Introduction

The Regional History Project conducted three interviews with former Chancellor Angus E. Taylor at his home in Kensington, California, from January 28 to 30, 1997, as part of its University History series. Taylor was appointed the campus's third chancellor in February, 1976, by UC President David S. Saxon during a difficult period in UCSC's history, when the campus's second chancellor, Mark N. Christensen, resigned amidst controversy after a tenure of barely 18 months. Saxon asked Taylor to assume the chancellorship and to stabilize the young campus while a permanent chancellor was selected.

Prior to his appointment, Taylor was a professor of mathematics at UCLA from 1938 to 1966; and served in the UC systemwide administration as vice president for academic affairs from 1965 to 1970, and as University Provost from 1970 to 1975. He was a seasoned veteran of the University and its unique system of shared governance; he knew the workings of the academic senate and University policies inside out and was well acquainted with the key figures in the University's administration, all of which stood him in good stead when he became chancellor at UCSC.

UCSC opened in 1965, and was a unique experiment not only within the UC system but in American public higher education. Founding Chancellor Dean E. McHenry and UC President Clark Kerr conferred closely on the conception of the innovative collegiate campus and in articulating its educational philosophy which was influenced by educational models such as Cambridge, Oxford, and Swarthmore College (where Kerr had been an undergraduate). The Santa Cruz version of the residential university emphasized the importance of undergraduate teaching centered in individual colleges, each with a specific intellectual theme and architectural design. As campus enrollment grew and colleges were added, the thinking went, the human scale of each college would eliminate the impersonal and bureaucratic atmosphere which characterized undergraduate education at the large UC campuses.

McHenry oversaw the planning and building of UCSC from 1961 until his retirement in June, 1974. He was singularly imaginative, devoted, and tireless in the founding of the campus and during his tenure was responsible for virtually all important decision-making in site-planning, academic appointments, and administration. When he retired, however, there was considerable ambiguity about how the campus would be governed and particularly in how the relationship between the colleges and boards of studies (Santa Cruz's designation for conventional departments) would be resolved. These issues proved to be problematic not only for the campus's second chancellor but for Chancellor Taylor as well.

Taylor begins his narration with the story of his early life and family history, his childhood on a homestead in Colorado, his high school years in Pomona, California, and his years at Harvard College. He then describes how he became aware of the difficult situation at UC Santa Cruz in 1976 and the background leading to his appointment as chancellor. Interspersed throughout his narration are comments on many aspects of his experiences as both teacher and administrator in the UC system (his participation in avoiding a confrontation between the UC Regents and the faculty during the Free Speech Movement at UC Berkeley and his comments on the history of affirmative action in the University) which influenced his approach to UCSC.

When Taylor arrived at Santa Cruz he found an ailing campus, a dispirited faculty, and an admissions office in disarray. Immediately he met with campus administrators and stated, "I want to begin my work as acting chancellor with this statement. This is not a holding operation. I am not merely a caretaker chancellor. I intend to work with you to solve some of the most urgent problems that face us. I hope we can accomplish enough to make it possible for a new chancellor to follow me with things in good order and in a good state of morale."

He then discusses the campus's most pressing problems and how he addressed them—the management and organization of the chancellor's office; interaction with divisional deans and college provosts; faculty recruitment; budget allocations and the budget process; and a serious decline in enrollment.

Applications to the campus were down by over 22% in 1975, and had been declining for five years.

Addressing declining enrollment was his first order of business and in his opinion proved to be the most significant and difficult problem of his tenure. He made a careful analysis of the admissions office situation, aided by the Stanford committee (appointed by President Saxon), which resulted in the difficult political decision to dismiss the controversial director of enrollment, Roberto Rubalcava. He then reorganized the admissions office and created a new position, vice chancellor of student affairs, to oversee this important campus function.

In his narration Taylor addresses the major issues he faced in his efforts to stabilize the campus including the relationship of colleges and boards of studies, the campus budget, reorganizing the chancellor's office and setting up various committees which improved communication among campus administrators, fundraising, town/gown relations, the role of the colleges, and completing the campus's academic plan. During his tenure he faced two major student political demonstrations—the first protesting his handling of the Rubalcava affair and then protests over South African apartheid and the University-wide divestiture movement, which pressured the University to sell off its stock holdings in companies doing business with South Africa. He discusses his approach to student trespassing and law-breaking and how his solution (he declined to encourage prosecution) met with some disapproval from administrators at other universities who thought Taylor was setting a poor precedent. He also reflects on the mission of the University of California, his thoughts on affirmative action, the search for a new UCSC chancellor, and his relations with University Hall and with President Saxon.

These tape-recorded interviews were transcribed verbatim, edited for continuity and clarity, organized into chapters, and the transcript returned to Taylor for his editing. He carefully perused the manuscript and made numerous changes and additions to the text which have been incorporated into the finished manuscript. Also, prior to our interviews, Chancellor Taylor kindly provided me with the files and correspondence he had retained from his chancellorship, which were invaluable sources in my research for these interviews.

Copies of this volume are on deposit in the Bancroft Library at the 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

February 15, 1998
McHenry Library
University of California, Santa Cruz

Early Life

Taylor: To start off, I made some notes that I thought might be relevant as a general background. I was born on a homestead in Colorado. We moved to Boulder, where I entered grammar school but then we came to California in 1920 and I finished high school in Pomona, California. I was good at mathematics from the time I was in grammar school. In high school I had very good teachers of mathematics and became really fascinated with the whole subject. But I also had a very good teacher of English in high school. She led me into an appreciation of essays and short stories and the writing of book reviews and imagined accounts of my experiences. I think that learning to write is probably the most important thing that any kid can have.

I was also very shy and in high school my social life centered largely around church rather than school. I was about 15 or 16 when I joined the First Christian Church, also called the Disciplines of Christ. This was a reasonably liberal church, not fundamentalist in the sense that some churches nowadays are. But most of my social life was through the Sunday school and Christian Endeavor and going to church. [1] I sang in the choir. But in high school I also was in the glee club. I

[1]In a margin note, Taylor wrote: "Christian Endeavor was a social-religious organization, big in the '20s among several Protestant denominations." —Editor.

began to acquire an interest in music. My mother was a good pianist. She was a graduate of Stevens College in Columbia, Missouri. My father was born in 1862 on Prince Edward Island when it was not a part of Canada but a crown colony. My father was rather well educated and read a great deal. He wrote a beautiful Spenserian script and could quote Robert Burns. The act of Canadian union didn't come until the 1870s. He had only eight grades of education, but read a great deal. He and my mother met in Colorado.

As part of my shyness I was always a little bit afraid of girls since I got a negative reaction when I asked for a date and the girl laughed. I had read the Dumas story, "The Count of Monte Cristo," and I don't know whether you know the plot but the protagonist wants to get revenge on the people who've wronged him. I think he was put in prison for a long time. So I used to romanticize about getting even with the girls who had jilted me. (laughter) Well I did meet a girl that I thought I was in love with but I ultimately did not marry her. The woman I finally married on very short notice (it took me five weeks to decide to propose to her after I first met her and she accepted) was Mary Kathleen Lapham, known to all as Patsy because she was born on St. Patrick's Day, March 17.

Another thing I want to mention before we get too far along is that in college I was really torn between the idea of literature and mathematics. I liked literature so much that I really seriously considered whether that would be a good thing to do. (My son Gordon is a professor of literature.) I finally decided it would probably be easier to make a living as a mathematician so I chose mathematics. But one of the most wonderful courses I took at Harvard was a course in English poetry of the romantic movement, beginning with Coleridge, and including Wordsworth, Byron, Shelley, Keats, Browning, Tennyson, and Walter Salvage Landor, not too well known but very interesting. At that time I began to write

poetry. Now I don't want to claim too much for my poetry but I put a lot of my heart into it and I'm pleased that I did, but I never tried to publish it. I think that's about all I want to talk about before we start on UC Santa Cruz.

Jarrell: Would you like me to start with my questions then?

Taylor: Sure.

Appointment as Chancellor of UC Santa Cruz

Jarrell: This interview is going to focus on your experiences relating to UC Santa Cruz just prior to February, 1976, when you were appointed chancellor. I would like you to describe the background circumstances which you think shaped your appointment first as acting chancellor and later during your tenure when you were permanently appointed. You can start back as far as you want in terms of when this was first broached.

Taylor: I think it probably makes sense to refer briefly back to around 1963, after I knew that [Dean E.] McHenry had been chosen as the chancellor at Santa Cruz, but the campus wasn't yet functioning. The first students enrolled at Santa Cruz in 1965. But I was chairman of the math department at UCLA and getting a little bit tired of the bigness of UCLA, the traffic and so on. On an impulse I wondered if it would be interesting to transfer to Santa Cruz?

I was fascinated by the concept of the colleges, which I had heard about. As a student at Harvard I was in on the very beginning of what they call the house plan there. Although it was not the same idea as the college plan at Santa Cruz, it did have the virtue that if you lived in a house at Harvard you had a chance to get very well acquainted with about 200 students who lived in the house. The

idea of having students live in colleges at Santa Cruz, seemed to me to be possibly of some similar value. So I wrote to McHenry and said I would be interested in the possibility of transferring to Santa Cruz, but not until my daughter finished high school since I didn't want to interrupt her schooling. He replied that he couldn't make any commitment in advance. That would not be until about 1967. And it was just, he couldn't do that, but he would try to keep that in mind. So I put that idea aside.

Then I was appointed vice president for academic affairs on the staff of UC President [Clark] Kerr, effective September, 1965. I had already had some experience as the head of the statewide academic senate of the whole University, one year as vice chairman and the next year as chairman. That occurred during the year of the Free Speech Movement at Berkeley and I played a significant role along with some of my colleagues in the senate in helping to prevent an outright confrontation between the [UC] regents and the Berkeley faculty. I got very well acquainted with [Clark] Kerr at that time. The result really was that Kerr finally decided he wanted me on his team; he asked me then if I would like to be vice president and since my wife came from the Berkeley area and actually was a graduate of Cal, she felt that would be a nice idea too. So that happened.

I had been following the development of UC Santa Cruz. I knew both McHenry and Page Smith, who had both been on the faculty at UCLA. They had very different ways of thinking about higher education, though. At any rate, by November, 1975, [David S.] Saxon was president of the University, having succeeded [Charles J.] Hitch. Hitch succeeded Kerr and then [Harry R.] Wellman was the acting president for one year.

Then Hitch became president and he decided that he'd had enough, although he was a wonderful president, so then Saxon was appointed. Now I'd known Saxon very well there when I was the president of the scientific honorary society Sigma Xi at UCLA for a year. Saxon was recognized as an up-and-coming young faculty member, an assistant professor. That's when I first got acquainted with him because my wife and I took him and his wife to lunch the day that he was to be honored. So I got to know Saxon very well. Then Saxon had become the executive vice chancellor at UCLA when [Charles E.] Chuck Young, who had been a vice chancellor, became the chancellor, after Franklin [D.] Murphy decided to get out. That made Saxon a much more noticeable figure in the University and he became a candidate for the presidency and was appointed as president. I had recommended him strongly to people I knew on the board of regents.

Saxon had decided to reorganize the administration of the University considerably. He had let some vice presidents go. In 1975, soon after he had become president, he had taken my job and split it into two jobs, but neither of those two jobs went to me. I told David that if he didn't need or want me, I could go back to UCLA. I still had a right to my position. But he said no, that I knew an enormous amount about the University; that I knew the whole system inside out. He wanted my wisdom. He wanted me to stay on and help do long-range planning at the University. I asked what my title would be and he suggested assistant to the president. That title didn't appeal to me. Earlier when Saxon had been appointed on a part-time basis to split his duties between UCLA and the president's office, I had invented the title University Provost for him. I suggested the title University Provost. He said that was fine. So I became the University Provost. But there was now a new academic vice president, and a new vice

president for personnel matters. In the last year I was vice president I had responsibility for personnel, both academic and non-academic. Saxon split the job . . . the academic vice president still had academic personnel responsibilities and Archie Kleingartner, from the business school at UCLA, had responsibility for non-academic personnel. So my job evaporated into two parts. I had a job that sounded kind of grandiose but no pieces of paper came to me to act on.

Jarrell: That must have been pretty disappointing.

Taylor: Well, I was kind of upset at the time. I finally persuaded him that I would still like to be involved in certain things. He let me continue on the board of control of the University of California Press, which I had been on automatically. He let me continue to attend the meetings of the academic council, but not as chairman, of course. The academic council was the steering committee for the statewide academic senate. And I had been chairman of that for one year.

Jarrell: Were you teaching at that time?

Taylor: Oh no, I was full time at Berkeley.

Jarrell: So you were a full time administrator.

Taylor: My family was up here [in Berkeley]. My daughter, Kathleen, or Kitty as she is called, by that time was already a student at [UC] Santa Cruz. No, she'd already graduated. She graduated from Santa Cruz in 1971.

Jarrell: That's very interesting. I didn't know that.

Taylor: She graduated from El Cerrito High in the first year we lived up here. Then she went to Santa Cruz in 1967 and graduated in 1971. Then she went to Claremont Graduate School for a master's degree. Her undergraduate program

was in history. She became a great friend of Page Smith and of [J.] Herman Blake. She spent the whole spring semester at Herman's place in South Carolina, Daufuskie Island, and got academic credit for it.

Jarrell: So here you were at Berkeley with this new title but with few responsibilities . . . or responsibilities that were not nearly what you wanted.

