

UC Santa Cruz

Institutional History of UCSC

Title

Page Smith: Founding Cowell College and UCSC, 1964-1973

Permalink

<https://escholarship.org/uc/item/9hr6t6b3>

Authors

Smith, Page
Jarrell, Randall
Regional History Project, UCSC Library

Publication Date

1996-11-23

Supplemental Material

<https://escholarship.org/uc/item/9hr6t6b3#supplemental>

Introduction

The Regional History Project conducted five interviews with Page Smith from January 23 to July 17, 1974, as part of its University History series. During the last interview session, Smith informed his interviewer, Elizabeth Calciano, that he had second thoughts about publishing an edited transcript (which had been the understanding at the start of the interview project) and that he preferred instead that people listen to the tape-recordings. The release of the infamous Watergate tapes influenced his decision; he believed at the time that a written transcript would not accurately convey the content or tone of his spoken interviews and wanted no ambiguity in his recollections. The concluding chapter of this volume (Smith's Second Thoughts about this Oral History") contains his reasons for this change of heart. Calciano told Smith that she would put the transcript away and hoped that he would reconsider releasing the manuscript at a later date.

In 1987 I met with Smith at his home in Bonny Doon, gave him an edited transcript and requested that he read it over, make corrections, and consider releasing the printed text. I heard nothing from him but assumed that someday the manuscript would be published.

Smith died in Santa Cruz on August 28, 1995, of leukemia. In November, 1995, I wrote Smith's daughter, Anne Easley, and explained the circumstances surrounding the oral history. I gave her a copy of her father's transcript, asked if she could find the manuscript I'd given him, and requested that she consider with her family the possibility of publishing the volume. In sorting through his papers and books she found the manuscript which Smith had carefully amended and corrected in his distinctive script. I was pleased to note as I read through it that most of his editing decisions agreed with mine.

Easley read through the transcript and had several friends read it as well. Smith's longtime colleague at the University, John Dizikes, also read the oral history at Easley's request. Both Easley and her sister, Ellen S. Davidson, agreed that the memoir could be published. Davidson signed a release enabling the Project to publish the Smith memoir.

Thus, *Page Smith: Founding Cowell College and UCSC, 1964-1973*, is published posthumously. Smith, the founding provost of Cowell College, the campus's first college, and a professor of historical studies, played a major role in creating the campus's innovative collegiate system. Prior to his appointment at Santa Cruz, Smith was professor of history at UCLA from 1953-1964 and had already published several important books of American biography—*James Wilson* (1956), the two-volume biography, *John Adams* which was awarded the Bancroft Prize in 1962, and *The Historian and History* (1964).

He joined the UCSC faculty in 1964 and embarked on the adventure of creating a new UC campus. The formative concepts shaping UCSC were an emphasis on undergraduate teaching and the creation of small human-scale colleges around

which the life of the campus would be organized. Page Smith became an informal leader of those who mounted a number of innovations during the campus's first decade, perhaps the most significant of which was what came to be known as the narrative evaluation system (or pass/fail grading), an abandonment of the old letter grade system.

As provost, Smith was confronted with an unexpected culture clash from the start; he recognized retrospectively that UCSC's founding coincided with the emergence of the counterculture including anti-Vietnam war demonstrations and the loosening of sexual mores. He comments on the appearance of a new sort of student at Santa Cruz who didn't automatically defer to authority, or to traditional classroom lectures, or to the University's traditional standing *in loco parentis*. Smith was a curious mixture of radical innovator (in educational matters) and social conservative (in behavioral matters) and struggled to understand the new students even as he issued to the Cowell community what he termed his "pastoral letter," taking the students to task for their public displays of affection, sloppy dress, and deficient hygiene. But he also appreciated the independence of mind and spirit which he encountered among many of his students and was himself changed by the campus's freewheeling cultural climate, especially in his approach to teaching, in Cowell's close-knit community.

I have organized Calciano's interviews with Smith into three sections. The first, "Creating UCSC's First College," includes Smith's commentary on his controversial appointment as the campus's first provost, the selection of early faculty, his efforts to recruit women and minority faculty, and college life. In his second section, "The Provostship," he discusses the significant issues which engaged him—administering Cowell College, establishing the pass-fail grading system, his teaching and curriculum philosophy, the conflict between boards of study (departments) and colleges, and defining the provost's role. In the final section, "UCSC's Development," he discusses a range of campus-wide topics, including his complicated relationship with founding Chancellor Dean E. McHenry, his opinion of campus architecture, his assessment of the History of Consciousness Program, town-gown relations, the arts at UCSC and the role of his wife, Eloise Pickard Smith, in the founding of the art gallery at Cowell College that now bears her name.

In the final chapters of the volume Smith candidly discusses his resignation from the University in 1973 after his colleague and friend Paul Lee, a professor of religious studies, was not given tenure. Smith used this occasion as a symbolic protest against what he considered the rigidity of the publish or perish system governing promotion and tenure. This issue was a major and paradoxical *bête noire* in Smith's attitude towards academic life; he himself was uncommonly prolific and published over two dozen books, yet he believed passionately that the research and publishing criteria for achieving tenure at the University were wrong.

I wish to thank Page Smith's daughter, Anne Easley, who carefully read the transcript and made many helpful comments and corrections which have been included in the finished volume. I also thank John Dizikes who generously read through the manuscript as well, at Easley's request, and gave me permission to

include his very moving Address at the Eloise and Page Smith Memorial Service on September 9, 1995. Special thanks are due Jim Hair who kindly gave permission to use his lovely photograph for the frontispiece and made the prints for this volume. Special Collections loaned us the Ansel Adams photograph of UCSC's first registration day in 1965. Finally, my gratitude to Irene Reti, for typing and carefully checking the manuscript in its many stages and for compiling the listing of Smith's book publications.

Copies of this manuscript are deposit in the Bancroft Library, University of California, Berkeley; and in Special Collections, McHenry Library, University of California, Santa Cruz. The Regional History Project is supported administratively by Alan Ritch, head of Collection Planning, and University Librarian Allan J. Dyson.

Randall Jarrell

November 23, 1996
Regional History Project
McHenry Library
University of California, Santa Cruz

Table of Contents

INTRODUCTION	vii
CREATING UCSC'S FIRST COLLEGE	1
Visiting UCSC	1
Acceptance of Cowell College Provostship	2
Selecting the First Faculty	4
Conflict with McHenry over Faculty Appointments	5
Controversy Surrounding Page Smith's Appointment	6
Recruiting Faculty	7
Byron Stookey	8
Recrui 1, 1973 until Faculty Appointments	11
World Civilization Program	18
Women and Minority Faculty	20
College Life	22
THE PROVOSTSHIP	23
Administering Cowell College	23
Pass-Fail Grading System	28
Teaching Methods—Old versus New	33
UCSC Students—1964 to 1974	36
Curriculum Philosophy	37
Boards of Study Versus Colleges	39
Assessment of the Provostship	43
Jasper Rose	48
Philip W. Bell	49
Campus Intellectual Life	52

The Mechanics of Decision-Making	52
Other College Provosts	54
Council of Provosts	59
UCSC'S DEVELOPMENT	61
Boards of Studies	62
The "Publish or Perish" Controversy	68
History of Consciousness Program	71
Professional Schools	72
The "Typical" UCSC Student	73
Relationship with Chancellor McHenry	75
Vice-Chancellors	76
University Library	77
Academic Senate	77
American Federation of Teachers	78
The Arts at UCSC	79
Eloise Pickard Smith and the Arts	84
The Music Program	85
Campus Architecture	86
Utopianism	87
Town-Gown Relations	89
Paul Lee	92
Resignation from UCSC	96
The William James Association	97
Smith's Second Thoughts about this Oral History	100

APPENDICES

106

Appendix I— John Dizikes’s Address at Smith Memorial Service, September 9, 1995

Appendix II—Publication List of Page Smith’s Books

INDEX

110

CREATING UCSC'S FIRST COLLEGE

Visiting UCSC

Calciano: I'm going to focus mostly on the ten years of UC Santa Cruz. I was wondering when you were first approached about coming to Santa Cruz?

Smith: Dean McHenry wrote me a note àpropos the publication of my [John] Adams book, congratulated me, and said, "if you are ever passing through Santa Cruz, stop by. I think you'd be interested in what we are doing, starting this new campus up there." The notion of "passing through" Santa Cruz was far off the mark. I didn't even know where Santa Cruz was but it happened that our daughter was at camp in Trinity County and we had decided to go up and get her. We thought that on the way back it might be interesting to stop by and visit the McHenrys. We called; they received the invitation and we stopped off. Dean showed me around the campus and we talked about the ideas for the University, and then sometime during the course of the discussion he got out a sweatshirt that had on it, "University of California, Santa Cruz," and said, "would you mind putting this on and letting me take a picture of you?" So I did that and then later on he asked: "Would you consider coming to be provost of the first college?"

Calciano: That quickly?

Smith: Yes.

Calciano: In that same interview?

Smith: That's my recollection. I could be wrong. But my impression is that it was almost as an afterthought—I was disarmed by his casualness. I thought to myself, well suppose we hadn't stopped by? I assume he would have pursued it further.

I said, "Well, I don't know. I have just done this [John] Adams book¹ which has gotten favorable attention and I've been very happy at UCLA. I feel that in a sense I owe them some return on their investment. Now that I have some national visibility as a consequence of the book I should really stay there awhile." We [had] never been interested in moving and we had had other opportunities to move, but we were happy in Southern California.

Acceptance of Cowell College Provostship

Smith: Of course the whole notion of the new campus appealed to me very much. I was very critical of higher education generally and had written articles critical of different aspects [such as] the grading system which I had really in a sense jettisoned at UCLA because I just gave B's or F's; in other words I used a pass-fail system within the regular grading system.

Calciano: You gave no A's?

Smith: No, I don't think so . . . I can't recall. I think the last couple of years that I taught there I just said to the students: "there are only two grades in this class—one is in effect a pass, and the other is a fail. If you do good work, satisfactory and so on." I may have in certain exceptional cases given A's, but in any event I was very resistant to the conventional grading system and very much oriented towards students. I was critical of all large universities because of the concentration on scholarly activities at the expense of the teaching function.

I'd been a delegate to a university faculty conference some four or five years earlier, where the committee I was on was charged with making recommendations about new campuses. We recommended that at least one of the new campuses be organized on a collegiate basis. I don't think that had anything directly to do with the decision to

¹Smith is referring to his biography, *John Adams* (1962).—Editor.

establish UCSC on a collegiate model but I mention it as an example of my prior interest in the notion. There was a more prestigious committee, the Pepper Committee, which I'm sure you know about, that made a similar recommendation. I think that had much more influence on the actual plan for UCSC.

I had known Dean, of course, at UCLA, and liked him very much. He'd been my sponsor in a student organization called the "Golden Bruin." So I said that I would think about [coming to UCSC] because much as the idea of the campus appealed to me I really did feel very divided . . . we had strong roots in Los Angeles, and I felt that I owed UCLA something. I had a sabbatical coming up and we were going to take a trip to Europe. I said when we came back would I let him know if I could defer a decision and have time to think about it? I suppose in a sense I had already thought about it. But it's interesting again, in terms of Dean's psychology, that he didn't press me about it, he didn't say: "Well, no, we really need to have a decision about it, it's very important [since] it's the first college and so on . . ."

I found out later that I wasn't the first person [asked] and there's no reason why I should have been. I don't know where I stood in the list of people that he considered [for] provost. I know he did ask John Galbraith, a UCLA colleague, before he asked me. Galbraith was later chancellor at San Diego for several years. I often wonder what McHenry would have done—since the whole issue was deferred for two or three months—if I had said when we came back from Europe that I wouldn't do it. It would have been late in the game for him to have started looking for another candidate.

Calciano: Was this the summer of '64 then?

Smith: This was the summer and fall of '63. We went to Europe in August and September as I recall, and maybe we got back in October. When I got back I called Dean and asked if he was still interested in my being provost of the first college. I still felt an obligation to UCLA and I asked him if I could be considered as provost for one of the later colleges. I don't recall exactly what he said but the general effect was that he thought that I would be particularly suitable for this first college which would have the humanities emphasis. He really didn't have me in mind as an appropriate provost for the other colleges, so that the answer in effect was that he wouldn't commit himself to that and if I was interested in coming, he wanted me to come then.

Eloise [Smith] and I talked it over at some length. She was willing to come. So the arrangement was made that for the second semester of that year I would be part-time at Santa Cruz on the Santa Cruz payroll, would agree to come up when necessary and to take trips with Dean to recruit faculty.

Selecting the First Faculty

Smith: When I called up Dean and said that we would come, he said he'd like us to come up right away to discuss plans for the college. So we came up in November of '63 and spent a weekend at what was then University House in Pasatiempo. I think we were very much in general agreement about the notion of the colleges. After dinner, Dean presented me with a list of names of appointees in different areas that he and Jane [McHenry] had drawn up.

Calciano: Proposed or confirmed appointees?

Smith: Proposed. I don't know that McHenry got the vibes, but I was really uptight because one of my principal interests in coming and being provost was in selecting the initial faculty; that was really a very attractive part of it. When colleagues of mine at UCLA said, "Why you're crazy to leave Los Angeles and go up there to this new campus where you're starting from scratch—you must be out of your mind to do that," I replied, "I'm interested in power and who has the power these days to appoint a faculty. That's just an extraordinary opportunity, to start an enterprise like this." Of course, the whole notion of beginning something was very appealing to me. But I was really horrified—horrified is too strong a word, but *dismayed*—at the notion that Dean already had very much in mind the faculty he wanted. I think Karl Lamb and Byron Stookey had already been appointed—I know Byron had, and, yes Karl had, prior to my coming, or just about this time. The only name on that list that ultimately came was [Sigfried] Puknat. I read several of the things that Sig had done, and Sig was on this committee, the representative from [UC] Davis, charged by President Kerr to superintend the beginnings of the campus.

Calciano: You say, only one of them came?

Smith: Only one was asked. Yes. I very strongly resisted Dean's guidance in this and I was very determined to run my own show, so to speak, because I was spoiled, I'd always had my own way. I'd never had an administrative job and I wasn't used to compromising and making accommodations. I had a notion of what I wanted to do and

the kind of people that I wanted to get and I was determined to carry that through. Dean had, I think, the attitude towards me of a younger colleague . . . he'd been a senior person when I came to [UCLA], although our difference in years wasn't that much. He'd been a full professor and taken a sort of avuncular interest in me as a young faculty member. I suspect he'd been on my promotion committee, but he's very discreet about things and has never admitted it nor have I asked him.

Conflict with McHenry over Faculty Appointments

Smith: I don't know exactly the sequence—it's not important—but the recruiting went something like this: he wrote me or called me and said, "I'm recommending so-and-so as the first appointment in literature. [The prospective appointee] was out here from Ohio State and I guess I met him at University House when I was there. He was the kind of tall, handsome, clean-cut-looking guy that I think Dean has a particular receptivity or response to; but I didn't particularly cotton to him. Dean wrote that he was going to present him to the Regents as the first appointment in English. In a certain sense, because of the humanities emphasis, this might be considered the most crucial appointment in the college.

Calciano: This was the first appointment, or the first one in literature?

Smith: I think Karl [Lamb] had [already] come. It was the first senior appointment perhaps, outside of Sig Puknat . . . I don't know whether Sig had been appointed or not, but that was sort of in the offing I guess. So I wrote and said that I would resign if he presented that appointment to the regents.

Calciano: Whew!

Smith: I would not come and serve as provost of the college. Well, that put me in quite a bind. I didn't answer the telephone; I couldn't see any point in talking with Dean because I had said where I stood and I just felt that he had to make up his mind at that stage whether he was going to go ahead and do it, in which case I would not come, or whether he was going to give way.

Well, Dean's what the students call a hard ass . . . I mean he's tough and doesn't like to be crossed and certainly in his position I would have been very angry. He was furious . . . he didn't present it to the regents, but he asked me to come up to Santa Cruz the next day. We had quite a tense session which I think was terribly important because I had to

get out of the lead strings. Maybe I overdramatized it . . . I had to overcome Dean's sense that I was somebody that he could lead and direct, that I would be acquiescent in the things he wanted to do. Of course it was a terribly important position, and Dean's anxiety about it was understandable.

Controversy Surrounding Page Smith's Appointment

Smith: Somebody told me at that point—maybe it was Dean—that there'd been a lot of criticism of [my] appointment. People had said that I had no administrative experience, was completely untried, untested as an administrator, and that it was a very impolitic thing to do to appoint me. It was characteristic of Dean—in his own way he's as stubborn as I am, or maybe more so—and he has these little flashes and ideas. During this session he told me that [Clark] Kerr told him that it was a great mistake to appoint me, that I had no administrative experience, that I was hot-headed.

When I was just an associate professor I had written Kerr an indignant letter when he, as I thought, pushed through the change from the semester to the quarter system. He did it over the resistance of the faculty for what I felt were primarily political reasons to appease the legislature and the regents. It seemed to me that it never worked, this third, this fourth quarter never really panned out. I think it was a bad mistake and it cost Kerr the support of the Berkeley faculty. But I had written to him and said that it was the only thing that had happened since I was in the University that made me seriously think about leaving and so on, and I suppose Kerr was very sensitive on the whole issue. But he has a memory like an elephant, the way Dean does; he remembers everything and I guess this stuck in his craw.

This must have been the basis for his saying this to Dean, and it showed how much the note irritated him. So Dean mentioned this to me and said: "Never threaten to resign on me again," and I said, "No, I never will. I'll just resign. I won't *threaten* to resign if you . . . unless such and such happens. I'll just resign if there's a situation in which I feel I can't function." So we parted very tense, but I think Dean took it in good grace.

One of the things I admire about him is that I've never known him to harbor resentment. He can be very angry and I think he had a punitive streak in him; he will punish people when he thinks they've done wrong. He's a very patriarchal and authoritarian figure and in some ways in a good sense. I don't think that's all negative by any means. He's always been very generous and I suppose you could say under the

circumstances, very forgiving. Often I've been a very hard person to get along with because I was stubborn, had my own ideas, was determined to have my own way whenever I possibly could. So I'm sure that I gave Dean lots of bad moments and sleepless nights, but it's never affected our relationship in any discernible way. His graciousness and openness really—I don't quite know how to put it, but I just like that quality in him, admire it.

Recruiting Faculty

Smith: So from that point on we went around; we were kind of a funny tandem, we traveled to different campuses and talked to a number of people, and in many instances we had the same kind of gut reaction to people, but there were people that I was very anxious to get for the faculty, and Dean resisted in some instances. I can think of one particular one: I wanted very much in sociology a man named Norman Birnbaum, a rather eccentric guy who had made enemies in the world of sociology, and somebody wrote a devastating letter about him. I collected letters and letters and letters until we finally had twenty letters in the file.

Dean brought Birnbaum here but Birnbaum was a great bone of contention. Dean said he would offer the position for a year because of Birnbaum's record of being volatile, he'd offer not tenure but rank; that he had to come as an associate professor, as acting associate professor.

Calciano: Oh, was this as a visiting professor, then?

Smith: Well, maybe visiting, yes.

Calciano: Did he come to UCSC?

Smith: No, we made him an offer but he didn't come. Dean and I went to Chicago, moved around to different places, meeting and talking to people. By and large, I think Dean suppressed his misgivings—which I'm sure in some instances he had—and went along with my desires. And I was often careless; I'm sure I wasn't easy . . . I suspect Dean will never talk about it. I think he has a much stronger sense of what should be kept confidential than I do, and I suspect he wouldn't talk freely about these matters, but in any event, I really don't know to what extent he felt annoyed and impatient with what must have often seemed my head-strongness.

Byron Stookey

Smith: But on the whole it was really quite amicable and the thing that was crucial for me in the whole situation was that Dean had made an initial appointment that was in some ways even more eccentric than his appointing me: that was Byron Stookey. I just heard rumors that year, word going around, that people said: “McHenry must be crazy, he’s going to open a college in a year and all he has done there—instead of department heads, administrators, deans, or assistant deans . . . all of the panoply of administrators . . . all he has is a person without any administrative experience, Page Smith, and Byron Stookey, a young man from Harvard without an advanced degree or any academic standing at all.

Of course Byron was an absolutely *inspired* appointment from my point of view: he had more to do with the success of the campus initially and in the early years than any other single person, with the exception of Dean.

Working with Byron was just *so* harmonious: he was everything, the chancellor’s administrative assistant, or whatever titles he had, the budget—everything went through Byron. I don’t even remember exactly when Sig (Puknat) came down, or Karl Lamb, but for some months Dean, Byron and I were the works for all practical purposes.

Since Byron and I were in rapport about almost everything, Dean didn’t have a barrier of intermediaries to interpose between us, so that making decisions was easy, much, much easier, and pleasanter than if there had been deans and such. I wouldn’t say that Dean was outnumbered—that’s not exactly the way to put it—but the fact that Byron and I often presented a united front on things was very helpful. This was helpful to me in achieving what I wanted to achieve. It would be a mistake, an exaggeration, to paint a picture of some vision that I was determined to press despite Dean’s resistance. I think we saw very much eye-to-eye on a great many things, and on a number of people as well.

Recruiting Philosophy

Calciano: What were you looking for in the faculty members?

Smith: That was a source of conflict between us all along. I was looking for people whom I personally responded to and liked and found intellectually appealing. In other

words I was absolutely shameless in my determination to collect a group of compatible people whose general approach within their own fields was similar, whom I would call roughly “humanistic” in their attitude.

The appointments in philosophy would be a good example of this conflict. I think we had three appointments to make in philosophy, or maybe it was only two. Dean’s view was that there should be maybe one logical positivist, one metaphysician, and maybe one existentialist, that different fields of philosophy should be represented no matter how incompatible and hostile those fields were. And I thought, “why at Cowell?” If you want a logical positivist, a good place for a person with that kind of mathematical orientation would be Crown [College], or maybe if Stevenson’s going to be sort of hard-nosed and statistically oriented in the social sciences, that would be a place for him. But I saw no point in building in intellectual conflicts in the college. It seemed to me that the optimum, the desired thing for the college would be personal and intellectual compatibility; that the value of the campus was that the different colleges could each have their own personality defined in this way.

I discovered as I went around recruiting, that the academic world was divided into hard noses and soft noses. The hard noses were the hard-boiled empiricists, the quantifiers, the statisticians, and in psychology, the experimental psychologists. The soft noses were the people who had a more general—for want of a better word—humanistic orientation . . . we could think of a whole list of adjectives. I would of course stack the deck because I was clearly on the side of the non-positivistic; I was soft, in the soft-nose camp, despite the size of my proboscis. And I wanted the college made up of soft noses.

Calciano: I assume you’re not meaning soft noses to mean general all-around good guys?

Smith: No, no. I certainly wanted people of outstanding ability and quality in every area.

Calciano: And with standards of . . .

Smith: Yes, yes.

Calciano: Yes, but to have a broader scope in what they were doing? Is that it?

Smith: Well, you see there's so much other pre-intellectual history behind this whole issue: briefly, the academic world has moved—it seemed to me—very decisively for a generation or more in the direction of . . . well, I keep picking on logical positivists . . . the philosophers who say that the only problems that philosophers should deal with are not these airy general metaphysical problems that philosophers have dealt with for centuries, but things that can be proved and demonstrated; that can be turned into mathematical formulas and worked out. In sociology you have people who are primarily statisticians, [whereas] somebody like David Reisman—who's a humanistic sociologist—views society from what's in a certain sense a classic, old-fashioned perspective as something that in the last analysis can't be reduced to quantifiable, absolute, scientific formulas. In psychology, the experimental psychologists just want to do these experiments with animals [and sometimes people] where they can make charts and diagrams, and work out and prove that if you do this to a pigeon, then the results are that. You have other psychologists who are concerned with the broader issues that encroach on philosophy; the Freudians would be typical of those whose interests are the ultimate goals and problems of man . . . that sort of thing. So that was really the kind of person I was looking for, very broad people, but certainly people who were substantial scholars.

