88/103
C

Regional Oral History Office
The Bancroft Library

University of California
Berkeley, California

University History Series

Roger W. Heyns

BERKELEY CHANCELLOR, 1965-1971
THE UNIVERSITY IN A TURBULENT SOCIETY

An Interview Conducted by
Harriet Nathan
in 1986

It is recommended that this oral history be cited as follows:

> Roger W. Heyns, "Berkeley Chancellor, 1965-1971; The University In A Turbulent Society," an oral history conducted in 1986 by Harriet Nathan, Regional Oral History Office, The Bancroft Library, University of California at Berkeley, 1987.

Copy No. 1

ROGER W. HEYNS

Photograph © Karsh, Ottawa

Berkeleyan
September 13 - 19, 19

Former Chancellor Heyns Dies

He Was Credited With Holding the Campus Together During the Turbulent '60s

Former Chancellor Roger W. Heyns died on Sept. 9 at age 77. At the time, he was in Greece with his wife, Esther, on a three-week tour that began in the Holy Land.

Retired for two years from the presidency of the William and Flora Hewlett Foundation in Palo Alto, Heyns served as chancellor from 1965 to 1971.

Described as a warm, thoughtful man who stayed calm and fair though many crises, Heyns is widely credited with holding the university together through the height of student dissent and anti-war protest.

"He came like a gift of heaven to leadership of the Berkeley campus," said former UC President Clark Kerr. "He was an ambassador of goodwill when so many others were expressing ill will."

Chancellor Tien, who knew Heyns well, described him as "a very warm human being with a strong dedication to the campus."

"Time after time he went to the center of trouble and did what needed to be done to keep the university open," said Tien.

Tien added that Esther Heyns also "worked hard for the university and made many contributions to this campus."

"Heyns presided as chancellor at Berkeley during some of the most turbulent and difficult times in the campus's history. His courage and even-handedness kept Berkeley open and its academic integrity intact," said current UC President Jack Peltason.

Born in Iowa in 1918, Heyns grew up in Holland, Mich. He attended Calvin College, becoming president of the 500-member student body. Following service in World War II, Heyns completed his graduate work at Michigan, earning a doctorate in 1949.

He joined the Michigan faculty in the early 1950s, specializing in such areas as group dynamics, social conformity and motivation. He is the author of "The Psychology of Personal Adjustment" (1958) and co-author of "An Anatomy for Conformity" (1962).

Heyns was a bright star at Michigan when in 1965, UC regents selected him unanimously to head the Berkeley campus.

Friends and associates of the former chancellor take particular note of his humanity and sense of equity. Upon taking office at Berkeley, Heyns moved into University House, the on-campus residence for chancellors that had been unoccupied for several terms.

According to Earl F. Cheit, vice chancellor at the time, Heyns did that because he thought he "ought to be in the center of things." Finding the house locked upon his arrival, Heyns simply climbed through a window, said Cheit.

"Heyns had clarity, good humor and an utter lack of a sense of self-importance," said Cheit, recalling that he once told his staff that leaders could either get things done or get credit for getting things done, but rarely could they choose to do both.

JANE SCHERR PHOTO

Roger Heyns

Heyns was committed to equality of opportunity. During his tenure, he made great strides in expanding outreach to minority students.

Upon leaving Berkeley in 1971, Heyns returned to teaching for a short period at Michigan before taking on the presidency of the American Council on Education in Washington, D.C. He was with the Hewlett Foundation from 1977 to 1993.

Heyns is survived by his wife and three sons and their families: Michael of Sioux City, Iowa; John of Holland, Mich.; and Daniel of Jackson, Mich. He also leaves his sister, Jacqueline Rudeen of Olympia, Wash., and seven grandchildren.

Funeral services will be held in Holland, Mich. A memorial service will be held in California, but dates have not yet been determined. ■

California Monthly
November 1995

ROGER W. HEYNS
1918 – 1995

"The University," Roger Heyns once observed, "is especially good in teaching humility to its chancellors." He made this discovery during his first hour on the job. It was August 13, 1965, and the regents had just appointed him chancellor (and me his executive vice chancellor). He and I walked from the regents' meeting to University House, his new residence, only to find the doors locked. We found an unlocked window and climbed in. His term of office as chancellor had begun.

Heyns, former Berkeley chancellor during the turbulent 1960s, died September 11 while on vacation in Greece. He was 77. Retired from the presidency of the William and Flora Hewlett Foundation in Palo Alto, Heyns was chancellor until 1971, when he became president of the American Council on Education in Washington, D.C.

Born in Iowa in 1918, Heyns grew up in Holland, Michigan. He graduated from Calvin College in 1940 and earned a master's degree in psychology from the University of Michigan before joining the Air Force in 1942. After World War II, Heyns completed his graduate work at Michigan, earning a doctorate in 1949. He joined the Michigan faculty in the early 1950s, specializing in such areas as group dynamics, social conformity, and motivation. He became Berkeley chancellor in 1965.

A warm, thoughtful man who stayed calm and fair though multiple crises, Heyns is widely credited with holding the campus together through the height of student dissent and antiwar protest at Berkeley.

During his tenure, he made great strides in expanding Cal's outreach to minority students. But one of the most lasting memories of Heyns was his ability to pull people along with him even while he told them unpleasant truths and enforced the rules. On one occasion in 1965, he had to order antiwar signs removed

from campus that violated the rules on size and location. But rather than using police to remove the signs, he called in a group of janitors, the sight of which confused resistance by the protesters.

Roger Heyns was a public man with a strong, private sense of direction. One that I observed most consistently was his unusually clear view about duty to others. Nor was there any ambivalence about the way he approached his work. He faced and completed whatever tasks were at hand.

Because he was above all an academic man, he understood the job of University chancellor as well as its limitations. The power of a chancellor has been described as analogous to the leverage one gains by pushing on a rope. He understood that effective leadership derives from persuasion, example, the willingness to make difficult decisions, and vision. And he strengthened the commitment of everyone involved in his efforts by his clarity of thought, his good humor, and his utter lack of a sense of self-importance.

He is survived by his wife Esther, three sons, and seven grandchildren.

—Earl F. Cheit, dean emeritus of the Haas School of Business

San Francisco Chronicle
September 14, 1995

Roger Heyns — Chancellor in '60s At UC Berkeley

Roger W. Heyns, who served as the chancellor of the University of California at Berkeley during the tumultuous student anti-war demonstrations in the 1960s, died of heart failure Monday while vacationing in Greece. He was 77 and lived in Atherton.

Mr. Heyns had left a cruise ship and was admitted to an intensive care ward in the port city of Volos the night before his death. He had been on a three-week trip that began in the Holy Land.

Mr. Heyns, who retired in 1993 from the presidency of the William and Flora Hewlett Foundation in Palo Alto, served as chancellor from 1965 to 1971. He has often been credited with guiding the campus through perhaps the most fractious period in its history.

"He came like a gift of heaven to leadership of the Berkeley campus," said former university President Clark Kerr. "He was an ambassador of goodwill when so many others were expressing ill will."

Said Chang-Lin Tien, the school's current chancellor: "Time after time he went to the center of trouble and did what needed to be done to keep the university open. We will miss him."

Mr. Heyns was the second retired UC leader to die this week. Former university President Charles Hitch, 85, died Monday at a San Leandro rest home.

Born in Iowa in 1918, Mr. Heyns attended Calvin College where he graduated Phi Beta Kappa. He received a master's degree in psychology from the University of Michigan and then joined the Air Force, where he rose to the rank of captain during World War II.

After the war, he returned to Michigan to pursue his doctorate. He then joined the psychology department faculty, eventually earning the campus' Outstanding Teacher and Distinguished Faculty awards. He became a dean and vice-president for academic affairs at Michigan before receiving the unanimous selection to head the UC Berkeley campus.

The author of two psychology books dealing with group dynamics and social conformity, Mr. Heyns was known for his sense of equity. He moved into University House, the on-campus chancellor's residence that had been unoccupied for more than a decade.

Mr. Heyns once described the university as a "community of learning" in which some people served as masters and others as apprentices. "What brings us all together ought to be an atmosphere conducive both to the Nobel laureate and the incoming freshman."

Mr. Heyns later said that the stormy period produced some unexpected results.

"Those experiences increased sensitivity to students and their wishes and desires," he said in a 1972 interview. "Not just at Berkeley, but elsewhere. It produced some improvements in curriculum. A lot of experimenting is going on now that could be attributed to the criticism made during that period."

When he left Berkeley in 1971, Mr. Heyns returned to teaching for a while before assuming the presidency of the American Council on Education in Washington, D.C. He was with the Hewlett Foundation for 16 years.

Mr. Heyns is survived by his wife, Esther; sons Michael of Sioux City, Iowa, John of Holland, Mich., and Daniel of Jackson, Mich.; a sister, Jacqueline Rudeen; and seven grandchildren.

Funeral services will be in Holland, Mich. A memorial service will be held in California at a future date.

— Kenneth J. Garcia

TABLE OF CONTENTS -- Roger W. Heyns

PREFACE

When President Robert Gordon Sproul proposed that the Regents of the University of California establish a Regional Oral History Office, he was eager to have the office document both the University's history and its impact on the state. The Regents established the office in 1954, "to tape record the memoirs of persons who have contributed significantly to the history of California and the West," thus embracing President Sproul's vision and expanding its scope.

Administratively, the new program at Berkeley was placed within the library, but the budget line was direct to the Office of the President. An Academic Senate committee served as executive. In the more than three decades that followed, the program has grown in scope and personnel, and has taken its place as a division of The Bancroft Library, the University's manuscript and rare books Library. The essential purpose of the office, however, remains as it was in the beginning: to document the movers and shakers of California and the West, and to give special attention to those who have strong and often continuing links to the University of California.

The Regional Oral History Office at Berkeley is the oldest such entity within the University system, and the University History series is the Regional Oral History Office's longest established series of memoirs. That series documents the institutional history of the University. It captures the flavor of incidents, events, personalities, and details that formal records cannot reach. It traces the contributions of graduates and faculty members, officers and staff in the statewide arena, and reveals the ways the University and the community have learned to deal with each other over time.

The University History series provides background in two areas. First is the external setting, the ways the University stimulates, serves, and responds to the community through research, publication, and the education of generalists and specialists. The other is the internal history that binds together University participants from a variety of eras and specialties, and reminds them of interests in common. For faculty, staff, and alumni, the University History memoirs serve as reminders of the work of predecessors, and foster a sense of responsibility toward those who will join the University in years to come. For those who are interviewed, the memoirs present a chance to express perceptions about the University and its role, and to offer one's own legacy of memories to the University itself.

The University History series over the years has enjoyed financial support from a variety of sources. These include alumni groups and individuals, members of particular industries and those involved in specific subject fields, campus departments, administrative units and special groups, as well as grants and private gifts. Some examples follow.

Professor Walton Bean, with the aid of Verne A. Stadtman, Centennial Editor, conducted a number of significant oral history memoirs in cooperation with the University's Centennial History Project (1968). More recently, the Women's Faculty Club supported a series on the club and its members in order to preserve insights into the role of women in the faculty, in research areas, and in administrative fields. Guided by Richard Erickson, the Alumni Association has supported a variety of interviews, including those with Ida Sproul, wife of the President; athletic coaches Clint Evans and Brutus Hamilton; and alumnus Jean Carter Witter.

The California Wine Industry Series reached to the University campus by featuring Professors Maynard A. Amerine and William V. Cruess, among others. Regent Elinor Heller was interviewed in the series on California Women Political Leaders, with support from the National Endowment for the Humanities; her oral history included an extensive discussion of her years with the University through interviews funded by her family's gift to the University.

On campus, the Friends of the East Asiatic Library and the UC Berkeley Foundation supported the memoir of Elizabeth Huff, the Library's founder; the Water Resources Center provided for the interviews of Professors Percy H. McGaughey, Sidney T. Harding, and Wilfred Langelier. Their own academic units and friends joined to contribute for such memoirists as Dean Ewald T. Grether, Business Administration; Professor Garff Wilson, Public Ceremonies; Regents' Secretary Marjorie Woolman; and Dean Morrough P. O'Brien, Engineering.

As the class gift on their 50th Anniversary, the Class of 1931 endowed an oral history series titled "The University of California, Source of Community Leaders." These interviews will reflect President Sproul's vision by encompassing leadership both state- and nationwide, as well as in special fields, and will include memoirists from the University's alumni, faculty members, and administrators. The first oral histories focused on President Sproul himself. Interviews with 34 key individuals dealt with his career from student years in the early 1900s through his term as the University's 11th President, from 1930 to 1958.

More recently, University President David Pierpont Gardner has shown his interest in and support for oral histories, as a result of his own views and in harmony with President Sproul's original intent. The University History memoirs continue to document the life of the University and to link its community more closely--Regents, alumni, faculty, staff members, and students. Through these oral history interviews, the University keeps its own history alive, along with the flavor of irreplaceable personal memories, experiences, and perceptions.

A full list of completed memoirs and those in process in the series is included in this volume.

The Regional Oral History Office is under the administrative supervision of Professor James D. Hart, the Director of The Bancroft Library.

Willa K. Baum
Division Head
Regional Oral History Office

Harriet Nathan
Project Head
University History Series

9 November 1987
Regional Oral History Office
Room 486 The Bancroft Library
University of California
Berkeley, California

INTRODUCTION

Writing an introduction to the oral history of a prominent person is like introducing a distinguished lecturer to his audience. One must draw not on an advanced reading of the text, but on one's knowledge of the speaker. From my knowledge of Roger Heyns, I believe it appropriate to introduce his oral history with two observations: first, a note of caution; and second, a few words about his view of duty and his relationship to the University of California at Berkeley.

First, the caution. Although I am writing this introduction without having read his recollection of events, I can safely warn readers that when Roger Heyns mentions his own role, it will be understated.

"The University," he once observed, "is especially good in teaching humility to its Chancellors." He had made this discovery during his first hour on the job. It was August 13, 1965 and the Regents had just appointed him Chancellor (and me his Executive Vice-Chancellor). He and I walked from the Regents' meeting to his new residence, only to discover that the doors to University House were locked. The Chancellor had been appointed, but no one was there to receive him. We found an unlocked window and climbed in. His term of office as Chancellor had begun.

Shortly after he became Chancellor at Berkeley, he told his staff that leaders could either get things done, or get credit for getting things done, but very rarely could they choose to do both. Even when he had the choice, he preferred the quiet, productive way.

One of his priorities was to initiate the Berkeley Educational Opportunity Program to extend access to more minority students. He was commended by federal officials for this pioneering effort, but he never made much of that fact, nor is it yet well understood in the larger academic community.

He particularly prized, as an object lesson about the hazards of publicity, a news clipping about a man who was arrested under circumstances that had nothing to do with the University at a location far from the campus. He was described as "a would-be Berkeley student." The lesson, the Chancellor told a student convocation in 1966, was that the University community was so much in the news then that its members were becoming typed and assigned roles in the anxiety of others. Which brings me to my second point.

Roger W. Heyns is a public man with a strong, private sense of direction. Much of his work--as Vice-President of the University of Michigan, Chancellor at Berkeley, President of the American Council on Education, and President of the William and Flora Hewlett Foundation--has either been performed in public view or has later become the subject of public discussion and debate, or both. But his is not the do-what-it-takes-to-survive style of public life. His public work has consistently been shaped by principles that guide his private life.

One that I observed most consistently was his unusually clear view about duty to others. He is a religious man. Nothing is routine or self-conscious about the way he gives a prayer of thanks before a meal. Nor is there any ambivalence about the way he approaches his work. He faces and completes whatever tasks are at hand.

When he was first introduced at a press conference as Berkeley's newly appointed Chancellor, he was asked, "Where are you going to live?" "In University House, on campus," he replied. Since the reporter knew that his three predecessors had chosen not to live there, he pursued the matter. "Why?" The answer is quintessential Heyns: "I thought I ought to be there," he said, "in the middle of things." It was in the middle of things that people came to know Roger Heyns, to respect his integrity, to appreciate his wry humor, and to respond to his leadership.

Because he is above all an academic man, he understood the job of University Chancellor as well as its limitations. The power of a Chancellor has been described as analogous to the leverage one gains by pushing on a rope. He understood that effective leadership derives from persuasion, example, the willingness to make difficult decisions, and vision. Roger Heyns' vision of the nature of the University was (and is) as clear as his commitment to duty. He saw the University as a center of learning. He elaborated that model in his speeches. It informed his decisions and was a guide to his colleagues. His focus was always on the process of learning, the bond between the University and the intellect.

It is a model that expects high quality in all campus activities. As Chancellor, he had a strong interest in intercollegiate athletics. But his test for football was the same as the one he applied to any academic endeavor--anything the University undertakes should be performed at a high level, or not at all.

The high turnover rate around the country of University Presidents and Chancellors has increased our awareness of the standards by which their tenure is evaluated. Was the endowment increased? Were important buildings built? Were significant plans made? Were significant academic programs begun? Did faculty and students win prestigious prizes? Was access improved? Were salaries raised? Were good faculty and students attracted to the campus? These are important standards, and Roger Heyns met all of them. Moreover, he did so while leading Berkeley through one of the most difficult times in its history.

But important as these standards are, they are an inadequate basis for understanding the contributions that Roger Heyns made to Berkeley. They do not explain the tears and the emotion of gown and town that I saw expressed in the crowded room when, on November 13, 1970, in his low-key, self-deprecating way, he announced his decision to leave Berkeley.

His initiatives did not weave an unbroken string of successes. But he strengthened the commitment of everyone involved in his efforts by his clarity of thought, his good humor, and his utter lack of a sense of self-importance.

What accounts for the extraordinarily warm response to Roger Heyns? An introducer has no license to offer long explanations, so I will close with a short one: His inner strength, his sense of proportion and his caring touched people in a way that leaders in large organizations rarely can, and almost never do.

Earl F. Cheit

Berkeley, California
November 2, 1987

INTERVIEW HISTORY -- Roger Heyns

Roger Heyns came to the Berkeley campus as Chancellor in 1965 in the brief lull that followed the Free Speech Movement. The storms were not over; they returned even more fiercely in the years that followed. Among the thousands in the University community studying and working on campus, many found the recurring turmoil exciting; others saw it as disorienting, disquieting, and at times frightening. As a graduate student and University staff member during those years, the interviewer recalls the hopes held for Roger Heyns and the intense scrutiny focused on him.

Probably no one expected him to make all the campus troubles go away. Many hoped he could restore some civility and equilibrium, and find ways to combine freedom of discussion with the survival of the institution. Chancellor Heyns has noted that survival was an urgent issue, and although accomplishments did take place, opportunities for needed changes slipped away in the urgencies of keeping classroom doors open.

Roger Heyns was the fifth of Berkeley's Chancellors, in a line that began with Clark Kerr, followed by Glenn Seaborg, Edward Strong, and Martin Meyerson. The first four served 14 years all together, with terms of office ranging from six years to less than one. Chancellor Heyns was to ride the storms for six years, choosing to leave in the comparative calm of 1971. He had come to Berkeley from a successful career at the University of Michigan, where he served with distinction in the faculty and the administration.

Both at Michigan and Berkeley major support came from his wife, Esther, and their sons Mike, John, and Dan. During the Berkeley years Mike was away in the service; John attended Berkeley High School for his senior year; Dan began with Berkeley schools in the ninth grade and continued through Berkeley High School.

From the outset of his term as Chancellor, Roger Heyns spoke clearly and directly. His presence was quiet and firm. His style was to calm the angry, reason with both the reasonable and the unreasonable, and to inspire loyal staff and faculty administrators with team spirit. In time, he began to make friends for himself and for the University, drawing on his own conviction, stamina, and droll sense of humor.

A staff member recalled a series of exhaustive briefings to prepare the Chancellor for virtually any question that might arise in an upcoming meeting. The briefing group watched him walk toward the door, portfolio under his arm. He stopped to glance at each one, and said quietly, "While I'm away, if you get a good offer for the campus, sell."

As one of his tasks, he sought to interpret the University to the community in an atmosphere charged with confusion and often anger. He explained that "if the University does anything at all in the pursuit of knowledge, it often complicates problems....There's a kind of avoidance of oversimplified solutions. If you do your job right, people discover that what looks simple is really very complex." He also tried to explain student ways so that the larger community would be aware that some behavior was not really crucial. "I don't think that that was a critical matter, that they [the students] didn't go to bed [as implied by a proposed all-night teach-in]. As a matter of fact, they usually took the afternoon off, as far as I could tell."

The Chancellorship of Roger Heyns covered a crucial period in the University's life. His post as a prime participant and observer gave him an unequalled chance to view the workings and hitches of the University during a communitywide period of social and political turmoil. In addition, his ability to work, communicate, and survive suggested a personal adventure that paralleled public events. His regard and concern for the University have survived intact.

Over the years, a number of his friends in the Bay Area recognized that the memories and perceptions of Chancellor Heyns should be captured in an oral history memoir in the University History series. By 1985 Arleigh Williams and James W. Dieterich, Jr. were working to raise funds to support the memoir; their success is shown by the list of donors in this volume.

Roger Heyns consented to provide the oral history memoir. The five interview sessions took place during March-June, 1986, each lasting approximately two hours. The setting was the comfortable Menlo Park offices of the William and Flora Hewlett Foundation, where Roger Heyns serves as foundation president. After sojourns at the University of Michigan and the American Council on Education, he appeared happy to be home again in California and in touch with friends whose goodwill has lasted for decades.

In shirtsleeves or professorial sweater, with pipe in hand, Roger Heyns looked and sounded much as he did in the sixties. His easy manner and clarity of thought and speech reflected his years as an academic and university administrator. He considered a list of suggested topics prepared by the interviewer, based on a review of University records, his own speeches, and a series of conferences with faculty and staff members who had served during his administration. He used the outline as a springboard for discussing and analyzing principles and issues; the more detailed narrative of events served primarily as signals for the exploration of basic problems.

When the tape-recorded interviews were completed, they were transcribed, lightly edited and submitted to him with a few additional queries. He reviewed the text, responded to the questions, made some corrections, and approved the transcripts.

Chancellor Heyns assessed the Berkeley campus reactions to such issues as the Vietnam War and the shock of the Cambodia episode, through the Third World Strike and the Peoples Park events in the context of what a University was and should be. He recounted how his administration resisted pressures from the far left and the far right to politicize the University and to close it down. He saw the primary task as "reestablishment of an educational institution with primary dedication to teaching and research." He sought to assure freedom of speech and assembly, but "without having those interfere with the major purposes." He saw the University as a social institution, warning that its freedom is "a gift of....society, and not any kind of divine right. That delegation and that freedom can be lost through the carelessness of the university community itself. If the community chooses to make the university a political instrument, then it makes it fair game for everyone, and that is a serious risk."

Without bitterness, he remembers regrets over lost opportunities to meet student requests promptly. He noted that shared responsibility for responding to campus demands caused delays that sometimes elevated a request to a crisis. For example, when Black students asked for courses related to Black culture, he agreed that the idea was valid. He saw their "need for a psychological home, some evidence that this huge institution recognized their existence and their particular needs and their anxieties." The inability of the campus to respond promptly, he feels, contributed to fueling the Third World Strike a few years later. He and his colleagues had some clear ideas about what needed to be done, but often could not establish ways to make the University more responsive both to the needs of the students and the long-term educational needs of the community.

Roger Heyns spoke with appreciation of what he called the University's elegance as well as its flavor and oddities. He looked over his glasses in referring to Berkeley's cultural pretentions: at one time a spokesman said that symphony orchestras would not be acceptable for the campus; only chamber music would do. In a road-building plan, he found that virtually each bush and tree on campus had a personal defender, and observed with some wonder the winding of Campus Drive around the well-loved trees.

As Chancellor Heyns and the University survived the rigors of the late sixties and early seventies, he went on to leadership posts in education and in philanthropy. His experiences prior to the Berkeley years developed his strength, patience, and understanding. He now draws on those qualities and the campus experience in his presidency of a foundation of nationwide and international significance. For those who watched his grace under pressure at Berkeley, his success in other major endeavors is both expected and deeply gratifying.

Harriet Nathan
Interviewer-Editor

September 1987
Regional Oral History Office
486 The Bancroft Library
University of California, Berkeley

Regional Oral History Office
Room 486 The Bancroft Library

University of California
Berkeley, California 94720

x

BIOGRAPHICAL INFORMATION

(Please print or write clearly)

Your full name Roger W. Heyns

Date of birth January 27, 1918 Place of birth Grand Rapids, Michigan

Father's full name Garrett

Birthplace Allandale, Mich

Occupation Educator & Penologist

Mother's full name Rosa Klooster Heyns

Birthplace Muskegon, Mich

Occupation Housewife

Where did you grow up ? Iowa (Hull), Western Michigan (Holland) Northwestern

Present community Atherton, California

Education Calvin College, Michigan, A. B. 1940

University of Michigan, M. A., 1942, Ph.D., 1949

Occupation(s) College Professor (Psychology)
University Administration
Foundation

Special interests or activities Sports (spectator: baseball, basketball, football); Golf; Symphony Orchestras, Reading, Rough carpentry & construction work

I FAMILY AND EARLY YEARS

[Interview 1: March 6, 1986]##

Nathan: Would you like to talk about your beginnings, to give us a sense of your childhood and how you grew up?

Heyns: In the general category that you have under Roman numeral I, you'd just like me to kind of free associate on that?

Nathan: Yes, your memories, the things that stand out in your mind, the things that seem important to you, that may have influenced you as you grew up.

Heyns: You've done your homework very well as far as the major issues are concerned.

Dutch Heritage and Role of the Church

Heyns: All four of my grandparents were Dutch. Only one, my father's mother, was born in the United States. The other three were born in the Netherlands and came over as part of a general migration in the 1840s, fifties and sixties. I think that Dutch heritage played a role in my life. I've always acknowledged that that's where my roots were. And like a lot of immigrant communities in those days, Grand Rapids (while not a Dutch community exclusively) had a very large Dutch element in it.

##This symbol indicates that a tape or a segment of a tape has begun or ended. For a guide to the tapes see pages 174, 175.

Heyns: We moved soon after my birth. My parents moved to northwestern Iowa--Hull, Iowa, about 60 miles from Sioux City, and it too was heavily dominated by Dutch, all of whom or most of whom belonged to one branch or another of the Reformed Church, either the Reformed Church of America or the church called the Christian Reformed Church, which I grew up in. My grandfather was a professor of the seminary of that church, my grandfather Heyns. My parents went to church regularly and the church was an important part of the social as well as the religious life of the community.

So there was a strong Dutch ambience, very much influenced by us being Dutch and by the church. It is interesting that when I was a young, very small child, in the morning the sermon was in Dutch; the evening sermon was not. There was not a lot of emphasis on the acquisition of Dutch. They were all taking pride in the fact that their children didn't know any Dutch anymore and that was regarded as a sign of Americanization. So this society was not oriented toward perpetuating its origins, but there nevertheless was that overall fact of its being an immigrant community.

Christian Schools

Nathan: Were most of the people, most of the children you associated with, from that same community?

Heyns: Yes. We attended schools called Christian schools that were not run by the church but run by societies of church members. There was a public school also in this town of Hull--but the Christian school, which I attended, was really run by a society of church members. I think we always made it a point to mention that these were not parochial schools, they were private schools.

Farming Community

Heyns: That little town of Hull was just a shopping community for the farmers in the area. Some of my earliest memories are with respect to agriculture and the farms, going to the farm homes of schoolmates, and spending summers on farms of, usually, the girls who worked for their room and board in my home. My father was a principal at such a high school, and we always had one or two girls working for their room and board in our home. I used to accompany one or another of them

Heyns: every summer to a farm in Iowa or South Dakota, and some of my happiest, I think, lingering memories are of the agricultural communities.

It was a long time before I got over my hatred for bankers, because this would be in the twenties, and the Depression hit the farm community long before it hit the industrial community. I remember going to auctions, foreclosure auctions, selling the farms and implements and so on. That was always due to the terrible bankers, and even now I'm much more sympathetic to the farmers than most people are. It goes back to those early days. It's terrible to be at an auction with your friends and have them have to sell everything and move somewhere else. It was always a traumatic experience.

So I lived in a small Iowa town from the time I was two until we moved to Michigan in 1928 or so. That was another small town, Midwestern. That's how I started.

Father's Education and Interests

Heyns: My father, meanwhile, had gotten his master's degree from the University of Michigan somewhere around 1913, 1914, and really spent that whole period from that time on as a school principal in Royal Oak, Michigan, and a little town in southern Illinois called Blandinsville, and then moved to Hull, this town I just got through describing, a town of about a thousand.

In 1927 he got a job in this same type of Christian school system in Holland, Michigan, where they had not only a high school but a grade school and junior high. That's where a number of this Dutch migration I referred to earlier landed--in Patterson, New Jersey, Western Michigan, Eastern Wisconsin, Iowa, and Kansas. Some in that same group even migrated to Bellflower in California, Redlands, and up to Washington. Ripon, California, had quite a large Dutch migration from that same Dutch element. Indeed, in Ripon, California, the churches are on street corners, the First Christian Reformed churches here, and the Second Christian Reformed churches in the next block, just as in Sioux Center, Iowa.

Holland, of course, compared to Hull, was a metropolis; it had perhaps 20,000 people. That's where I developed my great affection for Lake Michigan, the lake itself. It became and still is a very important part of our lives. We have a cottage on Lake Michigan, which I guess was an ambition of mine when I was just a kid. We used to go to the cottages of friends.

Heyns: Because this was a pretty large school system, my father as superintendent was an important figure in the town. He was really a remarkable person. I started to say the he went from about 1915 to 1927, I think, studying part-time for his doctorate, which he finally got in Medieval History from the University of Michigan in about 1927. This was done by attending summer school, except for one time we lived for one semester in Ann Arbor.

Nathan: What drove him? Why did he want to do this?

Heyns. I think he was really a scholar. He didn't turn out to be that, because of the Depression and getting his degree at a time when there weren't any jobs available, but he really loved graduate work, loved libraries. Even when I was later at the University of Michigan, when he came to visit he would disappear and turn up in the library at the university, where he still had friends and acquaintances, librarians who would remember him. He had really a very scholarly temperament. I think at another time he might have been a university professor. He wrote, I understand, a very good thesis on the French, the early development of democracy in France--the Estates General. I think it was the Estates General of 1784, or something like that.

He taught one summer up at Northern Michigan College in Marquette, but he didn't get a teaching job in a university. I don't recall ever that he hankered for one, because his life got occupied with other things, but left to his own devices in more propitious times, I think that's where he would have ended up. He ran for Congress on the Democratic ticket some time in 1933-34, something like that.

Nathan: Were there many Democrats in the area?

Heyns: No, almost none. [laughing] This was an act almost of heresy. I think he was one of the few Democrats in the whole town of Holland. He was highly respected. People liked him and respected him very much. He was a very impressive, person, although not ostentatious. He was a very modest man, but they couldn't understand anybody like that. There was an old joke that went around, of the Dutchmen who came to Michigan. It was said that the first two words they learned were "Republican" and "Widdicomb." Widdicomb was a furniture manufacturer. They worked in the furniture factory and voted Republican. No, this was quite a departure for him to have done that.

He was appointed warden, I think, about 1935-1936, maybe even later.

Frank Murphy was the Governor of Michigan at the time, and he later went to the Philippines as governor general. Then he later went on to be a Supreme Court Justice. Well, when he became governor

Heyns: somewhere around that time, he decided that he wanted to modify the penal system in Michigan, and he put educators in charge of several of those institutions. He made my father warden of a reformatory for young first offenders.

So my father left the school business and became a prison warden and engaged in lots of innovations in that prison. He set up a vocational school, an academic school and set up the system that nobody left the prison until they had a job in their own community--lots of things that people are now inventing. He was really a very inventive and highly respected and admired person.

He made a career, then, in corrections. He became head of the corrections department in Michigan and then later went to the State of Washington to be head of the Department of Institutions, which included mental hospitals as well as prisons. He was 65 or so years of age at the time and did that for another 10 years and developed a marvelous reputation there. The people up there still talk about him now. He died while I was at Berkeley, '68 I think it was. He was a very important person in my life. We got along very well. I could give you this whole oral history about him. He was truly a Renaissance men; he loved art and music, history, and was curious about everything, constantly learning.

Mother and Sister

Heyns: My mother was a remarkable lady, as well. She never got beyond high school herself, although she was very bright and very ambitious--very ambitious for him and very ambitious for everybody else that came within her purview. As a matter of fact, she was not only ambitious, she was quite opinionated and bossy about that. She was a very pretty, attractive woman. She had health problems most of her life. I still am not sure whether those were real or imagined, but they worked for her pretty successfully. And she was a good mother. I have a sister, six years younger than I, who now lives in Olympia, Washington. That's a big age difference, but we always were close--it was a happy family, a happy family life.

We were very poor for, oh, five or six years during the Depression, because these schools that I talked about were supported by the people, and these were never upper class people. They were factory workers. I think the richest man that I knew in the thirties, the richest man in the whole town, made $10 thousand a year--and he was regarded as very rich. He had a Cadillac, even.

Heyns: So these were poor people, and they were the source of support. I remember my father talking about this at the table--that the man who was responsible for collecting the monthly payments for the school had gone around and had gotten $120, and my father was going to now divide that $120 among 30 teachers. So a teacher went home with $5 that week, or whatever.

That was the time when I became acutely aware of economic deprivation, although I don't remember going to bed hungry or anything like that. But it's made me resonate to the unemployment question, for example. My memories associated with that are very vivid and they go back to this time. Unemployment is one of the worst things that can happen to a family and to a man. At that time men were the principal wage earners.

Jobs for a Boy

Nathan: Did you as a little boy try to get a job?

Heyns: Oh yes. Kids in this kind of community were expected to work as soon as they had the strength to do it. I mentioned these summer experiences on the farm. I was given assignments; I collected the eggs or helped to milk or weeded the garden, or carried the lunch out to the men in the field. There was always something appropriate for your age. Kids always worked.

I think I had my first pay, where I actually want to the neighbor and got a job, with a man who owned a hatchery and there were little odd jobs that I could do, like putting eggs on trays before they went into the incubator. I worked on Friday nights and Saturdays. I guess I was 11. I worked after school and weekends and from then on, I guess, the rest of my life. I worked in a bookstore, sweeping the floor and handing out the newspapers to the kids. The newspapers from Chicago and Grand Rapids were collected by this bookstore and then I would hand them out to the other fellows on the routes. They'd collect their newspapers and then go out on the route. That was one of my favorite, important responsibilities.

Well, gosh, I could go on and on, but I think the small town experience, the Depression experience were important to me.

Grade School, High School, and an Intellectual Tradition

Nathan: Yes, I see. What would you say about the quality of your education as you judge it now?

Heyns: Oh, I think it was very good. Those were good schools. They were accredited. My father was very serious about having them be accredited by whatever agency was appropriate. In Holland it was the North Central Association. He was very proud when they were accredited or maintained their accreditation. Although this was a private school, the supporters of the school did not believe these schools should be established at the expense of public schools. And so the Dutch who sent their kids to the Christian schools always voted for the bond issues for the public schools, for example. It was not an escape from the public school. It didn't represent some of the hostility of people who are now associated with private education in the South. It didn't have that flavor at all, and my father often used to go out and speak on behalf of bond issues for the public school. In other words, this was a privilege to have your own school, but it did not eliminate the responsiblity for public education in the society on the whole. What are you asking again?

Nathan: About the quality of the education, including high school education.

Heyns: It was just excellent. Matter of fact, I don't remember exactly, but let's say that in the high school, which never had more than 200 students, there were maybe eight teachers. They were all college graduates; I think all of them with their master's degrees. I would say out of the eight, six were really teaching as an interim between college and graduate school. One became one of my best friends when we were later colleagues at the University of Michigan, he in the German department and I in psychology. These teachers were kind of in between in their careers, but it shows you the caliber of the people.

Nathan: It must have been very stimulating.

Heyns: Right. They were very, very good and many of them ended up teaching at colleges. One became a physician, and so on. I think it was just a marvelous high school experience, and the grade school was very good, too, and they still are. Lots of us went on to college. Proportionately, I guess I've got to modify that; there were from every class some kids going on into Calvin College, which was the main place they went to.

Nathan: Was that also affiliated with--

Heyns: --with the Christian Reformed Church. Calvin is really a church school, not a private school. I mean, the church is actually the governing agency.