Taylor: That's right. Helping Saxon with long-range planning was very fuzzy; there weren't any decisions to make right off the bat. So I finally told him what I wanted to do; that I wanted to write a long essay on the improvement of undergraduate education and go back and dredge up some of the things about the great teachers that they'd had in the University. I would expound my principles on the importance of undergraduate education and why it deserved more attention than it was being given by the faculty. So I did that. It was finished just about the end of 1975. Copies were mailed out to all the chancellors and to the educational policy committee of the statewide senate. It sank like a stone.

Jarrell: That has usually happened over the years with anything to do with undergraduate education or curriculum reform. It drops without a trace. So you wrote this report. It was disseminated, and nothing further was heard?

Taylor: Nobody said anything more about it. I gave a public talk at Berkeley about it. I think maybe twenty people came. In November, I was going to meetings of the academic council, because the president had said that I should do that. But of course I didn't have much to say because I was not any more an officer of the senate. I was talking to Sig[fried B.] Puknat, a faculty member at UCSC, and he told me that things were tough at Santa Cruz. I said, "Really?" "Oh yes," he said, "they're in bad shape." Well about two weeks after that Saxon

called me and told me what was happening. He said they were in revolt down there [at UCSC].

Resignation of Chancellor Mark N. Christensen

Jarrell: The faculty?

Taylor: The faculty. The provosts. Saxon said everybody was upset down there; that they didn't think [Chancellor Mark N.] Christensen could cut the mustard. [2] He tried first one thing and then another and never settled down very firmly on what he was going to do. So it was determined that Saxon wanted me to go down to Santa Cruz on November 24, 1975, to attend the academic senate meeting scheduled on that evening. I kept notes on the meeting, but I won't go into great detail about it.

The president provided me with a driver to take me down to Santa Cruz. We didn't get home until 1 o'clock in the morning. Now my understanding of what had happened was that Christensen had drawn up two proposals on the 12th of November and the 19th of November. I never saw them . . . I could probably get ahold of them, but I haven't done so. He had proposed to cut what is sometimes thought of as the gordian knot of the colleges and the boards of studies. What he proposed was to eliminate the divisions of social sciences and humanities and allocate entirely to the colleges the responsibility for curriculum in those areas of study, but to leave the natural sciences division alone, because the natural scientists were the only people who had offices completely outside the colleges.

[2]Christensen served as UCSC's second chancellor from July, 1974, until January, 1976.—Editor.

Well, what I learned about this was that the faculty said essentially no, that they would not permit him to do that. They didn't want to do that and simply would not agree. Well, I went down there and I sat next to Barbara Sheriff [3], whom I knew, so she could help me in identifying the speakers.

Jarrell: Were you the personal representative of President Saxon at this meeting?

Taylor: That's right. He wanted to know what was going on. So my job was not to speak at the meeting, and I didn't. But I was to give him [Saxon] my report. Now, I've made notes about the names of some of the people who spoke. [César L.] Barber made a motion which was written out and expressed the opinion that the senate did not support Christensen's proposals. It attacked them. Harry Berger, Jr., seconded the motion and then spoke, addressing the subject of these two papers, November 12 and 19. Berger claimed that the chancellor's analysis was misdirected; he said he was unwilling to accept the chancellor's assumptions. He said the conflict between boards and colleges was healthy; that the weaknesses were inseparable from the strengths, and that faculty must continue to live with the problem. He suggested that the chancellor was more concerned with organizational panaceas than with human concerns.

Next the chancellor spoke. He thanked the senate members for the opportunity to respond. I have my notes here and they read: "He seemed cool and collected. He recognizes the widespread lack of confidence in him and that there is a great deal of cynicism about the motives for his proposal. He explained his reasons for making the proposals but sees now that his proposals are hopelessly intertwined with the issue of confidence in the [campus] administration. He stated his

[3]Barbara A. Sheriff was Assistant to Chancellor Dean E. McHenry—Editor.

observation of faculty operation of academic personnel processes. The budget committee was one of the committees that reviews personnel actions and had strongly differed with him on some things, too. But there was no discussion of detailed personnel actions. Also that there were some problems in the budgetary processes. Problems of turnover in academic administration [were] cited as a problem. The proposals were designed to stimulate discussion, he said, and consultation. He would like to follow the line suggested by Berger. He does not think the present occasion is going in that direction. That is what was being criticized that evening. No applause." That's what I've written down here. It says no applause.

Jarrell: Right. These were the notes that you took contemporaneously.

Taylor: Yes. His wife, Helen, who was known as H.E., was there, but she didn't say anything. So I came home and made a report to President Saxon about that. There were several meetings I attended in the evenings at Blake House, where the president lived. Chester [C.O.] McCorkle was there, the vice president who was the number two man in the president's office. We talked about the situation. I think Beverly Liss was there. She was the president's administrative assistant, had been his administrative assistant at UCLA, and was considered to some extent a "hatchet woman" in University Hall. Well, she was an able woman.

Saxon had to respond to a number of letters from the campus. I drafted responses, suggested responses for him, but most of them he didn't like and he wrote them himself. But then there was an evening in which the whole retinue from [the UCSC] campus came up to Blake House and I was invited again to be there. Most of the provosts and deans of the divisions and the University Librarian David [W.] Heron were there. I can't remember, and I don't think my

records show, whether [Eugene H.] Cota-Robles was there or not. But he was the number two man, really.

Jarrell: The academic vice chancellor.

Taylor: That's right. So Saxon did not want to fire the chancellor. He thought that would be a very bad thing to do. He wanted to find some way to let the chancellor tough it out.

Jarrell: Just to back up a moment. This delegation from Santa Cruz of administrators and faculty members who went to Blake House. What did they want Saxon to do?

Taylor: They said, "Christensen's incompetent. He can't do the job!" I don't think they necessarily said that he had to go. I don't remember if they said that. But they said he really was lacking; he was not on top of the job; he couldn't make up his mind. So then finally Christensen decided that he should resign himself. Now I don't have detailed notes on this but I know that Christensen went and talked to Chancellor [Albert H.] Bowker at Berkeley. You see [Bowker] had been appointed as the number one person at Berkeley. When Bowker first became chancellor at Berkeley, Chris was chairman of the academic senate at Berkeley. Bowker apparently thought that gave him some status and so he made Christensen a vice chancellor.

I knew he was behind on his job; he was supposed to prepare an affirmative action plan for the Berkeley campus. Now I was in charge under Hitch, [before Saxon became president] to make sure that the campuses had appropriate affirmative action plans in conformity with the whole University's policy on affirmative action. Chris was slow in doing that. Finally somebody was brought

down from Davis to do the job for him. Later when the problems became apparent Jack [John Henry] Raleigh, a professor of English at Berkeley (who is still alive) said, "well we all knew that he was behind and we were surprised that he was even chosen to be chancellor."

Some of these meetings went on into December. It was on January 20, 1976, that I came home (to Kensington) from attending a meeting of the University-wide senate's coordinating committee on graduate affairs and my wife said that President Saxon wanted me to come to see him after dinner. I went, and Saxon was there with Vice President McCorkle. We talked a bit and Saxon asked me to take the job of acting chancellor at UC Santa Cruz. I said I would need to discuss that with Patsy. We thought about it overnight and the next day I accepted. The regents meetings were on Thursday and Friday January 22, 23, and I was appointed at the January 23 meeting, to take office on February 1, 1976.

There were some things about being chancellor that I felt I might not be very competent at. I expressed my reservations to Saxon. I didn't know very much about dealing with the campus budget. Saxon said that there would be somebody who would help me with that. So Patsy [Taylor] and I talked about it. She knew that I wasn't very satisfied with my job as University Provost. She said to me, well, let's do it. Anyway the decision was made.

Jarrell: When President Saxon made you this offer, did he ever define it in terms of he wanted you to be a caretaker or that this was a very . . .

Taylor: Oh no, he said he wanted me to take charge. We didn't talk about the question of how long it might be or whether it would sometime be as full chancellor. I don't remember. We did talk a little bit about money. I told him I didn't want to have a salary less than that of the other chancellors. They had

different salaries. I knew what all those salaries were and that the Riverside chancellor had the lowest salary. I said I didn't want anything less than that. He said that was not a problem. Then he said, "I want you to take charge; we'll support you in whatever's necessary." It was about three months, I think, before they decided to regularize the title and drop the "acting," from my title as chancellor.[4]

Well, when the date came, Chris hadn't yet moved out of [UCSC's] University House. So my wife and I went down and spent the first couple of nights at the Dream Inn. Then we moved into University House. I remember we went and met the staff of the chancellor's office. Some of those people are still around, I'm sure. There was a woman named Willeen McQuitta and I think she's higher up now. Gene Cota-Robles was there. Now I had met him because I had been meeting with the academic vice chancellors of the different campuses. My wife said, "he's looking at you very carefully and I wonder if you can trust him." (laughter) Well, I never had any problem with Gene. He was always loyal to me.

Roberto Rubalcava and the Admissions Office Controversy

Taylor: So when I began I wanted to identify the major problems at UCSC. The first problem, and perhaps the most critical one at the time was that the admissions office was in an uproar. They were way behind in processing the admissions applications. It turned out that [Roberto] Rubalcava had been given a very important title, director of enrollment; he supervised the admissions office, relations with schools, financial aid, and affirmative action. But things weren't

[4]Taylor wrote a margin note at this point: "In my journal on 6/18/76 I recorded that Saxon said he intended to change my appointment to be chancellor (instead of acting chancellor). But he didn't get around to this until the September '76 regents meeting. The change in title was effective 9/24." —Editor.

getting done. The admissions office had a big backlog of unprocessed applications and the morale had just about hit bottom. He had relieved the director of relations with schools of his responsibility and instead had picked several Chicano students and told them to go out and visit the schools.

Jarrell: To backtrack here a moment, Angus. In the files you sent me, I read them very carefully, especially the whole Rubalcava controversy. But I noticed that this really significant reorganization of enrollment, creating the enrollment office, took place under Christensen and had only happened a few months before. Rubalcava's previous history was as a very polarizing head of the EOP [Educational Opportunity Program] office on campus. So in the reorganization he got an enormous consolidation of all of these other entities under his new title, director of the enrollment office. So when you came in, it just landed on your plate immediately.

Taylor: That's right. I had a meeting with all the provosts and deans. That was one of the first meetings I held. I asked them what was going on. They began to unload all these different problems on me.

Elizabeth [A.] Penaat knew quite a bit about this. It was never quite clear to me though, exactly whether she had been in favor of giving this job to Roberto. I never figured it out completely. There was plenty of evidence in the file that there were people who thought it was a bad decision. In the papers I gave you there was a letter from Bruce Rosenblum, a physics professor, critical of this situation.

Jarrell: Yes, he wrote an eight-page letter to the John [H.] Stanford committee.

Taylor: President Saxon appointed the Stanford committee to assist me in understanding and getting the problems untangled. Stanford was, I think, the chairman of that committee. He came from Davis and stayed at Santa Cruz later on.

Jarrell: And this committee was to help you . . .

Taylor: Yes, Saxon had appointed a committee of people to help me investigate the situation and understand it better.

Jarrell: I see. One of the things that was quite remarkable, also as of November 30, 1975, was that UCSC applications were down by 22.5 percent; UC Berkeley's were up by 17 percent during that same period. I think for five straight years UCSC's freshman applications were going down.

Taylor: Yes.

Jarrell: So this was really serious.

Taylor: Well, it was a serious indication of what was happening. It was also serious because student housing is done on government loan and they have to pay off the loan. If the dormitories are not full, then it's hard to get those things paid. So that was a financial burden. Also a scary idea of what was going wrong at UCSC. I didn't immediately decide that I had to fire him. In fact, that was kind of a daunting idea, the idea of firing a Chicano. But first of all, I just wanted to get a handle on what needed to be done.

Jarrell: I found here in your notes—you kept such wonderful notes, Angus. They were so helpful, documenting every little dot and dash of all of this. But I saw how you analyzed the whole enrollment office picture, and made

recommendations. You even wrote out a report card at one point that the admissions office should get an F. You gave a C for the enrollment office; relations with schools was iffy. Then you moved financial aid to the new acting vice chancellor for student affairs. But I saw that for the first four or five months you [were here] you really tried to work with him.

Taylor: That's true. Well, of course one of my personal strengths as an administrative officer is that I'm systematic. I don't shoot from the hip, as they say.

Jarrell: No. You didn't at all.

Taylor: But I was very upset by that problem and it was one of the first things I dealt with . . .

Jarrell: I'd like you to give me a narration of the unfolding of this episode, in light of your comment to me that you thought that the decisions that you had to make around Rubalcava and the admissions office were perhaps the most significant during your tenure as chancellor. So tell me how you faced this difficulty?

Taylor: Well, probably the very first problem I ran into when I arrived at Santa Cruz early in February was the state of the admissions office. It was a real crisis. I had a meeting of the deans and the provosts to get acquainted and they began to spill quickly the problems that they saw, of which one was admissions. They realized that admissions were dropping, and that was really scary to them. I was aware of the failure to move rapidly. Well what happened was that after awhile I decided that I had to change Rubalcava's responsibility, because I told him that he had a very wide span of responsibilities and was neglecting part of it; that

he'd made some bad mistakes in judgment, but also was just not even doing his work. So I was going to change his assignment. I was going to narrow his responsibilities. Well he was pretty angry of course. But anyway, that was done.

Well now here I find the culmination of this occurred in May. The Chicano group which is called MEChA [Movimiento Estudiantil Chicano/a de Aztlan] announced they were going to have a protest demonstration at the chancellor's office. This clipping here in my journal reminds me of some of the details of what had been going on, if I can just refer to that as I talk.

Jarrell: Please do.