Calciano: You said you were looking for them for Cowell. Did you feel that the other types should be represented in Stevenson or Crown or would you have been happier if all the major appointments in the first three colleges had been soft noses?

Smith: Oh no. See, that was one of Dean's arguments. He said, "If you get all these people of a similar disposition, even within a field in Cowell, then they in turn will give the campus a certain tone or quality, and then these other types may steer away from it and make it difficult to recruit. Not only will the people who are here already be inclined to choose people of their own temperament and intellectual disposition, but you may frighten off other people."

And I could see the logic of that, but I thought it was much more important in a small college to have intellectual harmony. I said, "with the deans and vice-chancellors, departmental deans and divisional deans, and the provost, by picking a particular kind of provost for a college, you can't protect yourself against the whole campus being excessively influenced by these early decisions." I like to think it was that that influence was a good influence, that it was better than the other although I am glad to have the other represented properly.

Calciano: In your initial reaction to the list that he presented, was it because they were mainly of the hard-nosed school or was it other things that . . . ?

Smith: Well, it was just the sense that Dean had sort of made up his mind about people that he wanted and some of them were people I didn't know at all, and I don't even remember . . . I don't think Dean had any special predilections for the hard-nosed school. He was committed to the notion of diversity, that all different theoretical positions be represented, and that was his responsibility as chancellor.

Cowell College Faculty Appointments

Calciano: In the first year were there any people appointed to Cowell whom you did not approve of, and were there any that you didn't want that were appointed that would be going to Stevenson [College] right from the start?

Smith: Yes. I don't remember that clearly. Certainly people were appointed with the understanding from the beginning on everybody's part that they would go on to Stevenson. Some of them were probably people that I wouldn't have chosen or didn't choose in a few instances.

Calciano: Was anybody rammed down your throat in Cowell?

Smith: No.

Calciano: No. What were some of the most significant appointments for the college?

Smith: Well, I suppose the most crucial one in many ways was Jasper Rose, because he played such an important role in the college and was an ideal preceptor, or senior tutor, whatever he was called. I think he was really sort of vice-provost. I think that was his really best role. I think he's been a very good provost, an excellent administrator, but I think he was a superb preceptor, and he really took a lot off my shoulders . . . When he was a preceptor his nerves—his disposition and temperament—which were problems in the way he functioned as a provost, were never a serious issue. It seemed to me that all his gifts came out in his role as preceptor. His great imagination, his great support for me . . . well, he just couldn't have been better; I couldn't have had a better person to work with.

I think he had an unusual feeling about relationships with students . . . he had been a proctor at Cambridge and thus had experience with disciplinary matters firsthand,

although in a very different setting to be sure. I was constantly instructed and impressed by his perceptions, and judgments. I got credit from the faculty for a lot of things where the credit really belonged to Jasper. That was one reason I was so very anxious to have him succeed me because I felt that he wanted to be provost. I felt that he had earned the right to be, that he had all kinds of gifts and qualities that were important in that job—qualities that were not fully perceived by many of his colleagues, who were often inclined to write him off as a sort of a semi-comic character because of his . . .

Calciano: Flowing robes and . . .

Smith: Yes. All that theatrical business that he surrounds himself with. I think there's no question that that was, for me, the most important point. And it's interesting, the first year working so closely with Byron, and then I suppose you couldn't have found in the whole world two people more different in temperament than Byron Stookey and Jasper Rose. Yet each one of them just was ideal for that stage . . . at least for me. I don't know how they've been for other people, but those were two of the pleasantest and most rewarding associations of my life. It's funny, now that Jasper's provost, we see and talk with each other very seldom so that while there's no estrangement, there's a gulf and I'm sorry for that . . . I think that's inevitable. I have to stay out of the college and college matters and not mix in things. I didn't want to seem to be hovering in the background with him. So I think it was inevitable that we would move apart in that sense.

I think Bert Kaplan was a very important appointment of course, and Harry Berger was a very crucial appointment because he has been a very effective person in the development of the literature board. He's almost a classic academic politician in the good sense.

I think the appointment of [Siegfried B.] Puknat was an important one . . . although he was proposed to me and was the only appointment that was in a sense pressed on me—urged, I wouldn't say pressed . . . I always felt that I could have said, "No," that I didn't want Sig, but I liked him and he had so much experience in administration; he was a great-by-the-book person and I think he was always dismayed by my lack of respect for the rules and regulations. He would often say to me, "Well, there's a rule in the Academic Senate that says this shouldn't be done; this is against the rules and the

Committee on Rules and Jurisdiction will be furious,” and so on. But I think it was good to have a person of that kind, with that kind of experience.

Another very important appointment was Bernard Haley because he gave a kind of stability to the college emotionally and intellectually. There were so many young faculty that having a senior person of his particular qualities—very wise, very stable, the things that are supposed to come with years of experience . . . I think people were devoted to him . . . I certainly was. And I think he really was a very important appointment . . . it’s easy to forget it in some sense because he’s been away now for three or four years but he had a very, very important role in the college.

Calciano: In the whole college, or just in the economics department?

Smith: No. As a whole, in terms of leadership, maturity and good judgment and unflappability.

Calciano: Were there any of those early appointments that you made that you wish you hadn’t, or didn’t turn out well?

Smith: Well, I think the most painful one was [Associate Professor of Music] Julia Zaustinsky. It was Byron’s enthusiasm for her because she was such a kind of plain, direct New England-type woman, a type that Byron obviously responded to and admired; he couldn’t resist her. Her lack of any “side.” I was never particularly enthusiastic about Julia . . . but I went along with Byron’s enthusiasm and Julia—as difficult as she’s been as a person—certainly made very important contributions to the life of the college in the early years as well as great efforts in the music program. In my opinion, she has just a terribly difficult temperament. I never had any unpleasantness with her and we got along well and I don’t know whether I want to say that I regret *that* appointment because in those very important and crucial early years she was very unstinting in her efforts.

There are a few other minor cases. I didn’t want to appoint David Ratner the first year. He seemed to me a very mercurial and flighty young man, but Harry Berger took a fancy to him and I went along with that. Once the senior people had been appointed, they in turn appointed junior people whom I didn’t in every instance respond favorably to. I felt that just as with Dean I had wanted to have my own head so I should go along with their preferences unless there was some very serious reason for resistance.

There was an appointment in philosophy that Maurice Natanson was very anxious to make, but I didn't respond to the young man. Again I wouldn't have made it . . . and I also felt a little sheepish sometimes about the fact that I depended so much on gut reaction to people . . . I don't know that my guts were more sensitively attuned than anybody else's.

He wasn't, I would say, a very successful appointment; he didn't stay very long and the same with Ratner.

Calciano: You made a comment earlier, something to the effect that often you were rather careless in your faculty appointments. Did you mean because you went on gut reaction or what were you talking about?

Smith: I didn't mean to say "careless." I certainly gave a lot of time to them.

Calciano: Oh, you were comparing yourself to McHenry.

Smith: Impulsive, maybe, but I wouldn't want to say careless because I took all the appointments very seriously, read things that people had written, talked to them—no, I wouldn't say careless.

Calciano: I'll probably want to pin that phrase down because it rather surprised me.

Smith: I may have said that I must have seemed something rather . . . no, I know what I said the "careless" about: I was careless sometimes in regard to clearing things with him. Now his attitude was that he gave me a certain amount of leeway, but he didn't want me to go too far down the road without checking with him. A case in point was the appointment of J. Herman Blake—in speaking of important appointments this of course would be one of those at the top of the list.

I met J. Herman Blake when he was a graduate student at Berkeley; he came down here and we met and talked for awhile and I was very taken with him. I decided I wanted Herman Blake on the faculty, and went ahead and submitted papers or started appointment procedures. I got quite a sharp rebuke from Dean, saying in effect: "Do you realize how important this appointment is—the first black faculty member on campus and you have the . . ." I don't know quite how he phrased it, something like, "You've gone ahead on your own without bringing me into this decision and I insist on meeting and talking to him." Which [was] quite right, and that's the only way I was

careless, at times [in] not observing protocol, and neglecting to clear things with Dean the way I should have. So Dean met Herman and to my pleasure and relief was as taken with him as I was.

Calciano: But, it was sort of getting yourself used to the administrative channels that was a problem.

Smith: Yes. I was always a wretched administrator; I never did things right, I never sent letters in triplicate to all the people who should have routinely gotten them. If you want to talk about careless—I was just a careless, disorganized, bad administrator. I'm not interested in administration. Whatever gifts I had were on the side of my relations with the students and the faculty, my teaching, and the general spirit and life of the college. That was one reason that I was anxious to get out of the role of provost. When we began, I told Dean that I would do it for five years; I didn't think that I would want to do it any longer than that.

Calciano: Who brought Ted [J.W.T.] Youngs? Was that one of your appointments?

Smith: Yes, I guess it was. That's a kind of an interesting story. I guess Dean had gotten on the trail of Ted when we were at Dartmouth. Somebody who had been a student of Ted Youngs' at Indiana mentioned him as a person we ought to talk to. As I recall the circumstances I went on to Princeton and met Ted; Dean wasn't with me. I did also talk to Charles Page there as a possibility for an appointment, the lead appointment, senior person in sociology.

But I didn't really think Charles Page was the person I was looking for; I felt a little guilty, subsequently, because I pressed him as the provost for Stevenson, supported him for provost because that [situation] was getting kind of desperate. Dean needed a provost and didn't have one and I thought Charles Page had had experience as an administrator in the Department of Sociology at Princeton. While he wasn't the kind of person that I had in mind for the college, I thought he might be a good person to head Stevenson. Well, to get back to Ted. I met him, but I'm not quite sure what the sequence was after that; I have a wretched memory—but I guess we were (Dean and I) of a mind. I can't really remember whether Dean was a warmer advocate than I of Ted, but that was certainly an important appointment.

Calciano: Why did you want Ted Youngs?

Smith: Well, we heard that he was an awfully good teacher . . . that he had imagination, that he had ideas about a general program in the sciences. He had considerable enthusiasm for that. He came to the so-called Pleasure Point Conference and participated very actively in that. He seemed to have a real enthusiasm for the college. I suppose to be very frank—not that I haven't been very frank all along—I didn't take the sciences appointments as seriously as the others. I felt that this was an area more or less outside my competence, very hard for me to judge.

I felt I could make an intellectual judgment about anybody outside of the sciences—whether they were in my field or not . . . I could get some sense of the quality of their mind, intellectual liveliness and imagination and so on. I didn't have that feeling about the scientists and was much more disposed to accept other people's judgments.

Calciano: Not put your own stamp on them?

Smith: For one thing, I didn't feel competent to really evaluate the letters of recommendations that were written in behalf of the junior people in the sciences. Those letters were always so inflated. Also there was an attitude that I came to identify in my field and other close fields, particularly at eastern places like Harvard, Princeton, Yale, most especially those snobbish institutions: their attitude seemed to be, "well here was so-and-so who was a good old boy, and he'd been around four or five years and obviously couldn't cut the mustard at Harvard. He was interested in teaching and had been a reasonably good teacher and had done a lot of the dirty work of the department and they had to find a job for him. He was interested in Santa Cruz, so let's get him into Santa Cruz." And I was always fighting off people like that. I also had letters from, inquiries from very senior and well-known people, a senior person in literature at Harvard and a senior historian at Brandeis and people of considerable academic distinction and prestige. But I certainly wasn't interested in them just because they were full professors at Harvard; that was not of any interest to me.

Calciano: In itself, yes?

Smith: And I was always kind of, touchy on this matter of their trying to fob off their second best on us.

Calciano: I asked about Ted Youngs . . . I was wondering, did he fit in well at Cowell?

Smith: Yes, I think he did. He had a funny manner about him that sort of put people off initially . . . a certain pompous way. But at heart he was an awfully generous, nice person. I was very fond of him, got to be. At first he was really not my type, and I went along with the appointment because the recommendations were good and I thought he had some interesting ideas about teaching science in a collegiate situation. But I got to be very fond of him and feel that he was an asset in the college. He was often difficult and irascible and it's interesting to me that in spite of that, that the people perceived that as being only skin deep.

At least that's my feeling—that sort of bustling officiousness and prickliness and sort of breaking out at faculty meetings in quite an irate, indignant way, or having sort of mini-tantrums, that that really wasn't all of him.

Calciano: People have mentioned to me that Harry Berger really did shape the literature [board] in those early days.

Smith: I think there's no question about that.

Calciano: And made the eight or nine basic appointments in literature.

Smith: Yes.

Calciano: And so, following through on what you said . . . you tended to give Berger his head in which appointments he wanted. What other people did you tend to give their heads?

Smith: Well, of course there are only a few in the college . . . [George T.] Amis and [Thomas A.] Vogler were people that Berger had known at Yale . . . Now in psychology, Bert [Kaplan] brought along with him, or urged to Richard Randolph to come, so that Randolph came to our attention . . . both [Jasper] Rose and Randolph came to our attention through Bert who was brought to our attention by David Reisman. I can't remember who turned up Bhuwan [L.] Joshi. Then Bill [G. William] Domhoff—I can't quite remember how he came into the picture; I don't know whether Bert discovered him or whether he was already sort of in consideration when Bert was appointed. But I don't have the sense that Bert was nearly as aggressive and active and sort of going out and getting his people as Harry [Berger] was. Harry had his little coterie that he wanted to bring.

I think Harry had a much more highly developed power drive than Bert, who's a much more private person, much more preoccupied with his own teaching; he's not an empire-builder basically and Harry seemed to me to be an empire-builder, to be very ambitious for his own ideas and plans.

Calciano: Was [William R.] Hitchcock one of our earliest historians?

Smith: When I talk about important appointments, I consider Mary [A.] Holmes only second maybe to Jasper, and second only in the sense that she didn't have that sort of administrative role. I was very devoted to Mary and had great affection and admiration for her intellectual qualities. She had, I think, been treated miserably at UCLA and dumped on professionally because she hadn't published or done the conventional things. This [attitude] was partly because she was such a brilliant teacher that other people envied her and put her down. Certainly her appointment was very important to me and was the appointment that I suppose got more flack and resistance and trouble than any other—not from Dean but from some mutton-head in University-wide administration whose name I don't even recall. He said, "Well, she'd not been recommended for tenure by UCLA and therefore blah, blah, blah . . . we shouldn't be bringing her to Santa Cruz and on and on."

World Civilization Program

Smith: Mary was important and Hitchcock was important; Hitchcock to me *and* to the college in the early years; Hitchcock because I had this notion of a World Civilization [program] which really depended on their coming.

Calciano: Why?

Smith: I was very anxious to have World Civilization as the center of the first two years of the students' experience. I felt that it would have been crazy to do that unless I had been assured of two teachers of proven quality who could do it. And I knew Hitchcock was a very, very successful and effective teacher in Western Civilization at UCLA. I also felt that he had been treated badly; he hadn't been promoted; he'd been passed over year after year and kept in an assistant professor status because he hadn't published . . . well, there were two things: first, he didn't finish his degree so that he was kept on as an acting assistant professor in this kind of limbo for five or six years. Then, when he got his degree and was an assistant professor, it was judged that he hadn't published enough; his promotion from assistant to associate professor was delayed and he was

kept in a humiliating and unpleasant situation. I never really knew him that well except that I sympathized and admired him as a teacher from what I heard about his teaching and work with students. And even that appointment turned out to be fraught with problems and difficulties; the principal storm in the college during my period as provost centered around Bill [Hitchcock] . . . But he did an awfully good job. He just turned out to be—to me—psychologically, temperamentally, a very, very difficult person and he came to perceive me as his enemy which was in a way ironic because the faculty from the beginning sort of sniped away at World Civilization. Harry Berger, particularly, had his own conception of world literature and he sort of sniped away at Bill and said that program was flawed. The course was a source of controversy and tension almost from the beginning, certainly after the first three or four years, which were the most successful years of the [program].

Calciano: Of what?

Smith: Of World Civilization. I don't know that I would want to say that I had regretted having made the appointment of Hitchcock because a great deal of the character of the college came from that World Civilization course which I believe was the most successful of all the so-called college or core programs.

Calciano: Was the failure of World Civilization because of Hitchcock's way of administering it or was it because you just can't get all that many senior faculty members working in tandem on something?

Smith: It was a combination of two things I think: first, the pressure of the first year, second, the need for everybody to participate and cooperate. That was possible, but then each year it became more and more of a problem. I don't think that was the real problem though. I think Bill is just a very funny, eccentric, quirky kind of guy. He's done well at Crown, you know. But so much depended on the course and there was a great weight on him. He turned out to be in my opinion, very rigid and very conventional in his attitude towards academic things. He always felt that the college was too lenient with students, that we didn't fail enough people and maybe he was right. But I was surprised at that element in him. I felt somehow that a person who had been dumped on by the system should be a person who's more open, more flexible, or whatever, but the system probably can't dump on you unless you buy into it . . . When I think back on some of the people who've taken the worst beatings from the system they're people who really in their heart of hearts believe profoundly in it . . . I've heard

Bill sit up and say, “Well, we can’t promote that person because they haven’t published enough.”

Calciano: Mary Holmes—had she worked with Hitchcock at UCLA or did you match the two up here?

Smith: I think they had done a little teaching together in extension . . . I’m not really positive about that, but they knew each other and I think they had a kind of basic sympathy with each other as people. Mary is certainly vastly different from Bill in almost every way except for being a brilliant teacher. But I think they respect each other as two people who existed in the system and had suffered from it because of their commitment to teaching. They got along awfully well; I never got a sense from either of them that there was any serious conflict or tension.

Calciano: Early on, was it a sort of policy or hope that UCSC would be bringing in a lot of faculty over the age of 65? What happened to that idea?

Women and Minority Faculty

Smith: I think it ran aground on the basic snobbery of the faculty. It was Dean’s idea. There [were] two things that we talked a lot about that didn’t come to pass, or when they did, came in very different forms. We talked a great deal about trying to get a large number of women, a large proportion of women on the faculty. I asked five women among the first ten people I made initial approaches to I guess: Roberta Wohlstelter, Fawn Brodie, Susan Sontag, and Suzanne Langer. Langer I discovered was really too old and crotchety, and hard of hearing, to be movable. Helen Merrill Lynn, one of the first women I approached, almost came. There were several others, but the problem of course in those early days in recruiting women was that women scholars were—except for the ones that had emerged as people with reputations—almost nonexistent. If somebody had the time it would be interesting to look at all the letters of application that came into the college from prospective faculty; I can’t remember any, *any* from women. And I *think* I would have, since I was committed to the notion of having women well represented on the faculty. I even had this fantasy that I would have a faculty of *nothing* but women presided over by me. That was never anything more than a fantasy. But out of all that talk, obviously very little resulted.

Sometimes women come to me to ask in a sort of accusatory way about why there weren’t more women on the faculty. Since I was recruiting faculty in the beginning,

why weren't there more women? I say, well, I was very committed, and Dean was, to trying to get women but it was very difficult; maybe I didn't go about it in the right way . . . obviously part of it was that I didn't look in the right places. I wanted women that I knew about, whose work and achievements I was aware of, rather than just a woman to have a woman. I wanted women that were outstanding people. Another failure was that Dean was very anxious in the beginning to have Mexican-Americans. He hired some young guy from the Peace Corps who'd been in South America. I just saw him around town the other day . . . Tom Fletcher . . . to really take that as a kind of special assignment. But it was really just a very up-hill job; and of course when the Chicanos began to come in numbers they immediately got in rows with Dean and depicted him as a sort of very harsh, racist kind of a person which always seemed to me to be the height of irony.

Part of that was Dean's fault because I think . . . he's basically tactless in his dealings with students. If you push Dean, he pushes back; I supposed that's human. But he's really quite rigid and has a very low boiling point.

Calciano: I always thought it rather ironic that he had such a good following among students when he was a faculty member at UCLA.

Smith: Yes.

College Life

Calciano: For awhile here he was really depicted as the ogre by students of the late '60s.

Smith: I think that several things contributed towards that attitude. The collegiate system encouraged that because if you were a college administrator in constant contact with students you knew them well and were aware of the things that they didn't like about the University or the college. They were disposed to blame the things they didn't like on some more remote figure, so that Dean really became the sort of lightning rod that attracted all the complaints and discontents.

It wasn't only the visitation issue, the whole manner of parental rules, and girls' and boys' residence halls. That was such a constant, unending interminable issue which was made more difficult and complicated by—in my opinion—Dean's rigidity. I am very conventional and old-fashioned; I certainly went along completely with the original

rules, the notion of segregating the sexes, etc. My conventional views were put forth in a notorious pastoral letter to the students the first year of the college. But you know, at certain points, it seemed to me that the life of the college [itself] began to be imperiled by issues that weren't worth it . . . and at that point I was ready to give way. But it usually took six months longer to get Dean to yield. So, there was always the sense among the students . . . that he was this stern, unyielding and repressive character.

Calciano: Did you ever fight over this issue?

Smith: I don't think we fought. I think at stages he felt that I had lost the stiffness of my spine and was becoming too pliant and giving way too much to the students' pressures, and sort of undercutting him. I think he felt that probably about all the provosts. I suspect he felt it a bit more about me because he and I started out so much in accord on the basic issues and then, I think, he just felt probably especially aggrieved at what he thought was my desertion of the cause.

Calciano: Somebody made the comment to me that . . . we were talking on the subject of faculty and the major influence some of these early appointments had on the life of the college. I've heard the comment that the senior appointments did *not* have as much influence as was expected because most board decisions and most college decisions were participatory-type decisions where all faculty—junior and senior—had their say. Did you have any comment on this?

Smith: Well, I think it's true, yes. I think that old-fashioned notion of the board chairman-type who just could establish the whole character of a board through his decisions . . . that day is long over. When I went to UCLA I didn't realize that I was part of generation of junior people who had a major voice in the determination of departmental policies. It just seemed very natural and certainly measured that standard . . . I think you could say that that was true; Harry (Berger) had more influence on determining the character of the literature board and was closest to that old sort of authoritarian or paternalistic department chairman who really did impose his own stamp on the whole operation. I was thinking of their influence more in other ways and the general intellectual tone . . . in the life of the college itself.

THE PROVOSTSHIP

Administering Cowell College

Calciano: Someone else has said they felt that you relied quite heavily on Bert Kaplan's judgment and yet you haven't really mentioned him in that light. You mentioned Rose and Stookey.

Smith: No . . . I think Bert and I are very divergent in our attitudes; we've been, I suppose, on the opposite side of issues more often than on the same side. The first year I did establish a kind of kitchen cabinet. I don't know how much interest there is in my own personal idiosyncrasies as an administrator, but never having administered, my inclination was always to do things myself which then appeared to be arbitrary or authoritarian. It was done I think less out of an authoritarian impasse than from the feeling that was the simplest, quickest, easiest way to do things and that everybody must agree that if they didn't they'd speak up. And in many instances, I think, people did agree but became increasingly irritated at my acting unilaterally and without that kind of endless consultation and going over things that's so much a part of the academic world. Here's something that I read recently that I thought was so appropriate in some ways to our discussion that I would read it into the record.

Meetings

For a long time
there have been many meetings
of many men
for many days.

At the meetings
there is talking,
talking,
talking.
Some this way.
Some that way.

In the morning
when my father
leaves for a meeting
he says to us,
"When I come here again
then I will know
if it is best
to have many sheep

or few sheep,
to use the land
or let it sleep.”

But
when my father
comes home from meeting
he does not know
which talking-way to follow.

Tonight
when my father
came home from meeting
he just sat, looking
and looking.

My mother gave him coffee
and bread and mutton,
but my father just sat,
looking.

