

UC Berkeley

Journal Articles

Title

Few concerns, fewer Women

Permalink

<https://escholarship.org/uc/item/4m74r6v3>

Journal

Chronicle of the University of California, 1(2)

Author

Colvig, Ray

Publication Date

1998

Peer reviewed

FEW CONCERNS, FEWER WOMEN

Ray Colvig

THE EVENT ON OCTOBER 10, 1960—a dinner at University House hosted by Chancellor Glenn T. Seaborg—was to honor forty-five Berkeley faculty members who had earned tenure through promotion to the rank of associate professor. Among them were future academic leaders such as Earl F. Cheit (business administration), Norman Phillips (chemistry), Arthur Rosenfeld (physics), Neil Smelser (sociology), and Robert Wiegel (engineering). The invitation said “stag.” That was not unusual. It meant, as everyone knew, that wives weren’t invited. Except, as Seaborg noted in his journal, “it turned out it was not a strictly stag affair because one of the new associate professors is a lady—Mary Ann Morris of the Department of Nutrition and Home Economics.”¹ A lady at a stag event! Heavens, how embarrassing!

During Seaborg’s years as chancellor at Berkeley (1958-61), it was never surprising when gatherings of upper-ranked faculty and administrators were entirely or mostly all-male affairs. The fact that women had a different “place” was widely understood and was only mentioned jocularly if at all. An example of treating the situation with humor was a note that Seaborg’s secretary circulated in 1958 to the clerical workers as well as the higher-ups on the chancellor’s staff: “Dr. S. has agreed to tell us all something about the Geneva Atoms for Peace Conference [which Seaborg had recently attended] during the first hour of the next Cabinet meeting—Tues., Dec. 2—Conference Room—noon—bring your own lunch. The ladies will adjourn to their drawing rooms at one o’clock and leave the gentlemen to their brandy and cigars—and business.”²

For a university that had been dedicated to coeducation³ for almost nine decades, Berkeley remained a place where women were welcomed as undergraduates but seldom actively recruited in those years bridging the “silent” ’50s and the growing activism of the ’60s. A comparison of pre-World War II and postwar enrollment statistics⁴ tells an interesting story. In 1939-40, women were thirty-eight percent of Berkeley’s 14,331 undergraduates and thirty-one percent of 3,539 graduate students. In 1949-50, in a campus population swelled by thousands of war veterans (mostly men), women comprised twenty-nine percent of the 19,237 undergraduates and twenty-two percent of the 6,066 graduate students.

After another decade, in 1959-60, Berkeley’s undergraduate population had declined to 15,283, nearly to its pre-war level, and women had regained their earlier portion at thirty-nine percent (a figure that would continue to rise toward full parity over the next two decades). But while the total graduate enrollment had continued to inch upward, to a total of 6,656, the portion of women graduate students (twenty-three percent) had remained stuck at the earlier postwar level.

In the fall of 1997, after years of affirmative action and in a far different environment, women were forty-nine and one-half percent of Berkeley’s 21,783 undergraduates and forty-four percent of the 8,552 graduate students.

The failure at Berkeley and elsewhere to improve the participation of women in most graduate fields during the “baby boom” period (the missing women, in fact, were among those having the babies) produced repercussions later when the baby boomers reached college age. By that time there was a strong demand and even a policy requirement to hire

more women faculty members, but qualified candidates were scarce in most fields and almost nonexistent in some.

Berkeley students arriving toward the end of the 1950s found a highly distinguished faculty that was only a few years away from gaining the campus recognition as “the best-balanced distinguished university” in the nation⁵—but as at most other universities it was a faculty that was overwhelmingly white and male. The university’s public accounting of its faculty occurs in the annual *Announcement of Courses* (now called *The General Catalog*), where traditionally the “regular” faculty (both active and emeritus tenured and tenure-track professors as well as instructors) are listed first and those in temporary positions (lecturers, visitors, teaching associates, etc.) are in a second category. Counting all the departmental lists in Berkeley’s *Announcement* for 1958-59 yields a total “regular” faculty of 1,187—of which sixty-one (5.1 percent) are women.⁶ Subtracting twelve women listed as emeritae leaves only forty-nine women in active status on Berkeley’s entire “regular” faculty. Thus each of Berkeley’s sixty-six teaching departments in 1959-60 had *on average* one seventy-four hundredths of a woman on active “regular” status.

Even those meager figures are misleading, because Berkeley’s small cadre of women faculty members was scattered unevenly around the campus. For example, there were only seven departments with three or more women on the “regular” faculty: decorative art (six women), education (three), librarianship (three), nutrition and home economics (nine), physical education (four), public health (eight), and social welfare (three). And, furthermore, this “honor roll” itself was shaky: decorative art was to be reorganized within a few years into a smaller Department of Design and moved from the College of Letters and Science to the College of Environmental Design (and, much later, to be absorbed entirely into the Departments of Art or Architecture); also, the home economics major was to disappear by 1962, with several women faculty either retiring or transferring to UC Davis.