Taylor: There was a man named Jesse de la Cruz, who was on pay in Oakes College, but he was hired on soft money. So the question of whether he would be able to be continued on the budget for the coming year was known to be a question.

Jarrell: What did Jesse de la Cruz teach?

Taylor: I'm not sure exactly, but it probably had something to do with social problems. [5] This article doesn't touch on that in detail. But I know that the students were particularly worried about the loss of him. Those were sincere and justifiable concerns. So here was this announcement of a demonstration. So that's the background. When the day came I knew that there was going to be trouble. I had arranged with Elizabeth Penaat that I didn't want to call in anybody. I wanted to let things ride with whatever happened. I didn't want to have the campus police involved. But I also wanted to make sure that we had a certain amount of security.

[5]Jesse de la Cruz was a lecturer in history from 1974-1976, and was affiliated with Oakes College.—Editor.

So coincidentally I had scheduled an interview with Rubalcava (as I did with all the people in the management program) on the same day that the students were going to have a demonstration outside my office. The people in the management program of the University have a different status in terms of their privileges compared to other employees. They serve at the pleasure of the higher administration and they can be replaced without having to have a kind of a hearing that talks about their rights and so on. You can notify them that you're not going to keep them anymore. But they have a better rate of pay, too.

So Rubalcava was in the management program. Well, I had to give him a statement of my evaluation of his job performance. Then I gave him a copy and told him he could make a written response if he wanted to. So this meeting with Rubalcava was going on in my office.

I had locked the door from the inside, just turned the knob. My secretary, Evelyn [Smith later Pritchard] was outside in the outer office. She could communicate with me by telephone. At one point the phone rang and she said, "Dr. Taylor, there's a group of students here who want to talk to you." I said, "Well, I'm busy right now. I'll finish this interview and then I can do that. But not right now." Roberto got up and headed for the door. I said, "Roberto, do not open that door." I got between him and the door. He said, "Get out of my way or I'll knock you down." So I gracefully got out of the way. (laughter) He opened the door and the students flooded in.

Jarrell: Well, it's funny now, and you're laughing. But can you get back to that time? There you were. What did that feel like?

Taylor: Well, I wasn't personally feeling afraid that the students were going to bother me. I wasn't sure whether he might . . . you know . . .

Jarrell: You weren't afraid that you were going to be hit?

Taylor: That he might throw a punch? Well, I got out of the way. [6] So he opened the door and nothing more was said at that point. Well, the students flooded in. I decided the thing to do was to go out to the outer office and hope that they would follow me out. There was just a single door.

Jarrell: This was when your office was over in Central Services?

Taylor: That's right. I showed you that photograph yesterday of the demonstrators. Well the room was jammed. So I went out there and said to the students: "I understand you people have some grievances. Let's talk about them. I cannot promise you anything for certain at this moment. But I will listen to the grievances and I will see what can be done. It's possible that we may be able to find some money for Mr. de la Cruz's pay next year. But I don't know."

Jarrell: I'm a little confused. Rubalcava heard you on the intercom, or the telephone, that the students were outside. Now, these students were protesting Jesse de la Cruz's not being rehired. What was the relationship of the students' grievances to Rubalcava, if any?

Taylor: They had learned that his job had been modified.

Jarrell: How did they learn that?

Taylor: He may have told them. I don't know.

Jarrell: Because you never said a word. You couldn't have. That's confidential, right?

[6]Taylor wrote in going over the manuscript: "I knew that I didn't want to be hit or punched, but wasn't so much afraid as I was merely taking care *not* to have a physical event." —Editor.

Taylor: This article says that the students were planning a protest over the demotion of Rubalcava.

Jarrell: So he must have told them?

Taylor: Well this article alerted us to the fact that something was being planned. So I fully expected something. Now, I went outside my private office and I'll just repeat what I said. That I would listen to their grievances, and I would arrange some meetings for that purpose. But I couldn't make any promises right at that moment. Approximately at that moment, Roberto was outside my office again. There were still some students, I think sitting . . . because the room was so crowded some of them were probably still inside my office. He said, "Oh well, I don't like working for this senile old fart anyway." I said, "Roberto, you'd better watch your language. Be careful what you say." I had another appointment at another place on campus so after fifteen minutes or so, I left. The students stayed there. That was a Friday. The sit-in continued over the weekend. It was the end of May, Memorial Day weekend.

Jarrell: It was May 29, 1976.

Taylor: Yes. Because I know the next year we had a sit-in and afterwards I remarked to myself well, we've had the second annual Memorial Day sit-in. (laughter) So, then I had to think about what I was going to do.

Jarrell: Here are all of the students, they have taken over the outer office, the reception room where Evelyn was at her desk . . .

Taylor: Well, it turned out that there was a telephone line at University House; it was the chancellor's telephone line and you could pick up the phone at University House and talk to the administrative assistant in the office. I don't

know if they have it set up that way now. But I could pick up the telephone and find out that these kids in the sit-in were on the phone themselves.

Jarrell: On your phone?

Taylor: That's right, yes. They were calling their parents and telling them that, "well here we are in the chancellor's office and . . . don't be alarmed." I didn't want them to find out that I was listening in. So I was careful not to make any inadvertent noise that they might wonder who was on the line. I listened in just a little bit. They were actually talking to their parents. Some of them were talking to the news media. Well sometimes, I used to have lunch in my office to save time, rather than go out since my schedule was very busy. I used to like to go over to the restaurant by the bookstore. But often I kept some Metracal and Fig Newtons in my office. Well, they cleared out on Monday morning, and they had eaten up all my supplies. (laughter)

Jarrell: You make all this sound as if it were a big lark.

Taylor: Well, of course. I think I have a pretty good sense of humor.

Jarrell: I think so, too. Can you tell me—during that Memorial Day weekend who was in charge of security and sort of overseeing this? The campus police?

Taylor: Well, the instructions that I'd left were to not force them out, to just wait.[7]

Jarrell: Okay. That's what I wanted to know.

Taylor: They were out by 9 a.m. on Monday morning.

[7]Taylor clarified this incident in a margin note: "I wanted Vice-Chancellor Penaat to make sure the police did not try to force the students out. She was the person in charge of the campus chief of police."—Editor.

Jarrell: How did that come about?

Taylor: They just decided that themselves, apparently.

Jarrell: Were they ordering pizzas?

Taylor: I think they had food brought in, yes. Now they ran up a phone bill, but they paid that bill. Not right off the bat, of course. But there were people among them who recognized that something like that had to be done. So the phone bill got paid, but then my problem from that point on was what I was going to do about this.

I think I told you yesterday that my wife and I liked to go to the Heritage House up on the Mendocino coast, a very nice place. So that weekend we went up there and I began to think the whole thing over about what to do. The first thing that I decided was that Rubalcava had to go. I couldn't keep him on.

Now, the basis for letting him go was I could not tolerate on my staff a person who would threaten to knock me down in my office; whatever else might be wrong with this man, that simply closed the door on it as far as I was concerned. I don't remember now about the timing, whether it was before that or after that, but I checked carefully; I communicated with the general counsel's office, the president, and the vice president for student affairs, Robert L. Johnson, about what I was intending to do. I didn't get any objection to it but I wanted to find out . . .

Jarrell: You wanted to see if it was legal and . . .

Taylor: Yes. Now I gave him a certain length of time to reply to me before I would finalize the decision; I told Rubalcava that as of a certain date he was going to be out.

Jarrell: Right. In my notes here I see that you terminated him on June 22, 1976.

Taylor: Yes. That was about three weeks after the episode. Now I'm not sure whether you got copies of the letters that were written.

Jarrell: Yes I did. I read all of your letters.

Taylor: So. Time went by and several things happened in between, I believe, although I'm not absolutely certain of the timing now. I was called upon to go up and talk to the Chicano caucus in the state legislature. There was a Santa Cruz graduate who was up there; I don't think he's in the legislature any more now, but . . .

Jarrell: Art Torres.

Taylor: Anyway, McHenry thought he was a reasonable guy. There was also a Mexican-American [UC] regent, [Vilma S.] Martinez. She was a lawyer. She said to me, "what's been going on, Angus?" I told her the story about Rubalcava. She said there was nothing else I could do. At the last minute, just before the deadline was practically on us, I finally got a note from him. But it was too late. Anyway, I had no intention of changing my mind. He wanted me to reconsider. I had also touched base with the UCSC Mexican-American faculty. There were not very many of them, but there were some. One of them wanted to go out on a limb.

Jarrell: . . . on which limb?

Taylor: (laughter) One of them wanted to go out and defend him. Well anyway, so that happened and the thing was finalized.

In addition to that there was another entity, the FEPC [Fair Employment Practices Commission] having to do with adjudicating claims of people who felt they hadn't been treated fairly on the job. This got him nowhere. So that put an end to it.

Reorganizing Student Affairs

Now at the same time that this was going on I had announced that I was going to appoint a vice chancellor for student affairs to pull together a number of things, and that Roberto's job and some of these jobs that I had taken away from him would all fall into the purview of this new position. I appointed Paul Niebanck as an acting vice chancellor for student affairs. That meant I had to get a replacement for him since he was the provost of College Eight, I believe. So I did that. But anyway, Paul took over that job, but a permanent appointment to that job was not made effective until [Robert L.] Sinsheimer became chancellor. Although I had talked with Sinsheimer about the need for a vice chancellor of student affairs, I made the search . . . and he was a man from the State University of New York at Stonybrook. He didn't stay very long. Well I never had anything to do with him after he came. Well, he came during the last part of the academic year which concludes at the end of June. But I was very upset by that problem and it was one of the first things I dealt with.

Of course one of the serious problems that I had not fully understood was the difficulty of meshing the boards of studies and the colleges. I assumed that that had been much better handled than it really was. I remember Hitch always

wanted reports on the condition of the campuses. I regularly made evaluations of the academic status of the different campuses and submitted them to Mr. Hitch. One of the things I thought was well, now that they've gotten this far along, what's next? What next great thing are they going to do at Santa Cruz now that the colleges and the boards are functioning? Well you see, I was really off the mark. Because I didn't know.

Jarrell: You were just talking about identifying UCSC's problems when you first arrived. You said you met with administrators, and I noticed that Gene Cota-Robles gave you a list of ten issues, which he thought would greet you when you came to Santa Cruz. The management/organization of the chancellor's office; interaction with deans and provosts; faculty recruitment; budget allocations and the budget process; enrollment. Those were the main ones.

Taylor: Well you see, Christensen had actually given quite an important load to Gene; he was really running the academic side of the campus. Chris didn't begin to dig into that really at all at first. I think Gene was making a lot of the decisions about faculty promotion and merit increases—all of those things. I was given to understand fairly soon that quite a few faculty didn't have full confidence in Gene's judgment. But they knew that I had played an important role in the statewide academic senate and that I knew the academic personnel procedures backwards and forwards. So they wanted me to take that job. But I still wanted Gene's recommendations.

Jarrell: But you were going to take it over?

Taylor: Yes. I was going to make the decisions about promotions myself. And . . . one of the other things I began to do immediately was to try to get acquainted

with people. I made a fairly regular routine of taking somebody to lunch with whom I wanted to get acquainted. I took Harry Berger, Jr., to lunch fairly early on; I had known something about him from things that I read when the committee on educational policy and the statewide senate reviewed the Santa Cruz academic plan. Berger said the assumptions about Santa Cruz were inaccurate, that the verbiage was less than true. [8] In other words, the great boasting about the way the colleges and the boards of studies work together was inaccurate. He said, "It's all very idealistic, but that isn't the way it is."

College/Board Conflict

Jarrell: So that was your initiation into this . . . I don't know, it's the chronic *bête noire* of Santa Cruz, the college/board conflict.

Taylor: Yes. Well as a matter of fact I think Berger's statement that it was healthy has something to it. But I soon discovered, and I'm not sure where it begins to show in the notes that you've got there, was that there was quite a bit of slippage in the use of resources. Faculty members were being asked by the provosts what they were going to teach for the college, since they were also board members. The boards of studies wanted their faculty members to teach their specialties. A lot of faculty were sort of ad-libbing and making up courses that they thought would be interesting in the colleges. I thought there was virtue in that. For instance, my daughter took a course in which she learned how to take photographs and develop the film herself. I thought and said there was a waste of faculty talent here. The institution was not being fully efficient in its use

[8] Taylor wrote that what he meant is "that the sales pitch in the catalog is to some extent puffery." —Editor.

of faculty teaching power. The committee on educational policy . . . there was not a committee on courses at Santa Cruz at all.

I remember Kerr was the one who told me much later, "the committee on courses is a joke. They always approve everything." So he didn't think that they were doing any deep analyses. Now that wasn't true at UCLA. I served on the committee on courses and we had big arguments about whether to allow this course or that . . .

That was one of the things I began to discover, that the use of resources wasn't tight. I began to grapple with that problem, but I never solved it in the sense of how to make sure that colleges and boards made full use of faculty resources and accomplished what should be accomplished by the colleges. I thought what if I put all the resources in the colleges? You probably know that the original plan that McHenry had was fifty percent of the FTE went to the college and fifty percent to the board or to the division [which meant that each had 50 percent in the decision to hire and promote faculty]. I said, well I wonder what would happen if I gave the colleges all of the FTE's and . . .

Jarrell: None to the divisions?

Taylor: And let them scrap with the divisions about how they were going to accomplish everything. But I couldn't see my way through that.

Jarrell: No, I think there would have been a firestorm.

Taylor: (laughter)

Jarrell: Don't you think?

Taylor: Oh yeah, that would have blown the roof off, I think.