So there was an intellectual tradition. I have to go back. I went to my fiftieth high school class reunion last year, and I think probably there were just two of us who got doctorates in that class and maybe one or two others graduated from college. But that was a real Depression class, you know. A lot of them would have gone on under anything like the GI Bill, had it been in existence, or other real support. So I think my class's experience was kind of an anomaly and that probably the college-going habits are stronger now than they have been for quite a while. But it was a very, very good school and I think that a lot of my interests, like interests in the theatre, in literature, in history, all those go back to those days. I had very good teachers.

Nathan: Were there lots of books and newspapers around your home?

Heyns: Oh, yes. My father loved books and they were always around. My mother was an avid reader, did join the Book of the Month Club very early, when it was the principal source of books.

Nathan: Was there talk about politics?

Heyns: Oh, yes. Oh, yes. Lots of talk about politics. As I said, you know, my father was one of the few Democrats, but that didn't mean that they were engaged in conversations exclusively on political issues. My father was always very much interested in the social and economic affairs.

II COLLEGE YEARS, STUDENT AND TEACHER

Nathan: I'm interested in how you chose clinical psychology.

Heyns: Oh, boy. I wish I could give you a nice, lucid answer to that. The plain fact is that the model of being very clear about your goals early in life and going after them persistently is a model that doesn't apply to me at all. Calvin was incidentally a very good school. Hope College was the school for the Reformed Church and I went there my freshman year. That's probably a significant event I ought to talk about.

Applying to Ivy League Schools

Heyns: Right after I graduated from high school, I applied to several Ivy League schools. And I'm sure that was my mother's perspective on my abilities. She thought I was smart enough to go on to a major university and I had been, I think second in my class in rank, what they called the salutatorian, you know. Remember that? And I'd been on the debating team and the basketball team, so I might look like an all around person to the Ivys. We sent applications to Princeton and Yale and Harvard, and I was accepted by a couple of them. I remember my mother writing a letter. I can't recall it now and I don't think it's in existence, but she wrote a letter in addition to the essays that they asked for and so on, that I had to write.

Interruption by Illness, and Starting College

Heyns: But I got polio then, or rather it was alleged to be polio. I spent the next year and a half in bed most of the time--six months in bed totally--and then up an hour a day and two hours a day, then three hours a day and finally all day. That first year that I was able to go back, which was a year after my graduation, I was up for two hours a day and I went to class at Hope College, took courses the first two hours a day for that whole first year. See, Hope was in Holland and that was cheap and close by and I could do it on a two-hour trip.

When my parent moved to Ionia, Michigan, when my father got the prison job, I went to Calvin, and I was interested in sociology and psychology largely because the psychology teacher was a superb teacher.

University of Michigan, and Opportunities

Heyns: I got a scholarship after my senior year to the University of Michigan.

##

Heyns: Well, the application had to state what it was I was going to do graduate work in, and I put down sociology. It was the area that I had done the most work in. Calvin didn't have that many psychology courses and so I think I had more in sociology. I put that down. These scholarships were by the University of Michigan and they were called Rackham Scholarships, and they were really quite important.

When I got to Ann Arbor, I went around and talked to people in the various departments and I ended up by enrolling exclusively in psychology courses. I didn't know a soul in the department, and I remember the assistant dean of the graduate school called me in around November or so and asked me how come if I'd been admitted in sociology I wasn't taking any courses in it. I didn't have a terribly good explanation, but things were kind of relaxed in those days and I just said I was interested. That was all right with him and nothing happened to my scholarship.

I don't think the sociology department knew I existed, in any case. So I took psychology courses and I did very well in them. I took a course in Race and Individual Differences. The man who taught

Heyns: that course was the head of the clinical psychology program and he offered me an assistantship. After the first semester I'd done a good job in his course and he offered me an assistantship in a psychological clinic. So I switched. They had a master's degree program--two year master's--in clinical psychology and so I said, "Okay, I'll do that." And I did, for two years; I was in that clinical psych program and finished it, and then I went into the service. I think I had a teaching fellowship my second year at Michigan in that program--the second year of my first two years.

When I came back there was a whole different crew there. The same professor, Dr. Charles Griffits, who was very kind to me and very helpful those first two years, would have liked to have had me back in clinical psychology, but I had become interested in other things in the meantime and was offered a teaching fellowship and got into the social psychology program. All of this sounds very, very casual, and in a way it was. I just kind of went where the opportunities were--terribly pragmatic and not all that impressive from the standpoint of intellectual drive.

Wartime Service and Psychological Research

Heyns: During the war I was in a unit called the Psychological Research Unit, which was involved in the selection of air crews. We gave tests to people who wanted to become pilots, navigators, and bombardiers in the air force. Part of the allocation to these three programs of navigation, pilot, and bombardier was based on tests that these outfits that I was in, administered. I was in Miami and San Antonio and then in San Francisco. I think to put a little bit of an intellectual face on it, I became less and less interested in testing measurements as time went on, and by this time found more intellectual excitement in the area of social psychology. The war experience probably had something to do with it.

Nathan: Did you feel that the tests were effective? Did they do what they were supposed to do?

Heyns: They did, yes. They were not fine tuned, but there's just no question but what that program was very effective. You just had to be moderately better than chance to save a lot of money and to save a lot of lives. It was, I think, a very successful program. I don't have the data at hand, but there's just no question but what we were useful.

Nathan: So then you went back to Michigan after the army?

Heyns: Yes, right, and finished my doctorate in social psychology. The war experience was useful and certainly played a role in my life. I enlisted and then after about a year went on to OCS [Officers' Candidate School], which was a rigorous experience and one you emerged from with a great deal of pride, at least most of us did. I had some leadership responsibilities at that time, and that was all useful. I think that the opportunities the service gave me were really very useful. I made lots of friends.

Nathan: Did you find that you had--I don't want to put words in your mouth--a flair for getting along with groups of people? Is that part of the experience?

Heyns: Well, I certainly have never had trouble in interpersonal relations. In these psychological units both the enlisted and officer personnel were graduate students and professors, and so it had a kind of an academic flavor to it. Intellectual life was really quite vigorous. They were all going to go on, and many of them did, to careers in psychology. It was an interesting bunch of people. I think I appreciated the discipline. Of course, we really had the sense that what we were doing--and I'm sure it wasn't unique--for the war was important.

I don't have any idea of percentage, but certainly a significant percentage of them were Jewish. I don't remember being as aware as we probably should have been as to what was happening to the Jews in Germany, but we were keenly aware of Hitler's attitudes toward them. So the war seemed like a good war, there's no question about that, and I had a sense of accomplishment at being in it. I tried hard to get into it, as a lot of us did. It's really amazing the differences between World War II and subsequent events like Korea and Vietnam. All of us who went through OCS [Officers' Candidate School] tried to get into combat units, the Strategic Air Command, or something like that. There was no heroism involved; it was just an expectation.

Nathan: Then after the war you got your Ph.D. I wondered, does clinical psychology imply practice?

Heyns: The master's degree was in clinical, and that did involve working with patients, yes. I never practiced therapy or counselling, but I did do it under supervision.

Nathan: I wondered whether your work in, I gather, group dynamics, social motives, and group observation methods--did that inform your work in Berkeley? Was there any carryover?

Heyns: Oh, that's a hard one.

Graduate School

Heyns: At the time at which I went back to graduate school there were a number of very prominent people. Kurt Lewin and his associates really had generated a great deal of interest in group dynamics. They came to Michigan--Kurt Lewin didn't but his students did--and that was really a very exciting, interesting time. I got very much interested in group processes and what little I have in the way of scholarly bibliography came out of that interest in groups and group behavior. I was in a project to study problem solving and decision making in groups, and that was important.

I did learn a good deal about conducting meetings, observing what was going on in meetings, and the observational system that is mentioned in the bibliography really came out of my thesis, which was an attempt to describe what was going on in terms of the categories that were useful in describing the problem-solving process itself.* I don't mean to say at Berkeley I sat down there and used that system. I can assure you I didn't, but familiarity and ease with groups and group discussions, group decision-making; I'm sure that had a bearing on how I conducted myself.

Illness, Radio, and Recuperation

Nathan: Could I go back for another question? If this interests you, fine; if not, that's fine, too. I thought of you a year or more in bed, not being able to go to college, and probably with a certain amount of uncertainty. Did that make any change in your life or your interests?

Heyns: Oh, yes, I'm sure it did. I turned out, I should probably add, that on the basis of subsequent conversations with physicians, I think what I had was Guillain-Barré disease. Joseph Heller has recently written a book about this disease. You know, the man who wrote Catch 22. I understand that Norton Simon, the former Regent of the University of California, now is suffering from Guillain-Barré disease. I think that's what I had, rather than polio.

---

*E.g., R.W. Heyns and R. Lippitt, "Systematic Observational Techniques," Chapter 10, in G. Lindsey, ed., Handbook of Social Psychology (Reading, Maine: Addison-Wesley, 1954).

Heyns: It was the kind of disease that caused muscular weakness in every part of my body, except my arms. Strength just gradually came back over a long period of time. I'd been an athlete, played on the state championship basketball team, and to be incapacitated after you'd--I wasn't a great basketball player but I was good enough to play on those teams, anyway--oh, that was tough to adjust to the fact. It took years before I came back, and as matter of fact I don't think I ever came back in some sports, although I don't have any residual paralysis or anything like that.

I have thought that what I learned out of that was patience. I just became much more patient than I might have been otherwise, because you just can't do things, that's all, and you have to learn to get along with that fact. There are lots of little side effects. One of them is I became an expert at that time on all the soap operas on radio. "Vic and Sade" and "One Man's Family," there wasn't any of them that I didn't follow. I should also add at this time that I couldn't read. I had iritis and at the same time they said I had had encephalitis, and the doctor said I shouldn't read. I have no idea whether that was a sound prescription. But anyway, I was stuck with the radio. It was my sole source of entertainment aside from visiting.

I was a nut about what the radio provided at that time, including dance bands. I am almost unbeatable in Trivial Pursuit now on any questions having to do with jazz between 1935 and 1940. What I used to do was to turn on the dance band broadcasts as they started in the east, like Frank Daily's Meadowbrook in New Jersey, and then go to Chicago and then go to the western places, like the Coconut Grove, and listen. And the Fairmont Hotel. That would be one of the last broadcasts, with Rex Morgan, and there were some other names out here that were associated with playing at the Fairmont. I knew all those dance bands. Anson Weeks, for example, was out here. There was a band leader associated with Stanford, in fact, Griff Williams. Those are names that I remember [laughter].

Nathan: [laughter] That's wonderful.

Heyns: That all goes back to that marvelous educational period I've talked about.

Nathan: You were partly a Californian already and you didn't know it.

Heyns: Right. Well, those are the only consequences of that, except I guess I got a kind of an awareness of human frailty.

Nathan: You had a head of steam about wanting to get out and learn.

Heyns: I certainly was eager to do that, but that couldn't go fast, because even two years later I was lying down in the afternoon. The word was that I had to avoid getting tired. That was the signal, as soon as I started getting tired. If I got overtired I'd have some kind of relapse. So I had to kind of pace myself, with that terror in my heart that if I got tired I might relapse. I don't know if that was really true, but it did kind of slow me up. It meant when I got up I didn't plunge right into life again, but got into it more gradually than otherwise I would have.

Nathan: Somewhere in here, 1941, you found your wife and got married?

Meeting Esther, Marriage, and a Family

Heyns: That right. I think I had already spent a year at Calvin when Esther came. She had gone to Wheaton College in Illinois. Actually, I had met her earlier. One of her boyfriends, of which she had many, was a friend of mine in Grand Rapids, and he one time took her to see me when I was still in bed. That was when I met her first. But, heck, she came with another guy. I was impressed with her, but we didn't meet again until several years later, at Calvin, and then we hit it off very well and went together, as they said in those days.

I'm afraid I had a terrible impact on her career. She went into nurse's training the year I went to Ann Arbor. Then the war came on and it looked very much like we were going to be in the service sooner or later. We both decided that it was inevitable and that we should get married, and we did. It was a year later that I went into the service. She came to Ann Arbor and she got a job, first with the hospital there and then later in the registrar's office, and we had a wonderful year before I went into the service.

The terrible effect on her career is that she should have stayed in nurse's training, but in those days they didn't allow a married woman, as you probably know, to complete nurse's training and be married at the same time. Why that was true was beyond me, I recall now, but that was the rule. She did get a year's training and it's been useful to her, although I'm sorry, and I think she is too, that she never finished that. I think she should have gone to medical school after I went into the service, but we had a baby instead.

Michael was born in '43. It was possible for Esther and me to be together most of the time I was in the service, and we lived together in San Antonio. Mike was born in Miami Beach and came to

Heyns: California with us. The other two were born after I had gone back to graduate school. I think I was already an assistant professor when Dan was born. Mike was already in the service when I went to Berkeley. He went to the University of Indiana and had gone into the service, and was in Vietnam part of the time that I was at Berkeley. He was a lieutenant in the Quartermaster Corps.

John was a senior in high school when we got to Berkeley. He spent his senior year at Berkeley High. Danny was in junior high when we got here. It was a tough time to ask John to leave his senior class in Ann Arbor. He like Ann Arbor; Ann Arbor is a wonderful place to live. We were all very happy there. We lived across the street from the park and the boys had lots and lots of friends. It was a tough uprooting for them, although they didn't put up any fight about it. They didn't resist it.

Of course, Dan was here all the way through high school. John, after completing Berkeley High, went to the University of Colorado for a year, and then went to the University of Michigan.

Impact of the Berkeley Years

Heyns: Dan, who was a good athlete and played on the Berkeley High football team, went to the University of Michigan, and his first year was a member of the freshman squad there. I think had he gone to a smaller school he'd probably have been a football player, but he just didn't think he was good enough to make the varsity and dropped out of it.

Let me just speak about that. I'm proud of all three of these guys. But I think it was tough, for Danny particularly. Berkeley High School got very much caught up with the political life on the campus. Lots of the human recruits came from the high school, and since much of what I did was controversial to one group or another, Dan caught a lot of that. He would get criticized by his classmates and in some cases his teachers, for decisions that I had made. I felt very sorry for him. He never complained about it, but we did learn about it, often from his friends, who would tell us about it. So I think Dan had a tough time with that.

I think it was very clear that I just didn't have time to spend much time with them. We had a rule that I didn't take any University obligations on Sunday and so we did have Sunday together, but that isn't an awful lot of time, and I felt often that I neglected them during that time. They don't say that. If you were to ask them, "Are

Heyns: you glad your dad went to Berkeley?" they would say, yes, they were, that it was a useful experience and it was important to them and they're proud of their relationship. But I'm sure that it was at some cost to them.

Their mother was very alert to their needs and made up for what I couldn't do. And then I want to mention that three of the women in the house there, Viola Bailey--she got married again but her name was Johnson at that time--and Kate Benford and Alma Garrett were just wonderful to the boys. Those women were very, very supportive to Danny, and whenever he comes out here he goes to see them.

Nathan: You were living in University House?

Heyns: Yes. We lived there all the time. So, they were very solicitous about him, spent a lot of time with him, and were motherly, you know. As a matter of fact, we see all three of them and Esther is in constant contact with them. They're our friends and they played a very, very important role for all of us--not just the kids but me and Esther, as well.

Michigan's Psychology Department, Teaching, and a Doctorate

Nathan: Would you like to say anything about your experiences as a professor, as an instructor at Michigan?

Heyns: Well, I stayed on after I graduated, got my doctorate. The psychology department at that time was one of the very best in the country; not only did we think so, but I think everybody else did. The man in charge of it, the chairman, was a man named Donald Marquis. It just so happened that a lot of the people during the war had retired, the department had gotten old, and they'd brought in this man from Yale, and he was phenomenal. We had some outstanding talent. There were first-rate graduate students and many of them stayed. It was a great bunch of people. They were balls of fire. It was a period of great opportunity. Several of us who got our degrees about the same time were given important courses to teach, something that we probably wouldn't get for another 10 years at another time in our lives. But, boy, we were riding high, and we were good. Some of those people have made careers in psychology.

Heyns: It's still a first-rate department and many of the people were there when I was. We were cocky and good and it was a very, very fine department to belong to. Wonderful collegial relationships. Some of these people were 10, 15 years older than I and my generation, but they really treated us as collegues, and we were part of the inner circle right away. This usual hierarchical business wasn't operative. And so, we became very, very good friends of truly distinguished people in the field. Many of them went on to be presidents of the American Psychological Association. I think probably five or six of those people went on to that distinction. The Institute of Social Research came at that time and the group dynamics people I mentioned before were a part of that. There was just a lot of vitality.

I think universities were terribly interesting at this time, anyway. Everything was booming. Enrollment was going up. Students were great. Lots of GI Bill people were back. It was a wonderful time to teach. I guess the only other thing I want to mention was that one of these courses I was asked to teach was called the Psychology of Adjustment. I also taught in the social psychology program.

##

Heyns: Well, this course that I was describing was a follow-up to the introductory course, in order for people to get a year of psychology. It was directed toward the general student. It was about personal adjustment, personal development, and so on, and it was what we used to call--I never called it that but that's what it was--a gut course, a snap course. It wasn't a terribly intellectually demanding course.

It was exclusively a lecture course. We didn't have any sections in it, although we could have had; we elected not to. It was entirely lectures, three times a week, and it had 500 students in it. As a matter of fact, one year I taught it for both eight and nine o'clock, and I think there were probably 700 total. So it got to be a very popular course. I still run into students who were in that course. We had lots of fun; I enjoyed it very much. It was not, intellectually, as I said, demanding, but I think I'd go on testimonial support. One of them is that the students took it in large numbers and they seemed to enjoy it, and I think that led to that teaching award that I got. [Outstanding Teacher Award]

I also taught some graduate level courses in the social psych program, and that program had lots of good students in it. I was conducting this research project studying decision-making in small

Heyns: groups that I mentioned. Then I got into administration in a kind of left-handed way too, without any intention of doing it. It carries on the pattern I referred to earlier of never having any real goals.

The dean of the College of Literature, Science, and the Arts, Charles Odegard, who later became president of the University of Washington, asked me whether I would be interested in a fellowship to go to Harvard to participate in their general education program. The Carnegie Corporation had set up a number of fellowships; I think three for Columbia, three for Yale, and three for Chicago--but wherever there was an effort to reorganize the first two years of college education. They had various forms. Columbia had a course in contemporary civilizations, Harvard had this general education program.

Nathan: Were these interdisciplinary?

Heyns: Yes. I guess the general rubric was an interest in providing general education. Some of them did it by means of historical courses, like the history of western civilization. At Harvard it was organized pretty much around teaching a particular course, like the history of science or economics, or something like that, for the general student, for the non-specialist.

Harvard had a program that had some very distinguished senior members of the faculty participating; James Bryant Conant actually taught in a course, and Harlow Shapley, a famous astronomer, and Ivor Richards, a linguist. They'd all organized courses to appeal to students and give a background aside from specialization. I taught in a course in social relations in the general education program. It was organized on the case method, and it was really an introduction to social science. That was an interesting experience. I enjoyed my year at Harvard. I also was writing a text for the University of Michigan course that I had been teaching, so I was working on the book at the same time that I was in this general ed program.*

When I came back the dean asked me whether I would be his assistant and work with the curriculum committee at Michigan to reexamine the beginning two years and see whether we couldn't use some of the insights that this general education effort had been developing at places like Harvard, Columbia, and Chicago. I worked with the curriculum committee that year, a couple of years, in fact. Then the dean left. I guess I was his assistant for about three years, and I didn't just work with the curriculum committee.

---

*R.W. Heyns, The Psychology of Personal Adjustment (Hinsdale, Ill: Dryden, 1957).

From Dean to Vice-President

Nathan: Were you still teaching that course?

Heyns: I was teaching the course for part of that time. I also taught an honors course in psychology at that time. It was half-time teaching and half-time working for him. That was largely on curriculum affairs, maybe devising an interdisciplinary course in the sciences, and stuff like that.

Then the dean left and, by golly, they made me dean, which I did, then, for another three years, I think, or four. That was a wonderful job. As a matter of fact, that's the best job in educational administration that I ever had. You were close to the departments. You were close to the educational process. If you want administration and you want to stay close to students and to faculty members, the dean of the college is a wonderful place to do it.

The College of Literature, Science, and the Arts at Michigan was an important unit, it was a high prestige unit, and all of the graduate faculty were in that college. That put me in contact with graduate training, as well. It was big enough, it had about, maybe, 17,000 students in it, 27 departments, and five or six museums. We were right in the middle of the university, right in the middle of graduate education itself, but close enough so that I don't think anybody was hired there that I didn't meet before they were hired. I don't mean to say I was the crucial one.

This college was governed in an interesting way. The executive, the actual, responsible body for the administration of that college was the dean-and-executive committee. The executive committee consisted of six faculty members. The tradition was they each served for three years, two were added each year, and they were the distinguished members of the faculty. When I got there the chairman of the astronomy department, of the physics department, the distinguished professor of economics, the real cream of the crop were elected to this committee. We really were people working on the budgets and the promotions, and all the educational policy questions. It was one of my first experiences in really working with a decision-making group. I don't mean that everything was brought to the committee, but that was the apparatus, and I became very comfortable working with shared authority.

After about four years of that there was a change in the president's office and they asked me to be vice-president for academic affairs. So that's what I did. I did that until I went to Berkeley

Heyns: in '65. It was during that time that I got the Faculty Distinguished Service Award. It was a wonderful time to be an administrator because it was a time of great growth, and the real problem was not so much could this be done or could that be done, but when. There was a queueing problem, not an either/or problem.

Nathan: How did the financing hold out for the new projects?

Heyns: We had our ups and downs. Michigan was always affected by what was happening to the economy because of almost immediate repercussions on automobiles. I think the first year I was dean we had to live with a 10 percent cut, which came in usefully when I had to live with a 10 percent cut when we got to Berkeley, soon after we got there, anyway.

I think that if you think in terms of creativity and accomplishments, this was by all odds, this dean vice-president period, was the most satisfying from the standpoint of getting things done. We started a center on continuing education for women. We started an equal opportunity program for minorities. We started a center on population studies, a center on learning and teaching. There are just scads of things that are now part of the University of Michigan landscape that were begun during this period. That was very gratifying. We started a new education-psychology doctoral program. We began a center for conflict resolution at that time. There were lots of ideas and lots of energy, and we got an awful lot done. We changed the landscape. I used the word "we" because that was such a seminal period, with lots of people in their most productive years writing articles, teaching classes, and doing things. It was very, very exciting.

Nathan: It sounds like a wonderful spirit.

Heyns: It was. It was. In a sense, Michigan was an easier place to do things than Berkeley, quite apart from the fact that we didn't do anything terribly constructive when I was there at Berkeley. I think the structure was easier.

Nathan: How many campuses does Michigan have, or did it have at the time?

Heyns: They had three: one at Dearborn, one at Flint, and then the major campus at Ann Arbor. The Flint and Dearborn operations were really quite small.

Anyhow, it was a very exciting time. I didn't generate most of these ideas, by a long shot, but it was possible to help getting them started. We started a residential college at the time and we started an honors program in the college. We had a heck of a good time.

Heyns: I didn't have many direct contacts with Berkeley during this period when I was in Ann Arbor. There was a professor, a very prominent professor at Berkeley, named Ed Ghiselli who had been my boss, commanding officer when I was stationed out here in San Francisco with the Fourth Air Force. He went back to Berkeley. Actually, I got an offer to go to Berkeley when I was an assistant professor, which I didn't accept at the time. But I did have it and was flattered by it. I had visited the campus during the war and knew about it. This was not a period that I had much contact with Berkeley--I don't think, really, in effect any--except this conversation with Ghiselli about coming to Berkeley.

Nathan: Was he the one who was testing people, who developed a series of tests?

Heyns: He certainly was very expert in tests and measurements. That would be one way of describing his field. He was a very able man.

Nathan: Did Michigan have the chancellor system?

Heyns: No.

Nathan: As you described the main campus at Ann Arbor and then two smaller ones, I wondered about titles.

Heyns: Yes, the top administrators at the other campuses were called deans. In a sense they were like the chancellors, except that Ann Arbor dominated things.

At Michigan when I became vice-president, and as dean also, I spoke at alumni gatherings, went on a trip, for example, to New York and went to Binghamton and Syracuse and Buffalo, and talked to alumni groups.

One thing about Ann Arbor that many people don't know is that for many, many years, almost from the start, Michigan attracted students from out of state. I would say maybe 30 to 40 percent were out of state students. So there were lots of alumni, and as long as New York and New Jersey didn't have any public university system, Michigan was the university of choice. I guess Michigan probably has more graduates in the state of New York now than Albany and Buffalo put together. There were an awful lot of young people from Ohio, Illinois, New York, New Jersey. It was a big group. We had lots of contact with alumni.

Heyns: As vice-president of the university I helped in the presentations of the budget of the university to the legislature, the budget committees of the senate and the house; and as vice-president worked with the Academic Senate and student organizations, had contact with student organizations, like the ASUC here. As vice-president for academic affairs, all of those units reported to me, as well as the dean of students, deans of all the other schools and colleges, medicine and the rest. Now, I shouldn't leave the impression that I was the major external spokesman of the university. That was the president, clearly, but we all shared in that and I at least had contacts with community groups, certainly the city of Ann Arbor, itself. The relationships between the city of Ann Arbor and the university were really quite good.

Mr. Hatcher was a very successful university president, and I learned a lot from him, especially I learned about relationships with trustees. Subsequent history may not suggest that I did learn anything from him about relationships with trustees, but I did. He spent a lot of time informing regents and keeping them up to date so they didn't get hit from the blind side, and so on. He had an interesting arrangement. He chaired the regents' meetings; he was the chairman of the Board of Regents. All the presentations to the board for appointments, promotions, academic policy, new schools, or whatever, those presentations were made either by the vice-president for business and finance or by me, or the vice-president for academic affairs. So I had lots of experience during that time with regents' meetings.

Nathan: Would they question you?

Heyns: Yes. The president didn't present those proposals. They were argued for and defended or challenged or responded to by me, or by the vice-president for business and finance. That's an old tradition and that was how it was done.

Michigan's Tradition

Nathan: That would certainly be good experience. Is Michigan a land-grant college?

Heyns: Yes, it is. See, both Michigan and Michigan State were land-grant institutions, and Michigan State almost immediately picked up the agriculture. As a matter of fact, I think it was at one time called

Heyns: the State University of Agriculture, or something like that. It certainly changed during this period into a general university, but yes, Michigan was a land-grant institution.

The University of Michigan had a unique history. It was started originally by a Methodist and a Catholic priest and somebody else, and it really got its charter very early, like 1837, way back. I think there are all sorts of difficulties one gets into when comparing the two universities. They're both just excellent institutions but had quite different traditions and history.

For example, the history of private support goes back much farther at the University of Michigan than it does at the University of California, and private support was always a part of the financing of the University of Michigan, whereas it's been the last twenty years where that's begun to happen at UC. That means the University of Michigan alumni were trained to make contributions to the university, whereas California graduates were led to think their education had been paid for by the state. That just meant they got a subsidy, which they didn't recognize. The habits of philanthropy on the part of graduates of the University of California aren't nearly as developed as at the University of Michigan.

The trustees of the University of Michigan are elected. There are eight of them and they're elected. They're nominated by their parties. A Democrat and Republican will run against each other for regent in the general election. I think they are eight-year terms, I can't remember. They're not appointed, as the University of California people are, which might lead you to think that the Michigan regents were politicized, but they were not. If anything, they were less politicized than the University of California Regents. Both parties appeared to take seriously the idea that the university ought not to be political. I think that's been true of California Regents, too, but it's interesting that those two very different systems would end up being very similar.

Some Research Interests

Nathan: Yes, it is. This last question has to do with whatever you would like to say about your writings, any writings of interest.

Heyns: I don't have an extensive bibliography. I worked with John W. Atkinson and Joseph Veroff in development of a measure of affiliation motivation, using thematic apperception test--a method of asking subjects to look

Heyns: at pictures and having the subject tell stories.* Then we'd code those stories. TAT it was called. We had an interesting time. As a matter of fact, the test is still used and it's led to a good deal of research. The other work was either reporting on what we were learning about problem solving in groups or methodology of group observation. Those were really the three areas in which I worked as a publishing scholar. I probably would have done more of it if I'd stayed in it, but actually my participation as a full-time teacher didn't last all that long.

None of these things is by accident. I was, I think, more skillful in administration than I was as a scholar or at least more motivated, although I liked research and did it, and did it well enough to get it published and have good collaborators. As a matter of fact, everybody on that list that I wrote with is very distinguished; people who went on to do excellent things as scholars.

Nathan: There was an earlier remark about the research project that you had been involved in before the Carnegie Corporation invited you, before the Harvard year occurred.

Heyns: When I was, you know, close to my thesis state, two of my colleagues got a research grant from the Office of Naval Research. It was called the Conference Research Project and the subject was really decision-making in small groups. We did some experimental studies, one of which was my thesis, but also the major time was spent studying decision-making groups in corporate settings. We observed maybe a hundred actual decision-making groups--the Toledo Scale Company or Burroughs or whatever. We got permission to enter those meetings and interview the participants before and after. We sat there during the meeting itself with a system of observational spectacles, if you like, or coding systems. We tried, then, to see what aspects of the way they proceeded related to the quality of the outcome or the degree of satisfaction that people had at the end of the meeting, and so on. That was the research project I was referring to.

Nathan: I see. Is there something more that you would like to say before we close for today?

---

*J.W. Atkinson, R.W. Heyns, and J. Veroff, "The Effect of Experimental Arousal of the Affiliation Motive on Thematic Apperception," Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 1954, 49, 405-410.

Heyns: No, I think that's about all. Did I hit on everything that interests you on this?

Nathan: I think you've covered everything admirably.

Recollections of Calvin College##

[Interview 2: March 20, 1986]

Heyns: I wanted to go back to talking a little bit more about Calvin College, because my experience there was really very important in my life. I met some wonderful people, teachers, a professor of philosophy named Henry Stob, a sociologist named Henry Ryskamp, and a psychologist named J. Broene. All three were wonderful men and had a real influence on my life. I admired them and respected them very much. Calvin had a very good academic reputation and a long history of sending people on to graduate school. I have a real sense of indebtedness to that college and those people. I wanted to have that on the record.

Nathan: That's fine. How did you find these three individuals?

Heyns: First of all, it was a small school. When I went there there were 520 students, perhaps. So there weren't a lot of options, and I was interested in sociology, economics, and psychology and ran into those people. Philosophy was a very good department there and everybody took a philosophy course. I took quite a lot of them.

I think that the most important impact that those people had on my life was to help me and help me throughout my life integrate Christianity with intellectual matters and in my own personal life. I got to be very interested in those kinds of problems, and I think they helped me a lot. Lots of people leave their religious upbringing behind because of incompatibilities that they find. I didn't really have that problem, I think largely due to these three people--and then the whole school.

Nathan: Did you find that ethics was a fairly large component of your religious approach?

Heyns: I think that Calvin put a very intellectual flavor onto theology and religious experience, yes. It was a Calvinist based institution and Calvinism is interested in the interaction between one's daily life and one's religious position. But it was not a fundamentalist

Heyns: institution, at all. It was quite antithetical to fundamentalism, as a matter of fact. Anyway, that's all I really wanted to say about that.

You want to just start down this other set?

Nathan: That would be fine. I'm glad you picked up that comment on Calvin. That's very important.

III CHANCELLOR AT THE UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA, BERKELEY

Nathan: I tried to follow your preference about clusters of issues, and that doesn't mean that this is the only way to organize it. It's simply an offering. Perhaps starting with your coming to Berkeley, you might comment on some of the circumstances and what your hopes were when you decided to come.

The Nature of the Problems

Heyns: I think I came because of the opportunities that Berkeley provided. I also recognized that the problems they were facing were real. However, I had no notion at all, really, about the severity of the problems. I was completely unprepared for all the ramifications of the Free Speech Movement and I only gradually--gradually is the wrong word, because I soon learned about all of them--but I didn't know the extent of the problems when I came. Let me talk about those for a minute.

As I saw it, anyway, the administration lacked credibility, the administration of the Berkeley campus. It was distrusted by both students and faculty. It was suspected by the Regents; I don't mean every Regent, but the Regents were really quite in a posture to review almost every action that the Chancellor made.

This went on for years. I don't think a Regents' meeting went by that I wasn't asked to explain or justify something that was going on on the campus or some action that I took. There was a great deal

Heyns: of caution on the part of the Regents as a body and some of the Regents very specifically, were doubtful about our commitment and doubtful about our ability. There was an enormous antagonism against Berkeley on the part of the public. The Berkeley campus was part of the campaign when Governor Reagan ran.

I think in addition to the unhappiness in the public about the disruption of the University there was a lot of anxiety in the society as a whole about the war and about activities in opposition to the war. I think the political activities on the Berkeley campus were responded to negatively in part because people didn't think that's what a university ought to be doing, but also because the subject matter, civil rights and the war, were sensitive subjects, about which the society was not at ease.

A part of that antagonism, of course, was evident in the alumni. A lot of them were disappointed with the campus, embarrassed by the things that were going on, and some of them were out-and-out hostile. I remember Dick Hafner set up a series of meetings with alumni and I went up and down the state. Almost invariably those groups started out with hostile questions. They were very, very angry, very suspicious and wanted to have lots of explanations. Sometimes they were uninformed and explanations would help. But there was a lot of antagonism. Hafner made a list of how many speeches I made that first year; there were more than a hundred, up and down the state, and invariably those were tough audiences, not very cordial or friendly. They had had, in their college days and since, very positive attitudes toward Berkeley, but they certainly weren't positive at that time. I don't mean to say every alumni group I ralked to was hostile, but that was the prevailing mode. The first major point I want to make is that the administration lacked credibility with the students, with the faculty, with the Regents, with the public at large, and also with the alumni.

The second big problem that became apparent almost immediately was that the administrative staff was in disarray. I don't think it's an exaggeration to say that it was demoralized. There were a number of explanations for this, but the dean of students office had been overruled on a number of occasions and decisions had been made above them without their being consulted. And so, lots and lots of decisions that could and should have been made down the line were coming up to the Chancellor's office--decisions about the use of a building or the use of a playing ground. Due to the reversal on key decisions that had been made by people down the line, they just didn't want to face those questions down below. So they came up to the Chancellor's office.

Heyns: I remember soon after I got there four people came in to talk about the use of Edwards Field. It turned out that only one of them was a student. Nevertheless, that wasn't anything really that the Chancellor ought to be involved in. I use it only as an illustration of the demoralization of the administrative staff.

I think the campus police suffered from the same lack of certainty as to what the policy was going to be, and if they executed the policy, would they get into trouble or wouldn't they. Sometimes they had undoubtedly thought that what they were doing was consistent with University policy, only to have it be changed on them, or at least they perceived that.

Nathan: Should we assume that having recognized this, you moved to reassure people down the line? How did you deal with it?

Heyns: Well, let me come to that. Let me just list some of the problems as I saw them.

There were also on the campus lots of what I would call low-grade irritations, things that bothered the students as a group. There were poor registration procedures, for example. The lines stretched for a half a mile. Inadequate counselling. A predominance of large classes, a lot of anonymity, and relatively low amounts of attention paid to the teaching of undergraduates. By the time I got there, under the leadership of Charles Muscatine and Joe Tussman, there were the beginnings of efforts to deal with the need to place more emphasis on undergraduate teaching. Those two men led efforts to shake up the curriculum a little bit, so there would be more attention given to undergraduates.

These are a couple of illustrations of lots of places in the system which resulted in low satisfaction with the institution, which in turn created a general disposition to join the critics. There was an undercurrent of dissatisfaction with the place on all sorts of levels, and I think then that it was very easy to recruit dissatisfied people.

I think another big category of problems was that the University was terribly preoccupied with political action, with controversy, with one conflict after another, usually involving Vietnam activities and civil rights issues, but anything could start a fight. It might have been only peripherally related to those things. There was a great preoccupation with political action. That was almost always led by a small minority but always with the vulnerability that I cited, namely always the capacity or the potential of seducing large masses of bodies. Now the University was continuing, but there was an awful

Heyns: lot of disruption, especially if the administration committed what was perceived to be an atrocity of some sort. The use of police, or unfair punishment, or anything like that could start something.