What we might call the “dishonor roll” included twenty-two of Berkeley’s larger departments—those with ten or more men *but no women* in the “regular” faculty status: agricultural economics (thirteen men), anthropology (sixteen), architecture (twenty-one), art (twenty), bacteriology (ten), biochemistry (eighteen), botany (fourteen), chemistry (thirty-six), classics (fourteen), engineering (college) (175), entomology and parasitology (sixteen), forestry (fifteen), geology (fourteen), military science (thirteen), music (sixteen), optometry (eighteen), philosophy (sixteen), physics (forty), plant pathology (fifteen), political science (twenty-eight), soils and plant nutrition (sixteen) and zoology (twenty-five). Three departments listed women on the “regular” faculty only in emerita status: law (eighteen men, one emerita), mathematics (forty-six men, two emeritae), and sociology (seventeen men, one emerita).

A few women “enjoyed” the status of being the only woman in both active and “regular” faculty status in their departments: anatomy (six men and Miriam E. Simpson), business administration (fifty-eight men and Catherine DeMotte Quire), dramatic art (five men and Henrietta Harris), economics (thirty-three men and Emily H. Huntington), English (forty-three men and Josephine Miles), history (thirty-four men and Adrienne Koch), journalism (six men and Jean S. Kerrick), landscape architecture (six men and Mai K. Arbegast), oriental languages (eight men and Mary R. Haas), physiology (four men and Paola S. Timiras), psychology (twenty-two men and Jean Walker Macfarlane), and Spanish and Portuguese (fifteen men and Dorothy C. Shadi).

The shortage of women teachers was particularly acute in the College of Letters and Science, where a headcount from listings in the 1958-59 *Announcement* shows only twenty-five women (3.9 percent) among 646 “regular” faculty—and seven of those women are listed as emeritae. Toward the end of 1958, with plans calling for a large expansion of Berkeley’s

enrollment over the following decade, Lincoln Constance, dean of the college, sent a questionnaire to his forty-five department heads to inquire about their faculty recruiting problems. Seaborg summarized the results in his *Journal*:

. . . One of the questions asked in [Constance's] questionnaire to department heads and in subsequent conversations concerned the willingness to consider qualified women for open positions. The response to this question varied greatly between departments. The Political Science Department reported that "women will be considered for regular staff appointments in any field in which they are qualified." The Zoology Department indicated that women would be considered for teaching assistant positions but would not be considered for regular staff appointments. The Biochemistry Department bluntly stated, "Qualified women candidates will not be considered for appointment." Other departments, such as Physics and Mathematics, commented on the lack of qualified women in their fields. Mathematics remarked that there are so few women who enter their field that "one might infer that women have a prejudice against mathematics." Considering the critical shortage of higher education teachers anticipated in the next ten years (which has been so much talked about recently), it seems a real pity that women are not given more serious consideration.⁷

The issue had come up in another way, but only by implication, when *Esquire* published (in September 1958) an article titled "The Bright Young Men of Science." Author Paul Klopsteg, then president-elect of the American Association for the Advancement of Science, wrote that he had consulted with many scientific leaders to develop a list of eleven scientists, none over thirty-six, who could be considered the most brilliant in the nation. They included several present and future winners of the Nobel Prize (Murray Gell-Mann, Tsung-Dao Lee, Chen-Ning Yang, James D. Watson, Joshua Lederberg, and Elias J. Corey) along with such other developing superstars as Allan Sandage, Carl Djerassi, and Frank Press. What President Clark Kerr wanted to know, in a request he sent to Seaborg, was why there were no faculty members at Berkeley or any University of California campus on the list. Seaborg and his assistant, Professor William Fretter, researched the issue and held extensive consultation with other chancellors, provosts, and deans throughout the university system. Their report, presented to the board of regents in January 1959, cited such problems as intense salary competition, inadequate facilities, and (in the case of Lee and Yang) prejudice on the West Coast against Chinese-Americans. But no one thought to mention what might have been a key element in solving the problem—that is, the advancement of efforts to educate and then recruit to the faculty many more bright young women.⁸

Seaborg's papers⁹ as well as his *Journal* show that at least one effort at Berkeley to consider the lack of academic opportunities for women was sprouted and then withered on the vine. Before Kerr left the chancellorship of the Berkeley campus in July 1958, to become president of the university, he authorized the appointment of a committee to find a "home" for a new major program in community and family living—which up to that time had been an adjunct of the soon-to-disappear major in home economics. When committee chair Catherine Landreth (of the Department of Home Economics) met with Seaborg in January 1959, she reported that the committee had searched among several departments but had failed to find any interest in sponsoring the major. But then, as Seaborg wrote, the committee was drawn to a wider discussion:

