a member of a college faculty just doesn't have time to do anything about it. And I think most of us are opposed on principle to having a graduate faculty and an undergraduate faculty, and there's an implication if you have one guy in a graduate faculty, that the other people are in the undergraduate.

Calciano: Yes. It makes the undergraduate faculty almost second-class citizens in a sense.

McHenry: Yes.

Calciano: So you will resist this then? In all fields, I mean, not just because you don't like History of Consciousness?

McHenry: Well in a way we've already got some non-college appointments, in engineering for example; and we inherited a lot of them in astronomy. And the job of chewing away at this backlog and getting them college

affiliated is a big one, and a lot depends on the attitude of the colleges. I've never forced a college to take anybody that it didn't want, and I don't intend to. But somehow this backlog of eleven professional astronomers has got to be spread through the colleges, or we are going to have in fact a graduate faculty. I think two of the engineers are in colleges and two not now. Well I think all of them ought to be assimilated.

Allocation of Teaching Assistants

Calciano: What are we going to do about TA's, the graduate students who do teaching? Are they going to be junior fellows of colleges, or have absolutely no relation to the colleges?

McHenry: Well we've got a \$200,000 grant from the Danforth Foundation which calls for internships in the colleges, teaching internships in the colleges, and it provides a certain amount of money, Danforth money, to supplement teaching assistant money. We only got about a third of what we asked for, and they crossed out the most important part of the program, which were first-year graduate fellowships, something akin to Woodrow Wilsons. But it's money enough to play with and start,

and I think more and more we're beginning this fall to assign teaching assistants, sometimes rather irrespective of the field in which they're doing graduate work, we're assigning teaching assistants to colleges for their teaching work. For example, a graduate student in History of Consciousness might for his ... well obviously there're no undergraduate courses in the History of Consciousness, and so his teaching assignment has to be in something else. If his interests were historical, for example, he might be assigned to Cowell College's World Civ course. If his interests were scientific, he might go to one of the Crown senior seminars or the Crown core course.

Calciano: This would be a case of administratively assigning.....

McHenry: That's right. It's his work assignment, and it'd be done by the graduate division on the request of the college.

Calciano: Oh! Well what if you've got a guy that nobody wants to have in their college, but you still have to find a teaching position for him?

McHenry: Well of course this is the ... he might function without it, but these ... the colleges have pretty much an open door. You see teaching assignments have up to now been in disciplines; next year for the first

time we're saying, "How much out of the pool of teaching assistants do you, the colleges, want?" And one said, "Oh I want three," and another one said, "I want four," and another one said, "I want two," and so on. So those had to be cut down, but they're all established now. And in many cases even now in June they don't know who is coming for sure. The draft has picked off some, and various other ... but the colleges will take all they can get,. I'm sure, and they'll try to arrange so that the field looks like it would be helpful to the graduate student to teach a section of World Civ or whatever it is. So a substantial amount of teaching done by TA's, maybe a third of it even, next year will be done in the colleges, and in core courses in the colleges.

Calciano: But they aren't going to be considered junior fellows of that college?

McHenry: Well, we haven't used "Junior Fellow." They may be used; they may be. We haven't used junior fellow in practice; we did talk a little bit about using junior fellow in the planning period with Lamb and Megaw.

Calciano: I guess that's why I keep saying it, because I've been reading all those earl^y reports.

McHenry: Yes.

June 26, 1968 9:15 a.m.

UNDERGRADUATE ENROLLMENTPlanning for Steady Growth

Calciano: There were a few loose ends that I wanted to pick up after reading over last session's transcript. I asked a question about married-student housing, and you said, "We call it graduate-student housing." Now by this am I correct in inferring that it will be for graduate students only, or not?

McHenry: No. It's very likely that in the beginning, half the units will be occupied by unmarried undergraduates. The reason for calling it graduate-student housing is that when this campus started, one of the very important things that I was hoping to do was to discourage too-early marriage by immature teenagers. And there is a little evidence that availability of cheap on-campus married-student housing has been a factor in inducing early marriages. That is, the question of, "Why not?" and the question of "Can we afford it?" was partly answered, especially by war surplus and other cheap housing. And the modes have changed as you well know; there are relatively few teenage marriages among college students anymore. But the name got started back then when we wanted to establish firmly that the priority was for graduate students. There's no college coming on the line in '70 -- that's the year we build

married-student housing or family housing -- and one of our possibilities is that College Six might get an early start by taking over, say, a hundred units, or 110 of the 220 units in the married-student housing, and putting four youngsters, four unmarried students in each two-bedroom apartment, and start on a quite different basis. Then moving them over to College Six when it was ready. So....

Calciano: Why would you want to do that instead of just wait until it was ready?

McHenry: Because we don't like these lumps of growth. We could have no increase in undergraduate students at all in 1970 if there's no college coming on the line. And we could have a growth of 400 or so, 500 perhaps, by using the married-student housing.

How UCSC's Yearly Quota of Students is Determined

Calciano: This brings to mind another question that I had. You have mentioned at various times that there was going to be the skipped year, and that this year at Merrill we were supposed to take 500 students, and we only had half as much faculty allotment ... who decides? Do you decide, or do the Regents decide the actual number of students we're supposed to take each year?

McHenry: Well, it's a matter of many people having a hand in

it. The campus puts forward its figures, and the University-wide officers will counter by saying, "We have 2,000 unaccounted for among the campuses of the estimated demand; couldn't you take 200 more, ten percent, as your quota?" or something. Or sometimes they say, "Well the way capacities are working out on the other campuses, we don't need you to grow by 800; we could do with 700," and so on. They're all negotiated depending on the capacities of instructional facilities and the housing. And it's a give-and-take negotiated figure. But in the end, all of the campuses have to total the estimated number of total students; the sum of the parts must equal what the University is obliged to take, and it's all based on the work of the State statisticians, on birth rates of two decades earlier, and various kinds of statistical formulae that are used to guess how many of them are going to college, and how many of them are going to the University of California, and what they'll be studying, and what the campus choice is, and so on. It's extremely complicated. And in the end, usually, I think invariably, almost, we get an agreed-upon figure that the campus can live with and University-wide can live with. And then this is ratified by the Regents. But even so, it can be

modified in practice, and is, often involuntarily. The Director of Admissions has to admit more students than we can accommodate because some of them get a chance to go to Radcliffe or Stanford and take it. And even Harvard has to overadmit, because the draft picks up a few, and some get ill, and some even decide to go to Dartmouth. So we're feeling our way, trying to guesstimate how many more we have to admit in order to get a given number. And every institution in the country is doing it. But our take is quite high; it's probably as high as any public institution in the country.

Calciano: You mean Santa Cruz's take?

McHenry: Santa Cruz's take.

Calciano: It's higher than the other UC campuses?

McHenry: Yes, it is. And we have occasions when UCSC is chosen over very prestigious colleges -- we have a girl who's just finished her freshman year, Jill Farrelly, who applied two places, Radcliffe and Santa Cruz, and I know the family well, and I'm sure they felt they couldn't afford Radcliffe. Now the other factor was she had a brother here who is very, very happy, so she applied to both, was admitted to both, turned down Radcliffe, and came to Santa Cruz. Then of course

there are many who do go elsewhere, though from the very first there were scattering numbers of students admitted to Harvard and Stanford and other very prestigious institutions who, for various reasons, usually financial, preferred to come to Santa Cruz.

The Minority Students Admission Program

Calciano: You mentioned that we were bringing in 30 minority and underprivileged students this next fall who would require large amounts of financial support. Where is that money coming from?

McHenry: Well, a lot of it is coming from Federal sources; the Regents are matching some that we raise locally, and ... but it's hard. And there are some emotional faculty members. I was thinking of a physicist at UCLA in a recent All-University Faculty Conference who said, "Well two percent outside the regular admission standards is much too small; four percent is better*"; why not go to ten percent?" and I say (I keep sounding like a banker), "Where's the money coming from?" You shouldn't, morally, take on an underprivileged youngster unless you're willing to commit for each

* Ed. note: In March, 1968, the Regents changed the Admission Exemption from two percent to four percent and directed that the additional two percent "be drawn from disadvantaged segments of society..."

such student about \$1700 of support money each year for four years.

Calciano: Also there would be involved, I would think, extra staff time for the tutoring and the individual work that is necessary when you start to retrieve somebody who's been so undereducated.

McHenry: Yes. Well this fellow took it just like if you have a large family, why somebody will provide. "It'll all work out," and so on. But somebody's got to raise that money, and when you don't have responsibility for it, it's very easy to say, "Oh, let's take on an unlimited obligation." I think it's better to experiment with four percent for several years before you can try to take on more.

Calciano: Have we taken in our full two percent in other years or not?

McHenry: No, we've never used the whole of the two percent, partly because we didn't have anybody recruiting, and you can't round these people up, I think, especially a remote campus like this, without going out and encouraging them to come. We're much interested in Mexican kids, and the family unit is so tight, and the father so dominant, that it does take a year or two to argue them into letting the kids come. The Negro families are less organized, and often you can get

Negro youngsters to come on fairly short notice. But since our big push is going to be with the Mexicans, it's not going to be until the fall of '69 that we really know how well we're doing.

Calciano: Why have we selected Mexicans for our big push?

McHenry: Well, it's the biggest minority in California, and in my opinion the most underprivileged, perhaps outside of women. (Laughter) But they're a majority, aren't they?

Calciano: Right. (Laughter) I was just interested because of course the Negro minority is getting all the publicity now.