Another problem in connection with that political action business, the pattern of leadership of student radical groups was always complicated. There was always a struggle for power within these groups, and so it was often difficult to know whom to deal with so an agreement or a negotiated settlement could be implemented, because it might turn out that the people with whom you were dealing were by the next morning no longer with any influence. Some of those groups made a practice, really, of not having a leader. They were kind of committee decisions and you may not have met with all the members of the committee. So whom to deal with was always a problem.

What to Do and How to Do It

Heyns: Well, what was the task? I can describe it in lots of ways, but there had to be the reestablishment of an educational institution with primary dedication to teaching and research, with freedom of speech and assembly, but without having those interfere with the major purposes. Another way to say this is that I really felt the need to adopt an administrative posture that resisted the forces that wanted to turn the University into an instrument of social action to be captured for political purposes. The issue really was what kind of values and rules were going to govern our common life. The threat to institutional integrity came, and in lots of people's minds stayed, with the radical movement, assisted by lots of people who were in and out--liberal faculty. Later on the threat to institutional integrity came from the right, as well--the far right, political right, including the governor, who was, I think, often disposed to intervene.

The other thing I'd say about this was that the successful handling of this contention was important because the controversies made people anxious. Not everybody was involved in them and there often would be real trouble in Sproul Plaza or some other place on the campus, and the rest of the campus, as you know, would be completely free from any kind of disturbance. Nevertheless, it generally made people anxious.

Well, what did we have to do? I guess this is as good a place as any to say that when I talk about what we had to do and how we did it, I want to make very clear that I had a very, very high caliber,

Heyns: conscientious, and dedicated group of people working with me--Bob Connick, Budd Cheit, John Searle, Bob Cole, Carl Schorske, Neil Smelser, Loy Sammet, Bill Bouwsma, Alan Searcy. All of those people were enormously loyal and hardworking. Not all of them were involved in the student unrest problems, but many of them were responsible for keeping the place going.

Nathan: Would these be your faculty aides?

Heyns: These were the members of the administration, vice-chancellors and so on. Vice-Chancellor Boyd and Bob Johnson were both in the student affairs area. Johnson succeeded Boyd. Those were the key administrators, and the little we accomplished was done really as a team.

Reestablishing Credibility and Redelegating Authority

Heyns: The first task, it seemed to all of us, was to reestablish credibility with these various groups, faculty, Regents, students. The principal way we did that was to be absolutely scrupulous and correct and honest in every way with respect to our intentions, our promises, our adherence to our own rules, fairness, discipline, enforcement of rules. It was terribly important for us to be totally accurate and not make any promises we couldn't keep or any threats we weren't prepared to follow through on. That process of restoration of credibility was very slow, but we never lost sight of it and we really regarded it as one of our major objectives.

Another one was the redelegation of authority, the one I mentioned to you before, primarily accomplished by stating clear policy and then backing up decisions that were made in accordance with that policy--even to the extent where I think sometimes--I remember several occasions--where we backed up a decision made by a dean even though it was an error in judgment. I thought he made a mistake, but we backed him up anyway and didn't ever say anything about what we thought. That was just because we wanted them to begin to operate and do their jobs.

We did make some efforts, substantial ones really, although I can't claim how much effect they had, but we certainly increased our attention to the quality of life of the students and the faculty. We set up the ombudsman office. We tried to really respond quickly to grievances. Everybody on the staff made themselves available to both faculty and students. I had a regular student office hour every week. That sounds like a small amount of time, but it was nevertheless

Heyns: a practice. Anybody could get in. They might have to wait for a week or so, but I don't recall that the line got very long. I imagine I saw five to 10 students a week. And everybody was doing that just to increase the communication and to detect grievances, and detect them early, problems that we could deal with.

Stability, Integrity, and the Size of Signs

Heyns: I think that if you look at the speeches you'll agree that we spent an awful lot of time talking about the overriding goals about which the faculty and the students could rally, namely the stability and integrity of the University. And of course all the time we were trying to avoid making mistakes that would recruit the bodies.

I remember we had an amusing time over some signs. It had symbolic meaning for what we called the time, place, and manner rules--which was really an effort to get some stability back into the place. I think, at least my colleagues felt, it was quite deliberate that some of these political signs were too big, outside the rules. I can't help but say that's a good example of how deteriorated the situation was, that we had to worry about the size of signs. But anyway, the signs were too big. We had to enforce the rules, it was there. So how do we handle it without creating a bigger fuss than we had originally? Somebody conceived the brilliant idea of having some of the groundspeople sweep the plaza one morning about eight or nine o'clock, but anyway, it wasn't the police. These men, big and strong, just picked up those things and walked out. Nothing ever happened. That's what I call the avoidance of an atrocity, because the students were so buffaloed that these janitorial types were going out and picking up these signs, they didn't know what to do. We spent a lot of time trying to figure out that solution.

As I say, the restoration of stability was slow and involved people at all levels. I think there was a gradual increase in support from the faculty, slow, but it began to happen, and some increase in confidence on the part of the Regents, although that never really got solid, I don't think.

In this connection, I did want to mention something that I was keenly aware of at the time and that I mentioned to people since. The nonacademic staff of the Berkeley campus was just marvelous. I'm talking about the departmental administrative secretaries, the people in building and grounds, and the people in the business office. The nonacademic staff really, I think, in a very important way, held the

Heyns: University together. They went about their work under terrible conditions, often, and they stayed on the job, they didn't take sides, they worked for the University, and they were absolutely marvelous. This was also true of the police force, incidentally. I really think a terribly important part of the stability of the campus at that time came from those people. They kept the campus clean, they kept repairing the windows. If we had a fracas on one day, by the next morning Sproul Plaza was cleaned up. It took some extra money to do it, but they were conscientious. The concern about the environment was not a trivial matter. I think people do respond to the environment in which they work, and when it becomes very trashy I think other things become trashy. So we were quite deliberate about it. But I did want to pay tribute to those people.

The Chancellor's Authority and Its Limits

Heyns: Well, if you consider the parties involved, the public, which was anxious and hostile, the alumni, the government, the Regents, the students, the faculty, and the media, all of these with different and often conflicting concerns--actually, this is the major point. If you consider those parties and the problems they had, the Chancellor in a campus at the University of California has almost no authority over any one of them. The authority of a Chancellor is very, very limited. I was chuckling the other day when I was at the Riverside campus and somebody read the authority of the Chancellor. He's held responsible for everything that happens, but he has not got the authority to match that at all. There are enormous amounts of delegation to the faculty for academic programs. There is the budget apparatus, which has played a very important advisory function to the Chancellor. So there's really very little place where the Chancellor alone has the authority to act. So much of the leadership was really a matter of influence, negotiation, persuasion, mediation, but very little in the way of effective authority.

Nathan: Would the Chancellor's authority be delegated by the President? Is that the line?

Heyns: Yes.

##

Heyns: The point I'm trying to make is that the Chancellor is not really, in terms of effective authority, well equipped. He has to share almost every important responsibility with somebody else--the budget committee, the committees in the Academic Senate on curriculum matters.

Heyns: There's a long tradition at the University of California for sharing of responsibilities, and I don't object to that at all. But I do want to make the point that I couldn't say we're going to have this course or that course or change the distribution requirements or introduce freshman seminars. Bob Connick had the idea of introducing freshman seminars when he started as vice-chancellor, but I guess it took him a couple of years before he really got it done, because of the apparatus.

Now there are two points about that. One of them is that the Chancellor doesn't do anything by dictates. He does it by persuasion, by influence, and the rest.

Complexity and Slow Response

Heyns: The second point is that sharing of responsibility, means that the institution responds slowly. I've already mentioned all of the grievances and the problems in a shorthand way, but the response capability of getting something cleaned up and fixed up and changed was very laborious. Even after we knew exactly what the problem was we may have had to persuade 10 people to change their practices.

The same is true with the departmental chairmanship. If you actually look at the operating authority, the authority that comes by virtue of the position for a department chairman, it's almost nil. He convenes the meetings, he's got an executive committee. So if you want something done by departments, as we did on occasion, first of all it was new to them. You asked the chairman, because the strike is going on, to report whether people are meeting their classes. He didn't have any apparatus for doing that. None of those chairmen thought about their role that way. They were first among the equals. They had the job for a temporary period and they were delighted to move on. So the whole administrative structure was characterized by complexity and slow response time.

Nathan: Where is the power, then?

Heyns: It's shared. It's shared with the faculty.

Nathan: Is the Academic Senate--?

Heyns: The Academic Senate is one of the units. It varies from one area to another, but the big point is that it's a very complex structure. All universities are characterized by a nonauthoritarian structure. There are traditions of faculty involvement and faculty participation and substantial delegations to the students.

Heyns: The ASUC is by no means a trivial organization, but our control over that was minimal--as a matter of fact, nonexistent--by the time I got there, anyway. The Daily Californian; we didn't have any control over that. Now the Regents might say "This is your responsibility, that newspaper is your responsibility," but by the time I got there traditions had developed that didn't give any direct effective power to the Chancellor. There wasn't any atmosphere to be very sympathetic to authoritarian behavior, either. The point, I guess, ad nauseam, is that because of the administrative decision-making structure, we had to use the techniques I described, and the response time was often very slow.

Black Students' Requests

Heyns: Let me give you an example. When the Black students came to see me about the possibility of a set of courses that might respond to their needs--Black history and Black sociology and that sort of thing--those demands were really requests and they were not unreasonable. I don't happen to think that at that particular time I had any clear idea that we were or were not covering Black history as well as we might, but I saw lots of possibilities for the Sociology Department to concern itself with the Black family, for example, which would have been a damned smart thing to do. All the Black students were asking for was to have some courses that were oriented toward them and their experience. They weren't talking about a department, nor were they talking about a college or anything like that, and I was eager to help on this. Quite apart from the intellectual merits I thought that what it reflected more than anything else was the need for a psychological home, some evidence that this huge institution recognized their existence and their particular needs and their anxieties.

Okay, so I started talking to some members of the curriculum committee or whatever it was called, educational policy, about the idea of some work in that direction. Well, that dragged on and on: were there any intellectual merits, whether there was anybody who could teach it, and all kinds of questions. Two years later we didn't have the option of setting up a degree program or a couple of courses that interested these kids. Hell no, they wanted a whole college, with their own dean and their own appointing authority.

I attribute that sequence to the slowness of the decision-making process in the University. We were caught up in something very laborious and were not able to respond quickly at a level I think

Heyns: really would have been quite satisfactory at the time. We wouldn't have had to go on through the strike and we probably wouldn't have had to go on as far as was subsequently done with respect to the department or whatever it is now. We probably would have ended up about the place that some of them now are ending up, which is to have exactly what they wanted, at places like Harvard and others.

That gives you my kind of overall strategy, what I saw the problems as being, and the broad objectives that we had in mind. I think almost everything we tried to do was consistent with those goals.

Political Issues and the Integrity of the University

Heyns: Let me just say one other thing about the political aspects, the goal of not having the University be an instrument of social-political action, something to be captured. This point I regarded as absolutely important. If the University turned itself into an instrument of political action, led by the faculty or the students, then it becomes itself a political instrument, an object to be possessed, an object to control. That would be just as much of a threat to the integrity of the institution if it came from the left or the right. And so I tried very hard not to identify myself with any of these political issues. I never said anything about the war in Vietnam because even though I could say, "Oh it's just my own personal reaction," I wanted to be scrupulous that the University was not going to be run according to my wishes, which could well be inferred to be, oh, anti-whatever. So I didn't take any political positions myself and I worked very hard to keep the University from doing it. That didn't mean that I resisted activities on the campus that had to do with this, but I didn't want the University identified with it.

That kind of deals with those first sets of questions. Do you want to start me on something else?

Lines of Authority and Support

Nathan: Yes. Maybe I should ask one further question. With respect to your access to the Regents, did you go through the President's office? What is the method?

Heyns: Formal recommendations from the Berkeley campus do go to the Regents through the President's office and my line of responsibility was to him. There is a practice when I was there concerning important presentations. First of all, the Chancellor's always present to answer questions and often speaks in favor of the motion or against it. So I was always present at every Regents' meeting, but the reporting line of responsibility was to the President and my relationships both to Kerr and Hitch were very good. They were very supportive.

Nathan: I don't know if this is the place to ask it. I'll mention it and you can deal with it at any time you wish, certainly. There had been some question when Berkeley started to warm up, whether President Kerr found it easy to hold back and let Chancellor Strong deal with issues. What was your feeling of the President's attitude and your freedom to do what you thought best?

Heyns: I can't comment at all on how much Strong was left to himself. I had no problem with it. I think I made it very clear right from the outset that rightly or wrongly I was in charge. I think there were times when President Kerr had input that he thought was useful for me, but I called the shots and I never had any interference at all from either one of them. They may not have agreed with me every time, but they never intervened or overruled what I had to say or what I decided to do. That was very important, I think.

President Kerr was associated in the minds of the faculty with some of the things that they disliked intensely, and in the minds of the students, as well. It wouldn't have done me any good to be perceived as Kerr's flunky, and I wasn't.

Nathan: I see. You alluded to a number of faculty members whom I think you described as your team, people you consulted with. It was said that you pulled together a very distinguished group of consultants and I wondered how you found them.

Heyns: They were good. They were just superb. I think I was terribly lucky, so let's attribute some of that to luck. I met with a faculty group when I came, met with several as a matter of fact. I think I made two visits out here and in the course of that met a number of them, including Connick and Cheit. They had some suggestions to make, Clark [Kerr] had some, and then I talked to them to make my own appraisal. Then I made the decision. Of course some of them were characterized by having been closely identified with the students, John Searle for one. I remember people were quite unhappy about my appointing Searle. They thought that was proof positive that I was going to give the place away, but he turned out to be a very, very insightful and firm person--all of these people were. They all would

Heyns: accept exactly what I've already said, the integrity of the place, keeping it first rate and having it be a place where teaching and learning went on. They all had that value and they all shared in the desire to keep it from being a political playground with its own foreign policy. That's how I found them.

Nathan: Did you deliberately try to cover various approaches, not hawks and doves, but to try to get a balance?

Heyns: Oh no, I think we were very eager to get people who had a reputation for concern for teaching. Schorske and Smelser were highly identified with the undergraduate students, popular teachers themselves. Connick, of course, is highly respected as a scholar and dedicated University person. I think he's a marvelous man. So under his supervision as vice-chancellor for academic affairs, people didn't have to worry about appointments and working with the budget committee and that sort of thing. He just was on top of it and that was absolutely essential, that I have somebody like that. Budd Cheit was very skillful, had lots of contacts on the faculty, and he was really responsible for the nonacademic side, including dealing with the political action, the time, place, and manner rules. Of course we had vice-chancellor Boyd and then later Johnson on the student affairs side. Yes, I was really trying to get a balance, not so much politically as I was in terms of administrative skill and interest.

Some Student Needs

Nathan: You have touched on some of the issues related to student life. Would you care to comment, for example, on some of the necessities for students--for example, student housing?

Heyns: I was appalled at the lack of housing for students on the Berkeley campus. I don't remember, but I don't think we could have taken the whole freshman class and put them into dormitories. I came from a midwestern university where, gosh, we didn't feel good if we couldn't take about 90 percent of the undergraduates into the university housing. That I thought was terrible. Nothing much happened with respect to that while I was there. I don't think we made any progress on that front.

As I say, we tried to support the Muscatine and the Tussman activities on the academic side.

Nathan: Like small college proposals?

Heyns: Right, residential colleges, or whatever they called it.

Nathan: There was also mention of plans to build a student center just inside North Gate. Does that ring a bell?

Heyns: Yes, I remember that and I saw that reference here, but I'll be darned if I know what happened to that. We were certainly exploring that. That's a good example of the trail we went down, but I can't recall why it didn't go. There was an area of the campus that was set aside for that. I think it got caught up in gradual constraints put on the University budget. I'm sure we presented it at one point or another.

Audiences and Speeches

Heyns: I referred earlier to the partisan politics in the State of California. I didn't expect to get deeply involved in that when I came, but I was. I don't think we had any unique theory about them except to try to convince them we weren't a bunch of Communists and weren't going to turn the University over to student radicals. They often disagreed with things we did because they had a very simple-minded notion that all I had to do was say no.

Nathan: Are you speaking now of the legislature?

Heyns: Of the politics and political people in the state. But gradually I think they began to think that maybe we knew what we were doing.

By and large I think my relationship to the Academic Senate gradually improved. We certainly spent an awful lot of time speaking off the campus to community groups and up and down the state. I have no idea how many there were, but in one year, as I said, or in one six-months' period, there were 70 speaking engagements. That was all really to try to reduce the tension about the campus and to create a more positive attitude for it, or if not that, at least more understanding about what was going on.

Nathan: Did you have any criterion for accepting invitations to speak? You appeared at sort of interesting places, small groups and special interest groups.

Heyns: I think we just had the general theory that if we could do some good we'd do it. I don't think we had any tough criteria at all.

Nathan: Did you have a process for preparing your speeches? Did people help you with drafts?

Heyns: For most of these, no. I made notes on the back of the 3x5 cards and then I hasten to say that some of the remarks at a particular time might be the same from one group to another, because it was a current issue or something like that. So I can't argue that every one of those was different, but no, I didn't have any speech writer.

On the speeches to the Academic Senate, the Berkeley division, those were pretty carefully worked over. I usually worked on the first draft and then they went through lots of revisions with everybody looking at it from the standpoint of how this sentence is going to impact on this group or that group. But no, I didn't have any speech writer.

Nathan: I wondered, too whether you had a team of speakers that you could dispatch around the state, or was it mostly you?

Heyns: I think it was mostly me, although I'm sure that the other ones did some of it. But no, I think I was the principal one.

Nathan: Perhaps people wanted to have a look at you and hear you?

Heyns: Right.

[looking at outline] I don't remember some of these things about the ASUC proposal to go off campus, Searle's letter, the ASUC funds. I just don't remember about that. This graduate student compulsory membership in the ASUC, I don't remember that either.

Access to Campus Space

Heyns: One of the things that I'm reminded of is that when I came it was very clear that the nonstudents, non-registered-students, were playing a very important role on the campus. They could go in and ask for and get a University room. We decided very quickly that that was not a good situation and we just closed it down. From now on we were going to deal with students and only they could reserve University space, and they were the only ones we were going to deal with. Once we were clear about the policy and were firm about it, I don't recall that that caused a lot of trouble. I think it was a very important move to make, but if it did cause a flurry it was a very short one.

Heyns: We've already talked about housing. I thought the fraternities and sororities were important because they were relatively small units that could cut down on the anonymity of the place. So I thought they were useful. I don't mean to say I liked all their parties or whatever, but the concept of living units, small ones, I thought was very beneficial and useful.

Students in Policy Decisions

Heyns: On student participation in campus policy committees there was, not just on the Berkeley campus but everywhere else, a lot of talk about increased student participation. Interestingly enough, it was often resisted more by the faculty than by the administration. We had more students on administrative committees than they had on the senate committees. My own feeling is that that was something of a fad and something of tokenism, and certainly cosmetic. I think there are more useful devices to get student input and more important places where it ought to be gotten, but you don't have to have student membership to do it. With student membership you're terribly dependent on the quality of the talent available and interested. And there, too, you're very dependent on how long that interest lasts. Lots of students got on policy committees that they thought would be great, only to be bored stiff. So if you really think that certain things ought to be more sensitive to student wishes and student desires, and I do, and I think Berkeley had been very slow about that, that still doesn't mean that the form that it takes need be membership on committees. As a matter of fact I think it's one of the weakest ones and I don't think even the idea of student membership on the Board of Regents has been much more than cosmetic. They're heavily dependent on the quality of the person and that person can't possibly claim to represent the student body of the University of California nor could a student member on the Berkeley campus come in and do it.

One can't justify administrative action on the basis of advice from a policy committee just because it's got students on it. I'm really quite skeptical about that way of doing it. I think student hearings, public hearings for students, or a special student advisory committee or something like that is much more effective.

Okay, which one is the next one?

Allocation of Resources

Nathan: I was looking at limitations, the questions of enrollment totals, redirection of applicants, deferral of admission. Were you concerned with these kinds of problems about how big Berkeley could get and how to deal with the numbers that were applying?

Heyns: I don't think that I was particularly. I was quite content with the enrollment total we had been given, 27,500, which is an arbitrary number, but I certainly wasn't eager to get any bigger until we could behave ourselves.

Nathan: What about the balance between undergraduate and graduate enrollment?

Heyns: I wasn't particularly concerned about that either. I was more concerned with attitudinal matters like more interest in undergraduate teaching and undergraduate life. I don't think the difference was so much enrollment differences, size of those two bodies, as it was allocation of resources.

##

Heyns: I was saying that lots of large research universities, I think, support their graduate work at the cost and the expense of undergraduate instruction. That's a general criticism and it's very hard to reverse that.

Nathan: What is the cause of that, would you say?

Heyns: I think it's partly faculty interest. They're more interested in graduate teaching and research. There isn't a great lobby for undergraduates the way there is for graduate students in the faculty themselves. Berkeley wasn't unique in that. Nor did I make any real progress on it. So I wouldn't have regarded the total enrollments as of interest. I was more interested in the redirection of funds to undergraduate teaching, and the freshman seminars was a case in point of putting more money into undergraduate education. But I hasten to say that on lots of those issues--the improvement of undergraduate life and making the University more satisfactory as an undergraduate place--I don't claim we made any real progress on that at all.

Matter of fact, it's probably as good a time as any to say I don't regard my time at Berkeley as a terribly constructive time. I don't think we did anything very important from the standpoint of making the place better. I will say that my colleagues and I kept the place from blowing up, I think, but we just didn't have the time to devote to more constructive things.

Heyns: I did want to mention the topic of tuition. Interestingly enough, I wasn't orthodox on that subject. I'm not an opponent of tuition. I thought that our position at the University of California was kind of quaint. First of all, we were going a long way toward charging them tuition, but we didn't call it that.

Nathan: You called it fees, didn't you?

Heyns: Fees, yes. Well, that's a quibble. But also, it was certainly true, it seemed to me, that given the socioeconomic class that Berkeley and other campuses attracted, there could be more money from the individual students. That didn't mean we shouldn't make scholarship funds to permit youngsters with socioeconomic problems to come in. But that can just as effectively be handled with a good scholarship program and higher tuition, as by low fees for everybody. So I was really in a minority on that.

I didn't sound off at that meeting, I'm telling you. Some of my colleagues were incensed by the decision of the Regents to go ahead with or to discuss that issue, but I didn't feel that would have been so terrible.

Nathan: Were you satisfied with the scholarship program?

Heyns: I thought we were doing pretty well, really, with the student loan program and the scholarships. I was always eager to build that up, but I thought we were doing quite well, yes. We certainly needed better athletic facilities, still do, and the loss of that playing field--what was that, Edwards Field that we lost?--

Nathan: Isn't Edwards Field still there?

Heyns: Well, maybe so. But where Zellerbach Hall is, there was a field.

Nathan: That's right, Union Field. That was a huge--

Heyns: --loss. --And then we didn't have good intramural facilities and Harmon Gym was not really adequate, still isn't, although they've improved that situation somewhat.

On the undergraduate teaching, I think that Chancellor Heyman has really put that very high on his priorities. It took years to get around to it, but they're working on it.

The Cambodian Episode: Turning the Academic Enterprise to Political Action

Heyns: Your notes here bring up the Cambodian episode, and I want to talk about that. I regarded that at the time as the most serious threat to the institutional integrity of the University.

Nathan: That was in 1970, wasn't it?

Heyns: Yes.

Nathan: So you saw that as the greatest threat after that whole chain of events?

Heyns: Yes. I was more apprehensive about that particular set of events than any other during the whole of my time at Berkeley. First of all, it was an intensely emotional experience. The students were very dismayed at national policy and there was a great deal of just kind of throwing up their hands at the inappropriateness of the President's action there. That was one part of it. The other part of it was that they began, with the assistance of faculty members, using their classes to go out into Walnut Creek and educate the people about how to feel. Lots of diversion of the academic enterprise into political action.

That was terribly divisive because in May there are an awful lot of kids who aren't interested in US foreign policy and want to get their degree and go on to graduate school. And so the protection of their rights to attend class was very important. We had to protect that, the integrity of that. Let me also say that some of the Regents got terribly involved in this and had students watching what was going on and reporting to them what was going on. Mr. Connick had to go through weeks of certifying that classes were attended and were met and all that sort of stuff, at the request of the Regents.

Nathan: You mentioned earlier that departmental chairs had no particular setup to verify what was happening. How did you manage something that difficult?

Heyns: I'm sure it varied from one department to another, but the department chairmen were asked to find out, "Are those classes meeting, are they meeting when they're supposed to meet?" or whatever. Now I'm sure that Connick made a very serious effort to get accurate information, and the chairmen, recognizing the threat, were very eager to help and did. But we couldn't verify all those data. That was one of the things we had spent a lot of time on.

Heyns: So there was the diversion, lots of social pressure on the faculty not to meet classes, to dismiss classes and to encourage them to do educational work in the community. Then the governor decided that the situation called for closing the University. That was symbolically a very, very negative thing. It wasn't just I, but all the other Chancellors and the President of the University pleaded with him and his colleagues not to do that. We had kept the University open for six years under very trying conditions, and it was an important symbol for us that we kept it open. We kept it open with classes. For him to, first of all, suspend activities and then to bring on the troops was really very harmful. We thought it was a sign of failure, which we didn't think was necessary at all.

Nathan: Did you feel that you got a hearing?

Heyns: I didn't have any direct contact with him about that, but I don't think we did get a hearing. I think he thought it was politically expedient to do it and he did it, and he may have gotten some credit for it, I don't know. The only problem is that once you get troops on the field you've got the problem of how long you're going to keep them there and how you're going to move them off. That became a very difficult problem.

That had happened to us before, that there was some pressure to get the California Highway Patrol on the campus. They didn't enjoy that and neither did we. That was probably the biggest threat to the integrity of the place. If we hadn't been able to keep that place going--you know, some universities at that time really did close up. Princeton closed and so, although we closed it briefly, we reopened and kept it going, which was very important. But that was the biggest threat, the political uses of the University that occurred during that student unrest period.

I guess I'm not the only one who felt that way. I talked with some other presidents and chancellors later about that, presidents at other institutions. They too felt that it was the most threatening time.

Nathan: In some of your speeches you alluded to trying to find out why the students who left campus did so. You made the point that most stayed but some did leave. Would you care to discuss your thoughts about the students who decided to go?

Heyns: At that time?

Nathan: At that time.

Heyns: I remember that there was a lot of speculation as to how many did drop out, and I don't think we ever really knew how many left the campus. I think that some of them probably were clearly satisfied with a pass grade, and I think some of them were just very upset by the disruptions in the quality of their life and the criticisms they got for going to class, and so on. These are all reasons why I thought this was really a very bad time. That was an interesting time, also, if I may point out again that this is a case where the behavior of the activists--and there were a lot of well-intentioned kids in here, this wasn't a radical movement particularly--was significant. There was the reaction of the right outside the campus and the right on the campus. One of the persons who was bird dogging us most on this was a student. He was collecting data about people not going to class and he was writing reports to the Regents about this. So the University was a source of conflict because of both what the students were doing and the reaction to it. That made it difficult, as well.

What else do you want to talk about?

Time, Place, and Manner Rules 1965, and Protection of Free Speech

Nathan: You did allude to the University's responsibility to keep going, to stay open. We might talk about the time, place, and manner rules, which were developed in 1965. This was, I guess, an early attempt to set the structure and the civility that one would hope would continue. Was that something you were especially interested in?

Heyns: I was interested in the concept, namely that we did have to have rules that reflected our manners and our values. I was interested because of the lack of civility that characterized the place, the rudeness and, strangely enough, the anti-free speech attitude--the fragile commitment to freedom of speech. I'll come to that in a moment. But the actual work of time, place, and manner rules was done by Bob Cole, John Searle, and Budd Cheit. I don't think an outsider like myself in 1965 could understand the reasons for some of those rules, because they were so specific to previous atrocities or previous issues.

Nathan: The size of the signs [laughter]--

Heyns: The size of the signs. Yes, that's actually just one example. I don't care what those rules were once they were agreed to, and we did spend a lot of time negotiating that with the radical student

Heyns: movement, the student leaders. That worked, and I think by and large it was pretty successful, the rules themselves. We had lots of problems in enforcement and there were lots of problems of violation.

There was one thing I want to mention in that connection. The devotion of a campus to true freedom is really fragile. Here you had the Free Speech Movement, and within a year they were denying freedom of speech to lots of people. John Tower comes on the campus and we have a tough time providing him a platform. And Arthur Jensen from the education school gets harassed. There is a kind of hypocrisy there, that they want to use the University for political purposes, not because they want freedom. Now that problem is still here on university campuses. Jeanne Kirkpatrick has trouble on campuses, so does Henry Kissinger. I think the problems we had with recruiters, CIA recruiters, or Marines, was really an effort to impose political tests on the use of University facilities, which is just as much a violation of free speech as opposing an invitation to Eldridge Cleaver, or whatever. We had a constant problem with respect to the rules to protect both the right and the left. The campus rhetoric was always that Berkeley was a great place for free speech, but sometimes it was not.

Nathan: So in this sense you were being careful to protect the people who were most likely to give you grief?

Heyns: Right, exactly. Yes, in both directions. The radical Black speakers gave us grief with some of the Regents and the far right speakers gave us trouble with the students. So we were going to get into trouble with a far-out speaker on either side.

Some Educational Issues and Efforts at Reform

Heyns: The Eldridge Cleaver course is an example of something I referred to earlier. There was some kind of a mechanism at the Regents had approved which was to accommodate the quick introduction of courses. I've forgotten what the devil that was called.

Nathan: Was it the Board of Educational Development?

Heyns: That's it. It was really a structural attempt to speed up the process of curriculum change that I referred to. It had students and faculty on it. Of course when they came up with that Cleaver course I had to defend it, and it was really controversial with the

Heyns: Regents. It was a delegation of authority from the Regents to the faculty, it wasn't to me. No, it was a delegation to the faculty. They asked for the authority to do this and they'd gotten it, and there wasn't any violation of any procedures there. I thought it was a dumb course and we were accident prone to use that authority that way, but nevertheless, that was an example of that delegation I referred to. I can't remember what happened to Cleaver's course. I think he had a couple of--

Nathan: My recollection was that there were a few sessions. People packed the first one and there was a drop off after that.

Heyns: That was my recollection, too, yes.

I've certainly spoken of the student role in confrontations.

Nathan: Did you have any concern about the wishes of some of the students to get ROTC [Reserve Officers Training Corps] off campus?

Heyns: I knew it was an issue. I wasn't supportive of it. As a matter of fact, I think there was a faculty vote to kick it off the campus, but I ignored it and nothing happened. Another historian might have a somewhat different interpretation of what happened, but I know I never recommended it to the Regents.

Nathan: Apparently it became voluntary in 1962.

Heyns: Is that what it was? I don't think it was ever mandatory while I was there. We did have a proposal in it to strengthen the academic, nonmilitary side of it, and I think that was done. I think its status never changed while I was there, because it looked to me more like a political judgment than an educational one.

Nathan: Right. You're right about concern over the academic standing of the instruction. That was important.

Were you at all interested in that Ford-funded program that was supposed to expedite the work of the Ph.D. candidates who were taking many, many years to complete the degree?

Heyns: Yes, I was. I really thought it was a scandal the way some of those departments were operating, just letting those people drag on and on and on and on, largely due to inattention, as a matter of fact. So, yes, I thought that was a very important thing. I don't know that we ever got anywhere with it.

Nathan: Apparently the funding of the program, the Ford funding, went from fall of '67 to summer of '74 and you alluded to it in some of your speeches.

Heyns: I think we were making some progress, but I was gone by '74, so I don't know what the final thing looked like. It was a disgrace, really.

Nathan: Apparently the humanities and social sciences had the worst problems?

Heyns: They were the worst, yes. It was a very important thing and that grant did help us. As I say, aside from the fact that I was optimistic midway into the thing, I don't know how it finally ended up. We certainly made some progress on student evaluation of teaching, as I recall.

One of the things I think that I have to confess is that often I would start something and try to get it going, but I was too preoccupied with the other stuff to really get involved and follow through in ways I might have at other places or at other times in my life.

Nathan: Yes. This point, if you would care to comment on it, deals with the way the teaching assistants performed, having to do with the quality of undergraduate education. Did you have time to think about this?

Heyns: I certainly did think about it. There were all kinds of problems, I think, and not unique to Berkeley, but certainly they were present at Berkeley because of the heavy dependence on TAs. It was very clear that TAs did not feel themselves to be a part of the academic side. They had a TA union and so on. So there were real problems in identification with the place. They felt exploited and they felt overworked and undersupervised. I think all those things were there--inadequate training and very poor supervision. This was the real vulnerability of the place, that some of the dissatisfactions that the students had with the quality of undergraduate life was related to the TAs and their lack of competence, or their indifference. I think departments began to work on that, but again, I didn't follow it up. I was aware of it and tried to help, but I can't recall any progress in that area.

Nathan: Again, the budget restrictions seemed to have hit some aspects of that program.

Heyns: Yes. I think it was a deliberate effort to try to increase faculty teaching loads. It was one of the motivations for cutting down that budget, as I recall.

Heyns: There were a number of efforts. We mentioned the Board of Educational Development, Tussman, Muscatine. Those things reflected this commitment to improving undergraduate teaching--tutorials and interdisciplinary courses.

Nathan: Were the interdisciplinary courses hard to introduce and sustain?

Heyns: Yes. Typically they are. When you get highly motivated people to do it there's no problem; it's getting the second generation of teachers that's hard. You can encourage two or three people to do an interdisciplinary course. The problem is when they lose interest, what happens to it?

We certainly did a lot of things like having the students be able to initiate a course and then get a faculty member to teach it. Those are all efforts to stir up and get rid of the rigidity. Well you've got quite a list of things that we really tried to do. I'm not vividly aware of, aside from the fact that we tried scads of things [laughter], how much of it was useful and how much of it has lasted. I don't know.

Nathan: I was thinking once more about the second generation in the interdisciplinary courses. I wondered whether those faculty members who participated benefitted from that participation or whether they were penalized in some way in a professional sense?

Heyns: I don't know of anybody who was penalized for doing it. I think there was gradual acceptance, as represented by those faculty reports and division statements and all the other things. There was real belief that the institution was vulnerable to the criticism that they were neglecting undergraduates. That meant that a lot of people were encouraged to do some of these things by their colleagues. The reason why I'm reluctant to say what the long run consequences were is because I don't know whether that recognition lasted after the crisis was passed.

Nathan: That's a good point.

Heyns: I wasn't aware of anybody suffering from that. As a matter of fact, my recognition is that it was appreciated. I do think that some of the leaders there--Muscatine, Tussman, and others--were full professors and prestigeful, and didn't have to worry very much about their lot. Whether assistant professors who hadn't yet gotten tenure felt that that was a risky thing to do, I just don't know.

I'm glad to be reminded of some of these things; I'd forgotten them. I remember being involved in them.

Nathan: You made some great speeches about these, too.

You have already said that the Chancellor did not designate what courses should be developed and what should not. I assume the Board of Educational Development would have related to your office in a different way?

##

Heyns: We did have somebody working with that group in the Chancellor's office. I think it was Neil Smelser, Assistant Chancellor for Educational Development.

What I referred to earlier was that it was a group that had been given responsibility and the assistant chancellor stimulated, brought ideas to them, and tried to implement some of the things they wanted to do. But it was not the case that we could just by fiat get something done.

Here's where Connick and Bill Bouwsma were very helpful. I just could leave these things to them.

Nathan: That's very important. You had to divide your attention. Does this at all ring a bell--Proposed Study Commission on Governance of the Academic Senate?

Heyns: No.

Nathan: No. You weren't getting interested in that in 1967.

Outreach to Other Schools

Nathan: Perhaps we could move on to religious studies on campus, if that would be of interest.

Heyns: Okay. I had a personal interest in religious studies on campus, as did Bill Bouwsma. There were some discussions about it. I think that probably the most significant in this connection was establishing a useful relationship to the Graduate Theological Union [GTU] up on the hill there.

Nathan: Tell me why you found that particularly important.

