Transformations

UC Santa Barbara, 1909-1979

Robert Kelley

The Associated Students
University of California
Santa Barbara
1981

[Map] ***A map of the 408-acre central UC Santa Barbara campus in 1979. The Events Facility is shown in dotted lines, at left center, for it was not yet completed at the map's drawing, nor was UCen II (the Pavilion). Permanent structures are shown in black, while former Marine Corps buildings, still in use, are shown in hachure markings, together with the Faculty Club and some metal prefabricated structures. To the northwest, largely off the map, stretched the 200-acre Storke Campus, acquired in 1960-61, occupied by athletic fields and student housing (Stadium Road forms its eastward boundary). A mile westward, beyond Isla Vista, was the undeveloped 221-acre West Campus, acquired in 1966-67. Isla Vista lies just westward of the central campus. Building No. 434, opposite Stroke Tower, was the Marine Corps base headquarters building; the rifle range still stands southward of Carrillo Commons, in the campus's southwest corner. The Old Gym was that constructed for the Marines, as was the adjacent campus pool, of Olympic dimensions. The small wooden building near the campus's East Gate, No. 512, was the commandant's home (this was not its original location); The Robert Maynard Hutchins Center for the Study of Democratic Institutions occupied Building No. 446, the former Marine Corps officers club, at the campus's northeastward corner, an historical conjunction within one now elderly wooden building that many would find piquant.***

Preface [not available online]

Not available online.

Prologue: The Small College on the Hill 1909-1944 [not available online]

Not available online.

I. The Liberal Arts College 1944-1958 [not available online]

Not available online.

II. Becoming a General UC Campus: The Gould Era 1959-1962 [not available online]

Not available online.

III. Vernon I. Cheadle: The Confident Years 1962-1967 [not available online]

Not available online.

IV. The Crisis: Beginnings 1967-69

Once again social and international transformations occurring beyond the boundaries of the campus invaded and revolutionized UCSB's history. In the mid-1960s it had been the upward surge of the generation of young people born just after the Second World War, when the American birthrate for a few years leaped fifty percent and large families, replacing the shrunken households of the depression years, became the rule. A national conviction that higher education for young Americans was an unmixed blessing both to them and the nation, to be given as freely as in earlier generations it had been denied, had produced outpourings of federal and state funds and the building of an immense higher education establishment. Now, however, three converging forces combined to make the late 1960s a whirlwind of violence and wrenching social change: the rising ethnic consciousness of black and brown America; the emergence for the first time since the 1920s of an assertive youth culture; and a tragic war, desperately condemned and resisted by the young, which twisted and warped all sensibilities.

Thousands of Americans broke away from traditional patterns and began experimenting with doing their own thing. The media were filled with fascinated discussions of the way young people were dressing, behaving, and relating to older people; the changes in sexual practices and attitudes, and new styles of living; and the status and temper of minority groups. The sense of community and of “pulling together” induced by thirty years of national crisis—the depression, the Second World War, and the Cold War—was fading. A professed realism had been the mood of the 1950s, disenchanted and ironic, but romanticism was the mood of the 1960s. The emphasis now was on instinct and impulse rather than reason, joyous release rather than group discipline. Members of the younger generation had not personally experienced the anxieties of a depression or a world war, nor the mood of team spirit which these crises induced. All they knew was that their society was gravely

ill and in need of reform, and that it was engaging in a war in Vietnam which hundreds of thousands regarded as misguided, immoral, even criminal.

The excitement of John Kennedy's brief presidency and his calls for self-sacrifice in the service of the nation had earlier created an uprush of hope among the new young, searching for their cause, but his assassination in 1963 produced a vast collapse of this temper. Soon the quiet generation of college students that had attracted puzzled criticism in the 1950s gave way to the “wild generation” of student radicals and hippies who rebelled against all political and cultural hierarchies. The measured, disciplined mass protests of black Americans in the South that Reverend Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr. had been leading since the mid 1950s exploded in the northern and western states, in 1966, into “Black Power” riots, fire and destruction in the ghettoes, and pitched battles with police and national guardsmen.

Styles of life changed swiftly. The pill, nudie flicks, *Playboy* magazine, and crucial Supreme Court decisions made the United States, long one of the world's most puritanical nations in sexual matters, one of its most liberated. The drug culture mushroomed. Communal living groups of drop-outs who rejected mass culture and offended their neighbors became objects of national alarm. Older people were shocked to see beards suddenly sprouting on millions of young faces, men growing their hair long, girls in men's clothing, and the male American wearing a rainbow of colorful garments not seen on men, perhaps since the Renaissance. Older people reacted angrily against all of this, and especially against the new youth, among whom a predominantly

white, middle class minority flouted traditional standards, glorified self-indulgence, and scorned discipline.

Radical young whites determined to reform their society were drawn in the early 1960s to the black cause, marching and suffering in biracial protests against discrimination in the southern states. In 1964 Mario Savio, having been battered in the “Freedom Summer” campaign in Mississippi, rose at Berkeley to become the figure around whom briefly crystallized the passionate impatience of the new generation with the world their parents had made. Then that anger turned against the elite research university, its impersonality, meritocratic values, and residual paternalism. Since 1960 the Students for a Democratic Society had been condemning American life as dehumanized by bureaucracies, powerful corporations, and big government. The SDS called for black dignity and equality; condemned wars and anticommunism; and demanded that universities be reformed and used as bases for political assaults upon the system. Now, that cry was seized upon nationally by the radical student community, and transformed into “The Movement.”

Tumultuous confrontations at Berkeley and elsewhere enraged the public at large. Ordinary Americans thought of colleges as acting in loco parentis—that is, closely controlling the behavior of their students—and they condemned them now for not sternly disciplining and quieting the protestors. Students, on their side, found the universities easy marks for disruption, for the academic world was liberally oriented and reluctant to be punitive, while at the same time it was physically weak and practically indefensible. Within the faculties of elite institutions, where most of the disruptions occurred, bitter divisions erupted. Many academics were sharply hostile to protesting students

because they used force to get what they wanted, whether overtly or nonviolently, instead of rational argument. For others, simply the sight of students demanding things of professors and their institutions was infuriating.

Most crucial was the fact that student protestors were seeking to take over academic powers that the professors themselves had slowly and at great labor built up over many generations, usually in long struggles with administrators and governing boards. By winning these powers the academic community had secured not only its freedoms and autonomy, but what it believed to be essential safeguards for the unfettered search for truth. Few faculty members would ever be able to accept the charge that their institutions were the corrupted enemies of the people, or that students could achieve intellectual and personal growth without rigorous challenge to higher performance and by disciplined effort under the tutelage of learned faculty.

Other professors, in spirit if not necessarily in age in close alignment with the rebellious generation, shared their view that America was deeply sick, needed massive cleansing—to include its universities—and a chastened withdrawal from a condemned war. Some agreed that the learning process itself required total freedom from what they regarded as the punitive sanctions of grading. Thus in some cases with gingerly but principled courage, in others eagerly and fervently as if in ultimate battle, small groups of faculty gave support to the students' protests. Between these poles of support and hostility scattered the rest of the faculty community, torn in both directions and appalled at the massive disorder, as well as at the unhappy disappearance of the relationship that had formerly existed between the universities and the American people at large.

Difficult at the time, or in hindsight, to understand was the fact that, for all the massive turmoil, college-based activists amounted to but a small minority of the students. Research studies by social psychologists reveal a wide range of cultural styles among those in college. For vocationally oriented students with a specific occupation in mind, as in engineering or business, college is a place of practical training. Such students usually show little interest in being culturally sophisticated or socially and politically active. They are instead concerned with working hard and building traditional lives of accomplishment. “Professionalists” head toward law, medicine, and executive positions in business and government. Though usually from wealthier families, and more culturally adventurous than vocational students, and more likely to get high grades, they too are

usually uncritical of the American system and "stay cool." The "collegiate" student is the classic Joe College who regards studies as a necessary but boring evil, plays the social game of sex, drinking, or drugs, and pursues long, fun-filled weekends. Then there are the "ritualists," who go to college simply because it is the thing to do, and they do not know what else to do with themselves. For these unhappy souls, the collegiate scene holds little interest, either academically or socially, and political activism is irrelevant.