Jarrell: You know, I suggest we stop for now. We can resume after lunch, okay?

Not a Caretaker Chancellor

Jarrell: This is the second half of our first interview. To continue where we left off: you talked about what was on your plate when you initially got to Santa Cruz. I found in your notes of February 2, 1976, "I want to begin my work as acting chancellor with this statement. This is not a holding operation. I am not merely a caretaker chancellor. I intend to work with you to solve, if possible, some of the most urgent problems that face us. I hope we can accomplish enough to make it possible for the new chancellor to follow me with things in good order and in a good state of morale." So that's a kind of a jumping-off place. Here you've kind of itemized some of these problems and things that you wanted to face.

Taylor: I don't know whether it was at that time or perhaps the first meeting of the academic senate that I made the confession that I had once dreamed about coming to Santa Cruz. And the *Santa Cruz Sentinel* published the headline, "Chancellor dreamed of being here." (laughter)

Jarrell: (laughter)

Taylor: Scotchy [Gordon R.] Sinclair was the editor then. He was an irascible guy in some ways. But I had a lot of fun with him. Well, I think the first thing I wanted was a vice chancellor for student affairs. I got Paul [L.] Niebanck to take that job. [9] I think he kept the job until the end of my tenure, but I'm not sure

[9]Taylor notes in his journal: "I found a clipping from the *Santa Cruz Sentinel* by Wallace Wood, date 6/4/76, that I had just announced the appointment of Niebanck as acting vice chancellor for student affairs." —Editor.

about that. Now Paul was an interesting character. He did not really come from an academic background; his previous background was as a city planner, I think. But he also had the instincts of a Quaker. Whether he was a Quaker or not, I'm not sure. But the faculty was sort of slightly uneasy about him. I don't know if you sensed that or not. But they thought that he was unpredictable. I think Sinsheimer started off by trying to make him the academic vice chancellor.

Jarrell: Well, he tried to.

Taylor: He was going to do it.

Jarrell: He wanted to, but it didn't work out.

Taylor: Well that is a reflection of the fact that the faculty was uneasy about him. They somehow felt that they didn't know what he was going to do; he seemed unpredictable. He might have even been ambitious. At any rate, that's one of the things I did. It was essential to do that. Now, Dean [McHenry] did not like that; he wanted all of these affairs to be handled in the colleges. He didn't want an umbrella dean of student affairs or vice chancellor of student affairs.

Jarrell: Right. Then everything would be decentralized in the colleges in terms of student affairs?

Taylor: Yes. So he didn't like that. But perhaps I also ought to put into the record that Dean did not want me to become the chancellor.

Jarrell: How did you learn this?

Taylor: Saxon told me. He said McHenry said I went by the book too much. Well, I don't know whether that's true. But I can tell you why he might have thought that. I don't know if I can reconstruct this exactly. When I was vice

president I thought that McHenry ought to have done certain things in his personnel organization that he wasn't doing and I told him so. Of course I didn't have any authority; vice presidents don't have any authority over chancellors. I thought that he [McHenry] was allowing people to hold certain responsibilities longer than he should have. I think you ought to change certain things periodically.

Jarrell: Periodically. Like, for instance that people would burn out?

Taylor: Well, I don't recall the full details, I'm sorry to say. But he wanted to continue it still quite a lot further. I think he wanted to keep people on after they were over-age, when a man should be retiring. Don't keep them on another year in an administrative role. Anyway, that's why I think he believed I went by the book too much.

Now Dean and I never had a quarrel, I don't think. But he viewed me as going by the book. Saxon said to me, "You don't have to consult with McHenry if you don't want to." I was a little careful not to . . . let him be seen as steering me. Because I knew the way in which a lot of the faculty at Santa Cruz regarded him as being too dictatorial in a certain sense. Dean is not really a dictator. But he didn't want to delegate. So I was careful not to invite his advice very much.

There was the problem of how to deal with the bookstore. I appointed a committee to advise me on that. The decision was to not have an outside business run the bookstore, but to have it run by the University. I took that advice although some people thought we shouldn't do it that way. I think it worked out all right, eventually. Another issue was the counseling service which Dean thought ought to be handled in the colleges. But I thought you can have counselors in the colleges but there ought to be an overall director. So that was

another example, I think, of the conflict in the role that the colleges could play and the situation which I thought was somewhat disorganized at the time.

Jarrell: There are so many issues that spin off between the colleges versus a more centralized administrative organization. There's that tension always. Then there's the college versus the board controversy, which certainly was well embedded in the UCSC culture by the time you arrived. But prior to being there, you had no idea that this was even a problem?

UC Santa Cruz's Colleges

Taylor: No, I didn't understand that as a problem. Of course part of the reason for that was that in the first year with only Cowell College this actually didn't arise. Now you see, Page [Smith] was not an administrative type. In the first year everybody was very enthusiastic. That was my impression. Everybody was very enthusiastic and they worked hard. But as soon as the next colleges were established, it began to get more and more up in the air. The concept of the colleges in the beginning seemed to me a reasonable kind of picture. Cowell started out . . . it had to represent everything that was appointed to it.

Jarrell: It was the campus.

Taylor: It was the campus. They had people from all different disciplines there. But the number two figure on the campus was Francis H. Clauser, from Cal Tech, who was going to be dean of engineering. [10] He was a twin, by the way. Did you know that?

[10] Clauser was vice chancellor for science and engineering. Early campus plans for establishing an engineering school did not come to fruition until 1997.—Editor.

Jarrell: No I didn't.

Taylor: Well I knew both him and his twin brother when I was at Cal Tech. Well, the focus at Cowell continued to be history and humanities more than anything else, although some languages too, I guess. The focus at Stevenson was more on social sciences. But an interesting thing is that Dean was a big enthusiast for Adlai Stevenson. He named the college without ever getting a financial commitment from the Stevenson family. He never got one. They showed no willingness to . . .

Jarrell: To endow it . . .

Taylor: To endow it at all. But the focus at Crown was science and society, a very well-conceived idea. I think [Kenneth V.] Thimann pulled it off very well. So those three colleges, I think, made sense in their themes. From then on I think the thematic character of the colleges began to be much more of a problem. Merrill was conceived with a theme that had something to do with ethnic problems, maybe minorities isn't the right word.

Jarrell: Right, I think we'd call it multicultural today.

Taylor: Yes. But, they had trouble filling the provostship on a steady basis. Kresge . . . I didn't know too much about that college, but I learned quite a bit about it. The provost, Robert [S.] Edgar, decided he was going to run the college on a consensus basis. Were you here then?

Jarrell: No, I wasn't, but I've heard about it.

Taylor: Well, the idea was that the students and the faculty together were going to agree about what they were going to do in the college. He was sort of hooked on this idea of the whole college community chewing the fat. What apparently

happened was that the people who were the most fixed in their ideas outlasted all the others and at the end of the day a lot of people just got up and left because they were tired of arguing. That's the way things kept up. But when I got there, the head of Kresge was a woman sociologist from UC Berkeley.

Jarrell: Let's see . . . May [N.] Diaz.

Taylor: Yes. Now, she tried hard to get financial support from the Kresge Foundation but I don't think she was very successful. So it essentially eventually drifted into the orbit of being a women's studies place. Now I don't know if that's still true or not.

Jarrell: No, I don't think so.

Taylor: Well, at any rate, the main point I was trying to dwell on was the idea that each college should have a theme and it could not very well be played out all the way to the end, I don't think.

Jarrell: Each of these colleges came on board until there were nine and of course the whole thing was truncated. Because originally, you know, UCSC was going to have 27,500 students.

Taylor: Well, mainly it was truncated by the fact that the original growth plan was overambitious. That is to say the demand for graduate studies began to taper off to some extent by the creation of so many new degree-giving colleges and universities. Then Governor [Ronald W.] Reagan and Governor [Edmund G.] Brown, Jr., were both very tough on the University financially.

Jarrell: Absolutely.

Taylor: There was Oakes College of which the first provost was [J.] Herman Blake . . . then College Eight came into existence at a time when they didn't have any buildings for it at all; it was headquartered in Kerr Hall, I think. The theme for Oakes College made sense, perhaps in that it was going to encourage minorities to get interested in science.

They provided laboratory facilities there. But of course this was just at the end of my stay there. Oakes had just barely opened when I left. But at any rate, it seems to me that the idea that you could go on multiplying themes was clearly going to run out. Well I would guess that the thematic idea has probably run its course. So, I was unable to do anything other than to tell the academic senate that they had to stop making up courses simply as some kind of a sense of obligation to do something for the college. In other words, there ought to be a curricular plan and every college and every board had to contribute in a sensible way to that academic plan. But I couldn't. Of course there's no way for a chancellor to enforce that because the curriculum is the province of the faculty.

Jarrell: Absolutely. But you thought they were kind of frittering away their resources for teaching?

Taylor: Well they were. Now in the meantime, as I refreshed my memory about this, I find the earlier part of my stay at UCSC had some other interesting features including our social life and giving dinner parties.

Social Life

Jarrell: When you arrived in the Santa Cruz community the campus was seen as very troubled. There was a lot of anxiety about what had gone on. We had

just lost Chancellor Christensen. Everything was kind of up in the air. I know that when you came down that entertaining and outreach, both in the campus community and in the town-gown relationship were very important. I'd like to know how you approached that and how you feel you and Patsy contributed. What kinds of social gatherings did you initiate to heal, to allay anxiety, to make friends?

Taylor: Well, it was very interesting, actually. I think my wife was rather apprehensive about taking the job, because she was very happy here in this house in Kensington. She liked Berkeley and its atmosphere, and had many friends and former teachers here. She saw my chancellorship as kind of an unknown, a jump into a different pool. But once we decided to come to UCSC everything was fine and I think she enjoyed it very much.

I like social life, probably more than she did. I got so tuned into the idea of having parties frequently that when we were through and came back to Kensington I said, well we ought to have parties every now and then and she said no. (laughter)

Jarrell: You really enjoyed it.

Taylor: Well I think she did too in a certain sense because she had a very outgoing manner. She was interested in people and was a charming woman. But she had had enough of being responsible for entertaining. Now of course being responsible for entertaining at Santa Cruz did not involve us having to do our own cooking and washing up . . .

Now I don't know who originally hired Shirley Cameron. She might have been hired by the McHenrys and inherited by Chris. I don't know. But she was in

charge of entertaining at University House. I'm not sure whether she had a formal title. She was not paid by state funds. I think she was probably paid by funds the University has for entertainment, regents monies. The chancellors, the president, and some other administrators all have a certain budget for that. They have to file monthly reports of how they use it. If they don't use it all up they have to return what's left over, too.

Shirley's job was to manage dinners and only dinners, not luncheons and things like that, at University House. She would consult with Mrs. Taylor on menus and offer her different choices. Patsy would decide what she thought would be good. Shirley bought the food and charged it to the account.

Jarrell: Who cooked it?

Taylor: Her staff did the cooking and students did the serving. She hired the staff and had her people do the clean-up. She handled the laundry and everything else. So it was great, from the point of view of a chancellor's wife; it was a very important part of the job, of course. Patsy didn't have to do the dirty drudgery of all of that.

Jarrell: Did you and Mrs. Taylor sort of put your heads together in terms of strategizing, having a plan about whom you would invite, what groups you'd bring together, whether on the campus or bringing people from off campus?

Taylor: Well, we worked in cahoots with Dan[iel H.] McFadden. Dan McFadden had been hired by McHenry originally.

Jarrell: Yes.

Taylor: His job was public relations, I think.[11] Incidentally he and Barbara Sheriff were at sword point all the time.

Jarrell: They didn't get along?

Taylor: That's right. Barbara was very protective of the chancellor and of the campus. She had a capacity to resent anybody who was doing something she didn't like. Dan was also a prickly person. But Dan told me of possibilities for bringing in outsiders to the campus. Now, that first year we had a regents lecturer. There was a fund for both regents professors and regents lecturers. That's not with state money. For instance, Robert Commanday, the music critic for the *San Francisco Chronicle* was a regents lecturer. He was on campus a certain amount of time and talked to groups and classes. He was our guest and we had a dinner for him. Now I was familiar with him because my wife and I were opera buffs and went regularly to the San Francisco Opera. We always read his reviews with considerable interest. He was a stiff critic, too.

Another person we invited was Michael Murphy who was head of the Esalen Institute. At these dinners we would have something like twenty guests. We'd have two tables and there would be faculty, some staff members, and some outsiders, including people who were fairly close outsiders like Gurden Mooser, for example, whom we invited frequently. We had the editor of the *Santa Cruz Sentinel*, Scotchy Sinclair, once or twice. We also invited Frank Orr, of the *Watsonville Register-Pajaronian*, a very nice man, and his very interesting wife too.

Jarrell: Yes, Zoe.

[11]Daniel H. McFadden was assistant chancellor, public affairs.—Editor.

Taylor: Yes . . . she married again after he died and I think her home was a sort of a historical monument.

We also invited people on the UC Santa Cruz Foundation. One of the people on the foundation I remember quite well was Norman Lezin and his wife who was a very interesting woman, and we enjoyed having them around. So these dinners were partly faculty, business people, partly people who were not very closely associated, but whom we had some reason to invite. They were relaxed affairs. I usually didn't have much to say but would occasionally say a little something about campus activities that I thought they might be interested in. Another notable guest was Stephen Spender, the famous English poet—a man of charm but rather unorthodox ways. He was a regents lecturer in connection with a campus program on Bloomsbury that lasted four weeks—the push coming from Madeline Moore, a professor of literature. My wife was a godsend because she was so gracious and so sincere and she just made friends everywhere.