... These considerations led the Committee to explore the role of women in the University because they felt this major had been suggested on account of concern with this larger matter. The Committee put to itself four questions: (1) Why are there only 50 percent as many women as men in Berkeley in view of the fact that intelligence is not genetically determined by sex? (2) Why is distribution in various departments as it is? (3) What is the obligation of the state university with respect to educating women? (4) How can women be given equality in the light of number 2 above? ... The Committee feels these are the more important questions to be considered and must be faced up to in the near future. They do not feel a report on their original assignment, other than this verbal one, would necessarily be fruitful.¹⁰

Vice Chancellor James D. Hart, who had originally appointed the Landreth committee a year earlier, responded to Seaborg's information the following day with a tone of some annoyance. In charging the committee, Hart wrote, he had said that he was "not proposing ... to study the larger issue of the status of education for women, which was proposed by Dean [Knowles] Ryerson [of Berkeley's College of Agriculture], because I believe the subject ... previously mentioned ... is more immediately pressing and the larger issue, which might involve some of the same people, can wait until the subject of a group major has been studied." Nevertheless, Hart wrote to Seaborg, the committee appointed to study the new group major "seems to have studied the whole issue of the role of women in the University ... I do not know what can be done about the committee's four questions since so far as I am aware there is no discrimination against the admission of women to the University or to departments within it."¹¹ Therefore, unless a formal request comes from the committee or some other source, I assume that all issues raised in my letter [of a year ago] should be tabled."¹² And, of course, that is just what happened.

In his inaugural address at Berkeley's Charter Day on March 20, 1959, Seaborg made it clear that he was aware of the lack of opportunities for women and minorities—and that changes were needed: "... According to our creed, the individual must be free to cultivate to the utmost his own talents. If we are to survive in the contest of the intellect, we must persuade young people that fullest development of their talents will be rewarding to them and is essential to the survival of humanist ideals. To the same ends, we must extend our efforts to rescue lost talent, among women and among minority groups."¹³ In areas where he had direct influence, Seaborg did try to open more opportunities for women; for example, he championed the admission of women into his graduate group in nuclear chemistry (which met weekly at the Radiation Laboratory) and throughout his career as a science leader he has supported the advancement of women scientists in teaching, research, and government service. But Seaborg's term as chancellor was brief—he left after two and a half years to become chairman of the U.S. Atomic Energy Commission—and there was neither time nor evidence of support for improving the status of women.

Seaborg's world both on and away from the campus was often in a place where women's voices were faint or not heard at all. Only men made up the group of "chief campus officers"—the chancellors and provosts who met each month with President Kerr. Only men made up the director's council at the Radiation Laboratory. Only men could belong to The Faculty Club. (Women could eat there only as guests of members, and by long tradition they were not supposed to be seated in the Great Hall or to use the lounges and recreation areas.)¹⁴ Within the Northern Division of the Academic Senate, men held all the key committee chairmanships except one in 1959-60, while at the powerful Academic Council (the faculty's conduit to the regents) there were no exceptions.

When, in 1959, Seaborg was invited to join President Eisenhower's Science Advisory Committee (PSAC), he found an influential and prestigious organization of eighteen members (all men) assisted by six major consultants (also all men). Much of PSAC's work was conducted through study panels, where members were joined by outside experts (including leading scientists, educators, and business executives) to study and issue reports on vital issues of the nation's defense, economy, and civic well-being. There were fifteen such panels during Seaborg's tenure comprising a total of 156 members. Again, all men.

In the student area, the Associated Students (ASUC) had a long tradition of electing men as president (with brief exceptions during World War II) and a constitutional requirement that the second vice president be a woman (to serve as "hostess" of the Association). No one seemed to object to that; it was the way it had always been. Women had a better shake in some other student activities, however. At the *Daily Californian*, for example, the first woman editor (Sarita Henderson) was chosen in 1941, and women appeared regularly in the top position after that (including Marge Madonna and Anne Ruggeri during Seaborg's tenure).

Major-level intercollegiate athletics were restricted to men at Berkeley until the 1970s, with women's sports relegated to intramural and low or non-funded "association" competition. At Cal football games, the large area of central seating on the east side of Memorial Stadium was the men's rooting section—a source of frequent worry to the administration because of outbreaks of rowdiness. Not much had changed since 1948, when *LIFE* published a huge article on the University of California with a striking portrayal of the contrasting situations in sports.¹⁵ On the cover are eager, well-dressed women students sitting in the "mixed" rooting section. Inside, in a color photo, women in bathing suits are grouped around the pool at Hearst Gymnasium—an Esther Williams-like tableau. But then, ending the big spread, is a full-page photo enlarging a portion of the men's rooting



section. With the yell leaders whipping up spirits ("Everybody up for the *LIFE* photographer"), every student stands up shouting with his fist raised. And if you look carefully, you can see what the airbrush artist didn't quite eliminate: every middle finger raised as well. The men's rooting section was making its "statement."