Heyns: First of all, I think the GTU itself was an important effort to develop a high-class theological institution. There were ways in which the access to the Berkeley library would be helpful to them, and joint, easy cross-registration. I thought that worked both ways. Our students in classics and Greek or Hebrew might well profit from having access to faculty up on the hill. I thought there were mutual advantages to the institution and there were, as I say, some faculty members who were interested in that. I just encouraged it. That's about all there was to it. I didn't necessarily think there had to be a degree program, and it seemed to me that a very useful way was to have the faculty up at the GTU and interested faculty members on the campus work cooperatively. The main things they found useful were library privileges and cross-registration. I think those were the main things. We may have introduced some courses, but I'm not aware of it.

Nathan: Were you particularly interested in reaching out to other educational institutions in the area?

Heyns: I certainly was interested in the efforts that we had with Stanford on the library and in encouraging cooperation where it seemed to be appropriate and useful. I think it was mainly Stanford and the library that I was aware of at the time, although I knew that physicists and others were having joint seminars, and so on, which I thought was all to the good.

Nathan: Did you have occasion to work with the community colleges for transfer purposes?

Heyns: I spent a good deal of time cultivating the community colleges around here. I went to visit several of them, spoke at commencements for others, and had all of the presidents of the community colleges in the area over at the University House, they and their wives one night, my wife and I.

Nathan: What an interesting idea.

Heyns: That was an important bridge to keep repaired. It had gotten into disrepair, I think, although the master plan alleged that we were supposed to be upper division places for and get a lot of our students from community colleges. That really didn't happen, and it didn't happen in part, I think, because of lack of cultivation and lack of receptivity. There are lots of other pressures on the community colleges, quite properly, to do more than just pre-college or pre-baccalaureate training, but I had the sense that we had kind of become remote and disinterested from their kind of activity. I think that's true.

Nathan: Did you have any sense that they were interested in working more closely with Cal?

Heyns: Well, they certainly were more appreciative of those contacts, and we did have, as a result of those meetings, more effort on the part of our admissions office to make them aware of what was happening on the campus. I think there was a kind of attitudinal change, but I don't know that that, for example, increased the number of transfers to the Berkeley campus. I just never followed that up. I never did it more than once. I am dismayed at all the things I just started and then left.

Nathan: Well, when you're fighting fires there's not much else you can do.

Heyns: Well, each one of these called for, you know, some time, but I didn't stay with them because, hopefully, I'd delegated them to somebody.

Minorities: Admission and Acceptance

Heyns: Let me talk about the minorities. I was astonished at the low incidence of enrollment from minorities when I got here and the absence of any program to increase that number, and very soon started the special minority admissions program. It had several elements in it; more emphasis on recruiting. I guess we called it the Educational Opportunity Program. We spent a lot of effort making high schools aware of our interest, got more participation from the counsellors and then did, indeed, increase the number of minorities. Once having gotten them, however, there was a problem of whether they were adequately prepared and if not, whether we had remedial programs for them, whether we gave them good counselling, and also whether we made a systematic effort to integrate them into the community. It was okay to have them, but if they were just a kind of black stream in a white river, that wasn't what we had in mind.

I think we have to give ourselves higher marks on getting the enrollment up than I do on the satisfaction side. I don't have those data at my fingertips, but we did have to scramble on the remedial side, and I don't think we did a good job on acceptance into the mainstream of university life. There weren't any Blacks in the band, there weren't any Black in the male chorus. It was not unique to Berkeley. It happened in Michigan, and so on.

Heyns: There were a couple of faculty members who had begun, on their own, to identify very, very bright kids, I think almost exclusively in Berkeley High School--identified them, gave them tutoring and special attention and then helped them when they got to Berkeley. Mark Rosenzweig was one of those people and somebody else--

Nathan: I think it was a nuclear physicist.

Heyns: Chamberlain?

Nathan: Yes, it was Owen Chamberlain.

Heyns: There was another group of faculty members that were working with some of the predominantly Black colleges. So that was a multi-faceted effort, to increase the number of Black kids who were applying, to set up the special admit program for the marginal ones, and then to work on tutoring and counselling, and then on remedial work. That was slow going, and I think that some of our problems that ended up in the Third World Strike were due to the failure to really make these people full members of the University community. I don't think there's any question about that. Edward Barankin is the guy who was on the committee for faculty exchange with the predominantly Black colleges.

I thought all those efforts were very valuable, absolutely necessary. I think that Berkeley was, by virtue of its traditions, very slow on the remedial side. I just believe, philosophically, that we've got to make these institutions, especially the ones as elegant as Berkeley, make them available to people. We recognized that if the schools weren't doing the job then we couldn't do it either without supplementing their work. All those called for big attitudinal changes, and we were slow, as most places were. Cornell's biggest problems were in this area.

Nathan: I came across the name of Bill Somerville and his high school visits, which you recorded, I think, in some of your speeches. Apparently that effort got started in 1966.

Heyns: We started right away with it, yes. I don't know what else to say about that except that it was a great interest of mine and something that I thought we were obliged to work on. I think we made some progress, but obviously we ran into problems of not working fast enough or effectively enough, and that led to a lot of unrest. But basically that was, I think anyway, a failure to deal with the psychological needs of these people. Some of them were threatened by the place, some were scared, some of them undoubtedly ran into

Heyns: hostility, but part of the motivation to have a department or a Third World College, was really, by God, we're going to make this place have some visible indication that we're here. That was really what I think it was.

Nathan: Interesting. Was this, then, somewhat different from the Michigan experience?

Heyns: Yes. Well, let me take that back. I think we did a better job at Michigan than we did at Berkeley on academic performance. We took a smaller group, we had an ex-high-school principal who was Black, who saw those 30 kids of the first batch every week and asked them where they were studying or how much they were studying and sent them to the reading clinic if they weren't able to read. There was more personal, one-on-one supervision. I think we did better there. Michigan ended up, however, with much the same kind of problems that we had--failure to get them integrated--and they had a big strike, also. And Cornell did.

I don't think American education did this very well anywhere. I'm talking about a big campus, predominantly white, and no, I think it was just that we were in the middle of a big system and we could have only limited effects. We were dealing with all kinds of malfunctions. We were not uniquely bad, I don't think.

Nathan: There was a mention of Harry Edwards being named acting professor of Sociology. Was that a big deal at the time?

Heyns: I don't remember what we finally appointed him at. It certainly was a big issue. The Sociology Department recommended his appointment. It caused a lot of consternation. It caused consternation in the athletic world. They were worried about him because he was so anti intercollegiate athletics. And then there were people who thought we were bringing in a revolutionary.

Nathan: Had he already published his book on the sociology of sports?

Heyns: No. There were questions about the quality of his academic work. Not everybody in the Sociology Department thought that was such a great appointment. I did talk with him before we appointed him and satisfied myself that he was interested in being a sociologist and not using it as a political platform. He still sounds off, I guess, but to the best of my knowledge he did get appointed to tenure. I don't think the original one was a tenure appointment.

Nathan: No, I guess acting professor probably wouldn't be, would it? That was pretty late on. That was about 1970.

Heyns: Oh, yes. That was a controversial appointment.

Faculty Role in Course Offerings and in Discipline

Nathan: I wondered if you had any comment on the 198 and 199 courses--which would be the more unusual ones, probably.

Heyns: Those are the ones that faculty members and students could agree on. I thought it was a good loosening up of the rigidities and permitted a kind of one-on-one or two-on-one personal contact between a faculty member and a group of students. I think there was some abuse of that. They were not rigorous, not terribly well supervised, and some of the faculty members really signed up with many more students than they could adequately supervise. It's by no means easy to make a good experience just because you're one-on-one, and so I think that it probably wasn't monitored as well as we should have, but we were willing to take some risks.

Nathan: That was pretty bold.

Heyns: Yes, it was bold. On the other hand, you're supposed to have a faculty of distinguished, hard working, responsible people. The idea of having them have personal contact with a student didn't sound outrageous to me, but I do remember that there were some people who would let a student sign up, write a paper, and then get a grade, get an A.

Nathan: It's pretty hard to monitor such a faculty, also?

Heyns: Yes. And some of them were just, really, being political themselves. They'd approve things that probably their colleagues would not have accepted as a course.

Going back to academic freedom and related issues, I really believe that it is important for the primary responsibility for course offerings to be in the hands of faculty members. I believe that the administration's job is to help define the criteria and to monitor that process and I think ultimately the responsibility for dealing with breaches of discipline is a joint faculty and administration responsibility.

I'd like to see a return to the day when there was more faculty participation in student discipline. I don't know whether it will ever come back. I'm talking now about breaches of academic civility. The fact is that the administration became exclusively responsible for discipline. Most of the breaches were in the area of time, place, and manner regulations, and so on. It was unfortunate the administration was held to be responsible for those disciplinary cases, when in point

Heyns: of fact those rules were in effect for the protection of the academic characteristics of the institution. Presumably faculty members ought to be as interested in the enforcement of those rules as the administration is.

I'm not apprehensive about federal funding. We've had too many years of experience. Where there's any really serious restriction on the activities of a faculty member, we shouldn't take the money. That's why I don't think we ought to take money for secret research and that we ought to have rules that federally funded research can be published.

Nathan: Those seem to be major concerns currently, too.

Heyns: Yes. Do you have any other things you want me to talk about?

Subpoenas and Testimony

Nathan: Would you care to say anything about the subpoenas in 1969 after Peoples Park from the US Senate Subcommittee on Investigations? Did the Chancellor's office have a role in advising or helping faculty members or individuals who might be subpoenaed?

Heyns: I don't remember who got subpoenaed. I know I appeared before that subcommittee that was chaired by McClellan. I don't know who else got subpoenaed.

In general, I think if there were people who were subpoenaed, we had Bob Cole and others from the law school who were always available for consultation. But I really don't remember any other subpoenas.

Nathan: When you went down to the meeting did you have any legal counsel with you?

Heyns: No, and that was a big mistake. In retrospect, we were dumb for having gone there without it. There was a chap who represented the University in Washington, Peter Goldschmidt, and he made the arrangements with the committee. He was caught flatfooted, as well.

Nathan: You were called to have a conversation, and you did get hit. Adversarial is a good term.

Violence and Simple Solutions##

[Interview 3: April 15, 1986]

Nathan: Before we get into the meat of the discussion, I wondered whether you had been following recent events on the campus concerning Apartheid and divestment of University investments related to South Africa, and whether that rang any old bells with you.

Heyns: It sure did, and lots of people have been prompted by those news stories to ask me that very same question. Some of them asked me about my feeling nostalgic. I did not. I was reminded again, though, and I was saddened by it. One of the things that has troubled me most at the time and in retrospect and now again with the current violence on the campus is the incongruity between violence on the campus and the basic purpose of an educational institution.

Of all the institutions of our society, and maybe I've said this before, the University is dedicated to rationality. There are other ways of responding, many of them valid in certain conditions, under certain circumstances, but the University is society's commitment toward rationality. It's basically incongruous to me and somehow a violation of this major purpose for a university to suddenly become identified in the minds of people with irrationality and the use of violence as opposed to the use of reason. That grieves me.

The other thing that's closely related is that if the University does anything at all in the pursuit of knowledge, it often complicates problems, it complicates people's understanding of events. There's a kind of avoidance of oversimplified solutions. If you do your job right, people discover that what looks simple is really very complex. I don't mean to say that in pursuit of scientific knowledge, we don't end up with simpler solutions sometimes, but generally it's true that the University is not a place that indulges itself in simple explanations.

Very often in these campus protests they're characterized by simple solutions to complex problems. That's the kind of lack of consistency with the commitment that I think a university makes. The problem of disinvestment's impact on South Africa and the effectiveness of economic sanctions; all those are complex questions, and to come along with a simple solution seems to me to be incongruous.

Then there's a final thought that I was reminded of by the current controversy. It's very easy for a campus community to engage in social action that is really so safe and involves so little personal commitment. It's kind of aseptic, if you like. The problem

Heyns: is a long way away, the actors are a long way away; members of the campus community are not the principal actors, and so campus protest has a kind of remote quality to it, which makes it look self indulgent and not serious. People don't have anything personally to give up or personally to sacrifice. I guess I think that idealism ought to cost a little and not involve better behavior on somebody else's part, but involve better behavior on your part.

It also, Harriet, reminds me of the fact that the tactics of handling large groups of people are very difficult and if police are needed to protect the interests of others and the ongoing activities of the University, the Chancellor isn't in any position to win. If they don't have enough force the police get anxious and frightened and overreact; if they have too much it looks like a terrible attempt to intimidate.

I really am very puzzled at the fact that the media haven't learned anything about how to report these things. They came very belatedly to the notion that there were nonstudents involved and don't seem to appreciate the fact that one inert body carried off by two policemen looks brutal, whereas, in point of fact, that's exactly what some of the people want.

So, yes, I sure as heck was reminded of those days, but had no inclination to go in and volunteer or give Chancellor Heyman any advice. I've talked with him at a social gathering. He is as I was just totally preoccupied with the importance of keeping the University an open and functioning place. So the problem hasn't changed, nor has the role of the Chancellor. But the limited resources that the Chancellors have, certainly showed again.

Nathan: Limited resources in what way?

Heyns: If the University's property or access or educational processes get interfered with and a large number of people are involved the only thing one really can do is bring in the police. That's always a cause in itself of discontent and may itself be directly the cause of further problems. Certainly it always antagonizes people. If there'd been a consistent commitment to reason you wouldn't have to do that, either. But Chancellor Heyman isn't getting anything like the same kind of criticism for his tactics that I did. There is more understanding in the public at large; at least he reports that he isn't getting anything like the kind of criticism that I did.

When I was there the public was experiencing this kind of thing for the first time. Well, that's all I did reminisce about.

Nathan: That's very useful.

Faculty efforts on major issues are dealt with again when we get to more on the confrontations, but I wondered whether you would care to give us the faculty activities and concerns separately. Did you have any observations about the way the faculty sought to deal with some of these issues?

Heyns: Maybe some opportunities to comment will come later on. It's a perfectly legitimate thing for faculty members to express themselves on these issues. It's hard to make a generalization about the faculty because there were so many different categories. There were some people that were highly identified with the antiwar movement or with student activities. There were others who just went about their business and really didn't pay any attention to it unless the event or the series of events began to interfere with their work, and then if that happened either they communicated to the Chancellor's office directly or it became an issue in the Berkeley division [of the Academic Senate] again. So it's hard to generalize.

With the exception of just a handful of people whose names I can't even bring up with any alacrity, the faculty members did not constitute the leadership of many of these events. I'm not referring just to this list. If anything, the most active, visible faculty participants in these things were kind of followers of the students rather than the other way around. That would be my impression.

Administering and Organizing

Nathan: You may recognize some of these divisions of topics. I pulled them out of a presentation that you made. This next group focuses on the administration and the structural organization on campus.

Heyns: I had a general feeling that Berkeley was underadministered in terms of people assigned to administrative duties. I don't know that I can recall whether I had an estimate of how many people needed to be added, but there was a tradition at Berkeley of Chancellors who were really only part time, who would continue to teach or continue to work in their laboratories. I remember Chancellor Seaborg told me with a great deal of pride that he continued to work a certain number of days a week in his lab. That may have been very legitimate in those days, but it sure wasn't any more when I got there.

Heyns: There were not enough people to do what had to be done. In the student affairs area, and to deal with the crises on the campus we brought in a number of people: John Searle, Bob Cole, and others, on a part-time basis--not always throughout the whole period but we certainly did add to the staff. There was Neil Smelser as Assistant Chancellor for Educational Development. It was his job to begin to work, not on just the current crises, but to provide staff assistance to faculty committees on curriculum, to help on educational reform.

I can't remember exactly how we did reorganize the College of Letters and Science. I don't remember that at all.

Nathan: I remember one specific, that the Department of Journalism was terminated and the Graduate School of Journalism was established. There were certain criteria, I think, for inclusion. Some thought that maybe the College of Letters and Science was a little all embracing; they were trying to define what really belonged in there.

Heyns: I suspect that that was initiated more by the Berkeley division than by me, but I don't remember.

I did play a part in the establishment of the School of Public Policy.

Nathan: What was your thinking on that?

Heyns: I thought that it would be very useful for a university with the competence of Berkeley to have a unit that would concern itself with the formulation of public policy. Lots of universities had schools of public administration, but this was intended to be somewhat different, in the sense that we weren't just going to train administrators, but train people for policy studies. They might eventually end up as policy makers, but the emphasis was on the study of the process of public policy formulation and the training of people in that.

Aaron Wildavsky was very much interested in it. He really is a distinguished political scientist. He had been chairman of the Department of Political Science, very eager to push this, and I personally had an interest in the area and did help to establish the school. It was probably the only item on the landscape at Berkeley that I could be said to have had a part in developing. Other than that I can't think of anything that we did that lasted. But that was one of them, and it's a fine school.

Nathan: You saw the mission as quite separate from that of the Department of Political Science?

Heyns: I don't know that I saw it as separate. In some universities training in policy studies might have been a major activity of the political science department, but not at Berkeley. There are very few people in the department who were interested in it. Certainly Berkeley by and large is not terribly hospitable to interdisciplinary programs. As a matter of fact, lots of universities aren't. Havard is not, either.

So you had to create another unit in order to be hospitable to economists and political scientists and other social sciences interested in public policy. The Department of Political Science was not a good home for it. As a matter of fact, at that time and much of the time I was at Berkeley, it was a mess--not in terms of the quality of the people, but there were so many factions and frictions that I think, as I recall it, they'd gone two or three years and maybe even more unable to agree on any appointments. So it wasn't what I'd call a hospitable home for anything new or different.

Nathan: I see. I was wondering when you spoke of the understaffing of the Chancellor's office, whether that might have had anything to do with the fact that the whole structure involving a Chancellor at Berkeley--or separate chancellors on any of the campuses--was relatively new at the University of California. We had not had that kind of organization very long.

Heyns: That's true, but I don't really think that that was the major factor. After all, Kerr had been the first Chancellor, and that must have occurred around 1952, more than 10 years before I came. I think, however, there was a tradition in the University of California of part-time administrators and not much commitment toward administration.

Nathan: Would this, then, apply perhaps to deans and departmental chairs, that they saw themselves primarily as faculty persons and secondarily as administrators?

Heyns: That is correct. Also there was not a strong administrative tradition anywhere in the University, at the departmental level, or at the school or college level. I think that worked in the University of California, especially because of the extensive apparatus for faculty consultation. I also think it was a weakness. When the time came that there were large problems that were universitywide, campuswide, like affirmative action or the student unrest or the need for curriculum reform in line with the changing student interests that I mentioned before, the need for some systematic attention to undergraduate curriculum, the system was not satisfactory. The apparatus probably worked fine until the pace and the complexity and the urgency changed. Then there was a real problem.

Berkeley Campus Share of Support and Authority

Nathan: Somewhere I read a comment, I think it was yours, to the effect that at times there was a feeling that Berkeley got a little shortchanged by the University--that is that the Berkeley campus seemed somehow not to receive the attention, funds, that people here thought they ought to get.

Heyns: Certainly that was our feeling on the campus. I don't know that that would actually get supported by the data. My feeling is that it would. The reason for it was the extensive commitment the University had made to these other campuses. They were growing rapidly and getting a very large portion of the annual increments.

My sense of it was that it wasn't so much the actual dollars, although we later did take some cuts. Reductions continued during my time and there was pressure always on us to cut back in one place or another, which we had to do. It was kind of an atmosphere that we had arrived and the rest of the people had to be helped to arrive, and therefore our aspirations for new programs or new initiatives just were if not ignored at least not supported in any significant way. There was an atmosphere that Berkeley and UCLA were in good shape, and now we've got to do something for the others. Even if that didn't translate itself into huge dollar cuts, it did dampen the spirts on the Berkeley campus.

Nathan: Would this be an attitude at the Regents' level or the President's level?

Heyns: I think both. I think it was in University Hall, let's put it that way, including the President and the Regents. There was a corresponding, at least a coincidental, shift toward more authority on the campuses, which I thought worked very well. I was very much in favor of it, urged it, and tried to get it wherever we could. All the Chancellors were eager to reduce the number of things that went to the President.

It wasn't entirely or even exclusively an interest in power, certainly not personal power. But if the chief campus officer could have matters of some importance decided on the campus it just gave the administration the capacity to respond quickly. After something had been approved on the campus, it had to be finally approved by the Regents, and I don't think that particular process helped in the quality of the decision. It was a task; it took longer. You had to fit it in with the agenda of the other campuses, and so on. So

Heyns: this centralization was time consuming and frustrating, rather than that there were so many reversals. As far as I can tell there weren't any harmful repercussions at all of doing that [decentralizing] and it was a help to morale.

Nathan: With respect to one point that's mentioned here, dated February 1966, would the Chancellors have authority to approve all appointments and promotions to tenure that were not over scale? Was that one of the significant points?

Heyns: Oh, it definitely was, yes. That was a very important one.

Nathan: Did you actively push for that one?

Heyns: Yes. All the Chancellors did. I think it would be unfair to single out any one of us as being more eager for it than any other or having more effect on that outcome. After all, President Kerr pushed for decentralization too. He believed that was important.

Nathan: Could you tell that this in some way aided your relationship with the Academic Senate or the committees?

Heyns: I don't know that I can cite an example of it, but it was reassuring to the campus as a whole, and I think the faculty was pleased about it. But I can't say that there was any specific effect from the delegation of appointing authority to the campus.

Nathan: So the system would be that you would receive a recommendation from faculty committees?

Heyns: Right.

Nathan: That put you in close touch.

Heyns: I was in close touch even when I was recommending it, because, after all, it was my recommendation, finally, that went to the President's office, so this didn't increase the attention I gave to such recommendations. It's just that they could be resolved at the campus level rather than waiting for a long process of approval. It didn't increase my contacts, no.

Interests of the University and of the Individual

Nathan: I see.

This next point is getting into some of the spin-offs, I think, of the challenges on campus, selective service, subpoenas and academic freedom.

Heyns: I don't know what that prompts me to remark about. I think we were sophisticated about the constitutional guarantees of freedom of speech and the campus rules. I certainly encouraged that. Also, those topics remind one of the fact that individual behavior occurs in a social context and there are actually limitations on individual freedom that are derived from the need of society as a whole, to protect itself or to continue to function. That conflict was often a big source of controversy.

We had to make a decision all the time as to whether or not a particular exercise of freedom of speech had moved to a point where individuals' need to go to class or study or use the library or pass freely through an area that was important--whether all those things would come into conflict with freedom of expression. That's where we had to decide whether the interests of the University or the interests of the individual were uppermost. Almost invariably, when I thought the University was not functioning effectively then I was quite willing to allegedly interfere with individual expression. I want to add to that statement. It isn't enough of a justification for all forms of formal protest that the individual is obeying his own conscience. And it is important for the individual to recognize that the rest of society isn't obliged to get its guidance from the conscience of the protestor.

I'm reminded by your references to them earlier, Harriet, that I don't know of a single instance where a subpoena or an injunction helped us. It was not a useful thing. They were unenforceable.

##

Heyns: At the outset we thought that injunctions might be helpful, but we soon discovered they weren't even worth getting. I don't think we ever asked for one.

Going back briefly to my comment about the interaction between the good of the social order, the larger good, and the individual conscience. It certainly was common, an attitude that I had and I think my colleagues shared, that if you do elect to disobey the law, it was certainly in the civil rights tradition, probably epitomized by Martin Luther King, to accept the consequences--arrest, conviction, or whatever the consequences were. I think that notion got pretty rapidly eroded, too, to where you could disobey the law and it was the law that was wrong, and therefore you didn't have to put up with any of the consequences. Nevertheless I think we adhered to the original principle, or at least I did.

Access to University Documents

Heyns: I'm not sure what your questions are about what kind of information the University can provide about individuals on campus?

Nathan: This may or may not be something you'd want to talk about. During this period there were subpoenas and threats of subpoenas from some legislative committees, un-American activities committees. The issue became, in a sense, what can the University do in the way of responding to legal requirements, and yet not break faith with students and others who would expect you to defend their interests.

Heyns: There was a lot of controversy about that matter and sensitivity on the part of the campus, the Chancellor's office, not to hand out personal documents, personnel files, and so on, files that were traditionally private ones or confidential ones within the University community. I don't remember any instances particularly, although we did protect the personnel files, and I'm sure there were inquiries about those, and procedures and minutes of the committees.

I know we, toward the end of my stay, were under heavy pressure from the federal government with respect to ethnic discrimination cases. The government wanted access to University documents. By and large we resisted those pressures, because we felt it would invade privacy and affect our function.

Let me explain why, for example, in this discrimination. I think we were very interested, I was certainly, and my colleagues, Bob Connick and others, were very eager that we not discriminate against people for sexual or racial reasons. Berkeley had an extensive practice of seeking the recommendations and observations of people off the campus. If we had a young historian we were thinking of appointing we'd write to Princeton, Yale, Harvard, and a whole bunch of other places asking for their evaluations.

If their evaluation became part of the file and then went to the federal government, in no time at all you would have lost the confidentiality of that process, and hence turned off important sources of information. That was why we resisted the idea. We felt it would jeopardize a very valuable and important procedure.

To the best of my knowledge we did not share personal data with the FBI, for example. We often compared notes about what people in the FBI or the city police or others knew, about some of the parties and participants, and I'm sure we didn't withhold that. But that was a matter of record, that was a matter of intelligence, if you like.

McClellan Committee

Heyns: We did get subpoenaed by McClellan's committee, at least I think we would have if I'd decided not to come.

Anyway, I went to Washington at the request of the committee. We prepared a statement about activities on the campus, met with McClellan. It very quickly turned into a political effort on his part to establish the case that I was aiding and abetting student radicals, that I didn't know what I was doing, and that campus protests were really Communist led and I was giving evasive answers. It turned out to be an interrogation, really, and a prosecution of what was happening at Berkeley. It was part of a vast conspiracy and that I ought to know better and appreciate that fact.

It was becoming increasingly uncomfortable until Senators Javits and Percy came into the room, saw what was going on, and then began to ask questions that were more along the line of what is happening to the society, what is happening on the campuses, what's the best way to handle protests, why are we handling them the way we are. It became a very useful and instructive thing, which is what I thought it would have been all the time. McClellan obviously had another axe to grind. Incidentally, I later wrote to Javits and went to one of his retirement dinners and he remembered the occasion. We just walked into a big trap. That's the only subpoena I can remember.

I inherited an ongoing controversy about Professor Katz that had gone through various stages of investigation as to whether he was or wasn't a Communist.

Nathan: Did this have anything to do with a promotion, or was it just an identification of his politics?

Heyns: I met with him. I don't recall whether he was in the department any more when I got there or was stating a claim, having left, but claiming he was either wrongfully dismissed or wrongfully put on the shelf. I can't remember really. All I know is that I looked at the file, talked with him, and concluded that there wasn't any evidence that I saw that he was a Communist. He might have been, but I couldn't find any evidence that he was. It kind of petered out. I just don't remember what happened then. It was less important than lots of other issues.

Nathan: Was that part of what you were required to do as Chancellor, to deal with some of these developments?

Heyns: Sure. I had to come to some kind of ruling about it. Whether it would have held or not, I don't know. That case just died. I'd be curious to know myself what happened to it.

TAs' Strike

Heyns: There was at that time, and one of your notes reminds me of it--I think there was a TAs' [teaching assistants] strike. I can't remember what the issue was. I know it was pretty tough because we talked with the man who was the head of the labor council in Alameda.

Nathan: Was this one that had to do with the kind of supervision the TAs received from the professors?

Heyns: No, I think it had to do with pay.

I met one Sunday with the head of the Alameda council. The TAs were members of the Alameda labor council, but the Alameda labor council was very gingerly about that relationship and didn't regard the TAs as major sources of union strength, as a matter of fact, they thought they were flaky. Nevertheless, what we were apprehensive about was that the labor council might join them and close the place down, with the teamsters and other unions participating. We persuaded them not to do that, but it was a sticky business, because there is a kind of loyalty within the labor movement, understandably. Budd Cheit was the main one to work on this and he remembers it, I'm sure, much more clearly than I. Fortunately, he's an old labor negotiator and was enormously helpful there, as in lots of other places. He's the one who really handled that. He knew these people very well.

The TAs did strike, however, and we did insist that we would follow the traditions of the labor movement itself. If they struck, they would forfeit their pay. They certainly wouldn't get paid while they were on strike. This is a long-standing practice. Indeed, the Alameda labor council didn't object to that. That was perfectly all right with them, but the TAs did object. Just as we had a lot of problems at the time of the Cambodia thing as to whether people were working, teaching, and that sort of thing, we had a heck of a time finding out whether TAs were or were not on strike. They could argue that they met their classes at other times.

It was a "nice" example, an excellent example of how a university is so much an institution of conventions, of understandings, nonwritten, certainly not in any bylaws, where people are expected to be where

Heyns: they said they were going to be, where the course catalog tells them when the classes are going to meet. In other words, there are just lots of informal, but acknowledged and conformed to, rules of the road, social contracts. That means that it's very easy to disrupt that process.

The best way to describe it is if you have people punching in and punching out at a time clock you know whether they're there or not. The more sophisticated, the more civilized the system, the less need there is for that. But by the same token, when violations begin to occur, they are much harder to detect and you've got to institute a whole new system to answer the question, "Are they there or not?" You have to ask people like the department chairmen, who haven't thought about that kind of a problem in their whole lives, suddenly going around trying to figure out whether people are meeting their classes or not.

The fragility of a university as a result of those, what I think to be, signs of civilization, is very great. It's a part of the wonderful life of academia, student life as well as faculty life. If you have to begin to formalize those rules in terms of practices and procedures, this would be a loss to a university. That was true of the time, place, and manner rules themselves.

Nathan: When you speak of forfeiting pay, that is different from losing your job?

Heyns: I was talking about forfeiting pay, but I think that it was also possible--I don't think it ever went that far--we would have to replace them, and hence they would lose their old jobs. It wasn't the salient thing at the time, because we didn't immediately fire them. The strike got into lots of discussions as to how many people were striking, and so on. The number was vastly overestimated by the TA union, but I think we never got around to dismissals.

Political Climate, and University Financing

Heyns: I'm not sure that there ever were any, I'm talking now about punitive state financial proposals. I don't know that there were any that were actually specifically directed at Berkeley, but I'm sure the University as a whole had a much tougher time with its budget because of the negative attitude of the public, hence the legislators, toward the University and Berkeley in particular. The University used to be a fair-haired institution, and it began to get put on the list of desirable institutions; the budget process was much more competitive and eventually there were cuts.

Heyns: It may be that history would show that the cuts were punitive acts--I think some of it reflected the fact the governor himself wasn't crazy about the place. There were also hostile legislators. It's also true that other issues went up on the priority scheme. It isn't so much that we went down exclusively, but that other things went up--health, environment, social welfare, and so on. So we did, not just in California but elsewhere in the country, move down the priority scale. I think some of it was due to that, although an awful lot of it was negative.

There was one effort to deal with the shortfall in state support. It had to do with the imposition of tuition and increasing the fees for out-of-state students and so on; various methods were discussed. As I guess I told you before, I never resisted the idea of tuition. It seemed to me that the State of California had been unusually generous. I did know from my experience at Michigan that one could have tuition and still have a pretty heterogeneous study body and still have a large graduate student body from the rest of the country, and so on. I thought the Regents and the administration of the University were unduly anxious about that. It didn't bother me. We never used the nasty world "tuition," of course. We always talked about "student fees," which seemed to me to be a subterfuge. Of course there was, as there should be in that case, a special sensitivity to people who got priced out of the market as a result, and so some of the money was appropriately set aside for student financial aid, which was proper.

Nathan: Speaking about some possible disenchantment with the University on the part of the public, aside from specifics, do you have a sense of anything that the University would be well advised to do in outreach, to make itself an institution that the community wants to support?

Heyns: Oh, I think that the University always has to sell itself. Is that what you mean?

Nathan: In a way, yes. So people will understand that there is something of value here.

Heyns: Right. I think there was a time when the University just sailed along so successfully, with lots of support from the legislature and the governors, that they neglected their selling job. I think that the Chancellors and the President really began to recognize the need for more effective public relations and more effective relationships in Sacramento, and more of an effort to persuade the citizens of California of the value and, really, uniqueness of the University of California. I know I spent a lot of time on many of my speeches

Heyns: to make that point and not have their public attitudes be influenced entirely by the current turmoil on the campus--you know, to talk about its contributions. Oh yes, I think that that needed to be done and needed to be done even apart from the public relations that were needed because of the student unrest.

Often the student unrest problem would call for so much attention and explanation that you didn't get around to these more fundamental contributions of the University. We had an older problem of neglect of public relations and a newer problem of campus turmoil, and tackling the older in the presence of the newer one was harder than it might otherwise have been.

As I said, we did have to respond to that cut in FTE [full-time equivalents]. I don't think that that particular cut was fatal, at all, but it certainly was the beginning of a process that was harmful. It certainly made us apprehensive and it was very tough on morale.

Nathan: And this FTE relates to faculty appointments? The loss of about 110 FTE?

Heyns: It was a lot, and as I said, we were able to adjust to it by some juggling and with help by retirements and reduction in some part-time appointments, and so on. At least, although I grieved about it, I had to objectively conclude that it was not a disaster, but if that were to continue it certainly would be.

Nathan: It probably made recruitment harder, I would think, when you're not even in a steady state.

Heyns: Right. It was indeed difficult.

From Quarters to Semesters

Heyns: To go on to another topic, the change to quarters from semesters, I thought that was a nuisance. You can argue about quarters and you can argue about semesters. My only advice is whatever you are, stay with it. I wasn't in favor of this change at all. I think it was intended to have the effect of going towards year-round operations, that it would be effective in bringing that about. I had come from a university where we had gone to year-round operations. Year-round operation was a kind of shibboleth. We'd done that by just inserting another semester. So it wasn't necessary to go to a quarter system in order to get the year-round operation. I just thought that whatever system you're on you ought to stay on it.

Heyns: Indeed, it was ludicrous, because some institutions regarded the quarter system as the ideal way to get to year-round operation, while others of them were changing from the quarter system. Actually, one of the absurd parts of it is that it began to be treated with utmost dignity, that there are all kinds of learning problems and pedagogical issues involved. There was a great deal of nonsense in the discussion.

Committee for Arts and Lectures

Heyns: You want me just to go on?

Nathan: Absolutely.

Heyns: I thought the Committee for Arts and Lectures was really a very valuable asset to the campus, although I also thought that they were a kind of snooty outfit.

Nathan: How is that?

Heyns: They had a kind of precious notion as to what ought to be brought onto the campus. It got pretty esoteric from time to time, I remember. I happen to be very fond of symphony orchestras. At the University of Michigan we had a concert series that featured the Philadelphia and Boston orchestras and lots of others. I remember talking to the San Francisco Symphony people including Maestro (is his name Krips?)--

Nathan: Yes, Josef Krips.

Heyns: who came to the office. They wanted very much to have a couple of concerts during the year and a couple of them during the summer on the Berkeley campus, in spite of the fact that when that discussion took place Zellerbach Hall was not up yet. They were willing to play in the Greek Theatre, even Harmon Gym. I thought that was a splendid idea. It would have helped the orchestra as well, but I was told by the people in Arts and Lectures and others that Berkeley was really too sophisticated for a symphony orchestra.

Nathan: That's new to me, too. Of course it all happened later.

Heyns: Yes, sure it did. But Berkeley was alleged to be much more sophisticated than that.

Nathan: Would only chamber music do for Berkeley?

Heyns: Yes, that's it. Only chamber music.

Nathan: That's marvelous.

Heyns: Isn't that great?

Nathan: Yes. You made your point.

Zellerbach Hall

Heyns: I inherited both the concept of Zellerbach Hall and the museum. They were at varying stages of construction when I came. They were both sources of problems. There had been a competition, which led to the selection of Ciampi for the design of the museum. He came in twice in a row, separated by a year, let's say, over budget. I had to go back to the Regents twice to get a supplement, which wasn't easy.

Zellerbach Hall was not yet started. We had taken away the playing field and begun to prepare the grounds for Zellerbach Hall.

##

Heyns: I think the original intention was that it was to be entirely financed by student fees or to be student fees plus private gifts.

Nathan: Are you talking about the operation of it?

Heyns: No, just the building of it.

Nathan: Wasn't the building a gift?

Heyns: No! By a long shot it wasn't a gift. I think the building cost was maybe $6 or $7 million. That may be wrong. Maybe it was 10 or 11. In any case, I don't think the Zellerbach gift was more than a million. The rest of it came from student fees.