Then my mother
spoke to me.
She said,
“A meeting is like rain.
When there is little talk,
now and then,
here and there,
it is good.
It makes thoughts grow
as little rains make corn grow.

But big talk, too much,
is like a flood
taking things of long standing
before it.”

My mother
said this to me,
but I think
she wanted my father
to hear it.

“Little Herder in Spring, In Summer”
—Ann Clark, (United States Indian Service)

Smith: This is “Little Herder in Spring, In Summer,” by Ann Clark, of the United States Indian Service. It is an Indian girl writing about her father’s sheep, but it reminds me of

faculty meetings. I came to temper my impatience certainly and largely as a result of faculty pressure. But that first year when I thought I needed some help and advice I just would ask some people to help me and advise me. As I recall I asked Sig and Bert and I can't remember now who else . . . a couple of other people. That seemed to me a simple, easy way to do it. I think the notion that I depended so much on Bert's judgment is the result, in part, of my personal regard and affection for him and our very close personal relationship. He was very supportive in many things in the college that I considered important—the culture breaks, those kinds of things. I think it was more a matter of that Bert always started with the assumption that he wanted to back up and support anything I wanted to do. Then often he came reluctantly, to differ, but he never wanted to make that difference a source of contention or to seem to be opposing me. He would say with a sort of a sad smile, that he thought that was wrong and he was going to vote against it or something. But I think he was always scrupulous in not wanting to appear as being in opposition.

Calciano: I have a lot more questions on different categories and I wondered if you would prefer to continue in a couple of weeks in another session or do . . . usually an hour and a half is as much as anybody wants to go at a time.

Smith: Yes, yes. Sure. I think that's fine. You know, my problem is that one question sets me off . . .

Calciano: Oh, this is great. I . . .

Smith: I talk and talk more than probably is useful.

Calciano: Oh no. It's just that . . . I want you to give full answers and when a person tends to get tired after a couple hours of interviewing, you tend to get one-sentence answers.

Smith: Right.

Calciano: So, I'll be wanting to talk about the development of the college . . . the development of the boards of study and the relationships. And also about some of the administrative figures . . . okay, is there anything that you want to add on this particular topic of early faculty appointments and the . . .

Smith: No, I would just emphasize the extraordinary opportunity . . . I'd like to talk at a future date more about the various notions about the curriculum, the experiences of the students, the teaching situation and some of the problems of the first and second years and why it seems to me certain things didn't work out as one had hoped.

Calciano: Yes.

Smith: But it was an extraordinary opportunity and because there was no faculty, and it was even more than that, because there were no department heads; everything was so late we had to plan the college in considerable detail and then in effect say to the faculty, here's what we've planned: if you find this interesting, please come and join us and help put it into operation. I suspect that's an almost unprecedented situation because usually the planners are appointed first, and they, including a substantial faculty group, plan and plan. Now, of course, students would also be involved and so everything was kind of easy and fun and really a delight because there was no bureaucratic structure to contend with and in large part because there was such harmony between Byron Stookey and myself. So that really was delightful, interesting. People were always coming here, prospective faculty, and they usually stayed with us . . . there was no campus house of course.

Calciano: I thought we might talk now about the years from '64 on as far as your provostship. What were some of the major administrative problems you ran into in the early years of your provostship?

Smith: Well, let me go back a minute. I don't know whether when we talked last the articles in *Sundaze*² had come out.

Calciano: No

Smith: I can't remember. I guess they had.

Calciano: Well, they either hadn't, or we didn't discuss them. I didn't read them till later.

Smith: Yes, yes. Well, I wanted to mention in commenting on the articles—which I thought on the whole were quite fair and balanced and were not hostile to the

²*Sundaze* was an alternative weekly newspaper which was published in Santa Cruz from November 23, 1970, to November 3, 1972.—Editor.

chancellor . . . I don't know how he perceived them, but that was generally my feeling. A faculty member was commenting that the result was inevitably a distortion because approaching the matter from this biographical point of view, you inevitably left out some very crucial things and I would say the most important one was Byron Stookey's role in the beginnings of the University without which it was really impossible to make much sense of the whole beginning. While the chancellor had a kind of a cautious commitment to certain changes and innovations, this commitment was extended in a very striking way by Byron Stookey's far more subtle and radical, educational thinking. I think Byron just perceived a whole range of problems that the chancellor really wasn't aware of or interested in. And I think that was very important.

Calciano: Problems in education *per se*.

Smith: Yes. Right.

Pass-Fail Grading System

Smith: And the other thing . . . this is a purely personal kind of thing that I may have mentioned last time . . . I can't remember . . . but I take credit for the pass-fail grading system because I was determined to have it. I'd already, as I think I mentioned, done something like that at UCLA within the conventional system. And while Dean was not opposed to pass-fail grading I think he was very uneasy about the whole thing and thought that the University rules forbid it, that we'd get in trouble trying to do it; that was trying to do too much too soon. So I just want to reassert my claim since it is one of my particular obsessions—that we should have the pass-fail system. A phrase the Senate rules was ambiguous enough to allow for this although I think neither of us thought that it was intended to; we *could* say that, well, it seemed to us that this could be interpreted in such and such a way. As soon as the college started we got word from the Committee on Rules and Jurisdiction that we *had* misinterpreted the rule and we weren't supposed to have pass-fail. There was quite a flap and as I recall, [F.M.] Glenn Willson, who was probably then chairman of our Academic Senate, went up and made a particular plea, saying it would very disruptive if we tried to change pass-fail now, since we had just started. So we were given the right to do it for a couple of years and then have it reviewed.

Calciano: Was pass-fail decided upon at the time when it was just you and the chancellor and a few people?

Smith: Yes, it was decided on *a priori*; it wasn't a decision that the faculty participated in. It had already been stated as.

Calciano: That's what I wanted to know. *Stated.*

Smith: That of course, was true of most of the aspects of the college. I may have already mentioned—my memory's so bad—a faculty member from Irvine, one of the original faculty at the Irvine campus which was started just about the same time, who wanted very much to come to Santa Cruz. He wrote me . . . he was part of a big contingent or fairly large contingent of faculty that was planning for the Irvine campus; and I really think that it was a great blessing that we had no faculty in the early planning stages; with a faculty everything would have been much more protracted and difficult to decide on. I think there would have inevitably been disappointments with some people saying that they were much in favor of, or very much opposed to this or that. I think a good deal of good feeling and good spirit in the faculty was really due to the fact that we had gone ahead and tried to think of what would make an intelligent curriculum and an interesting college and then invited faculty to come if they were interested in the sort of thing we were going to do. This professor at Irvine wrote me that everybody was meeting all day in committees and he was very self-important about all the time that was being spent, but I don't think they came up with anything very interesting or novel. I think faculty, people generally speaking, even a more liberal or innovative faculty, are in lots of ways very conservative, so I think it was a great advantage not having faculty. It's a funny thing to say, and might sound prejudiced—I'm not speaking in terms of any particular personalities—but if you're going to do something you're far better off if you decide to do it and *then* go and try to find people who are interested in doing that, rather than trying to do everything in committee.

Calciano: What was the reaction of the potential faculty that you were recruiting?

Smith: I can never remember any resentment or resistance, any feeling from them that they should have been in on the early planning; resentment at being asked to come here and then not having a say in how things were going to be done. That just never seemed to come up for whatever reason. I suppose it was that the people who decided to come, came because what we thought we wanted to do seemed to them to be

sensible . . . So that the issue never really arose. Although certainly by the end of the first year there was a kind of underground, an undercurrent of resistance to my way of doing things.

It would be interesting to know how other faculty view the first year. There were all kinds of problems and crises; the most conspicuous and striking came about over World Civilization and the large numbers of students who had failed on that final comprehensive exam at the end of the first year which resulted in the dismissal of almost a fifth of the freshman class, over a hundred students. We failed that many and dismissed a very large number, an excruciating experience for everybody. I'm really amazed that we came through it as well as we did, that it didn't leave long-standing scars. A lot of the students who were dismissed, a substantial number, came back and finished up.

Calciano: Well when you dismiss, can you be dismissed for failing one course?

Smith: Since the World Civilization was one third of the student's program the whole first year, failure represented failure of a third of a year's academic work, fifteen units out of forty-five. Before we had any inkling that this would happen the faculty had decided that students who failed this ultimate comprehensive exam would in fact have to be dropped because that was such a large part of their workload. It was really a very harrowing experience. The students in the college were so close-knit that the first year was like a perpetual campout or party—there was a very close feeling among the faculty and students and between the students in these little trailer units.

Calciano: Did they have problems getting readmitted, or . . .

Smith: I don't think so, no. Some of them came back three and four years later. They were readmitted and finished. A boy named Eric Bocs came back and worked with Al Johnson in ceramics and became a superb potter . . . really very outstanding and he was a complete failure in every way, I think, the first year. He got into all kinds of trouble.

The way we'd set up World Civilization . . . I think that was the most excruciating crisis that the college went through. But the rewarding thing about it for me was that we preserved on the whole a very pleasant and amiable spirit. The college never became, in my opinion, polarized or had bitter divisions or antagonisms. My regrets are that gradually, year after year, the faculty participated less and less in the life of the college and I blame that largely on the competition from the boards. The real mistake was in

just not having the gumption to make the colleges the whole show. I don't know that we could have under the circumstances. There were many things working the other way, but the (lack of) resolution to really make it a collegiate arrangement and to have the boards function in a much more limited and informal way even than they did, was the principal failure about the college. Indeed, the problem of the collegiate system at UCSC is that the colleges haven't really been able to compete effectively with the boards in the long run.

Calciano: Oh this pass-fail thing, I want, I'd like to just follow up on that. How did putting pass-fail into practice . . . how did reality meet up with what you anticipated? Were you happy with it?

Smith: Well I have always been very pleased with it. The system had to make its way against many problems such as complications in terms of students' admission to other schools. That problem was never as bad as we had anticipated. I've heard it said that people felt that we got more people into graduate school on the basis of pass-fail than we would have if we'd had a regular letter-grading system. In our first graduating class, an extraordinarily high proportion of students won fellowships, several Woodrow Wilson fellowships and perhaps three were admitted to Harvard in biology. In just about every field we really did much better that first year than we ever have done since. But I always said that the greatest thing—which I had not anticipated—about the pass-fail system was that it freed the professor, at least it freed me; I didn't realize the extent to which the way I thought about teaching was conditioned by the fact that my relationship with the students had to produce this thing called a grade. That really limits the kinds of things you can do and you could teach in a way that really involves the whole class in common enterprises. The conventional grading system inevitably produced a competitive situation in the class where some people prospered at the expense of others. In other words, the less bright group was made to appear less bright by the very bright, and so on. I think that it's one of the most negative aspects of the whole teaching situation. I don't like the course system but that's a relatively minor problem when compared to the negative effects of conventional grading, which I see as a kind of by-product of a competitive society. I think it's true when the University is described as simply reproducing the competitive situation in the world outside. It is set up to produce often meaningless distinctions between people. Somebody's an A person; somebody's a C person. Well, you know (sigh) life is so much bigger than that. That never made me very happy.

Calciano: Do you think that students who are interested in the competitive outer world, getting into medical school, law school, and so forth, would be better off going elsewhere?

Smith: I suppose in a way . . . I see students all the time in graduate school who say, “graduate school is just a terrible experience for me and Santa Cruz really ruined me for graduate school because I just can’t put up with the stuff that I’m asked to put up with.” Well, my undergraduate days, which were very different in many ways, ruined me for graduate school at Harvard which I thought was a terrible drag and a bore and much too protracted. So I don’t really know. I think graduate school is just a mess generally. I hardly know of a student who hasn’t had a disappointing and frustrating time in graduate school however well they may have done, and most of them have done well. I know one former student came back and just gave me and the college hell. He’d gone to the University of Pennsylvania and he said he just couldn’t fit in at all because of what was required in graduate school. He’s one of the few that’s blamed us. Most of them say, “I don’t regret going [or] having gone to Santa Cruz.” Even if graduate school *is* bad, it’s crazy to say that you should make the undergraduate experience bad too, so that students will be prepared for it.

I think the biggest brouhaha over the pass-fail thing came on the issue of closed or opened evaluations [and whether students should have access to them]. The students began to agitate the second or third year that they wanted access to the evaluations. And it seemed to me that in order for the evaluations to be as candid and useful as they should be to the people reading them, they had to be confidential; you just simply wouldn’t say things in an open evaluation that you would in a confidential one—at least I wouldn’t. But I think in retrospect, it was right and inevitable that students have access to their evaluations. It’s an awfully touchy thing when well-intentioned people can write unfair or unjust evaluations of students. If the students don’t have access to them, they have no protection against them, no way of knowing where they stand. What really developed was that you wrote your evaluations for the students. When you had to write letters of recommendation, as you almost inevitably did anyway, you made those more candid in terms of the student’s particular strengths and weaknesses. Although I was very opposed to making the evaluations available to students, I think I was wrong. The decision to make them public was both right and necessary. Although it’s interesting how many students never bother to look at their evaluations.

Calciano: Oh, really?

Smith: Yes.

Calciano: I would think that it would be a learning process to . . .

Smith: Well I say “how many” . . . I’m of course surprised when I find any. I mean every now and then a student says to me, “Well I never bothered to look at my evaluations,” or, “When I went and looked at my evaluations after two years, I found that there was a very bad evaluation that I think was unfair” or something of that kind.

Calciano: Umhmm.

Teaching Methods—Old versus New

Smith: So I don’t think it’s widespread, but it’s obvious that some don’t do it. What I’d emphasize more than anything else is the way in which pass-fail frees the teacher; I could teach very differently in a much more interesting and rewarding way.

There is something not strictly relevant to the college, but it relates to the larger problem of education in the last decade. One interesting thing that has happened, and I gather a good many of my colleagues have had the same experience, is that the things that I did very well or that the students seemed to find very satisfactory in terms of my teaching, conventional kind of lecture things were less and less successful until finally I abandoned them entirely. I just went to a whole different approach to teaching. That’s a very strange experience.

Calciano: Would you like to be a little more specific?

Smith: Yes.

Calciano: I’d like to move this table a little closer to you so that I’m sure we’ll pick you up. Okay.

Smith: There was the conventional lecture situation; you worked hard on lectures; you tried to make them as interesting as possible; you got up and delivered them to the students and they wrote down what they wanted to write down and read what you told them to read and took examinations and did well or badly, as the case might be. I was quite good at that and students often said, “I enjoyed the course so much; I never thought history could be that interesting,” which was kind of ironic. In other words, you were appreciated in the view of the student to the degree that you transcended the

inherent dullness of the material and the whole situation in which the student found himself. It didn't occur to the average student to really protest, or be restless or dissatisfied in the way they later came to be. Their appreciation when something was better than their general experience had led them to anticipate was only the manifestation of this general situation. That's a very funny sort of situation when you look back on it. I always felt, even at the time, that it was a little ironic to hear a student say, "I never thought history could be so interesting," because then you wanted to say, "Well, what the hell did you ever take the course for anyway?" And they would have answered, "I had to have so many units of this . . . in social science or in history," or, "I heard this was more interesting than most," or something like that. It was a very hit-or-miss arrangement. I really had a very keen sense that it worked less and less well, and for two reasons in my opinion.

That the credibility, the whole coherence of the academic world had begun to diminish, come apart at the seams; where you had a kind of tacit acceptance before, you now had an active challenging, often even hostility, a sort of "show me" attitude rather than the earlier more accepting, passive one. You had this really demoralizing sense of the diminishing effectiveness [of your teaching]. I think this has been a general experience for American teachers of my generation on the high school level, but certainly at the college level. I don't know if it's just my generation, but in the last decade, people whose whole way of teaching was sort of set, established and rather conventional, but reasonably successful, have had this sense that for some reason we often couldn't understand and sometimes just tried to close our minds to, it wasn't working. And so that really switched things around . . .

I tried lots of different ways of teaching. Almost all of them involved trying to put more responsibility on the students, to jolt them out of their passive attitude towards the course and the material and persuade or cajole or force them to take a more active part . . . such as finding some portion of the course that they were particularly interested in and asking them to join with other students in working up a presentation for the class. I tried quite a variety of things, none of them I'm sure particularly novel and some quite resented. The last time I taught a course, I started by saying to the students that this was not going to be a class in which I stood up and delivered material to them and they wrote it down and so on. If they wanted that, they should go elsewhere. But they were going to have to be the active agents in this process. I was there to suggest and provide some kind of resource and talk about certain things which seemed to be unlikely they

would discover by themselves and to point out to them things to look for. At the end of the course, the chairman of the history board sent me a letter from a student which was an angry attack on me, saying that I had failed to carry out my proper role in the class; it was a terrible course, because I hadn't done what I was supposed to do. He was sure that I was too aged and eminent to be reprimanded, but he thought I should be.

The last couple of years that I taught I came very clearly to have this feeling that I had two constituencies in a way that I hadn't before . . . a portion of the class which might have been from a third to two-thirds—it varied from class to class—which was thoroughly turned off by conventional teaching situations and by having a professor who just got up and lectured in a perfectly routine way or even a very interesting way and didn't like and accept and respond to that sort of situation. Then another constituency of the more conventional students that simply wanted the old-style instructor. Some of them, but not all, from junior college backgrounds . . . they didn't want any disturbing or unusual or anxiety-producing elements beyond those that were already in the conventional situation and which they'd already learned to cope with. They wanted a very conventional situation, a very conventional lecture; many of them would have preferred, grades and quizzes and a sense that they knew where they were. It was very odd to have that group appear at the end of a decade in which everything had seemed to move in the other direction. It was a kind of counter-revolution . . . a Thermidorian reaction which was really hard for me to cope with. I found it very, very difficult to have those two constituencies. It was hard enough to wrench myself out of familiar ways of doing things and try to teach in more interesting and imaginative ways. Then on top of that, people who challenged us on the grounds that I wasn't doing my duty to them. I don't know how much you want me to get into my whole philosophy of teaching?

Calciano: Yes, I do very much.

Smith: You see, I had the feeling that one of the troubles with our present system was that it turned professors into accountants and having everybody teach five courses over the period of a year . . . I always taught more than the minimum . . . I was always an academic scab . . . when I was an administrator I usually taught five, almost always, three to five courses. And sometimes six. And then at the last, after I quit as provost, I taught, I think, oh, between seven and ten courses a year.

Calciano: Well, just for the record, what's the average load?

Smith: Five.

Calciano: Yes. I thought it was, but I wanted to put it on the record.

Smith: And I taught these courses in a variety of different ways. Some were taught largely by the students themselves; some were courses where I put relatively little time and effort into them, because I thought, that they could be done and should be done that other way. If you're conscientious and you're responsible for teaching five courses, you feel that you have put in so much time. It really makes the whole system inflexible. The ideal would seem to me to be if you could teach ten courses and induce students to do most of the work on their own.

UCSC Students—1964 to 1974

Calciano: You were saying that it rather startled you to have the students' reaction to teaching, some of it an element of students changing.

Smith: Yes.

Calciano: Were students more homogenous in the '64 through '68 period than they are in the '70 to '74 period? Our students, I mean.

Smith: I don't know. I suppose what was probably true then was that the most articulate and active and militant and maybe even the brightest students were so evident that they really set the tone for the whole group. The more conservative or idiosyncratic or individualistic students really laid low and didn't catch your attention as much; you really assumed that they were *all* rather of this character of the most conspicuous and articulate group. During this period of upheaval (I don't know that agitation is quite the word I'd want to use) but when that period of ferment died down, then I suspect the other students, the more conventional students, became more visible. That's just a guess. I think there was also a change, too. I'm told that Santa Cruz has lost its reputation as a particularly exciting, interesting place to go which would be borne out in part by the decline in applications for admission. Probably some of the more interesting students aren't even going to college now. So that now we're getting a larger proportion of the more conventional students. I think it's a combination of those two things, that you are getting some more conventional students, some higher proportion, but also that there's a kind of passivity, kind of a sense of defeat among the

students. The voices of the objectors, the militants muted . . . Why don't you sit over here by the fire?

Curriculum Philosophy

Calciano: You said the other day you wanted to talk a little bit about the curriculum and maybe now's the time to do it. We seem to have been skirting around the topic as we've talked about what students want pass and fail.

Smith: Yes, yes.

Calciano: What did you have in mind about talking about the curriculum? Were you thinking of the early years, or its change over the years, or . . .

Smith: Well, I'm not too sure. I think that there should be more coherence in the curriculum than there is. One thing I would like to comment on, and that is my feeling, from the beginning work study was never given as much effect in the college as I would have liked. The most notable example of this of course was the students going to Daufauski under Herman Blake's direction. That now has become very common and Merrill has made a particular point of it, but I have always thought it terribly important that students be off the campus a good portion of their undergraduate time. I would have made it a requirement if I could have gotten away with it, that every student in the college would have had to spend at least a quarter or two off campus. Again that's the sort of thing that if you don't do it at the very beginning as I think Merrill is doing and it's awfully hard to institute. All kinds of vested academic interests are opposed to it because they *want* the students on campus.

Calciano: Did you think about proposing it, back at the time you were putting in pass-fail?

Smith: No, I really didn't. I just thought about trying to encourage it and really the success of it in the college turned out to be so dependent on Herman Blake's leadership that it would really have been hard to institutionalize it. I had it as a sort of ideal or goal. I don't know whether you call it curriculum really, but the Culture Break idea was very important to me. I always said from the beginning that I wanted to find some way to overcome the strain and anxiety that it seemed to me a typical undergraduate education produced in the student. Doing away with grades was one of the ways I hoped to effect this. I wanted a more pleasant environment where people could learn

and I suppose to enjoy the delight of learning instead of being exposed primarily to the strains and anxieties . . . I don't know that we've accomplished much with this but I think Culture Breaks have survived as a kind of historical residue of that ideal. When I left the University, I said that I thought Paul [A.] Lee was a person who had taken this notion very seriously and had tried to enhance our common life . . . in pleasant, delightful ways: [Alan Chadwick's] garden [project], the Whole Earth Restaurant, a general sense that there should be a pleasure in learning and living together in a learning community. The University's rejection of Lee was in a sense a rejection of this principle which was so important to me, and that is why I felt an acute responsibility to him.³ I thought he'd taken seriously what I had said, whereas other people had said, "Well you know Smith, he's sort of eccentric and that's his thing," you know, "he's reliable in other ways, but . . ." So I was allowed that indulgence . . . indulged in that because of my seniority and what not, but Paul Lee suffered for it, and so in a certain sense I saw that light go out and that was a symbol of the disappointment of that expectation. Of course that's overstating it, and in lots of situations, lots of people and lots of places I'm sure that that spirit survives and is nurtured and is an important part of the life of the University. But it was, in my opinion, ultimately weighed down and overcome by conventional academic attitudes and ways of doing things. For instance, there was a great hoop-to-do over the Culture Break: whether it was just an eccentric Cowell thing or whether it should be for all the colleges. The only reason it became an issue was because the instructors didn't want to call their classes off just so that Cowell could have its eccentric Culture Break. And the faculty, really from the very beginning, were awfully stuffy about their classes . . . you'd think that the world was going to come to an end if the students didn't hear their lecture in "the dispersion of social classes in urban centers or something," whatever the particular topic was.

Calciano: Well, how was that resolved?

Smith: Well they finally allowed a college day one day a year in January you know; we'd had the Culture Breaks for every quarter and when they were that, they were real kind of loosening up and a nice change of pace and diversion . . . when they happen just once a year, well that is already a considerable retreat from the notion, the original notion. Do you have any questions that you feel I should cover?

³Smith is referring to Paul A. Lee, an Assistant Professor in religious studies whom the University did not advance to tenure.—Editor.

Calciano: I definitely will have at least one more session, because there were several categories of questions that I want to give to you. I gather you're saying the University has changed in character over the last eight years.