In an earlier decade, even the pre-game spirit events were segregated. A student writing home to his parents describes the "men's smoker" held at the Men's (later Harmon) Gymnasium before the Big Game in 1937: "... Boy, what a mad mess that smoker was. Six thousand men students in the gym with no restraint at all—a good proportion were drunk. For

the first 15 minutes, everybody just yelled and yelled. . . . Such a racket, it didn't sound like it could possibly be made by any 'civilized' group of people. Thousands of firecrackers, among them giant ones, put the finishing touch on the din. . . . The coaches, the NBC football commentator . . . [and a] big cheese Pacific Coast football scout all gave little talks and told filthy jokes; nasty songs and yells were lustily bellered forth; the band played; the team was introduced; and it was over." Afterward, the student wrote, the men joined the women students (who had attended their own "smoker" in Hearst Gymnasium) and as crowds surged through the streets they broke windows, looted stores, started fires, and even turned over the official car of Berkeley's fire chief—because it was painted hated Stanford's red!¹⁶

Much of the discrimination in 1958-61 that affected women's roles was subtle—the stuff of omissions and euphemisms. But sometimes it could be blatant, even brazen, with the assumption that no one would object. Such was the case when the position of school and college placement officer was "decentralized" from the systemwide administration to the campuses. The new campus Educational Placement Office would help students find teaching jobs at all levels—certainly, a position of special importance to women. The longtime systemwide manager sent a memo to the chancellor describing the role of the office and spelling out specifications for the job search: ". . . In the light of the above considerations, desirable qualifications for the manager are: (1) He should be male. (2) He should be between 35 and 45 years of age. (3) He should possess sound judgment, integrity and a high quality of leadership . . ." and so forth (listing twelve qualifications in all). Later, the chancellor received a follow-up memo listing five recommended candidates for the job (all male, of course) and enclosing a copy of the published job criteria, which included "male, approximately 40 years of age." Although a policy of fair employment had been established at the university, it obviously did not yet apply to gender—or to age either.¹⁷

The calendar had just turned over to 1960 when an upscale women's magazine, *Mademoiselle*, featured the first published article by a new writer—Berkeley alumna (class of 1956) and former *Daily Californian* staff writer Joan Didion.¹⁸ Titled "Berkeley's Giant: The University of California," it is a sometimes breezy but fact-filled portrait, tailored for the young woman's point of view, exploring the prevailing ethos and lifestyles of the campus.



Freshman editors of the *Daily Californian* staff, Didion seated second from left. 1953 *Blue and Gold*.

In the opening paragraph Didion takes us women-watching: “. . . Sit among the flowering crab-apple and loquat trees in front of Dwinelle Hall and watch the girls with white buck shoes and pale cashmere sweaters and the inevitable mackintoshes; should you see a girl wearing knee socks, you’re looking at a transfer from Wellesley. Watch the sunburned, long-legged girls from around Los Angeles; watch the sunburned, long-legged girls from the San Joaquin and Sacramento Valleys. You can tell the valley girls from the southern girls because they move faster and make up their eyes.”

Later, Didion startles us with a charming put-down of the intellectual atmosphere at her alma mater: “. . . Call it the weather, call it the closing of the frontier, call it the failure of Eden; the fact remains that Californians are cultivating America’s lushest growth of passive nihilism right along with their bougainvillaea. Enterprises that seemed important in the East, where the world is scaled to human beings, lose their significance beneath California’s immense, bland sky; transient passions fade in the face of the limitless Pacific. Most of Berkeley’s students grow up under that sky and in sight of that Pacific, spend their childhood in that climate of Eden, and they come to college totally unequipped with what makes Sammy run.”

In her passages on Berkeley’s faculty, she alludes to the gender roles: “. . . The faculty comes for one or more of three reasons: the prestige, good as gold in academic circles, the library, ranked with Harvard’s and the Library of Congress as one of America’s three top research facilities, and the charm of the countryside. They live in redwood-and-glass houses hanging perilously from the hills; the higher their status, the higher they live on the hill. Their wives may wear tweeds from Magnin or batik skirts; in either case, they’re likely to keep looms in the living room. They gather at one another’s nests to drink California wine and eat artichokes, to sing *The Streets of Laredo* for auld lang syne and to throw darts at the big-name members of their departments.”¹⁹

Much of Didion’s article, however, describes the experience of women students—with emphasis on those who are “affiliated” (i.e. living in sororities)—and there are hints toward explaining why their ambitions were often limited (as in these passages):