About that time, there was a lot of student agitation about Zellerbach Hall, because Crown Zellerbach was associated with certain labor practices by the corporation at Selma, Alabama. It was one of the featured centers of exploitation, at least as the students saw it. So there were a number of protests and a number of negative editorials in the Daily Californian. Mr. Zellerbach got very unhappy about that. This was before we got the money.

Nathan: Curiously enough the gift had nothing to do with Crown Zellerbach, did it? It was Jennie Zellerbach's money.

Heyns: Exactly. But Mr. Zellerbach got very unhappy about the protests and the editorials. I imagine I was called over to Harold's office two or three times with the task of persuading him to follow through with the gift. Tears would come to his eyes and he'd talk about what an insult it was to his mother.

Nathan: You had to go over to San Francisco to do that?

Heyns: Sure, because we needed that money. I think Mr. Kerr got the name on that building too cheap, as far as I was concerned. It should have been $3 million at least, but I don't think it was more than a million. In any case, I had to fight hard to keep the million. Harold and I, incidentally, became very good friends, and we remained such, but those early encounters with him were very ticklish. I really had to go over and persuade him that I really couldn't do anything about the Daily Californian and didn't want to, didn't think it would be smart, and generally hold his hand. I tell you, we even dedicated or put the corner stone in a very furtive way so that nobody knew that was happening, and we got away with it.

I'll tell you a funny story in connection with that. I used to think often that Berkeley was accident prone, that our timing was often terrible or we did something at just the wrong moment. Something would happen at the most unpropitious time. Well, the opening concert at Zellerbach Hall featured the music of John Cage and the dancing of Merce Cunningham.

Here Harold Zellerbach is an opera buff, and not a modern opera buff, either, but a classical opera buff. He and I were sitting there in that box. He started out very alert and we weren't more than a half hour into the mission than he began to sleep. I, of course, was becoming more and more uncomfortable and thinking back that this had been nothing but a pain to him from the start and expected him at intermission to come down on me like a ton of bricks. But he got up and shook my hand and said, "Roger, to Hell with it!" and he went home.

Nathan: He must have been pretty comfortable with you.

Heyns: He was. As I said, we remained very good friends and often chuckled about this whole thing.

The University Art Museum and Lawrence Hall of Science

Heyns: The museum presented the problem that I talked about before. As a matter of fact, this was also true of the Lawrence Hall of Science. These were projects that were begun before I got there. The financing for all three of them was inadequately planned and, I suppose because of the demands of the other campuses and the general decline of the affluence of the University, they were all underfunded. It was a real struggle to get them completed.

Nathan: So the Hans Hoffman gift--

Heyns: That had already been made by the time I got there.

Nathan: The proceeds of some of the pictures was not sufficient?

Heyns: I knew we were going to get the Hoffman paintings, not all of them, but I don't think we sold any. The whole thing just was not adequately financed. I know that Peter Selz was brought there before I got there and he had an understanding that he would have a substantial acquisition fund. He'd been promised that, he said, by the President. There wasn't any such acquisition fund. If there was to be such a fund it would have to be something that I found in my budget, and I couldn't find the money. So all three of those wonderful things, now very important to the campus, were nothing but a pain in the neck to me.

Nathan: Where did the partial funding come for the Lawrence Hall of Science? Was that a gift?

Heyns: It was started by the Regents. I don't think it has ever been the subject of a large gift. I think it was finally paid for entirely by the Regents. I think there were some expectations that there might be some private gifts, but it was a struggle to get that money from the Regents, even though they had committed themselves to it. I don't mean to say they'd gone back on their word, but things got tough and they didn't have the money, so I was constantly arguing for it.

I've got another funny story to tell you about the Lawrence Hall of Science. They were in the middle of constructing this. This was my very first Fall. Akiko [Owen] told me there were people in the outer office, members of the faculty, who lived up on the hill. They were disturbed by the fact that the contractor was working all night. These people told me that this was against the city ordinance. So I inquired and ascertained that that was true.

Heyns: So I said, "Okay, tell them to quit, not work at night." Decision number one, decisive. That was the end of it, as far as I was concerned.

The next day the contractor comes in. He's a big, healthy guy and he says, "Did you say that?" and I said, "Yes." He said, "Well, I got a contract here and I gotta finish it before the rains come." I didn't know that the rains could be expected to come in a concentrated way in a couple of weeks. He says, "If I don't finish that there's a default payment required in the contract," and he went on to talk about the fact that I would be exposing myself to some penalty. If he had to pay the default he'd sue me.

So I talked to the Regents' counsel, Tom Cunningham, and I said, "If I obey the laws of the city, tell him to quit, and then I do get into this penalty business, who pays for that?" thinking that the Regents would have to pay for it. I was told in no uncertain terms, no, that would be a charge against the Berkeley campus, which was a piece of advice I didn't appreciate or understand.

I now made my second decision and told the contractor to go ahead, and he did. My next visitor was a man named Johnson, who I was told by Akiko was the mayor of the city, Wally Johnson. He lived up there and was also troubled by this working at night. Lights were shining in his bedroom and all kinds of things. So he was protesting and wanted me to change my decision a third time, but I didn't. The uprising among the citizens didn't get too strong and the contractor did complete the project. And gosh, I think it was only about a day later that the rain really, really came down. I didn't think that was a very exemplary set of decisions.

Nathan: It was a perfect introduction to what you would be facing thereafter.

Heys: It was a good introduction, yes.

Nathan: That is a very nice story. When the Berkeley mud slides, it really slides, doesn't it?

Heyns: Yes, it really does.

You asked what happened to the museum financing. It just fell apart, and Peter Selz was very unhappy, felt betrayed, and never really pitched in. He was a very able art expert, had been a curator at, I guess it was New York's Museum of Modern Art, and he kind of got caught up in the whole turbulence of the time and was unhappy. I

Heyns: think it was really a blow to him and I don't think as a result we got his full, serious attention. We never created the opportunity that he had envisioned when he came. As a result, we were operating on a shoestring, and I think the first couple of things we put in there were probably folk art or far out stuff. We did have a very distinguished art critic, Harold Rosenberg, there as the dedication speaker. That was a treat, to hear him. But the beginning was inauspicious, let's put it that way, and I'm not sure that during my time there we adequately supported the museum. We did create a Friends of the Museum, and they began to pitch in and play a useful role, but it was tough going.

The Centennial and Fund Raising

Heyns: The centennial celebration was to be accompanied by a fund drive. They had worked it out where we should raise $15 million. Well, we were having a heck of a job raising $10, let alone $15 million. It was not an auspicious time. Berkeley was not popular.

Nathan: This was the '69 centennial?

Heyns: Yes. I think we made the 15, as a matter of fact I know we did, but it was not because of any major gift. It was more that we could honestly say that during that time we got $15 million. I spent a lot of time going to prospects, and so on, but I'm not impressed with the fact that I brought in a lot of money. I was just relieved that we got to the 15, but it shows you what a tough time that was for Berkeley. Heck, at that time other universities, like the University of Michigan, were probably getting $30 to $35 million in a year, whereas the habits of contributing to Berkeley were not good. There were too many of our graduates who thought about Berkeley as free, as being state supported. So the habits of alumni giving were very primitive.

We started the Sproul Associates at that time and it had maybe 10 or 12 people in it. That same concept at the University of Michigan had at that time maybe 200 people. So we just started in a big hole and at a bad time, from the standpoint of public attitude. So it was very, very difficult at that time and we, I think, made only a mediocre start.

At that time there was a further complication that fund raising was divided between the Alumni Association and the Chancellor's office, and that relationship was not very good. There was competition,

Heyns: lack of coordination. At the end of my tenure I had worked it out that the basic responsibility for fund raising would be in the Chancellor's office in cooperation with the Alumni Association. It turned out that Chancellor Bowker did not implement that plan immediately, but I think we laid the groundwork for it. This lack of organization was another problem in getting private support.

Since that time Mike Heyman has done much better with that than I was able to do. Bowker himself was able to do much more than I did.

Nathan: Is that related to the UC Berkeley Foundation?

Heyns: That kind of thing, yes, although I think the foundation existed when I was there, but it was led or dominated by the Alumni Association and not the Chancellor's office. So there were lots of independent activities going on. I don't mean to say that the people who worked in the alumni office weren't working for the campus, but the point is that the priority system of the campus did not influence the fund raising efforts in as precise a way as it should have, as it does in most other places and as it eventually does now.

I'm not much of a celebrator, anyway. I forget my wife's birthday and our wedding anniversary and so on. But here's where it's a good time to talk about Garff Wilson, who is an absolutely marvelous man and played while I was there, both before and after for that matter, an enormously useful role. He's great at thinking of things to do and he's a celebrator. He's got a sense of class and style, and so we did a lot of things in connection with this centennial celebration that never would have occurred to me. I just had the wit to do it when he said it was a good idea. I trusted him. We had Robert Gordon Sproul plant a centennial tree; we did lots of stuff, including creating the Berkeley Citation. That was Garff's idea, and we also set up the Berkeley Fellows at that time. He and George Stewart, I guess, were the founders of that idea. That's been hugely successful, the Berkeley Fellows, and so has the Berkeley Citation.

Berkeley Citation

Heyns: I'm not sure about the timing. If it's important, historians can find out. I think one of the values of the Berkeley Citation--whether it was that at the outset or one that evolved, I don't know--was as an alternative to an honorary degree. I remember one of the first times we used it was when [New York's Mayor] John Lindsay came to be the Charter Day speaker and the Regents didn't want to give him an honorary degree.

Nathan: Because he was a politician? Or did they have some other problem?

Heyns: No. He was a Republican, later a Democrat, but in any case they didn't want to. I don't remember exactly why. I do remember that the more conservative Regents didn't want it, so we gave him a Berkeley Citation instead. He didn't mind. He thought it was great. I think a lot of people felt the same way about it.

Faculty Union

Heyns: You've got an item in here called the development of union activities. I suppose you mean efforts to form a union in the faculty?

Nathan: Right.

Heyns: I was not at that time, nor have I been since, enthusiastic about the unionization of a faculty. I thought of it as, really, eventually certain to incur costs on the collegial relationship between the faculty and the administration. While I often criticized or grumbled about the elaborate mechanisms of faculty participation and faculty control, I still valued it. The faculty committees at Berkeley were conscientious and thoughtful, the faculty members were elected with a great deal of care and worked at those committees very seriously, and had a lot of influence. The budget committee was a very influential committee.

I thought that it was ironic, really, that a campus about as much faculty governed as any in the country, would be tempted at all to form a union. They had the most to lose, I thought, if the practical measure of loss would be influence, which indeed it should be. I thought that unionization would just raise hob. I don't know that I ever had an occasion to speak emphatically about it, because I don't think it ever really got anywhere. That's my recollection, anyway. But I certainly was prepared to say, and I certainly indicated whenever asked, that I thought it was a mistake. I don't think it ever got a positive vote on any campus of the University, did it?

Nathan: I don't know. I had the impression that perhaps it was the more junior members of the faculty who were interested and those who were at the top, who had tenure, didn't find themselves so attracted by the idea.

Heyns: I think that's probably true, yes.

Nathan: This next point had to do with the discussion as to whether Berkeley should be three-quarters graduate students, one-quarter undergraduates, or whether there was a magic formula that would make the ideal academic community here. Was that during the time you were here?

Heyns: It might have been, but I don't remember. It was always true that graduate students cost more than undergraduates.

Nathan: And the faculty kind of likes graduate students?

Heyns: Yes. We talked about that last time. There's a tilt and bias in favor of graduate students, but I don't recall that significant shifts to more graduate students, whether that was ever a serious possibility.

Peoples Park

Heyns: And now we get to Peoples Park.

Nathan: Are you ready for that one?

Heyns: Yes.

Nathan: I was interested in something you said about the relationship of land acquisition to what finally happened at Peoples Park, with the various slow steps, various recommendations.

Heyns: Well, as you note here, the area that ultimately became identified as Peoples Park, was identified for acquisition by the campus. Certainly it needed it. I mean, if you think about the size of that campus, what is there, 150 acres down below the hill? It is terribly small. The University had done an awfully good job of exploiting the space and still retaining its beauty, but the campus was much too small. Acting President Harry Wellman urged the Regents to either implement that plan or release the land and get it into the city planning mechanism. We did get allocations to buy that land. We were thinking about it primarily, although we knew there were budgetary problems, that eventually it ought to be for graduate student housing, as I recall it.

We had those people in Albany Village, but we certainly had the need for more apartments for young faculty as well as graduate students. That whole process took an inordinate amount of time.

Heyns: There were lots of discussions about it, trying to get it moving. Then at some point, I don't remember when it got occupied. Is that in here? Is that April 1969?

Nathan: April 1969 was when the confrontations came.

Heyns: Well, there is a whole, long Berkeley Division speech [May 23, 1969] on the history of which I haven't refreshed my memory.

Nathan: I think that's where I got your sequence, beginning in '56 all the way to your resignation.

Heyns: I think it's very relevant, this long period of time during which this area really deteriorated, I'll tell you, very badly, because the people who owned land that we hadn't yet acquired knew it was on the acquisition list, and they didn't keep it up. Sometimes we were slow in tearing down buildings.

It was very run down, which means in my view that there was a certain kind of culpability on the part of the University with respect to the poor planning and slow execution. Part of the frustration on the part of the city that later became apparent was due to this long period of time.

First, of course, people moved in and put up tents and slept there, had parties late at night and all through the night. I remember getting telephone calls at two and three o'clock in the morning from irate citizens.

Nathan: They called you?

Heyns: Oh yes, complaining about the disruption caused by that activity. We began to get reports from the police as to who were there. There was a lot of drug use there, a lot of sexual activity, and just generally a mess. The police were constantly finding runaways and young girls hanging around. It was real social disorder. I got lots of pressure from the city about this. They didn't put it in the paper, but they were very unhappy about it. The police were unhappy as well as the city manager, who is a very nice man-- There was lots of pressure from the city to close the place up.

Nathan: Was that Hanley?

Heyns: Yes, a very nice man. We had a long meeting about it and I'm sure we met those people and tried to work it out.

##

Heyns: As a result of the failure of those efforts to get some rules about use, and the continued complaints from the citizenry and the city, we had a big meeting. The decision was to erect a fence, which was intended, really, to buy us some time, to cut down on the social complaints, to satisfy the city. I don't want to put the blame entirely on the city here, but it ought to be a matter of record that they put a lot of pressure on us in addition to our own desire to clean it up. And it was a depressing sight.

I don't think that any of us were delighted about the decision to put up the fence. I think everybody recognized there were some risks involved in that, some feeling that it wasn't going to work. Logistically it was a huge success. We got the darn thing put up, but then you know about the famous march down there and the tearing down of the fence.

Nathan: Yes. You mentioned an attempt to meet with people to try to resolve some of the problems. Were you able to get anybody to negotiate with?

Heyns: One of the problems was, not just in this incident but lots of others, that it was often very difficult to identify somebody with some kind of representational authority. That comes up again later. But no, I imagine we talked with many groups who would come forward as having some capacity to negotiate on behalf of the people and turned out not to have, or would fail to show up, or in one way or another the thing wouldn't go anywhere. Certainly one of the problems was that there wasn't any representative mechanism. We put up the fence and it was torn down and we had a lot of difficulty on the campus. And of course one person was shot, another person blinded. It was a terrible situation.

We then began to resume talking about the uses that area could be put to and we again tried to find responsible representatives. This whole social organization was such a mob, really. It was impossible to find representatives because of the very heterogeneous population.

There were a minimum number of students directly involved; I never did ascertain how many, but not very darn many. But there were a lot of students who were seriously interested and even more as a result of the violence after the march. They recruited lots of interested students at the time, but not because the students were using that park.

Heyns: We did establish a committee. I used to go and meet with this committee. One of the members was the manager of the bank down there on Shattuck, I think. It was a motley committee, including a kid who was about 12 years old, maybe older, maybe 15 or 16. He was not a student. He was not in any school. He was just a street kid, and he'd been elected by the people to show up. We'd sit there in that bank, talking about uses of that property. It was ludicrous. It was absolutely wild. Budd Cheit and I and others met with them frequently, maybe a dozen times. It shows you the total absurdity of that situation.

That doesn't mean we were just working with that group. We were working with Hanley and others to try to arrive at a solution.

Nathan: Did you have much to do with the Telegraph Avenue Concerns Committee, with the Codys and others?

Heyns: I didn't myself, but I'm sure other people did. That may be the Telegraph Avenue Concerns Committee. Budd Cheit was certainly right in the middle of that, trying to figure out what to do about it. And then, you know, it ultimately resulted in my presenting the idea to the Regents to turn it over to the city to be used as a park, or whatever else they wanted to do with it.

There was a time, as I recall it--and I'd have to refresh my memory--when the city was actually taking that possibility seriously. I don't know whether Mayor Johnson continued to be enthusiastic about it. As I recall it, at the Regents meeting where this was discussed--because, after all, it was University property I was discussing, and I didn't have any authority to make any rulings about it--I did present a plan.

Nathan: Were the Regents at all interested in this?

Heyns: They'd had a hearing about it, and then there was a formal meeting. It was debated at some length, but it never did get any support. I don't think there was anybody who voted for it. I remember ending that speech with a quote from Buell Gallagher, who was at CCNY. I thought that there was one option that they had never tried, which was to try to give the administration some support.

This was a very acrimonious period with the faculty. There were old, old friends of mine who were really very antagonistic, very hostile. I probably was, in terms of faculty support, at a very low point here. I don't think that there was much sympathy for what I was trying to do or the stand I was taking.

Nathan: If you could have had your way, was there something that you hoped or wanted to happen?

Heyns: I thought at the time that the suggestion that the University lease it to the city was really the best solution that I could think of. That would put the responsibility for management and for police control and everything else in the hands of the city. After a particular period of time it might revert to the University. I didn't talk about a sale; I was telling them about a lease, and that was my genuine view.

I didn't see how the Berkeley campus could ever manage the problem of the control of that land, at least not in the immediate future. It would continue to be a battleground. Changing the ownership and changing the entity with which to deal--the people would have to deal mainly with the city, as opposed to the University--might have a chance, but the University wasn't about to do that. It was a very bad time, very low. They had big marches, you know. I remember one Sunday, I think it was, exclusively devoted to marching around. I remember being concerned about whether it would end in violence. It so happened it did not. That's the end of that one.

Nathan: It's a little after 3:20, so do you want to just go to here and stop?

The Campus Drive Solution

Heyns: Well, let me go on to take that next question. We did have the problem of Campus Drive. I found that kind of amusing, at least a little bit of a light touch, although there was a lot of agitation about it. It brought home very vividly how earnestly people feel about the Berkeley campus. I decided that there wasn't a shrub or a tree on the campus that wasn't somebody's favorite, I'll tell you. I thought that the solution that the campus people, the campus architect and the landscape people, the solution they arrived at was really quite ingenious. I think it's great.

Nathan: What was the solution?

Heyns: Well, they just left every damned tree up there, except maybe one or two, and wound that road around it. The shortest distance between two points was not a feasible thing, but I didn't get exercised about that.

Nathan: That's a nice metaphor for Berkeley in a way.

Heyns: Yes.

Nathan: That is great.

[Interview 4: May 5, 1986]##

Nathan: Oddly enough, the last word on page nine of the outline, where we'd gotten to last time, was parking. Do you have anything you'd like to tell us about that?

Heyns: I was on the Berkeley campus last week and thought the person who invited me had arranged for me to find a parking place. It turned out that the arrangements she had made were unknown to the parking people and so I felt everything was still normal.

Nathan: [laughter] How delightful.

Heyns: That was always a big problem and I suppose it still is.

Collective Memory and What Is Useful

Nathan: It certainly seems that way.

Perhaps before we get into the issues of events and confrontations, there are a couple of questions, if they would interest you. One has to do with institutional memory. You came in under very trying circumstances. I wondered whether you and your staff had tried to pay attention to the former Chancellor's files. How much history had you delved into? What sort of continuity were you thinking about or able to deal with?

Heyns: There were lots of informants. I don't mean that in any confidential sense, but there were lots of resident experts on the Free Speech Movement. They didn't hesitate to tell me what the mistakes were and what the effective techniques were. They didn't always agree on what the lessons of history were, but there certainly was a lot of intimate knowledge. I'm not sure how much of that information was in the files. I don't remember going through the files on this. I know that Mr. Strong kept some confidential notes about that period, but to the best of my knowledge, I never looked at them and I think he retained those.

Heyns: I don't feel, however, that there was any lack of collective memory about the tactics and the events. Certainly most of the people I brought into the office, Budd Cheit, John Searle, and Bob Cole, all had seen aspects of that and were fairly sophisticated and insightful students of what the administration had done, what the student movement was like, and so on. So I think we didn't start from scratch. That's certainly true. Is that responsive?

Nathan: Yes, very much so. Was there any particular effort when you left to convey what you felt might be of value to the next person?

Heyns: I don't recall that I made any special effort to talk with Chancellor Bowker about the tactics of student unrest. He, of course, was a pretty sophisticated man himself, and had had experience as chancellor of the City University of New York. I think for that reason I'm sure we didn't talk about that. We were much more interested in my informing him about what certain things were in the mill on the campus, the history of academic matters.

There's another reason for that, however, and that is that I'm not sure that a kind of tactical history of these events is very useful. The situations are all different in one way or another, and so a kind of journalistic history of what we said, what the student said, or whatever protagonists were there, and what we did and why we did it, and whether it worked or not--that's all kind of journalistic and not terribly instructive.

The kinds of things that are useful are a fairly good theory of how to deal with disruption and what the principles are, and there I don't think Mr. Bowker needed to be edified. I'm certainly sure that the people I left behind were as sophisticated about that as I was.

Wingspread: Some Principles

Heyns: I may have mentioned to you that a number of us who were involved in these student unrest times met at Wingspread. We more or less agreed not to talk about tactics, because their experiences were so particular. I think there are some general propositions that we all agree on, but they're not profound and not of the sort that you feel, gosh, if I don't tell them they'll never know.

Heyns: The desirability and importance of being completely candid and not to stonewall, those kinds of concepts are some of the theoretical or conceptual framework for handling situations of conflict. But that's a whole other chapter and I don't think it's a terribly edifying chapter.

If the police are going to be involved be sure you've got more than you need rather than less, for example. Almost always when you bring in outside assistance you've got a control problem; who runs it? You create a situation where conflict may be desired by some of the people who are there and eager to have you call the police. The police may be an issue themselves and they may misbehave or be provoked to misbehave, and so on. That's another area of tactics, if you like, that I think most people are quite sophisticated about. In other words, I don't think that we made a very big effort to develop a tactical handbook.

You take a man like Chief Beall, who was at that time head of the city police, but later came to the University. He was a very sophisticated man and had learned a lot about how to handle these situations, and was an excellent repository of knowledge. Certainly that was a legacy. He was a very competent and able person, and a very fine man.

Nathan: I was thinking also of, let's say, administrative decisions, not necessarily related to the conflict, although that was certainly a large load for you. Is there a channel of some sort for referring back to earlier decisions if that should be necessary?

Heyns: Well, the Chancellor's office had excellent records. Zelma Gelling was in charge of the records office; she and her colleagues were very good. They could come up with a document, and if somebody had made a pronouncement or issued an order, it would be almost certain that they would be able to go back and look for it, find it, or bring it to your attention in advance. No, I thought the record keeping was excellent there. As a matter of fact, I think they could be said to overdo it some. But they certainly are not erring on the side of having anything unrecorded.

Nathan: This is a bit to the side, but when the Regents make a decision, whose responsibility is it to see that that decision is implemented? Is it the President, the Chancellor? Is there a clear-cut line of responsibility?

Heyns: Oh, yes. I don't think there was much ambiguity about that. If the Regents made a decision, the President would communicate it to the campuses, and it would be the responsibility then of the Chancellor

Heyns: to see to it that it was then a part of the practice and policy. I don't recall any malfunctions that had to do with poor communication at that level.

Style of Negotiating

Nathan: Yes. Once in a while, though, these questions arise and I'm interested to hear you describe this.

Perhaps related to this is some matter, of personal style in negotiating for the administration, let's say, with the students. What was your style? Did you tend to hold yourself in reserve and send a spokesman out? Just what was your own sense of how to operate?

Heyns: I don't think I ever did direct negotiations. That's probably too sweeping a statement; I may have on occasion, but that was not our style.

Our style was that somebody from the Chancellor's office--Vice-Chancellor Boyd or Cheit--somebody else from the office would handle the discussions. My participation might be at the beginning, directly to see what the problem was, to see whether that was the proper way to proceed; or at the end, to kind of ratify an agreement. But by and large I did not do that directly.

Nathan: Was there a reason for this method?

Heyns: Yes, I think the strategy was that all the issues could get explored very easily without the risk of a Chancellor committing himself on the spur of the moment to something that would be hard to execute or impossible to do. So it permitted a lot of freedom to the person doing the negotiating. It also gave us time to evaluate how things were going and what we could or couldn't do. It was understood that the person doing the negotiating couldn't make a deal. On the other hand, there wasn't a big long lapse of time, occasioned by the fact that the rest of us had to be consulted. We did an awful lot of group discussion of these matters, and we often developed a negotiating strategy or posture, put limits on what could be done, as a result of these discussions. So I never felt that it was necessary for me to be present. I don't recall that these ever broke down because they thought they were talking to the wrong person. It came to be known that this person or these people were the representatives of the Chancellor, hence important and worth talking to. I don't recall that any negotiations ever broke down because they wanted to talk with me directly.

Opportunities, Confrontations, and Use of University Space

Nathan: That is a good setting to get us into whatever you would like to say, if indeed you would like to talk about some of these confrontations. As you have said, not in a journalistic style, but interpreting the issues that you saw.

Heyns: The first one that you have listed here, the Stop the Draft and Vietnam--I may be repeating some things we've talked about earlier, but at the outset lots of the discussions and lots of the tense interaction between the Chancellor's office and whoever the people were on these issues, had to do with time, place, and manner.

The basic principle here is that we had to work out opportunities for expression, opportunities for discussion, for demonstrations, that were not themselves disruptive. And indeed, that was a very fundamental matter, because it had to do with how the rest of the University behaved, and the rest of the University was free to go about its business. So circulation, noise, and clutter, all that sort of thing, while superficial on the one hand, had to do fundamentall with the social contract that would provide guidance for those who wanted to do this kind of thing on a university campus. Some of the rules were trivial, in a way, like how big the signs should be, and all that sort of stuff. Actually, what was behind that was our concern not to have the place look like a cluttered Hyde Park. As a matter of fact, before the time, place and manner rules, it was more cluttered than Hyde Park ever got. It was just a mess. It was aesthetically not good, and I think symbolically, there was a need to discipline that process.

So my only recollection about the utilization of Vietnam protests really had to do with time, place, and manner rules, and access to University facilities. The procedure for getting them, the procedure for the utilization--those were the foci, not the issue itself, not whether they should have a demonstration or a discussion about the Vietnam War. The utilization of University space was important, because the University had increasingly become a vehicle for nonstudents.

I think I mentioned to you that one of my first encounters was a request for the use of a playing field, and there was only one student in the group. That whole system of allocating, reserving space had gotten just chaotic. Almost anybody could walk in and reserve anything. We had to begin to enforce some rules that were negotiated by student activists themselves. So I guess the major

Heyns: point I want to make about that whole sequence having to do with demonstrations about the Vietnam War really had to do with student participation and the style, mode, and rules of doing that.

I think you and I talked about the Third World Liberation Front strike.

Nathan: Right, I think we have.

Heyns: The main point I would make there is that it was a gradual politicization of an academic issue, starting out with the Black students, and it became an issue in which there was a coalition of Third World people. I've never thought the participation of the Oriental students was very great at all, but there was a small participation from the Native Americans, and the Mexicans. The leadership was primarily Black, and it was frankly political, utilized by the radical white students, who didn't necessarily have a serious interest in the issues. It was a long and troublesome time. Wasn't it during the Third World Liberation Front strike that the library was burned?

Nathan: I believe so, and I know that the files in what used to be the Reserve Book Room were destroyed, so that access to those books was not available. When you say the issue was politicized, were you thinking in terms of campus politics, or of outside politics?

Heyns: Well, I was thinking that it became a prime issue, a political issue on the campus itself, and that the substantive issues of should there be a separate department, should there be a separate school, which are all legitimate questions, got very much obscured. I think I mentioned to you earlier that I think that could have been handled much more expeditiously than it had been. So the frustration level was high. There were some people who were delighted that there were frustrated people, and then they could use their skills to keep the fight going, rather than to solve the problem.

I'm not sure how far that teach-in in '67 went, but it was very clear to me that we did not want to have the academic process taken over for political purposes. That, I think, was what had us exercised there, and not the issue of discussing the war itself.

On one of these occasions--it might have had to do with the antiwar protest--we authorized the use of the Student Union for an all-night teach-in, and had a number of faculty members participate in that process, to try to domesticate it, if you like, or to try to make it a useful experience, a serious one. I think somebody got an injunction, somebody outside got a court to enjoin that, and

Heyns: successfully. I remember spending some time in the courthouse talking to the judge, urging that he not do that, on the grounds that it was not an injunction we could enforce. It seemed to me to be very important for authorities--the Regents, University, and Chancellor's office--not to make rules that they couldn't enforce, not to make threats that they couldn't back up. I thought that whenever you did that, you had a rule that you couldn't enforce, that that really played into the hands of students who were cynical about government, cynical about authorities. I thought that was serious issue and not a good use of civil authority. The judge, when I told him that we couldn't enforce any injunction, I remember his comment, which I thought was terribly cynical: "That's okay; this is what the people want." I suppose, what the society wants. Well, I thought that was cynical and unhelpful, just to issue something which ostensibly the society takes seriously, and he was doing it just for political purposes.

Nathan: Was this a municipal judge?

Heyns: Yes. At least, I think so, although--no, it must have been a county judge, because it was in Oakland. It was not a Berkeley judge.

Nathan: Yes, that's a very curious view.

Heyns: I think they also were going to use, at the end of--my memory isn't perfect here, but I think that at the end of the teach-in, they were going to march on Oakland. That caused us real problems, because our relationships with Alameda County and Oakland were not cordial, and we didn't want to be in the position of helping the marchers organize, but on the other hand there was not much we could do about it. I think the march did take place, but I don't remember that there were any incidents in connection with it. I don't recall that there were any student suspensions, because there just wasn't any way in the world in which we could have prevented them from assembling. I don't think we did.

If I made any efforts to interpret student preferences, like their propensities for staying up all night--to the larger community, that was just part of trying to help them understand what we were up against, and to make sure that some of these things weren't regarded as crucial. I don't think that that was a critical matter, that they didn't go to bed. As a matter of fact, they usually took the afternoon off, as far as I could tell.

Nathan: Well, they had to sleep sometime.

Heyns: That's right.

Faculty Attitudes and University Values

Nathan: Could we go back just a moment, if this interests you--a comment that the faculty had not stated clearly that intellectual pursuits and intellectual discourse are the values of the University. This raises a question of your interest in having a statement by the faculty. Was that important at the time?

Heyns: Well, it seemed to me that, in the establishment and the enforcement of time, place, and manner rules, we were in effect saying how people behaved in a university. Not just out of some kind of Victorian notion of being polite, but because conducting yourself in a civil manner, not interfering with other people, and being hospitable to the views of others--all of those are values of a university, and not ends in themselves, the time, place, and manner rules, that is.

It seemed to me that we were, in the Chancellor's office, constantly stating what we thought the purposes of a university to be. Lots of the support that students got from faculty members, seemed to me to suggest to the students that they did not have those values, that the purpose of a university was to be politically activist, to make the university an instrument of social action. This was not our notion, and I don't think anybody's proper notion of the purpose of a university. It seemed to me that we needed--I was stating those things--some kind of clear-headed statement on the part of the faculty that said, "Look, these values of ours can only be enhanced in a civil and decent society." That would have been very helpful. I don't mean to say there wouldn't be students who wouldn't dismiss that as being self serving. But it would have supported our efforts.

##

Nathan: You were saying that there was the implication that rules might be so picayunish, but--

Heyns: Yes, what I was thinking about is that some of the rules, and I've already alluded to this--some of the rules looked trivial to the faculty, and sometimes they would criticize the rules. What I wanted them to understand, and was eager to have them understand, was that if they knew the history of those rules, they would not necessarily regard them as trivial. But more importantly, if they were to assert the efforts that the Chancellor was making to have this be a civil society, protective of the important pursuits of the University, that the students themselves would begin to take those rules seriously and relate them to the proper purposes of the University.

Heyns: I would also say that, had they really come out in that direction and thought about that matter, they would have been more supportive of what we were trying to do, and at least had a serious debate about the risks the University was running by operating in a way that would permit the politicization of the University itself, which I thought was going on, which my colleagues thought was going on. If they wanted to go that way, they clearly could have done so. I hate to think of what would have happened, but at least they would be debating what I thought was the central issue, and that's why I criticized its absence. I'm not sure I understand exactly why they didn't assert such a value officially, because I'm sure that would have won; I mean, that would have clearly gotten the support of the community. But I think there were some people on the faculty who were delighted with the politicization of the University. Not wisely, and maybe on reflection they might not have stayed that way, but the capture of the University, turning it into the purposes that they had in mind--that idea appealed to some faculty members, and part of their support of that element in the faculty was because they really liked that.

I don't think the Chancellor had any compelling authority there. The only value of the Chancellor speaking out was that it was one voice in that direction. Indeed, there were people there, lots of them, who knew what we were talking about.

Nathan: That's interesting, particularly in view of the power of the Academic Senate.

Heyns: Well, I don't want to leave the wrong impression. There were people in the Academic Senate who very clearly appreciated the position and tried to be helpful. They were not overwhelming in their numbers, certainly.

Nathan: So that sort of debate in this format didn't really develop?

Heyns: I guess I don't really know how to answer that. It certainly was underlying all my contacts with the Senate, and the reasons that I gave for the actions that we took. I'm not sure we ever debated the political uses of the University directly.

The Regents and High-Visibility Events

Heyns: In connection with those activities having to do with the antiwar movement, there was always a problem with the Regents on anything that was highly visible on the campus. Sometime in this period an anti-Vietnam War commencement was planned, as I recall, where they were going to have a separate commencement and it was going to be organized around the antiwar movement. That agitated the Regents something fierce. There were Regents that were afraid that the concept of commencement--they had appropriated that like a copyright--the Regents' copyright on the word "commencement" had been violated. They were terribly eager that we weren't giving any official approval to this. I think they finally had this somewhere, in the Greek Theatre or on the Sproul Hall steps. We had a big argument about where it was going to be. All we were trying to do was domesticate it; we weren't trying to prevent it, but the Regents were very upset by it. I must have had to report to them a half a dozen times on that.

So one of the constraints, and this is the general point I wanted to make about that whole period--there wasn't a single one of these major incidents that I didn't have to deal with at first on the campus, and second, with the Board of Regents. We used to spend days getting ready for our Regents' meeting, listing all the questions that could possibly come up. Some of the Regents had informants on the faculty and in the student body that were in daily or more frequent consultation with them, who gave them reports on everything that was going on. We even had a member of the police department, the campus police department, that was a steady informant to one of the Regents. So if there wasn't direct and accurate knowledge, there was always some rumor or alleged fact that we had to deal with. We would spend two or three days before a Regents' meeting briefing me on all the questions that might come up, all the things that had to be answered. We would have to have a total presentation on what we did, why we did it, what happened.

Often this was against a background of contrary information or some rumor, which made it inevitable that in our handling of these things, we had to think not only about whether it was good for the campus, whether it helped us in our dealing with that problem, but also what the impact of a decision would be on the Regents. While I don't have any specific recollection in mind, I think that there were many occasions where we, if we could just be self-contained on the campus, might have handled a situation somewhat differently. But we would know that all we had done as a result of that was to get into trouble with the Regents. The difficulty there was not that I would get fired, but that the Regents would do something that would be even tougher to deal with, in other words, impose some limits on our freedom. So we were constantly trying to protect against that.

Variety of Constituencies

Heyns: The point I'm making, I guess, in a broad way is that we were fighting these wars on lots of fronts. We had to think about the group itself, about the students (and their attitudes) who were not directly involved; we had to think about the faculty; we had to think about the Regents. That meant that we were always engaged in complex solutions, because the problems were complicated, with all those different constituencies to think about.

Nathan: As you list these constituencies, would you include alumni? And of course you had a relatively unfriendly governor.