McHenry: Yes. Well, if you think of our area, six or seven counties, we reach over into Fresno County and Merced County, the Mexican population must be in the factor of 3 to 1 for Negro. And so in our own constituency, with minimum travel time and so on, we've got loads of Mexican youngsters, and nobody's doing much for the Mexicans. Almost every good college and university in the country is looking for very bright high-achieving Negroes, but hardly anybody's looking for Mexicans, and so I think the Mexican-American is our big frontier, and I don't say we shouldn't try to get Negroes, but in this area, promising young Negroes are picked over pretty thoroughly by the Ivy League. Your alma mater, Radcliffe, and lots of others are going

through the country looking for the really bright girls, and we've just got to get promising kids where we can, and the Mexican group I think is the most hopeful.

Calciano: What about Filipinos?

McHenry: Well there aren't very many. You know we have some Filipino young people, but they aren't numerous; you'll find pockets of them in Watsonville and various other places, but many of the Filipinos who migrated to this country were men who never married, and the number of Filipino women is significantly lower. It's like the early Hindu workmen who were in the Sacramento Valley. They never found women, and they haven't perpetuated, and they're dying off. This has been less true of the Chinese and Japanese who used picture brides and various other devices through which the family unit was established.

Calciano: Well most of our local Chinese population went back to China or remained unmarried. I think the Japanese are the main....

McHenry: Yes. But we still have a strong base in San Francisco in which there were Chinese women. But the Japanese used the picture bride and other methods of doing it. But I think the Filipino and Hindu groups are a declining group, or at least they are not increasing

proportionately, whereas the Mexican one was here already when California became a state, and it's been replenished by the movement of people. Oh, the biogs that some of these Mexican kids write are just fascinating; how the father came across the border first and got caught and was sent back, and then the father took the whole family, and they were sneaked over the border in a truck in the middle of the night, and somebody took them in, and somebody exploited them; these are fascinating stories. We have them write a little sketch of how they came to be here, and what they want to do and so on. We have a Korean war orphan who has Anglo foster parents who is underprivileged in that his use of English isn't very good ... beautiful essay about the joy of at last he wrote a paper that got a passing grade in an American school.

Calciano: Oh my.

McHenry: But the ability level, if you take SAT'S seriously, is sometimes about half what our regular students will be. And we've got a big job to do to tutor them.

Calciano: Yes. I've had two brothers-in-law that I've been helping in high school and, my, the amount of remedial work that is necessary if somebody has not been "with it" right from the first grade on is fantastic. I have

one more loose end: when we were talking last week about the boards of studies and the absolute ban on departments, you said that so far as you know, there's only one person on campus who wants departments. I was wondering what were his reasons and who *is* he, if you don't mind?

McHenry: Oh! It's Ted Youngs of mathematics, Chairman of Mathematics Board of Studies. And his reasons are that he was for many years, eight years, chairman of a very large department at Indiana University. And he enjoyed having the power and the perquisites of a chairman of a large department, which include a battery of secretaries and a great many such things, of services and prestige -- the chairman of a big department like that is virtually the equivalent of a dean -- and control over a vast budget, and he misses it. It's inevitable that somebody who lives a certain way a good long time should be disappointed. He also, I think, resents somewhat the relatively greater influence of the Vice Chancellor in the picture, the Vice Chancellor for the division in which Mathematics is located, and resents what should be in his and most areas a lack of monopoly over the suggestion of new personnel. In point of fact, Mathematics has operated so cleverly and so quickly that they have assumed a

kind of a psychological monopoly. But he would have liked to have had this as a matter of right, rather than a matter of finesse.

Calciano: Well he must have been aware when he chose to come here that it was going to be a little different.

McHenry: Yes. Well he's Chairman of the Senate now, and yet I think that he came ... he's perhaps the one senior member of the faculty who came here for the wrong reasons. He wanted to live in California.

Calciano: Oh. Well now his being Chairman of the Academic Senate, could he switch your Santa Cruz ideal around a bit?

McHenry: Well I don't think so; not so long as I'm here. But I don't know what might happen if there were somebody who was less deeply rooted in this thing. But I think as long as I'm here there will be an early detection of any defection.

Calciano: Also I wanted to ask you ... we've mentioned San Diego several times, comparing us to San Diego; you've talked about the troubles at San Diego, and the "new Chancellor, if they find one" and so forth.

McHenry: They found one!

Calciano: Yes. What is your opinion of him? He's homegrown apparently.

McHenry: I don't know him well. He's been at San Diego only

two, three years. His name is William McGill ... and it's an interesting thing that he had a colleague at Columbia named William McGuire, and we made McGuire an offer once to come here, he's a very good social psychologist, and in the end he declined on the basis of relatively small points, technicalities, and he has now joined Bill McGill, Bill McGuire has, at San Diego, so the two Columbia psychologists are together. Well I don't know McGill well at all. He's relatively new to the system; he's a very agreeable personality, extremely friendly and outgoing, and he has risen very quickly in the Academic Senate; indeed, he's the Chairman-elect of the University-wide Senate organization and would have come into that on July 1 had this appointment as Chancellor not taken place.

Calciano: Was it coincidental or not that Tschirgi and the other Vice Chancellor resigned one day later?

McHenry: Well it could have been that they were just trying to give him a clear road so that he could organize to suit himself. And I think it is proper that a Chancellor or a President should have in effect the offered resignations of those who hold the posts, the senior posts. Indeed, when Hitch was appointed, I thought quite seriously that perhaps all the Chancellors ought to offer their resignations, and I

was sure he'd decline them all. But it would have been a possibility that ... of doing so. I don't think any Vice President or any Vice Chancellor ought to, for very long, hold his post if his chief doesn't enthuse about him. Now Tschirgi was thought of as a possible successor to Galbraith, and consequently there was a special reason there why he probably felt he should unload. Biron has been controversial. When Galbraith resigned at an earlier period, he, Biron, resigned with him. They offered their resignations, and in the end they withdrew their resignations.

Calciano: It's sort of like a soap opera. (Laughter) What's going to happen in each installment?

McHenry: Yes. That campus is quite a difficult one to manage now. I suppose they all are, but San Diego's had special complexities. On top of it all, a very expensive medical school started, and it's an expensive staff, and it's a difficult one to deal with, and I think it's remarkable that the committees agreed upon the proper person to lead.

THE COLLEGES

The Role of College "Sponsor" in Developing a College's Plans

Calciano: You mentioned that College Seven is going to have 50

units for graduate students; you said Byron [Stookey] has been working on the plans for College Seven; two questions came to my mind: How is it decided that College Six won't, College Seven will, and secondly, these decisions are going to be made and put into architectural plans before a provost is ever even sought. Is this not right?

McHenry: Well, we have mild negotiations going on for a provost of College Seven; indeed there's a leading figure in the Johnson Administration who could have the Provostship of Seven if he'd say, "Yes," now. Whether he will is another question. But almost all the major physical decisions are made before a provost really gets on top of the situation. Though, even late as he was in appointment (he was the very latest), Bell has made a number of physical changes during the course of construction. But the question of whether there are graduate students or not, facilities for them, isn't a crucial one so long as you don't overbuild the facilities. Take College Seven, for example. The 50 spaces for graduate students are just a wing, and now this is just a program still ... the architect hasn't even been appointed for Seven.

Calciano: This is a program that Byron and you have agreed on?

McHenry: Yes. Oh, he's gone into the program, and we reviewed

the program, and the Campus Planning Committee has had some say in it, and of course Wagstaff was in the meeting on College Seven, which took place Monday, which was ironing out the final points of contention. It was Byron's chairmanship or sponsorship of the committee that has now gone over to George Baer, the historian of Crown College, who was a Rhodes scholar and Stanford man. You may have known his mother -- no, as a graduate student, you wouldn't have. She plays quite a part in the student housing at Stanford. George was a Rhodes scholar, and George is taking it over, and I wanted a meeting with the architects there, Wagstaff and the project architect who is Bruce Lane, Byron, and the new man, George Baer. And we talked through all these things so that everybody understood why ... and I had requested that the architects and engineers work out a statement of cost of everything that was still in the program that was unusual and had not been in previous colleges, what was the cost of them. And then we figured out what to do about it. Now this was the remaining parts of it; the first time around I thought that Byron's plan for College Seven might have cost about a million dollars more than we had, than was within the realm of possibility for loans and grants and all the rest. I

went through that pretty ruthlessly and crossed out things, and this was what was remaining after that first cutting. And we did cut some more this time. One of the ways in which some of this is done is to just put items that he had in the basic program over into the gift program, so that if a gift came along that was a million dollars, we could do it, but if it were \$700,000, we couldn't. Now go back to College Five: there is an area in College Five that we think graduate students will inhabit, about 50 also. There's an area in College Four that we think graduate students, or older students, will inhabit. It isn't being built in the first round, but we have the Federal money to build it, and the only reason it isn't underway now is that we put it out to bid once, and it came back too high, so they're redesigning it. But we'll have space for as many as 50 graduate students in Four, Five, and Seven, and maybe some in Six. But the important thing to bear in mind is that whatever is occupied by a graduate student can be occupied by an undergraduate or vice versa, so they....

Calciano: Well haven't you said that graduate's rooms would be a little bigger and fancier?

McHenry: Well yes, but you could still put a premium price on

them and rent them to undergraduates.

Calciano: I see.

McHenry: So there isn't any commitment that these are for graduates only, and they'll stand vacant if graduates aren't there.

Calciano: Well now Byron did the idea-cooking for Seven. Who did it for Six, for Five; different people each time?

McHenry: Well yes. For Six we had Ray Nichols, who also like George Baer had been a Rhodes scholar, and who had lived in this pattern. Ray Nichols is in government, as you may know, and he also as a graduate student had lived in the Princeton environment, which is a very good student environment.

Calciano: Even though it's a sciency college, you didn't mind having the ideas coming from a social scientist?

McHenry: No. Because there's nothing in Six, in the design of Six, that would indicate it's science except that it's the college that's the closest one to the science buildings; that's the only thing. And it could be changed drastically right now. We haven't got a single appointment in there.