“A lot of us don’t admit it, but what we came here for was to meet a husband,” a sophomore tells you over tea in the large and rather formal living room of one of Berkeley’s “good houses.” A good house is a sorority with a high bidding power; i.e., one that can depend upon pledging its pick of the seven-hundred-odd girls who rush each September. Members of a good house bear a startling resemblance to one another, although the “look” of a house can change from year to year. Kappa Kappa Gammas at Berkeley tend to be tall, blond and healthy, with a creamy placidity to their complexions; Pi Phi is tall and rangy; Tri Deltas and Delta Gammas are on the whole smaller, less placid and generally count several home-coming queens and sweethearts of Sigma Chi among their number. The same homogeneity, which suggests that rushing is an exercise in narcissism, operates among the “good” fraternities; the Betas, for example, are solid but charming, the Dekes fancy themselves devastating wastrels.

. . . In a house a girl observes all the amenities of life at home. She reads or plays bridge until dinner, against a comforting counterpoint of soft voices, muffled telephones and someone picking out an everlasting *Autumn in New York* on the piano. After dinner the housemother pours coffee in the living room from a silver urn, pledges drift off to their compulsory three-hour study period and upperclassmen settle down to study or knit or watch television and to wait for the telephone.



Bridge game in sorority. 1951 *Blue and Gold*.

Since dating at Berkeley is largely intramural, the Weekend, in its Eastern sense, does not exist. On Friday night an affiliated girl is likely to go with her date to a movie or to one of a dozen pleasantly murky bars with open fires in Berkeley or San Francisco; later they drive up into the hills to drink beer and talk and watch the blaze of lights spread out below: Oakland, San Francisco, and the bridges that span the bay. Should the mists begin to blow in off the Pacific, they come down immediately; lockout is 2:30 a.m., the penalty for missing it is a campused or dateless weekend, and Berkeley's frequent blinding fogs fail to impress the dean's office as a valid excuse for anything at all.

"... I wish we could go somewhere besides fraternity parties," a pretty girl tells you wistfully, and another, a transfer from a smaller California college, adds: "I used to go out with boys I wouldn't dream of marrying. Sometimes now I miss that." She sounds quite as if she were expressing a desire to see the far side of the moon, and she is, in her terms, doing just that. Her entire *modus vivendi* is oriented toward the day when she will be called upon to pour coffee in her own living room. Losing sight of that eminently sensible goal is wandering down the primrose path indeed and is regarded with the same wonder in her circle at Berkeley as it would be in a Jane Austen novel. . . . They have come to Berkeley to prepare for adult life, and adult life is that "Scarsdale Galahad" or his California equivalent.

Didion didn't notice, or she didn't think it was worth mentioning, that a small but noisy element of political activism had recently emerged at Berkeley. The rise of SLATE, a campus "political party" (although it wasn't supposed to call itself that), is often seen as early evidence that the "silent" '50s were ending. SLATE engaged in gadfly politics on campus, and its first target was racial discrimination in student housing—particularly in the fraternities and sororities. (Quickly, of course, a second target became the campus administration, resulting in endless threatening arguments about campus rules.) There was lots of talk about

fairness, but gender issues were seldom if ever included.

In May 1960, student activism got a boost when people from Berkeley and other campuses protested outside hearings held in San Francisco by the House Un-American Activities Committee (HUAC). After clashing with police, many of the demonstrators were dragged or hosed down the steps of City Hall and some were taken to jail. Newspapers listed the names of sixty-four who were arrested (the cases were later dropped): sixteen arrestees, one-quarter of the total, were women.

Another early and more heralded step in the rise of 1960s activism occurred in June, 1962, when students from a number of universities gathered at Port Huron, Michigan. Their purpose was to issue a manifesto ("The Port Huron Statement" drafted by Tom Hayden) and to lay the groundwork for a "new left" based in the recently-launched national organization called Students for a Democratic Society. The "Statement" itself, running to more than sixty pages, speaks sometimes forcefully and often ponderously on many subjects. Among these is "discrimination"—which means concern about "the plight of 'non-whites'." But the document says nothing at all about gender issues; about discrimination against women or the need for a feminist agenda. The SDS helped radicalize a generation, but it was slow coming to the aid of women's rights.²⁰

The fact that UC Berkeley was so dominantly a male preserve at the beginning of the 1960s should not suggest that all women lacked power or that women's influence could not be decisive even where it was often invisible. Those few women on the faculty had to be extraordinarily strong in their teaching and scholarship to earn tenure and break through "ceilings" in an unsupportive environment. Sometimes, for women administrators, it took the toughening of a "male-track" experience to reach the top—as with Dean of Women (later Dean of Students) Katherine A. Towle, founding commander of the women's unit of the U.S. Marine Corps in World War II. (Another former officer in the Marines was Assistant Secretary [later Secretary] of the board of regents Marjorie J. Woolman—known as "The Major.")