The "academics" are students seriously committed to scholarly achievement who have their eyes on graduate school and careers in higher education, usually in the sciences. Talented and hard-working, they like learning, follow politics only incidentally, and though sympathetic to reform causes are usually

too busy studying to participate. The "intellectuals" are similar people, but their interests, which in the 1960s usually ranged into the humanities and social sciences, are wider than those of the academics. They think of themselves as headed toward some form of public service, normally teaching, but as generalists their objectives are not specific. They are interested in ideas and seriously concerned with getting an education, conceived in the broadest terms. Almost always of a liberal turn of mind, they give warm support to political and social causes, though usually not as leaders.

Then there are those small sub-cultures in the student community, the "leftists" and "hippies." They alarm the public far out of proportion to their numbers, when, as in the 1960s, they become prominent. Constituting in that decade probably no more than two percent of the college population, activists and hippies populated the fevered imaginations of millions of older Americans, who seemed to conceive of college campuses as overrun with them, as well as with wild-eyed radicals on the faculty who supposedly encouraged them daily in their destructive activities. In cocktail parties in Santa Barbara, when the student rebellion was at its height, in the late 1960s and at the opening of the 1970s, local residents were heard to say that they would happily close down the entire University of California at Santa Barbara, just to remove one or two professors whose names inevitably stimulated angry comment.

Leftist students and hippies differed sharply from each other. Leftist activists believed that the system was worth saving (though they were profoundly alienated from it in its existing state), that it could be saved, and that personal involvement in the revolutionary transforming of American life was the highest possible goal. For the most part highly intelligent, often concentrated at such prestige institutions as the University of California and Columbia University that demand high grades for entrance, and springing from affluent, well-educated families, they called themselves the "New Left." They were outraged young people angry at what they felt to be the hypocrisy of the American system, the mistreatment of innocents, and public evil. They operated from the oldest motivation among reformers in the modern centuries: a conviction that the society they lived in was corrupt, and required cleansing.

The hippie, on the other hand, was so culturally alienated from American life that he or she withdrew from it. Almost always white, hippies were also from affluent families and had little sense of the need to succeed at anything at all. Like the activists, who resembled the Puritan reformers of earlier Anglo-American history, the hippies were a familiar phenomenon. As far back as the Adamites in the second century, there have periodically been highly self-conscious groups of people who feel that they have found the road to innocent, pure lives: withdrawal from society and a total rejection of its ways. Hippies, like their predecessors, denied reason and exalted feeling; detested restraints; searched in Oriental mysticism for a means of transcendence, or in drugs of various kinds; and dispensed with the ideas of work, production, and achievement. The senses were to be freely deluged with "experiences," either ecstatic or manic; everything was to be "naturally" done; and laws and principles were to be discarded. They established what they believed would be innocent communes of mutual love and sexual freedom.

UC Santa Barbara, therefore, in the late 1960s and at the beginning of the

1970s was trying to respond to an almost bewilderingly complicated mass of demands, protests, and upheavals. As much as they could, its faculty and administration enacted educational reforms designed to get at what seemed to university faculties across the nation to be the most reasonable and justifiable complaints. At UCSB as at many other institutions, curricula were reorganized and recast to make them more relevant to student interests, and to the country's needs. The last remnants of control over students' private lives was terminated. The power of grading systems was greatly reduced, the rigidity of course requirements was much relaxed (in those disciplines where activists tended to be concentrated, as in the humanities and social sciences), and the total exclusion of students from a voice in educational policy was ended. Like universities elsewhere, UCSB refused, however, to hand over control of educational policy to students, or the hiring and promotion of faculty members. The campus also joined the rest of American higher education in refusing to let universities be converted into bases for radical political action against the surrounding community, as the most passionate of the reformers were demanding. Colleges and universities suffered, therefore, from a mounting assault of “trashings” (random destruction of windows and facilities), disruptions, and bombings, while the war in Vietnam became more violent, dwarfing any disturbances at home. The universities were condemned by radical students for alleged complicity in that conflict, and for fatal involvements in the military-industrial system.

The slogan that such students had shouted in 1964 was Power Now! By 1968 it had become Revolution Now! In that year, the year of the assassinations of Robert Kennedy and Martin Luther King, Jr., the talk of revolution was everywhere. Tactics verged toward terrorism, as The Weathermen and other extremist factions shouted over and over, “tear it down.” At San Francisco State, Columbia, Harvard, Berkeley, Wisconsin, and scores of other institutions, arson and hit-and-run bombing created a steady stream of incidents that often brought education practically to a halt in the years from 1968 to 1970. Around the world the turmoil spread, from universities in Germany and France to those in Japan. The crisis reached a climax on May 4, 1970, when students at Kent State University, demonstrating against the invasion of Cambodia, were fired on by national guardsmen and four students fell dead.

* * *

All of this struck UCSB with great force in the later 1960s. The turmoil built up in 1967-68, produced a series of rocking crises in 1968-69, and created an explosion in 1969-70, when massive riots in Isla Vista and the burning of the local branch of the Bank of America caught national attention. Ronald Reagan became governor in late 1966, and soon after he and his appointees began sitting with the Board of Regents, that body voted the dismissal of Clark Kerr as President of the University. Severe budget cuts soon followed, with the imposition of an “educational fee” not far behind. Charles Hitch, one of Kerr's vice-presidents, was formally elected president in September, 1967.

At UCSB, still an almost wholly white enclave, events seemed destined to proceed in their accustomed ways at the opening of the fall term, 1967-68. A

successful Frosh Camp was held, green beanies and all, and Homecoming saw another parade of elaborate student floats down Santa Barbara's main street. There were 11,776 students on campus, 1502 of them graduate, both categories representing a healthy growth since the previous fall. It was the Centennial Year for the University of California, and associated rituals celebrated themes of grandeur. At UCSB, during 1967-68, the Library's collection rose to 530,000 volumes and its eight-story tower opened in September, 1967. The College of Creative Studies opened its doors, doctorates in Chemical Engineering and Education were established, and over $4.1 million in contrasts and grants were raised by the faculty. The Stadium was ready in May, 1968, and the Faculty Club at year's end, in June.

The latter structure, with its high shed-roof lines and bold internal use of line, space and light, was designed in the Third Bay Area style by Charles Moore of Berkeley and Yale. It was intended to recreate the sense of architectural lightness in mood that Moore perceived in the Men's Faculty Club at Berkeley. However, the building aroused distaste among architecturally conservative faculty members and radical students alike. The former disliked its strangeness, the latter its apparent opulence. Student radicals, with their austere and egalitarian tastes, found the Club corrupt and self-indulgent, regarding with disapproval its great hall, designed in lighthearted emulation of the similar room at Hearst Castle (from which came some of the Club's interior walls, ceilings, and fireplaces); its pool and handball courts; the guest rooms clustered European-village style; its serene setting by the campus lagoon; and its air of faculty exclusiveness.

Peace and stability on campus soon disappeared. Governor Reagan and the Legislature were slashing budgets, the war in Vietnam was escalating, there were draft quotas, anti-war groups were active, and a Student Peace Committee had been formed at UCSB against ROTC, the draft, and on-campus recruitment by war-connected contractors. In October, 1967, came a national anti-draft week, with a teach-in at Berkeley. Eighteen UCSB students went into the city of Santa Barbara to turn in their draft cards, supported by ten professors who made a public statement that the draft was compelling young men to commit illegal and immoral acts. UCSB's students, however, were thought to be politically quieter and less sophisticated than those at metropolitan campuses. When in 1966-67 a caravan of Santa Barbara students had marched on Sacramento to protest budget cuts and the threat of tuition, everyone had remarked with approval how respectful, well-dressed, and well-mannered they were, in contrast with the wild ones at Berkeley.

This situation, however, was now rapidly changing. Metropolitan newspapers, at first not even on sale in the new University Center, became available and were now picked up in growing numbers, and the campus was a rash of posters and activist groups. The Legislative Council became a politically conscious body, beginning to debate world affairs. In late November, 1967, student legislators passed a resolution calling for “immediate and unilateral American de-escalation and gradual withdrawal” from the Vietnam War. At the same time, the Council made its first recognition of the needs of minority students. By 1967-68, there were 78 students in the Educational Opportunity Program, so that non-white faces were finally beginning to be seen, at least in

small numbers, upon the campus, but funds were short. During the previous several years the faculty had raised sums among themselves by telephone campaigns and voluntary contributions, with the spur that the Board of Regents would match such funds five-fold. Federal moneys were available for a similar matching arrangement. In response to the urgings of Dean of Students Lyle Reynolds, who for years had been working hard to reach into minority communities in southern California and bring such students to the campus, the Legislative Council appropriated $3,000 of student funds as a contribution to the EOP, which with matching became $30,000. Henceforth, the minority community on campus would rise to several hundred students.