Heyns: Yes, I would certainly include the governor.

I would include certain highly alienated legislators, like Don Mulford, and I would include the alumni, although they weren't interested in controlling the University. They were part of the support of the University that I didn't want to alienate, but they weren't somebody whose approval I necessarily had to get, or whose approbation I had to have achieved at the end. So I didn't think about them as a particular group that I had to keep informed and posted. There were many alumni who were very devoted to the University and were supportive and became close friends and still are. There were too many to list and I am afraid I would leave some out but I remain very grateful to them.

Nathan: Perhaps one more word about the Regents, if you would care to talk about this. I gather certain Regents were relatively supportive, while others were relatively not so. Did you make any attempt to line up support?

Heyns: I never caucused. It was obvious to me who the people were who were suspicious of me and doubtful about my judgment or my motivation, and I knew them and could count them, but I never made any effort to meet with them in advance, or with the group that I could count on to be supportive. There were a lot of 8-7 votes, or 9-6. Or, if not an actual vote, that would be the way in which the tone of the meeting would go.

As far as the governor was concerned, there were decisions that I made where I would get clear messages from the governor's office that that was the wrong way to go, and to stop doing it. So they were involved in the strategy; I mean, involved in trying to influence the strategy.

Nathan: I might ask about your relationship to the University President.

Heyns: That was not a problem area at all. Most of this period was with President Hitch, and he just gave me all the running room he could and was very supportive and very understanding. I didn't have the slightest interference from his office, and only eagerness to be supportive. I tried to keep him informed, and so on, and we had lots of discussions, but he didn't look over my shoulder, and when something was going on on the campus, he was not directly involved in the decisions I was making. No, he was very wonderful and very supportive, and we never had a lick of trouble.

National Guard and Highway Patrol

Heyns: I don't know how much time we have spent on Peoples Park; I think last time we talked about it quite a lot. We were never eager to bring on the National Guard, never asked for it. This was the governor's idea from the beginning to the end. We always tried to be sure that those troops--whether it was the CHP [California Highway Patrol] or the National Guard--were careful about their capacity to instigate or initiate something that would itself be an incident, an atrocity, if you like. You know, if you looked at the National Guard, you had to remember and be made anxious about the fact that these kids were the same age as the kids on the campus, inexperienced, very puzzled by the whole thing. It was a dangerous situation just from those demographic facts.

Nathan: Who briefed these outside groups?

Heyns: Oh, that was mostly done by Chief Beall and the campus police, and the vice-chancellor for student affairs. We never had any control over the helicopters. I'm still traumatized by helicopters. We had a very definite message to give them. By and large, the commanders themselves were not eager to come onto the campus; they were not.

I remember the California Highway Patrol--it was kind of amusing, after they had been on the campus for a while, and I think maybe with a notion that somehow or other we didn't know how to keep the peace. I didn't know that that's how they felt at the time, but it was revealed by a comment that the commander made after they had been there, and he wanted to leave; he wanted to get out. He said, "You know, this is a big place. You can't control this kind of thing; it's too big." Well, precisely. Therefore, you had to do it in a different way. He never wanted to come back.

Occupation of Moses Hall

Heyns: Let me go back to the Moses Hall occupation, which was a rather unique event, if my memory serves. First of all, there was a very large element of outside, nonstudent leadership in that. As a matter of fact, I think our distinguished Assemblyman Tom Hayden was in this. There were outsiders from other campuses as well, and they occupied this building. We brought in a lot of CHP and law enforcement people from Alameda County and all around. I think we must have waited until three or four in the morning before we got them out of there, made any effort to. That was actually a pretty tough crowd. There were people up on the top of South Hall, throwing lumber off the top with jagged nails. It was a tough crowd outside, supporting the occupants inside.

Gradually, as the night went on, more and more people got out of Moses Hall, until the final group was not huge. I don't know that anybody knows how many were there at the outset, but by four in the morning there weren't all that many. In a very calculated way we were going to go in there, we were going to get them out, and it was going to be with a minimum amount of violence. We were waiting until we had all the people in place, everybody instructed: a most meticulous police operation, with lots of cooperation from the CHP and the Berkeley Police, our police--a beautifully coordinated matter. They handled it beautifully, and they got them out. Nobody got hurt. There was no violence at all. It was perfectly done. The thing was all through at eight in the morning. Maybe I've told you this?

Nathan: No.

Heyns: At eight in the morning they had a formation of all the troops. No National Guard involved in this; all police, professional police officers. They had all of them in formation, preparatory to dismissing them and shipping them back to where they belonged. We were very eager to have this all done before the students came back to school. But as we went past 8 a.m., students began to come, and a number of girls came around and started to jeer at these fellows, these officers. Several of the girls spat in the face of these officers.

I remember standing next to the commanding officer of one of those groups, and he looked at me with total scorn. You know, what kind of people are these anyway? It was one of the sickest moments in any one of these episodes, because there wasn't anything I could be but just speechless. Here they had been beautifully handled. The

Heyns: campus had gotten wonderful cooperation, it had been done just exactly the way we wanted it, only to have a kind of vivid example of the disruptive and really callous, thoughtless, and even worse kind of behavior on the part of some of your own students. It was a dreadful moment.

The other interesting thing that makes me want to single it out is that--you can check on the actual numbers, but--when we finally got the names of all the people that were trundled out of the building, none of the leaders were there anymore. They had all gone. My recollection is that 90 percent of the 100 students left were freshmen. No history of experience in this. They were really just pawns in the hands of that radical leadership, which was gone. There is so much symbolism in that story, so many morals in it, that it's an important episode in my memory.

Nathan: Yes, it is. Were you aware of what had gone on inside the building? The destruction and so on?

Heyns: I certainly became aware of it, and I knew some of it was going on at the time. But I don't remember any of it. We were very apprehensive about the things that were being done during that time to student records and so on. So we were upset about it. We thought this was one of the most serious things that was happening to us.

You might go back and check and see if you want anything more said about Peoples Park.

Nathan: I think you've approached it through a number of different elements.

Cambodia and the Purposes of the University

Heyns: Yes, I think we can leave that one.

I would like to go to the Cambodia thing. I guess I've already made clear that the--

Nathan: That was 1970?

Heyns: Yes. From the very start I was concerned about the academic values of the University being uppermost, and the conduct of the University being appropriate to those values, and that there was sufficient protection through the rules and our enforcement of the rules of the essential activities of the people who wanted to engage in them in their normal pursuit. That was always the vast majority of the campus.

Heyns: Having said that--mainly that I had this constant concern with the fact that the University remain that way and not be an instrument controlled and governed and used for political purposes--the Cambodian episode was in my mind. Although it was not the most violent, it was the most serious of all the events that took place on the campus because those values were the most clearly threatened. The idea of stopping the teaching of classes to turn students loose to work in the communities, was that the whole thing should be changed. There was a lot of rhetoric from quite a number of people, faculty included, that, okay, now that this has happened, we're clearly going to change the purposes of the University and we're going to turn it into a very different kind of institution.

Almost immediately it was very clear that there were people about to graduate, about to go to graduate school, wanting to complete their programs, whose values and purposes were very much threatened by that. We heard from them almost immediately.

Then there were also people who were, from the very start, fearful that we were going to lose that battle, and that the University would be turned into an instrument of social action. People on the Regents, right-wing students, and others used this rhetoric and some of the behavior as a way of proving that we were not serious about those fundamental purposes.

It was very clear that the movement was very strong and could really close the place up, as Princeton did and others were doing. That didn't help us a lick either, that these other places were closing up. We were under a lot of pressure to do that. Given the history I've talked about, we weren't about to do it, but this was a very, very serious time.

It was a very serious time on the campus, and it was a very serious time with the Regents. Actually, I had to assign Mr. Connick to keep track of where classes met and work with the chairmen. I remember mentioning this to you before. We had to spend hours documenting what was going on, for two reasons. One was to satisfy ourselves as to the extent to which people's normal careers were being interfered with, and also to be able to face charges that might have distorted the actual data.

Now this was made complicated by the fact that there were so many students who themselves hadn't had any history of political activism, and who weren't ideologically in disagreement with my basic contention, but were terribly exercised by Nixon's decision. I thought it was outrageous myself. You know, I think it was a terrible moment. And then, of course, the event of--what was it? Kent State?

Nathan: Yes.

Heyns: So there was lots and lots of anxiety about administrative behavior and use of troops. This was a very, very tough time. I think we got through it by just being zealous about it. You know, we tried to enunciate some principles that were there, in my mind, all the way through the whole six years.

In other words, everything that I think we were trying to achieve kind of crystallized: the need to protect the rights of individual citizens, individual students, and faculty members. It did call attention to the fact that the faculty members were responsible for the intellectual life of these kids, but they also couldn't be insensitive to the anxieties that these youngsters had.

Nathan: Sharing that frustration?

Heyns: Yes. And that classrooms shouldn't be used for political purposes, and the same is true of University facilities, and so on. So those were all principles that we had been enunciating. Maybe I stated them more emphatically at that time, but they were the guiding ideas all along.

There were lots of things that went on at that time that were distressing. I mean, you couldn't be sure that faculty members actually did complete the work in a normal way. Some of them tried, some of them didn't try at all, some of them met in strange places.

##

Heyns: I was just saying that this was a very chaotic time, and we were not a normal operating University. I don't remember how long it took for us to get there. As a matter of fact, we may never have gotten there during that semester. I think we kept a semblance of it, but there were lots of things going on that we didn't approve of, and I'm sure there was lots of disruption. I don't think that we were operating as a place of rational discussion or learning.

As I say, Vice-Chancellor Connick did a very good study, and I think the amount of criticism that we got from the students who felt most disrupted began to drop off. I think we just kind of fumbled our way through it. I think we did not let it get out of control, that we did actually finish the semester with a modicum of stability and performance. It was a very wild period, and lots of crazy things went on, there's no question about that.

Nathan: In an earlier part of the conversation, we mentioned, I think, that some of the Regents had their own sources of information. Is it possible for a Chancellor to have sources, pipelines, special ways of knowing what's going on?

Heyns: Oh yes. I don't know all the details of it, but we were rarely caught by surprise, totally. We might not have as much warning as we would like, but we usually knew what was going on, through extensive contacts with students and faculty and so on. We had a pretty good intelligence network ourselves, and the police did, and the FBI did, and so, yes, there were lots of sources. Not all of them were reliable.

Now that sounds like what we were trying to do was, you know, engage in some kind of warfare. I think I've made the point before, that some of the predisposition to joining in some activity that would embarrass the University or be antagonistic to the administration, some of that motivation came from dissatisfactions that people had. So part of our intelligence network really had the motivation of "What are these students thinking about? What can we do to help with this problem or that?" So it wasn't just snooping; a number of my people established excellent rapport with students, who began to believe that we were doing the right thing, and were trying to be helpful.

Nathan: I was thinking, too, of the difficulty of knowing what is going on in every class, every section, every department.

Heyns: Oh. Oh, I don't claim we knew that at all.

Nathan: How difficult that would be.

Heyns: As a matter of fact, I would feel that we had lost the war if we had to develop that kind of a system. I would hope that we could retain the elements of a civilized society, where that kind of monitoring wasn't necessary. So we never did do that.

Nathan: It was sort of ironic reading about this, that it looked as though many of the difficult things had been resolved, and as though things were beginning to quiet down when the Cambodia issue arose.

Heyns: I think that's true, yes. I think that's true. I think that the fact is that subsequently things did go very well. We didn't have a resumption of this at all in the fall. So I think it really was the case that we had weathered it. There was discussion about it, you know, that in the fall we'll really turn the University into a political establishment, but it never did materialize.

Attracting and Keeping Faculty Members

Heyns: Well, should we leave this student unrest business?

Nathan: You've given a lot of interesting insights that only you would know. I might raise one other question about the problems during the various times of turmoil, of losing faculty members. Somebody mentioned Lipset, Landis, Rosofsky. Was this issue in the forefront of your concerns?

Heyns: It always was a concern, the possible loss of faculty members. Lipset had already left when I got there, and so had Rosofsky. And I'm sure from time to time there were others that we were concerned about leaving, the possibility that they might leave. I don't recall now any person who left because they just found the whole situation distasteful. I don't have a vivid recollection of any single person like that, but I could understand that attitude. Part of my concern about civility was that vulnerability that people who have no taste for politics and no taste for violence and no taste for disruption would find Berkeley an unattractive place. That was one of my motives for trying to have a civil society. But I don't recall that this was as serious a problem in actual fact as we thought it might be. It may be that some of these people who found it very distasteful just withdrew from the scene. I'm sure that happened. Others had become adapted to it. That's regrettable, but I'm grateful now that they did.

The other side of this coin was that we were also in the process of trying to attract people. At that time one of the really distinguished appointments we made was Charlie Townes, a Nobel laureate who has turned out to be a wonderful member of the University faculty. He came during this period; I can't remember the exact year. This was not an issue with him. I wouldn't say he was unaware of it; it might have played some role in his thinking and decision-making. So we were bringing in people at the same time. I think we were terribly lucky at that time, but it was always a concern of mine, that it might become very unattractive to our best people. It just didn't turn out to be as bad as it might have been. Maybe it helped us that other places were also in a state of turmoil.

Nathan: Yes, right. Were you trying also at this time to deal with various equal opportunity issues with respect to minorities, women, and others, who were proportionately underrepresented on the faculty?

Heyns: Well, I think we did talk about it, you know. I did establish an equal opportunity program that Bill Somerville handled at the outset.

Nathan: You're right. I was really thinking of faculty.

Heyns: Oh, I see. Yes, we were. We had influenced the search process in such a way as to increase the likelihood that ethnic minorities and women would be embraced in the search. I think every search committee was clearly informed that they had to make an extra effort to be sure that the net they threw out contained such people. I remember that some were turned back when they hadn't done so; this was done largely by the vice-chancellor for academic affairs.

Nathan: I see.

Public Relations and the University

Heyns: One of the questions you raise here [looking at list of interview topics] has to do with, in what sense does the Berkeley campus resemble another university that's not part of a nine-campus system. Obviously the Berkeley campus was a part of the whole University. But from the standpoint of the daily life of a Chancellor, Berkeley was a University, and comparable to others, of comparable quality. So it created somewhat of a different pattern, but not a significant one. I think that the president's role at the University of Michigan and the Chancellor's role at the University of California at Berkeley were more similar than they were different. There are occasions when th President is the proper spokesman for the whole University, but there were lots of occasions when the Berkeley Chancellor was the proper spokesman for Berkeley, not the President.

As I mentioned to you before, we made an enormous number of efforts and speeches and articles to interpret the University to the rest of the public.

Nathan: Did you get any positive response from the public when this happened?

Heyns: I think that the editorial opinion began to be more positive, more constructive. We certainly made a serious effort to involve the University in the affairs and the problems of the city. I'm thinking about Gene [Eugene C.] Lee, who was very much oriented as head of that Institute of Governmental Studies to provide service to the state. And I think there were meetings that we had with legislators to encourage them to see the University as a resource. There is always the problem of the academic community putting lesser weight to services to the state than it does to research and teaching. But that's not uniquely true of Berkeley; that's true of almost every research-oriented university.

Nathan: Do you have any views about the University's responsibility to provide education outside of the academy, to get connected with the community?

Heyns: I came out of a tradition at the University of Michigan where there was much more interaction between the University School of Education and schools, school districts, school boards, school administrators, than there was at Berkeley. Actually, there was an unfortunate shift there. I think that at one time the University of California was actually the accrediting agency for all of public education in the State of California. They had long since given that up by the time I got there, but there was a long history of very good relationship between the University of California and the school districts. That had disappeared by the time I got there; very little interaction between the School of Education and schools.

Maybe I mentioned this to you before--I did make a number of visits to community colleges and had the presidents of northern California community colleges come to have dinner at University House, in an effort to establish some rapport with them. We began--or at least we invigorated--the practice of having high schools and high school counsellors come to the Berkeley campus during the year for a series of discussions.

Our public relations group had to go through this revolution along with the rest of us, and I don't think found it any easier than the rest of the place did, to adjust to it. Almost immediately some tasks that had never figured in their activities became very important.

Heck, the first reporters that began to cover the campus were unfamiliar with education and were police reporters, because it was a police event. As time went on, the quality of the people that the newspapers brought on improved enormously--Carl Irving, and the LA Times man, Bill Trombley--very able people who began to understand what was happening on the campuses. Dick Hafner and the rest of the people began to really develop a rapport with those fairly serious writers about the campus, but that was a whole new ball game. I mean, up to that time it was a matter of press releases and so on. Now they had to begin to deal with the press and the media in a much more vigorous and much more intense fashion.

So they began to be heavily involved in the care and feeding and education of the press, and this was not easy. One of the things that I think we worked on very closely together with Hafner, in the Chancellor's office, was to be sure that our news releases were totally

Heyns: accurate, were not equivocating, that we were blunt and direct. Dick was very useful in that. He was very straight, eager for us not to be manipulative. He held to that very firmly.

I think we've talked about some of these other things.

Nathan: Yes. Have we mentioned much about TV coverage?

Heyns: Well, I'm not sure I talked about that. Television at that time was showing many of the same tendencies it shows now. You know, an orientation toward an event rather than toward the understanding of the event. The media have got some fatal flaws, the TV media, from the standpoint of dealing with background. It has to be a special effort. The thing they're most skilled about is reporting what's going on, not why or how, or how it came about or what the background was, and so television that does nothing but that is going to give a distorted picture. I don't mean to say that they went out and deliberately distorted it, but it's going to be incomplete, and we were often very annoyed by that. We never made any effort, however, at all, to limit their access.

They were always very well informed about what was going to happen, so that they were there. I think they got used. I don't know whether they have any sense that they were themselves inadvertent parties to keeping up the sentiment, or to keeping the controversy going. But they were clearly manipulated; I don't think there's any question about that. I think that some of them, in retrospect, realize that they were.

We got annoyed at the fact that Hayakawa appeared to be the only person in the academic work who was standing up for law and order, since as far as we could tell, the San Francisco campus, the state university there was a bigger mess than we were by a long shot, from the standpoint of morale and the civilities of the campus. So he, in one marvelous gesture, worked himself into a position of being the only tough educator in the whole world. But that was all jocular; I mean, we never developed any personal resentment against him. It was interesting--the symbolic act, which wasn't followed up as far as we could tell by any kind of firmness on the campus itself, just captured the day for him, and as a matter of fact, made him senator, I think.

Nathan: It probably helped a great deal.

Heyns: Much to my surprise. I can't think of anything else for me to say, unless you've got something you want me specifically to talk about.

Priorities, Staff Work, and Some Campus Figures

Nathan: Thinking of the quantity of things that you had to do and people you had to see, did you have a system of organizing and setting your own priorities? When things were popping all the time, I wondered if there was a kind of priority and schedule system that you and your staff worked out?

Heyns: Obviously the scheduling was enormously difficult. But we did work long days, and, you know, managed most of the time. I think that we tried always to stay very close to the academic side. That would be Bouwsma or Connick. They were, of course, themselves extremely competent people, but they always had access to me, more than anybody else. So the academic side of the place kept going.

I can't give enough credit to Akiko Owen. She was tireless herself, and very, very smart. She was a kind of student of what was going on. She knew what my values were, and what I thought was important. She was a very sensitive gatekeeper, and she did most of the ordering of the way in which people came in. She did that because she did it so well. It very rarely happened that when she postponed somebody I would have disagreed with her. She knew what the issues were, and there were people that I might not have known at all, and she would say, "I think you ought to see them," and it turned out to be right. Part of the daily calendar making was hers, and she was extremely sensitive about it. Now, she might say, "Do you want to see so-and-so?" I don't mean to say I was presented with something that I have never seen before, but we worked that out together, and she was very successful at it.

Nathan: Was there sort of a hierarchy of people--could you say, so-and-so takes care of all of these things, and somebody else takes care of those things?

Heyns: Oh yes, sure. There was a lot of delegation here, and a lot of sharing, people who would want to see me, and maybe the appropriate person for them to see was Cheit. Nancy Fujita was a wonderful person also--Budd Cheit's secretary. The women just put up with the most difficult conditions, with enormous loyalty and intelligence. They were very, very bright, hard-working, conscientious and responsible people. And pleasant to work with. Very, very lovely people.

Budd Cheit, I've already mentioned on a number of occasions, was a very, very able person. He understood the faculty, understood combat. Bud has a wonderful sense of humor, and is also very loyal

Heyns: and hard working. He worked unselfishly for the common cause. Very protective of me. He had a very orderly mind, so we could transact a lot of business rapidly. John Searle was a very insightful, thoughtful guy.

One of the things about that whole group, as I look at them--Cheit, and Searle, and Cole--they had a very good sense of humor. I think that humor kept us going, more than any other single thing. Bill Bouwsma, I've already mentioned, was a very fine, level-headed, even person. Connick, I think, is just an outstanding man. Carl Schorske was helpful to us. He writes beautifully, and I'm sure I plagiarized some of his stuff. Bill Boyd, I've mentioned frequently, was a very fine vice-chancellor for student affairs, and was a wonderfu member of the team.

We used to meet, you know, hours on end, planning and working through things, trying to solve problems. We became a very congenial group, and worked very easily together. There wasn't anybody who was difficult. We were all frank with each other. Morale was very good.

Nathan: Is that your natural style?

Heyns: Well, I'd like to think that I was totally responsible for that. [chuckles] No, I just think that they came with those traits, and we capitalized on them. Garff Wilson I've already described. Alex Sherriffs had been vice-chancellor for student affairs, and he was on leave when I first came. The decision I made about him was that we would not return him to his previous job, largely because it was my judgment at that time that he had lost his credibility with students and with the other administrative staff, and with his administrative colleagues, and hence would not be an asset. I didn't make any judgments about what he had done in the past, or whether he had been effective or not effective. All I could see was that he wasn't going to be able to function effectively, and hence he wouldn't be an asset. I don't think he ever liked that decision or agreed with it, but I made it.

I didn't have very many associations with Bettina Aptheker, although I remember with some amusement when we were in the middle of, I think it was some discussion.

##

Heyns: We were talking about Bettina. This was some time after the time, place, and manner rules had been developed; she was one of the people, one of the students in that group. They were having some trouble about compliance. Whether she had agreed to something and couldn't

Heyns: get her colleagues to agree--I can't remember the exact circumstances--she finally said in a kind of plaintive voice about her colleagues, "You know, some of these people," she said, "can't be trusted," which I thought was hilarious, since I was constantly being advised that a Communist like that Bettina couldn't be trusted. And here she was doubting the credibility of some of her colleagues.

[looking at list] Harold Jacobs--am I supposed to remember him?

Nathan: He was one of the activists. I put him in because his name came up. I think Aptheker, Jacobs, and Stein were three who were going to be admonished or punished in some fashion.

Heyns: I can't remember about them. I don't think we ever had any disciplinary problems with Bettina, did we?

Nathan: There was some deliberate breaking of the rules, and it was a relatively low-key sort of event.

Heyns: I don't recall it.

Arthur Goldberg does prompt a memory. I'm sure that even his best friends would say that Arthur was not encumbered by a lot of self-doubt. We were having these antiwar discussions. He was ambassador to the UN, and we invited him, I think, to be a Charter Day speaker. He came. They were guests; Mr. and Mrs. Goldberg were guests in University House. He very clearly felt that if he could come and talk to the students about the war, what we were doing, and defend the University position, that that would straighten everything out.

He spent some time on the campus before Charter Day; I'm not sure whether he came a day early or not. Some people had contacted him and asked him to speak in Harmon Gym, and he was all for doing that. He was very eager to do it, for the reasons I just mentioned. I remember thinking it was very, very unwise; not likely to be useful at all. I wasn't apprehensive that they were going to mistreat him physically or anything like that, but that it wasn't going to be effective, it wasn't going to be useful, and that he would be pretty well manipulated.

They did have the debate. I've forgotten--was it Franz Schurmann who debated with him?

Nathan: Yes, it was.

Heyns: First of all, Goldberg is no spellbinder, and he was very pontifical, very condescending. It couldn't have been worse.

Nathan: Were you there to watch this?

Heyns: Oh yes, sure. Oh yes. And I remember walking to Harmon Gym with him, and he was just the epitome of confidence, that these problems that I had been having, he could straighten them out. Well, it was a disaster. It wasn't a disaster on the discipline side, or anything like that; it was all very orderly. It was also boring, because Schurmann wasn't any more volatile than Goldberg was. They were both boring. It didn't lead to any fireworks at all, but it was, for Arthur, a terrible experience. We walked back to University House, and though he would be the last to say he was chastened, it was pretty clear that he was no longer ebullient. This was not one of his great moments.

John Raleigh's name reminds me of another one of these people in the Chancellor's office, on the academic affairs side, always supportive and helpful. You put Sandy [Sanford] Elberg and Raleigh and Bouwsma and Connick on the list. If the University kept on getting good people and making good decisions about appointments, salaries, dealing with academic issues, those are the people that did it. There is just no question about that. Loy Sammet is another one. Alan Searcy was vice-chancellor for research. Milt Chernin--lots of the deans were very supportive. George Maslach--the engineering dean. That was a good group of people, that deans' group. They were really supportive. I don't think there was a single one that wasn't. We developed a good rapport in that group.

Proposals for Reform of Undergraduate Education

Heyns: All along, while we were dealing with student unrest and dealing with the Regents and trying to keep the academic thing going, there were a couple of people who were trying to do something to make the academic life of the campus more interesting to undergraduates Bob Connick was certainly an important part of that as was Neil Smelser.

So were Charles Muscatine and Joe Tussman; they had both been chairmen of committees that re-examined the undergraduate curriculum. They were genuinely concerned about the general pattern of large undergraduate courses with lots of student assistants and very little attention by senior faculty members, very little in the way of really stimulating the academic environment.

Heyns: These two men broke their pick on that, I think. They worked at it doggedly and were forces for examination. I don't think we did a lot of it, because there were so many people preoccupied with other things, but they deserve high marks for what they were trying to do at the time, and they were bucking the tide. Not so much on their academic ideas, but in that lack of compatibility between what people were interested in and what they wanted to promote. So it was not an easy time for either one of them. But they were constant voices and kind of special pleaders for the undergraduate students on the Berkeley campus. They ought to get some kind of a medal for it.

Nathan: They were involved with an innovative college or program?

Heyns: Yes. Well, both were, weren't they? I think they both were. Tussman had the Experimental College Program [nicknamed Tussman Tech]. It was certainly one that he had recruited some faculty and some students for. Muscatine started another effort, Strawberry Creek College; maybe it got implemented after I left. Certainly he was an important leader of the discussion in the Academic Senate, in the Berkeley division anyway.

Nathan: Apparently they were both interested in sort of interdisciplinary structure of some courses, reforms in undergraduate education, and also in a smaller ratio of students to faculty.

Heyns: Right. Well, you know, they would be the last to claim that those were unique ideas. They were ideas like Honors Programs; also we had a residential college at Michigan 10 years before. So these were not new ideas, and they wouldn't claim that, but they were new for Berkeley, interdisciplinary courses, small courses with first-rate people teaching them, and people capable of having a sustained interest in the intellectual development of undergraduates. They were certainly proposing that, and wrote eloquently about it. Muscatine, particularly--capable of very penetrating analyses of what undergraduate education at Berkeley was like.

Shall we quit at that point for today?

Nathan: All right, I think we can.

[Interview 5: June 5, 1986]##

Nathan: We might start with the first lines on "moving on," if you would care to talk about your leaving the campus.

Heyns: All right. May I do something else that occurred to me after you left?

Nathan: Sure.

More Campus Figures

Heyns: In your list of names on page 12 [of the outline]--it reminded me of something that I wanted to be sure came through very clearly in this oral history, and that is--I was surrounded by just a great team of people. And I think to the extent that that was a successful period given the problems, it had very much to do with those people that you mentioned: Akiko Owen, Budd Cheit, John Searle, Bob Cole, Neil Smelser, Bob Connick, that whole group. They just devoted endless hours, with lots of intelligence and loyalty. They were, I think, very much responsible for the good that happened, and I wanted to be sure that my debt to them was acknowledged. Certainly I've left out some names, but I suspect they know who I mean.

A View of the Berkeley Days

Heyns: The other thing I wanted to say is that a lot of people ask me about my Berkeley days, kind of on the assumption that they were miserable, and they weren't. There were lots of trying periods that weren't pleasant, but I have only the happiest feelings about Berkeley, and respect it enormously, and was pleased to have been associated with it. I don't feel like a martyr in the least. It was a great experience. I think my family shares that view. It was something that I wouldn't have missed for anything. I made lots of wonderful friends, and it was an important time for the University, for a great University, and an important time for higher education. And I was glad to have been there at that time, a very significant moment in my life, and I'm grateful for having had the chance.

It was tough on my family from time to time, but even they agree that it was a great experience. My sons enormously enjoyed living in University House. That was a great privilege. It's a marvelous home, and we had many great times there. We made lots of friends, of course, who have remained our friends.

So all in all I wanted to make clear that, although you and I have talked most of the time about problems, understandably, it was a period of lots of satisfaction. I guess the only regret I have is that we didn't start Berkeley athletics off on a stronger mode than we did, and we still haven't, I guess. I don't blame myself for that, but I wish we could have done better in that field, because I think it's an important one.

Esther and Roger Heyns at the doorway of University House

Photograph by Tom F. Walton

The University and the Gift of Freedom

Heyns: I want to make a couple of comments about student protest. I recently read an article in the Wall Street Journal by a student. I'm not sure where he went to school, but he was reminiscing with his classmates about the days when they were activists. I think he was at Yale. He was very frank to observe that as soon as the draft was over, the fervor, the moral fervor disappeared. Now I would be the last to say there weren't very conscientious and serious students in the antiwar movement, but it's also true, that in that complex situation, there was an element that was not all high-minded.

I think the whole experience of dealing with student protest, and the faculty protest for that matter, has made me a conservative on the uses of a University for political purposes. I was reminded by that article and by other things we've talked about, about the fragility of the University's commitment to freedom of speech and inquiry. Our record on that score is not as elegant as it might be, and I'm not just referring to Berkeley. Freedom of speech is not necessarily a firm commitment by everybody. It applies to them, but not necessarily to everybody else, so universities have been ambivalent on that subject, and often very inconsistent.

I guess the point I really think about that is that the university is a social institution, and it exists largely by the choice of the society. The freedom that it has is a gift of that society, and not any kind of divine right. That delegation and that freedom can be lost through the carelessness of the university community itself. If the community chooses to make the university a political instrument, then it makes it fair game for everyone, and it's a serious risk. I think the Latin American universities, which are by and large not great universities, are good examples of what can happen.

The Decision to Resign

Heyns: Turning to the subject of the decision to resign, I am reminded by your notes that that was the last of October that I made that announcement, of 1970. It wasn't something that I had thought about frequently during that period. But after a couple of weeks' reflection about that time, I decided to indicate to President Hitch that I would want to resign by the end of the academic year.

Heyns: My reasons sound a little noble, but I remember them. I felt that the student unrest period and the period of great turbulence was over, and that there would be a period in which positive, constructive developments could take place; a period of growth and restructuring and positive accomplishment. I don't happen to think that there was much that was very positive academically or any other way had taken place. It was more a matter of holding the place together. So there were lots of things that needed to be done of a constructive sort, new programs developed and studies made and so on, and I just felt that somebody else could do that better. I felt that there were barnacles attached to me, suspicions and other kinds of scars, and that somebody else could do it better. And I really believed that.

The other thing I said at the time, at the press conference, I thought that a university, to be well led, needed a very high energy level on the part of the chief executive, and that I didn't have the kind of energy for that that I once had. It was still considerable, but not enough, and so I just decided that I wanted to do something else, and that I thought it would be in the University's interest. There wasn't any pressure on me to do that. None from my family or from anywhere else. I had recovered from my heart attack by that time, so health was not a consideration, and I can't think of any other, really.

I have since reflected, when I hear about my poor contemporary colleagues, people in positions comparable to mine, struggling with the Apartheid problem and other issues on campus, I have a feeling of relief that I'm not involved in that, but for a strange reason. It doesn't have anything to do with energy or fear or whatever, but just boredom. I've been through this thing so damned often that I'm bored to death with it. So the sense I have is boredom. Boredom might have played a role had that student unrest continued, but it wasn't operating at the time and I didn't have any particular concerns about it, but I have since reflected on the fact that I had gotten bored with some things.

Nathan: Did you feel that there tended to be a kind of sameness?

Heyns: Repetition, yes. Yes. All the issues would arise in the same form. Not that there weren't unique aspects each time, but it did have a kind of ritual dance quality to it.

IV MOVING ON

Heyns: At the time I made that decision I didn't have any alternatives. I mean, I didn't have a job that I was going to.

University of Michigan, and American Council on Education

Heyns: It later developed in the course of the year that I got this offer from my old alma mater, the University of Michigan, to be a professor of psychology and education and to be a part of the staff in the Center for the Study of Higher Education, but that developed after I announced my intention to resign. After having decided to do that, I was offered the presidency of the American Council on Education.

Nathan: Would both of those be full-time jobs?

Heyns: They were both full-time jobs. I had made a commitment to the University to go there and I did, for six months. The American Council on Education job came, the offer came after that. I discussed with the University of Michigan people this new opportunity, and they very graciously allowed me to pick that up, but I did stay at the University of Michigan for six months. They treated me very cordially, and in a way I've always had a sense of guilt for having left them so soon. They were very gracious and thoughtful about it.

Nathan: What was there about the opportunity at the American Council on Education that particularly drew you?

Heyns: Well, I had been familiar with the work of the American Council and had been on some of their committees and spoken at their annual meetings, and I thought it was a very important institution. It's really a holding company or a trade association of all of the major universities, and a very large proportion of the large colleges in

Heyns: the country. So it was really the spokesman for all of higher education to the extent that there is one. It resembles the National Association of Manufacturers, because it has a very heterogeneous population and hence many differences of opinion within it, within the membership. Nevertheless, it was in a position to help to build a consensus on such subjects as student housing and student aid. Historically the association has been very important in developing the basic ingredients of the GI Bill of Rights. So it has an important consensus-building, spokesman-type role. The central mechanism for the interaction between government and higher education, the central role there, was that of the American Council. That isn't to say that the Association of Land Grant Universities or state colleges or liberal arts colleges didn't have members on their staffs in Washington that didn't have governmental relations as part of their job, but the coordination of their efforts was really the responsibility of the American Council.

We were able, I think, to increase the sense of solidarity during that period by being sure that there were people from each of those segments on the board of the American Council. We had a secretariat that consisted of the heads of those other associations. There are eight or nine of them. That was not an invention of mine; it had been in existence for a while.

I like to think, anyway, we strengthened the ability of those various groups to coordinate their efforts, tried to get some divisions of labor so we didn't all repeat the same things, and we tried to weld a team of governmental affairs people, under the leadership of one of the staff members at the council, Charles Saunders; prior to that, Jack Morse.

It was not an easy job, in that sense, because there was a lot of heterogeneity, but I think we accomplished some things. We started an office for the women in education, the purpose of which was to increase the number of women in positions of leadership in higher education.

We started a commission on intercollegiate athletics, anticipating some of the problems that have since emerged. Probably the fact that they are still there means we didn't accomplish very much, but at least we were ahead of the game a little bit. The council has renewed that activity and it has had some real effect on the governance of the National Collegiate Athletic Association. I like to think that some of that initiative began when I was there, but it certainly didn't move very rapidly, and that's a shame, because I believe the conduct of intercollegiate athletics now is a real embarrassment.

Issues in Intercollegiate Athletics

Nathan: What were you aiming for in that area?

Heyns: Well, the National Collegiate Athletic Association is really an instrumentality of the institutions themselves. It had been allowed to go on its own way, largely led by athletic directors and university representatives, many of whom were not closely associated with the central administration in the university.

Nathan: Did it have to do with recruiting and academic status?

Heyns: Oh yes; recruiting, academic status, size of coaching staffs, but the main purpose was to get the presidents back into a responsible position. Unfortunately a lot of the presidents felt that the problems lay on other campuses and not on their own. There were presidents who had almost no control over the athletic programs that were in the hands of separate boards that their regents had set up. So there wasn't a lot of control in many places, and still isn't. And in some cases it took a lot of nerve for a president to begin to assert himself or herself in that area.