Calciano: Right. It's not till the provost gets selected that you're committed?

McHenry: Yes. And College Five, the sponsor of College Five was Karl Lamb. And Karl has had unusual residential

college experience. He had four years living in at Yale College -- you know, the Harkness plan at Yale -- and then he had three years at Brasenose College, Oxford, as a Rhodes scholar. And of course Karl was one of the original planners in the thing, and he has a practical bent about him, and feelings and so on, and these sponsors are some help to the architects. Some of them are very skillful at writing down their pet hates and their pet likes and expressing it in graphic language or telling them. There's a good deal of liaison, you know, between, say, a literary man and an architect, especially an architect like Moore, who is Chairman of Architecture at Yale, and who is doing College Six. He understands it when Ray Nichols writes down the mood that he wants. "This room ought to provide an inducement to do this or that." And the architects like that kind of guidance. And these fellows who have lived in New College at Oxford, or Brasenose, or University College, Oxford, or Berkeley College, Yale ... they've got a feeling for it, and that comes through in some of these descriptions they write.

Possible Emphases for Future Colleges

Calciano: Well now in this genesis of a college, Seven is going to be urban affairs, is that right?

McHenry: Yes.

Calciano: Now who decided that? Was it a one-man decision,
or....

McHenry: No, it was originally a....

Calciano: The Regents didn't decide.

McHenry: No, no. The Regents approved the Academic Plan, of which you have a copy, which sketched out perhaps eight possibilities, and almost certainly Seven wasn't urban; I think Eight or Nine was. They change, varying with the personalities of the people who are available for the provostship and with the donors. These emphases aren't terribly important. We moved a second science college into the sixth line about three years ago when the Sloan Foundation withdrew from College Three, which they had originally intended to sponsor, and they needed more time to get organized after Mr. Sloan's death. Now they won't finance Six, and we may shift it around; it's been located up near the science complex, but if we got a donor who said, "I want a college that's based on a good old-fashioned conservative great books course," or something of the kind, you could still transform one of these, Six or Seven, there's still time, though the basic sketch-out of these was made originally in the summer of '62 with Karl Lamb and the Williams man who was here. Neill

Megaw and I were sitting around the table when Neill was out recently (we were looking him over as a possibility for Provost of Five and concluded he wouldn't do) and I went back and read that file. I hadn't read it for five years, and it was fascinating to see how many of the ideas that we had eventually have come into definite form. No, the way a college emphasis is stated for future colleges varies a lot; it's like baiting a hook. If you can't catch them on salmon eggs, you try a spinner, and if a spinner doesn't work, you may try a fly. And you may get a different kind of a fish when you start changing the bait.

Calciano: Then it's essentially your decision; you don't have

McHenry: No.

Calciano: It's within your powers....

McHenry: That's right.

Calciano: ... and you just judge the situation.

McHenry: Yes.

Calciano: I noticed in the summer of '62 plans, well there's a statement, "Some of the colleges would be coed," which made me wonder, are there plans for some not to be coed? All so far are.

McHenry: No plans at the present time. But I've always felt that if somebody drove up and offered us \$800,000 for a model women's college, or a model men's college, that we at least ought to think about it.

Calciano: It's an interesting possibility, because the people still would have all the other colleges to run and take courses in.....

McHenry: The paired colleges ... it might just be popular. There are still a good many mommas and papas who would like their youngsters to go to a men's college or a women's college as they did. And if you had it paired, that these were in juxtaposition, as they are going to be in Hamilton College, and maybe at Wesleyan, and maybe someday at Yale and so on, you have all the benefits of co-education, just as you had at Radcliffe with Harvard nearby. It's a real possibility, but I think the trend of the times is to co-education and pretty full integration.

Calciano: I hardly even feel that I was at a girls' school. The dormitory was the only thing that Radcliffe meant as far as a separate entity. Everything else....

McHenry: But you [the Radcliffe women] did tend to eat together, didn't you?

Calciano: Yes, now that's right. Well that's what I guess I was thinking when I said, "the dormitory." But you see a

coed school like Iowa State has the girls' dorms where the girls eat together, and boys' dorms where the boys eat together.

McHenry: Yes. Well I think that the demand in this setting would be a great deal of free interchange. If we had a men's college and a women's college, I think they ought to be built cheek by jowl, and possibly we ought to consider a common dining room for the two of them. If not a common dining room, a very free interchange, so that if the line was long in one, you could go to the other, but couples could go, or groups, mixed groups could go.

Calciano: But am I right in assuming this is not an idea you feel must be explored, and you are not going to be beating the bushes trying to dredge up money for these paired colleges?

McHenry: No.

Calciano: It's just if it happens to come?

McHenry: Well if we got a bequest that said the money could be used only for a women's college or a men's college, we'd sure turn it down with great reluctance. We'd try to work it out. But I think it would require much more thought before you went to press on it.

Calciano: But now urban affairs, you feel that some one of the twenty colleges ought to be that, don't you?

McHenry: Yes.

Calciano: And you will beat the bushes for that kind of money?

McHenry: Yes.

Calciano: Are we going to have a college focused on non-western culture specifically?

McHenry: Well, in some ways Four is doing this.

Calciano: It started to, then it shifted gears, didn't it? In a sense?

McHenry: No. It's ... yes, it's shifted a lot. But in its original form it was the one in the Megaw-Lamb-McHenry manuscripts which was referred to as language and linguistics. You remember that there was one? It was called Kim College.

Calciano: That's right, that's right.

McHenry: Well, the more we looked at it as the years went by, the more we thought that this college would be mainly women, because of the language-linguistics thing. Languages organizationally here, instruction in the language, became a kind of a petty-officer function -- that is, languages are rarely taught, the elementary languages, by regular members of the staff. We have an army of associates instead, about a dozen associates, who teach language. And linguistics made a somewhat slower start than expected. Shipley came from

Berkeley, but we haven't had a major appointment in linguistics yet.

Calciano: Is Shipley good?

McHenry: Shipley is good, but he is not an organizer or administrator. And he's kind of fuzzy. He thinks up bright ideas, but doesn't carry them out and so on. And he ought to see a psychiatrist. (Laughter) His wife is one.

Recruiting Provosts for Stevenson, Merrill, and Five

McHenry: So then the question of leadership for Four came, and there wasn't anybody in that area ever suggested who looked like he could make it. And then Seabury became available, and Seabury's interests are very much international relations, and there was a short courtship, and he accepted, and he worked at it a few months, and by February of last year, '67, he was pretty well convinced he'd never make an administrator.

Calciano: Is that why he left?

McHenry: Yes.

Calciano: Was there static developing because he was not an administrator, or....

McHenry: No. It was more that he had, I think, and I think he told me honestly how he felt, was that he had ideas

about the Cold War, and a new book, and an article, and so on, and he just hated being tied down to an office. When he got the idea, he wanted to run to the Library and spend two weeks reading everything he could read on the subject and writing it up furiously and so on. And there was always some secretary who said, "Well now, tell me where I can reach you," and "What will I do if so and so calls?" and so on. And he just hated it. And he told me as early as February that he thought he just didn't want to do it. And by that time I'd found out a lot more about his personality. I'd known him many years, but I hadn't known him well. But he was kind of a dilettante. He was a bee that goes from flower to flower and not ready to settle down and do as most of us do, work twelve, fifteen hour days. But that year, that first year, he left his family in Berkeley and commuted down, and he kind of resented the time it took to come down, and he tended to hole up in a motel and not go to college evenings and see what other provosts were doing, what was right or wrong. There wasn't the keenness of observation and the interest and commitment. And then he tried for a couple of appointments, and one of them was an old crony of his from Swarthmore days who was on the staff of the

University of Pittsburgh. His name was Chapman ... and I never oppose an appointment, an early appointment, that a provost says is essential to his college. And so I said, "He doesn't look like much of a political scientist to me, but let's see what the Budget Committee says." And the Budget Committee rejected him without any hesitation. There was a Review Committee set up under the Budget Committee. The guy was not really interesting in personality, and his research work was both meager and dull, and the Committee said so, and after that rejection, why immediately Seabury's morale dropped way off. Well, he resigned and we then were left to recruit someone else, and I did very quickly a man that I'd known from Pomona College called William Olson. And....

Calciano: Recruit for....

McHenry: Seabury's position; he was leaving. And here again there was a Budget Committee problem. Olson was willing to come; he was at Columbia then, and was Associate Dean of the School of International Relations, and it was on the agenda of the May meeting of the Regents, which was here (that's 13 months ago now) and he called me on a Tuesday and withdrew before the Thursday when they would have acted on it. So....

Calciano: Because....

McHenry: Well ... as Harry Wellman said, "Because you're so doggone honest." I told him that one of the committees -- he got a favorable report from the Ad Hoc Committee and an unfavorable from the Budget Committee -- and I told him that one of the committees felt that he had not done enough professionally and published enough, particularly, but that all the rest of us were enthused, and the offer was being made, and the President, Acting-President Wellman, had agreed to it, and the Regents would approve it on Thursday. And he said he didn't want to come if there were any elements here that felt he wasn't going to make good. And he has since joined the staff of the Rockefeller Foundation and is very cordial and helpful to us, but that left a big gap.

Calciano: Why did you feel that you ought to tell him that one committee had been against him?

McHenry: Because I felt that he'd probably find it out eventually, and that it's like being engaged to somebody, and there's some episode in your life that you think maybe nobody would ever hear about, and then it comes out after you're married, and it raises hell.

Calciano: I see.

McHenry: And so full disclosure is my policy. And I'm not sorry because we got a better man.

Calciano: How did you get Bell?