The war in Vietnam, however, was a more pressing issue at this point. In December, 1967, a group of students startled the campus by sitting-in at the Placement Office, protesting and preventing, by the physical interposition of their bodies, any recruitment of students by Dow Chemical Corporation, a manufacturer of napalm. Student marches made their appearance, with crowds of students winding through the Administration building in support of their fellows. Nine students were afterward subjected to administrative discipline, in the form of official censures and warnings, and Senate members reacted in stern disapproval of the students. In January, 1968, after sharp internal argument, the Santa Barbara Division of the Academic Senate adopted by a sizable margin (in a mail ballot) a resolution deploring the use of force by protestors to intimidate others in the free exercise of their legal rights and options. The tide, however, was not to be swept back in this manner. In February, 1968, a protest march against Dow involving hundreds of students occurred on campus, with a faculty organization, the University Committee on War and Peace, marching in open support with placards held high.

A black student, William James, who would be elected Associated Students president for 1969-70, mounted a Workshop for Racial and Ethnic Understanding in February, 1968. He sought to lead, in day-long sessions, discussions designed to explore the causes behind the massive urban disruptions and ghetto detonations then underway in the country at large. The time for such mutual colloquies, however, in the Martin Luther King tradition of biracial integration and cooperation, was rapidly passing. The Black Action Group quickly took over the meeting, insisting that just talking with whites would accomplish nothing; that the problem was essentially rooted in white guilt, which must be admitted. Within a few days Black History Week was held, under the auspices of another black activist group, Harambee (hah-ram-bay). To its sessions came such national black leaders as James Forman, Ron Karenga, and Harry Edwards to press the theme that the solution would only be found when whites laid aside their complacence and eliminated racism. The Black Panthers were organizing in inner cities, and only months before, at the national Conference on Black Power in Newark, New Jersey, H. Rap Brown had lauded black rioting as “dress rehearsals for revolution,” urging black Americans to “wage guerrilla warfare on the honkey white man.” Over and over, during Black History Week, blacks were urged to work for self-determination, self-respect, self-defense—and to organize.

On April 4, 1968, occurred the first domestic tragedy of this deranged year: The assassination of Martin Luther King, Jr. A nationwide hysteria of rioting

and the shooting down of protesting black citizens now ensued. All classes at UCSB were cancelled for a mass observance of national mourning, black student Ernie Gambrell angrily bringing the addresses to a close with a bitter assault upon white racism. The Santa Barbara Division of the Senate then took the unprecedented step of endorsing without change a student-originated petition to the Board of Regents that urged that body, not then notably friendly to ethnic protestors, to alter the ethnic and income class distribution of the student body, and that of the University's administrative and academic staff, to match that of the state's population. The petition also called for changes in recruitment and admissions policies to bring minorities into the University; for programs to help them meet the academic and financial problems they would face; and for the altering of existing courses and curricula to give “all students. .. a better understanding of the minority and low income people of California and the nation.”

The Senate, indeed, was trying to respond to mounting student demands for a more open and student-centered learning experience. The decision was reached in spring 1968, that the experiment in pass/not pass grading had produced favorable results, despite widespread faculty doubts. All undergraduate courses save those to be taken as part of a major were authorized to be opened to the grading option if departments so decided. A special committee was then formed to promote and reward effective teaching. Then the faculty, paradoxically enough, enacted a new arrangement which allowed plus and minus letter grades to be recorded by the Registrar. Thus the relaxation of the grading system in the pass/not pass option was balanced by increased rigor in the use of letter grades. Twelve boxes were now available in which to place students, where formerly there had been simply the four of A, B, C, and D grades.

The Division, however, was weak, distracted, and confused in these days. Few professors turned out for its meetings, which were held town hall fashion, all faculty members being free to attend and participate. A thirty percent turnout at one of its more important meetings in May, 1968, was satirized by the Chairman of the Division, the oboist Clayton Wilson, as “healthy.” Many meetings died in mid course for lack of a quorum. Santa Barbara's students, the Chairman warned the faculty at the end of the year, wanted to work with the Senate. With so few Senate members in attendance at most meetings, Wilson observed, “we may find that the students out of impatience or lack of respect, choose the more flamboyant avenue of direct confrontation.”

* * *

The spring and summer of 1968 were filled with mad events: Robert Kennedy's assassination, the mini-war that ripped apart the Democratic party in its national convention in Chicago, the howling nightmare of obstructionism that its unhappy nominee, Hubert Humphrey, made his way through thereafter, and the declamations of Spiro Agnew, who called Humphrey “squishy soft” on communism and confidently poured out his contempt upon intellectuals, now massively distrusted by the American people. In November, Richard Nixon was elected President of the United States.

— 40 —

Five hundred more students than ever before appeared on the UCSB campus at fall enrollment, 1968 (12,220), the graduate students continuing their climb of about 300 students a year to reach 1754. The Marine Science Institute was finally approved, after many delays, in April, 1969, and the Library, growing rapidly, would reach 667,000 volumes by December, 1969. Three more doctoral degrees came on line: in Art, Art History, and Religious Studies. Within the College of Letters and Science a new Agency for Experimental Programs, to serve as a kind of academic department for unusual courses of study, was forming. So, too, was the Quantum Institute, given final approval in December, 1969. Ellison Hall, primarily for the social sciences and philosophy as well as for University Extension, opened in January, 1969, thus completing the development of the campus's north side. San Rafael Residence Hall opened in the same month, bringing on-campus student housing to a total of 2600 students and rounding out the complex of buildings around the lagoon. On March 12, 1969, in a happy and elegant ceremony, Music II was opened and its opera hall was named Lotte Lehman Concert Hall. The artist (a longtime Santa Barbara resident) was present for the occasion. Storke Student Publications Building and bell tower was rising, its 61 Holland-cast bells being lifted high and placed in the structure in October, 1968.

In the same month, however, an ethnic uprising transfixed the campus. Twelve black athletes had met with the Chancellor on the 1st of October, 1968, to protest their treatment, and less than a week later the Black Students Union held a noon rally to give its support. The questions raised by these events were given to a faculty and administration committee to explore, but on October 14 the time was up: sixteen black students occupied North Hall, with its Computer Center, giving it the appellation “Malcolm X Hall.” While crowds of students congregated around the building, the occupying students issued communiques protesting institutional racism in the form of admission requirements, courses, curricula, hiring, faculty staffing, and financial aid. They demanded, in consequence, more black participation in the administration of the University. The Chancellor refused to push matters to a crisis, alerted but did not call off-campus police, had the campus police withdraw from the emotionally tense scene, and began negotiations. Ronald Reagan declared that “administrators have no right to negotiate with students,” but agreements settling most issues, and involving probation (closely controlled) for the students, ended the crisis peacefully. The campus was now committed to increased minority enrollment and faculty presence, and to minority studies programs.

In January, 1969, a United Front formed by the Black Students Union, the Students for a Democratic Society, and UMAS (Mexican-American Students Association), demanded that the promised increases in minority enrollment and faculty be speedily put into effect. Now, as later, leadership in the ensuing negotiations came from a calm and reasonable man, Assistant Chancellor David Gardner (who would later become President of the University of Utah), and from Vice Chancellor for Student Affairs Stephen S. Goodspeed, who by his retirement in 1978 would spend almost twenty years at the top levels of UCSB administration. Both made remarkable contributions, sometimes separately, sometimes together. Indeed, the entire administration was plunged into

— 41 —

almost continuous internal dialogue over what to do in these difficult circumstances. There was an inescapable suspicion, impossible fully to dismiss, that the leadership of the protesting groups was not in fact interested in settlements, but in a continuously unsettled campus in which student leaders and their cause, nationally, could

garner high off-campus visibility. On their side, the minority students regarded the administration's refusal instantly to give in to all demands, many of them impossible to grant, as institutional racism. Meanwhile, Gardner and the Chancellor paced the fifth floor of the Administration Building, and the living room at University House, debating possible solutions. Moving ahead in the midst of angry confrontations and mutually exclusive demands from extremists on both sides, on and off campus; remaining calm and taking the reasonable course despite the most violent and abusive provocations and incessant misinterpretations of motives: these were the essential tasks given the Chancellor, his advisers, and the leadership of the campus Academic Senate (which was as yet given a limited part in these matters, though in the pressure of circumstances the Senate's role would grow).