Smith: Yes. I'm sure that's not an original or even a controversial proposition. It certainly has changed a great deal inevitably and I don't think by any means all for the worse. I think I mentioned last time any experimental venture is going to fall short of its original expectations and this particular one ran into vast sea changes in the whole realm of education, so that I think it was inevitable that there would be a good deal of what appears to me to be retrenchment. I understand that the colleges are now coming up with some final proposal to try and save the collegiate situation by . . . centering more of the intellectual academic life of the students in the colleges. I don't know whether that can succeed. I certainly think it's worth trying, because I think otherwise, in another few years if it isn't already that way, UCSC is just going to be another campus of the University with funny things called colleges that students don't pay much attention to.

Calciano: Do you really feel that the college idea has eroded that much?

Smith: Yes, I do. I talked to a young student just the other day and I said, "What college are you in?" and he shrugged and said, "Well I'm in college so-and-so, but I don't go there. I don't even get my mail there. I live off campus and I don't take any courses there. The college has nothing to offer me." Many students say that. I'm sure that there are many who find the college more rewarding, but that's a general feeling, I would guess. If you talked to students on a systematic basis, you would get a very negative response on this. I suspect that each college has a little nucleus of students who are very closely identified with the life of the college; and then a larger group that have only a casual relationship with it. But I just don't think the boards and the colleges can peacefully co-exist. The nation can't exist half slave and half free.

Boards of Study Versus Colleges

Calciano: You mean the arrangement that on any faculty appointment or promotion the college has half a say and the board has half a say? That's the way it started out.

Smith: Well . . . yes, but it's more extensive than that . . . that's one manifestation of it, but it's a particularly difficult and thorny sort of problem that is just symbolic of the whole general situation of boards, because the so-called professionalism is rooted; that's

where they want the time of the faculty and some boards are very unsympathetic, or at least used to be, towards their members doing too much college teaching, and that's just an absurd situation for the college to be competing with the board for the time of the faculty person. I'm not as concerned about the troublesome time-consuming process of college and board appointments. I think that may serve some ultimately useful purpose; but I am concerned by the issue of the time the faculty person gives to the board.

Calciano: Are they supposed to teach four courses for the board and one for the college?

Smith: Well, yes. It varies. Some boards accept a three and two, but by and large, it's a four and one; and it's just a bad kind of a situation for faculty members to be in. If they want to teach in the college and do much teaching then they run the risk of having the board not support them very strongly and say that well they spend too much in the college and vice versa. It's a very bad situation, particularly for junior faculty, and I don't think it does anything to stimulate and encourage the real intellectual life of the institution, the scholarly, academic side of it.

Calciano: Were there any steps that could have been taken in '65 or '66 that would've changed this erosion of power from the colleges?

Smith: (Pause) Yes. We could have gone the whole hog and not had boards of study and I think in retrospect we should have. I don't think that the chancellor would ever have stood still for that. I think if he had not been so preoccupied with our social rating, our standing in the eyes of the outside world, that that could have been done and that Kerr might have backed him up and I think we would have been infinitely better off for that. We were often frightened by our own temerity, since we were trying something that by the standards of the University of California was quite unorthodox. We were constantly being reminded of the need to achieve respectability in certain areas in order to be allowed to be experimental in others. So I think in retrospect that without any question we should have grasped the nettle firmly. The notion of college autonomy which I certainly didn't fight for or propose at the beginning was in fact essential.

Calciano: But how would it work if the colleges had full sway because didn't you need the coordinating ability of a board of studies to make sure for instance that all areas of math were being taught.

Smith: I can't really speak about the sciences but I don't think so. I think you could have had informal consultations between people. I suppose you could say, well, what is the difference between informal consultations and a board? I think there is *some* difference. The boards with their power, the power of appointments and promotions, really have called the tune. But if you had your instruction entirely in the colleges, I don't know why a chemist in Cowell couldn't meet with chemists in Crown and Merrill and say, "This quarter I'm going to be offering so-and-so, but we do need to cover such-and-such and such-and-such, and will somebody do that," or "How can we take care of that aspect of things?" Certainly in the humanities and social sciences, I think it's less of a problem. People by and large teach what they want to teach anyway really. They're brought here to teach something that they've considered qualified to teach. I suppose the divisional chairman who never had any real power . . . vice-chancellors in that instance would have had some power because they could have said to the colleges, "Well you have three people in American History and we can't have any more appointments in that field." The divisional chairmen have been just a cipher more or less; they varied in terms of their own personal capacities and forcefulness, but their office is a nothing office, always has been; they've never played a really important role in developing policy and making decisions in my opinion.

Calciano: Well, have they been supportive as part of the chancellor's staff perhaps?

Smith: Yes, I think they've been fair and have tried and on the whole have succeeded in being fair brokers between the colleges but inevitably they're discipline-oriented. I mean, they can't help but be.

Calciano: Originally the colleges were to have half-say in promotions so that the faculty would feel that they ought to be spending a good part of their time towards the college. Now what happened?

Smith: I think that is still observed in principle; it's a very complicated process in actual fact. I guess it works to some extent, but it hasn't been sufficient, it hasn't been enough. The participation of the colleges in promotions and appointments hasn't been sufficient to give the colleges the academic support that they need. We don't have the time and I suppose it's too big and complex a problem to deal with superficially, but I would love to argue the point that the colleges should each have their own curriculum and their own faculty and this would be better than the present situation and there would be some exchange . . . people could take courses between colleges. But the colleges would

be where the academic life of the University was plainly established. And I think it would make for a much livelier situation and mean that the colleges had much more real vitality.

Calciano: You've alluded to the fact that you don't feel curriculum is coordinated enough. What steps or programs . . .

Smith: Well, I don't know that I'd want to put it that way. I don't believe that there's any salvation in curriculum. Most educational institutions keep monkeying around with the curriculum; changing and adding things. And revising, and I think the results are never worth the effort. When I say curriculum I mean something rather different. The curriculum is loosely what the students study and it's equally important how they study it, where they study it, and under what circumstances . . . Student-taught courses are very important in my opinion and for the most part have been a great success here. Another issue besides curriculum are extramural activities . . . I don't know whether that's curriculum or not curriculum . . . college programs, that's curriculum . . . the World Civilization program . . . that was a crucial part of the Cowell curriculum. So I'm not sure just how I want to respond to that. I think that the real issues and problems and questions are not basically curricular in the traditional sense of changing this curriculum and revamping this curriculum and so on.

Calciano: More all-encompassing?

Smith: Yes.

Calciano: One quick question. I gather you were probably the one who decided it, but I don't know . . . how did history end up in humanities here rather than as a social science?

Smith: I certainly cast my vote for that. I don't think there are disciplines that properly are called social sciences. I would call them all humanistic studies or disciplines. I think the whole social science thing is a fraud and a delusion and just confuses the issue.

Calciano: Okay.

Smith: In fact I urged the chancellor and I think made him very angry by bringing up unannounced, without any warning, at a general meeting, that I thought there shouldn't be separate divisions of the humanities and social sciences . . . that I didn't

think that the division was justified in terms of the nature of the respective disciplines. For instance, psychology is not science in my opinion, nor is sociology or anthropology any more or less than history. Since history was the only discipline that I could influence, I did my best to push that into the category of humanities. I think calling a certain group of studies social sciences gives an entirely erroneous notion of what goes on in those [disciplines]. And it often impels the people in them to try to make them work like sciences.

Calciano: You feel the name matters.

Smith: Yes. I think it can. At Irvine, for instance, they put history in the social sciences and made a great deal about how scientific history was going to be there, but it's not any different there than anywhere else so far as I can see . . . any more scientific. They probably have more historians who use computers, but that's not science as far as I'm concerned . . . that's method.

Assessment of the Provostship

Calciano: We talked the first time about the very early years. Now I'd like to talk not only about the early years but also the years that you were at the campus and your thinking about the years you were provost and I'd like to ask . . . what did you like best about being provost?

Smith: Well that carries us into such a funny, personal thing. I liked the relationship with the students above all, because it really was a great luxury. I've always been close to students and been concerned and interested in them and it was that fact I think that prompted McHenry to ask me to come up here. But my contacts with students had always been such intermittent ones; students came into your class, your class, you got to know them, and then they disappeared and you lost track of them unless occasionally one of them might show up later in his academic career. But that whole sense of being involved in the lives of students and seeing them through . . . seeing them develop through the four years of college and then having contacts with them after they left was the most interesting and rewarding part of the whole experience for me. Also the . . . constant contact with them through the agencies . . . the administration of the college . . .

There was the so-called Provost's Advisory Committee and there were the Cowell assemblies and the whole process of trying to work out some sort of funny, eccentric

student government. They deliberately set out to make a combination of the New England Town Meeting and the Greek polis; all that effort to form instruments, agencies, of student government was fascinating to me. I just found it an enormously interesting and rewarding task. And I learned an awful lot of things about administration. My views could be underscored by quoting John Galbraith on the “administrators.” Somebody told him that administrators were necessary evils so that every morning he looked in the mirror and said, “I’m evil, but am I necessary?” I don’t know how necessary I was, but . . . it was a very interesting experience. I think that a lot of administration is like everything else . . . there’s a whole formal structure. Administrators do certain things, and if you become an administrator you do those things because you look around and others are doing them. I ignored that conventional aspect. I really had more time to myself and had better control over my time than I had when I was simply performing a professorial and teaching function. Of course I did a lot of teaching, taught a full load almost every year that I was provost. I don’t think I ever taught less than three courses in any one year. I usually taught five and the last year I think I taught seven or eight courses. So I was doing a lot of teaching. And that was very important because I could always, in a sense, escape from administrative tasks into teaching. As I have said before, I was a terrible administrator. I had a series of very bright and somewhat rather intense women as my administrative assistants. They really wanted support and direction and help from me, and I had in my mind as an administrative assistant a sort of efficient, rather retiring person . . . a kind of mother figure. I finally got her with Daphne Brown who was really just ideal. I certainly enjoyed and liked the other women . . . I think I was a great trial and burden for them. They dropped out because they were just too energetic and frustrated by the job.

I think they found it frustrating working with me because I was so scattered, so hit or miss. That was hard on my administrative assistants, my sort of casual and unsystematic way of doing things. I never thought of myself as an administrator and I was determined to do the thing the way I enjoyed doing it which was in a certain sense irresponsible. But you only have so much time and energy and I wanted to put that into the development of the life of the college, into the Culture Breaks and the college nights and the things that I think made life agreeable and gave the college a kind of aura or character that I think was on the whole a good one. At least it was one that I liked, or one that I enjoyed.

So I enjoyed administering probably in part because I'm such a bad administrator. I made some kind of calculation when I started . . . I noticed that most administrators spent a great deal of time on committees and doing all kinds of things that had only a peripheral relationship to the primary task. I was determined not to get involved that way. I thought if I took all the time that the typical administrator spends in ceremonial functions, in traveling about and doing all these other things and spent it for my own pleasure then maybe I'd come out just as well. I always rode horseback, played tennis and never allowed the job to beat me down. I saw administrators all around me who groaned and repined about how terribly exhausting and difficult and demanding their jobs were; they worked all the time, including Saturdays and Sundays, and I thought that was really crazy. I mean if that's the way they wanted to do it, that was up to them. I never noticed that the colleges ran much better as a consequence of that.

I suppose one could say that my ways were high-handed or arbitrary; if it seemed to me that something was sensible to do—not some big controversial thing—then I would go ahead and do it. I suspect that people initially suppressed their irritation or negative reactions to that way of doing things.

By the end of the first year—I think I may have mentioned last time—when I wanted faculty advice I just simply appointed a little cabinet of faculty. Sig Puknat and Bert Kaplan and Maurice Natanson . . . I don't recall just who was on it. But it was really kind of funny when I think back on it. And then the second year the faculty made known to me that they wanted an elective council of faculty . . . I don't know what the thing was called . . . executive committee I guess . . . that was not just appointed by me, but that truly represented the faculty. I suppose I was a little disconcerted at that, but it wasn't a real source of contention. In choosing Bernard Haley who was such a tactful and nice person it helped any sort of awkwardness or difficulty which might have developed in the situation. I suppose any time you have been doing things your own way and people challenge it, you have an instinctive kind of reaction and are defensive about it. I remember there was talk that I shouldn't preside over faculty meetings; that it should be the elected chairman of the faculty executive committee. The committee met and the chairman presided over those meetings. But then in *general* faculty meetings, some people argued that the chairman of the executive committee who was then in effect the chairman of the faculty at the college should preside. I resisted that because I thought that was going a good deal too far; that as provost of the college I should preside at

meetings of college faculty and I think that was quite right. It wasn't a serious source of contention.

Calciano: I'm intrigued to hear you say that you in a way had more time once you became an administrator.

Smith: Yes.

Calciano: Because that certainly is not the customary reaction.

Smith: I suppose you're right.

Calciano: In a way you've already answered this . . . what did you like least about being provost? You mentioned your disappointments, but were there other things that were more characterized as burdens or things you wished the provost didn't have to cope with?

Smith: Well I think the provostship has become a very problematical role. I was provost at the ideal time to be provost because I had a lot of opportunity. I probably mentioned already, but I remember a friend expressing astonishment at my leaving UCLA and coming up here . . . he spoke of Santa Cruz as a "rundown Ashbury Park" and said I must be out of my mind to leave UCLA for such a problematical venture. And I said, "Well I am interested in power and that's what appeals to me, and who has such power to choose a faculty and establish a curriculum and do all these things that the provost has a chance to do." In a sense that was a joke but it was the opportunity of a lifetime and the ideal time for the provost was the first time . . . that's when you really were free of all the constraints that developed later. And that was what was the most fun to do. And I think it's become an increasingly frustrating and tiring task and the fairly rapid turnover among provosts would seem to me to suggest this. I have very mixed feelings about the future of a provostship as well as the future of the colleges. At this stage I'm almost inclined to say, "Well, maybe it's better to do away with the office of the provost and have the college run by a committee of the faculty and just have the chairman of that committee perform whatever nominal college functions need to be performed." That's a very radical point of view—a very extreme point of view, but I just think that if we've been going ten years and can't find within our own ranks first-rate provosts—and when the question of a provostship comes up we go looking outside for people, that seems to me to indicate in a sense that we need some savior from outside; that we can't we don't we haven't developed our own resources. Because,

God knows, if we can't produce a provosts here, then it's an illusion to expect we can go to Yale or to Brandeis or to this or that place and find somebody who will just be ideal and will come in and infuse the whole enterprise with new life and energy. I just can't believe that it's going to really be a good way to go.

Calciano: Have people on our own faculty been approached for provostships? Why are we going off elsewhere? Is it because people on our own faculty won't serve?

Smith: I think it's a combination. I get the impression that there are people who would very much like to be provost. I think people get ahold of some funny cliché or notion—that seems to have a kind of plausibility—about needing new blood for instance, and then everybody says, “Yeah, that's true; we need new blood,” whatever that may mean. Then they decide to look outside for people. In another college of which I know something, the person that everybody would, I think, most be ready to agree on as an internal person is unwilling to be provost. I think that's a sticky problem. Why is he unwilling to be provost? If the job is interesting and important then good people should be pleased to do it. So in one way or another, if it's because we have some sort of notion that we need a redeemer from outside or if the good people that we want from inside won't do it, something must be wrong with the office. At least, that's a *possible* conclusion.

Calciano: Who has been the most able provost in your opinion?

Smith: Well, of course that's a touchy subject. I think Glenn Willson has been a classic provost of a certain kind. He's been the most successful provost simply in terms of endurance, but more than that, I think, he's been balanced and flexible . . . he has some ideal qualities as an administrator. I would say he hasn't been an imaginative person, but I don't know that that's necessary. It seems to me that in a provost or in any high position or president or chancellor, what's ideal is what is often most desirable—are people who are not perhaps themselves very imaginative or innovative but who are receptive to the ideas of other people and encouraging and attentive to new ideas, willing to see them tried. I don't know how true that is about Glenn. I wouldn't make a judgment one way or another. My guess would be that he was attentive to suggestions and ideas. He certainly is awfully good on the sort of day-to-day running of a college and getting along with people and doing the political and administrative things that need to be done.

I think Ken Thimann was a very good provost of a somewhat different kind. I think he was perhaps more conventional in his thinking than Glenn, but he is a man of such personal charm and warmth . . . an admirable kind of person who succeeded in part because he was not terribly self-conscious about the role; he did it in a rather direct, simple way and enjoyed it. That endeared Kenneth Thimann to me very much because he was one of the few other provosts who admitted that he found it an interesting job and enjoyed it and was glad he'd done it. Some of the other provosts groaned and moaned about what a terrible burden it was.

Jasper Rose

Smith: I think Jasper [Rose] with all his volatileness and temperament did a great deal and was in some ways a brilliant administrator. I mean he was much better about all the kind of day-to-day things that an administrator needs to be attending to, than I was. I don't know that he ever was given credit for it, because of his temperament, which so often put people off. He was indulgent, self-indulgent, I think. I suppose it's hard to say self-indulgent, in terms of letting himself go, because I think it's just more than he can contend with. He gets swept away in the different passions and snits. So it's not as though he really indulges himself in these passions and tempers but they certainly made his tasks more difficult for him and for the people that he worked with. In a way what I think is surprising is that in the face of that he did and has done so well. It's hard for me to judge the situation objectively. I was very anxious for Jasper to be my successor for two or three different reasons. It was somewhat of a struggle . . . there was a good deal of resistance to Jasper, particularly among some of the older faculty. I thought the resistance was important to contend against because I felt that Jasper would be the most difficult of a number of possible candidates for provost, but the most energetic and enterprising and interesting and original.

Calciano: You said you had two reasons you wanted him . . .

Smith: Yes. He'd been my senior preceptor and I was enormously impressed with his wisdom. I think that would be the best way to put it. A lot of the things that I got credit for as provost were due to Jasper. The fact that I was able to take a rather self-indulgent line in being provost was due to the fact that Jasper did an enormous amount of work. He was absolutely invaluable and I felt that people in the college didn't see that . . . that I got the credit for things that were really Jasper's doing; that Jasper often saved me from what I think would have been bad decisions. He is so fruitful in ideas and schemes

and plans and cares so much about the life of the students that I really was stubborn in my determination to campaign as actively as I could for Jasper; it was probably indiscreet for me to do that. But I don't have any regrets about it. One of the reasons I was very anxious for Jasper to be provost was that he wanted to be provost. I felt that if he was passed over that it would embitter him very much. He would probably leave and I thought he was a great intellectual resource for UCSC; he's a brilliant person of enormous range of interests and knowledge, a fine teacher. For him to have served as my right-hand man for five very difficult years, then to want to be provost, and be passed over would have been a terrible rebuff. He would have perceived it as a rebuff and a rejection, and either have left or been permanently embittered. So I thought that was sufficient reason although that certainly wouldn't have been enough if I hadn't thought he would be a good influence in the college. He was certainly committed to moving in a direction that I thought was important . . . with a strong emphasis on the arts in the college. There wasn't much sympathy for that in the faculty generally and I don't think the faculty on the whole is inclined to give Jasper any particular credit for it because they didn't think it was important. They thought it was just Jasper's little eccentricity. But I thought that was very important. So those were the basic reasons I was very anxious that Jasper be my successor and I don't regret it. He wasn't always an easy person to get along with but I had the general feeling in the faculty that, by and large, people had a positive feeling about his administration.

Philip W. Bell

Calciano: What did you think of Philip Bell [as founding provost of Merrill College?]

Smith: I think Phil Bell was a bright, nice person without at all the temperament to do that job. Let me put it this way about Phil Bell . . . I think he had what I would call a utopian imagination . . . somewhat like the chancellor, and also, like the chancellor, he was rather inflexible, and wanted his own version of utopia. He was committed to openness, to having students and faculty very much involved, and democratically determining decisions and so on. Yet with all this his own utopian vision was so intense that I gather, he often acted in what other people perceived as authoritarian or arbitrary ways. This is all gossip and impressions. He would make a commitment to a democratic approach and then when the solution that he really wanted didn't come out, he would impose his own view. At least that's what I heard some faculty felt. This created tensions and problems, it was a very difficult situation psychologically. It would have been much easier for him had he been provost of the first college. As provost of

Merrill he had to contend with ingrained views and attitudes that were not always compatible with his. He had to deal with a faculty that was already dug in on the different boards, and wasn't particularly interested or sympathetic with Phil Bell's own vision. That's been true of all the subsequent colleges after Cowell. Although I really know very little about Phil Bell's situation I liked him personally very much and found him an appealing, nice person.

There were other things, too, that I'm sure weren't Phil's fault at all; for instance hitting on the notion of a Third World college, at the moment the whole issue of the Third World was *so* heated up that nobody could have managed that situation. I think that he was the victim of that situation which was certainly beyond his control. I think Phil Bell took things too hard.

To revert to my own style, one of the things that was a great bulwark for me psychologically was that I never knew much about what the Cowell faculty were thinking. In a certain sense I didn't care; I did care, I certainly wanted them to like me, to be happy in the college and in their situation, as I think anybody would. But I never was very aware of or concerned with whatever currents might be running. For example, McHenry has been the victim of too good an intelligence system, so that he always seemed to know every little undercurrent and eddy and every dissatisfied faction, all these things which considered in the whole sweep of things might often have been completely unimportant. He was always picking up noise through this radar system that he had, which reached down into everything, so that he knew . . . God, I don't know, the most astonishing things, who was teaching what quarter and so on. . . I think it's absolutely extraordinary. I don't know how he did it, what kind of a sensing apparatus he developed. But there's just an awful lot that no administrator needs to know. Certainly you need to know a lot of things and maybe in some sense . . . I started to say as much as you can . . . but you don't really; you need to know what you hope to do and have some sense of how you want to do it, but beyond that, the less you know of all these funny little personal things that are going on, the better. [These things] stick in your own imagination, can become corrosive, can keep you awake at night, and you can expend an enormous amount of nervous energy worrying about them.

Calciano: What was your feeling about Marcum?

Smith: I don't know John Marcum at all. I've met him maybe once or twice, and I think highly of him. All I've heard about him has been positive. It's funny . . . in this case it's off the track a little bit when you're asking about Marcum, but it brings to mind . . . we sat here a couple of days ago giving a doctoral exam to a young woman in the History of Consciousness [program] with Michael Kahn and Bill Everson and Bert Kaplan and myself. Now Kahn's been here, what, four or five years now, and Everson three or four, and this was the first time we've spent even a couple of hours, even a couple of minutes together. I mean I've met Everson, but I'd never even met Kahn; perhaps we've shaken hands at some point, but we met and talked and we got interested in the sense of we were meeting each other and encountering each other in an intellectual way, examining each other as much as we were the candidate. At the end Bert Kaplan said, "Well, maybe we should meet again." We responded to that quite enthusiastically, or I did. And the girl I thought looked rather appalled by that. I said, "You know what we're really saying is that we've enjoyed this chance to get together and talk and meet each other except for Bert and myself of course. And we'd like to do it again." In a sense it's an example, a demonstration of what an extraordinary situation it is, that in a relatively small academic community three people, four people whose intellectual interests are rather similar and have certain points of convergence or contact, only come together by virtue of this academic exercise.

Calciano: Well, this surprises me.

Campus Intellectual Life

Smith: Well, it's not only surprising; it's shocking in intellectual terms that that kind of situation characterizes the so-called intellectual life of the campus, and I don't think that it's an exceptional situation. I think it's a common situation. Almost the only intellectual life that I have had with my colleagues on the campus since leaving the provostship has been encountering my colleagues on doctoral examinations.

Calciano: I would have thought that there would have been more meetings for lunch or chatting . . .

Smith: It's not unique to this campus, except it's particularly disappointing here, because here above all other places you'd think there would be a sense of camaraderie. But people are just worn out and exhausted by these insane committees and the time

that people spend, waste—in my opinion—well, that’s just part of the cost of democracy.