McHenry: Well, Bell ... I'd heard about Bell for years; I'd never met him, but he'd been at Berkeley for a Master's degree (indeed Clark Kerr taught him there) and then he went back to Princeton to get his Ph.D., then he taught at Haverford, and the Berkeley people kept after him, and they got him out as associate professor in the '50s. I didn't meet him, but he was very popular with the age group who are now the senior people at Berkeley, and I'd heard a good deal about him. He'd represented Rockefeller in East Africa for two years, had a nice family, two girls and two boys, (that alwa^ys attracts me, because it's like ours (laughter)) and so, after Olson's withdrawal, we got Bell out here in early June, and he looked terribly good and was very interested, and it happened that things were developing at Haverford in an interesting way ... I don't know whether he ever expected to be offered the presidency of Haverford, but at any rate, he wasn't ... he'd been somewhat disassociated, not intensely in Haverford life for a matter of three or four years, in Africa, teaching in Negro colleges, at Fisk and Lincoln University simultaneously, as well as carrying certain duties at Haverford, and he hadn't come fully back into Haverford life. He had this

intense interest in African education, and then in American Negro education. And just at this time, a new President of Haverford was appointed, who'd come from the Ford Foundation, and I caught him on the rebound in a way. And so he came out, was interested, and by July we had him pretty well settled. The Regents didn't ratify until September, but by that time it was too late to move family out for the year, and so we've had this business of his coming out for periods of time, and the family has just moved and arrived on Sunday. We got such a good man, and at such a late time, and he's recruited so well.* While I'm alarmed that College Five leadership is not settled, history has just repeated itself on Five, in a way, except that we didn't have this period of anybody comparable to Seabury. There's been a terrible disagreement among the leading people on the campus about Five -- its nature, the extent to which it goes into the arts, and Page Smith and certain others have been extremely alarmed lest Five eclipse the others and their work in art and music or whatever art form, that it draw off all the talent, the good musicians and good artists and they be left with the dregs and not have a lively

* Bell left the provostship in 1972 when the first four-year class graduated. He failed to live up to the bright promise reflected above. D.E.McHenry 1/3/73

program. And we have paraded through here now about nine people, some of them more than once, in the last twelve months, trying to find a provost, and we've gotten agreement only on one.

Calciano: Well who has to agree?

McHenry: Well....

Calciano: I shouldn't say "have to", but who do you want to have agree?

McHenry: Well, I want to have the Budget Committee convinced that a person is qualified for a full professorship. I want the other provosts to be satisfied that a guy would make a good colleague. I want the Vice Chancellors to be satisfied that this is a good quality appointment, and I want at least the faculty in the sector, humanities, social science and so on, to generally, in the majority, think the person will succeed. And only in Wilfred Stone of Stanford have I gotten consensus, and he withdrew in May, almost on the wire; his papers were in the Regents, and he withdrew. He's having wife trouble, and his wife doesn't want to interrupt her career as a psychiatric social worker, and there are much more deep-seated problems between them, I'm sure, than this, but it came to this, and he wasn't quite willing to make the break, though he sort of regards it as inevitable,

eventually, I'm sure. But we're at the stage of almost having to start over again, or to take somebody on whom there is not consensus.

Calciano: You said you leapt too fast on Page and you don't want to leap too fast again ... but yet this is not a post where you can really appoint an acting provost or any such thing, is it?

McHenry: Well, if we had just the person to do it. It's a very complicated thing; there isn't a senior person here who is available, that we could ask, in my opinion, to be acting provost, and I guess maybe I have a kind of a death wish about all of this, and that is that we have just gone out to bid for College Five, or for the Federal-State portions of College Five, and I guess my death wish is simply that it'll come in over-budget, and it will be delayed a year. (Laughter)

Possible Emphases for Future Colleges, continued

Calciano: What are some of the other areas that you feel some one of the twenty colleges must focus on? You said you felt urban affairs was worth pushing for. What are some of the other big ones that you will push for at some point?

McHenry: Well I think there would be a legitimate case for this classical great books sort of approach. Sort of on the line of the college called St. John's in Annapolis,

Maryland, which also now is operating another campus at Santa Fe, New Mexico. Though enthusiasm for great books approaches is diminished greatly among students, and....

Calciano: Sort of seems out of touch to them, I'm sure.

McHenry: Yes. The relevancy issue is raised. I think it's possible that we might go as you suggest in some future one to an emphasis upon the new nations, and we've talked about, and indeed in Seabury's time planned a good deal for an international relations approach. And there are several other possibilities.
[Phone rings; interview interrupted.]

Calciano: Well now, when we do have fifteen or twenty colleges, isn't it almost inevitable that several are going to be virtual duplicates of one another, or do you think they'll all be distinctive?

McHenry: No, I think they'll be distinctive, and I don't think that the starting out announced emphasis makes very much difference really. I've never been keen on setting an emphasis and holding it. This is a point on which President Kerr and I disagreed. He wanted an exact charter, "this college will forever do this or that." And I have felt that exact charters were wrong; that with the pattern of recruitment, the faculty, the change of provosts and so on, a college would change

direction. And in this I'm influenced a lot by the experience at Oxford and Yale over the years. There's a period in which a good share of the leading historians and political scientists of the whole British Commonwealth came from Balliol, and then I ran into a man who's an organic chemist who was a Balliol graduate, and it surprised me so much. Trinity Hall, Cambridge, is known everywhere for the lawyers it produces, but when you get acquainted with Trinity Hall, you find that they do almost equally well in other disciplines. It just happens that a few people from Trinity Hall made big marks as lawyers. And then this tends to accentuate; ambitious youngsters who want to go to law apply to Trinity Hall. But my feeling is that these are all liberal arts colleges, and one doesn't ask in what does Swarthmore specialize? For what vocation does Radcliffe produce girls?

Calciano: (Laughter)

McHenry: The answer is housewifery. (Laughter) And what is the emphasis at Carlton, or Pomona? And we're building colleges the size of these. And they're multi-purpose institutions. Now Kerr had a good point that we didn't want them to be peas in a pod, all just kind of general, and so we did start out saying that we'll get

the nucleus in humanities in Cowell, and the nucleus of social sciences in Stevenson, and the nucleus of the natural sciences in Crown, but I don't regard that emphasis as important, and I've spent a good deal of energy, and the faculty has lately, de-emphasizing the emphasis. Indeed I was reading the proof on a new little guide to the campus for the visitors just yesterday, and Gurden had written down this emphasis on humanities, social sciences and so on, and I debated some time crossing it out entirely. They're all liberal arts colleges.

Calciano: Well on this urban affairs college, you're going to be picking provost, and faculty and staff....

McHenry: But it's a liberal arts college arranged around a problem. Now there are two kinds of separate approaches. One of them is arranged around traditional academic fields, the humanities, social sciences, natural sciences, but Four starts a new generation of colleges in a sense, arranged around a problem. And this is an answer to the relevancy or irrelevancy charge. Four says, "We're going to study economics, and politics, and this and that," ... every liberal arts college does, "but the center of focus is going to be one of the overwhelming problems of our time -- poverty." Poverty at home and poverty abroad. And this

then means that we're studying not just economics in the abstract of, "Here was Adam Smith, and here are his principles, and here's the way Lord Keynes looked at it," and so on ... but we're looking at an economy of a new nation in Africa, and we're saying, "Now how does this thing work?" And then we have to come back to the classic economists and the revisionists and so on. But it's a different approach, not a textbook approach. You put on the table the Republic of Chad, and, "Here *is* what it does; now what can we draw from all the so-called science of economics that bears on that? What can we draw from the world of religion and philosophy that helps us to interpret this?" Or, "Here's the ghetto in New York, and here are these people with different traditions and cultures; let's look into them, and then let's look into the urban environment in which they live. Then let's look at the whole question of investment and private enterprise and the modern corporation, and how they're organized; and how you're going to marshall all these forces here." And in the course of this you get a liberal education. This *is* the idea. And I'm much more interested in the problem approach, but the urban problem might be solved before College Seven dies, a thousand years from now, or maybe there'll be nothing

else but an urban problem, which is more likely. Now we have one, you know, of the ecological problem -- the problem of the environment, and....

Calciano: Which one's that?

McHenry: Well, I think it's Eight. But all these are very flexible, and people such as Gurden Mooser who have to write brochures and so on want things exactly, exactly which one is which. And I don't care. If we've got an exciting guy whose main interest was learning, psychology of learning and so on, why we'd have one that was primarily interested in the process of learning and teaching, and yet we wouldn't want it to be called a teachers' college, but it might concentrate very heavily this way. So I think it's in getting exciting individuals to lead them, and then you turn a guy like Bell loose, and he runs at a hundred miles an hour, and things that no academic planner could ever have thought of will be evolved this weekend when Bell has his faculty and they strike sparks and so on. It's very important that I not sit there and say, "Well that wasn't in the original plan." It's very important that I have the dinner on Saturday night and say, "What new ideas came?"

Calciano: Is there much rivalry between the existing colleges? You mentioned that they're all worried about what

number Five is going to do in the fine arts.

McHenry: Yes.

Calciano: Do you see more rivalry developing or not?

McHenry: Oh, I think so. I think, I hope there'll always be rivalry. There's a style in Cowell that you've probably recognized. It's kind of literary ... their students are predominantly, the students have taken this emphasis much more seriously than the faculty. The faculty's well balanced. We do that by just allocating -- you need three chemists or this and that, even if it's a social sciences emphasis college. But the students read this stuff, and they say, "'Social science.' I want to be a lawyer, so I'll go there." And this has been done to the point now where we, you may know this, that we have 70 majors in psychology in Stevenson. Well it's ridiculous. There are only three psychologists in the faculty there. We can't even have a psychologist to advise each of these 70, because the advising load would be much too heavy. So we are trying hard to correct this. But the rivalries that are emerging are ... well, for example, Provost Willson was in to say goodbye (he left last night for six weeks in England) and we were discussing a wide range of Stevenson problems; he said that Stevenson students looked upon Cowell students as kind

of "Mickey Mouse". Now I think they probably are a little bit making fun of some of these elaborate histrionic gestures of Jasper Rose. But the students in Cowell by and large, I think, rather like them.