The Santa Barbara County Sheriff's force entered the controversy on February 3, 1969, by making an early morning raid on the Isla Vista apartment of seven Black Students Union leaders, alleging non-payment of rent. Upon a search of the dwelling, they arrested them on various drug-connected charges. More than a thousand UCSB students now gathered before the County offices in Santa Barbara, protesting police violation of due process and selective enforcement of the laws. By this time Isla Vista realtors were publicly complaining that Educational Opportunity Program students were the principal source of defaults in rent payments, an interjection which heightened the growing tension between landowners and student renters.

On the 17th of February, 1969, the United Front broke off its negotiations with the Chancellor, and a body of protesting students marched on the University Center, seizing the building to declare it a New Free University. Again refusing to escalate the confrontation into violence, the Chancellor allowed students to begin holding impromptu classes on a wide variety of current national and cultural issues. They also transformed the building, for a time, into a dormitory for homeless young persons, “street people,” who were now beginning to gather in Isla Vista. Four days later, on the 21st of February, 1969, Chancellor Cheadle warned the Board of Regents, then considering harsher rules on student discipline (which they adopted), that they must respond to “the needs of the times and the tremendous resentment, particularly of our minority groups. ..” There was a “crystallization of disappointments on the part of many of the students that we consider as moderates. .. I just want you to know that when Armageddon comes, I think maybe the administrators are going to be on the sidelines watching the faculty and the students fight it out with the Regents.” (For these words, and his general course during the year, the editors of *La Cumbre*, the student annual, were to dedicate to him their 1968-69 issue, “for offering us hopes for action on existing grievances.”)

The New Free University flourished briefly, but then it slowly died, being gone for lack of student interest by May. However, a mood of suppressed and overt violence had settled upon the scene. On February 28, 1969, Sheriff Peter

Pitchess of Los Angeles had on television urged ”good guys” to go into the University Center and ”clean this thing out.” In early March there had been the first reports of gun fire in Isla Vista, and in early April, Congressmen had called for the FBI to take a hand. They alleged that a course in guerrilla warfare was being taught at the UCen, though no such class was ever held.

Then on the morning of the 11th of April, 1969, a tragic event shocked the community. Dover Sharp, custodian of the Faculty Club, observed a strange object against a wall in the courtyard of the structure, next to the spot where faculty members stood in line at lunchtime. He examined it, and with a tremendous roar it exploded, flinging him violently backward, across the patio. The device had contained bottles of some substance, and his body was riddled with fragments of glass. He crawled to the small wading pool for children nearby, seeking its quenching waters; two days later, he was dead.

For weeks thereafter the broken windows, the stain upon the walls left by the detonation, and the bloody tracks of Dover's painful process across the patio, drew the eyes of faculty and administration members as they

waited to receive their meals. Grieved and confused by the contrast between their present trivial occupation and Dover Sharp's senseless death, they were at the same time shaken by this reminder that there were persons loose in the world who were convinced that they were free to destroy whatever they deemed an affront to the people; who hated the University and its faculty enough to do such things. The whole scene had passed, for most of them, beyond some line of lunacy.

* * *

In the midst of these violent events, wild beyond anyone's experience save in wartime and impossible fully to comprehend, the Santa Barbara Division of the Academic Senate labored to take a meaningful role. Working with Assistant Chancellor Gardner, the Senate's leadership studied and approved the proposals emanating from negotiations with the ethnic minorities to establish new departments, bachelor's degrees, and research centers for Black and Chicano studies. It also successfully urged the establishment of a campus ombudsman to give students a means of mediation and direct access outside the established lines of authority. To encourage innovation in teaching, the Division created a Council for Experimental Courses. The Committee on Effective Teaching, in its first year, tried to get some direct understanding of current student opinion of teaching at UCSB, and worked as well on the elusive, persistently frustrating problem of defining, locating, and rewarding excellence in teaching. Everywhere students were urging that their views of each professor's teaching be taken into account in promotions and merit increases, and the committee urged that some regular system for course evaluation be established for perusal by the Budget Committee when considering individual professors for promotion.

Altogether, however, the faculty had not responded well or actively to the mounting crisis. Clayton Wilson, in his last observation to the Santa Barbara Division of the Senate before completing his term as chairman, made a

forceful appeal on May 22, 1969:

> It is essential that in the immediate future the Division take a more active and **leading** role in helping to solve the problems of this University Community, be they academic or otherwise. Neither the ultraconservative, who is unable to see the cracks in the ivory tower which are widening and lengthening due to society's pressures, nor the ultraliberal, who is so involved with principles that he would push for these principles to the point of destroying that which he seeks to modify, should be the leading force in a more active Academic Senate. Nor can the leading force turn into a middle-of-the-road, fence-sitting, strengthening of the status quo. Student rebellions, such as those occurring on university and college campuses during recent years, are clear evidence that the status quo is not acceptable to an important segment of these campus communities. At UCSB the students have been critical of us, and with good cause. To the students, the Division must appear to be a dead weight against constructive change; certainly, there is little evidence that we are providing them with enlightened leadership towards constructive change. The students have presented the University Community with problems which we also should have foreseen and joined with them to solve. However, in order merely to get our attention, the students believe that they have had to use means of direct confrontation, and that in itself is a severe criticism.
>
> I urge that the leading force of the Division, whatever its label, listen to the students, talk with them, and prove to them that direct confrontation is not necessary in order to bring about change in this University Community. It is late, but not too late.

V. The Crisis: Climax 1969-72

The summer of 1969 passed with President Richard Nixon announcing the ”Vietnamization” of the war in Indochina and beginning slow withdrawals of American troops. In July, astronauts landed on the moon, and as Americans pored over the striking color photographs taken from the lunar vantage point of spaceship earth suspended in the immensities of space, an environmental and ecological awareness finally swept the country. A draft lottery established in November eliminated college deferments, while at the same time it removed uncertainties from college students and released them from the constraints that had kept them on campus. As American involvement in the fighting waned, draft calls were cut back. The women's liberation movement made its entry into national consciousness as the slowly mounting enforcement of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, and the activities of the National Organization for Women and more violently radical groups, caught the country's attention.

For UC Santa Barbara, hopeful that its time of troubles was past—though Chancellor Cheadle was skeptical—the year 1969-70 opened auspiciously. Enrollment was up another thousand, to 13,254, and graduate students numbered more than two thousand for the first time (2037). Multi-storied Biological Sciences II was completed in June, 1969, and as the year moved forward two more structures were completed: the Student Publications Building and bell tower (December, 1969), dedicated in a stately public ceremony honoring 93-year-old Thomas More Storke; and the Physics building (April, 1970), now the Herbert P. Broida Hall of Physics. After this, the Physical Sciences Building, at this point sixteen years old, could finally be converted to the use of just one discipline, Geological Sciences. Also, during 1969, a Biogeology Clean Laboratory (now the Preston Cloud Research Laboratory) was constructed to receive and study rock specimens from the moon. By the end of 1970, the Library's holdings had reached 750,000 volumes.

The Department of Black Studies opened, and that in Chicano Studies

prepared to admit its first students in fall, 1970. The two organized research units related to them, the centers in Black and Chicano Studies, also began operations. Major changes which had been made in admissions procedures allowed the campus to enroll up to four percent of its students, each year, by special action: that is, it could admit students who did not meet the usual criteria but demonstrated in other ways their promise for University studies. By this means, and with new arrangements for student support funding, UCSB admitted 650 students to the Educational Opportunity Program in fall, 1969, primarily from minority groups. Among them were several hundred Chicano students, who had earlier not figured so prominently in such admissions or in campus life.

Abroad, fifteen study centers on four continents were in operation, and during 1970 the faculty brought in $5.3 million in contracts and grants. In response to the nation-wide surge of concern about the environment, which saw a rush of new state and federal legislation, the campus inaugurated a new baccalaureate program in Environmental Studies, the second such in the country. Two new organized research units were also in operation: a Bureau of Educational Research and Development (which had been approved in April, 1968), and an Institute for Behavioral Sciences (July, 1969), bringing together faculty members in speech therapy and psychology. (In November, 1975, they would merge in the Social Process Research Institute.)

It was clear, however, that the state-wide context for University operations had changed. In March, 1968, Vice Chancellor Buchanan had already told the Division that ”Santa Barbara is moving into a new phase; the period of extreme growth in both students and faculty is ending [and] with it will diminish supplemental funds which have been supplied by the Regents and the University administration. .. Plans for new schools on this campus thus will be delayed by at least one year.” They were, in fact, never to be funded. The Chancellor's *Annual Report* for 1969 remarked that the ”rapid escalation of graduate enrollment which typified the past years has abruptly leveled off, braked. .. by a profound change taking place in the outlook and direction of large federal

agencies which support much of the graduate training and research." Since UCSB's strength lay in the core arts and sciences and not in professional schools, which meant that the institution stressed basic rather than applied research, it was in a weak position in the new national situation.