The Mechanics of Decision-Making

Smith: The chancellor has expended more . . . kilowatts of nervous energy [on these things] in the last ten or twelve years than I suspect could be calculated. I’ve never known or could imagine a man who could be so intensely involved on so many different levels without just flying apart: physically and psychologically . . . he’s an absolute wonder. I couldn’t last six months that way and I don’t really think he has any other life. I never hear of him taking exercise or playing, or doing anything but being chancellor.

Calciano: Well, he’s got his farm.

Smith: Yes. But for years he only got out there every couple of months. I can’t imagine living [like that] . . . when you don’t systematically, week after week, have something that you do regularly that takes you out of all the tensions and problems that kind of job creates. At that I’m just astonished . . . and Jane [McHenry] of course is terribly important in that whole situation. I think I mentioned in another discussion that her support and backing, and their obviously remarkable rapport has been crucial for him. I can’t imagine that he could have weathered the strains and stresses of that job without her.

In the first couple of years at Cowell I made such decisions as I chose to, a very economical way of decision making in terms of time. I just decided to do this or that or whatever. And it didn’t really make much difference whether I was right or wrong; I mean if I was wrong all the time it would make a lot of difference, but if I batted 50 percent I think that’s good enough. Now when all these decisions, virtually all of them were taken over by committees, it meant just an incredible multiplication of the amount of time spent by people; this is a kind of reckless calculation but it has some truth to it If you could plot it, you could have worked out some chart and shown that for each area where I had [acted] simply, without really thinking about it and not intending to be consciously arbitrary, but just thinking that this was the easiest and most sensible way to do things, where I had made the decision [by myself] . . . that three or four years later was made by committees or different groups in the colleges . . . you would get a quantum jump in the amount of time consumed in making a particular decision.

Calciano: Yes. When I'm at one of these big meetings I often sit and kind of mentally total up the staff hours that are being utilized and . . .

Smith: It's absolutely staggering and nobody seems able or willing to face the implications in it, or even to consider what could be done. If there are decided areas in which decisions have to be made, I would rather that powers revert where appropriate to administrators like provosts and elsewhere have one czar do it for a year and replace every committee that's not absolutely essential, by a (single) person; let that person serve in that role for a year as the representative of the faculty in that area and then be replaced. For every person you add to a committee, you add some time factor. It's not just that you have five people sitting there for an hour to make a decision, but the more people you have, the longer it takes to reach a decision. So it's not just the five people for one hour, but it's the five people for *five* hours, or whatever. If two people can do better in their deliberations than three, and three can do it more quickly than four and so on. To come back to the general issue I think the problem is how can intellectual life be sustained on a campus, on any campus, this and others, where the amount of time and energy required to simply sustain the institution has increased geometrically . . . it's just got to be wrong.

Other College Provosts

Calciano: One of the earliest appointments to provost and theoretically it would have been a very chief one, would be the provost of the second college starting up Stevenson.

Smith: Well, Charles Page [Stevenson College's first provost] . . . again I'm fond of him . . . he's a funny guy and I think I may have mentioned that I take the blame in a sense for his appointment . . . part of the problem was that Dean never could make up his mind. In some ways he's so positive; in other ways he's an extraordinary vacillator; at least he couldn't seem to make decisions about provosts . . . The decision to ask me to be provost of Cowell was made comparatively late in the day, and he moved with such deliberate speed, so slowly and cautiously on other provostial appointments that.

Calciano: Why?

Smith: Just his temperament I guess, I don't know why. It's either that it was very hard to find somebody called a provost—which the subsequent history of the institution

would seem to bear out—or it's that Dean finds it very hard to make certain kinds of decisions. I think it's a combination of the two.

Calciano: Is it his decision to make entirely? Doesn't he have to get a consensus from budget committees and college committees?

Smith: He does now. But at that point he just had one committee which was this sort of supervisory committee that was appointed by Kerr . . . and appointments were really not a great problem; I think they went along quite readily with his recommendations. So that I would say that his procrastination, and I've seen it not once but a good many times, that . . . I think it's concealed by the fact that just as I did, he has devolved the authority for these matters; the principal responsibility for making recommendations has been placed on other people as groups or committees. But I do think that it was true that he was very, very slow to come to a decision. Maybe indecisive is not the word, because it's rather out of character with him, but just very, very deliberate, so in any event in the cases of the first two or three colleges, it was coming down to the wire and people were saying, "My God, the college is going to start next year, and we still don't have a provost."

This was very much the case with Stevenson. I had interviewed Charles Page as an appointment in my college and I liked him, but I didn't think he was the kind of person that I really saw as an ideal appointment within my college. But Byron Stookey and I both did press him with the chancellor because the time was getting short and we thought that he was the best of the people who were presently in sight. And so we put on a good deal of pressure; we urged the chancellor to make the appointment and I think we overcame his misgivings and I think his misgivings in retrospect were right. But as for the problems with Charles Page—I don't know that anybody could really have anticipated them.

Calciano: Such as?

Smith: Again, I know very little about these matters, but I was told that [his wife] really was very unhappy here. So I think that complicated things. The longer I live the more evident it is that you're always taking a kind of guess when you have a new position to fill a new kind of job that really hasn't been defined . . . and the person that you are asking to come has not played a similar role somewhere else. It's really quite a gamble to know how things are going to work out.

Calciano: Everybody said Page was a disappointing appointment, but in what ways, what . . . besides his wife being unhappy that . . .

Smith: Well, yes. I mentioned that only as what I understood was the basis for his leaving after . . . what a year or so, two years I guess? One year of preparation, one year of the college, was that it? I'm not sure. I think of him, again, as the person who worked sixteen hours a day, seven days a week.

Calciano: Well has there been any lasting effect of his having been the [campus's] second provost rather than someone else?

Smith: I don't know. I don't really think so. I think Glenn Willson was from the first, as soon as he came on the scene, very clearly heir apparent and was running the college . . . well, my saying "running the college," Perhaps that is putting it too strongly, but he was able to counterbalance whatever negative effects Charles Page may have had. I find it very hard to make a judgment about Page. I would say that he turned out to be lacking in resilience. I think he took a terrible beating. It was a terrible drain on him physically and emotionally. He and the chancellor were particularly incompatible. I don't know why. He became a kind of a whipping boy for the chancellor. The chancellor has, I think, a tendency to let his wrath fall upon the people who are least able to cope with it. And Charles Page was never able to deal with the chancellor as an equal. The chancellor kind of leaned on Page and Page kind of bent. I remember one instance Dean said something to me, I may have already mentioned it, the instance being at a Chancellor's Advisory Committee meeting . . . and he said to me, "You shouldn't have done that; that was irresponsible," or I don't know exactly how it was, but he rebuked me in the company of my peers. I went to him afterwards and said, "You can't talk to me like that. You think of me as if you're king here and I'm the younger colleague at UCLA whom you sponsored and you evidently feel that you can correct and admonish me under certain circumstances, but if you ever speak to me like that again I will resign. I came very close to doing it this time."

Calciano: How did he react?

Smith: Very well. I think he's very good in situations like that. He listened and, I can't remember our conversation, but I suspect he said he was sorry, and he would not speak to me in that way again and that never in any way beclouded our relationship

which has always been a very agreeable, pleasant one, although not a very . . . well, never close.

Calciano: Contenders.

Smith: What?

Calciano: Well I said contenders . . .

Smith: Well, I think we have contended over a great many issues without having permanently affected our relationship with each other.

Calciano: Do you have any comment on [James B.] Hall as provost of College Five?

Smith: No, I don't think so. Again, I like Jim . . . and I think I supported his appointment. It's hard for me to comment on provosts because I was on at least two provost search committees and my recollection is that I had some input with Hall's appointment. I was on the search committee that recommended Bob [Robert S.] Edgar [as founding provost of Kresge College].

Calciano: You opened my next question.

Smith: Well, Jim has hung in there and again I think he took a beating from the chancellor. The problem is . . . to be fair in the discussion of a person is not easy.

Calciano: Does his college bear the stamp of his personality, or not?

Smith: I don't really know it well enough to answer that. My feeling is that the college has developed rather independently of Jim's personality and that they found a way to live with each other, so to speak. I suppose I'm saying I don't think the college will bear his stamp in a positive way, i.e. the imprint of his temperament or personality, more perhaps in a negative way. And more in terms, as I say, of their having found a *modus vivendi*, a way to live with each other; they got along under those circumstances reasonably well as time went on.

Calciano: In a way your comments about the provosts also illuminate your concept of the colleges and the individual college, like that about Edgar . . .

Smith: Yes. About Edgar too . . . I liked all the provosts and never had any unpleasantness or hostility, never felt that I was at odds with any of them. Bob, I think,

suffered like Bell from having a utopian imagination. And though he's a very different person from Phil Bell, he was like him in that particular sense, that he was a dogmatist, for the sort of encounter group way of learning. On the other hand, he headed the first college—Kresge—since Cowell that, as some said, really had an innovative spirit that set out to do things in a very different way. And of course he was much more innovative or experimental or whatever than Cowell and he himself much more radical in his educational ideas than I. I think that Kresge both benefited and suffered for that. Lots of people resented having that sort of put up or shut up thing, the, “come along with us and accept encounter groups as the new panacea for the educational problems of the world or else you're against us.” The, “you're either for us, or against us,” situation. So that created some problems, but I think on the whole his kind of innocence, in a sense his naiveté, enthusiasm, devotion to this whole scheme, infused the college with vitality and energy and created a kind of esprit which in spite of some of the tensions that were created by it, gave a vitality to Kresge that the other colleges lacked. So I think on balance the total effect was a positive one. Although I'm personally very unsympathetic to that whole approach.

Calciano: Concept of encounter groups?

Smith: Yes. I think that what is right about it—the positive residue of that particular notion—was that it created an intense emotional-intellectual life that's so important to the collegiate notion. The community association, the interaction among people that is the essence of collegiate life and probably the essence of any true learning . . . whereas in Cowell we talked in much more conventional ways about community and tried in a much more conventional way to create it—college evenings, Culture Breaks etc., being examples. The thing that Cowell and Kresge shared with a very, very different educational perspectives was this feeling all the energies of people had to be recruited in order to create a genuine college.

Calciano: Kresge was tremendously controversial . . .

Smith: Yes.

Calciano: When it first started, during the first year and a half, I kept hearing a great deal about it. And I haven't [heard] much since. Did everybody just get used to Kresge ideas? Or did Kresge change?

Smith: I'm really talking about Kresge's esprit and morale. I thought Kresge was the only other college perhaps besides Cowell that has a real mystique about it. Whatever people's reservations were, or their dislike for certain aspects of the college's educational philosophy, there was a special feeling about being in Kresge.

Calciano: Do you have any comments you'd like to make about [J. Herman] Blake?

Smith: I really can't say anything about Herman as a provost. One of my regrets is that since he left the college, I've seen him maybe twice for a total of five minutes and that's a great disappointment to me. I just don't have any notion, firsthand or even really secondhand . . . of how he's done as a provost. What I've heard is positive. I've talked to a few students who are in Oakes College, and who've been positive about it. I think he's such a remarkable person and if Herman can't make a college work and can't be a successful provost, then I don't think anybody can because he has a great deal of drive and intelligence and I think a great deal of charisma. Again, I say, if he can't do it, I don't think anybody can. That's as good a measuring stick, a yardstick as I know, for the viability of the office of provost.

Calciano: What about [Paul] Niebanck?

Smith: Who?

Calciano: Niebanck. Provost, College Eight.

Smith: Yeah. I've never met him.

Calciano: I've never heard much about him and it's kind of interesting . . . Colleges Seven and Eight will start at the same time, and seven with Blake and Eight is kind of a mystery.

Smith: Well of course College Eight had this triumvirate or troika beginning which I think was part of the problem. They didn't really have a single person that came in and really made the initial plans and directed it in its infancy.

Council of Provosts

Calciano: When was the Council of Colleges or Council of Provosts . . . I'm not sure whether that's its official name or if it has an official title, but when was it formed, what is its function, how built in is it to the system?

Smith: I can't really remember when it started. I think there was a sort of an informative . . . a period of informal getting together of provosts at lunch once a week and just when that came to be defined as the Council of Provosts, I'm not sure. But there was certainly constant meeting and discussion of conflict between the provosts in the early years. I think it has been a very useful, in fact essential, entity or committee. And I don't really know what more to say about it . . .

Calciano: Was it mainly thrashing over the thoughts of the day, or is it more a bastion against the takeover by the boards of studies?

Smith: Well, I think both. I think the more important function was really discussing problems common to the colleges, and trying to present a common front to the boards, both to the boards and to the chancellor on various issues. We spent an awful lot of time, wasted an awful lot of time in retrospect, on parental matters, rules and regulations about students, regulations in the dormitories. For the first two or three years an awful lot of the time of the provosts whether it was technically called the Council then or not, was taken up trying to form a united front against the chancellor on how the colleges should function. [Just deciding] about dogs took up an incredible amount of everybody's time and energy.

Calciano: But just for the illumination of somebody reading that in a hundred years, you were debating about whether dogs should be on campus or not.

Smith: Yes.

Calciano: Is there much rivalry between the colleges?

Smith: I don't know. I don't think so. I just think there should be more probably, because there's a growing kind of indifference here. There were occasional episodes of rivalry. I can remember when College Five came and stole the Cowell rock that stood in the courtyard there. And there was a great to do about that, and indignation and Cowell rushed over and retrieved it. But some of that stuff I suppose is just hijinks. I think the colleges probably would have profited from a little more of that kind of competitive spirit; certainly in the earlier years there was a good deal of the, "we're better than you are and just because you do this, we're not going to do it," that sort of thing, a certain amount of rivalry. That could easily go too far, but it never has gone too far yet. Oh I don't want to say far enough, I don't know *how far* far enough is . . . but there's little communication between the colleges on the faculty level. Not nearly so

much as there should be. Cowell faculty the first couple of years, made some effort to be hospitable to the faculties of the new colleges. I think Jasper had been particularly good at that. At college social functions he always invites faculty and administrators from other colleges. And I think he's made a particular effort to overcome that kind of isolation and provincialism in the colleges.

Calciano: I was thinking of rivalry also in terms of provosts protecting their domain or colleges or faculty . . . if a faculty person is being recruited for the board of such and so, would there be rivalry between various colleges as to who got the candidate into their college?

Smith: Oh, a little bit, yes. There's some of that, but I don't think it's ever been particularly strong or has affected relationships between colleges. But again, I'm not a very good person to ask about that, because it's just something that I don't think I would be particularly aware of. I think it would be manifest within the faculty and in faculty attitudes. You really have to run a kind of questionnaire profile asking different faculty what they thought of Crown faculty, how they perceived Cowell faculty, how they perceived Merrill faculty, how they perceived Stevenson faculty and so on. I think such a thing would be interesting and it would really be the only way that I would know to get at that kind of answer.

Calciano: Well in a way you've answered the question. I gather it was *not* the feeling amongst provosts to stake a claim to their territory.

Smith: I don't think so.

Calciano: The way a department chairman will sometimes [inaudible] among initial things is say this is mine.

Smith: Yes. I don't really think so. It doesn't seem to me that that . . . that I recall any.

Calciano: And I had not sensed it. It sort of surprised me a bit that there wouldn't be. Some provosts would be fighting harder for their college than others. The only thing I ever recall hearing much concern about was when College Five was being planned that it would take away, draw away from the other colleges, their efforts in the arts.

Smith: Yes. Well I certainly felt that very strongly. And as I think I mentioned earlier, I was very opposed to College Five's emphasis in the arts for that reason. But that was

sort of a philosophical, theoretical issue, and my objections were expressed. I think people would say a kind of unfortunate compromise resulted from that in which College Five was called an arts college, but not really given the financial support that the people in College Five thought was necessary in order to make that designation a reality. So that it was in some ways the worst of all possible worlds.

Calciano: But it had not been the candidate on campus for the other . . .

Smith: Well, I wouldn't think so. I would say [in relationship] to the three, I would think that was bad.

UCSC'S DEVELOPMENT

[This interview was held on May 9th 1974. On the evening of May 8th on the local cable television station, Page Smith interviewed chancellor Dean McHenry. The half-hour show touched on both the early years of the campus and its current status. In the following pages of transcript, Page Smith refers several times to his interview with McHenry.]

Boards of Studies

Calciano: A couple of weeks back when we were talking about pass-fail and you said it was decided at the start that that would be the case . . .

Smith: Yes.

Calciano: . . . and only those who could live with this type of idea would be enthusiastic about coming. Well also the college system was decided at the start and people who came supposedly were committed to the idea of an undergraduate college system and undergraduate teaching. And they in turn recruited mostly like-minded people. And yet still the boards of studies⁴ have taken over.

Smith: Yes.

Calciano: Why?

⁴At UC Santa Cruz, the traditional "department" was replaced by "boards of studies," designating the grouping together of faculty in the various disciplines—literature, biology, history, etc. In 1996, the designation was dropped and UCSC now has departments, as do all other UC campuses.—Editor.

Smith: Well I just think there's too much inertia in the traditional ways of doing things. That when people are conditioned, very thoroughly conditioned, to disciplinary approaches and attitudes, as I think we suggested in the talk (on TV) last night, the only way (the new system) could have worked was if you had deprived people of that refuge, that home, that point to which they instinctively turned, where they really felt more confidence and more capable of dealing with the kinds of problems than a department deals with.

The real mistake was in ever letting them have the boards at all. It might have made it more difficult to recruit some people, but I think in the process, you would have gotten people who were prepared . . . who were willing to exist without the boards, who would have come [to UCSC] without the boards. Most people who came, certainly in Cowell, would have come whether there was a board or not. That's my opinion.

Calciano: Do you feel that you could have had a first-rate academic institution as well as a teaching institution without the boards?

Smith: Absolutely! Yes. I think that we might have . . . I think that what the chancellor was so obsessed with, which was how the outside world was going to view us, which came out again last night in talking about the science thing, which I'm so sick of . . . I wanted to really ask about how come the arts were so neglected . . . but there was only so much one could go into [on the TV program], and he would have said that that was being worked on now, and that so forth and . . . that the sciences were needed to establish [UCSC's] position and reputation. Of course Dean and I have talked so much at this stage that I know what he's going to say about most things and I'm sure that he knows what I'm going to say. One of the pressures, one of the things that was constantly in Dean's mind was how to make this campus both innovative and prestigious. I think you can't. That was really trying to carry water on both shoulders and I don't blame him for that. I just think that made inevitable the colleges' decline, and I certainly didn't fight against it. I accepted that as a proposition. And again it's always hard after the fact to retrieve the whole mental and intellectual situation at that time. It's easy to be wise after the event, but I still come back to that. I think our subsequent history makes very clear that with all our concern with so-called innovations we weren't ready to go the last mile. And that that was a very serious mistake.

Calciano: Well you also had the factor that you were one campus of the nine campus system.

Smith: Yes.

Calciano: And I wonder if it was possible at all to have gone the whole way?

Smith: Yes. I think it was. The rest of the University was willing to let Santa Cruz be its conscience . . . to be that [institution] which discharged its responsibilities as an innovator. While there was a lot of contempt and superciliousness from the older campuses about Santa Cruz, there was nonetheless a real acceptance of the notion that this was going to be an eccentric venture. At one point the presiding committee, the sort of planning group, announced or proposed that Santa Cruz not make any pretense of doing scholarly things, but just emphasize teaching and that therefore people appointed here would be expected to teach more than people at Berkeley or UCLA and not be expected to do scholarly work.

Both Dean and I very, very strongly opposed that. That was, I'm sure, as you've heard it, discussed. Probably Dean's mentioned that that was a kind of a crisis of the spirit in the early period. I think it would have been a great mistake. But if we'd come back and said, "No. We're certainly not willing to do that. We expect to have a very substantial number of able people and be able to attract them and keep them. But what we *are* going to do is say that we're not going to have departments or boards; we're going to go all the way with the collegiate notion and we still think we can have a very intellectually distinguished, and productive faculty." And I think that would have sold. But, as I say, I don't assign blame for that. Certainly, if there's blame to be assigned, it's as much mine as Dean's or anybody else's, because although the pattern had been established before I came here, if I had perceived things clearly enough, I would have fought for that principle even if it had not prevailed. And I think that as far as the University generally, or really what we're talking about is Kerr and this committee . . . I think they probably would have bought that.

Calciano: How early in the game did you realize that the boards were going to be the dominant force?

Smith: Well, it was a slow process. I don't know that I came to that firm conclusion that the colleges weren't going to be able to hold their own against the boards until four or five years out, after we'd started, so . . . the trend . . . that feeling was I suppose not

really very fully articulated and was more a sort of uneasy concern than a settled conviction. I would say it was seven, eight, nine years, it was when I left and looked back and I thought well it just really . . .

Calciano: Who were the main people who really supported having strong boards as opposed to strong colleges?

Smith: Well, I don't know. Harry Berger was very good academic politician, in a good sense, and I've spoken of him before, somebody who draws a great deal of respect and affection and works hard and has a great sense of loyalty toward the people in his board. The literature board is the largest board and Harry presided over that and really made that a strong board which was very aggressive about appointments and became the prototype of a strong, active board with an able and aggressive chairman. I think Harry was doing what he did well and what came naturally . . . he was very strongly committed to the college, the irony of the situation being that I think he was sincere in both respects. . . He didn't try to build up the board in any conscious way at the cost of the college. But as I say, I think in the long run the two things simply were incompatible and I suppose we had to find that out by experiencing it. If the new chancellor felt that way and was . . . strong enough to really make it a campaign, particularly in the so-called honeymoon period of any new executive or administrator, it might be carried. I don't know. I sense a substantial degree of demoralization and disappointment among faculty and a feeling that things haven't really worked out as it was hoped they would and that is a good basis certainly for trying to effect some changes, or that particular change.

Calciano: Has the composition of the faculty changed over the years or its philosophy and attitudes?

Smith: Well I really don't know. There are probably half of the faculty that I don't even know now. It's really hard for me to say. I think there have been very innovative and open people in all the colleges . . . I think Kresge went out in a very ambitious way to try to get people who are not conventional academic types and certainly George Hitchcock and William Everson and some of the people that were appointed were thoroughly unconventional. The fact is I don't know whether they're in College Five or in Kresge . . . but I certainly don't have the feeling that appointments grew more and more conventional as the years went on . . .

In fact I would think rather the contrary. Beginning with Merrill the appointments were if anything, bolder and more enterprising probably than they'd been in Cowell. The fact that in spite of this the campus moved in a more conventional direction, it makes all the more inescapable the conclusion that the problem was in a sense one of institutional arrangements rather than . . .

Calciano: Which of the boards of studies do you feel are the best at Santa Cruz and which ones are the weakest?

Smith: I really don't know. I think it would be a very casual and hit-or-miss thing for me to try to say. I can think of two. One is best in terms of the most distinguished people, the other is best in terms of harmonious relationships. I suspect the biology board is probably the best from what little I know of it [in terms of] the combination of those two things, of having very good people and a very strong orientation towards teaching and research, and in having turned out a very large proportion of outstanding students. I think that the history board has good people on it, but it was a very unpleasant board to be on. There were great expenditures of energy and as a consequence of personality conflicts . . . I think junior people on the board suffered a great deal from rancorous disputes and bad feeling among senior people. It's hard for me to imagine a board that was more divided and contentious.

Calciano: Could this have been related to what you referred to earlier as the hard noses and the soft noses?

Smith: No, I don't think so really. I just think it was a personality matter. I think it was the people on the board. Bill Hitchcock is extremely difficult temperamentally or has always appeared to me to be so, though he's been very successful as a faculty member of Crown. He was the center of a great deal of controversy and trouble in Cowell before he left and that's why he left. Larry [Laurence R.] Veysey is a very outstanding historian, a very difficult person to get along with; Jasper Rose is a very strong-willed and emphatic person. He and Veysey never got along. I suspect that Bill Hitchcock dislikes Jasper intensely. Style and personality were more important really than ideological difference, although there were some of those. I don't think they're ever important if there's a general good feeling in the group . . . personal trust . . .