I remember when I was Chancellor at Berkeley that there was a decision by the association, by the NCAA, to make freshmen eligible. I didn't even know it was coming up as an agenda item, and would have strongly opposed it, and still do. But that shows you how removed presidents had got--the system had begun to leave them out. We had a very good representative, a faculty representative. It still wasn't routine to inform the President about issues like that. Now that was a big decision.

Nathan: On what basis do you oppose the eligibility of freshmen?

Heyns: Well, I think, first of all, it's possible now for youngsters to play for Berkeley before Berkeley opens, before they're actually registered students, which is absolutely absurd. That may be a quirk of the athletic schedule, you know, the school calendar, but it still illustrates how bizarre that can be. More importantly, I think that a youngster ought to get his or her academic feet on the ground, be a student. That first year is not an easy year, and all the major sports are terribly demanding in terms of time. I think it's just much more sensible to have such a person have very limited intercollegiate competition. You know, we used to have freshman teams, and we played three or four games. There wasn't any great hoopla about it. That's just a better introduction, and it emphasizes that the purpose of being there is to get an education.

Heyns: Well, that was just one of many issues: not only the adequacy of the rules, but the adequacy of their enforcement, uniformity of enforcement, and then the absence of some very important regulations. I think, for example, there should be a requirement concerning graduation. Now there are places where youngsters play, are eligible to play for four years, and then leave at the end of their four years of eligibility without a degree. I think that's a disgrace, and often a terrible exploitation of these youngsters, many of whom are Black and don't need that kind of neglect by a long shot. So I think it's a great embarrassment. And then recruiting practices need cleaning up, and I think there are lots of other problems.

I got started on that because the American Council on Education, at my insistence, began to get interested in that problem. I have to say that a decade went by before there was a serious interest on the part of the university presidents to pick that up, but again, under the leadership of the American Council and my successors, they have picked it up and have had an influence on it. Now there is a special Presidents' Council that is involved in the governance of the NCAA. I don't think they have enough power yet, but they're getting there.

Nathan: Well, that's quite a long way from not even being informed about what's going on.

Heyns: Yes, right.

Washington is a wonderful city to live in. The American Council had a home on Dumbarton Rock Court, which is between 30th and 31st, just off P Street. A lovely home, and we just enjoyed living in Washington very much. It's a lovely city. So that was a great treat. Just one more wonderful job that I had--all my life, I just got so lucky.

Nathan: That was fantastic. Did the American Council on Education attempt to be active, let's say, at the federal level, to do lobbying, or to enter into that area?

Governmental Relations

Nathan: You were there, physically, in Washington. I wondered whether the organization did lobbying.

Heyns: Well, I referred earlier to the fact that governmental relations was one of our functions. We had an educational research unit, policy studies, and we had this office for women. We had a program

Heyns: of training for young administrators, people who wanted to go into university administration. We had a publication department that put out a monthly or at least a quarterly Journal of Higher Education. There were, oh, I imagine, 50 or 60 people who worked in the council.

One of the departments was the Department of Governmental Relations, and I guess governmental relations is just a nice euphemism for lobbying. As a matter of fact, we were clearly not terribly effective in the lobbying sense of winning votes for a proposal or a piece of legislation. That was really best done by the institutions themselves, working with their own congressmen and senators. I would say that we might coordinate that, or all of the associations plus the council might organize that effort by selecting university presidents who we knew were articulate and able presenters, and organize the effort to kind of move in on the House or Senate or both. I think our principal role in governmental relations was really in connection with the staffs of the two houses of Congress and the legislative branch in developing policy issues, and dealing with, oh, regulatory problems, affirmative action, and other kinds of Title 7 affirmative action components.

So it was largely on policy-making and on regulatory problems that the council did most of its governmental relations. We helped to develop student aid packages. As I said before, we played a very active role in supporting and in getting the concept of aid to universities for student housing, and so on. So I would say we weren't very good at twisting the arms of congressmen. I think that's actually very true of lots of the lobbying efforts in Washington, that they're more and more inclined to be useful in the development of legislation or the development of policy.

For example, now there is quite a lot of controversy about the charges that universities make to governmental agencies on indirect costs. That problem has come up many, many times in the last 30 years, and usually the American Council has been active in organizing a task force to work on that problem with the OMB [Office of Management and Budget], and I'm certain that the American Council is doing the same thing right now.

Is that enough on the American Council?

Coordination or Competition

Nathan: It's very interesting. If you think of more things that you would like to say, that's fine, too.

Heyns: Oh, I think that's enough.

I think I aspired to more coordination than we actually achieved. There is a great tendency for those associations to go off on their own.

##

Heyns: There was duplication of effort and competition between these other associations and the American Council, even though there was a kind of rhetoric that the American Council on Education was the over-arching coordinating body. That was more than just rhetoric. But there was also competition for the attention and devotion of the individual members. You see, the University of California would be a member of and pay dues to the American Council on Education, and also to, say, the Association of Land Grant Universities, and maybe also the Association of American Universities. They might be a member of as many as two or three of those, and each one of those associations was, in one sense, in a competitive mode with the council. Many of the leaders of those organizations felt that it was more in their interests to do something unique or in some way of a service to the organization, to the university, and less return on a cooperating investment. That wasn't true of all of them, certainly not true at all of the AAU, which was the association of 45 or so major universities where the relationship was always very, very close.

I think higher education suffers in Washington as a result of that kind of heterogeneity. Even though one recognizes that there are different interests and different problems vis-à-vis the federal government from one of those groups to another, I still feel a sense of frustration that we didn't make more progress along those lines. But I comfort myself--I've now had two successors in that job, and neither one of them has done a hell of a lot better than I did on the subject.

Nathan: Territorialism is a difficult issue.

Heyns: Right.

V THE HEWLETT FOUNDATION

Heyns: Turning now to the Hewlett Foundation--I came here in '77, but I had agreed to come a year earlier, and announced that intention to the board of the American Council and promised Mr. and Mrs. Hewlett that I would come a year after they asked me to join them.

Nathan: How did they find you?

Heyns: I'm not sure. Mrs. Hewlett is a Berkeley graduate.

Nathan: Really?

Heyns: Yes. Flora Lamson Hewlett was from the Class of 1935. She was a chemistry major, which was unusual in those days. I had met Mrs. Hewlett because of her interest in the Berkeley campus. She was very interested in student problems, and the interest of students in political and social affairs, and I think in the management of the University. She was a very quiet person, very intelligent, and very serious about social and political affairs, active in her own church and active in social agencies here in the city, including activities having to do with the senior citizens. She was socially conscious, not an activist, but a serious student of what was going on. She knew me, although we were not intimates at all. She was just a friend of the University and one of the people who was at one or more of the meetings at which I reported what was going on and so on.

I had met Mr. Hewlett on several occasions, also when I was out here. I knew two other people on the board of the foundation at that time--Robert Brown, whom I had met when he was on the board of trustees at Stanford, and Lyle Nelson, who is a professor of communication at Stanford, and who was vice-president for public affairs at the University of Michigan. I had known him for a decade. Somewhere out of all that, the idea developed that they would ask me to be head of the foundation.

Heyns: They had had the help of John May, who had been the executive director of the San Francisco Foundation. Mr. Hewlett had been on the distribution committee of the San Francisco Foundation. I had met John May, also when I was out in Berkeley. So those people knew me, but I've never asked them. I don't think they went through any elaborate national search, or anything like that. John May had helped the foundation a good deal begin to move from really what was a family philanthropy activity, conducted by Mr. and Mrs. Hewlett and their son Walter. They had been the founders. The foundation from 1966 to, oh maybe 1975, had been pretty much their vehicle for their own personal philanthropy.

They began to feel that they needed more professional assistance, and they turned to John May, and he did a good job for them. He had retired already from the San Francisco Foundation, and he helped them a lot in the examination of proposals, and helped them get started with the outside board and with some procedures that turned out to be very useful. He had a couple of people who were working part-time for him, kind of the beginning of a professional staff.

Building the Foundation Organization

Heyns: I came in June of '77 and brought Marianne Pallotti with me from New York, where she had been on the staff of the Ford Foundation, in the business office. She had had lots of administrative experience. She and I really began then to build the organization as it now exists. We began to appoint program officers, people who were responsible for making recommendations or evaluating proposals, I think at the outset, in four areas; the environment--I think we combined the environment and the population program at the outset; the performing arts; something we started out calling the regional grants program, but is now really a kind of urban affairs program; higher education. Did I mention the performing arts?

Nathan: Right. Environmental, performing arts, regional grants (which became urban), and higher education. Those were the ones you mentioned.

Heyns: I think that's right. We had four program officers at the start; now we have five. But I think the first year that we began, our grants totalled $3 million. This present year, '86, they'll be at a level of $33 million. During that time we've added only one program officer.

Heyns: We committed ourselves very early to the idea of larger grants of longer duration, which were primarily oriented toward general support of institutions, as opposed to projects. That meant that our program officers did not have to be highly specialized subject matter specialists. Our population person didn't have to know the various kinds of biological research, or different modes of delivery of family planning. Rather they became students of organizations and the people, the principal actors in the field, identifying major issues and selecting promising recipients. They're not highly specialized. Now it inevitably happens that they begin to develop some subject matter, special knowledge, but that's not the purpose. They're primarily generalists.

Probably a departure for us is that I don't regard foundation work as a career. I don't think somebody ought to go out and graduate from business school and become a foundation employee and stay in that field. I think it's a job that is attractive and exciting and interesting, but it's not a career, and so my understanding with all the appointees is that they'll stay for five to seven years and then go on their way.

I like to look for people who have been on the other side of the fence, raising money, so they're sensitive to the frustrations of doing that and to the ways in which foundations can be helpful or harmful or unpleasant to deal with. I think it's also important for program officers to have had some organizational responsibility. Finally, I think it's important for them to have the kind of preparation that enables them to move on--you know, a law degree or some kind of competence so they're not dependent on their foundation experience for getting another job. We've begun to implement that. It's easy enough to have that understanding, but I don't intend to put people out on the street until they get some other place. That is an important concept, I think.

Program Grants vs. Project Grants

Nathan: It's very interesting. Can I back up a bit, to your desire not to have program officers who were experts in a particular field? Would that be a drawback in some way? What would the drawback be?

Heyns: Well, it all hangs together. The nature of the grant, the size of the grant, the duration of the grant, and then the qualifications of your staff--all have to be integrated. If you decide to work in

Heyns: an area like health, and you decide to support individual research projects, then there are implications for all aspects of the grant including the specialized training of the program officer. If you decide that you're going to work in the area of genetic engineering, then you've got to have somebody who knows something about that field.

Nathan: So if I understand what you've been explaining, a program grant is related to an institution, and a project grant, then, would quite possible be related to a smaller entity or to a few people?

Heyns: Yes, except that it isn't the size of the entity. Brookings Institution, which we support, is a policy-making organization in Washington. We provide them with general support, which means that the executive committee and the president of Brookings decide how the money is going to be spent, within the total mission of Brookings. Brookings might conceivably have come to us with a proposal to study the trade policy of the United States.

Well, okay, if we start getting into the project mode, then we have to ask ourselves: is trade policy as important to us as a foreign policy question, or something else? I mean, of course, you can elaborate that; if it's a scientific area, is this as good a proposal as that? So we've tended to avoid that. We try to find organizations; we try to define areas of interest to us, and then good performers in that area. In the public policy area, people with a history of objectivity, a history of high-quality work, a history of opinion leaders paying attention to what these people do and say, and quality control apparatus that assures us that the money will be intelligently spent, and so on. Those are organizational characteristics, if you like. Once we're satisfied that those conditions have been met, then we allow a lot of discretion to the leadership of those organizations for the allocation of funds. We also recognize that most of those outfits are heavily dependent on project support. A governmental agency or another foundation might respond to some proposal that they put in front of them. But the development of proposals, providing the overall leadership for the organization--those things cost money, and I'm sure that a good deal of our grants are spent for the organizational structure itself, its leadership and its supporting service.

Nathan: Does this relate back to your experience on the campus?

Heyns: I'm certain that my interest in general support is probably another clear direct line from my university experiences.

Heyns: There's a program we have for liberal arts college presidents. It's called a discretionary endowment fund. We put up a certain amount of money and it's matched by the organization, and the proceeds of that endowment are to be used at the discretion of the president. That's the kind of unencumbered money that's very hard to find on a university or college campus, since so much is allocated almost immediately to departments. There's usually very little discretionary money, so that's a program that goes back to my experience.

Role of the Foundation Board

Heyns: However, that leads me to the role of the board. Let me preface it by saying that one of the big attractions to coming here was, of course, the personalities and motivations of Mr. and Mrs. Hewlett, who were really remarkable people. She is no longer living, but she was herself a very intelligent philanthropist, and he is too. They were very generous people and they had some excellent grants. As a matter of fact, I've told my colleagues when we first gathered that if we did as well as the two of them did, we would be doing fine.

Mr. Hewlett has been enormously supportive. He's a very intelligent person, and I enjoy and profit from his advice, but he does not make the active, the day-to-day operation of the foundation his concern at all. We see each other maybe once a month and maybe have a couple of telephone calls. He's very interested in the policy of the foundation, and he's a very close observer and interested observer of our practices. He was seriously interested in the development of a board, and had begun that process. We've added some people to it since.

Nathan: These board names are interesting. Eleanor H. Gimon--is the H. for Hewlett?

Heyns: Yes, she's a Hewlett, right. So there are three members of the Hewlett family on the board. And Arjay Miller, who came aboard after I had gotten here, was a former dean at Stanford, the former president of Ford Motor Company. Lyle Nelson, whom I mentioned earlier, was on the board already, and so was Bob Brown. They're experienced people. We've added Bob Erburu, who is now chairman and CEO of the Times Mirror Company, and Bill Ruckelshaus, former EPA director.

Heyns: Getting back to Mr. Hewlett--he wanted to have a strong board. He doesn't try at all to push his favorite projects; he's scrupulous about that. He wants the board to make these decisions about policy, and about grants. The board began, naturally enough, with spending a lot of time on individual grants, reading all the proposals with great care. Most of the board meetings were spent discussing each of the proposals. As time has gone on, however, more and more of the board discussions have been devoted to policy questions and with selection of programs. What areas do we want to continue to work in, what areas do we want to reduce in size? Every January we have a meeting particularly devoted to those questions--allocation of funds for the coming year to the various program areas.

Nathan: How often does your board meet?

Heyns: It meets four times a year, and at every meeting there are policy questions which I bring to the board. The programs that I described really were not new to the foundation when I came. If you looked at where Mr. and Mrs. Hewlett and Walter had made grants, they were in the area of the environment, population, higher education, social agencies in the area. So all we did there was help them, help the board to focus. Higher education is an enormously complicated area. So we began to focus on libraries, international studies, primarily Black colleges, liberal arts colleges, and so on. We developed in each of those areas a focus, or several foci, and that process was really one of the staff preparing a memorandum presenting options.

Nathan: Oh, those were the papers that I read.

Heyns: Those papers, yes. And then the board reacting to them until we finally arrived at some agreement about what it is we were interested in. We worked at that hard, because first of all it saves the applicant community a lot of time, to know what it is we're interested in and what we're not. It saves a lot of staff time, because we can very quickly dispose of a good deal of mail. I don't mean that in a cavalier way, but we know what we can do and what we can't do.

Once the board has defined what it wants to do, the areas in which it wants to work, then of course the staff job is to come up with interesting and relevant and appropriate ways of meeting those objectives. And as a result--as confidence develops between the staff and the board in both directions, and understanding on the part of the staff as to what's wanted, and confidence on the board's part that we are sticking to the policy--then there is less and less need for minute examination of every proposal. That doesn't mean they're cavalier about it, but they don't have to worry about some of those things which they might if the policy wasn't clear.

Use of Consultants

Nathan: I see. There was some reference to the use of consultants. How are consultants used by you and your staff?

Heyns: Well, they are used in several ways and for different problems. We have invited people who were expert in the particular field to brief us on what they think the major issues are; that may be meeting with the staff or with the board. We've had people in the field of population do that. We've also had a consultant who helped us define a program we're actively involved in, having to do with social development of children in schools. He helped us to design that program, and is still a liaison between that project and the foundation.

I think our principal use of consultants has been to evaluate programs after a period of years. We had a program on community development, and we had maybe supported 15 or 20 community development organizations. We asked a consultant to come in and look at those grants, interview the people, the recipients, and then give us some advice about that program--whether it ought to be continued, whether it ought to be focussed in another way, whether the grants were of the right size, and whatever else he had to observe.

We have a program just to stimulate the development in community foundations of unrestricted funds. One of the problems that community foundations have is they administer funds for people, and the donors restrict the application of those funds. And so, many of the foundations, the small ones, the community ones--East Bay, Peninsula, Santa Clara, and so on--have had only a limited amount of unrestricted money. We've set up an endowment program in which we will match, on a two-to-one or three-to-one basis, grants, gifts to foundations that are unrestricted. Our intention is to get those community foundations, four or five of them in the Bay Area, up to the point where they have about $10 million worth of unrestricted funds, at which time the evidence across the country suggests that they'll begin to grow, for some reason. Why it's 10 and not nine or eight--I'm sure there's no magic about it, but it happens after a particular point. I think one of the reasons is that once they have unrestricted money, their basic costs for their core staff, for the administration of the foundation, can be met out of that endowment. A donor doesn't have to worry that he's helping to support the foundation, or that all his or her money is going to go for the administration of the foundation. So it helps those foundations get to the point where they acquire a reputation as a good trustee. That program is moving along. Well, we had a consultant give us advice about that, what the target ought to be, and we interviewed these various foundations, and we worked out a plan which we're now implementing. Those are the principal uses of consultants.

Heyns: It's true also that one of our jobs on the staff here is to know lots of people in these fields. We by this time have gotten rapport with lots of people who aren't necessarily grantees of ours, who are really very well informed.

Advisory Boards##

Heyns: You inquired here about the use of advisory boards and delegation of grant-making decisions. I think that those are options, but they haven't particularly appealed to us. We do have periodic reports to the board, using consultant information and maybe bringing in an expert from time to time, but we haven't felt the need for an advisory board, particularly.

That isn't quite true. With that liberal arts college program that I mentioned to you earlier, there are about 80 eligible institutions, and we did appoint an advisory board to make recommendations on those decisions; I had forgotten about that. But on the delegation of grant-making decisions to community groups; we don't. I know there's a foundation in San Francisco, I think it's Vanguard, that does that.

We haven't felt the need to do that at all. As a matter of fact, that hasn't been enormously successful in my view. It becomes a kind of a political business, that all the community groups, for example, begin to kind of share the pie equally rather than make discriminating decisions. I think it's very tough for such a group to make discriminating decisions. So I haven't been very strong for that idea, and we never have done it.

Board Members' Interests

Nathan: I see. Just as a partisan observation, I noticed that on your board there are many people affiliated with Stanford, and not very many affiliated with Cal.

Heyns: Yes. Well, that's true. But it's also true--if you really knew the facts that, somewhat to my embarrassment, and I get a lot of kidding about that--the university in the United States that has received the largest amount of money from the Hewlett Foundation has been Berkeley.

Nathan: [chuckles] Well, maybe Berkeley's better off this way.

Heyns: No, we haven't made any effort at all to do that.

Nathan: I thought of it only in connection with your remark that Flora Hewlett had been a UC student.

Heyns: Yes. Well, and one of their children was also. I think three of their children have had Stanford connections, and one, Berkeley. But Mr. and Mrs. Hewlett both had interest in The Bancroft Library and made grants to The Bancroft. Mr. Hewlett has made a grant to Flora Hewlett's class gift. It's not strongly partisan; we just don't operate that way. We do have a category called special grants, which don't fit in the existing programs but are of interest to the board. That is a point where a particular board interest might operate, but it still has to pass the whole board, and there's not a lot of mutual back-scratching about that at all. Each proposal stands on its own merit.

No, I think what we're looking for on the board are people with broad experience, identification with philanthropy itself, who find the objectives of the foundation congenial, the areas of interest congenial to them, are interested in high-quality performance, and who can bring something to the party. Mr. Ruckelshaus was a welcome addition because we were interested in policy formulation, policy studies, particularly as it affects government, and of course, Ruckelshaus has had lots of experience in that area. Mr. Brown is experienced with the university and educational world. Nelson has interest in that same area. Lyle Nelson is a broad gauge person with lots of interest in the social affairs of the country. So we tend to look for skills or interests that complement those that are already present. We don't look for, you know, having all demographic cells filled or anything like that.

Nathan: Is there a particular number?

Heyns: Not particularly. I think we're up to nine now. We've thought about going to 12, but we have picked people who look interesting to us, rather than feeling any great need to be more representative. If you look at our actual grants--I don't know if you've seen them.

Nathan: I did read--

Heyns: The latest one?

Nathan: No, '84 was the latest annual report that I saw.

Heyns: Oh, well, we'll give you one to take home.

Nathan: I'd like that.

Heyns: Well, we've got a couple of us who might be called senior citizens now, but we don't do anything with age. Mr. Hewlett is an engineer and a scientist. We don't support science projects. Mr. Miller is a financier and a dean of business administration. We don't support business schools. Bob Brown is a lawyer, and we don't do anything in the legal profession. And Nelson is a journalist, and we do very litle except maybe a couple of special projects in that area. There isn't a lot of personal ax-grinding, contrary to what I suspect a lot of people think.

Nathan: Does Mrs. Gimon have any special interests?

Heyns: She's interested in the things we're interested in, like population and so on. But I'm not aware of any particular interest different from the ones listed; the board is just very admirable that they don't push proposals themselves.

It's a common practice in this country to think that you're making some progress if you talk to one of the board members. This board says, "Go talk to Roger," and then if it comes up, it comes up. So they don't do a lot of politicking. That makes this a very much easier job and more rewarding job. I don't have any problems; as a matter of fact, that whole special projects concept was mine, in order to permit board members to do some things that the general policy program definitions do not permit. I'm sure that's a source of satisfaction to them, but they're still not, you know, kind of personal bias things.

Matching Grants

Nathan: I was aware of your interest in developing and supporting private philanthropy, and wondered whether you had views about, let's say, cooperation between the private and the public sector, and the relationship with public programs.

Heyns: Let's take those separately. We've adopted the matching grant idea wherever we thought it was useful to the organization and had the possibility of stimulating new sources of support. Even though this is a generous country, we're still giving much less than 2 percent of our disposable income to anything. Individual gifts are the largest single source of philanthropic money, much more than all the foundations put together by a factor of 10 or 12. But there's still

Heyns: a long way to go before we're anywhere near the Biblical injunction about tithing. So we think that habits of philanthropy can certainly be strengthened. It's hard to know whether that matching requirement really does bring about an increase in philanthropy, because maybe all we've done with a matching grant is shift it from one place to another. But I think we often recommend or suggest new or increased grants from previous sources, so it has some effect.

Public-Private Cooperation

Heyns: On the public-private cooperation--an illustration of our interest there would be the early stages of community development organizations, neighborhood improvement and that kind of thing. There was a good deal of federal money in those efforts, and this federal money began to disappear. We've begun to provide some core leadership support for those organizations, and then they are in a position to get project support from the government. Sometimes we've helped them get started so that they can get in a position to attract those kinds of dollars. As I guess one of my essays pointed out, we think there's more that can be done of that sort. We certainly are receptive to that.

Discretionary Authority

Heyns: You asked somewhere if I was going to talk about my own discretionary authority. The board has allocated 5 percent of each year's budget to be spent at my discretion. Now typically those turn out to be grants worked out with various program officers. They're all at my discretion, but most of them, by far the majority, are really in the program areas already defined. We've used up that money every year. So about 5 percent tends to be spent for, oh, a variety of things. I guess there isn't any single tendency. An emergency comes up. For example, we made a discretionary grant to help some activities in that flood area in Napa County, and we've helped in other kinds of emergencies like that. Sometimes an organization comes upon unanticipated hard times; they thought they were going to get a grant and didn't, and so on.

Heyns: Sometimes our discretionary grants are purely exploratory. We want to get some experience with a possible grantee, and we make a grant that gives us a chance to observe how they work, whether they are ready for a larger grant from the board. Sometimes they're to encourage something that we want to have happen, and our participation might stimulate interest on the part of other foundations, other donors. It just gives us a little more flexibility, and it also is useful in the development of our programs, pilot studies and so on. Sometimes those are planning grants that lead to full proposals. If we think that there's something there that's interesting, and if they need more planning money, we help them do it. Sometimes the grants are to help organizations in which we are interested get management or technical assistance.

Evaluating Support

Nathan: Are there any areas in which you find you are perhaps less active and look to see whether there's something emerging that you should pay some attention to?

Heyns: Oh yes; I think that's part of our job. I'm not arguing that we always do it perfectly, but one of the purposes of that January meeting is that it is an occasion to which the staff points, for looking at what we're currently doing. They have to face the question, "Is this the right emphasis? Is there something we should drop and something else we should pick up?" A good staff person, stimulated by me and by the posture of the board, is expected to have a critical posture.

If you look at the regional grants program six, seven years ago and looked at it now, it's almost totally changed. Changes in emphasis, I would say, are not necessarily big ones, because there's another consideration. If we say one year we're interested in population and the next year we're not, that's really quite a devastating blow, especially in areas in which we're a particularly big actor, like population. We're probably the major source nongovernmental, private foundation source of money for family planning overseas. So you can't just pull out of that abruptly. Now sometimes we will tell an organization, "Okay, we've supported you now for eight years, and this is the last grant." We structure the grant in such a way that it goes down in decreasing amounts, but that's an individual transaction and not a program change that's bluntly and directly and immediately effective.

Heyns: We're active in the support of the Council on Foundations and the Northern California Grantmakers group, and the group called the Independent Sector, because we're interested in the performance of philanthropic organizations in general, and interested in high standards and we support the development of policy there.

Risk-Taking

Heyns: You asked about Nielsen's books about large foundations. Nielsen's latest book is quite positive about us, so I would be ungracious to be critical of him, but I'm never really very impressed with those kinds of single-person evaluations. But if they are going to write about us, I'd just as soon have them write nice things.

I think he's got a strange view of what constitutes risk-taking. An enormous number of our grants, I think, are high risk, and you can't tell by the recipient whether it's a high risk or not. Let me just make the observation that Harvard is a very inhospitable place to interdisciplinary work. If you make a grant to Harvard for interdisciplinary work, that's a risky venture, and we did make such a grant to Harvard, a big one. It's by no means clear that it is going to be a success. So you can't look at the institution and say a grant to that institution is a nonrisk affair. It could very well be a high risk.

The general notion in Nielsen's book is that large foundations, especially Mellon and Hewlett, are low-risk outfits because they give money to institutions. Well, we give money to community development organizations. We're trying to support studies of teenage pregnancy. We're supporting a population project that permits the use of money for abortions; that's certainly not a non-controversial item. There are all sorts of risks involved, and I just think he's got a very limited view of that.

We are interested in public education, and our first set of grants were directed towards improving the virtually nonexistent relationships between major universities and public schools, and I mean, schools of education. So when you give Berkeley or Stanford a grant to work on their relationships, develop cooperative partnership arrangements between the School of Education and the school district, that's a risky one, not in the sense that anybody is going to run off with the money. Whether it's going to work or not is highly problematical, because those relationships have been neglected for 40 years.

Heyns: So that's probably all I'm going to say on that subject, but it can be enormously oversimplified. There are lots of our grants that I would say are high-risk grants.

Nathan: I take it that you define risk as being that success is by no means assured.

Heyns: Right. Right. And there are two senses, I guess, to risk. One is unpopularity, like the support of abortion, unpopular in certain segments of the population. But yes, really, I'm talking about probability of success.

Conflict Resolution

Heyns: I should have mentioned conflict resolution. One of the few things that was not being done by the foundation when I got here, and one of the things about which Mr. Hewlett and I agreed in advance, had to do with a mutual interest in conflict resolution; finding alternatives to litigation or legislation in the resolution of conflicts. We started out by doing that, supporting organizations using arbitration, mediation, and so on, in the environmental field. Now we're doing it in lots of other fields: neighborhood disputes, child custody, and so on; not just limited to the environment. We've tried to support organizations that were doing that, providing alternatives to litigation. In order for them to get a track record so that they might become the sources of governmental support, we have supported an outfit in Atlanta that is now, I would say, 80 to 90 percent supported by the police department and other county agencies, because they've become important social institutions.

Sometimes that interest in conflict resolution is described as being motivated entirely by an interest in modifying the judicial system, the adversary system. I think that is certainly something that motivates us, as the use of litigation is often quite inappropriate for important environmental decisions like land use, and so on. It can tie up development and tie up conservation projects enormously.

An awful lot of our nonproductive conflict in our society doesn't end up in the courts, but it can be a source of real dysfunction. I mean, if you can get a couple to agree about the handling of the custody of their children in case of divorce, and do it fairly quickly and in a way that they can adhere to and live with, you've done something about the quality of life, quite apart from what it does to the court calendar. And this is true about neighborhod disputes.

Heyns: If we can increase our nation's capacity to resolve disputes through the use of arbitration and mediation, collaborative problem solving, or whatever, we're improving the quality of life. So our interest there is not just to impact the courts and the judicial system. When we started this, this was not a big item on the national agenda. Now there's a lot of interest in it, and we were kind of ahead of the game. It's gratifying to see a lot of people beginning to support this kind of activity.

Collaborating with Other Foundations

Heyns: We've done some collaboration with other foundations, notably the Bush Foundation from St. Paul, Minnesota, and the Mellon Foundation, the latter one on this liberal arts program. The Bush Foundation has been our collaborator; as a matter of fact, they've been the leaders, the Bush Foundation has, on work in the Black colleges. These have come out of a mutual interest, and we've shared costs and hence multiplied our effectiveness by those partnerships. They've been very, very good. I don't suggest that we were the only ones that do that; it's happening more and more frequently that foundations collaborate. I think it's very useful, because foundation money is really a small part of total philanthropy in the country, and so it ought to be aimed very carefully and be maximally useful.

Well, what else do you want me to talk about?

Initiative and Responsiveness

Nathan: You had some interesting observations on the question of initiative and/or responsiveness of foundations.

Heyns: Yes, well, that's a kind of rhetorical business; at least, I think it is. If you just respond to proposals that come across your desk, you're alleged to be lacking in initiative, just being kind of docile. I don't really think that's the way it works.

If we indicate what our interests are, that is itself an initiating act. If we indicate that we're interested in conflict resolution or teenage pregnancy or community development, that initiates things, and so, you know, it's a chicken and egg problem. Of course, there is a sense in which we limit ourselves as a result of adopting that

Heyns: mode, I suppose, is the sense that the program definitions and statement of interest do limit what we get. We're not likely to get a big proposal from some organization interested in disease prevention, because we've said we're not interested in health, and so on.

On the other hand our special projects category invites things that don't fit. I think, going back to the illustration I mentioned earlier in another connection, we initiated the idea of university schools of education/school district work. Now we didn't go and tell Berkeley and Stanford how to set that up, but once they knew we were interested, then they came in with something. So, you know, did we start it or didn't we start it? I think it's a spurious distinction.

The Longer Term and Institution Building

Nathan: Yes. You might be thinking about the--this is again theoretical--distribution of the corpus versus perpetuity of the foundation. It seems to be one of the points of discussion.

##

Heyns: You asked about whether there was any discussion about distributing that corpus as opposed to thinking of the foundation in longer term. That never has been a subject of very serious discussion, in part because I think the decisions had been made by Mr. and Mrs. Hewlett, who understood that a very significant part of her estate would come to the foundation after the arrangements they had wanted to make with respect to their children. It's also been my understanding from Mr. Hewlett that it is his intention for the foundation to be the principal recipient of his estate.

So the kind of assumption is that we were really institution-building, and indeed, that's the way we've been operating all along. That's why we're interested in policy and procedure and the quality of our relationships to clients and so on. I think that's a very legitimate way to operate, and if I look at some of the great foundations like Carnegie and Ford and Rockefeller, I like that idea. We started at maybe $40 million when I came and we're up to almost $700 million now. Even if you set a 25-year limit on something like that, it takes an awful lot of wisdom, I think, to decide how fast you're going to do it. In any case, it has never been an issue, and I don't think it will become an issue.

Heyns: The Markey Foundation with Dr. Glaser at its head, is committed by trust to spend its money in a 15-year period. It was a more limited trust; it's a large one. They're doing a very good job with it. So I don't think there's one method better than another. It's just a matter of what's congenial. I've always liked the idea of building an institution, and this is certainly one now.

Procedures

Nathan: I might ask you a question you've already touched on. Let's say your generalist program officers would make recommendations about certain grants--do they come to you? Do they have to pass through a hearing of other program officers? I'm not quite clear on the procedure.

Heyns: Well, I look at everything that comes in through the mail. That permits me to know what is in the house. I also look at all the letters of declination. Because of the clarity of the foundation policy, the program officers can make decisions about fit with foundation interests. Marginal cases are discussed with me. I look at all the decline letters to see if I have got any reason to ask for reconsideration, or if I think a letter is unresponsive or something like that.

We try to get those decline letters to projects that clearly don't fit out within a couple of weeks. If it looks like a possibility because of program fit and attractiveness, then the program officer will look into it more fully. When the program officer thinks that there's a good probability of it coming to the board, then he or she writes up a description of the project. The description deals with common questions, like the organization's government structure, the nature of the problem, its relevance to the foundation interest, a lot of categories and criteria like that.

Then we have a staff discussion on each of those reports, and everybody's there, including the nonprofessional staff. It may not survive the staff meeting, although there is no formal vote. The discussion may reveal the presence of problems that just don't look soluble.

If they meet that test of the staff discussion, then they'll be prepared for the board. I would say 99.9 percent of the proposals we've submitted have been approved by the board, although a couple

Heyns: of times the board has asked questions that I couldn't answer, or raised questions that made me doubt whether we were on the right track, in which case I withdraw them. We either go back to the board with those questions answered, or we drop it. So that's the procedure.

Nathan: I see. So only the positive recommendations go to the board. You have weeded out the rest.

Heyns: Yes, but we report to the board in the quarterly meeting all of the declinations, so they get a chance to see them. Sometimes, not often, sometimes they do ask questions about why was this turned down--largely out of curiosity, not in an accusatory tone.

Nathan: I did note in the annual reports that major jump between 1979 and 1981 as the estate of Flora Hewlett came in. Did you have a lot of re-planning of the organization to do?

Heyns: No. Well, first of all, we knew it was going to occur, so we had some preparation. Mr. Hewlett was very sensitive to that problem, and permitted us to grow during that period, in terms of the grants we made, from $3 million to $6 million to $7 million to $15 million, so that when that money came in, it was not a big jump for us. That was all just part of the original planning, that we wouldn't stay at $3 million until that money came in; we would spend more than the law required during that interval. And we did. So that was just a case of having had the luxury of being able to plan for it.

Nathan: And I gather, then, you probably had some financial advisors about the investment of the funds?

Heyns: Yes. First of all, we have an investment committee--

Nathan: Is that a board committee?

Heyns: --consisting of the board members, yes, and myself. We also have a financial advisor, State Street in Boston, and we periodically review our investment policy. Most of our assets are in the form of Hewlett-Packard stock. I think about, oh, two-thirds of it is HP stock.

Some Pleasures of the Job

Heyns: It's been a wonderful job, Harriet. Mr. Hewlett, as I said earlier, is just an absolutely wonderful man with a great talent for partnership and a great talent for being a philanthropist. He's very modest, doesn't seek publicity, doesn't impose his will on the board, and truly appreciates a professional staff. So that my relationship to the board and to Mr. Hewlett himself and to his second wife, Rosemary, and to the Hewlett children--it's all been great, and to the rest of the board members as well.

One of the great delights of this job is that, given the fields in which we work, it always puts you into contact with some of the most exciting ideas and the most interesting people. And so it's a constant source of intellectual stimulation, if you're working in higher education, population, environment, performing arts, and urban affairs. We've also supported, on a special project basis, university centers working on national security. We're interested in public policy in lots of areas. So there's very little that's going on in this country that doesn't come through the door at one point or another. We're in close contact with interesting organizations, interesting people, and that's been a great source of pleasure, lots of stimulation.

Then, it's also true, in contrast to what a lot of people think, you rarely get truly lousy proposals or manipulative proposals. The proposal may not be well written or terribly well conceived, but if you work at it with some sympathy, usually there's a very good idea there. It isn't that we have to be wary. There are questions that we have to ask, and we've got to be hard-headed about the ability to execute. Is it an important idea? Does this group have the capacity to deliver, or a reasonable chance at it? But it's not in the picture that there are a lot of people out there trying to swindle us out of money. It just isn't true.