The Reagan administration provided far less money for construction than the Regents requested, and the state construction bond election of 1968 had been turned down by the voters, angered at college students and the universities. The architects and engineers staff on campus was cut in half, for all state construction was halted and little new work remained. Planning for the second married student complex, an exceptionally attractive cluster of buildings, was underway, but the only new start ahead was a multistoried annex to South (now Harry K. Girvetz) Hall. Even more disheartening, and a major blow to campus development for years to come, was the almost capricious decision of the state Public Works Board at the last moment not to release funds, already appropriated in the state's 1969 budget, to build Engineering II. This structure, planned for the chemical, nuclear, and mechanical engineering departments, would not thereafter be built.

* * *

The year 1969-70, however, was to be remembered not for these things, but for its violent explosions. National tension had long been building up over President Nixon's continued war in Vietnam. Student radicalism, indeed, was at a fever pitch over a multitude of causes throughout the year. Bombings and the threat of bombings cleared public and corporation buildings on hundreds of occasions in the nation at large, and on campuses, general disorder and class disruptions were a constant fact of life. The universities were in siege, their faculties confused and alarmed, their administrations almost in shock.

Within the University of California, 1969-70 was the year of the firing of Angela Davis from the UCLA faculty by the Board of Regents for alleged professional misconduct, in connection with her membership in the Communist Party. At UCSB, multiple crises which came one after the other began in the fall of 1969-70 when students circulated petitions protesting a decision not to retain William Allen, an assistant professor in the Anthropology department. At this point all the currents in the campus's recent history converged to produce a head-on collision between the faculty and administration on the one side, and the students on the other: UCSB's fully developed commitment to research and creative activity as a requirement for tenure; the weeding out process underway by which young professors who did not meet this criterion were released to make way for others; the new educational consciousness circulating in the "counter culture," so prominent at UCSB, that scorned traditional values of disciplined academic effort and perceived as a hero any rebel against them; the rising ethnic consciousness; the massive anger of radical students against established authority, and their determination to take control of the University's central processes; and the developing alarm of the faculty, increasingly determined after the events of the spring of 1969 to preserve its autonomy and its freedoms from external dictation.

Many students were convinced that Allen was being dismissed for his radical politics and his permissive academic style. By January 23, 1970, they were able to present petitions carrying what proponents stated were 7776 signatures which demanded a public hearing. Chancellor Cheadle was in Europe and Africa, visiting UC Education Abroad centers, and decisions as to these matters for the crucial next two weeks would be in the hands of Vice Chancellor Buchanan, in close consultation with the chief administrative staff and the Chairman of the Santa Barbara Division of the Academic Senate, biologist James L. Walters. Buchanan rejected the assertion that Allen had been discharged for political beliefs, and took the stand unswervingly that decisions concerning the hiring, promotion, and dismissal of faculty members—the most sensitive of all matters in the life of a university—could and would be arrived at only by the professional peers of the persons in question and by the administration.

On the 29th of January, 1970, a noon rally involving hundreds of students gathered in front of the Administration building, loudspeakers at high volume. Led by those who had circulated the petitions, the Black Student Union, the New University Conference (an organization of faculty members), and the Radical Union (a body of activist students), the gathering demanded not only

— 47 —

an open hearing, but wider student participation in the governing of the University. The doors of the building were sealed off by campus police. Demonstrators responded with the assertion that the doors would not be reopened until the Acting Chancellor agreed to the demands. An estimated two thousand students now encamped before the structure, filling the air hour after hour with a cacophony of sound, a long succession of speakers taking the bull horns. When Associate Dean of Students Robert N. Evans emerged to inform the crowd that their gathering was illegal and that they must immediately clear the area, a confused scuffling broke out. Campus police charged out of the building to ward off what they took to be a concerted attack, and windows were broken.

For twenty-four hours, a reduced blockading student force remained. Proposals were made for a binding but confidential reinvestigation of the Allen case by a combined faculty-student-administration committee, but Buchanan refused. Allen himself spoke to the crowd many times on this and following days in the street language then current (“vulgar, improper, and indecent,” the administration's later charges termed Allen's words). On the morning of the 30th the crowd swelled again, allowing only campus police and chief administrators into the building. When the opening of a pathway through the demonstrators was attempted, the effort was physically prevented.

At this point, having been informed by the campus police that they could no longer maintain access to the Administration building, Buchanan, relying upon the state penal code, asked for off-campus assistance (as he had repeatedly warned demonstrators, earlier, that he would have to do if the existing situation persisted). Some three hundred highway patrolmen, Santa Barbara city officers, and sheriff's deputies arrived, formed in line and made several advances upon the students, billy clubs raised, and secured public entry to the building.

Relative quiet settled on the scene over the weekend. Buchanan, interviewed by the student newspaper *El Gaucho*, was reported to observe, “Frankly, I can't think of any compromise as far as the Allen case is concerned.” When classes took up again on Monday, February 2, 1970, several hundred demonstrators gathered once more in front of police lines and more rallies were held. It was announced that nineteen students, identified during the uproar on Friday, had been arrested for their participation, barred from campus, and suspended from the University pending hearings (based on new regulations, announced by the Regents in February, 1969, which provided for two-week interim suspensions for alleged participants in campus disorders).

Now the tension heightened, for a new demand had entered the controversy: amnesty for those arrested and suspended, and the termination of what was termed double jeopardy proceedings. As attempts at further negotiation failed, a student group accompanied by a young professor “liberated” the Faculty Club, doing some damage to its furnishings. Meanwhile, intense discussions proceeded within the faculty over whether or not to make promotion proceedings public, beginning what, in Chairman Walters' later description, was to be “the most tumultuous [year] in the Senate's history...” There were Sunday meetings, debates late into the night, and seemingly endless tense gatherings in crisis situations which brought together Walters,

— 48 —

his Advisory Committee, and the administration.

Thus, in these turbulent circumstances, the student rebellion at Santa Barbara had reached the most sensitive of all the guarded preserves of the University of California: the confidential review and evaluation of professors for promotion or retention by his or her academic peers, and by responsible administrators. This process had

to take place, most professors believed, without the intervention of any outside person or authority, whether they be, as in former times and other states, legislators, governors, or—now—students.

Promotion procedures for faculty members in the University of California were unusually complex, given the special role and powers of the faculty. At each step, from the original discussions of individual cases in academic departments to final decisions by chancellors (to whom the Regents, at President Clark Kerr's urging, had delegated authority over such matters), administrators had to consider the advice and counsel of faculty members senior to the person being discussed. This meant confidential discussions within departments, often lengthy, sometimes sharply divisive and embittered; the soliciting of off-campus letters of evaluation by authorities in the candidate's field when tenure was involved (i.e., appointment or promotion to the rank of associate professor), or promotion to full professor or an elevated salary step within that rank, these letters being gathered with the promise of confidentiality; the convening of confidential panels of on-campus professors, again senior in rank to the person under review, and from the same and related academic disciplines, to give advice to the Chancellor; the preparation of confidential recommendations, on the basis of this advice, by the Senate's Budget Committee; and recommendations from deans and vice chancellors.

It was this system that the Santa Barbara faculty, on Tuesday, February 3, 1970, convened in South Hall to debate and vote upon. During the heated discussion, hundreds of students gathered outside (where the food-service Arbor is now located), clashing with police and cat-calling in derisive abuse at the parliamentary maneuvers proceeding within the meeting, whose debate was carried over radio and loudspeakers to the listening crowd. (In April, 1970, a sit-in by members of the Radical Union, who demanded that Division meetings be open to the public, caused the adjournment of one meeting, after which Senate members decided by mail ballot to open their meetings hence-forth to students and University employees.) After a harsh and sharply divided debate, the Division adopted, by a 211-87 vote, a long resolution prepared by the Chairman's Advisory Committee in which the Division affirmed “again its support of the principle of confidentiality in personnel appraisals...” Since “open hearings conflict with this principle, the Senate cannot support open hearings in personnel matters.”