Calciano: Where would George [W.] Baer and John Dizikes fit into this equation?

Smith: Well I think there're plenty of very good people on the board, and I don't mean to suggest by any means that all of them were contentious or even any large portion of them. I just think that some of the antagonisms among the senior people made things very difficult particularly for the younger people on the board. Maybe I've exaggerated, I don't know. I think that they weren't nearly so bad from all that I can tell as the philosophy board, which I think was a scandal. The hostility there among different members and the way people suffered from that is a whole separate chapter. I mean senior people not even speaking to each other and so on. Things never got that bad in the history board.

Calciano: Again, was that just personalities or differences in philosophy?

Smith: I think it was personalities, yes. Philosophy is a very odd field in any event to me, academic philosophy, because ideological matters often enter in very strongly there. But I think this [situation] was really based on personality. It began quite harmoniously and then just grew terribly bitter. There were specific issues . . . somebody wanted to appoint somebody and somebody was opposed . . . But it seems that in a conventional place, you put up with that, you can't help it, that's the only way to run things, but in this situation to have to put up with all that nonsense and in addition to the concern the running of the colleges was much too great a burden to place on people. I can't see that anything was gained by it comparable to what was lost.

Calciano: One of the things was that Cowell got a reputation as a contender against the boards of studies, a bone of contention, maybe I should say, between them . . . that Cowell had a reputation for wanting to defend *all* its fellows for promotion and the boards of studies wouldn't accept all these recommendations. Is this a factor . . .

Smith: It's interesting because I wondered whether the chancellor was talking about Cowell last night when he . . .

Calciano: That surprised me too.

Smith: . . . when he said that.

Calciano: Because this didn't come from the chancellor.

Smith: Well, that may be. I was tremendously impressed by this seriousness, the detail, the judiciousness of Jasper's evaluations of people and the general rightness of those

evaluations . . . that I saw when I was still at the college. And the way he conducted that whole business was much more thorough and systematic and careful than in my administration. Jasper is a much better administrator in the sense of taking pains and doing things carefully and accurately and fully . . . If we're talking about my régime, what Dean said that I *wouldn't* agree with, was that the colleges just recommended people willy-nilly whether they had really done much of anything or not, when they just lay around on their asses and expected to be retained simply by virtue of being in a college. Now, that was certainly never my view, but if I look at the people specifically that I supported, I don't have *any* regrets in any event. I think the University was wrong in every instance. It was wrong to fire Lenny [Leonard] Kunin . . . that was the economics board's doing. He was an extremely bright, able person who performed a very valuable function both in the college and the board by representing a radical point of view with great intelligence and effectiveness. I think that that man in mathematics whose name I can't even remember was treated very shabbily . . .

Calciano: Abraham?

Smith: No. He was a Cowell man . . . a younger man. And . . . I can't recall his name now, but he went on someplace else and did very well in a scholarly sense as well as in teaching. I think it was a mistake to fire sociologist Bob [Robert J.] Werlin. Werlin wasn't brilliant, but he was *very* able and he took great pains with students. He worked very hard in the college. I think that most of the people who were in Cowell from the beginning, the people who didn't do much, were people who were never in any jeopardy because they did so much on the scholarly side. Bill Domhoff was much less of a contributor to the college than some others . . . Maurice Natanson was loyal to the college, but he measured very carefully his commitment to the college. The same was true of Ted Youngs, who in a sense was very proud of his connection with the college, but who exerted a lot of pressure on young people and the math board *not* to be involved in the colleges too much, and put pressure on in the other direction.

The "Publish or Perish" Controversy

Smith: My problem is complicated by the fact that I have carried on a long-running argument with the University and the chancellor, and to some degree with my colleagues, over the whole notion of publish or perish. Not over the notion of intellectual quality but of confusing that with publishing. I think there are brilliant people who publish little or nothing and there are people who are intellectually third-

rate who publish a lot. I don't have to expand on that theme. It seemed to me wrong and ungrateful that the people in Cowell who had been there at the beginning, who had put so much time and effort and energy into starting the college, that when they came up for tenure fine calculations [were then made] about whether they in fact had published enough [or] whether the University's reputation would suffer by virtue of their being given tenure, in view of the fact that they hadn't achieved scholarly distinction as measured by publication.

Calciano: Haven't certain men though been promoted without having published?

Smith: Yes. But, take some of them. Take one of them . . . [historian] John Dizikes. He was treated in a humiliating and degrading way. The faculty, the college, strongly supported his promotion and so in fact did the board. And then the chancellor talked to John and said, "Well, you haven't published and I think you ought to publish," and I guess he intimated to him or to me that one of the reasons he probably hadn't was that I hadn't put the heat on him to publish. And Dean was going to put the heat on by holding up his promotion for a year so that other people wouldn't expect to be promoted just because John had been. Dean told John, I gather, that he considered him an exception, and if John told him that he would leave if he wasn't promoted, then Dean would overcome his scruples and promote him. Now, to me, that's absolutely scandalous. I know Dean had the best of intentions and didn't mean to be cruel or ungrateful . . . in fact he thought the reverse . . . that he was being very, very humane in recognizing John's contributions and promoting him in spite of the lack of publications . . . but it was just a terrible thing to put Dizikes through. It was a bitter and unpleasant experience for him. I just think that it was small; instead of doing the right thing and doing it generously it was done in this very grudging and unsatisfactory way. Then it was pointed to again and again, along with certain other cases, as an instance of how flexible we were and how here we could recognize commitment to teaching as opposed to Berkeley. I'm not a bit impressed by the record on that side. Yes, we have, but we haven't nearly as often as we should and then we've stood around congratulating ourselves for having done it. There's no excuse for having fired Lenny Kunin in my opinion. And I don't think we're a bit better off for having sacked Bob Werlin.

Calciano: So you're saying a few have been promoted here who might not have flowered elsewhere but not nearly as many as should have.

Smith: Well, yes. I think it's token, it's so-called tokenism. And I'm just not a bit impressed by it. I could go on and talk, tell one horror story after another about individuals here, but I'm not going to do it.

I've made a tape about it as a matter of fact which I might, if I can find it, give to the archives because . . . well, I don't know quite what to do with it. It was a long talk to the junior faculty; it was an analysis of the promotion procedures at the University of California and their inhumanity and their insanity. And I kept thinking well maybe I'd get it transcribed and . . . and lay it on the world, but anyhow that's another matter.

Calciano: Well, I'd like to hear it. However, I'll make my pitch for seeing it put in the archives after we're done. Agreed?⁵ I've often commented . . . I've heard it commented by the younger faculty that they feel the demand on faculty time here is greater than at other universities. Is this true or not?

Smith: Sure. And I think it's the board thing. In other words you're just doubling the time people are asked to give . . . you're more than doubling it because of course when I went to UCLA, for the first five or six years I was there, I was an assistant professor and then associate professor, nobody noticed me. I don't think I was asked to be on a single committee until I'd been there four or five years and then I was on, you know, some very unimportant committee that took very little time. Then maybe on a few promotion committees and so on. But the time that I spent in the first five years of my academic life doing committee work was minuscule compared to what is expected of a young faculty member here. No real account is taken of that, and as I said, the pulling and hauling between the colleges and the board I think is devastating. And Jasper has a very strong feeling about college loyalty, and he's always exhorting the faculty to do more of this and more of that in the college. But I just think it's an impossible situation.

Calciano: You've always carved out time to publish? Is this just a knack that you have, self-discipline, ah . . .

Smith: No. I'm very undisciplined. I just do the things that I enjoy doing and that's why I was a poor administrator in the technical sense. You know, I was all right on the public relations front, but I just didn't do a lot of things that conscientious administrators, or trained administrators, or experienced administrators do . . . that Jasper does. I played tennis two or three times a week and my publication record is very deceptive. It should

⁵I have not been able to locate the tape-recording to which Smith refers.—Editor.

really be clear that I did very little; I did not do systematic research while I was provost except when I was on leave. I took a leave and took a quarter in the summer and wrote a book for which I had, to be sure, accumulated a lot of material. And I did one other *long*, very long article, almost a monograph. But the way I work is in fits and starts . . . and I do as much work in a summer as I suppose some people would do in a year, because when I get into something I go into it very, very heavily and I work very fast. And so the notion that I was a person of such discipline that can use my time in such an efficient way is off the point.⁶

Calciano: I find that rather reassuring because I tend to work in blocks of time. If I can clearly slate for, you know . . . a week and a half, I can draw a building, but I can't do it with one hour a day.

History of Consciousness Program

Calciano: What was your role in the start of the History of Consciousness program?

Smith: I don't know who originated the thought, the notion, perhaps Bert Kaplan? He certainly shepherded it through and deserves the principal credit for it both in conception and certainly in getting it past the skeptical resistance of the administration. But certainly Harry Berger. Originally Bill Hitchcock at the first meeting or two at least . . . let's see Harry, Bert [Kaplan] and myself . . . and . . . I guess that was about it. There were four or five of us. I was active in all the preliminary discussions and plans but I wasn't very active in the early years of the program because I was pretty much taken up with the college. I gradually pulled back from the History of Consciousness program.

Calciano: Do you think it's been a good program?

Smith: Well I think it's been a good program for the University and for the people that have been in it. I think it's been an interesting non-program. I think it's been worthwhile by virtue of the very fact that it never took on the kind of formal structure of a regular graduate program . . . that it was always in flux, that it attracted very, very outstanding students . . . gave them a great deal of latitude, perhaps too much, but that's better than not enough. They came here because they wanted latitude and so if

⁶Notwithstanding Smith's matter-of-factness about his writing, he was extraordinarily productive, as the List of his publications in Appendix II demonstrates.—Editor.

they didn't make the best use of it, you know, fine. I suspect its attrition rate is less than almost any other conventional graduate program you can identify.

Calciano: It has the reputation of never having graduated anybody.

Smith: Oh that is of course wrong, it's graduated quite a few people. And . . . they've done reasonably well.

Calciano: Well I take it they either drop out or they switch into another field. They get their Ph.D. in straight history or philosophy or whatever.

Smith: No, that's not accurate. I don't know what the exact figures are, but I know that a number of people have gotten their degrees and a substantial number are in the latter stages of getting their degrees. People go and come back and so it's always hard to tell just what the state of affairs is at any particular time. The first year that I was chairman of it was very demanding, but very interesting and I enjoyed it. I have lots of friends among the students and I sit on the Ph.D. committees of, maybe a dozen students in the History of Consciousness program.

Professional Schools

Calciano: I know the answer to this next question. I'm not sure how involved you have been with it, but I'd like to have your perspective on what's happened to the various proposals for professional schools and our graduate schools at UCSC and what's your opinion of the changes that have either been made or haven't been made?

Smith: If such schools have been established?

Calciano: Yes. In the early days of planning . . .

Smith: I was never interested in them or saw them as being important. That was Dean's interest and he wanted, of course, engineering and other professional schools, but that seemed to me a frosting on the cake. It wasn't anything that I had participated in or had strong feelings about.

Calciano: So you don't feel that they were needed for balance particularly?

Smith: I don't know what balance is . . . Dean had some notion of it . . . I mean more balance of conservative students by virtue of having an engineering school or something else, but that never impressed me as being an important issue.

The "Typical" UCSC Student

Calciano: We touched a bit on students earlier when you mentioned how the expectations they had and how teachers can teach has changed a bit, starting to come around full circle from where it left in the early '60s. Was there, or is there such a thing as a typical UCSC student?

Smith: Well I think there was. I suppose there was and maybe to some extent still is, although it would seem to me that that's changed in certain ways. I think the profile was of a child of middle-class professional or successful business parents from Los Angeles or San Francisco, although there are many certainly from small communities as well, but then we're talking about typical it would be that with a very typical background in terms of their own family situation and very, very outstanding academically and rather neurotic, maybe that's not the word, but excessively preoccupied with . . . well, all those problems that concern people whose orientation has been most exclusively intellectual. They arrived here at a time when the whole pattern of that life was coming under very severe criticism from (inaudible) and so the typical Santa Cruz student was a student with background. Also we had very substantial numbers on other campuses of the University and private students all over the country, but it was *that* student, representing a much *larger* proportion of total student body certainly than the other public institutions in the state of California, placed in an environment that was very stimulating and that was also kind of a pressure cooker emotionally.

Calciano: Such as very small things . . .

Smith: There was a general introspective mood in the air along with the activism. And I sometimes said that it seemed to me that half the student body was acting as a lay analyst for the other half. And they would sort of switch over. There was an extraordinary preoccupation with peoples' emotional and mental states all the time. Everybody was tuned into this, which as I say was a phenomenon of the Sixties which was new to me, and which I think was seen here in exaggerated form. So I would say that Santa Cruz took part and was part of a remarkable transformation in the way in

which people felt about themselves in the world and that it's seen here in its more extreme form. I think often of the famous so-called pastoral letter where I took students to task for what I thought were just the results of the general openness or looseness at Santa Cruz—barefoot, hair too long, not as clean as they should be, raunchy clothes, public demonstrations of affection, and a whole series of things that to my very old-fashioned conventional way of thinking were going too far, getting out of line and really hadn't anything to do with what I thought of as being a more experimental, open, informal nature of the place. It just blew the lid off. It was, as I have said often like King Canute saying to the ocean, "Go back!" There was the wave of the future and it was about to engulf us all and what I thought was just something happening at Santa Cruz was the future.

Calciano: Probably a national phenomenon.

Smith: Yes.

Calciano: Well, how would you characterize the students of the '70s? Their qualities, the nature of the student body.

Smith: Well, I really don't know. It's hard. The interesting thing to me about the academic world is how much time is spent in conjecturing about it. Particularly the students, and the students this year, are asking, "what is the difference between these this year, and last year," and there is this constant analysis and pulse-taking. The first ten years of my academic life people didn't pay much attention to students; they were considered to be there as either an inconvenience or pleasure or combination, whatever the case may be, but it's really fascinating the way everybody is now so attuned to this whole issue.

Calciano: Okay. You made a statement in one of our other interviews that intrigued me. Particularly because you had said that very early on you'd become skeptical of the grading system when you were at UCLA and advocated pass-fail and so forth . . . but then you said that you felt that the college, Cowell, I guess when you were talking about the first year, was maybe too lenient with the students and didn't fail enough. In spite of the catastrophe of that World Civilization thing, I had the feeling that you meant perhaps we coddled people too much.

Smith: I don't think so. I don't remember making it . . . I think I misspoke myself, because I . . .

Calciano: I think you were talking about some of the discussions with Hitchcock and then you said, “Well I think maybe he was right, maybe we were too lenient.”

Smith: I think the first year there was a lack of structure or a lack of rigor that was a consequence of the way we set up World Civilization. I think it was a great mistake, in retrospect, to have that single exercise at the end so that people coming out of highly structured situations didn't have the sort of checks and checkpoints along the way that they were used to. I think at that stage, a little more order and system would have been very helpful and prevented a lot of the people who failed from failing. I think it would have resulted in fewer people being dismissed.

Calciano: Such as quarterly exams.

Smith: Yes, some academic checkpoints.

Relationship with Chancellor McHenry

Calciano: We talked a lot about the chancellor and I wondered if you wanted to think of the years from '64 to '74 and how your relationship with him changed over the years?

Smith: Well, I think only in the sense that I see him much less frequently. It's generally said, truly said, of the chancellor that he's not an easy person to know and that very few people have in any way an intimate relationship with him. I don't have, and I don't know of anybody that does, but I don't know that by the same token there aren't people . . . We've had a few times that we disagreed, but I think it's very much to his credit that he's put up with me because I'm a very different kind of person than he is; we see lots of things very differently. A fact which as I've mentioned earlier . . . he's always sort of downgraded our differences. On many occasions or quite a few occasions we see things the same way. In a certain sense, he establishes the nature of the relationship and the extent of it and it pursues that even tenor of its way. He's a person of such caution and such reserve that one never really knows him. I don't think we're six inches closer or farther apart than when we started in here together. It's sort of interesting considering all the opportunities that building a new campus open up. I think Dean himself puts great emphasis on loyalty and at times when I differed with him, he's been very irritated with me and felt I was disloyal. But I think it's very much to his credit that it hasn't affected our relationship.

Calciano: Talking about the administration of our own campus we mentioned Stookey and Puknat. I was wondering if there were any other members of the administration and or faculty that you feel were particularly outstanding, or good for UCSC or conversely, particularly disastrous for UCSC?

Smith: No. I don't think so. I don't know that I've spoken of Peter Smith. I think he made an important contribution. The arts have been so very badly neglected here that his efforts were particularly important at that time. I don't think Byron knew or cared much about the arts except in a very general way. As a consequence Peter Smith was almost the only person outside of Eloise and myself who really cared much about the arts.

Calciano: The arts is a topic that I want to bring up next week so maybe we can fit him into that. Are there others that come to mind?

Smith: Well, let's see . . . who would the other people be . . . there's [Francis] Clauser and I suppose the different chancellors that came and went.

Calciano: The vice-chancellors?

Vice-Chancellors

Smith: Vice-chancellors, I mean, who came and went sometimes with a bewildering rapidity. Of course Glenn Willson and Kenneth [Thimann V.] are both strong personalities in their own right. And they unquestionably had an important influence in their colleges. And Kenneth, whom Dean mentioned last night, in terms of developing a science faculty, I don't know how much general influence either of them had except as rather conservative and moderating voices . . . neither of them were adventuresome academically or intellectually in my opinion, but both were valuable people. Bernard Haley was very important in Cowell. Dean's notion of bringing older retired people here was an excellent one. I've spoken of our efforts from the beginning to get women faculty members which didn't come to anything substantial, but I think Fred[erick] Hard's role's been important, but we'll talk about that in the area of music particularly. He and Kenneth Thimann deserve a lot of credit for what's been done there. Bernard Haley in Cowell played a role of great importance because of his age and experience and personal qualities.

Calciano: Right. Personality.

Smith: . . . the affection in which people held him. Charming man.

University Library

Calciano: What is your feeling about the University Library?

Smith: Well, [University Librarian] Don[ald] T. Clark I think has done an excellent job. I'm not in any sense an expert, but as far as I'm capable of judging it, he's been both professionally and as a person a tremendous asset to the campus.

Calciano: I didn't know what you would say, but I thought you might have more to say in the vein that the library is to the humanities what the laboratory is to science.

Smith: Yes.

Calciano: So I thought you might have a reaction to the collection?

Smith: I think for a new library, it's an excellent library and has built up very rapidly and the whole spirit and attitude of the staff always seemed to me a very good one, but then that's an outsider's view. I discovered when the issue of the replacement of Don Clark came up that . . . there were very strong and rather bitter divisions in the Library, and that was a surprise to me because my contacts with it were through particular individuals who were always most responsive. I knew Bob [Robert E.] Fessenden at UCLA as he was a student of mine. He was the prototype of the helpful, progressive, and capable library person. I always had only the nicest experiences with and respect for the people there.

Academic Senate

Calciano: Well then, do you have any comments you'd like to make about the Academic Senate here at Santa Cruz.

Smith: Well I'll say a little bit about them maybe in connection with my interests in helping start the union . . . that was kind of fun and I'm in that because I thought that the senate really had become for all intents and purposes a useless body . . . that it had had its day. It played a very important role in development of faculty leadership or faculty participation in the administration, in the running of the University or its academic intellectual side. Then I think its creative period was over and it just became a liability . . . bogged down in committees. I'm sure that some of the committees perform

useful functions . . . but it just seemed to me another one of those agencies or aspects of the University which wasted time, burned up energy and time, distracted people from teaching and research. One of the principal administrative areas in which the output was not commensurate with or in proportion to the input. In the first couple of years the Academic Senate was important and well attended. But that trailed off; the pattern at other campuses as well. Senate meetings attracted administrators and people who had a particular ax to grind, unless there was some very big issue and then it seemed to me that it didn't handle it too well generally speaking. The senates on most campuses became cockpits in the period of student crisis but that didn't happen here and I think one of the things that's easy to forget about Santa Cruz is that every other campus that I know of in the University of California system and throughout the country went through the most bitter divisive experiences as a result of the whole Vietnam thing but not at Santa Cruz . . . If you wanted to take the real points which I would like to think of as the episodes or moments when it seemed that Santa Cruz was at its best was in that period of crisis where our particular eccentric form of localization of the collegiate system was remarkably effective in coping with, meeting, or responding to those situations and where faculties and students preserved a great deal of comity and good will through them. I found to my astonishment that among the faculty here there weren't those bitter divisions between right and left that I knew existed on other campuses. How deep and bitter those divisions were and how much their effects are still felt on some campuses, I didn't know until I went to some kind of conference of conservative faculty members and I don't know how I got there.

Calciano: I was wondering.

Smith: I heard tales of bitter strife at the conference. Everybody was giving testimony and when it came to me I said, "Well I'm sorry, I guess I don't belong here. I can't identify with these battles and campaigns and curious controversies because we, for whatever reason, have been spared them."

American Federation of Teachers

Calciano: You mentioned starting a union?

Smith: The AFT, the American Federation of Teachers, which was after the second or third year by far the largest [membership] proportionally of any campus of the University.

Calciano: Did you have senior faculty or was it just junior faculty?

Smith: I think it was probably a result of this relative harmony with which we passed through the crisis of the '60s. You see on most campuses there was a group of radical objectors, a disputatious minority that was pushing for the union whereas it was a much more general thing on this campus, people of different ranks and persuasions . . . Bruce Larkin, Sheldon Wolin and myself, and then of course a number of junior people. It was interesting first of all that there should be that much union feeling on a campus here where you had the intimate atmosphere of the colleges, with ample opportunities to hear grievances. Why should the union have been notably strong and active here?

Calciano: Well you started it because you felt that the Academic Senate was not responding?

Smith: We really needed a separate base of operations where we could develop positions and bring pressure on the university for teaching reforms.

The Arts at UCSC

Calciano: Well, there are several topics that I wanted to cover today, but I thought one of the first ones is the development of the arts on the campus. I know you've been interested in it, and Eloise [Pickard Smith] has been very interested. Would you like to start by just describing the progression or the development of the art programs?

Smith: Well, we felt from the very beginning that art should be part of the daily lives of the students at the college . . . in that spirit we had exhibitions in the dining hall when the college started. We tried to encourage drama and we got Althea Short, a dancer, to come on a part-time, makeshift basis since there was no formal provision for anybody in dance. We had Beatrice Thompson come and used college funds, money that we raised from parents, and student fee money, to bring painters and sculptors to the college . . . Eloise during the first and second years, set up the Cowell Gallery.⁷ We got no encouragement or help from the University. Of course the university began appointing people in the arts. Gurdon Woods came and other people were appointed to the art faculty but initially we had nobody. We had Mary [Holmes] and Jasper [Rose] in Cowell, but they were both part-time in the sense of having other responsibilities, particularly Jasper. We got very little encouragement from Dean who said, "Well,

⁷Now the Eloise Pickard Smith Gallery.—Editor.

College Five will be the art college and that's what we'll emphasize there. That's when we'll make the majority or the greater number of our appointments and College Five will have the general faculty with emphasis in the arts." I always have opposed this very strongly because of my feeling that if you call one college the arts college then those students who are interested in the arts would feel they had to be in that college and then you would diminish the possibilities of having art activists in the colleges.

Calciano: Had you tried to get more art appointments in Cowell initially?

Smith: Yes, but hadn't succeeded.

Calciano: But why?