Women who served as deans' assistants and departmental secretaries were often formidable figures, the gatekeepers who controlled access to the men at the top. At the Chancellor's Office, blunt-spoken Kathlyn C. "Kitty" Malloy was in that role, and she was the only woman on Seaborg's inner "cabinet." In President Kerr's office, it was Executive Assistant Gloria Copeland, and with her were other brilliant and highly effective women who wrote speeches, drafted policies, and analyzed developments—and who, because they sometimes seemed overzealous in "protecting" the president, earned a reputation as "The Valkyries."

When Seaborg left Berkeley in 1961 for his new post in the Kennedy Administration, there were still many "first woman" stories to be reported from the campus—and they would stretch over three decades and more (with some—such as a first woman chancellor for Berkeley—still not expected until sometime in the next century). There was the first woman president of the California Alumni Association, who also served as alumni regent: Shirley Conner in 1981-83. The first woman chair of Berkeley's Academic Senate: Herma Hill Kay in 1973-74. The first woman dean of the School of Law (Boalt Hall): Herma Kay in 1992. The first woman vice chancellor: Carol Christ in 1994. The first African American woman to advance to tenure: Barbara Christian in 1978. The first woman chief of the campus Police Department: Victoria Harrison in 1990. The first woman president (in peacetime years) of the Associated Students: Trudy Martin in 1977.²¹ The first woman president of The Faculty Club: Janet Richardson in 1987. And the list would go on with countless possibilities—such as the first women to move into a gender-mixed dorm (mid-1970s) and the first to join the California Marching Band (1973) and the once-secret Order of the Golden Bear (1970).

In early 1960, a professor from Illinois sent an inquiry to Berkeley and said that he was studying “the nation’s intellectual force” and that he wanted “to determine the participation of women on the faculties of leading universities.”²² The chancellor’s staff responded by filling in the blanks—professor: 481 men, 17 women; associate professor: 274 men, 18 women; assistant professor: 238 men, 14 women; instructor: 35 men, 2 women. The total: 1,028 men, 51 women. In *Chancellor at Berkeley*, Seaborg interprets the numbers and adds a historical comment:

. . . Women on the Berkeley faculty thus accounted for 3.4 percent of the professors, 6.1 percent of the associate professors, 5.5 percent of the assistant professors, and 5.4 percent of the instructors—for a total of 4.7 percent women.²³

A decade later, in 1970, women had actually lost ground in the regular [i.e. tenure and tenure-track] faculty ranks at Berkeley, although they had gained at the rank of instructor. The first comprehensive study of the status of women on the faculty was published that year by the Academic Senate, and it became a landmark for other institutions throughout the nation (as well as an important stimulus for affirmative action plans at Berkeley). The report, principally authored by Professors Elizabeth Scott, of Statistics; Elizabeth Colson, of Anthropology; and Susan Ervin-Tripp, of Rhetoric, listed percentages of women faculty during the 1969-70 year: 2.3 percent of the professors; 5.3 percent of associate professors, 5.0 percent of assistant professors; 18.9 percent of instructors—for an overall total of 5.0 percent women. Clearly, there was work to do.²⁴

Nearing the end of the century, most would agree that there is still work to do toward bringing women to full parity and recognition in all aspects of campus life and endeavor. But there is a lot to celebrate, too, when we make the comparison to the “stag affair” that characterized so much at Cal forty years ago.

ENDNOTES

- 1 *The Journal of Glenn T. Seaborg, Berkeley Chancellor: July 1, 1960-January 31, 1961*. (Publication 624, Vol. 3, Lawrence Berkeley Laboratory, 1987). Although she had earned her tenure at Berkeley, Professor Morris was not to remain much longer on the campus. With the phaseout of Berkeley’s home economics major, she transferred to the faculty at UC Davis to continue her teaching and scholarship in textiles and clothing economics.
- 2 Quoted in Glenn T. Seaborg with Ray Colvig, *Chancellor at Berkeley* (Berkeley: Institute of Governmental Studies Press, 1994), 381.
- 3 “Coeducation is the education of both sexes in the same classes in an institution. This term has been given several interpretations, the most extreme of which is that girls and boys shall be taught the same things, at the same time, in the same place, by the same faculty, with the same methods, and under the same regimen. This is based upon the assumption that there are no differences between girls and boys and consequently they should be given precisely the same education. The more accepted interpretation is that there are differences in their physical and mental powers and needs, but that because of their fundamental similarities they should be educated together, uniting in many classes, in many sports, and in much of their social life, but modifying all these to suit their special differences,” R. Louise Fitch, dean of women, Cornell University wrote in *The Encyclopaedia Britannica* (14th Edition, 1929). In the 1950s and early ’60s, women students at Berkeley and other universities were still frequently “coeds” in the media—implying that they

were a somewhat alien presence in a formerly all-male domain. With the rise of the women's movement, the term has mostly disappeared. (Perhaps male students who attend formerly all-women colleges should be today's "coeds.")