Calciano: Cowell students sort of regard themselves as much more intellectual than those at Stevenson.

McHenry: Yes, yes.

Calciano: (Laughter)

McHenry: And there are in Stevenson more of the so-called "jock types". When there are athletic contests, Stevenson usually wins, though Crown's pretty good, if you've noticed. But in the three-way competitions, especially in the spring, Stevenson first, pressed by Crown, and Cowell third. There are more political activists in Stevenson. And some of this just happened. They were people who started in Cowell and didn't find exactly what they wanted and put in for transfer to Stevenson and went there, and so they got some mal-contented who probably aren't any more satisfied with Stevenson.

Why Strong Provosts are Desirable

McHenry: But I think the personality of a strong leader, and in this category I would exempt Willson and say Page Smith's a strong leader. He knows what he wants; he's a definite personality; he's a bit of a showman, and

Jasper Rose even more so. Thimann is a leader in a different sense. He doesn't have a personal warmth that the people feel, say, nearly to the extent that they do in Cowell, but they respect him; at arm's length they respect him. And Bell is going to be a strong leader, full of ideas, and he goes at the board of studies that tries to obstruct or refuses to cooperate in finding personnel to fit the college that are also good scientists or scholars. He goes right at their throats. And I put him up to some of it, I'm sure. I said, "If they don't produce what you want, just turn them down. They can't make the appointment without you, and they'll scratch more if you hold out." And he did up to a point, and then he compromised, and it worked out pretty well. But a milquetoast as a provost simply won't work under this system. It's got to be somebody who can make up his mind and drive ahead and get things done and is willing to say, "Well, I don't know much about physics, but can't you find a physicist who plays a French horn or does something that would distinguish him from other physicists?"

Calciano: You said a strong leader ... "we need strong leaders and I'll exempt Willson," now did you mean he's not a strong leader or you didn't want to mention him.

McHenry: No. I think he's not. He's very much a conciliator type, and he's come into the picture where the thing was already cast; the concrete was hardening by the time he got in. He brings these elements together, but you don't find him taking a strong stand on principle. And men like Thimann and also Smith do. And I'm sure Bell will.

Calciano: It's interesting, because people that are non-conciliatory leader types would make your job more difficult, but yet you still want this. You feel that it....

McHenry: Oh I think that to get character, yes. Yes. No, I don't think we want a time-server. And there have been various people who would be kind of time-servers who have been suggested. They also have to be able to recruit on a national basis. And in a way, Jasper Rose might be a very good provost of Five, and we've talked about it more than once. But the big problem, it seems to me, well I guess there are two ... one is that he has a violent temper. And I was almost persuaded to consider him for Provost, and then he blew his top in the Senate meeting and stomped out one time over a language requirement or something, something in which he wasn't desperately involved, but he got, his emotions just got....

Calciano: Out of proportion?

McHenry: Completely, yes. And he is a great talker; he filibusters a good deal. But I've come to learn to live with this. But I think the most crucial single objection is that he doesn't know American academic life; he knows British academic life. But when you said to him, "Now, recruit an economist or sociologist." "I don't know any, except what's here." And then he'd become, a person of this kind, without contacts, becomes a prisoner of the ones we already have. And they're very busy reproducing their own kind. And pretty soon you have everybody who looks like McElrath in sociology, and you don't want that. You want new strengths. And the tendency would be then, in sociology, never to have a senior person, but all we'd just have is this young group deciding who's coming in. But a chap who, for example, has gone to the top in his own institution, in an American institution, he's bound to have faculty contacts that.... For example, if Stone were to come, Stone is quite limited to the literary area; he knows a little bit about drama, and he goes to art galleries and so on, and he reads music reviews, but outside of that, he'd be terribly weak, but he can pick up the phone and call Leonard Schiff at physics at Stanford and

say, "Leonard, the physics people here tell me that so and so is really good in high energy. What do you think?" Leonard Schiff, whose daughter just graduated from here, thirteen years chairman of the department at Stanford, knows the value of every senior physicist in this country.

Calciano: And no axe to grind, either.

McHenry: Yes. And he can say, "Why, that guy's the best," or, "That guy's mediocre; they're recommending only the second-rate people. Why don't you go for a first-rate person?" And the contacts of a Bell are such that (mostly Princeton, but also Rockefeller) they never can pull wool over his eyes, the board of studies. They put up a weak candidate, and he spots it, either by interviewing them, which is often the case, or himself just riding the phone, calling people at Princeton and at Rockefeller and saying, "Did you ever hear of this guy?"

Calciano: There is speculation, I've heard a couple of people speculate, that Byron Stookey might be asked back at some point to be a provost of a college.

McHenry: Yes. The difficulty is what would he be professor of?

Calciano: Are you referring to the fact that he does not have a Ph.D., or that he does not have a specific academic field?

McHenry: He doesn't have a discipline, and he doesn't have a Ph.D., though I don't think a Ph.D. is crucial. But he's never been through a regimen that's ... well, it isn't a licensed profession, but it's a little like appointing a guy your physician who hadn't studied medicine, but studied biology up to the master's level ... not very many patients would be quite happy about that.

Calciano: So you doubt that he would be invited?

McHenry: No, I think he might if he'd make a record and write about it somehow, but he hasn't. He's written practically nothing; most of his ideas are in memoranda and so on, and he doesn't have a whole body of his own thoughts in any organized ... if he wrote a book, an outstanding book, a critique of higher education or something, he might fit. But I don't think he does yet.

Calciano: Why is he moving at this time?

McHenry: Well, he's always wanted to do something in public secondary education.

Calciano: Yes.

McHenry: And the Philadelphia people offered him an exciting new job as principal of a new high school or junior high in a slum district; it's to be built. And Shedd,

the new superintendent in Philadelphia, has developed what has been called "The Ivy-League Mafia." He's brought a large number of people of Byron's age group, the average age is 35, in to just revolutionize the school system. And I guess Byron was one too much, and the Board balked. And we've done everything we can to persuade him to stay. In Merrill College, or in his old job, or anything ... but he's refused. He feels that he's been here five years and that's enough, that he needs a change, and he ought to get back to his original field. We pulled him out of the Graduate School of Education at Harvard where he was headed for a Ph.D., and he wants to get back to it. And once the Philadelphia thing was withdrawn, he just felt he ought to move anyway.

Calciano: So what is he going to do?

McHenry: He doesn't know yet. Please don't mention that, but....

Calciano: No.

McHenry: But it's very embarrassing to him.

Calciano: Oh, that's a shame. Well when I asked the question about rivalry between colleges, I was thinking it could show up: for instance, two colleges could be wanting a particular man for their college; or there

could be budgetary struggles; or there can be a lot of ... well there was a comment I read somewhere, I think in one of these early planning papers, that the Claremont Colleges' healthy rivalry had crossed the boundary into internecine warfare. Now could this happen here? Or are there too many limitations and checks?

McHenry: Well I think there's so much central control that it's unlikely that the colleges would fight among themselves; they're more apt to gang up and fight the University campus-wide administration. They tend to, the provosts ... we have an organization called officially the Council of Colleges; it's really often referred to as the Council of Provosts. They meet together for lunch, and in the past ... I've never been invited to meet with them. Once, one time, maybe, I visited. There is a Council of Divisions in which the Vice Chancellors get together, and they invite me every time, and whenever there's anything of particular importance on the agenda, I go in for that point. But the provosts have created a kind of gulf; they caucus and talk things over, and then they come out with a united front on it. And I think this is something that ought to be broken down. For example, about a week ago, two weeks ago, just at the end of

the term, Glenn Willson speaking for the group wrote a memorandum calling for a very drastic change on intervisitation rules, which has always been a sore point ever since we opened. And they never discussed it with me at all during the year. They just suddenly put this blockbuster in, which gave me, of course, no opportunity to talk to other Chancellors and the President and the Regents and parents. They just tossed the bomb in just as they were leaving, you see, and just as Willson was going to Europe. Of course they wanted an answer before they went away.

Calciano: What did you do?

McHenry: I wrote them a letter reminding them that they'd never discussed it with me, and I'd received no communication in the year, and what they'd taken months to recommend, it'd take me at least weeks to think over, and in the meantime I'd sound out opinions in various sectors of our many publics.

Replacing Retiring Provosts

Calciano: The personalities of the college are being molded quite a bit by the Provosts. Well now what's going to happen ten or fifteen years from now when ... well take Bell, for instance, presuming he stays in the job for ten years. Now would it be just very difficult to

find a man to fill up an empty provostship after the whole college had been molded around one man's ideas or not?

McHenry: No, I don't think it's a problem. These courses are changing already; core courses in Stevenson are being realigned as they enter their third year. And I think that ideally the leadership would grow from within in many cases. That you'd find somebody who emerged who we agreed on. And I'd prefer that, to have it internally, but I think we ought to also ask if there isn't somebody externally who'd be willing to come in and who would fit and might do a better job. We have only one instance of filling a vacancy at an operating college and that, of course, was Stevenson, and we were able to move to the number two man, the preceptor in Stevenson, and we got that appointment through in something like twelve days from the time the resignation was filed until the consultation was completed except for approval of the Regents. It was "twelve days in May".

Calciano: But yet I get the feeling that you, that Willson ... well you said Willson is not the leader type^{*}; he's

* In 1972 Willson was reviewed favorably and began his second five years as provost. On balance he has been an excellent provost. His conciliatory methods get results. D.E.McHenry
1/3/73

not giving the tremendous boost to his college that these other men are to their colleges. When you pick somebody internally, are you sacrificing at times?