Smith: We had only so many appointments left—forty I guess. Dean pointed out, I think correctly, that we had to start by representing all the disciplines adequately as a kind of model; we had to appoint two or three people in psychology so there was a beginning group in psychology. When you got through with all the traditional fields that had to be covered—physics, chemistry, math, and so on—there simply weren't enough FTE's [full-time equivalent positions] for the arts. Now I suppose in retrospect I could have fought harder for those . . . I wanted Mary Holmes very much. She was in the field of art, but she's not primarily a teacher of painting; she's a teacher of art history and that's her real field. Jasper had this interest in painting, and wanted to be appointed as Professor of History and Art or some title of that kind . . . so their two appointments were pointed to as already representing a commitment to art. In adjusting and readjusting FTE's that's all I could accomplish. In retrospect, I should have fought harder, but I think that the real problem was that Dean was not really sensitive to the arts. I don't think that he was opposed to them, but he had no zeal for them; they had no importance for him personally. He thinks that it's a good thing to have some art offered. But the fact of the matter is the campus was starved in the arts and when this committee headed by Bert Kaplan was appointed to review the state of the arts the year before last at Santa Cruz, they came up with a very critical report. Kaplan said to me on the telephone that he was astonished that here was a campus that was supposed to be strong in the humanities, of which, in his opinion, art was a very important element, and that it was way behind most of the other campuses of the University. So I think that the simple fact is that the arts have not gotten adequate support.

Calciano: I'm intrigued by your statement about McHenry, because he does collect paintings and art works . . . I would have thought that he . . .

Smith: I believe that he doesn't collect art in a serious and sustained way and that if he has, his aesthetic sensibilities are very limited. He's bought a work of my son's and so I suppose I shouldn't be so critical . . . On the surface he had an openness about it, but the simple fact of the matter was that, it's just not his thing. He talked and talked about science until I was ready to pass out from irritation and boredom. But he never talked about building up art. He said that to be a great university we had to have these ten people in the National Academy and so on. He never talked about having ten distinguished artists, or the role of art in the University, the need to build that up and how important that was. That was incidental in Dean's view and that's the very traditional, academic attitude held by a great many of the faculty in the University and in Cowell. I think that often the faculty in Cowell thought that my concern, preoccupation with the arts, and Eloise's and Jasper's was a kind of frivolous, peripheral interest that was nice, but wasn't serious, intellectual, academic stuff. So, in any event, I believe that we worked against the grain and that this problem was complicated by the appointment of Gurdon Woods who was interested in building up a conventional art department; he was completely uninterested and not sympathetic to efforts of the colleges to ground art in the colleges—the arts, drama, easel painting, sculpture. He got a big grant from the Carnegie people when he first came, some \$100,000. The provosts met with him and asked that some of it be made available to the colleges to help them with the development of art in the colleges. He said, "Oh, no." It was already committed and over-committed. The colleges never got one dime out of that. Now if we had a chairman of art who really felt that the place for art was in the colleges and who had gotten a grant, if he had a grant like that and had given even *half* of it to the colleges, it would have lent an enormous stimulus to the colleges, to art *in* the colleges.

Calciano: What did he use the grant for?

Smith: He brought famous speakers and artists to the campus . . . art theorists . . . and their things were recorded and they got together something pretentious, a book, describing it; they had "happenings" of which some were good and some bad; some of the lectures were good and some bad. The money wasn't all misspent, but it was all spent on the typical conventional sort of showy things that really didn't advance the arts in this situation. I don't think one can point to any single consequence of that \$100,000 and say this is the way in which that money strengthened the program in the

arts in Santa Cruz. It was kind of a typical academic boondoggle. What is interesting to me is that it's a mistake to judge the state of the arts at Santa Cruz simply on the basis of the very meager institutional support. The arts have overcome that situation and have been practiced by the students in quite a striking and interesting way; in terms of the quality of work done in the arts here we're probably way ahead of places that gave much more official attention to the arts; put more money into it, had more appointments, and so on.

Calciano: There seem to be many, many exhibits and many spontaneous displays.

Smith: Yes. The interesting thing is that in a sense the arts have triumphed over the indifference and lack of administration support. Everybody that I've talked to connected with the arts says one of the things people hope for in the new chancellor is that he would have as strong a commitment to the arts as Dean has had to science, so that the arts would *really* get a big boost. The potential that's here would be further actualized.

Calciano: What are his statements about the arts?

Smith: I think he's just like Dean; he's not opposed to them, he thinks they're a good thing, but there hasn't been any indication that he has any really strong convictions in that direction. Perhaps where people can make a case and persuade him that this needs to be done, then he'll do it. But he won't take any initiative in developing the remarkable potentials that are here.

Calciano: Our art department has been quite traditional would you say?

Smith: No, I wouldn't say that. Gurdon Woods of course is gone. He was replaced several years before he left by another chairman, because I personally believe he was making a, I don't say a shambles of the art board, that's probably putting it too strongly . . . he was not felt to be a good administrator of the art board.

Calciano: Was [Douglas] McClellan his replacement?

Smith: McClellan was his successor; he was really brought in to replace Gurdon Woods because of general dissatisfaction with Wood's regime.

Calciano: And what has happened since McClellan?

Smith: I think he's been a very good chairman, brought in some good people and things have picked up a lot. I haven't been in close touch the last year. I think he's resigned as chairman, too. I think he did a good job and did substantially what he was brought here to do which was to try to straighten the board out and try to overcome some of the divisions and animosities that had developed in it.

Calciano: Now, you said that in the early years when you were working for art appointments you kept being told that when College Five comes that's the place where it'll all happen. Did it turn out this way?

Smith: No, Jim Hall is, rather . . . embittered is too strong a word . . . but very disappointed at what happened there, because that was more of a surface thing that College Five didn't get the facilities that Jim Hall thought they should have—the space and the equipment to have a really lively program in the arts; it was neither fish nor fowl, an in-between point where the early development and encouragement of the arts were compromised or constrained by this expectation or this promise that Five would be *the* place. So Hall had to live with the consequences of that because then Five had to kind of scratch and improvise . . . at least *he* felt that in no substantial way had Five been an arts college in the sense in which he had anticipated or hoped it would be. In a way the whole thing fell between two stools.

In Cowell, Jasper developed a special program in the crafts. Cowell was jealous of its involvement in the arts . . . wanted it to be continued, to be an important part of the life of the college, thought the arts were very important and were dismayed at the prospect that students with interest in the arts would all feel they had to go to Five. It was the worst kind of solution or non-solution to the problem.

Calciano: A few weeks ago, when we were talking about various administrative people, you briefly mentioned Peter Smith as being . . . about the only person around the chancellor who was committed to the arts . . .

Smith: Yes.

Calciano: . . . and we didn't explore it at the time. Was there anything else you wanted . . .

Smith: I would stand by that certainly and say that his going was a great loss in that respect. I think he left in part because he experienced the frustration of feeling that his

proposals and ideas in the area of the arts—particularly but not exclusively—were not attended to by the chancellor, that he was really spinning his wheels. The Dartmouth thing was very attractive, and he took over the direction of what I suppose is the most striking arts facility in any university in the country . . . or was for many years. And there's no reason why Santa Cruz shouldn't have had something just as good or better.

Eloise Pickard Smith and the Arts

Calciano: Many people have mentioned to me that Eloise was responsible for the atmosphere of art from the early years of this campus on, that she was really the motivating force behind the development of the arts. Would you like to amplify a bit on her role in the arts?

Smith: Well I think there's no question about it. She never got any help or encouragement from Gurdon Woods . . . quite the reverse. She always had the feeling that he rather resented her activities. When we had Noah Purifoy⁸ who visited for a workshop in junk sculpture, Gurdon Woods came to the workshop, looked, and never said a word expressing interest or anything supportive or encouraging, and went away. So Eloise, not surprisingly, developed a very negative attitude toward Gurdon. When we brought Beatrice Thompson and tried to get the art board to take her on as a part-time appointment or to help in her appointment, that was resisted. There was never any support or interest in the college's or Eloise's efforts . . . the only gallery on the campus through the first five or six years, was the Cowell gallery, but that never got support from the art board and there was never any indication that her contribution to the campus was appreciated.

Calciano: How did she get that created?

Smith: Through the college. Originally there was supposed to be a snack bar in that space. When it was evident that it really wasn't economically viable with that many students—that you really couldn't run a snack bar in there, she fastened on it and felt that would make an ideal gallery space. In those days, the college was run in a rather autocratic way, you know, so I said, "Sure." I don't recall any mumbling or anything. I think people within the college and the faculty took pride in it, supported it, attended the openings, and considered it a real asset to the college.

⁸Page and Eloise Smith's daughter, Anne Easley, wrote in the margin that Noah Purifoy also served on the California Arts Council.—Editor.

Calciano: Since it was the only gallery going, I'm surprised that there wasn't a little bit of University support for bringing in the shows. She brought in shows from throughout the area?

Smith: Yes. There may have been one show where she got some University support. She'd know better than I. But generally, the picture was that she or the college raised all the money that it involved . . . I think she did have work-study students gallery-sitting and that sort of thing, which was a help, but other than that, there wasn't what you would call any real support.

The Music Program

Calciano: Do you ever discuss at all the music aspect of the arts? The music department?

Smith: Well, again, Julia Zaustinsky, who seems to me to be a very difficult person . . . did a great deal in the college in the first few years, making music part of the life of the college. She showed a great deal of energy and resourcefulness and in the third or fourth year arranged to make university-wide our music performance thing centered in Cowell. I just regret that things didn't work out . . . that Julia had problems with different people. For several years, she seemed reassured by my support and gratitude to her for what she did in music. But then as she developed difficulties with other people . . . she'd bring somebody here with great acclaim and assurances of their brilliance—people who were outstanding musicians—I just can't remember the whole series of them now . . . but she'd get in terrible fights with them, say that they were no good at all and had to go.

I can remember Bernard Haley called me up when the faculty was just being appointed. He'd already been appointed and heard that Julia was being considered. Haley said, "Don't, for heavens sake." I didn't pay any attention to that. I didn't know Bernard Haley then and the appointment had gone along far enough so that it would have been a big hassle to do anything about it. I feel that she did a great deal and that the college owed her a lot and I personally did . . . and she came close to the ideal of what music should be in the college.

There's a report by the students on the arts in the colleges . . . they refer to those days and the role that people played in the college as a kind of ideal time that we should try to recover. That's really all I could say about it.

Calciano: What was Fred Hard's role in music?

Smith: He was chairman of humanities. He was in music himself in a modern sense: a performer who cares a lot about music, familiar with it, has many friends who are musicians. The people Fred wanted to bring in, Julia was adamant about . . . I can't remember, one man was concertmaster of the Boston symphony with a very distinguished background, and she said he was absolutely hopeless and terrible. She brought William Van den Burg here as one of the best cellists in the country; a little while later she was saying that he was just terrible and hopeless. There was a great deal of contention between Julia and Fred over the man Fred tried to bring here. I'm sure Fred could be difficult as well, and may have been chauvinistic about Julia. I'm sure she encountered some of that, but I think honestly ninety percent of the problems were of her own making. It's a great pity because she had great energy and talent. I don't know enough about music to have any notion. Musicians are just an inscrutable bunch to me . . . when they get going after each other, they're worse than artists or historians. Music isn't my strong suit, but I enjoyed music, and felt that it, like drama and art, belonged in the college and was very important as an aspect of the life of the college.

Campus Architecture

Calciano: This is vaguely related to the field of art and so forth . . . what is your opinion of the architecture of this campus?

Smith: I think it's on the whole very good. It's interesting; there's a variety and it's not unharmonious. The different complexes and buildings seem to me to relate quite well to each other. I said at the beginning that while Cowell was the most conventional in its architecture of the first three colleges, I thought it would perhaps wear best . . . that it was very straightforward and as the trees and shrubs and things planted grew, it had a nice quality to it. I still think that way. The other colleges are more interesting architecturally, more striking . . . I think Five is not at all a successful college . . . it's too heavy and that courtyard has been compared from time to time to a sort of prison yard atmosphere with buildings around it, that it is incompatible with the setting of the campus itself . . . you'd expect to find it in some other kind of situation as part of a different sort of complex development. I think Crown is probably in many ways the most successful; I rather like that. Kresge seems to me the only really . . . I don't want to say disaster . . . the major disappointment. I think that sort of gimmickry and striving for effect is not really sound, satisfactory architecture. On the whole considering how

bad most public architecture is today, the University, and McHenry can really take considerable pride in what was accomplished. It's possible to take each building individually and criticize it, but I think on the whole that the result has been surprisingly good. I think [landscape architect] Thomas Church's influence is probably evident in this and in his whole feeling that the buildings should be supportive to the landscape.

Calciano: People every once in a while will say that well of course Santa Cruz is nice because look at its setting, but they forget or they do not know that originally we were going to all be down in the flat meadow and we would have looked like any other new campus in California.

Smith: Yes. Well I think it was a great achievement of Dean's to get the campus located, the buildings located, where they are. I think that this unqualified praise is due him for his care and attention to the terrain.

Calciano: You've commented about both McHenry and [Philip] Bell as being rather inflexible utopians, and then about [Robert] Edgar you also said that you felt he suffered a bit from having a utopian imagination. And yet "utopian" is a phrase that I would think could be used about you also. What is your reaction?

Utopianism

Smith: Well I always stated that I was not a utopian. I'm not a utopian on I don't know how many levels. To believe that things can be improved is not, in my opinion, to be utopian. To believe that you can create some ideal atmosphere [without considering] the limitations inherent in any situation is utopian. I think I've mentioned the instance of McHenry saying, "We never thought things like this would happen when we planned Santa Cruz," as indicating a kind of utopian belief that here we would be exempt from the ordinary woes and ills and pains of the world. And I was quoted as saying before the college started, the University started, that I thought it would fail. Well, what I said . . .

Calciano: You were quoted by whom?

Smith: By Bill Twombly in the *Los Angeles Times*.

Calciano: You were quoted as saying that UCSC was going to fail even before it started?

Smith: Yes. Even before it started. In the news story he had asked, “What do you think the long-run prospects are?” And I said, “Well, I suppose, in a certain sense it will fail as every enterprise with high goals and ideals fails to fully achieve them. But,” I said, “I think it will be, can be, an important and interesting experiment that may have a salutary influence on higher education generally.” So that’s the difference . . . it wasn’t going to remake the world. I hoped it would [exist] on its own terms and have some influence. Certainly it’s a tricky issue, what is utopian and what is non-utopian.

I am, I profess, to be a Christian, but in the strict sense a Christian can’t be a utopian although he may have utopian expectations of one kind or another. I was in the Penny University [at Café Pergolesi]⁹ and we were talking about the tension between the Christian notion of original sin and what I would call Christian utopianism . . . that is the sense that the world, the earthly kingdom, can be made more like the heavenly kingdom . . . but it’s never going to be the heavenly kingdom until the end of time. I was saying that I thought the founding fathers kept these two propositions in balance better than any other group or in any other period, because they were quite skeptical about human nature. They accepted, by and large, the notion of original sin as a political as well as a theological proposition. On the other hand, they thought the people could live a better life, and that human society could be substantially improved. They were, by the same token, not sure how long it would last. A good many of them said, “if it lasts for a couple hundred years that’s probably pretty good,” because they were still under the influence of the brief idea of [historical] cycles. They knew from the history of Greece that you could see times when Greece was in its glory and when things had been splendid and magnificent, and then you entered into times of decadence and decay. So there are these different elements mixed in, but certainly I would say my basic faith and beliefs rule out the possibility of utopian thinking in the strictest sense of that word . . . you get into all kinds of gray areas.

And I’m sure that if Dean and I sat and talked about what we thought utopia was . . . we’d be in some ways on a theological, theoretical level, very close together, but it seemed to me emotionally . . . that psychologically he had a kind of a utopian bent. I think Bell and Edgar also had that bent to a considerable extent. And that complicates life. If you think that the world can be made right and that you can do it, then everything you do is done under vastly more pressure. You think, “Goodness, if we

⁹The Penny University, a small group of faculty, including Smith, held weekly discussions with members of the community on American history, philosophy, art, and a variety of themes, at the Café Pergolesi in Santa Cruz. As of 1996 it is still meeting regularly.—Editor.

don't get this done and if in Kresge the encounter group technique doesn't take root, then everything is lost." I have great admiration for all those people, but that does seem to me to be an illusion.

Calciano: It would be fun to listen to you and McHenry and a couple others discuss utopianism as opposed to pragmatic approaches.

Smith: Yes. One faculty member said to Eloise at the beginning of the college something about, "Well, Page's head is in the clouds and his feet are off the ground," and it made Eloise very mad. I don't know why it should have annoyed and upset her.

Calciano: Did it bother you?

Smith: No.

Town-Gown Relations

Calciano: I'd also like to ask you about the town-gown relationship over the years. From '63 and '64 on to the present.

Smith: I am by no means as innocent about co-relations between town and gown, because now that I'm in the town and look up at the hill I understand some of the feelings that exist in the town about the University. That feeling has been exacerbated by the student upheavals of course, by the students' right to vote, and their mixing in county and city politics. But I think quite apart from those issues—as important as they have been or as much of a role as they've played in inflaming or increasing tension—the University is not really much interested in the town. At least the town perceives that the University is not really much interested in the problems and issues of the town except as the students come down and meddle in or vote in elections and faculty and (the University's) condescending attitude toward the community, feeling itself in some way superior to the community. I think that [perception is] right: I think the University—even with the best of intentions and putting aside Dean's very active public relations program which was largely a personal matter—has never understood this. Dean tried, in some ways very successfully, to represent the University through himself to the community by going to service clubs, by belonging to different groups, and by forming friendships with people, leaders of the community, all of which was very much to his credit. But that had nothing to do with the basic attitude of the University which is I suppose the faculty, as the element that's enduring and that persists . . . the students

come and go. I don't think Santa Cruz is very different from any other college town in that respect. I *do* think the physical distance makes the difference. If suddenly I were sitting down with lots of people now to talk about [creating a] university in Santa Cruz—having the experience and knowing what I do now—I would want it in the town itself. I don't blame anybody for not thinking of that in 1960, but that would have been rather novel and probably dismissed as an inappropriate notion, but I feel very strongly that that's where the University belongs.

Calciano: The buildings, the physical buildings?

Smith: Yes.

Calciano: The grounds . . .

Smith: Yes . . . right in the town. And that's hard to say in view of the beauty of the campus site—all those aspects of it. I just believe that the physical distance of the University from the town represents the intellectual and psychological distance of the scholarly community from the practical world, which is bad for both.

Calciano: Many universities are right smack in the town though. Certainly Harvard does not have a marvelously warm relationship with the Cambridge townspeople. I don't know that that would solve the . . .

Smith: No, I don't know that it solves . . .

Calciano: It seems to make it worse in a way. Columbia found this when they come in to build in their neighborhood, they're unhappy.

Smith: Yeah. Sure. That's Columbia as a case in point, surely. Since space in Santa Cruz is limited, I don't know whether practically you could do it. But it is the model of the great universities of Europe . . . they're all right in the middle; I can't think of any exceptions . . . Paris and others are right in the middle of the communities where they're located and I believe that's a better principle. In other words if the University's attitude toward the community was different, the fact that it was a distance away and up on the hill, wouldn't matter. But since its attitude towards the community is basically a condescending one, that distance is reinforced. The community feels a stronger sense of alienation from the University by virtue of this . . . I'm not saying that if it were in the community as is the case with Harvard, that would solve the problem . . . although

Harvard is in many ways such a different situation because Cambridge really isn't a community . . . but a kind of an industrial suburb of Boston and doesn't have the character of a community in the sense that Santa Cruz does . . . at least not in my mind.

Calciano: Most of our faculty lives in town or in surrounding communities . . .

Smith: Yes.

Calciano: I wonder why that hasn't built more bridges . . .

Smith: I don't know. Certainly some faculty have been active in the community . . . Manny [N. Manfred] Schaffer and Karl Lamb and Peter Scott on the ecology side and so on . . . others in different cultural things in the community. I know that that attitude exists and when I try to think back to my attitudes when I was in the University, I feel a little sheepish. I was not culpable in any active or overt way; there was certainly no hostility or deliberate condescension, but the community feels something there and I think that they probably feel it rightly . . . the University is rather proprietary; it's not very open with the community in sharing its facilities; it invites people to concerts and so on, but if a towns person goes up to use University facilities, [he's] apt to be told that the University rules are such that this is impossible.

Calciano: Now this is not true at the Library . . . one of the bridges.

Smith: No. That's right. I would certainly agree.

Calciano: It's rather interesting . . . my husband and I were invited to a dinner with a group of young faculty about a year or two ago and the question was "What department are you in?" My husband said, "I practice in town." The reaction was, "we've all been wanting to meet you . . . we never have the chance to talk with one," and then there were jokes about how we were the token townies.

Smith: Yes.

Calciano: But there was a feeling among the young faculty that more mixture between town and gown would be good, but the townspeople don't quite know how to go about it.

Smith: Yes.

Calciano: And there are just very few people who are in a position to build bridges between the two, I guess.

Smith: Yes.

Calciano: I remember also how startled I was, since the community was very much *for* the University coming in.

Smith: Yes.

Calciano: About 1964 or 1965 all of a sudden some seemed to say it's going to be terrible when they arrive and then our barefoot students arrived and shattered the image of varsity high school letter sweaters that the town had had.

Smith: Yes.

Calciano: I guess that Cabrillo College has managed to build a much better community image than the University.

Paul Lee

Calciano: To switch topics again . . . would you like to tell me a little bit about the Paul Lee episode?

Smith: Well, let's see. The whole question of Paul Lee being kept¹⁰ or not kept by the third year was already in the air. There was very strong opposition to him in different sectors or different areas of the University . . . I can remember coming to a meeting of what came to be the chancellor's Academic Advisory Committee and talking about matters of promotion and what would be the basis for promotion and so on and Dean said, "Well that I've just come (from a class with) Paul Lee teaching, and after class he was surrounded by a group of enthusiastic and excited students. I thought well now that's somebody we have to keep; a teacher who can generate that kind of excitement and enthusiasm in students . . . now that's a special situation and we have to keep a person like that." I don't have any idea whether Dean remembers that.

The efforts to save Paul's career began a couple of years before he was terminated. He'd been very active in the religious studies board and taught a lot of religious studies,

¹⁰The issue was whether or not religious studies Assistant Professor Paul Lee would be granted tenure.—
Editor.

was chairman one year, and I thought a very good chairman. He'd been involved, not as intensively, but to some extent, in the History of Consciousness Program. It was clear that the people on the philosophy board had closed their ranks against him and would not support him.

I found there was an available FTE [full-time equivalent position] for religious studies and I went to them and said, "I think really it should go to Paul. He is more appropriate in this area probably than in philosophy, since in the field of theology he's been very active and it's an important program and served a lot of students. I think we should give this FTE to Paul Lee and thus save his career here, because he has done a great deal, in my opinion, for the University." Joe [César L.] Barber said, "No. This [FTE] is only available for some very prestigious appointment, to be filled by bringing in someone who is very well known and prominent." I think the religious studies board or committee, voted to give the FTE to Paul although it was a struggle. My recollection is that Joe Barber said, "Well, then, the appointment won't be available."

Calciano: He was very anti?

Smith: Yes. I really don't know. Those things are complicated. I really couldn't answer that. I had such a funny relationship with Joe Barber about it. He began calling me "Paul" everytime I went to talk to him about Paul. He would say, "Now, Paul, I don't understand why you are so supportive. You're a distinguished scholar and yet you want to support somebody who hasn't done the scholarly thing." But it got to be a very funny, sticky issue because Joe Barber was always opposed to Paul's appointment being continued, but I don't mean to say he can be blamed entirely for it . . . other than his opposition to his getting the religious studies thing.

Calciano: Just a second . . . why had philosophy closed its ranks?