Town-Gown Relations

Jarrell: Do you recall during this period that community members you entertained ever expressed worries about the campus? There were rumors, for instance, that the campus might be closed. There was a lot of negativity, still, about the campus. Would you respond in ways to clarify people's misunderstandings about the campus?

Taylor: Well, there were several potential sore points with some members of the Santa Cruz community. One was the traffic situation; the traffic on Mission street was noticeably more congested, of course, as a result of the University presence. Now the University had originally had a negotiated agreement with

the county and the city to build what they called the eastern access road. It was to come up into the campus without going up onto Mission Street at all.

Jarrell: Right through Pogonip.

Taylor: But there were people there who were determined that they didn't want that to happen for two different reasons. One was cost. The county . . . I'm not sure whether the county and the town would have had to share the costs. But the University agreement was binding that that was going to happen. But it wasn't guaranteed to happen right away; it was in the indefinite future. Well the time really had come by that time. But the county was backing down to some extent.

The other reason was that some people believed that the road up through Pogonip would be a scar, would be a very unpleasant thing to see. I spent quite a bit of time talking with people in town about ways to minimize that. The idea that I pushed and got some sympathy for was to route the traffic up Highway 9 a short distance and then turn around and start climbing the hillside and come into the campus just at the very upper end of where the road along that side of the campus turns to go over by the garden beneath Merrill College.

Jarrell: Just a little ways. Like over near Golf Club Drive.

Taylor: Right. And then turn around and bring the road up through the trees where you couldn't see it. Well, no action ever occurred on that but that seemed to me a reasonable way to do it. Now there was a young fellow, Gary Patton, who was a county supervisor. Now Patton was a squeaky wheel.

Jarrell: Indeed. He just retired from the board of supervisors several years ago. But he is a very ardent environmentalist.

Taylor: He didn't want anything to happen to Pogonip. Well, so I dealt with him.

The mayor of Santa Cruz at that time was not a faculty member as it later got to be. I met the mayor. I don't remember having any particular difficulties with the mayor. But the town was mainly concerned, I think, about a reasonable solution to the traffic problems, plus they weren't very eager to spend money. Now, there was a good deal of goodwill in the town towards the University, but there was some feeling that the University was a little too radical perhaps. There's always a certain amount of difference in outlook between business and academic people.

Jarrell: Can you tell me, did you go and speak before service clubs in Santa Cruz, like the chamber of commerce or the Lions Club or . . . Can you talk about that a bit?

Taylor: I spoke at least once to one of the service clubs and I went to one of the service club luncheons and was introduced. But I was a principal speaker, I think, perhaps only once. A certain number of people on the campus chose to follow the line too, as public relations. I think on the whole that was very good. Now, I never ran into anybody who was really a right-winger, or pushed that point of view about the University as a dangerous institution. I remember in one talk I gave, I said, "Universities are like cathedrals in the Middle Ages. They're lasting, very important things. Universities play the kind of a role that cathedrals played in Europe." That got me a lot of points. You can see I'm emotional about that.

Jarrell: Yes. I think that's beautifully spoken, Angus. I think that metaphor is very, very apt.

Taylor: Excuse me.

Jarrell: That's all right. Let's stop for a minute and I'll turn the tape over. Feel like going on?

Taylor: Sure. Well one of the things that my wife did, for example, which I think was very clever, was the luncheon she gave for the wives of all the regents for whom streets on the campus were named. She also gave a tea at University House for students whose art had been exhibited in University House.

I remember Wayne Thiebaud was on campus . . . He was an artist at UC Davis, and an eminent painter. There was an exhibit of his paintings on campus. My journal entry records that we had a cocktail party for Wayne Thiebaud and Doug[las E.] McClellan. McClellan was an artist at UCSC. Well we had a party together, the three of us, and he introduced me to Joseph [M.] Long . . . Now that's worth talking quite a bit about.

Fundraising

Taylor: I don't know exactly how McHenry and Joseph Long became acquainted. He was a wealthy man and had been the first head of the UC Santa Cruz Foundation. Now that might have been Chris's job. I don't think Dean had even started the foundation yet. Joe Long lived actually in Walnut Creek but he had widespread business interests. I was introduced to Joe by Gurden Mooser. We had a foundation meeting or two on the campus while I was there. Gurden took me over to Walnut Creek to meet Joe. Well that was a fundraising endeavor that I think was important, because it's clear now, much more clear now than it was at that time, that private money has to be solicited in order to

make the University really do the finest things that it can do. It can't do everything with state money alone.

Jarrell: In the interim that's become increasingly and powerfully more obvious.

Taylor: Yes. So that was important. Now some of the people who were on the Berkeley foundation also were willing to be on the UC Santa Cruz Foundation, a few. So I made acquaintances that way who took me into an area where I think I am not as capable as I am in other ways.

Jarrell: Fundraising?

Taylor: Fundraising is something that . . . I don't feel that I'm a good salesman. At least I don't take pleasure in fundraising very much. But it's important. I think I simply tried to play the role of the person who was without any bias toward business people and was willing to put up with others' strong differences with my own biases. I think I was good enough in that way. But I couldn't go out and ask people to . . . I couldn't say, give me the money. (laughter)

Jarrell: Did you work with University relations?

Taylor: Yes. Now Gurden is very good at that.

Jarrell: Yes. Were you going to talk a little bit more about Long?

Taylor: Well, we hoped that Long would perhaps give us a really big slug of money. He did give us money for the [Long] Marine Lab. That wasn't peanuts either. He gave a lot of money to UC San Francisco, to the medical center. My friend Frank [Francis A.] Sooy who was the chancellor there, was killed in a tragic accident. He was a good fundraiser. Well, so Joe left much more money to

UC San Francisco than he gave to UC Santa Cruz. Also he remarried. That probably siphoned off money that he might otherwise have left to us.

David S. Saxon

Jarrell: I would like to move on now and ask if you could characterize during this year and a half period your relationship with President Saxon. I would imagine that you'd report back to him. You had an ailing campus when you came down here. I wonder what kind of communications you had with him and how involved or interested he was in what was going on at Santa Cruz?

Taylor: Well Dave and I had a long, established relationship. He was younger than I. One of the interesting things about his career was that he had refused to sign the oath . . .

Jarrell: The loyalty oath.

Taylor: In the big controversy that began in 1949 and lasted until 1952. He had come to UCLA as an assistant professor after being a Ph.D. at MIT and he had gradually worked his way up and had become the executive vice chancellor of the UCLA campus, replacing Foster [H.] Sherwood, who had been chosen as the vice chancellor by Franklin [D.] Murphy. But I got along much better with Saxon than I did with Sherwood, because Sherwood didn't like to have me say no. You see I had responsibility for approving overscale salaries for professors when I was vice president. The chancellors eventually got the power to appoint and promote to tenure ranks, but not beyond the top of the salary scale. I had the job of saying no on a salary issue in consultation with the president, of course. I turned them down occasionally. Saxon and I would talk and if I turned him

down he would say, "Thank you, Angus." Before Saxon actually took office as president he began to talk to me about things he wanted done in the coming year. I said I suppose we'll probably do this in the way we did it last year. That was the reason . . . the state had given a million dollars to fulfill requests that the student lobby was very interested in for the improvement of teaching in the University. I was responsible for deciding how to spend that money.

Jarrell: For the whole system?

Taylor: That's right. Again, with the president's approval, of course.

Jarrell: Right. But you made the recommendations.

Taylor: But anyway, I said I suppose we'll do more or less what we did last year. Saxon said, "No goddamn it, I don't want that!" That's the first time I ever saw him lose his temper.

Jarrell: What was he angry about?

Taylor: Well it turned out he had a short fuse. He had a difference of opinion and that's the way he expressed it. (laughter) But he wasn't angry at me, I don't suppose. It was just that he had a different idea. Well I found out later that Saxon blew his fuse a lot as president. He never did that to me again. Well anyway, he and I had a good relationship except that I never figured out exactly why he had decided that he didn't want me to continue as the academic vice president of the University. He had chosen a man named [Donald C.] Swain who was the vice chancellor at Davis, to be the academic vice president. He had chosen another man to be the vice president for staff personnel and benefits, both of whom had been put under me in my last year as vice president.

Jarrell: So then during that period when you were sort of cast adrift, and . . . when you became the University provost as you described yesterday, prior to being appointed chancellor, that sounded to me as if those were not particularly challenging times.

Taylor: No, they weren't. I decided I was really unhappy about the whole thing.

Jarrell: But when you came to Santa Cruz you were entering a pretty volatile situation down here.

Taylor: When Dave explained to me what he was doing with me in his choice of these other vice presidents, he said that I had tremendous experience and knowledge and understanding and wisdom. He said he needed my help. But the point was, the way to use that help never became very evident. So we didn't have any fights. My feeling at the time actually, was well I don't know exactly what I'm walking into at UCSC but maybe it will be interesting.

Jarrell: Did you talk with President Saxon about the campus very frequently?

Taylor: Yes. Well the ramifications of my being down there apparently . . . attracted favorable attention very fast. Because I remember people said to me that they'd heard I was doing a great job and so on. David's administrative assistant, Beverly Liss, told me, "You saved a campus."

Well anyway, that's the way it was. I talked to him at least every month, because the chancellors met every month with the president. In addition to the meetings in a formal body like the council of chancellors, there was also the chance to talk at the regents meetings which are two days every month. If there was anything on my mind, I called him up. For example, I said finally sometime, probably in April, 1976, "Look, I've got to have a vice chancellor for student affairs. There're

too many loose ends down here that need to be pulled together." I guess I went to McCorkle, who was almost an acting president. But I asked if they could provide the funds to hire someone. Well I finally had to talk to Saxon, of course, about that. He said, "oh sure, we'll take care of that."

Jarrell: Because that wasn't in the budget and you needed fast action?

Taylor: That's right.

Jarrell: Yes. So you got support in that.

Taylor: That's right. No I always had good support from him in that. So Saxon supported everything I did at UCSC and I can't give him any negatives at all for that.

Jarrell: Can you recall, in your meetings with the council of chancellors, and with systemwide, with University Hall, what was the attitude towards Santa Cruz, if it's possible to generalize?

Relations with University Hall

Taylor: Well, I'm not sure I can give a fully adequate description on short notice. But there were people in University Hall from early on, particularly in the budget office, who thought that Santa Cruz cost too much, that the total expense per student at Santa Cruz was disproportionate. Now McHenry made a promise to the regents in the beginning that Santa Cruz would not be any more expensive per student than the other campuses.

Jarrell: Did that prove to be the case?

Taylor: Well, it's very hard, I think, to quantify exactly. There were more administrative officers, in a way, because you had all the provosts. As a matter of fact one of the student complaints at Santa Cruz, although maybe not based on knowledge, was that there was too much money going into administration and not enough into education. Sometimes it was even laughable. I discovered one day that the big sign at the main entrance to the campus, that has University of California, Santa Cruz chiselled in it . . .

Jarrell: It says *Fiat Lux* in gold letters.

Taylor: The original gilt paint had worn off. It wasn't there any more. So I contacted [F.] Louis Fackler in facilities and suggested we ought to regild the sign. He said, "Well we might even still have some paint on hand." So sure enough, they still had some cans on hand to regild the sign. *City on a Hill Press* attacked me for spending money to gild that sign again. (laughter) I told someone, all they had to do was open some old cans of paint.

Jarrell: Well, going back to University Hall, the budget guys thought that Santa Cruz was too darned expensive. You're saying, you don't know if that was true; that it is hard to quantify.

Taylor: Well I think it is. I think Sinsheimer saved money by cutting the salaries of the provosts, the relative pay of provosts. You see if you wanted a man to be the provost in the University of California system, at that time at least he was a full professor, so he had a salary base. Then you give him a boost for the administrative responsibilities. So if he happens to be a very high paid professor you're going to pay him more as provost than you would for a junior level faculty. I don't mean a low level professor's salary compared to a high salary. For instance, [Kenneth V.] Thimann would be a highly paid professor. [Joseph

H.] Silverman wouldn't have had as big a salary. But anybody who's a provost doesn't want to be too much at the bottom of the heap either. So ideas about that sort of thing vary. One of the things I discovered was Kerr paid vice presidents more than chancellors. But subsequent presidents have always done it the other way.

Jarrell: Paid chancellors more than vice presidents of the University? [12]

Taylor: That's right. At any rate, I had some people I wanted to be provost and I had to go above my original offer in order to get them to do it. So the question of how much of the total budget should be for administration and how much should be for direct instruction . . . you see, the way the budget is given to the University by Sacramento . . . the legislature and the governor appropriate a single large sum of money to the regents. The president and the regents then divide it up among the campuses. But the justification for the budget has been made by categories. We need so much for this; we need so much for that. Each year it's incremental. It's only . . . in addition to what we had last year we want a little more for this, for that. Well now, the University doesn't feel completely bound to use the money exactly, but if you shift it around too much the legislature will get teed off about it. They say, "you wanted the money for this and look what you did with it. We don't like that." So you have to be careful. But you do have some leeway.

[12]Taylor wrote: "A provost was paid an administrative stipend in addition to his faculty salary. I tried to adjust the size of the stipend so as to make the list of total salaries for the provosts proportional to the scope and quality of the work of each provost. So the stipend for Thimann (with an unusually high salary as professor) could not be quite as large as the stipend for a full professor with a much lower salary as a salary for his faculty rank.

About Kerr's practice: Except for UC San Francisco, UC Berkeley, UC Los Angeles, and UC San Diego, Kerr paid the other chancellors generally less than most of the vice presidents. Hitch raised the pay of the chancellors at UC Davis, UC Santa Barbara, UC Irvine, UC Santa Cruz, and UC Riverside above the salaries of quite a few of the vice presidents." —Editor.