McHenry: Well I think it'd all depend upon the individual and what's needed at the time. What Doctor McHenry prescribed, and also, I think, most of the rest of the people who were prescribing, was that there be a holding action and a conciliation of contending forces. It wasn't a well-organized college. Glenn had shown great capacity in the Academic Senate to bring discordant groups together in a slow gentle way. And the faculty of Stevenson, in my opinion, was not ready for a charismatic leader. There's some clans and subclans in there. And there are quite a few faculty swingers, and there are some potential agitators. And under the circumstances, Glenn is relatively a square, is square from the point of view of some of them, but he was the only one on which everybody could agree. And so I had the faculty set up a consultative committee of five, and they met with me, and this was of course making a precedent for the next time it happens ... it will happen, of course: How do you replace an existing, a sitting Provost? I had visions from having read the novels of C. P. Snow of all kinds of decrees and so on, but since this is ultimately a

Regents' appointment, we couldn't tell the faculty they could elect someone. They could recommend, and as it turned out, they recommended Willson, and that's exactly what I hoped they would do, and it was acceptable to the administration University-wide, and of course to the Regents.

STUDENT BEHAVIOR

College Discipline

McHenry: But you can't have all very charismatic-type leaders. Indeed, as you inferred, my job's made more difficult if we have them. Page Smith is a terrible administrator. He's getting better as he gets new office staff and so on, but he's still liable to do some damn fool thing for which he has no authority at all, and then we have to cover for him. He suspended two students in a handwritten note of which he took no copy! Nowadays when you suspend or dismiss students, you're liable to be in the courts. They hire an attorney and go to the courts, and he couldn't even remember what he wrote them. And this turns our attorneys gray. But this is the type of thing that he will do.

Calciano: A little naive really, about....

McHenry: Yes, yes. And you have to understand that....

Calciano: When did this instance take place? '65, or....

McHenry: Oh, about a year ago. '66-'67, second year. But he's

coming along better and learning the ropes and so on, and you hardly ever get a blooper of that kind anymore. But on the other hand, my God, he's so wonderful. He knows all the students by name; he understands their problems, is gentle with them in the way of handling them and their ... I was looking through disciplinary action taken in the various colleges yesterday, because I went down and spent an hour with Peter Chang* on law enforcement problems in relationship to the campus and the town. And I had tabulated the disciplinary actions taken in each of the three colleges. You know I've delegated the authority I have to discipline students to the colleges. And the only college that really has done a job with students on drugs and intervisitation is Cowell.

Calciano: Oh really!

McHenry: The only one. The others are permissive and behave like the three little monkeys, except for one little brief period when Max Levin was sick and Kenneth Thimann handled the student-relations problems (laughter) and then there was a blow-up.

Calciano: I was going to say, I thought Thimann would be strong.

* Ed. note: Santa Cruz County District Attorney

McHenry: I think they keep it from him..

Calciano: Oh! I see.

McHenry: He jet sets a lot and is away a lot and doesn't get the student problems, and Levin sits on them. I think both Rose and Smith believe that you've got to declare a standard and hold people up to it. And we had a very tough drug case in the college right at the end of May, and they dealt with it, I thought, very well, but I was scared as hell that under the law those of us who knew about it and didn't report it to the sheriff's office and the chief of police might be vulnerable to attack.

Calciano: You mean you dealt with it internally then?

McHenry: Yes. Indeed the college dealt with it internally except for the one case where we got involved in a dismissal. I didn't delegate dismissal to the colleges, but just other forms of punishment up to dismissal. And I dismissed the boy. But he was a seller. He was selling. He was selling marijuana.

Calciano: In Cowell?

McHenry: Cowell. One floor of Cowell.

Calciano: But you feel that some similar things could be going on in Crown and Stevenson and you would just never, you or the provosts would never....

McHenry: I think they are. But Rose and the others, the preceptors, have relations in Cowell such that one student saw this going on and said to a responsible person, "There's some terrible things going on my floor at Beard House." And the college carried on the rest from there.

Calciano: And this led to dismissal?

McHenry: Yes. Dismissal and four or five suspensions.

Calciano: But did you also turn them over to State or Federal authorities?

McHenry: No, we didn't.

Calciano: And this is where you're wondering whether you're vulnerable?

McHenry: Right.

Calciano: Was this the same instance you were talking about a minute ago where the college handled it internally?

McHenry: Well, this was the college, the same thing; the college handled internally and except for the dismissal case, which had to come to me, but I was involved from the beginning, because they called me at once, the college did, and I thought they handled it very well. And indeed they got confessions out of these kids. They said, "We have reports of drugs in your house and we'll talk to each of you individually, and if you've got any, you bring them in, and you make

your statement." And they went up to their rooms and came back with marijuana cigarettes, one case of hashish, and some marijuana seeds, and each of them turned in what he had, and this guy who'd been a supplier had quite a bit. And we fired him out of the University.

Calciano: Why were they so cooperative in bringing it all in?

McHenry: I think a good relationship established with the preceptors.

Calciano: And then what happened to the ones who were just possessing, not pushing?

McHenry: They were suspended for the balance of the quarter, but were allowed to take their exams, and they're returning in the fall on probation. But I thought it was very well handled, and I was awfully pleased to have Peter Chang saying not only that he thought it was well handled, but that he was going to write a letter to us saying that this is a good way to handle things; that such cases would probably lead to acquittals in the courts.

Calciano: Oh!

McHenry: Which then would induce them to do more.

Calciano: You're really on the spot, because if you toss the students right to the police, then you've got the

whole student community down your throat, and if you are too lenient, you've got the whole police and town community angry. I had heard that you were not too happy with the way the provosts were handling these disciplinary responsibilities, and that there was even a possibility that you might take back your initial powers.

McHenry: Well I just don't see how they could be taken back. I, as I told Willson yesterday, I still don't have full confidence that they're doing a job. The faculty preceptors say, "We don't want to be policemen." The RA's, the resident assistants, say, "You can't expect us to be policemen." And Willson says, "Well we told the proctor when we hired him, we didn't expect him to be a policeman." I said, "Who is the enforcement agent?" And also I think that the senior preceptor in Stevenson is particularly weak; that's David Kaun in economics.

Calciano: Did you pick him, or....

McHenry: No, no. Willson picked him.

Calciano: I see.

McHenry: And I don't think he has any real liaison with students. I think he just sits around and sucks on his pipe.

Calciano: Could Willson change him if he wanted to?

McHenry: Yes. But Willson doesn't have that kind of courage.

Calciano: Oh.

McHenry: I think he doesn't. I think he doesn't have much material to draw on. All the actors are on the stage; they're all there, and he can recast them a little bit, but not much.

Calciano: Why did Page quit?

McHenry: Well, he was breaking down physically and, I think, mentally.

Calciano: Directly from the strain?

McHenry: From the pressure. And I think he knew he wasn't doing a good job. It's a strange psychological thing; since I never studied any psychology, why I feel free to speak of it. They'd never had any children, and I think he's somewhat terrified of young people. I don't know. But he would go to this very permissive sort of attitude. We had at least two of his kids, Stevenson kids, who were arrested in town for marijuana, and he went down to the jail and talked in front of the jailer to the students in terms of, "When I was a student in Illinois, I smoked marijuana, and it never did me any harm," and of course the chief of the police department -- this is where Pini has, this is

one of the ways he got set that "something's going on up there," and they made a long distance call on the police phone to the lad's parents....

Calciano: Page did?

McHenry: Yes. Told them not to take this too seriously; these things just happen to all young people and so on. And this permissiveness, gee, just raised hell with our relations with the police department, and we've not overcome it yet. And of course I had then the spectre, and I still have since Stony Brook, of a big bust in which they got the search warrants and just descended on every college at the same time and roused people out of bed and so on.

Calciano: What is Stony Brook?

McHenry: Stony Brook, the State University of New York at Stony Brook.

Calciano: Oh.

McHenry: There was a 3:00 a.m. raid by a sheriff who was running for reelection with the most elaborate detective work done, pictures of every suspect, and they rounded out the strangest assortment of opium smoking devices, and caches of all kinds of drugs, and boys in bed with girls in the girls' dormitory and vice versa, and a family with two kids living in the

dormitory and ... oh, it was a terrible public relations thing, just awful. And they hadn't told the university at all that they were going to make the raid; they just came on. And this is the nightmare that we have that somebody could bust us.

Calciano: And they could, easily, right?

McHenry: Yes, except for our relations with the four judges who have to issue a search warrant, and the district attorney ... and this is our shield. The four judges are friendly and well informed, and I can't imagine that they would do this without warning us. I think our armor is in pretty good shape; that is, that the judges and the district attorney have a good deal of confidence in what we're doing.

UCSC's Relations with the City and County Police

McHenry: The relations with the police department and sheriff's office have never been very warm and intimate. They've been hot a couple of times (laughter), but not particularly friendly. You may ... do you want to go into this?

Calciano: Yes. I have questions on this.

McHenry: (Laughter) Well the first week the students came, most of them were without cars, and we had the Santa Cruz Transit Bus available, and they chipped in four bits apiece, 30 of them, and had a beach party ... you've

perhaps heard of this?

Calciano: I have, but the tape hasn't, so do go on.