Smith: Well they said he wasn't an orthodox philosopher and he didn't publish. . . Also there was a personality clash between him and the senior people in philosophy . . . Maurice Natanson took a very strong dislike to Paul and had a long list of complaints about him. Basically I think it was that he kept talking about writing, finishing a book, and doing articles, and he didn't produce them. Natanson felt that he misrepresented the state of the work that he was doing . . . that he wasn't as far along as he implied. It was a combination of things. Paul opposed [Albert] Hofstadter's being appointed and he was only a junior person in philosophy. I think in a certain sense that was the

beginning of the rupture between Natanson and Lee because Natanson very strongly supported [Hofstadter]. Now, of course, when Hofstadter came he and Natanson had a falling out because Hofstadter opposed the appointment of somebody that Natanson wanted and that was the beginning of the estrangement between them. They don't speak to each other. The only thing that they are united on is their common hostility to Paul. So it was clear that philosophy wouldn't back him. So I went from religious studies—when that door was closed—to history of consciousness which had an appointment to make. History of consciousness faculty and students voted to give that appointment to Paul Lee. Okay. Kenneth Thimann had given me reason to believe, indicated in some way to me, that they liked Paul in Crown, and if another board could be found besides philosophy, Crown would be glad to have Paul. But when I lined up the history of consciousness slot as a possibility for Paul, Kenneth Thimann told me that Crown was opposed to Paul and that they'd discussed it and had a vote and voted quite substantially against keeping him regardless of any board supporting him.

Calciano: Well there must have been some reasons.

Smith: Yes, I suppose there were. I heard some of the reasons, both pro and con, but how the balance came down, I really don't know. I never had any way of going very deeply into that.

I think the fact that he hadn't published certainly was important . . . I don't know how important. The fact that he'd been involved so much in the garden project and that the scientists in Crown were very opposed to the garden project as a kind of a return to some sort of mystical, unscientific thing . . . I'm sure that had a good deal to do with it.

In any event, Herman Blake at College Eight was quite receptive and talked to Paul and that seemed as though it would work out. Then Herman said that he had lost an FTE, the one that he had hoped would be available for Paul hadn't materialized. Then I tried Five . . . and there was a good deal of interest in College Five. [Pavel] Machotka was then acting provost and he was interested and Hitchcock . . . and others . . . but, of course, Albert Hofstadter was in College Five, and Hofstadter was adamant about Paul not being on the faculty there. So I thought, Cowell is where Paul had once hoped to be and that's where I should have gone to begin with. Kresge we also tried and that seemed to be ready to work. Bob Edgar and Paul had a very helpful talk and there were a number of people in Kresge who supported it, but then when they got into the actual vote on it, there was a group again that was adamant and that was dropped. I

went to Cowell. I went to the Fellowship Committee, described the situation and asked for their backing. They seemed inclined to give it except for one person who said that he would resign if Paul Lee was appointed. And then another person said the same thing. These were senior people in the college and nobody wanted to push the issue to the point where it split the college . . . I didn't. And when one of the senior people, with whom I discussed the matter said he would resign if Paul was appointed I thought to myself—well, that's it. I didn't say it to him. I thought—well then I'll resign. I mean, I had identified myself with Paul's cause; I believe[d] he should be kept. I believe[d] the grounds on which he was being terminated were wrong. And I [felt I] really should stand by him. And so shortly after that I told Paul that I thought the cause was lost, that I was announcing my resignation¹¹ on these grounds that I then described in my letter to the faculty. So that's it very briefly. In a certain sense it was a funny time too, you know, we explored the terrain.

At every point, Paul had intractable enemies, people who felt so strongly, were so hostile to him, that they wouldn't abide by any sort of group decision. That was really I think the heart of the matter.

Resignation from UCSC

Calciano: Before this all came up, had you been considering resigning for other reasons or to get more publishing private time?

Smith: I had inquired. I wrote to the people at Berkeley, the office of retirement. I had considered two possibilities—one, retiring early, and the other, not an uncommon arrangement, of teaching two quarters and being off a quarter in the summer . . . because I felt . . . I had a variety of feelings . . . I was disappointed with the way things were going at the University, and I really wanted to curtail my involvement, particularly in the administrative-committee side of things. I wasn't administering then, but I was chairman of history of consciousness and was on some other committees and wanted to clear myself of that.

I found out what the financial problem would be if I considered retiring at that age, at 55, of whatever it was. When I had accrued 20 years of service I realized that it wasn't practical financially and I would make a large sacrifice of the hundreds of thousands of dollars cumulatively . . . you know, taking what my retirement pay would be if I retired

¹¹Smith resigned from the University on June 30, 1973.—Editor.

then, as opposed to what it would be if I served out my career subsequently and lived another 10 or 15 years plus the difference between what I would get in retirement pay in the next ten years . . . It wasn't only my salary. There were in a sense two issues: what I would be getting after 65 or 67, and what I would be getting between now and then. I thought, well, that's really impossible and just dismissed the notion of retirement. But I had considered it, been interested enough in the notion to at least make the inquiry.

I think that when you leave an institution . . . the institution has to construct a story to save its conscience or its own self-esteem. So the story that I began to hear was that people said . . . well, that I [had] really intended to retire anyway to promote my book and this was just an excuse [retiring or resigning as a protest]. In other words, I heard a number of stories, sort of cover stories that were constructed out of whole cloth to really offer another explanation of why I retired that wouldn't seem to be negative in terms of the University's image of itself. I did get some letters, mostly from junior faculty, expressing support and sympathy. One senior faculty person spoke to me and two or three wrote letters expostulating with me and saying I was wrong and why I was wrong.

Calciano: Because you were quixotic, it wasn't going to get Paul Lee hired back . . .

Smith: That's right.

Calciano: Some people probably thought that you had decided to go out in a blaze of glory.

Smith: You know that's interesting. Two elements were involved and could be explanations. One, that people didn't want to consider the real reason and two, that it was quixotic and in that sense nothing could be accomplished by that. [inaudible] So I suppose it's not surprising when you think about it.

Calciano: Also people were very surprised that I think you made such an issue of Lee and the publish-or-perish thing when you were a man who had published right along.

Smith: But I've always said at the same time that I was publishing that I was completely out of sympathy with that as a standard for retention on the faculty of any university and I have written articles about it. In the letter I wrote announcing the reasons for my resignation, I quoted a letter that I had written to the faculty several years earlier on the

same subject. I could have made reference to an article that I had written eight or . . . well, ten years ago. So this wasn't a new principle with me. I've always felt that way. But this time it was a case that seemed to me very important and was close to me personally. One person said to Paul Lee that I was just a sorehead, that I quit because I was mad and didn't get my own way. I suppose there's something in that, too. If I'd gotten my own way I wouldn't have quit.

Calciano: I hadn't heard that. Well all of a sudden you found yourself out of a job so to speak and you've been doing a number of things since. Would you like to briefly mention some of them?

The William James Association

Smith: I'm on the staff of the People's Bicentennial Commission which is a group of young people in Washington, D.C. who set themselves up as a counter bicentennial group to the administration's official bicentennial commission. They want to stress the real ideas and principles of the [American] Revolution and insist that it was a revolution, that it was radical and that Americans should understand what the revolution was about and be exposed to the writings and thoughts of the participants of the revolution and encouraged to think about our present situation today in those terms. There are nine people on the People's Bicentennial Commission in Washington . . . they're all under 30 . . . I'm the only one over 30 and two of them are former students at UCSC. So a third of the People's Bicentennial Commission has substantial present or former Santa Cruz antecedents. Then Paul and I started the William James Association whose name is based on William James's essay, "The Moral Equivalent of War" which is concerned with voluntary work service in peace time, and indeed, the whole issue of work and war and peace and service to one's country and so on. That's been a basis for all kinds of particular ventures coming off of that . . . the People's Penny University . . .

Calciano: No one really seems to understand. I don't understand it either completely . . . the William James Association.

Smith: Yes. The William James Association is a kind of intellectual holding company or conglomerate, interested in stimulating activity in a whole range of areas having to do with work, with community, with intellectual life. We have reference points, of course, basically here. The Penny University is an effort to create some kind of intellectual center in the community outside of the University. The Saturday Market is an effort to

develop a modest economic venture that will also be an effective part of community life. The Work Company is an effort to get young unemployed people together, to utilize the energies of the unemployed to help themselves. The television program was an effort to develop a model whereby a group of young people in the William James cooperative produced fifty half-hour television programs, for a total cost of six or seven hundred dollars over the whole year by utilizing available energies and skills in the community.

Calciano: Was this mostly volunteers, or do you have a paid staff?

Smith: Yes. Volunteers. We don't have any paid staff except it's supposed to generate incomes for us, and we do have a woman who does our bookkeeping and hopefully keeps us out of jail. We have an office and that's about it.

Calciano: The Penny University . . . now that's different than the new university down at Seaside?

Smith: Yes. The Penny University is just an informal kind of teaching situation at the coffeehouse, the Café Pergolesi, four or five days a week from 5:00 to 6:30 p.m. I have the American Revolution seminar which has been going on about a year; Paul has a seminar in history of consciousness; Donald Nicholl, when he was here, taught a course or led a group under the title "How are We to Live." And Pat Liteky teaches a session on the theology of politics.

Calciano: Are you involved at all in the university at Seaside?

Smith: No.

Calciano: But Paul is, isn't he?

Smith: Well, he has a very nominal involvement in that. But I don't really know what it is. He has contact with some of the people but he hasn't been doing anything in terms of planning.

Calciano: Well, what about your writing . . . your volumes on the American Revolution?¹²

¹²For a listing of Smith's book publications, see Appendix II.—Editor.

Smith: Well, I have respectively four books, or I have contracts for four books . . . and publication dates fairly well set for two. A book on the chicken comes out in February or March of next year and the revolution book in the spring or summer. An anthology of writings of American women that I did with Ann Fabian is due to be published next spring and I'm in the process of signing a contract to do a book on radical Christianity in the American Revolution.

Calciano: If you had the chance, would you be interested in coming back to the University?

Smith: No. Or any other university appointment. When I went to the Organization of American Historians meeting at Denver, John Galbraith said that Dean said to him that the last thing he wanted to do before he left the chancellorship was to try to persuade me to return to the University. But he never mentioned it to me. Ah . . . when I was at that meeting I was a little startled by how many of my contemporaries said to me, "Well, of course you're out of it now, and I wish I was, but I've got to hang on another ten years" or whatever, nine, or eight, or eleven, "to protect my pension rights." And one of my colleagues from UCLA said, "Well, I'd like to retire, and I have private means and could retire without any problem, therefore I feel that morally I shouldn't." And I thought that was very circular.

Calciano: How do you feel about having left the University?

Smith: Well, I'm very pleased. I certainly had very substantial disillusionments with many aspects of not Santa Cruz specifically or exclusively, but of higher education generally, and I wouldn't have had the gumption to get out if this issue hadn't precipitated the matter for me; I would have been too protective of my economic interests for one thing. So I'm very glad that what I saw to be an issue, a matter of conscience, prevailed where I felt I should leave for my own self respect.

Calciano: Is there anything that you'd like to talk about that I've not asked about?

Smith: No. I don't think so. We've covered the waterfront.

Calciano: Fine.

Smith's Second Thoughts about this Oral History

Smith: I don't know whether I've said this before or not, but I decided at some point . . . maybe I planned to mention it to you and didn't . . . and I don't remember when it came to me . . . but at some point I resolved in my own mind that I would only be willing to have [this] tape played and not transcribed because I believe so strongly in the importance of the inflection, the quality of voice [of the tape itself] . . . I suppose that the whole Watergate thing has sensitized me too. The issue is that there are two very different forms of expression: one is the tape; and one is the transcribed record of the tape. Although, we take them to be, in effect, the same thing. But it seemed to me the more I've thought about what I've said [during these interviews] and the fact that I've been very candid and said exactly what I think and feel about people and issues without reserve . . . that it's particularly important that it be attended to.

Calciano: Yes. I'd like to . . .

Smith: Yes.

Calciano: Well first let me explain what we usually do.

Smith: Sure.

Calciano: Our process is to transcribe, to edit with a very light hand, to mainly do punctuation, checking that names are spelled right and so forth. Then the transcript comes back to you to make sure that it's accurate and, as you *learned* from [the] Watergate tapes, there are times when words are swallowed and you may have noticed me making little notes . . . every once in a while it's something that I'm *sure* can't be transcribed . . . There was a place there where you had a "not" on it; it wasn't going to come through on the tape. Then at that point, we give you a contract to look over and you either sign that the whole transcript is available for research or that parts of it are, that parts of it you want to be sealed for twenty years or that you want the whole thing sealed. Now we *have* been transcribing; we have already sunk a good deal of University Library money into transcribing this, so I am little aghast that at this point you mention that you prefer not to [have a transcription]. If it is something that you can go along with, I would much prefer to see a written transcript with a statement in the beginning that Page Smith would prefer users to also hear the oral [version] . . . I think frankly that if it just sits on tape, nobody is going to use it. We've always had our tapes as

backup material and not one person has ever come in and requested to use them. We've kept them because of the case of inflection.

Smith: Well I certainly entered in good faith into the arrangement and it was only after our last session, as I recall, that it came to me so forcefully how different the two modes are. Thus, I'm certainly aware of how this comes as a capricious or unexpected [decision]. But it's not capricious as I've thought a good deal about it and talked about it with Eloise. If it had occurred to me at the beginning, then we either of course would have preferred not to do it, and then we wouldn't have gotten into it, or if we had, we would have gone ahead with the clear understanding about it.

Calciano: Well I thought at the beginning that I had written you what it was that you were agreeing to by participating.

Smith: Yes. Well I knew. I certainly knew what I was agreeing to when we started, because I knew that that's what was done with [the tapes] . . . that the tapes were made and then transcribed . . . no doubt arose in my mind about that procedure. I thought—that's all right. But I have just come in the course of the whole thing, culminating last time, to this very strong feeling of what I would like to do. If there's anything I can do to get you off the hook since it could be an awkward and I assume, an embarrassing kind of situation for you to find yourself in, where a subject has tried to change the rules in the middle of the game . . . If there's some *informal* way that this can be accomplished . . . you see, I would be inclined to say, "Okay, well, I've talked in personalities about different people and been very uninhibited, unguarded, let's say, in a sense, that this could cause misunderstandings or problems if they're [the transcripts] available." I could say, "Well, I would want to reserve this for twenty years." That wouldn't be my inclination, but if it's transcribed, and that putting a time limit on when this [transcript] will become accessible . . . I could say that the tape would be accessible to everybody who wished to use it prior to the release of the transcript. But that's just a subterfuge, an arrangement whereby the integrity of the process is preserved, so to speak, where you don't get into the formal issue of my having in a sense misled you and used up a lot of time and tape and money and then come out at the end with some unreasonable restriction. I don't know . . .

Calciano: Yes. I really do feel that we entered into this with the good faith that you had the knowledge that you had control of the manuscript, as to when it would be released,

but that it would be a manuscript. I'd like you to see a bit of the transcript and see how you feel that it reads.

Smith: Okay.

Calciano: . . . because it might be, you decide it's not necessary to restrict your . . .

Smith: Well, I'd do anything that seems to be right about it.

Calciano: Okay. But we do have, we do have a clear understanding that if we go ahead and transcribe it, that you *will* release it at some point—it might be twenty years or so?¹³

Smith: Yes. Oh sure. Yes.

Calciano: Because I truly resent the waste of time.

Smith: Sure. Sure.

Calciano: . . . more than any awkwardness. It's just that we've put a lot of time into this.

Smith: Sure.

Calciano: All right. Well, now, as I say you will be dealing with my successor, but she'll have this understanding here . . . Also from the institution's point of view . . . I would want to think twice before we have those tapes go out because there are a couple of things that are possibly libelous that you said. And I'd have to . . . well maybe after my first year of law school, I'll know whether they were.¹⁴

Smith: Well that's certainly your problem, and not mine.

Calciano: So . . . it might be that they'd have to be made available with two deletions or something. I've no objection to dubbing off a copy of the tape and placing it in Instructional Services or wherever there are machines available if this is your wish, and having it very clear that this is your wish. We usually *don't* do that because it's the

¹³Anne Easley wrote in the margin here: "and it was 20 years." It was actually 22 years.—Editor.

¹⁴Elizabeth Calciano, the interviewer, resigned in August, 1974, from her position as founding editor of the Regional History Project to attend law school—Editor.

person's wish not to have the tapes made that readily available . . . so *that's* perfectly workable.

Smith: Sure.

Calciano: But I do want to make sure that the written record is available because that's the one that gets used, frankly. When we're talking about pragmatic or head-in-the-clouds approach, it . . .

Smith: Well the thing about it though is that if the transcript is not available for a period of time, and people care enough and want enough to get the other, they'll go and get it off the tapes, so that's a kind of safety valve if you then have erased from the tapes anything that would be libelous, or . . .

Calciano: Well there're just a couple of spots, and I think that they probably are okay because I think you could probably verify them.

Smith: Yes.

Calciano: . . . you know, what is it, "Truth, is the first defense of libel?"

Smith: Sure.

Calciano: Well, all right, then we *will* go ahead and transcribe this, and we *will* go ahead with the editing and present you with a manuscript for you to look over. Then at that point you can decide the time limit you want to put on it.

Smith: Okay. Great. I'm sorry to come up with that sleeper . . . that unexpected, misgiving. Well, the more I thought about it, the more I thought they will just miss . . . if you're just simply recording facts, but when you get into the whole realm of opinion and judgment and attitude and soon, it's a very different ball game, really.

Calciano: I'm curious as to why you feel the transcript would not represent you correctly in these areas of opinion.

Smith: I don't think it wouldn't represent me accurately . . . it wouldn't represent me fully. Because obviously as we sit and talk, part of what you hear, a very important part of what you hear, not simply the words, but the inflections, the pauses, the tone—

there's a whole range of very subtle things that are going on constantly in any communication . . .

Calciano: Yes. I certainly agree with that.

Smith: . . . oral communication between people. And after all the [Regional History] project is called an oral history project, you know. And I think it's something that your successor should really think about. And the Library should think about too. Because I *really do* . . . it may be farfetched to keep pointing to the Watergate tapes but they really do dramatize the fact that a transcript is a transcript and a tape is a tape.

Calciano: They also dramatize that a very bad transcript is a bad transcript.

Smith: But I feel that I'm better represented in the original form in which the words came out of my mouth, because of all these matters of tone and inflection and the subtle things that really are important.

Calciano: It's interesting, because you have talked in more of a monotone than most of my interviewees.¹⁵ There are people who *really* are going the gamut from uproarious exclamations to whispering to an incredulous tone. We try to reflect that by underlining or putting in brackets, "spoken in a mock whisper." You tended to keep a much steadier plane as you thought out your answers and spoke them. But before you make any hard and fast rule about how many years to block the manuscript, I would like you to see it in its written form. What I would also like to mention is that some of these things *are* difficult to understand and it's very hard playing the tape over and over again. You're not as likely to get accurate representation from somebody listening to the tape. They may not hear what you really said. Well, we ought to be able to work out something.

¹⁵Anne Easley wrote in the margin here: "This is because he took it seriously. He always talked evenly and steady of tone when serious—'monotone' sounds awful.—Editor.

Index

Academic Senate 13, 28, 77
American Federation of Teachers 78
Amis, George T. 18
architecture of UC Santa Cruz 86
arts at UC Santa Cruz 79
Baer, George W. 66
Barber, César L. 93
Bell, Philip W. 50, 57, 87
Berger, Jr., Harry 12, 14, 17, 18, 19, 23, 64, 71
Biology (Board of Studies in) 66
Birnbaum, Norman 7
Blake, J. Herman 14, 37, 58, 95
Brodie, Fawn 20
Brown, Daphne 44
Cabrillo College 92
Chancellor's Advisory Committee 56
Church, Thomas 87
Clark, Donald T. 77
Clauser, Francis H. 76
College Five 60, 61, 83, 86
college life 22
college/boards of studies conflict 62
Columbia University 90

Council of Provosts 59

Cowell College 9, 11, 58, 67, 83, 86

 faculty appointments to 10

Crown College 9, 20, 87

Culture Breaks 37

Dartmouth College 84

Dizikes, John 66, 69

Domhoff, G. William 18, 68

Economics (Board of Studies in) 67

Edgar, Robert S. 56, 57, 87, 95

Everson, William 51, 65

Fabian, Ann 99

faculty appointments 11

faculty recruiting 7

Farm and Garden Project 38

Fessenden, Robert E. 77

Fletcher, Tom 21

Galbraith, John S. 3, 44, 99

Haley, Bernard 13, 45, 76, 85

Hall, James B. 56, 83

Hard, Frederick 76, 86

Harvard University 91

History (Board of Studies in) 66

 as a humanities 43

History of Consciousness Program 71, 93, 94, 96

Hitchcock, George P. 65

Hitchcock, William R. 18, 19, 66, 71

Hofstadter, Albert 94, 95
Holmes, Mary A. 18, 20, 79
Joshi, Bhuwan L. 18
Kahn, Michael 51
Kaplan, Bert 12, 18, 23, 25, 45, 51, 71, 80
Kerr, Clark 4, 6, 54
Kresge College 57, 58, 65, 87
Kunin, Leonard 67, 69
Lamb, Karl A. 4, 5, 8, 91
Langer, Suzanne 20
Larkin, Bruce D. 79
Lee, Paul A. 38, 93, 97
Liteky, Pat 99
Literature (Board of Studies in) 64
Los Angeles Times 88
Machotka, Pavel 95
Marcum, John 51
Mathematics (Board of Studies in) 68
McClellan, Douglas 82
McHenry, Dean E. 1, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 11, 14, 15, 20, 21, 28, 50, 63, 69, 75, 81, 87, 90
McHenry, Jane 4, 52
Merrill College 37, 50
minority faculty appointments 20
narrative evaluations
 student access to 32
Natanson, Maurice 14, 45, 68, 94
Nicholl, Donald 99

Niebanck, Paul 58

Oakes College 58

Organization of American Historians 99

Page, Charles H. 15, 54, 55, 56

pass-fail grading system 28

Penny University 88, 98

People's Bicentennial Commission 97, 98

Pepper Committee 3

Philosophy (Board of Studies in) 66

Pleasure Point Conference 16

Puknat, Siegfried B. 4, 5, 8, 13, 25, 45, 75

Purifoy, Noah 84

Randolph, Richard R. 18

Ratner, David 14

Reisman, David 10, 18

Rose, Jasper A. 11, 12, 18, 48, 66, 70, 79

Schaffer, N. Manfred 91

Scott, Peter L. 91

Short, Althea 79

Smith, Eloise Pickard 4, 76, 79, 85, 89

 and the arts 84

Smith, Page

 approach to teaching 33

 assessment of the provostship 46

 at UC Los Angeles 3

 coming to UC Santa Cruz 1

 conflict with McHenry 5

- controversy over UCSC appointment 41
- curriculum philosophy 37
- resignation from UC Santa Cruz 95
- Smith, Peter 76, 83
- Sontag, Susan 20
- Stevenson College 9, 11
- Stokey, Byron 4, 8, 12, 13, 27, 55, 75
- Thimann, Kenneth V. 48, 76, 94
- Thompson, Beatrice 79, 84
- town-gown relations 89
- Twombly, William 88
- UC Santa Cruz
 - “publish or perish” controversy 68
 - “typical UCSC student” 73
 - campus architecture 86
 - intellectual life 52
 - professional schools 72
 - recruiting philosophy 9
 - selecting the first faculty 4
- University Library 77
- Van den Burg, William 86
- Veysey, Laurence R. 66
- Vogler, Thomas A. 18
- Werlin, Robert J. 68, 69
- Whole Earth Restaurant 38
- Willson, F.M. Glenn 28, 47, 55, 76
- Wohlstelter, Roberta 20

Wolin, Sheldon 79

women faculty appointments 20

Woods, Gurdon G. 79, 81, 82, 84

Work Company

 Saturday Market 98

 William James Association 98

World Civilization course 29

Youngs, J.W.T. 15, 16, 17, 68

Zaustinsky, Julia 13, 85