Now, one of the things that McHenry didn't like, and I can understand it, was that the University estimated the need for faculty positions in terms of the distribution of students. Teaching lower division students, let's say, that's one unit; teaching upper division students is one and a half units or two units. Teaching graduate students in their first year as graduate students is still more; teaching doctoral level students is still more. So depending on the distribution of your student mix, if you use that formula, Santa Cruz wasn't going to get as rich a faculty to student ratio as Berkeley was, because Berkeley has a very different student mix.

McHenry didn't like that. Well, as a matter of fact they didn't really follow that formula entirely. He got more money than the formula would deliver because the president knew that it was important to get UCSC off to a good start. But it always rankled in McHenry's mind that they used this formula. I had some part in making the formula when I was working for Kerr. (laughter)

Jarrell: Yes, but that has been just a given assumption about the way funds were allocated, according to . . . the weight given to undergraduates and graduate students. So any place with professional and graduate schools, they're going to get much more money, as opposed to a campus that was designed, ostensibly, to be favoring undergraduate education as opposed to graduate students.

Taylor: Well you see, some professors teach only graduate courses. But most professors teach a mix of things. The question was, teaching undergraduate freshman calculus, I can handle a class of forty students, and know everyone by name before the first two weeks are over. You can't do that nowadays because they teach them in large sections, two hundred or so at one time.

Jarrell: And then they meet with TAs in discussion groups . . .

Taylor: That's right. But the whole time I taught at UCLA, I made it a point to be able to recognize every student on sight and call him by name after two weeks. The largest class I ever had was about forty five, except right after the war when classes were huge. I had sixty or seventy for awhile. But then a graduate class is not going to be as big as an undergraduate class ordinarily. So . . . if a professor only teaches graduate courses his student load is much smaller than the person who teaches a mix. But you know, that's life, I suppose. You pay for what you get.

Campus Budget

Jarrell: Yes. Related to budget matters, whom did you rely on? Who was really helpful to you in terms of the campus budget? You had mentioned to me in one of our telephone conversations, and yesterday also, that that was an area that you didn't have a lot of prior experience with. So who were the most important people who helped you with that? And for you to educate yourself as well.

Taylor: Well, the person who was the budget officer when I arrived was a fellow named Pat[rick H.] Sullivan. Now there were a number of other people whose assignment was a mixture. There was a fellow named [Thomas] Clifton who worked in the planning office. The general plan is you have a planning office that's sort of associated with the budget. But Pat[rick H.] Sullivan was the primary person. But then there were people underneath who handled the bookkeeping details and so on. Now I never got terribly closely acquainted with most of those people. I dealt with a couple of individuals. What I understood finally was that it wasn't as mysterious as I had supposed. You see, the central

administration tells the chancellor and his staff, this is your budget. It's all printed out. I have a copy of it in here, by the way. It has people's names and what their salaries are. There were various expense categories, such as equipment, general assistance, and supplies. Now that was made up in the office of the president. Nowadays, I understand, it's much more decentralized. The campuses are given a lump sum, but not without . . .

Jarrell: All the allocations.

Taylor: That's right. But it wasn't that way in my day. So the point was that you don't have that money in the bank to draw on. You have to keep books and check regularly with someone in the president's office. It's your money for the campus. But it's not in the bank in Santa Cruz.

So that wasn't as complicated as I thought it might be. After a little while I began to understand it. I'm an organized person. But I don't think that Sullivan was as experienced as maybe he should have been for that kind of a job. Now when Karl Pister became chancellor at Santa Cruz he brought down from Berkeley Errol [W.] Mauchlan who had been the budget officer at Berkeley for years. So he had a crackerjack. Of course Pister had been dean of engineering for ten years at Berkeley, so he knew his way around. He was probably the most skillful chancellor that they've ever had at Santa Cruz, in my opinion.

Jarrell: I know you have followed the history of the campus. You've been on the UC Santa Cruz Foundation; you've come down to meetings until fairly recently. But you've followed Santa Cruz's coming of age, its vicissitudes . . .

Taylor: Oh yes.

Jarrell: . . . very closely, haven't you?

Taylor: Oh yes, I've watched it pretty closely. That's right. Now, you see Sinsheimer didn't have as broad an experience as I had had when I went to UCSC, as a matter of fact. He had been the head of biology at Cal Tech and was a very distinguished scientist. He'd made a big reputation at Iowa . . . before going to Cal Tech. But they don't have an academic senate at Cal Tech.

Shared Governance

You see in 1920 the regents gave the faculty of the University tremendous autonomy. No administrative officer can tell the faculty what courses to teach. A dean can have influence on the curriculum if he's clever, but he can't issue orders. But anyway, it's very different from other institutions. Every chancellor who is appointed from outside the University of California, I think, experiences a great shock of awareness that he has to get accustomed to.

Jarrell: Because the power is divided up?

Taylor: That's right. See now, when Sinsheimer came to UCSC he found after a little while that he really had to have some help. He brought in people he had known elsewhere to assist him. Later he also brought in an academic vice chancellor from UC Irvine to replace [John A.] Marcum.

Jarrell: Yes, the biologist, Kivie Moldave.

Taylor: Now, that turned out to be a very poor appointment, for reasons I don't fully understand. But the campus never really accepted him. But that was partly because Sinsheimer was trying to make Santa Cruz like Cal Tech, a great research institution to the exclusion of most everything else.

Jarrell: Or maybe to be fair, to play devil's advocate, maybe not to make UC Santa Cruz a Cal Tech . . . but how about this, Angus?

Taylor: Or a Berkeley?

Jarrell: Yes. To make UCSC fit more into the UC system mold?

Taylor: Sinsheimer in his book [13], said the Master Plan [for Higher Education] designated the University of California as the chief research arm of the state.

Jarrell: Yes.

Taylor: Okay. That defines how Sinsheimer perceived UCSC's mission as a UC campus. Well at any rate, budgeting as such was not a problem for me, and didn't cause any special problem for Santa Cruz. The most important thing, I think, was to make the most of the teaching facilities. Now, I discovered in my journal when I was reviewing it, a news clipping about a talk I gave to the academic senate at its second meeting. I'd like to read from that.

Jarrell: Certainly.

Taylor: The headline says, "Turn University attention to the students, says Taylor."

Jarrell: This is an article by reporter Wallace Wood, in the *Santa Cruz Sentinel*, 5/27/76.

Taylor: That's correct.

[13]Taylor is referring to Sinsheimer's autobiography, *The Strands of a Life: the Science of DNA and the Art of Education* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1994). The Regional History Project published Sinsheimer's oral history memoir, edited by Randall Jarrell, *The University of California, Santa Cruz During a Critical Decade, 1977-1987* (Santa Cruz: 1996).—Editor.

> It's time UCSC turned its attention back to its chief clientele, the students, University Acting Chancellor Angus Taylor said Wednesday. In his second address to the senate Taylor told the faculty it's going to have to buckle down and buckle up a notch if it expects to keep getting good students. He announced plans to appoint an acting vice chancellor for student affairs this fall. And he gently chastised the faculty for scheduling classes at their own convenience, taking their time about writing up "evaluations" of students in courses, because they have no regular grading system, and not keeping office hours too well, and wasting time on committees. "There is a hazard in having faculty members write their own tickets," Taylor said. And he also said it's time UCSC's eight colleges buckle down to a planned, undergraduate educational program involving its faculty members. "If there is a good, well-conceived plan for a college program, there should be little need for prodding and cajoling fellows of the colleges to teach something for the college," Taylor said. The mild spanking the chancellor administered in his talk was a reminder to UCSC it's time to get back to business after a long period which has ended with the resignation of Mark Christensen and the appointment of Taylor as acting head. The small audience at the academic senate meeting seemed to take the parental criticism without rancor, although the faculty came back later with a mild counterattack on administrative costs.

Jarrell: (laughter) Tit for tat, right?

Narrative Evaluation System

Taylor: Well, that was one of my beliefs, that if they would just do a little more careful planning and use their faculty resources correctly that might help us to cure the enrollment problem. Now some people feel enrollment at Santa Cruz dropped back, slowed down, because of the lack of a grading system. That's always been a question that's hard to decide. The record shows that Santa Cruz graduates on the whole do well in getting into professional schools and graduate schools.

Jarrell: Yes, exceedingly well.

Taylor: But Chancellor Sinsheimer hired a man to study the enrollment problem . . . what was his name?

Jarrell: Richard Moll.

Taylor: Yes. He focused on that and tried to persuade the campus to go back to a regular grading system and he ran into a buzz saw. But my own personal experience as a professor at UCLA was that grades are useful to the professor, as well as to the student. If you grade your students carefully, you begin to notice things that you may not notice if you don't force yourself to make judgments about the quality of their work. I think there's a temptation to be kind of sloppy about writing up just an evaluation. I found that people at Berkeley used to kid me a lot by saying, what formula do they use at UCSC . . . so this narrative evaluation uses certain code words so it means B, or they do it another way and that means C. And I don't know if that's actually true or not. I thought a little bit about maybe trying to make a revolution about that. I decided that was foolish. First of all, there were other, more important things to do.

Pre-enrollment

Taylor: I did try to do something that I had to back off from. I suggested that they regularize the question of when students finalize their course lists. You see the [quarter system] term is not very long. I was going to try to talk them into pre-enrollment.

Jarrell: Yes, I read about that in *City on a Hill Press.* I was going to ask you about that since there was a big flap about it.

Taylor: Oh yes. I said my experience at UCLA showed that pre-enrollment enables students to make it known what they want to enroll in next term. It doesn't mean they can't change their mind. But at least it gives the administration the chance to schedule as many sections as they're going to need of various courses. Then students don't waste the first four or five days of a quarter shopping around since they haven't yet focused on what courses they're going to take. So I proposed this idea and it was like throwing a firecracker.

Jarrell: I know, you were lambasted!

Taylor: (laughter)

Jarrell: I was reading old *City on a Hill Press* articles and they went right after you and the whole administration.

Taylor: Yes, well I backed off right away on that. That might have given Roberto [Rubalcava] the feeling that, oh, Taylor is a pushover.

Anti-Apartheid/Divestiture Demonstrations

Jarrell: I'd like to pick up a thread from yesterday about the demonstrations at Santa Cruz that started in January, 1977, over the whole divestiture, anti-apartheid movement. Would you discuss those demonstrations, and also that final question which you didn't really finish answering, what does a chancellor do with students who trespass? What are the legal implications, the costs of prosecuting students for trespassing, etc.?

Taylor: All right. Well, the national consciousness about the problems of apartheid was pretty big at that time. There was a lot of talk all over the country

about that. Of course there was a rather sharp difference of opinion between conservatives and liberals or leftists over that. There were even people who were very sympathetic to the plight of the blacks in South Africa who felt that totally disrupting the economy of the country would have some unfortunate effects among the blacks too, not just on the Afrikaners. Many of the whites were Dutch, although some were English. Archbishop Desmond Tutu was in the news to some extent, too.

Now, my own view on that was that I knew whites who had lived in South Africa and were very, very anti-government. But the question of how you could possibly change that without having a real bloodbath was worrisome to me. So I tended to be a little on the conservative side about going too far.

Jarrell: You as a chancellor, though, had no authority over University retirement funds, or how the University regents invested University money. You were being asked by students to take a stand, as other chancellors were. So, how did you approach this in terms of your role as chancellor?

Taylor: Most students could comprehend the fact that University investment policies were entirely handled by the regents. No administrative office of the president or any chancellor has any authority over how the regents invest their money. But the investment of money was important because the retirement system depends upon the investments. Making good money out of the investments was important. However, most faculty members, I think, were not primarily thinking with their pocketbooks. They were like me. There was a diversity of attitudes. So I simply told the students that I had no authority whatever to change this, but I was of the opinion that the best thing to do was to agitate peacefully and reasonably for change, but not to precipitate anything that

would lead to bloodshed because the blacks were hopelessly at the mercy of the South African government if there was going to be murder. Well, that didn't go over with some of them.

Well, it never came to a real tight showdown until late in the spring of 1977. Then we had what I called sardonically . . . the second annual Memorial Day weekend sit-in. However we made a plan with the aid of the chief of the campus police, Gene [R.E.] Stone. A very nice man, and Elizabeth Penaat, because he reported to her . . . We made a plan that we would not try to stop demonstrations but we would draw the line at trespass after 5 p.m. in the University's buildings where things were going on. The students would be told they had to get out at 5 o'clock. Well, as a matter of fact many of them deliberately allowed themselves to be called in on that. So a lot of students were cited, their identification was taken, and then they were released. The assumption was that they would be prosecuted through the legal channels of the sheriff of Santa Cruz County, I think.

Well, the next day, or very soon thereafter, the sheriff's office called me up and asked whether I really wanted to prosecute these students. I said it wasn't my duty to prosecute them. They'd been arrested, it was up to law enforcement to deal with them from that point on. I was willing to certify what had happened. But bringing charges wasn't my responsibility. I don't think very many students were actually in jail. But . . . I'm not sure about that. Well, they said it would cost a lot of money to prosecute them. How did I feel about whether we should do it or not? What if we just drop the charges? I said, "I'd like to think about that for a little while, but I'll call you back." So I speculated about it for awhile with Stone and Elizabeth. Then I called him back and said, "I do not object if you decide you want to drop the charges. That's up to you." That's what was done. Now, that

night or a night soon thereafter, as soon as this thing ran its course, and the students knew what the score was, my wife and I were awakened about 1 a.m. by a telephone call at home. We were in bed and I could hear loud laughter and noise over the telephone and they said, "Is this Chancellor Taylor?" "Yes, this is Chancellor Taylor." "Well," they said, "thanks very much. Goodbye. Ha ha ha ha." (laughter) So the students were having a party. Then the only further outcome of this episode was that one of the officers at Stanford called me up and expressed his real concern that I had set a very bad precedent.