McHenry: Yes. Well the youngsters had a good time at the beach, were getting acquainted for the first time, and a sheriff's office prowl car came, probably on a call from somebody, and they ran several of them in for a violation of curfew law, which of course I didn't know existed, even. And they hadn't any idea, and it isn't enforced against Santa Cruz residents anyway, in practice, I believe. And they caught two of our best young people, entering freshmen, with beer cans in their hands. And they were run in for possession of alcoholic beverages by minors. And one of them is a lad called Chapman who's from Sacramento and is pre-legal and I swear will be someday a very important lawyer in this State. The other is Bobby Richardson. Barbara Richardson's father is an atomic scientist at UCLA. They're the nicest kinds of kids, and if they'd been a little more sophisticated, they would have thrown it in the bushes or something. But it seems so harmless for kids of eighteen to have a can of beer. And I thought the sheriff's office threw the book at them. They brought them into the station, and they had to be turned over in the custody of somebody at the University ... indeed that's when I learned something

about Jasper Rose's temper.

Calciano: He rescued them?

McHenry: He was called down there, and he just blew his top. And they said, in effect, "Who in the world is that creature?" (Laughter) So after that we got new rules that the person to be called was Howard Shontz who was an old pro at this and handles people well and has had lots of military experience. But we had a meeting, the district attorney, Pease, his name was, Dick Pease ... he's practicing law here ... but Dick rather arrogantly summoned us to a meeting. And the police people, there were four or five of them, headed by Geno Pini, and the sheriff's office people headed by Doug James were there, and a deputy to Pease ... and they began to tell us how we should run things. And I probably went too far, but I told them that I thought our students, who came from good backgrounds and were a mighty gung-ho, mighty high-class select group, ought to be treated with the same respect that permanent residents of Santa Cruz from the best families were treated. And I said, "Perhaps you would not have booked for a first offense somebody from the Haber family, or one of the families here, and I don't think it's the proper thing to do that to our students." Well I think he probably would not, if we

had talked it over in advance, but this came on us in just the first week, and he had to back his deputies and so on. And Pease started telling me about all the terrible things that are going on up there, why somebody or other took kids from the Methodist Church, right out of the services in the evening, and young couples were going off with sleeping bags under their arms into the woods and so on.

Calciano: What did the Methodist Church have to do with it?

McHenry: Oh it just ... that was the reason they were up on the campus still.

Calciano: Oh, I see.

McHenry: And I said to Pini that you probably see a lot of things that you don't like, or that arouse your suspicions, but those people are on University property, and they have the permission of the Chancellor to make use of it for a picnic or whatever they like, and I would prefer that the city police not do anything about that ... that is, that our students on our property are at home. And it's just as if they were on property owned by their parents. If there's an offense of the law that's committed in their presence, why perhaps an arrest should be made, but they're not trespassing when they're using the property that's there for that purpose.

Calciano: Well you're thinking in the line of sex and beer?

McHenry: Well yes, yes.

Calciano: But when you get into marijuana, can this still hold? Because you really aren't allowed to smoke marijuana in your mother's living room, are you?

McHenry: It's an offense; beer's an offense, too, just the same, yes. Well I think it is, I'm not sure. Maybe providing it is the offense. Well possession, holding it in your hands, is an offense. The marijuana is a lot touchier because the penalties are very severe, and they can get up to five years in jail for it. In practice, the courts very rarely convict on first offense. And the possibility of getting evidence is very slight. And of course anytime that a city police car comes in the college area, the word passes immediately.

Calciano: By grapevine, or officially?

McHenry: No, no. I think it's just ... they're conscious of it, you see. And of course they can't enter without a search warrant either.

Calciano: Well now the city boundaries are on the bottom half of our campus only, aren't they?

McHenry: Well, we've annexed all the interior.

Calciano: Oh. Well suppose Pini or James did want to make a raid

out here and did have enough evidence and one of the judges did sign a search warrant, but warned you ... what would you do? What could you do?

McHenry: I don't know; I don't know. I think that I would be very surprised if a judge would do this without probable cause, and that is a good deal of detective work done in advance. But I don't ... if a judge issued such an order, there's nothing that we could do to stop him. And that's why we're concentrating on not having a warrant issued.

Calciano: I'm rather intrigued, because what you've been telling me now contrasts somewhat with the reputation that you have of being definitely.... Well of course you don't like drugs, but I think perhaps as an administrator and having to take the strong line, you've gotten an image in the minds of the kids and the faculty of being unrealistic, and here you are so "liberal" on this by a conservative definition.

McHenry: Well I think a lot of it is we should deal with these problems ourselves. That college is a period in which young people make an adjustment to adulthood, and that we ought to have a sort of a transition zone in which to operate. But if you look at it realistically, going at it this way probably produces a more effective law enforcement and a more effective curb on the use of

drugs than the other way. And I don't think that a bust, a raid on the whole of Beard House or all of Cowell College, would produce anything. I think that the youngsters, if they had marijuana, would flush it down toilets and so on. The chances of their catching anybody are very slight I think, with evidence that would stick. And the chances of proper legal procedures being followed are relatively slight -- the warning that any statement you make could be used against you, and all these other things -- the amenities of due process are unlikely, and so in the end.... Well, to my knowledge, no student of the University has ever been convicted in Santa Cruz County of a crime, certainly none involving drugs. And I think I can remember three instances in which there have been arrests in town, and each time they've gotten off on a technicality or stupidity of the arresting officer or something of the kind. When our preceptors can say, "Are you smoking a marijuana cigarette?" ... for example, the first case we had last fall was in Cowell; it involved the son of a State Senator. Herman Blake went down the hall and said, "It smells like somebody's smoking marijuana. Who is it?" And he knocked on a door and said, "Anybody in here smoking marijuana?" And a boy said,

"I am." Well now he would never have said that to a police officer. And a police officer would have had to have had a warrant to be there. Now we suspended him. Two weeks, or something like that. A terrible blow; the only child; a terrible blow to his mother and father, but they knew damn well he could have gotten 90 days in jail, or something more perhaps, or at least that they would have gotten publicity if it'd gone into the courts. So our penalties, our dismissal, for example, of this guy who was handling the stuff -- and incidentally this is locked up for ten years....

Calciano: It's sealed.

McHenry: The boy who we dismissed, I knew his mother slightly 35 years ago at UCLA. His father, who just retired, is one of the major motion picture producers of Hollywood. And his father and mother are both close friends of the Page Smiths and of the Ted Youngs, and socially, at least, are acquaintances of ours. So these things are tough. That boy might have gotten the book thrown at him, if they'd ever caught him, but I don't think the police could have caught him. But I think the punishment that we've administered, and Peter Chang agreed, was severe; that is, he's dismissed from this institution, and he may not

return.

Calciano: If he applied to another institution, is it on his record why he was suspended?

McHenry: It is, yes.

Calciano: What ever happens if one of our campus police sees a guy smoking a joint?

McHenry: Well I think the campus police are pretty much obliged by the nature of their oath to turn it over to ... if it's proper evidence ... to turn it over to the district attorney. But they're not likely to see it. The most common contact with drugs that they have is that a groundsman, or a tree crew working around a hollow tree, will discover a cellophane bag of some peculiar substance, and they just take it down to the police station, and then it's identified, and there've been quite a few such things hidden in hollow trees and so on. But a search warrant would never bring those out. They're just dropped accidentally or they're....

Calciano: Are these sort of guidelines that you put out, are they more liberal than other institutions, or are most institutions sort of walking this tight rope the same way?

McHenry: Well I think most are walking the tight rope. I talked to a couple of Chancellors last week during the

Regents meetings, and their attitude was that when there were serious suspicions of drugs, they used the campus police at once, and the campus police turned the materials and the people over to law enforcement. So in a way, I suppose we're more permissive. On the other hand, I think the way the college system operates, I couldn't send the campus police into a college and have the college have any sense of autonomy. And the tip-offs that come almost always come within the college, because the preceptors and the provosts know the students so well. And therefore that kind of thing wouldn't exist in another campus.

Calciano: So in effect we may have better control than other....

McHenry: I think so. I like to hope so.

The Campus Police

Calciano: I wanted to ask you at some point, and I might as well now. You mentioned that Kerr, when he became Chancellor, had to fight with Sproul to gain control of the campus police, and this is something that all Chancellors have. Well now, what did you mean by "control of the campus police?" You can deploy them, I've gathered.... McHenry: [Affirmative nod]

Calciano: You hire and dismiss them?

McHenry: [Affirmative nod]

Calciano: Now I don't quite understand their relation with other police agencies around. Are they....

McHenry: Well I'm not sure whether they're deputized or not. When we began here, Doug James, as Sheriff, appointed the first one or two as deputy sheriffs, and Hal Hyde had a deputy sheriff's badge. Hal's given it up since then and ... I think under the law, our police are law enforcement officers. They are a recognized police force and as such are somewhat parallel to a city police force. Indeed we have eight men, I think, and that's as big as many small cities have. In my day, in Lompoc, a long time ago, we had one part-time constable who sold real estate on the side. (Laughter) And that was all. But I think that many fair-sized towns do not have a police force bigger than we have, and I think we'd rely wholly upon the general laws for the authority of this force.

Calciano: Well when you have a thievery case or something, do you call on the city police, or do we use our own campus police?

McHenry: Well our own campus police handle these cases.

Calciano: Are they trained in the proper techniques?

McHenry: Yes. And we've given time off, in some instances, for people who didn't seem to be well enough trained to go to school. We've had a couple of them go to the FBI

school, and we have, as you may have heard in the Library, target practice.

Calciano: I know we've had thefts there; is that what you mean?

McHenry: No, no. Our police force goes on the range and does target practice.

Calciano: Oh, I see. (Laughter) I thought you meant something in the Library.

McHenry: You haven't heard the recent blowup about the National Rifle Association?

Calciano: Well I'm aware of that [the national controversy], but I didn't know we had a blowup of our own.

McHenry: No, no. I meant on the campus, now. Your colleague, Richard Moore.

Calciano: Oh no! Now this I don't know anything about.

McHenry: Well I got a letter from him, done on Library stationery, saying, "You ought to know that an application is pending for University membership in the National Rifle Association," and then he went on to say that they're terrible people and so on, and they ought to get rid of arms and ... you know Moore?