On Wednesday, February 4, the protestors' tactics escalated. Allen urged a student strike, and called for a serpentine march through the campus “to reach the people who can't get out of their labs, the Art Building and Chemistry and Physics and Engineering. Let's march around here, the whole crowd marching and yelling.” Some 2000 demonstrators thereafter ranged the campus, disrupting classes. The announced student strike did not materialize, however, and the crisis, at least on campus, slowly eased. Cheadle returned to Santa Barbara on Sunday, and on the 11th of February, 1970, stated his full support of

Buchanan's decisions, including his filing of disciplinary proceedings against Allen for professional misconduct. In the succeeding months protracted and difficult hearings on the administration's charges were held by the Division's Committee on Privilege and Tenure, presided over with patient skill by the committee's chairman, philosopher Harry K. Girvetz, who for more than thirty years had been one of Santa Barbara's most determined and active advocates of academic freedom and civil rights. On June 26, 1970, the committee found Allen guilty as charged, if not in all particulars. He had indeed made unauthorized use of voice amplifiers during a campus rally; his vituperative language had contributed “to the breakdown of that rational communication and mutual respect on which the survival of a university depends”; and he had not only contributed to the disruption of classes, but to a “confrontational situation which was fraught with danger to life and property.” Allen was, in any event, in the last days of his contract with the University, he had been under interim suspension of duties, and soon he was no longer a member of the faculty. [1]

1. For an account of this troubled period, see Robert J. Potter and James J. Sullivan, *The Campus by the Sea Where the Bank Burned Down: A Report on the Disturbances at UCSB and Isla Vista, 1968-70*, Santa Barbara, 1970.

The turmoil, however, had long since passed on to new issues. The eyes of the radical community all over the nation fixed on the trial of seven persons in Chicago, charged with a conspiracy to stir up a riot during the 1968 Democratic Convention in that city. On the 20th of February, 1970, the Regents had imposed the University's first "education fee," and on the 24th the "Santa Barbara 19" appeared in court in Santa Barbara to set their trial date. Meanwhile, for months the Bank of America had been under student criticism, the Associated Students Legislative Council in November, 1969, having condemned it for its alleged links to farm labor-exploiting agribusiness firms. Then on February 25th, William Kunstler, attorney for the Chicago defendants, spoke on campus in turbulent circumstances of restive large crowds and rock throwing at police cars, one of which was set afire. Many additional police had been brought to the area, and near-guerrilla warfare now developed between them and the taunting crowds. The Isla Vista Realty office was vandalized, store windows were broken, and sniping was reported. In a setting of confused violence so dangerous that sheriff's deputies finally withdrew, advising firemen to stay away also, the Bank of America building in Isla Vista was set in flames, after three attempts, and burned to the ground. Governor Reagan flew to Santa Barbara to declare a state of extreme emergency, and rioting continued, forcing police out of Isla Vista. National guard troops were then mobilized and sent in, and order was restored. Meanwhile, more than a hundred people had been arrested for widely varying alleged crimes and misdemeanors.

* * *

There was now enormous national media concentration on UC Santa Barbara, for years thereafter a name to be associated with the burning of a bank. Few

events were to have so lasting an impact upon the campus's history and image. Isla Vista now became mecca to hundreds of members of the counter culture, and its name produced aversion among parents throughout the state, many of whom thereafter were reported to have kept their children from enrolling at UCSB. The campus administration and faculty were both fascinated and appalled by the Isla Vista problem. Chancellor Cheadle strongly pressed on President Hitch the idea of creating a special commission on Isla Vista to explore all aspects of that complex community. In October, 1970, that Commission would urge that the University recognize it as an integral part of the university community, and help make it a livable place, with services, beauty, and crime control. Of its 13,000 residents, 9000 were students, four out of five being young people between the ages of fifteen and twenty-four. The non-student community of street people attracted to Isla Vista could only be estimated at between one and two thousand. At the same time, there was a total lack of community facilities: there were no parks, no governing body, no sidewalks, little street light—and no voice whatever by the students who lived there in the things that affected them.

The Bank of America crisis, and the riots, sharply modified the party campus image that had for so long clung to UCSB by joining to it a reputation for militant radicalism. While many students appear in later years to have gone to other UC campuses to avoid Isla Vista, it was to be clear, also, that others, liberal and reformist in temper, were attracted to Santa Barbara because of these events. Certainly the isolated provincialism of the UCSB student body was gone. A political sophistication and activism that faculty members remembered from their student days on metropolitan campuses was now the temper at Santa Barbara. When a Student Lobby would be later established by University of California students in Sacramento, UCSB students would lead it. Soon a Capitol Hill program would flourish, sending student interns into public action groups and legislative offices not only in Sacramento, but in Washington, D.C. as well. The enactment of the 26th Amendment in 1971, allowing voting by 18-year olds, revealed a student voting pattern at UCSB which placed it to the left of the Berkeley campus, along with students at Stanford, and considerably to the left of the state university campuses.

The Associated Students Legislative Council took the lead, in the spring of 1970, in setting up an elected Isla Vista Community Council to provide some focus and local governance to Isla Vista affairs—helping to create,

as it would turn out, a body which would serve as a constant goad and irritant to the University administration. In effect, the campus, with its crusading daily newspaper, which was renamed *Nexus* in a discarding of the older UCSB image, and its turbulent Legislative Council, arguing bitterly over the disposal of its large funds and various social causes, constituted with Isla Vista a laboratory in democratic politics outside of class and almost entirely under student control. The result was not a particularly comfortable situation for anyone. Democratic politics are volatile and disorderly in the best of circumstances. When they are conducted entirely by young politicians who are being annually replaced by a new crop also in search of self-realization, on a campus becoming multi-ethnic and politically sophisticated, the outcome

can on occasion be a test of everyone's patience. However, the sum result was to make use of the potentiality offered by the campus's isolation and its now-sizable population. UCSB's inward concentration upon itself provided an apprenticeship in community politics which for many of its students afforded an intensive preparation for real life careers in public affairs.

* * *

The year 1969-70, however, had not yet run its embittered course. In an immediate sense, the burning of the bank (widely advertised in the state by the Bank of America) made the state as a whole, and especially the Legislature, angrier at the University of California. The latter body sought for some means of vengeance against the UC faculty, whom it blamed for the disorders and rebelliousness, though most professors, in truth, were appalled at the disruptions and condemned them. A five percent cost-of-living salary increase, being awarded to all state employees, was accordingly withheld from the UC faculty, and funds which supported the internal operations of the Academic Senate were cut in half, severely crippling its work.

UCSB rarely quieted for long after the bank burning. Bomb threats regularly emptied buildings; disorder was endemic. At the end of the year the Division's Committee on Academic Freedom registered its alarm at external threats, such as those contained in new Regents' rules authorizing chancellors to order “interim suspension” of faculty. It also deplored internal, student-originated, encroachments.

> Those who interfere on campus with the exercise by others of freedom of expression and contemplation—by disrupting classes or the peaceful functioning of the Library, by continuous and loud heckling which prevents a speaker from being heard, by intimidation of those who express a different viewpoint—are guilty of a violation of academic freedom. However sincere, the motives of those who impair free expression are beside the point; the road to tyranny is paved with noble purposes.

To this warning the student representatives to the committee, in a revealing statement of the activist mood, made this rejoinder:

> [These] disruptive actions are, in fact, reactions to an unresponsive society and manifested in the University system which daily abridges constitutionally granted freedoms by its very design. When speakers are selectively denied the right to address the campus, when students and professors are selectively harassed for their political beliefs, when an Academic Senate jurisdicts for a campus community of 15,000, yet officially represents only 500, then disruption of the University and thus the society—as John Hancock and 13 states asserted in 1776—is warranted.

One of the events to which these students referred was Chancellor Cheadle's refusal, after wide consultations with President Hitch and other UC chancellors, to allow one of the Chicago 7, “Yippie” leader Jerry Rubin, to fulfill an April 16 speaking date on campus. (He had also been denied an opportunity to speak at UCLA.) Cheadle took this step, pleasing to outside critics of the “lax” University, on the ground that Rubin's appearance, in so volatile a situation, would “seriously threaten the welfare of the University.” On that day, after an inflammatory address by Rubin's wife Nancy, hundreds of persons gathered in front of the temporary

Bank of America building to protest Cheadle's action. By this time, however, moderate students had organized and were on the scene

— 52 —

to prevent violence. When rocks and molotov cocktails were thrown, sheriff's deputies arrived in the late evening hours, roaring down the streets in dump trucks to scatter and chase demonstrators, discharging tear gas and birdshot in all directions. At the same time, the campus radio station, KCSB, was carefully reporting the scene, thus informing students precisely where the deputies and other police were located, so that they could be avoided.