Jarrell: Oh, because you hadn't prosecuted them?

Taylor: That's right. Well, I explained to him that I'd I thought about it and if the county didn't want to pay the cost, I wasn't going to insist on them doing it. The students I think all knew what they were doing. They wanted to create an incident and get some news, some publicity. That's really all they wanted. So then I think Bowker from Berkeley was a little bit critical of me too. But that was the end of that. Later the students actually made a presentation for divestiture at the regents meeting. I think it was sometime after Memorial Day, 1977. It was all done very politely. There was no problem. The regents didn't all agree about it, of course. But it was very civil. There wasn't any disturbance at the regents meeting about that. So I didn't, of course, enjoy the experience very much at the time, because I knew that I was in the hot seat in a way.

The Search for a New Chancellor

Jarrell: Another thing I want to ask you about was your original agreement with President Saxon that you would come down to UCSC for a year, more or less, and take over the campus while the search committee was seeking a new

permanent chancellor. Did you have any involvement with the search committee, or any participation in its work at all?

Taylor: Well in reading through my journal I discovered things that I hadn't kept very clearly in mind. I think the membership of the search committee was made public, both regents and faculty, including faculty from some other campuses. I think there were a couple of students, too. But I was never asked my suggestions about that. I did find in my journal that Saxon had asked me privately if there were any people on the campus whom I thought might be candidates for the chancellorship. I wrote in my journal that I thought there were only a very few possibilities. I didn't think any single person seemed an obvious prospective candidate.

I was impressed with John Marcum but I thought he might not really have had enough experience yet. He was the provost of Merrill. I got to know John pretty well. He left UCSC to take over the Education Abroad Program at [UC] Santa Barbara, where he still is, or maybe he's retired by now. He seemed to me the most possible. Now, I can't pick out who else but possibly [John W.] Isbister, who later became a provost, although he wasn't at that time. [M.] Brewster Smith, maybe. But I think that was about it. None of those people, I think, showed up as serious candidates. Now yesterday when you asked me about this I told you that there was one man who came to UCSC whom I thought was an interesting possibility and that was Kai [T.] Erikson, the son of the famous Erikson.

Jarrell: Erik [H.] Erikson.

Taylor: Yes. Now Kai Erikson was at Yale, I think. He had a certain kind of an aura about him, and I thought he would really be a person to seriously consider.

But I don't know to what extent he was a finalist. The other man who came down here was Allen G. Marr, the graduate dean at [UC Davis]. I had known him through academic senate circles a bit while I was vice president. While I thought that he seemed to like administration I didn't think that he had very many interesting ideas. I had not heard the name of Sinsheimer until he was announced.

Jarrell: So you really just had a private request from President Saxon if there were any prospective people at Santa Cruz who had impressed you. But otherwise you had had nothing to do with the search?

Taylor: That's right.

Role of the Colleges

Jarrell: You've talked in our previous interviews about your approach to reorganizing the campus. I think that there was a feeling at the time, expressed in different quarters, that your approach kind of centralized power to the chancellor and de-emphasized the prominence of the colleges. Could you address that?

Taylor: Well, I was aware that I wasn't completely carrying the day with my own ideas. I set up a couple of committees. One was called COPAR.

Jarrell: Yes. I have it right here. Let's see. Committee on planning and resources. COPAR.

Taylor: That's right. That was one.

Jarrell: And then CAP. Your committee on academic priorities?

Taylor: Yes. And then there was one called CISC, the chancellor's immediate staff council, which included me and the three vice chancellors.

Jarrell: Was it governance by these administrative committees?

Taylor: It was not really governance; I did want to strengthen the planning of the use of resources. Well, I think on COPAR and CAP there were some representatives of the senate as well as administrators. That was in a certain sense similar to what at the president's level was called the academic planning and program review board, APPRB, of which I was the chairman when I was vice president. The idea was to get the thinking of principal administrators and the leaders of faculty opinion about what is important in looking at the big picture. What I really wanted to do was to bring about some way in which the role of the colleges would fit in with the role of the boards so that you would have a unified plan of using the teaching resources of the whole campus while at the same time capitalizing on the original intention of the colleges, of which I think the most meaningful phrase was Clark Kerr's, "to make the campus seem small while it grows large."

In other words, a unit on the order of several hundred students having a common bond from their membership in a college, together with a group of faculty members, who were so-called fellows of the college. That would form a kind of neighborhood. All these different neighborhoods would form the big city. But what was clearly lacking was that there wasn't any common way of planning how the colleges and the boards were going to fit together. That had never been done. They didn't even try to map it out at the beginning. At the beginning it was only one college. And [Page] Smith's ideas essentially

dominated that. So . . . trying to put in words the fundamental importance of the colleges was a task that I never succeeded in at the time, to my own satisfaction.

Jarrell: I don't think it's ever been solved to everyone's satisfaction. My sense is that when McHenry retired there was quite a vacuum; there weren't structures in place that had been thought out for decentralized decision making. Could you discuss UCSC in terms of its differences from other UC campuses, and how its administration and organization are different?

Taylor: All right, well I spent quite a bit of time last night and this morning thinking about that and I think my response is intended to do the best I can with that. But as a preamble to that I would say that I have tried ever since I was chancellor to talk to the successive chancellors. There're not very many of them: Sinsheimer, Stevens and Pister. I didn't really have to talk to Pister because he and I see UCSC in the same way. I wanted to explain to them how important it was that they do something to figure out how to make the college system useful. That was the main thing. The other one was to make them understand that they have to learn how to deal with the academic senate, because of the fact that it has been delegated authority over the curriculum, and that they cannot afford to bypass the senate on educational policy. The regents say the senate shall be consulted on educational policy.

The regents' Standing Orders specify that the academic senate may appoint a committee to advise the administration on the budget. The tradition was long established that every appointment to tenure has to be vetted through the committees of the academic senate. Well, Sinsheimer, I think didn't have any basis for understanding that because they didn't have anything like that at Cal Tech. Stevens listened but I couldn't tell whether it was making any real

impression on him. Although he and I met together to talk about this and so on. Now, I didn't need to preach to Pister and I thought that by that time of course that certain things had been changed a little bit. The notion that the colleges were to at least have, be permitted to have core courses . . .

Jarrell: That was settled.

Taylor: Yes. There was even some kind of a formula as to how many units might be contributed, particularly through the colleges. Although I don't think the statesmanship on that was done in a very crisp way. So at any rate, I have sort of what I might call my final thoughts on that to spill right now. I didn't think of them all just this morning, of course. What I tried to do is to tidy them up because I've been thinking about this ever since I left.

Jarrell: I know that you have kept a close eye on the campus and its evolution.

The University's Mission

Taylor: I'd like to begin with this anecdote. My wife and I and my family once or twice had gone on summer trips with the Sierra Club. The group sticks together for two weeks. There are campfires in the evening. I was invited one evening to be the speaker. I decided to talk about how I discovered the Sierra Club and John Muir while I was at Harvard. I discovered *The Sierra Club Bulletin*, which I'd never even heard of, in the Harvard Library. I'd heard of John Muir but I didn't know much about him. I bought and read a series of volumes that might be regarded as the collected works of John Muir, while I was still a student at Harvard.

So I introduced my remarks by saying there were three great passions in my life: mathematics, mountains, and my wife. Patsy said to me afterwards, "Well, I'm glad you included me." (laughter) Then I thought about this experience. On my honeymoon we had packed in to the Sierra Nevada, gone over on the east side, hired a packer to load up two weeks of supplies. I had a tent and we climbed into the mountains and stayed there for two weeks, just the two of us. We saw hardly any people at all. The packer said to me, "My God, what are you going to do there?" "Well," I said, "We're going to climb mountains." He said, "What do you mean, climb mountains?" I said, "Well, go up to the top and look around; I want to see what's on the other side." He said, "if you want to see what's on the other side, rent a horse and ride around there and see." Well in some memos to myself about this I wrote that there's always a mountain the other side of which you never see. You can try to climb but there's always something that you've never seen. There's this part of life that's a mystery.

That's part of the subject of the talk I gave at John [M.] Ellis's invitation called "Cold Logic and Pure Reason are not Enough." Well that started off with the famous dictum of Thomas Huxley, who said that the mind should be pure, a cold logic engine. Well, I came to the conviction as part of my liberal education that the use of the intellect to try to understand things, to learn things, is one very important part of education. But there's also the part of learning to live a life that's worth living, and for that you have to involve oneself in things that are mysterious, really. Because you don't understand exactly why you have emotions, and why you like music, or why you like art, or why you like mountains. Those things are all important.

Now in that light, I think that the mission of the University of California should be to educate the citizens of California, or a slice of the citizens of California, to

be good citizens, to be able to contribute to the betterment of the life of the community and also the world. The University of California should have a mission that extends beyond the state. It should have a worldwide influence. To do that you not only have to study chemistry, physics, and mathematics, and cosmology, but you've got to study human nature, art, and music. The collective body has to think about these other things. Now, what is philosophy? It is more than what is sometimes called analytic philosophy, especially logical positivism. You have to cope with the fact that there are mysteries of life that are very hard to plumb and maybe you will never succeed. But that's part of what you ought to do. So, the fact that the University of California is supposed to be the research arm of the state is fine. But that's a narrowing of the University's responsibility. It's much more than that. It's to educate people to be good citizens; to educate them to be moral and sensitive human beings.

Now the college concept at Santa Cruz, it seems, could further this. You have a small community of students and faculty, who see each other regularly enough . . . Students eat and meet together every day. They meet with certain members of the faculty once a month maybe, in some kind of a formal occasion. They're civilizing themselves. They're educating themselves in ways that have nothing to do with being lectured to. They're using their minds and bodies and souls. Now that's what the colleges should be for. So a certain share of the resources, perhaps only a small share in terms of hours, should be in the colleges. The colleges should promote these qualities that I'm talking about among students. The emphasis should be on cross-disciplinary programs. Every college should have a cross-disciplinary program of limited scope that occupies perhaps one tenth or one twelfth of the total program of study in the University. The rest of it should be by the boards of studies. You can't do that unless you can get people

who believe strongly in that to essentially crack the whip, make sure that they don't forget to do it.

The original planning of the Santa Cruz campus neglected to devise that mechanism. This neglect was symbolized by the fact of the absence of a plan. Well, plans should be loose, but there has to be some kind of a plan. Santa Cruz never had that on paper. Now, I'm not surprised in a way that it wasn't understood. At UCLA right after World War II there was a movement to revitalize liberal education. How do you get a liberal education? Well, they said you have to learn a certain amount of this and a certain amount of that, you have to have breadth, and depth. So at Harvard they call it concentration and distribution. Concentrate, that's a major; distribution means spreading out.

Jarrell: Most college students in California have two years of general education, breadth requirements; then as upper division students they have their depth, in the academic major . . .

Taylor: Yes, well I think to try to split it between the two levels is not the right idea, though. I think in the lower division the student should begin to build the foundations of his specialization. In the upper division, you go on and build up your specialization. But you shouldn't neglect the breadth even in the upper division. Crown College actually had perhaps the best plan of any of the colleges. Under Thimann, it was called Science and Society. There was a course in the first year and then they combined it in the last year.

Now at Harvard all departments except chemistry joined what was called the tutorial program. Chemistry never did, for some reason, which I never understood. But in the tutorial program, you abandoned classes near the end of the semester and had what was called the reading period. The only thing you did

during the reading period was to work with your tutor on assigned reading. That went on all through the second, third and fourth years. Freshmen were housed together at Harvard separate from other students. I think they probably still are, but I'm not sure. So, the house plan essentially was trying to do this. Except there wasn't any teaching program at all except the tutorial. You can't probably succeed with tutorials unless you have a somewhat select group of students. The University according to the [1960] Master Plan for Higher Education carved out for itself a select group of students.

Jarrell: 12.5 percent.

Taylor: I don't think it should be any more select than that. But that's already somewhat elite. You ought to educate these students for leadership, citizenship, morality and ethics. If I were chancellor at Santa Cruz I would build that program. I didn't have time to do it and I hadn't thought it through completely.

Jarrell: You didn't have very much time. You were there really to stabilize the campus; to calm the waters. Because I've heard about the unruly faculty of UC Santa Cruz. Or that this faculty, this campus is . . .

Taylor: Ungovernable.

Jarrell: Ungovernable! Yes, that's a common one. I think the other UC campuses have looked askance at Santa Cruz.

Taylor: Well, I think that some of the fiscally minded people have simply not had the imagination. But what I was going to say, going back to my UCLA experience, when we started to have a revitalization of liberal education right after World War II, it was incredible. A great wave of students came in after the war. They were older than the average because they had been held out of

education for the three or four years of the war. They were bright students, an awful lot of them. But what I found was that only a comparatively small fraction of the faculty even understood what a liberal education is.

Jarrell: Of the new, smaller campuses . . . do you think that UCSC is a legitimate child of the system now?

Taylor: Yes, I think . . . Karl [Pister] has done quite a bit to bring that about. I don't know for sure how much . . . There are people at Santa Cruz who think that Karl spent too much time off campus, and so on because he went to Washington D.C., a good deal and of course spent a lot of the time on what could be done to make use of the availability of land at Fort Ord and so on. But I have full confidence that Karl knew what he was doing. He decided he wasn't going to try to devote his major interest to trying to fix the colleges. In a certain sense the colleges are going along much better than you might think, under all the circumstances.