Calciano: Yes.

McHenry: And so by golly, soon as I got it, I circled this "application pending" and asked Hyde a series of questions: "Is this true? And if it's true, how did

Moore find out about it?"

Calciano: Oh yes. (Laughter)

McHenry: "And if it's true, cancel or rescind at once. We are not going to have a University membership in the NRA." Well it turned out that it was true.

Calciano: It was?

McHenry: That the University was proposing to pay a \$5 membership; this was for Instructor McClellan, one of the officers who is the instructor in the use of hand guns, so that they can use the rifle range in De Laveaga Park. Well the whole thing was pretty well settled yesterday. I put a \$5 bill in an envelope and handed it to Hal and said, "This is an anonymous donation to Mr. McClellan personally. Withdraw the application," (apparently Moore was sitting on it in the Library (laughter), because it came over because there were certain publications involved) "and get it back, but get it back through Don Clark and the Library office, and not through Moore. And we don't want anything on the books that indicates that the University in any way supports this, so use my \$5." (Laughter) So it's all over.

Calciano: Oh, the pitfalls are so many, aren't they? (Laughter)

McHenry: Yes, yes. Well the National Rifle Association at this time is to me one of the most reprehensible lobbies

there is. I'm awfully sorry. They've got all locked in with the military in so many ways, in rifle ranges all over the country, and Boy Scout instructions, safe use of weapons and so on. But then they've got this venal side to them of knifing proper legislation, and it's a sad one. But I'd say before we leave law enforcement and the police aside, I'd like to say that I think we've got an awfully good police force here. Ray McIntyre is first-rate, and it's a very professional group under his leadership. And they've accepted this notion that-the college is a kind of a sanctuary, and while they obviously don't like some of the agitator types in the faculty and the student body, they've been willing to, we taught them to at least not take any overt action. If we ever had violence, I don't know how vigorously they'd wield their nightsticks and so on. But one little episode that you haven't heard from the Library gossip. Within something like 24 hours of the time that Moore wrote this letter, he was arrested for riding his bicycle on the wrong side of the road.

Calciano: Oh no! (Laughter) Oh no!

McHenry: And both Aileen [Sanders] and Don [Clark] were very disturbed about it, because he'd copied Don in this letter and copied Ray McIntyre in the letter, and our

suspensions were aroused immediately that some of the police saw this letter, and they knew him because he rides the bike, and nabbed him.

Calciano: Oh. I suppose one other thing we should finish up.

There's a lot of stuff in the school papers about Mace.

McHenry: Yes.

Calciano: Do you want to make any comment?

McHenry: We have had Mace for about two years, and it has been carried perhaps a year and a half in little leather cases in the officer's uniform in small cannisters. And I think you know Mace is mainly tear gas, but the complete chemical formula for Mace has not been revealed, because it hasn't been patented yet, and therefore it's very difficult to get a proper scientific investigation of it. When Los Angeles and San Francisco canceled the carrying of Mace after the Surgeon General's report that there may be some danger to the eyes, scar tissue in the eyes for people who get it there directly and don't wash afterwards, the students began agitating to take it away, and how they ever found that ... I've been worried about a leak in the mails or in the police office itself, and I thought maybe Moore heard about the NRA through somebody who was operating in the police office, or in

accounting, maybe, as something had gone through. I hadn't thought of this publication angle. But somehow it leaked; that is, the fact that they were carrying Mace became known. And I think the officers fraternize with the students a little too much, "What's that?" and "What's that for?" and so on. At any rate, the students started the agitation. And after the Inter-college Board discussed it with me, I agreed to take it under advisement and that evening decided that the Mace ought to be withdrawn from the officers, but kept in the police office against the possibility of a riot someday. The next day a motley assortment of five people came deceptively --they said they had emergency information about dangerous drugs and so on -- made an appointment, then came, just before I had to leave for the Regents meeting. And when their spokesman said, "We want to talk to you about Mace," I said, "You've made this appointment under a deception. My secretary told you that I didn't have time, leaving for the Regents, to talk about anything except the most urgent matters, and this is a form of dishonesty that I don't think is appropriate for a University student." "Well it was important to them," and so on and so on. And you probably ... do you see Libre, the Stevenson college mimeographed publication?

Calciano: No. I picked this up out of the The City on a Hill.

McHenry: Yes, the campus one. They never ran the letter, but I did write a letter to the Inter-college Board which they released, and Libre printed it in full, which explained that the decision was made before these people came in on the basis of the representations made by the Inter-college Board, and I was sorely tempted after their display of bad manners and dishonesty to rescind the order, but I decided to let it stand and that the cannisters be withdrawn. They had themselves a kind of a protest meeting on the Friday, this ran in successive days, like Tuesday, Wednesday, and then Friday, skipping a day, then Friday, in which they met in the quarry and protested about the whole thing. But it's primarily an activist group that grabs onto anything that's a grievance. The Mace has never been used, and it probably is a good deal better being sprayed with Mace than having a bullet through your head, and that might be the choice under some circumstances.

Calciano: Yes, I've always been kind of intrigued at the controversy. I agree it should be shot at the chest and not right in the eyes, but it seems to me infinitely more desirable than nightsticks going whacking through a crowd.

McHenry: Well, I think the point is that some of the activist students just wanted to protest, and this was a thing in the newspapers, and the very idea that somebody's precious eyesight might be damaged.

Calciano: You got kind of a bad press out of it, didn't you?

McHenry: Well that's because of the ... a psychiatrist, a former student of mine who has been working some with students here since then, said that what they want is to strike at somebody who can't or won't strike back, and this is almost a classic case of it. And the newspaper has been slanted this way, and I have no way to answer.

Calciano: Does this get under your skin?

McHenry: Yes.

Calciano: Yes. You don't get used to it? (Laughter)

McHenry: No. No, I think it's bad journalism not to at least call me, and they made no attempt to do so. But there's a cheerful thing about it: the top two places in the newspaper are now going over to moderate heads, and if I had issued a blast, I don't think they would have. (Laughter)

Calciano: Look on the bright side. (Laughter)

McHenry: Greg Ward is the new editor, and the new assistant editor is Marilyn Shea, who is a first-class newspaper-woman; she worked on the Riverside Press

Enterprise.

Calciano: What's happened to Zack Wasserman?

McHenry: Well, I suppose he'll be on the staff, and I think this was largely his work, his and Alex Bloom's, the misreporting and the editorials.

Calciano: But you don't know how they got shunted down in a lower position?

McHenry: I don't know what all happened. But Nancy Coleman, who is their pal, is still going to be managing editor so ... but moderates hold two out of three places now, the top places.

Calciano: You may or may not know that I did a series of twelve student interviews last spring, and one of the reasons I did it, and I say so in the introduction, is that you can't tell from student publications what the mass of students are or are not thinking. And I wanted to get perhaps more perspective on some of these things, and I'm quite pleased with them. We aren't releasing them till all the kids turn 21, finally release them, but they were just short interviews, quite good.*

McHenry: Well it always amazes me that I hear so much bitching from students, and the newspapers have this negative tone that everything's wrong, and yet any one of those

* Ed. note: A second series of interviews were held in 1969 with twelve members of the class of '69, UCSC's first four-year

kids who's picked up by a visitor and asked will spend time showing them around and gives them lavish praise of the institution; it's the damndest thing. You know how the prospective donors every once in a while will come early for an appointment, two hours early, and go to the college and get a cup of coffee and sit and talk, and I think, "Oh, we're dead, we're dead," and then ... especially foundation representatives sometimes will do this ... and then when you talk to them you find out that they got the biggest sales line (laughter) from students who didn't know who they were. It's a curious thing.

Calciano: "We can attack our own institution, but, boy, nobody else on the outside's going to!"

McHenry: I don't understand it at all. But this whole question of whether you can answer attacks is one that has puzzled me a good deal. And Hinderaker of Riverside, when he got into a major controversy in the student body, asked for and received a few column inches in every issue of the paper. And he just used it, he may still be doing it, as a kind of a rumor clinic. And he answered things and straightened things out and so on. I've been thinking a little bit about this possibility.

Calciano: This is why I've already asked you in one case, and I will in several other cases, on controversial things, I'll say, "Now why have you decided not to make it more clear to the general University community what your stand is?" There seems to be a gap in communications at times. I'm sure you talk with the ones who are most grieved, but the other people on campus hear all the static and don't hear the answer.

McHenry: I think this place is much worse in gossip, probably because so many people live here, and live here so intensively, than nearly any place I've been. It's a curious thing that the gossip goes and goes, and sometimes there's no basis at all, or a very slight basis, and then it balloons up and the news spreads, you know. But I don't know what could be done about it. We don't have the resources to issue an internal bulletin on any basis of regularity. I just don't know. We use the Chancellor's Memo quarterly to deal with some of these things, and every once in a while I take a page of it to try to express some views, and I've got one to write right now for a Friday deadline.

Calciano: And I notice you used the commencement to state a policy.

McHenry: Yes, yes. There's quite a bit of controversy about

that. Faculty letters and so on. It's an interesting thing -- one of the best letters from students came from a lad who lives in the County and who was very anxious to disarm the police, very emotional, but it was a moving letter really about, "you've got to make a start someplace and take those arms away from police" and we checked the registrar's office and found that he graduated from high school while he was in reform school.

Calciano: Oh my heavens!

McHenry: We haven't run a criminal identification on him, but I dare say ... well I was just guessing ... but I bet it was an armed robbery, (laughter) when he was fifteen or so.

Trans: Doris Johnson

Typed: Doris Johnson

Digitized: TriAxial Data Systems

RESEARCH

See Volume I, pp 394-395, for the list of sources used
in preparation for these interviews.