Angered, Sheriff James Webster of Santa Barbara County informed Vice Chancellor Stephen Goodspeed that if the UCSB administration did not close down KCSB within half an hour, he would. This, in turn, faced Goodspeed with a crucial issue of freedom of speech. On the one hand, the sheriff's demands should have been summarily dismissed. On the other, it was clear that if the Board of Regents, who legally possessed the radio station's license, learned that it was interfering with law enforcement, in their existing mood the Regents would certainly take back the license and terminate KCSB's later operations. The station was instructed, therefore, to halt its news broadcasts for a time and it did so, but Goodspeed had to defend himself thereafter against criticism from both students and faculty.

On the following evening, April 17, 1970, in similar circumstances of confused and general disorder, the sheriff's deputies again launched an assault in Isla Vista. There were large crowds of students around the Bank, to protect it from damage, one of them a young man named Kevin Moran. Suddenly, in another tragedy which horrified the campus and surrounding community, he fell dead, victim of a ricocheting bullet. A coroner's jury would later describe his appalling death, which took place apparently at the moment a deputy's weapon was inadvertently discharged, in the unfeeling monotone of official language as an “accident at the hands of another person or persons.” There was no prosecution.

These violent days were still fresh in memory when, on April 30, 1970, President Nixon sent American troops on an invasion of Cambodia. Now erupted the last and most violent of all the campus protest upheavals around the nation, with its climax in the shooting down of students at Kent State University in Ohio. Hundreds of colleges and universities in the nation closed down, normal proceedings being practically impossible. The UCSB administration at the cost of great effort, however, kept the Santa Barbara campus open. On the 5th of May, thousands of students marched on the ROTC building, to be met there by campus police in riot gear and armed. Shortly they were at the Administration building, milling about inside and setting off fire alarms, until the police cleared them out—most of the ground floor windows being shattered, by this time, and “ON STRIKE” prominently painted everywhere. Vice Chancellor Goodspeed read to the assembled crowd, outside the building, a telegram he was sending to President Nixon concerning the emotional turmoil the Cambodia invasion was causing among UCSB's students, during which action he was spat upon by an enraged foreign student. Faculty and senior administrators passed among the students, as did many of the students themselves, calming people and initiating “rap sessions.” When one militant began throwing rocks at more windows, other students leaped upon and pummeled him down.

The Computer Center, rumored widely among students to be linked to

— 53 —

CIA-sponsored war-related research on campus, was as always an immediate target of assault. Bullet-proof glass had been installed, however, and rocks flung at its large window bounced off, causing consternation. Governor Ronald Reagan now closed all California campuses for four days, but as soon as classes took up again on Monday, May 11th, the locked Computer Center was being blockaded by militant students determined to prevent all use of the facility by the arriving staff and faculty. In this case it was a small group of militants barring entry, for moderate students were generally in control of campus meetings and had voted to leave the Computer Center alone. What had in fact happened was that the invasion of Cambodia, patently an

unconstitutional, illegal action by President Nixon, had finally aroused moderate as well as militant students, and the protests were generally in their mode: the ringing of doorbells, distributing leaflets, demonstrating peacefully, “soft strikes” (picketing, not disrupting classes), and telegrams to Senators, Congressmen, and the President. Thus even at the Computer Center, the mood was such that direct discussions with the Dean of the Graduate Division, Robert O. Collins, and others responsible for the Center's administration, dissipated the tension and the small crowd. On the following night a grimmer confrontation took place with a hundred humorless students determined to trade the Center, if they could not get into it to cause damage (some were fruitlessly working to get the pins of locked doors out), for access to the ROTC building. Hours of discussions again ensued between the students and Collins, Dean of Students Lyle Reynolds, and other administrators, in a mood of impasse and, on the students' part, embittered frustration. It was past midnight before the assemblage dispersed to their apartments and dormitory rooms.

Chancellor Cheadle now convened a campus Convocation to hear addresses on the Cambodia crisis. At length the Chancellor himself rose to speak, at which point some thirty to forty militants, painted and attired in bizarre costumes, began to heckle him. He had given them time to speak, the Chancellor burst out, thoroughly aroused, and now he wanted his own moments—at which point the six thousand students in the stadium roared their approval. The heckling nonetheless continued as he spoke. Then militants began moving up and around the platform, in so threatening a fashion that David Gardner and others moved down with them to protect the Chancellor. Once again the Chancellor pleaded for free speech, once again the crowd responded enthusiastically, and suddenly cherry bombs were exploding beneath his chair, making many think that shots were being fired, and transfixing everyone in their places. As Cheadle was later escorted from the stadium, it was plain that a virulent shift in mood against the most radical militants had occurred among the students. The afternoon was spent, on campus, in organized discussion sessions in many locations between students, faculty members, and administrators. In a drastic break with normal operations, the Santa Barbara Division of the Academic Senate authorized students whose studies had been disrupted by campus turmoil to enroll for up to twelve units in a special University Extension course, “The National Crisis: The Problem and Its Solutions,” sections of which were offered in sixteen academic disciplines to some 2500 students.

A pervasive mood of exhaustion and despair settled upon the campus. Most had had their fill of disruptions; there was an almost universal desire for peace and quiet. But the final and most spectacular of the UCSB explosions, this time in Isla Vista and not on campus, was yet to be experienced. On June 3, 1970, news circulated on campus and in Isla Vista that seventeen persons had been indicted by the county grand jury for the burning of the Bank of America building. At least one of these persons, a highly prominent black activist named “Lefty” Bryant, had been in jail the night the building was set afire, a fact widely known, so his indictment, to speak of no others, was clearly erroneous. Two thousand protestors gathered on campus on June 5, signing statements saying that they all took equal responsibility for the bank burning and asking for the charges to be dropped.

When rock throwing and demonstrations began once more in Isla Vista in the bank's vicinity, the Board of Supervisors of the County took a fateful step: they ordered a strict curfew in Isla Vista, effective at 7 p.m. Sheriff's deputies and Highway Patrolmen were moved in to enforce the order. As the days passed, it became ever more difficult permanently to keep so sizable a population of prickly young people cooped up every night, especially when relations between the occupying army and those under restraint were so charged and hostile. Violence, in fact, erupted almost immediately, and police sweeps were periodically sent through the streets. Suddenly, a new element entered the scene: the Special Forces of the Los Angeles County Sheriff's Department. They arrived to join local police in a major effort to impose order through the massive use of force.

These new arrivals were under no local control, they had no local loyalties or ties, and they interpreted the curfew, which referred to loitering near "public places," to mean that everyone in Isla Vista was to remain inside their dwellings, with doors and windows closed. In effect, they were imprisoned after 7 p.m. People were arrested in their yards and on balconies; in scores of instances doors were broken down without warning in "hot pursuit"; property was maliciously destroyed; people were beaten with nightsticks, thrown against walls, dragged by the hair, and sexually molested. More than thirty people who were beaten were not even arrested, in circumstances when hundreds were being so detained. Gas canisters were freely thrown into yards and dwelling places, and arrested persons were subjected to physical abuse, especially in crowded jail circumstances. (The Los Angeles Special Forces, after massive public criticism of their grossly illegal violence on this occasion, were later quietly dissolved, though all official investigations were quashed.)

During all of this disorder, many UCSB students were jailed, and both Assistant Chancellor Gardner and Vice Chancellor Goodspeed nightly visited them, to stay in touch and offer assistance. Then it became apparent that a new crisis was approaching. There was no way for students to take final examinations during the nighttime hours and still be back in their Isla Vista apartments before the 7 p.m. curfew. A meeting was convened between University administrators and the sheriff's forces and those of the Highway Patrol in which, after two hours of discussion, the police agencies finally agreed to allow the University to transport the students back to their homes by bus. On the night of the 10th of June, ten school buses lined up at Robertson Gymnasium,

ready to depart in convoy at 10:15 p.m., and 700 students got on board. With Goodspeed in a leading Highway Patrol automobile, Dean of Men Robert Evans in one following, and a monitor in each bus, all of them equipped with walkie-talkie radios, this extraordinary procession began its slow movement through Isla Vista, stopping at designated corners to let students disembark. Helicopters circled overhead, and burned-out automobiles from the days of violence littered the scene.

By now, almost 300 people had been at various times arrested, and the *Santa Barbara News-Press* was calling for an end to the curfew and to the arresting of innocent persons, the illegal entering of homes, police terrorism, and widespread violations of civil rights. When hundreds of people, including the newly elected Isla Vista Community Council and members of a faculty-clergy observers group, gathered in a massive sit-in protest against such lawlessness in an area by the bank called "Perfect Park" in Isla Vista, the climax was reached. Several hundred people submitted non-violently to arrest. Then, without warning, the crowd was suddenly instructed to disperse and attacked with clouds of gas and flailing nightsticks.