- 4 "Enrollment" in *The Centennial Record of the University of California* (Berkeley: 1967), 211-225.
- 5 American Council on Education Survey, 1966.
- 6 The statistics here do not include the Department of Nursing, which was still listed in Berkeley's *Announcement* in 1958-59. (By that time, the department had in most aspects completed its move to the UC San Francisco campus and the teaching staff was in residence there.) Also, the numbers do not include a few in the "regular" faculty lists with "associate in" titles—since their inclusion appears to be inconsistent among the departments.
- 7 *The Journal of Glenn T. Seaborg, Berkeley Chancellor: July 1, 1958-June 30, 1959*. (Publication 624, Vol. 1, Lawrence Berkeley Laboratory, 1987), December 1, 1958.
- 8 (See Seaborg with Colvig, *Chancellor at Berkeley*. Chapter 13: "The Bright Young Men.") Curiously, none of Klopsteg's eleven bright young men ever joined the faculty at a University of California campus. Fortunately, other young men (and eventually young women) of equal brilliance did come to the university in the years that followed.
- 9 Seaborg's papers are deposited in the Library of Congress.
- 10 Seaborg's *Journal*, Vol. 2, January 19, 1959.
- 11 Although it may seem implausible from a late-1990s perspective, given the earlier imbalances in enrollment, Hart was undoubtedly truthful in saying that he was not aware of discrimination in the admission of women. In 1959 Berkeley as a campus still admitted all undergraduate applicants who met basic admissions requirements. Where there were special requirements, as in engineering and many of the graduate programs, very few women applied—and in any case an instance of deselection because of gender would not have been reported or known at the Chancellor's Office. An exception, of course, occurred at the ROTC-related programs in military, air, and naval science: they excluded women on the basis of nationally-imposed policy.
- 12 Seaborg's *Journal*, Vol. 2, January 20, 1959.
- 13 "Learning in the World of Change," *California Monthly* (May 1959).
- 14 After the Women's Faculty Club was organized at Berkeley in 1919, *The Faculty Club* became known *unofficially* as "The Men's Faculty Club"—and the careless use of the designation has unfortunately persisted even after women were admitted to full membership and privileges in 1972 (and after men were invited to join the women's club).
- 15 "University of California: The Biggest University in the World Is a Show Place for Mass Education" *LIFE*, October 25, 1948, 88-101.
- 16 Glenn T. Seaborg with Ray Colvig, *Roses from the Ashes: Breakup and Rebirth in Pacific Coast Intercollegiate Athletics* (In press, 1999). (Cal beat Stanford on the day after the "smokers" by a score of 13 to 0. The Golden Bears then went on the Rose Bowl, where they beat Alabama, also by 13 to 0, on New Years Day, 1938.)
- 17 Seaborg with Colvig, *Chancellor at Berkeley*, 381, 382.
- 18 Joan Didion, "Berkeley's Giant: The University of California" *Mademoiselle* (January 1960) Quoted in part, and with permission, in Seaborg with Colvig, *Chancellor at Berkeley*. In 1980, Didion became the second of only four women to have been honored (as of 1999) as Berkeley's Alumna of the Year. Fifty-one men had won the Alumnus of the Year since it began in 1943. The other women: Lillian Moller Gilbreth (1954), Mimi Silbert (1990), and Marian Cleeves Diamond (1995).
- 19 *Shades of Who's Afraid of Virginia Woolf?!*

- 20 See *The Port Huron Statement* (New York: Students for a Democratic Society, 1962, 1964).
- 21 Martin was the first peacetime woman president of the ASUC to hold the entire office. Earlier in the 1970s, there had been a "troika" arrangement with three co-presidents (and one had been a woman).
- 22 Letter from Professor of Economics John B. Parrish, University of Illinois, dated January 25, 1960 (In Seaborg's papers, Library of Congress).
- 23 Note that total faculty numbers responding to the Illinois request correspond closely to the numbers reported earlier from counts based on the 1958-59 *Announcement of Courses*. The slightly lower total percentage of women here may be the result of dropping the emeritae from the compilation.
- 24 Seaborg with Colvig, *Chancellor at Berkeley*, 385.