Now my own opinion is . . . I encouraged my daughter to think about going to Santa Cruz, and she decided to do it. But I don't think she was disappointed at all, although she went there only in the third year of operation of the campus and she said the campus was very dead on weekends. She wondered sometimes whether she shouldn't come back to Berkeley. But she didn't.

Completing the Academic Plan

The original intention was that I would vacate the chancellorship June 30, 1977. But it turned out that Sinsheimer, who had already been chosen, didn't want to come until the end of the summer. So I agreed to stay on until the first of

September. But I actually took my month's vacation during part of that summer, and went to the Canadian Rockies, which my wife and I loved to do. Not a great deal happened on campus that summer. What was happening toward the end of that period in the spring was finishing the academic plan which we were required to develop by the central administration.

Jim [James E.] Pepper played an important role in helping to develop the academic plan. He was what you might call the deputy leader of the group. Tilly [Priscilla W.] Shaw was another person who played a role there. She's an interesting person. I liked her. I didn't think it was a very bad plan, but it didn't solve the problem of the colleges. People like Thimann told me that it didn't focus enough on the colleges which I think was a fair comment.

Jarrell: You know, just to interject something here. The problem of the colleges. Everybody talks about the problem of the colleges. But the problem of the colleges is that in terms of the disciplines, in terms of the demands on faculty to teach and do research, it's difficult to accommodate the colleges in terms of the way the UC system is set up. In the original few years I'm sure you're aware of the enormous amount of energy that early, young pioneering faculty spent in building these colleges into cultural and social entities. But they didn't get much credit for it when they came up for tenure review.

Taylor: It depends. That's exactly the point Pister wrote in a University-wide document about the role of teaching. It's a little bit like my paper on education. It sank without a trace. Because of the snobbishness of the people at San Diego in particular, who thought that the only thing that counts is professional excellence in your field.

I'll tell you one thing I did which I may not have mentioned to you before. I invited junior faculty, non-tenured faculty people, in small groups, several times, to come over and spend the evening at University House. We just chewed the fat about what's it like to be a young faculty member at Santa Cruz.

Jarrell: That was interesting, wasn't it?

Taylor: Oh, I think they appreciated it. Now, what I told them was, don't get too worried about it. Do your job. You have to develop a specialty. You have to make a career out of contributing some original ideas in one way or another. But just do that and don't worry about whether you're going to make tenure or not, as long as you feel satisfied that you're doing your best. I think many of them just felt completely relieved. First of all, that I would call them in and do it socially, not lecturing them at all. Well, [UC] San Diego has a college system too, you know.

Jarrell: Yes.

Taylor: It's much bigger, far fewer colleges, much bigger. They don't aim to do quite the same thing at all.

Jarrell: Yes, it's quite different.

Taylor: Yes. In fact the first college, Revelle College, is a highly elite science college. So that's one system. Diversity in an ethnic sense hadn't yet become fashionable at all. The colleges at San Diego didn't really contribute anything at all . . . well not towards the idea that I tried to develop here. Because I don't think they were self-conscious enough to talk about developing citizen leadership. They wanted to develop career leadership. Of course they have some very fine

people there; they are good but are very snobbish about it too. San Diego is the Cadillac of the campuses. Well, now do you have anything more?

Affirmative Action

Jarrell: Would you discuss—you mentioned it in passing—the whole issue of affirmative action. You said when you were a vice president at Berkeley that [Mark] Christensen had been appointed to write an affirmative action plan.

Taylor: Well, he was the vice chancellor of the campus, the number two person. But his office was lagging and they finally sent somebody down from [UC] Davis to do it for him.

Jarrell: But at that stage, affirmative action was acknowledged to be a very important, new dimension in University hiring of faculty and staff, and promotion and in student admissions. In 1978 there was the Bakke case. [14] I think that that has certainly been an enormous change that's taken place over your career.

Taylor: Well yes. It's a thing that interests me. Maybe I can say the following that relates to my role in it as a vice president. The original conception was to simply recruit faculty at any rate, to get away from the old boy network. People never even bothered thinking about looking for candidates of certain types at all. Now, I told my department at UCLA that we always thought of candidates in terms of Harvard, Yale, Princeton, Columbia, Michigan, Madison, and

[14]Regents of University of California vs. Bakke, June 28, 1978. The U.S. Supreme Court found that a public medical school acted illegally by saying a white applicant, Allan Bakke, could not compete for a set number of places reserved for minority applicants. However, the court embraced the concept of affirmative action, and said that admissions policies could consider race as one of many factors.—Editor.

Minnesota. We didn't ever think about other places. We didn't think about Washington or Oregon or Reed College. Of course Reed College doesn't grant doctorate degrees.

But I thought there must be good students at some of these places who were worth considering either to come here as graduate students, or to look for as potential faculty members. Even at the University of Kansas, or Ohio, or places like that. Well, we didn't because the main reason was we knew that the concentration of good graduate students was at the places I've named. Virginia was another one. We knew that there were good graduate students there and if you're looking for potential Ph.D.'s to hire, it's natural to go there.

Now the purpose of affirmative action was to require that you advertise the jobs so that you'd get applicants. Even though you didn't go looking for them, applicants came to you. That was the primary purpose from a truly operational point of view. The rules were that you had to advertise. You had to give them a fair look at the possibility. But this never suggested that you were to bend the standards. The federal government, however, had administrators who liked to say that we didn't have enough women; we didn't have enough blacks. They weren't in power to demand quotas but in a certain sense they put pressure on us to get a certain percentage.[15]

Jarrell: Yes.

[15]Taylor added this background: "A note of explanation about affirmative action. Governor Edmund G. Brown launched the idea of having state agencies prepare an ethnic survey of their employees. The reaction in the UC faculty was mixed. Jews on the faculty were inclined to oppose the idea, because they thought it would lead to discrimination. The UC administration and the senate were opposed to the use of quotas, and resisted federal agencies who were pushy about 'goals and time tables' for achieving quotas. The main positive reaction to affirmative action in the recruiting of faculty was to advertise all open positions and consider fairly all applicants. There was no official sanction for any preferential candidates that involved lowering of standards."—Editor.

Taylor: We never bent to that. Mr. Hitch and I were the main figures in the central administration on affirmative action. Our idea was we don't have to take unqualified people or people who are less than the best you can find. But you must look. That was the way we approached it. I still in general think that that's probably the best way. Now, there's a case to be made, I think, for claiming that you cannot rank people strictly in linear order as to quality. If you've got ten candidates for a faculty position, you can't, strictly speaking, say, one, two, three, four, five, in that order. If number ten happens to be black, he may be just as good as number three or something like that. So you really must not succumb to the temptation to count them in terms of only how much they publish. You must try to find out more about their minds. So I think that the current regents are wrong,[16] and especially Proposition 209 [17] is wrong. It will not allow you to fully use your judgment about who you hire, who you bring in as a student. That's a tough . . . it's one of these things that's highly political.

But that was never a problem during my time since the campus wasn't growing much and so there was not a lot of hiring in those days. I remember one question came to my mind. We hired an economist who was a well-known Marxist. I think Marx has got many things wrong with him, but I decided, well I certainly can't express any preference against a Marxist. If the faculty thinks he's good, well okay. And we hired him. I refused to give tenure to one person whom I had not known was a homosexual. It was thrown in my face afterwards

[16]On July 20, 1995, the UC Board of Regents passed two resolutions fundamentally changing previous policies on affirmative action. The first, in a vote of 14-10, with one abstention, eliminated the use of race, ethnicity, and gender as supplemental criteria in student admissions. The second, in a 15-10 vote, eliminated ethnicity and gender in the University's hiring and business practices.—Editor.

[17]Proposition 209, an initiative constitutional amendment, was passed on November 5, 1996, and prohibits the state and public educational institutions from giving preferential treatment to any individual on the basis of race, sex, color, ethnicity, or national origin. It effectively outlaws affirmative action programs.—Editor.

that I had been prejudiced against him because he was a homosexual. I didn't even know it!

History of Consciousness Program

I discovered that the graduate program in history of consciousness was in bad shape. I don't know how exactly it was called to my attention, but what I discovered was that several people who had originally started the program had lost interest in it and were no longer participating. But the program was producing a few graduate students each year. In fact the existing graduate students were playing the main role in selecting the new graduate students. In other words, the faculty were neglecting the program and letting the graduate students run it in a certain sense. I talked to [M.] Brewster Smith—I think he was chairman of the graduate council at the time—and I said, and he agreed with me, that this was unconscionable. You can't have a program in which the graduate students are in charge of admissions. I said they need a little more strength there, because various people who were in on it at the beginning had strayed away. Albert Hofstadter had been in on it and he'd gone. So I said they really need a good man in there and that I wouldn't produce an FTE until I'd been assured that the faculty would take responsibility for that program. Well that led to the hiring of Hayden White.

Jarrell: A brilliant appointment.

Taylor: But that's one of the places where I punched harder.

Jarrell: Tell me about his appointment.

Taylor: Of course he was at UCLA. It wasn't hard to get him appointed, but I had to persuade him that it was a good thing to do. I think he probably was able to be persuaded by various people. There were some very good graduate students in that program. But many people don't know what the program is. People at Berkeley used to throw it in my face. What kind of program can that be? There was a (well known and controversial) black man who got a degree in it . . .[18] I was assured by people that he wrote a credible Ph.D. I can't judge myself. But I was told that it was not just an idle thing. I suppose it was unusual in many ways, how could you expect a man like that to do that.

Jarrell: So I didn't know that you were involved in Hayden White's coming to Santa Cruz. And then of course he became a University Professor.[19]

Taylor: Well, I'm not sure if he got appointed while I was still there but Hayden White was clearly one of these very good people who doesn't fit exactly into his discipline.

Jarrell: That's right; he's astride a bunch of disciplines. That's precisely why his being in the history of consciousness program was so perfect.

Taylor: You know the history of consciousness program came into existence without McHenry even knowing it. After I became vice president I found that the way in which graduate programs get established required a good deal more careful attention. I first asked Clark [Kerr] what to do when it came to me to approve the establishment of a new Ph.D. program. He said if the senate

[18] Taylor is referring to the late Huey P. Newton, co-founder of the Black Panther Party, who received a Ph.D. in history of consciousness in 1980.—Editor.
[19] Hayden White joined the faculty at UCSC in July, 1978, and retired in June, 1994. He was designated a University Professor in September, 1990.—Editor.

recommends it, you accept it. Well, later on I came to realize that there are economic resources involved.

Library resources were involved. So I started looking much harder at graduate programs. I turned down a request for a Ph.D. program in classics at Irvine. I said that we had no need to have Ph.D. programs in classics at *all* campuses—that UCLA and UC Berkeley were able to handle all the needs, and that starting a Ph.D. program at Irvine would lead to extensive library costs. Oh, I got many slingshots for that. Now, mind you, the idea that you have people teaching classics to undergraduates is fine. Every university needs that.

Jarrell: Right. But it's hard to justify graduate programs in Greek at all nine campuses.

Taylor: Well, that was the position I took. But you see Clark himself, his first advice was, if the senate approves it, okay. That was early on.

Retirement

Jarrell: I would like you to describe the farewell celebration held for you at Cowell College June, 1977. From all accounts that I've read and the pictures you've showed me, it was a really marvelous convening of all of your friends and colleagues from your whole University life.

Taylor: It was a very interesting occasion, and very satisfying too. I'm not sure, but the affiliates might have had a role in that program. Well, when they talked to me about it I said, well of course we'd like to come to such an affair. I said I would appreciate it if President Clark Kerr could be invited to come as a speaker and also former Vice President McCorkle. So that was done.

Jarrell: There were around 150 invited guests who had written ahead . . . you know it was planned many months in advance.

Taylor: Well a group came down from Berkeley; they had a whole busload, including all of my former staff. Clark agreed to talk. I remember that sitting right in front of me in that big commons was a table at which a lot of my former staff from Berkeley were seated. I had a very long relationship with a lot of those people. Well I became aware that there were some possibilities of trouble in the program.

Jarrell: In terms of student demonstrators?

Taylor: Yes. But of course I wasn't asked to do anything about it myself. But I think it was handled very well. Herman Blake intercepted some of the people who I think had ideas in mind about a demonstration and he talked very sternly to them. They backed off. What happened finally was that two or three students were given a chance to speak.

Jarrell: I would add that this was an anti-apartheid demonstration.

Taylor: Yes, that's correct. But then there was a large number of students in the vicinity who weren't invited into the affair, who came and looked through the windows. (laughter)

Jarrell: Yes, I saw that photograph of all of the guests sitting at the tables and then on the other side of the windows you could see all the students peering in.

Taylor: Well anyway, Page Smith was one of the speakers; Saxon was another; and Kerr. Now Kerr had not prepared particularly ahead of time. He sat there during the time when we were eating, writing his speech.

Jarrell: Just writing a few little remarks?

Taylor: Yes. Well Kerr is an extremely gifted man. When he got up to speak it just sounded extemporaneous. I asked him later if I could have a transcript of what he said. I have it somewhere. Then my wife produced my tam o' shanter . . . and had arranged to have a person walk in playing the bagpipes.

Jarrell: Oh, what a lovely gesture.

Taylor: So it was a good send-off.

Jarrell: Well, Angus, I want to thank you so much for your hard work, for all the materials you sent me and all of your going over and studying your journals. I appreciate it so much. It's been a total pleasure working with you.

Index