Chancellor Cheadle issued a statement implying that a closing of the campus was imminent. Tension was greatly eased when Vice Chancellor Goodspeed was able to get through to a friend in the Governor's office in Sacramento, and persuade the authorities there to authorize a lifting of the curfew until 11 p.m. in the evening, thus allowing students to return to their apartments after nighttime examinations. On June 12, 1970, the curfew was finally lifted entirely. Judge Joseph Lodge of the Santa Barbara Municipal Court, in a courageous move given surprisingly wide support, dismissed charges against more than 300 people arrested in the Perfect Park sit-in, saying that they had been punished enough. The last major Isla Vista tragedy—"Isla Vista III"—was over.

* * *

UC Santa Barbara, as a community, was in a state of shock for at least the next two years. Important things were achieved, but a grave crisis of morale, intensified by a three-year downward trend in campus enrollment, persisted. There was a sense of drift, of almost querulous confusion. The years of upheaval had left deep wounds. Mutual animosities lingered within the faculty, and many professors harbored a bitter distrust of the local administration, itself sapped in energy and creative force. Too many memories remained for people to be able to work together effectively until many months, indeed years, had passed. New ideas and initiatives could

marshal little common campus effort. There were always the prevailing questions: would the troubles start up again? Was the siege over, or was its dying down only a respite? People withdrew into their private lives and researches after an experience which had chilled the urge to be publicly active or involved in campus affairs.

Through 1971-72 a major activity within the Senate and statewide administration was the drawing up of a faculty code of conduct stating what kinds of things professors could not do without suffering disciplinary measures. This led to continued discussion of issues that kept old controversies fresh in

memory and hostilities alive. A new prickliness within some departments meant that the Senate's Privilege and Tenure Committee was constantly busy, hearing accusations flung at each other by faculty members still simmering over past conflicts.

The national student community quieted down almost by common decision after 1969-70. From the opening of fall term, 1970, the era of disorders was largely, though not entirely, past. American forces were finally withdrawn from Vietnam, the ethnic revolution subsided in tone; and the sense of outrage that had fueled the youth rebellion dissipated. Among students as well as faculty and administration, there was a war-weariness and a recoil inward, personalism replacing the wide social consciousness of the former years. The glut in college graduates that was emerging, and the difficulty that liberal arts graduates had finding jobs after graduation, especially in teaching, induced new worries, a revived seriousness in studies, and a search for majors that were more directly linked to specific careers.

In truth, many of the grievances students had had against higher education were, in significant degree, answered. For undergraduates the system was now more open, flexible, and responsive to individual needs. The demand for a greater student role in university governance had also had its effect, if not to the degree demanded. At Santa Barbara, not only were Division meetings and those of academic departments open to student nonvoting participation, most of the Senate committees, including those concerned with educational policy, contained student representatives (although they were given no role in the Senate's confidential personnel committees).

For both parties, the change hardly fulfilled expectations. Students found that faculty affairs were tedious and undramatic, and before long it was the exceptional student member who remained active in committees. Chairman Walters remarked with some asperity at the end of the academic year 1970-71 that the privileges won seemed not have been much used: only at one special meeting of the Division in that year were more than three students present. Furthermore, opening the door had hardly meant an influx of student revolutionaries. Militants lost interest in regularly scheduled meetings with long, routine agendas. Those who came consistently were, instead, the kind of proto-professional students who would soon be lawyers or academics; that is, orderly and disciplined meeting-goers. From such persons came few revolutionary pronouncements, but rather, thoughtful colleagueship.

Students had demanded most of all that their evaluations of professors be listened to, and this cause, too, was won. In the fall of 1970 the Senate's Committee on Academic Personnel, following directives from the previous year's committee and from President Hitch, began requiring that each recommendation for faculty merit increases or promotions include sound documentation of the students' evaluations of teaching effectiveness. In practice, this meant the general use of evaluation forms passed out to classes, and the reporting of numerical scores on various teaching attributes. One major discovery emerged from this process: professors who taught badly were rare indeed. (On an ascending scale of one to seven, the average faculty member scored between five and six.)

To an extent not formerly true, faculty and administrators began talking

regularly about and reflecting upon teaching performance when particular promotion cases were before them,

though the actual weight of such information in final decisions remained impossible to judge. Many seriously questioned the validity of evaluations which primarily measured performance in class rather than effectiveness in teaching a particular body of knowledge, and some departments refused to use them. Perhaps the most important effects of the new system came not in the promotion process but prior to it. Few faculty members enjoyed the thought of low student evaluations being paraded before their peers. The fact of evaluation itself, therefore, was probably self-implementing, in the sense that it spurred professors to teach well and carefully.

The University moved strongly into Isla Vista even while the disorders were underway. In practice, this meant wide consultations with students, government officials, the sheriff's office, realtors and landowners, and the adult residents whose homes occupied Isla Vista's western section. On October 5th, 1970, the day fall instruction began in 1970, Chancellor Cheadle announced that the "University intends to participate in and to express its views about the entire range of problems concerning Isla Vista residents such as, but not limited to, zoning, variances, densities, traffic, green belts, parks, landscaping, and architectural controls, housing, policing and health." With several hundred thousand dollars in Regents' Opportunity Funds, major undertakings were soon in motion to establish cultural programs, a police Foot Patrol that would be closer to the students and more in touch with actual conditions, and an Isla Vista Community Service Center in the central business area—the "loop"—to serve as a sort of town hall.

At the same time, UCSB's general development continued in more traditional ways, though at a much reduced pace. A Student Health building was completed in 1970 (December); the multistoried South Hall Annex in 1971 (December); and the second group of Married Student Apartments in 1972 (September). Two more organized research units were formed: the Computer Systems Laboratory in February, 1972, and the Institute for Interdisciplinary Applications of Algebra and Combinatorics in July, 1973. Research funds, in contracts and grants, went over $6 million in 1970-71, and the Library was at 890,000 volumes by the end of 1971 and rising. In November, 1971, the Regents finally gave formal approval for a Law School at Santa Barbara—but it would not be funded by the governor, either then or later.

* For an account of this troubled period, see Robert J. Potter and James J. Sullivan, *The Campus by the Sea Where the Bank Burned Down: A Report on the Disturbances at UCSB and Isla Vista, 1968-70*, Santa Barbara, 1970.

VI. Second Wind: 1972-1975 [not available online]

Not available online.

VII. A New Time of Troubles: 1974-1975 [not available online]

Not available online.

VIII. Santa Barbara Campus in the Mid-1970s: An Overview [not available online]

Not available online.

IX. Santa Barbara's Students in the Mid-1970s: A Profile [not available online]

Not available online.

Time of Harvest: The Huttenback Chancellorship Begins 1977-1979 [not available online]

Not available online.

Chronology of Important Events

[Not available online.]

Bibliography

[Not available online.]

Note on the Author

Robert Kelley was born in Santa Barbara, California, in 1925. He received his B.A. from the University of California, Santa Barbara, in 1948 and his M.A. (1949) and Ph.D.(1953) from Stanford University. He served in the Second World War as an Air Force officer, and was recalled for more active duty during the Korean War. Since 1955 he has taught American intellectual and political history at UC Santa Barbara. Originator of the term and concept "public history" to refer to the training and employment of historians in research and writing posts in the community at large, in 1975 he created and has since directed the pioneering Graduate Program in Public Historical Studies at UCSB. Professor Kelley has been a Fellow of the National Endowment for the Humanities (1975-76); a Bicentennial essayist for *The American Historical Review* ; and served as sixth Fulbright/Hays Professor of American History at Moscow University in the USSR in 1979. His textbook, *The Shaping of the American Past*, is in use in several hundred institutions in the United States and abroad, and he has served as a consultant to the Governor's Office and other California agencies on the state's water resource history. He is married to a UCSB alumnus (they entered Santa Barbara together as freshmen students in 1942), Madge Haskin Kelley ('81), a writer and for many years an operating room nurse, and they preside over a large family. Professor Kelley's previous works include *The Cultural Pattern in American Politics: The First Century* (Knopf, New York, 1979); *The Transatlantic Persuasion: The Liberal-Democratic Mind in the Age of Gladstone* (Knopf, New York, 1969); and *Gold vs. Grain: The Hydraulic Mining Controversy in California's Sacramento Valley* (Clark, Glendale, 1959). He is a contributor to many journals, and to *The New York Times*.