Dorothy Clarke Shadi (1908-1992)

Dorothy Clarke Shadi received her M.A. in Spanish in 1930, and her Ph.D. in Romance Languages and Literature in 1934, both at Berkeley. She continued her scholarly studies, publishing in the best journals of the profession. She became a lecturer at Berkeley in 1945, and an assistant professor in 1948. An outstanding scholar of Spanish medieval studies, Professor Shadi was the first tenured woman in the Department of Spanish and Portuguese (the second was tenured only in the 1980s) and retired at the highest level of professorship. She was part of a brilliant group of scholars who raised Berkeley's Spanish Department to international prominence. In addition she served as assistant dean of the College of Letters and Sciences and member of campus committees on admissions, graduate study, courses, and relations with schools. Author of eleven scholarly books and monographs and over sixty scholarly articles, plus numerous reviews, Professor Shadi married and raised three daughters in Berkeley. In recent years, she was a crucial ally for younger women faculty. Upon her death in 1992, the former chair of the department described her in his press release as follows: "Modest, unassuming, and immune equally to praise and blame, she went her own way as a critic and scholar, never bowing to the vagaries of fashion or the dictates of editors."

Agnes Fay Morgan (1884-1968)

Agnes Fay Morgan earned a Ph.D. in organic chemistry from the University of Chicago in 1914. With this doctorate she belonged to the small group of American women who earned such a degree in the early 20th century. Even more unusual was the fact that she undertook her Ph.D. studies and obtained a faculty position as a married woman. (On most campuses women who married were expected to resign their positions whether their husbands were employed or not). Right after completion of her studies, realistic and pragmatic all her life, Morgan accepted an offer from Berkeley as assistant professor, despite the fact that it was in nutrition, and in the Department of Home Economics, rather than chemistry.



During the early years of the program she broke up the forced unity of household art and household science. As chair for thirty-six years, she shaped the identity of the home economics department and became recognized as an outstanding scientist, but her own prestige had no coattails. It never carried over to elevate the status of home economics at the University of California. Professor Morgan herself undertook research in three main areas: human nutrition, animal nutrition, and food technology. Her contributions to basic research earned her the prestigious Garvan Medal of the American Chemical Society in 1949 and the Borden Award from the Institute of Nutrition in 1954. At Berkeley, she received three of the university's highest honors:

selection by the faculty as Faculty Research Lecturer in 1951; an honorary doctorate in 1959; and recognition by the university regents in the renaming of the home economics building at Berkeley the Agnes Fay Morgan Hall in 1962. Morgan's real love was administration. She was remembered by her staff for her organizational skill, political finesse, and ability to distinguish the essential from the trivial. "She had the sublime confidence in her rightness and a genius for disregarding nonessentials and relaxing when the opportunity presented itself."



Margaret Murdock (1894-1985)

A graduate of the class of 1918 in economics, Margaret Murdock spent her life on the campus. She earned a master's degree and worked until 1959 as an education credentials counselor. She was office manager and president of the Women's Faculty Club until she retired in 1974. In 1923 she agreed to take on the job of playing the carillon in Sather Tower. Although it was originally a temporary job, she played the Campanile bells for the next sixty years. "The Empress of Tintinabulation" was the title bestowed upon her in 1978 by Chancellor Albert Bowker at the annual Charter Day ceremonies as he presented her with the highest award on the Berkeley campus, the Berkeley Citation. She said, "I don't know why there's such a fuss" over a woman playing the carillon for so many years, but she acknowledged that it was unusual "to stay so long in a temporary job." She mastered the twelve bells of the carillon in 1923 and extended her expertise when the bells were increased to forty-eight bells. During a routine maintenance, campus workers once asked Murdock to test the control-wire tension by playing a tune. She ran through the Doxology hymn ("Praise God from whom all blessings flow . . .") which immediately brought a spate of phone calls to campus administrators inquiring if the legislature had passed the budget. Although white-haired and frail, she played at least three concerts a week on a forty-eight-level keyboard named in her honor in 1972 and adorned with a brass plaque. She performed her last concert in 1983 at the age of eighty-nine.

Dorothy Bird Nyswander (1894-1998)

Dorothy Bird Nyswander left Berkeley after earning a Ph.D. in educational psychology in 1926. With an appointment to the School of Public Health in 1946, she returned to build a Division of Public Health Education. She drew upon a wealth of professional experiences, including working with Harry Hopkins and Eleanor Roosevelt on the Works Progress Administration and overseeing the landmark Astoria School Health Study in New York. Her academic background in educational psychology and mathematics was very different from other health education professors of the time, whose training typically was in the biological and medical sciences, or in education or physical education. Her background greatly influenced the courses she developed and the type of students she admitted into the new program. She was the first in the nation to introduce behavioral sciences to public health and emphasize quantitative research methodology and advanced statistics. In addition, influenced by the teachings of Kurt Lewin and others, Professor Nyswander made group process an integral part of the curriculum and incorporated a strong field training program. She was a world leader in public health education and built one of the most reputable programs in the nation at Berkeley.