The hardest part, really, is to make intelligent choices, and turn down ideas that are perfectly sound and worth doing, but don't fit with the interests of the board, or because our budget will not permit another grant. Those are harder problems, but they don't make the job unattractive at all. It's a great thrill, and it draws on the experience that I've had all my life.

Other Trusteeships

Nathan: I gather you're a trustee of the Irvine Foundation?

Heyns: I'm a trustee of the Irvine Foundation, yes. I think you raised the question about, you know, what's the argument for that. I joined the Irvine Foundation because they were in the process of moving to a larger role for the staff. The chairman of that board, Morrie Doyle, asked me whether I would come and help them through that transitional period, and so I did it. We try to keep these things separate. I try to avoid getting the Irvine Foundation to do what we do, and so on, so that it's not an interlocking directorate. I think I have been able to be helpful to them as they make that transition; at least, so they tell me.

Well, do you think we've covered it?

Views of the Future

Nathan: I think you did admirably. I might just ask if you have any plans for the future?

Heyns: Well, it's a legitimate question to ask whether I'm ever going to quit.

Nathan: I'm not at all suggesting that that's appropriate.

Heyns: No, I don't have any immediate plans. I don't even have a date in mind.

Nathan: I'm happy to hear that.

Heyns: Mr. Hewlett says that he will know and I will know and my wife will know when I'm not doing a good job anymore. And Marianne Pallotti, the vice-president of the foundation whom I mentioned earlier, is just a very, very able executive. I count on her to tell me, too, and she has promised to do that. I'll be the only one who will know when I'm fed up, you know, or not enjoying it, but right now I'm having such a wonderful time. Since it's a small organization and there's no requirement that I quit at any particular time, I think I'll stay with this for a while.

Nathan: Great.

Heyns: I'll let events determine that rather than have a plan. It's a little bit indecent for somebody my age, many of whose classmates and friends are retiring--they ask me in kind of an accusatory way when I'm going to quit. I have to tell them I'm having too much fun, and nobody's pushing me. It sounds indecent, but that's the way it is, for which I'm very grateful. I've had a wonderful life. Every job I've ever had I've enjoyed, and was different. So I've been a very lucky man. To say nothing about a happy marriage and nice kids, seven grandchildren. I have to work overtime to find something to complain about.

Nathan: Well, that speaks well both for your stamina and your taste.

Heyns: Okay. Good.

Nathan: Thank you.

Heyns: Well, I've enjoyed this, Harriet. It's been kind of fun. And I hope it's all right as far as you're concerned.

Nathan: It's much more than all right. Yes, it has been fun for me, too. I have enjoyed hearing about your life before, during and after Berkeley. As for the campus years, we need to see them from your unique perspective if we are to capture the University's history and understand it.

Thank you for the generosity of these pleasant and rewarding sessions.

VI ESTHER HEYNS: PARTNER, PARTICIPANT, OBSERVER

An interview with Esther Heyns, November 20, 1986

ESTHER HEYNS

Photograph © Karsh, Ottawa

INTERVIEW HISTORY -- Esther Heyns

Esther Heyns, known at Berkeley as the Chancellor's wife, found that her inclinations and her responsibilities came together fully during the family's residence at University House in 1965-1971. Warm-hearted and loyal, she later observed that her husband or any person "in a position of responsibility can be enormously affected by his personal life." She saw that part of the spouse's responsibility was to "make the family life congenial and nourishing," and proceeded to do so during some of the University's most difficult years.

In the campus community she was perceived as a welcoming presence, one who enjoyed her role as hostess, parent, and helpmeet. Esther Heyns had gained experience as a faculty/administrator wife at the University of Michigan, and found the assignment congenial. She said that for someone of her era, such work "was a marvelous opportunity, it was a lovely part-time job. I've always thought being associated with a university is one of the biggest breaks anybody gets. Certainly being the wife of somebody who's in a university gives you a wonderful milieu in which to live."

This up-beat assessment was tempered but not seriously altered during her Berkeley years. Despite a full schedule, she worked with the University YWCA, and on Sunday mornings helped in a church nursery. She remembered that "It was so wonderfully stabilizing to just pick up babies, and if they cried to hold them and they'd stop crying." She said that was the "most therapeutic thing" she could have done.

Esther Heyns maintained University House as a family home and a place for official hospitality. She cooked weekly breakfasts for her teenage son's friends, and enjoyed the support of a fine staff in the frequent entertaining that continued through good times and bad. "I liked having people come there. It was a beautiful house, it had a beautiful garden, and it was a wonderful place to entertain." Overnight guests whom she remembered with amusement ranged from the rambunctious and difficult (whom she would not name) to the poetic elegance of Archibald MacLeish, then Librarian of Congress.

As a participant and acute observer, Mrs. Heyns had much to contribute to the Heyns oral history memoir, and she agreed to give an interview for the volume. The preliminary planning meeting in her spacious and sunny Atherton home showed her as relaxed, candid, and thoughtful about the Berkeley experience and at times, amused. She mentioned a little of her own background and her interest in medicine and medical research. Her nurse's training was ended when she married, as regulations of those days demanded, but her intellectual interest has continued.

She chose to come to the campus for the taped interview session on November 20, 1986, partly as a way of sharing the chore of driving the freeways between Berkeley and Atherton, and partly because she enjoyed coming to Berkeley. An outline of suggested topics had been prepared, and the session was held in the upstairs TV room in the Women's Faculty Club. The morning portion was followed by lunch in the club's diningroom, and resumed in the afternoon for a total of about three hours. Later the transcribed interview was lightly edited and submitted to her. She reviewed, supplemented, and approved it.

During the interview, Esther Heyns balanced her enthusiasm about Berkeley, the University, and the values of intellectual pursuits with observations on the importance of the issues under debate in the late sixties, and some events that ranged from violence to incivility. University House experienced the fire-bombing of automobiles as well as noisy but peaceful demonstrations. One march ended in yelling and dispersal when her teen-aged son and a friend mounted a water-balloon attack from the University House roof.

She often accompanied her husband as he filled a "gruelling calendar" of public speeches all across the state. She found that among those who criticized the campus administration "there were always people who were understanding. Interestingly enough, we found that the grandparents of students were often more understanding than the parents." She appreciated the grandparents' views, and speculated that maybe they had a little more perspective than the parents did on the issue of boys' ragged jeans and long hair.

Esther Heyns acknowledged pressures and difficulties, but spoke more often about friends, and her lasting appreciation for those who rallied to help. She counts the staunch University House staff as continuing friends, along with many faculty and other members of the University community.

Her genuine interest in an individual is engaging; every now and then Esther Heyns would begin to interview the interviewer, and do it well. It was easy to see how she could meet, greet, and attract friends at the worst of times and continue now, when the times for the Heyns family and for the University they served, are so much better.

Harriet Nathan
Interviewer-Editor

September 1987
Regional Oral History Office
486 The Bancroft Library
University of California, Berkeley

Regional Oral History Office
Room 486 The Bancroft Library

University of California
Berkeley, California 94720

BIOGRAPHICAL INFORMATION

(Please print or write clearly)

Your full name Esther Gezon Heyns

Date of birth 11/4/18 Place of birth Grand Rapids, Mich.

Father's full name Hiram R. Gezon

Birthplace Jenison, Michigan

Occupation President, C.W. Mills Paper Co. Grand Rapids, M.

Mother's full name Gertrude Dykstra Gezon

Birthplace Grand Rapids, Michigan

Occupation Milliner and Housewife

Where did you grow up ? Grand Rapids, Mich.

Present community Peninsula - California

Education College - 3yrs

Occupation(s) Secretary

Special interests or activities Volunteer in hospitals, tutoring in literacy program,

VI ESTHER HEYNS: PARTNER, PARTICIPANT, OBSERVER

[Interview 1: November 20, 1986]

Family, Education, and Interest in Medicine

Nathan: We can begin to talk about whatever parts of your life and adventures, including the Berkeley experience, that you would like. Is there anything you'd like to say about your home and your family, growing up as a youngster?

E. Heyns: I thought that just very briefly I would mention the fact that I came from Michigan, born into a very large, close-knit family. My family were devoted to education, as a lot of immigrant families were. They were religious people, but very tolerant. I think Roger and I came out of pretty much the same type of background.

Nathan: So would these be Dutch antecedents?

E. Heyns: Dutch antecedents, and a rather homogeneous community from which we came. We both attended the same college, Calvin College. I went into a nursing program after three years of college, with the intention of having a bachelor's, a science, BS and a nursing degree. That was right at the time that the second world war broke out, and I had gotten into the hospital part of the training program when Roger was drafted. Nothing would do but I had to go with him [laughs].

Nathan: How did you like the nursing training and experience?

E. Heyns: I loved it. I really loved nursing. I've always regretted that I didn't finish, because I would certainly have gone back at some point, I think, into nursing. I love medicine; the first thing I read in a magazine are articles on medicine. I'm very interested in medicine as a science. But I think I really liked being a nurse, liked the caring-for-people part of it. So the pull of going with him was strong.

E. Heyns: As it turned out he was given a deferral for a year, and we lived in Ann Arbor for the first year of our marriage. I worked at the university hospital--getting as close as I could to the hospital, I suppose--for part of that time, and then I worked in the registrar's office at the university. My loyalties are pretty straightforward. Then after that first year he was in the service for four years. We traveled around the country, went to a lot of different places, and lived, I think, in about five different places during the war.

Nathan: Was that before or after you had one child?

E. Heyns: We had one child born during that period, in 1943, born in Miami Beach.

I think you probably can relate to this. I was following Roger all around. I had no real doctor at the time. I had one visit with an obstetrician at one post, and when I arrived in Miami Beach, eight months pregnant, the doctor said, "I don't think you ought to do any traveling." I had just driven myself from Texas to Florida, with the heat up to some 90°. Crazy young people do crazy things.

Nathan: That must have taken strength and determination.

E. Heyns: But not much wisdom.

Nathan: It's a sort of invincibility.

E. Heyns: I know. You just don't think that anything can really hurt you, do you?

Nathan: You had a successful birth?

E. Heyns: Yes. He came in due time. I'm sure that everybody who went through that war has some stories to tell.

Nathan: Did you find that you were able to make connections, make friends, in all this traveling around?

E. Heyns: Roger was lucky to have been assigned to a psychological unit in the air force, so most of the people with whom he worked were psychologists. That was his field, so it was just natural to become friends with people with whom he worked. We did make friends, whom we still have.

Nathan: Did you feel called upon to do volunteer work during this period, along with all the packing and unpacking?

E. Heyns: Actually I worked, at first, in an air force office. Then, after we had the baby, I did not.

Nathan: This went on then for several years?

E. Heyns: It was about two years later that the war ended. The war ended, didn't it, about February, 1945? Then we immediately went back to Ann Arbor for him to finish graduate school.

Nathan: Were some of your friends doing the same thing?

E. Heyns: Oh, yes. After the war there was a flood of people going back to college and doing graduate work. There were lots of couples of about our age back in school, desperate for housing.

Children and Life in Ann Arbor

Nathan: And very serious, for the most part, weren't they, about education?

E. Heyns: Oh, yes. And, you know, most of us had either started a family or were ready to start a family, so there wasn't a whole lot of partying.

Nathan: What did you do about housing?

E. Heyns: We bought a house in Ann Arbor with another couple, a two-family house. It was a very, very old house that needed to have painting done. The four of us painted every inch of that house, inside and out; every weekend and every holiday we worked scraping and painting. As a consequence it was a good investment, and we both came out of it with a little money at the end. When the other couple left, finished school, we sold it, and got our first little nest egg.

Nathan: You earned it.

E. Heyns: [laughs] Oh, gosh, did we earn it! But it was such fun. Every night, after the men had finished studying, at about 11 o'clock we would gather in one or the other person's apartment and have tons of Oreo cookies. And if somebody was lucky enough to have baked a cake we fell on that. It was a very good time.

Nathan: Then it wasn't long before your husband was involved as a faculty member.

E. Heyns: Yes. I think he got his Ph.D. in 1948, and then went on the faculty.

Nathan: Were you elected to type his papers?

E. Heyns: You know, I was just fortunate enough not to be a good typist, so that he didn't really trust me at it. I think that's probably one reason why our marriage has survived [laughs]. I'm not a good enough typist to do any kind of manuscript typing, and I'm thankful for that.

Nathan: Did you stay in the same house, then, afterwards?

E. Heyns: No, after he had finished graduate school, and the other couple also had finished, they left town, and we moved into a single family house in Ann Arbor. We lived there for about seven or eight years, and then moved into a much larger house eventually. By that time we had three children, and we needed more room.

Nathan: I was thinking ahead to your involvement with the YWCA, the church and so on, at Berkeley. Had you had any experience in those areas while you were in Ann Arbor?

E. Heyns: Well, you know, those were the Cub Scout days, and the PTA days, and the cooperative nursery days, and the volunteering at the school to take the money on stamp day. Did you ever do that?

Nathan: Was that for savings bonds?

E. Heyns: Yes.

Nathan: Yes, that's very familiar.

E. Heyns: They brought their little pennies, and they'd get a stamp, and then when the book was finished--I think it was a $25 bond that you could purchase with that. It involved just hundreds of pennies to be counted. My kids were very proud that they had their mother come to count the stamp money. I must say I got some good grades on that.

I always taught Sunday school in church, and worked in nurseries in the church, did volunteer work at the hospital as a Gray Lady. Oh, yes.

Nathan: Did you spend a lot of time chauffeuring children around?

E. Heyns: Sure. Ann Arbor is a small town and the children were able to bicycle to a lot of things, but there were riding lessons out in the country and dentist's appointments. It was close enough to to country so that horses were available. That was wonderful. But, you know, the activities of children vary. Some of them are more active than others, and I think between the three of them I did a fair amount of that. But I've always been pleased that we lived in a small enough town so that they did a lot of bicycling to practices and after-school activities.

Nathan: What was your general feeling about the schooling, the quality of education?

E. Heyns: Ann Arbor had absolutely first-rate public schools. There were no private schools in Ann Arbor. It was just such a college town that it was very homogeneous, and a lot of people were on the school board from the university. There was a university school in the school of education, and that was very small. It was kind of a laboratory school, and it was a wonderful school, but our children went through public schools.

Nathan: Did they become involved in sports, athletics?

E. Heyns: They were still pretty young. Our youngest son did here, in Berkeley, but the others I think were not terribly involved in sports.

Faculty Wife

Nathan: Did you feel that you had certain responsibilities as a faculty wife?

E. Heyns: Not particularly. When Roger became the dean of the College of Literature and Science, then I did have some responsibilities for entertaining and for appearing at things. Starting then I did feel some responsibilities, but not as a faculty wife, I don't think.

Nathan: You mentioned an observation on what happens to faculty wives after the children grow up, and what happens to the wives of administrators after the children grow up; do you remember that?

E. Heyns: I suspect that's all changed now, Harriet. I think that probably there are very few women now who don't have some kind of career plan for their lives, either running concurrently with their family responsibilities or certainly afterward, so that I don't think that's even a question any more--do you?

Nathan: I agree with you, I don't think it is. I was just interested, if you'd care to say it again, about your observations of that period, or earlier.

E. Heyns: I think for someone of my era, having a husband whose job made demands on you was very fortunate, provided you liked the institution and cared about contributing to it. It was a marvelous opportunity, it was a lovely part-time job. I've always thought being associated with a university is one of the biggest breaks anybody gets. Certainly being the wife of somebody who's in a university gave you a wonderful milieu in which to live.

Nathan: Yes. I was taken by the remark that you made a little earlier that often faculty wives, even in an earlier era, would work outside the home after the children grow up, but that the wives of administrators at that time seemed not to do that.

E. Heyns: That's really true. I didn't know any wife of an administrator who did. Maybe if they had an interest in music or art, they would pursue that, but the others that I knew just absolutely devoted themselves to the campus and its function.

Nathan: I wondered whether any went back for advanced degrees or completed degree work?

E. Heyns: Not at that time. That all began to change really during the late sixties and the early seventies. It became very much a part of the women's movement.

Nathan: Yes, that's true.

It's interesting that your own experience has sort of bridged those two styles, and you have observed them.

E. Heyns: I think if I were to say anything to a young woman today, whose husband was assuming one of these jobs, I think any person who is in a position of responsibility can be enormously affected by his personal life. If there are marital problems or family problems it really does affect the person's ability to perform these jobs if they're stressful jobs. So, to the extent that any

E. Heyns: spouse can take that as a kind of special responsibility, to make the family life congenial and nourishing, I think it is part of the responsibility of the spouse.

Nathan: That's very interesting. Was it the custom in your house for your husband to discuss issues or problems on the campus or in his profession with you? Did he open that area?

E. Heyns: Yes. I think the only time that he wouldn't talk about something was when he would feel it was a matter of involving a person on campus, and it might be an embarrassment for me to know too much about this situation. Then he wouldn't talk about it. But if it was just issues on campus, or things that were happening, we did a lot of talking about it.

The Move to Berkeley

Nathan: Did you find that you had much contact with students during this period?

E. Heyns: We started out with wonderful intentions. We were going to have weekly open houses, and we were going to accept every invitation to everything that came our way. We started out bravely. We were going to hit every dormitory and fraternity and sorority at least once during every year.

Nathan: This was at Michigan?

E. Heyns: No, this was at Berkeley. That became more and more difficult as the campus became more disturbed. We tried to continue some of that, but, for instance, we couldn't have some of those open houses finally because the security people didn't want us to do it. There were people coming in that you just couldn't open your home to; some of them weren't from the campus. University House was a big house, and people could get upstairs and do a lot of things that you might not want them to do in your home. I think we always continued to go to some of the housing facilities, the residence halls and things, we always did that. And we had some of the student groups in, the Oski Dolls and the Cal Band. Some of those organizations came for an event at the house.

Nathan: Those were certainly unusual times. Normal rules just did not apply.

Nathan: Moving towards your coming to Berkeley, did you accompany your husband when he came out to be met a couple of times before he finally came to stay?

E. Heyns: I think he came alone once or twice, and then we were both invited to come to a Regents' meeting. There was a Regents' meeting on campus, or in Berkeley. They were having dinner at the Kerrs' house that night, and we were invited to come to that. There were several Regents who wanted to meet Roger who had not met him on his previous trips out here. He spent the afternoon with them and then we went to this dinner. The next morning Harry Wellman came over to University House, which was where we were staying, and he did the best job to attract us, to sell this bad job, that I've ever heard. Boy, he was a persuasive salesman. So I think they must have offered him the job right then and there.

I'm a little fuzzy on it, I don't know exactly, but I know that Harry Wellman was walking up and down the living room giving his pitch. We had flown out here more or less as a kind of a lark; it was really pretty farfetched to think of coming here, because he had just been made a vice-president of the University of Michigan the year before and we were really enjoying our life there very much. I remember flying home back to Michigan feeling, "Hey, this is serious, this isn't just a lot of talk." I don't remember exactly when he made up his mind to come, but it was right after that time.

Nathan: How much would you say you knew about the situation at Berkeley?

E. Heyns: Nothing about it, nothing. The only thing I knew was that Clark Kerr's picture had been on the front of the Time Magazine because they had had some kind of a demonstration or something. The antiwar movement had already started at Michigan so that we were aware of the fact that there were people all over the country who were questioning our role in Vietnam. So this didn't come as any kind of surprise to know that Berkeley was also.

The Free Speech Movement and that whole business I knew nothing about. We certainly knew what a marvelous university this was--there was no doubt about what a great, great university Berkeley was--but we certainly didn't know anything about the whole University and the problems it was having at that time.

Nathan: When did you begin to get this kind of information?

E. Heyns: Almost immediately, when we came. I think that Roger began coming out in the summer. In the month of August he began making some trips out here to talk to people about certain things, appointments and things. Then, I think, it became apparent that there were some tough decisions to be made.

Nathan: That was quite a change for you. From the relative peace of Michigan into this maelstrom.

E. Heyns: And, of course, when you don't know anybody, or you don't know what people think or where their loyalties are, you really fly very blind. I don't remember, though, feeling that I had to walk on eggs, or that there were a lot of land mines around.

Nathan: You soon began to meet people. Who were some of the first people that you met? Can you remember?

E. Heyns: Well, of course the Kerrs and various Regents were the very first people we met. On campus it was the people who were in the Chancellor's office at that time: Bob Connick, Earl Cheit, Arleigh Williams.

Hospitality and University House##

Nathan: Was there anyone that you felt you could take questions to to have answered?

E. Heyns: Mrs. Kerr was very helpful, but she was also very sensitive about not interfering, because she had had some experiences where that freedom was not always given to the wives of chancellors. I think she was particularly sensitive about wanting to be sure that I felt that I should run my home and my life the way I wanted to.

I had a marvelous exposure to that with the President at Michigan, who I think was kind of a nice model--to me, anyway--showing what a president's home on campus should be like and how it could be used. That was Harlan Hatcher. He was just an elegant person and a wonderful man, and his wife was sort of the picture of what a President's wife should be: stately and beautiful, and always very impressive publicly. They entertained very formally and very elegantly, and I guess that was sort of my idea of what the role should be. University House certainly lends itself to that.

I don't know whether that was what the people on campus wanted or not. I guess I just assumed that that was the role. University House was marvelously well equipped. It had everything, left over from previous administrations, that made it possible to do things well. We had to buy some things, like silver and china and crystal, but by and large you could tell that the home had been used that way from the things that were there.

Nathan: Did you do much rearranging of rooms or changing use of rooms?

E. Heyns: Not really. We made a little sitting room on the second floor which I don't think had been there before. It was kind of like a family room, with a TV in it. Other than that I think that the rooms were used as they had always been used.

Nathan: Earlier, when we were talking about the Section Club, several people commented on your great willingness to have their events there and how welcome you made them feel. Was that part of your whole concept?

E. Heyns: Oh, sure, sure, and I really enjoyed it. I liked having people come there. It was a beautiful house, it had a beautiful garden, and it was a wonderful place to entertain. The Regents were very generous about allowing us to do decorating if we needed anything. We completely remodeled the kitchen, and we also did a lot to that floor under the first floor, where there's a kind of ballroom and kitchen. We improved that so that we could serve 120 people down there very easily, we put in some equipment and some services, china and crystal. We made use of that, I think, more than had been done in the past. You could easily have a sit-down dinner for about 50 upstairs, between the dining room and the drawing room, but beyond that we used to go down into the ballroom for larger groups.

Nathan: Would these be mostly campus-related activities?

E. Heyns: Oh, altogether.

House Guests

Nathan: I wondered whether you had to entertain foreign visitors.

E. Heyns: Not foreign visitors so much. We'd often entertain people who would, for instance, be the Charter Day speaker, or someone who was coming to be interviewed on campus or who had some special assignment.

Nathan: Were there any that you especially enjoyed of these guests?

E. Heyns: Yes, Archibald MacLeish. He stayed with us, and we became fast friends and corresponded. I cherish his letters--oh, beautiful letters. Right up until a year before he died we had nice, long

Esther Heyns in the kitchen at University House with
(left) Mrs. Viola Johnson, cook, and (right) Miss Alma Garrett, housekeeper

Photograph by Les Flowers, Jr.

E. Heyns: letters from him at Christmas time. He was lovely. Jim Webb was the head of NASA, and he was a house guest one time. He got up in the morning--I had told him that we would have breakfast at 7:00 or 7:30 a.m.--and he came charging down the steps, practically threw me out of the kitchen and insisted upon getting breakfast. He's a very forceful person, and he just took over the whole operation. [laughs]

Nathan: How many did he provide for?

E. Heyns: Just us.

I think it turned out all right. I think I had it pretty well started, you know. I think I had most everything done except frying the eggs and making the toast. But I'll never forget him flinging himself into the kitchen. Give me a poet any time, not one of these men who have been running large organizations.

Nathan: What was there about Archibald MacLeish that made him sympathetic to you?

E. Heyns: He had had a wonderfully interesting life and so he was very perceptive about things. At the time that he was there I think we were under a good deal of stress at that particular time. He was just very wise and understanding, had some perspective on the world that was helpful.

Nathan: That's wonderful. I had always thought of him that way, but it's nice to hear your experience. Were there any others that come to mind?

E. Heyns: There are a couple that I think I just won't even mention.

Nathan: I'd love to ask you, but you have that look in your eye.

E. Heyns: No, I think these shall go unrecorded.

Nathan: Without naming names, can you tell me a little about what happened? How they behaved?

E. Heyns: I don't think it would be useful.

Nathan: You are indeed a diplomat. Did you put people up at Blake House during this time?

E. Heyns: No, we didn't.

YWCA, the Board and the Building

Nathan: I wondered if you would like to say anything about your work with the YWCA?

E. Heyns: Yes. I thought that, because I had a limited number of community responsibilities or engagements, that the YWCA was the one thing that I was most interested in, and where I made my best personal friends. There were so many wonderful people on the board of the YWCA--this was the University YWCA--people like Ella Hagar, Jean Wood, Betsy Warrick, Betty Helmholz, Fran Tittman, and Frances Townes. There were just a lot of very able, hardworking women who had been with the YWCA for a long time, helped to build the original building. They had been there when that building was put up.

Nathan: Is this the Esherick building or the one before?

E. Heyns: The present one. For many of those women the changes that were going on on campus were hard to understand and hard to accept. This very much impacted on the Y; the uses of the building were really a source of some disagreement and some concern, because it was so strategically located that it could have been used as a kind of a launching pad, and it was at times. So it led to some discussions about the uses of the building, and at the same time every one wanted it to be a relevant part of the campus. They wanted it to be a place where people could find some kind of companionship and opportunity for discussion. It served a useful purpose, I think.

Nathan: Was there ever any effort to keep it just for the campus community?

E. Heyns: I think that was always part of the Y's understanding of its role. In the first place there is a Y in town, a community Y. I think this one here was always considered a University Y.

Nathan: I wondered whether they had the sort of problem of having non-campus groups use their area that the campus itself had.

E. Heyns: Oh, I think it was a problem, I think it was a very big problem. There were some meetings held there which were under the sponsorship of organizations like the SDS [Students for a Democratic Society] that were not recognized as student activities. Not everybody on the board approved of that.

Nathan: Did you have a personal opinion about that?

E. Heyns: I was a little reluctant to offer my opinions on those things. I felt I had kind of a conflict of interest, because my loyalties were with the University administration, obviously. I went to one meeting in which I sat in the back of the room (I think they had meetings in their dining hall): it was a kind of a planning meeting, a strategy meeting for some kind of a disruptive activity, and at the very end of the meeting somebody got up and said, did they know that the wife of the Chancellor was sitting in the back of the room. Everybody turned around and looked. The then director of the YWCA got up and she said that I was on the board, and I had been invited to attend the meeting as a member of the board. They said "Throw her out! She shouldn't be here." So I got up and left. [laughs]

Nathan: Very revealing story.

E. Heyns: Anne Kern was the director then, and she felt rather bad about it, because she thought she had gotten me into an embarrassing situation, and that maybe she had lost some of her credibility with this particular group. I'm not quite sure now who they were, all I remember is that it was the student radical leadership that were having this meeting.

Nathan: How interesting that a board member is not supposed to attend a meeting in this structure. That is strange. Did you ever know Lily Margaret Sherman, or had she left before you arrived?

E. Heyns: She had left.

Nathan: Her abilities to deal with issues and with students left quite an impression. But I know what you mean about the qualities of the people there.

E. Heyns: Gertrude Strong was on the board. There were a lot of wise and hardworking women. They would put on these rummage sales every year, you know, to raise money. My goodness, how they worked.

Nathan: Did the University YWCA have any particular link to Stiles Hall, the YMCA?

E. Heyns: As far as I recall there was none.

Church Nursery, and the Boys' Breakfast

Nathan: There is a note about church activities. Which church did you join?

E. Heyns: That was the First Presbyterian Church, not St. John's.

Nathan: How did you get drawn to it? How were you active there?

E. Heyns: I had a very self-serving relationship to that church: every Sunday morning I worked in the nursery, and it was the most therapeutic thing I could have done. Because it's wonderful to deal with small babies. There are just a couple of things that you can do to relieve the situation. It was so wonderfully stabilizing to just pick up babies, and if they cried, to hold them, and they'd stop crying [laughs]. Oh God, it was wonderful. You know, I could put a bottle in their mouths, and they'd stop crying. I did that every Sunday, I think, during the whole time we were there. My therapy.

Nathan: Were you called on to do other things there?

E. Heyns: No, I think that was all. Our youngest son was quite active in the youth group in the church, and I had breakfast every Wednesday morning for his gang of boys. There were about eight or 10 of them that would have breakfast together at our house. They had the same breakfast every Wednesday morning for all three years: oatmeal, scrambled eggs, toast and orange juice. I was not going to try to be creative at that hour of the morning.

Nathan: And you didn't have Jim Webb to do it. [laughs] It sounds as though you were the breakfast person; was that out of choice?

E. Heyns: The staff at University House came at eight o'clock, and so I always got breakfast for our family and whatever guests we had. On the few occasions when we had someone in the guest room who was very important, or if by the time breakfast was served the housekeeper and maid were there, they would probably have taken over. I remember joining them in the dining room for breakfast a few times.

Nathan: That must have been a little bit stabilizing too, in a way, just going through with that routine.

E. Heyns: Sure. Breakfast is a good time, I think--at least it was in our family--for looking everybody over and seeing if they had a temperature that day before they went off to school.

Nathan: Did they keep in reasonably good health, your own family?

E. Heyns: Yes, very good, except for Roger's having a heart attack in the middle of things.

Nathan: He touched on that very lightly--was that late sixties?

E. Heyns: That was in 1969.

Nathan: So you had to cope with that.

E. Heyns: It wasn't a massive heart attack, but it kept him in Alta Bates for about three weeks, in intensive care, and then he was on a rather restricted regimen for maybe six weeks altogether. Then he went back in arms again.

Nathan: But it was scary?

E. Heyns: Well, it was at the time, yes.

Nathan: I have a note about the Town and Gown Club. Was that something that you took part in?

E. Heyns: I used to attend their meetings, but I was never really an active member. I had a lot of friends in Town and Gown, and I went to all of those, I think they had monthly meetings, didn't they, with a speaker? I tried to go to most of those.

Public Speaking

Nathan: I wondered how you dealt with invitations to come to gatherings, invitations to speak; which ones you decided to accept, and which ones you decided not to.

E. Heyns: I wasn't asked to speak very often. In fact, I don't think I was ever asked to speak, except one time at one of the Section Clubs, when we first came. It was sort of an introductory kind of thing, but it was just, you know, a saying-how-glad-you-were-to-be-in-Berkeley kind of speech.

Nathan: I had a clue from a different oral history that at one point you and Nancy Hitch thought it would be pleasant to have a little training. Do you remember that?

E. Heyns: Sure, I do. Wonderful Dr. Gerald Marsh. I discovered that I really was not a good public speaker, and in fact I would be so absolutely petrified the minute I got up in front of three people that I couldn't talk. I would just be gasping for air. Charlie Hitch had just been made President, and Nancy and I talked about this, and so we said, it's crazy not to be able to stand up in front of people and say a few words. I must have mentioned this to Gerald, and he said, "I can help you get over that; I'll give you some tutoring in public speaking." So he came to University House a couple of mornings, and he gave us a lot of wonderful hints about public speaking, and both of us practiced a little bit with him. It was useful, it was a helpful thing. I think I got over some of my terror, although I've never done much of it.

Nathan: That's an interesting way to approach it, just do it. Do you remember his tips?

E. Heyns: I remember his suggesting that you look right at your audience and talk as if you were just on a one-to-one basis. You raised the level of your voice as you have a larger audience. He always felt that it was good to have some kind of a story that got their attention.

Nathan: It didn't have to be a joke?

E. Heyns: No, it didn't have to be a joke, but something. If you were introducing people to have a little story about them, or something that would be helpful to get attention on the subject. The kind of things you learn in speech class.

Nathan: It's about noon. Would you like to continue now, or come back after lunch?

E. Heyns: How much more do you think there ought to be? Are we pretty close to the end?

Nathan: I think there are a few more things that I would like to ask you.

E. Heyns: Well, why don't we have lunch then.

[tape interruption]

Wardrobe for Berkeley Events

Nathan: We had spoken about some of your community activities, and then you were saying a little about the wardrobe that was required when you came to Berkeley. That's rather revealing, I think, about your life here.

E. Heyns: There were daily occasions. We had about three and a half events at the house every week. This would include coffee hours, luncheons, dinners, and teas in the afternoon. And then, of course, there were things that I went to myself, so that it required a different kind of a wardrobe. There were enough formal occasions at that time, black tie affairs, that I had enjoyed getting a few new clothes every year.

Nathan: Did you feel constrained not to wear the same thing too many times?

E. Heyns: I think I probably felt that maybe something like the Charter Day Banquet sort of demanded a new dress every two or three years. I think there was a certain feeling that one had to make an appearance. I don't know whether that was right or not.

Nathan: I think there's something to it. How about the daytime events?

E. Heyns: I think I dressed the way most of the women at that time dressed, in suits and dresses. Most of us, I think, weren't wearing slacks as much as we are now.

Nathan: That's true. Did you have to do hats and gloves and all that?

E. Heyns: I came out here in that beatnik, fateful time to be interviewed by the Regents, with a wool suit on and a hat. I don't think I ever wore a hat after that to any occasion. Maybe I wore a hat after that--when Princess Margaret and her husband came to the campus I wore a hat, but hats were just going out of style at that time.

##

E. Heyns: Who transcribes this, now? Do you have a secretary who does the transcribing?

Nathan: That's right, we have transcribers; many of them graduate students who want to work a certain number of hours. After they're trained we do everything we can to keep them, because there is a skill in this, of course. Customarily the interviewer, with the transcripts in front of her, will also listen to the tape to see whether the transcriber has been sufficiently accurate, sufficiently attentive,

Nathan: or has somehow heard the words wrong. I will just tell you that on one occasion an outdoor man said, "I'm an ardent canoeist," and it came out, "I'm an ardent nudist." So we try to monitor that. [laughs] One was a member of the "Audubon Society," which came out "Autobahn."

E. Heyns: That's understandable. Sure. I would be quite capable of doing that.

Nathan: Willa Baum has each of us do some transcribing when she's training us, so that we will know what some of the problems are. That has to do also with the voice level. There's nothing quite like trying to listen when there isn't quite enough volume, although we have a volume guide that we can raise and lower. The transcribers have earphones and a footpedal so that they can send it back with the footpedal; you don't have to do what I was doing, poking the different buttons. It's an interesting process.

I'd love to go back to the wool suit and hat, if we may.

E. Heyns: Fran [McPeak] gave me some very good advice when I first arrived here: she said, "Buy dark cotton and light-colored wool." That still works, because there are all of those warm autumn days when you long for a cotton dress or light, cool outfit, but you don't want to come out in pink.

Nathan: That was very good advice.

Berkeley Turmoil, Friends, and Lively Boys

Nathan: I wonder whether you would want to comment about the time of the campus turmoil, and possibly a little bit about how affected Danny was, the boy who was growing up in Berkeley, and his friends. You've mentioned the name of Kent Stewart.

E. Heyns: Kent was one of this group of boys that I think became friends through the church, although they were classmates in high school, and had breakfast in our house on Wednesday mornings. Kent is related to Ella Hagar, she's his aunt, and his relationship to the University was, of course, very close. But this was an exceptionally nice group of young boys, and they turned out to be a wonderful, light-hearted element in the whole scene, because they were good friends and they sort of sensed when Dan needed to have his friends around. They were sensitive.

Nathan: Was this in junior high or high school?

E. Heyns: Started in the ninth grade but it went all the way through high school. They were just awfully nice young boys, and have all remained friends since that time; although Danny went off to the University of Michigan to college, and they all stayed out here, they've remained friends.

Nathan: Something had been said about the day that Martin Luther King, Jr. died, and the consequences in Berkeley High. Can you cast your mind back to that occasion?

E. Heyns: We happened to be at Riverside that weekend, because Riverside was having their Charter Day or something, and Roger was to be the speaker. We were down there as guests of one of the Regents, Phil Boyd, who was very close to the Riverside campus, and had been one of the founders and supporters and benefactors. When this trouble came to Berkeley and to Berkeley High, the campus became very tense, as you probably recall. This really erupted in the high school, where there was a lot of racial tension. Dan was on the football team, and the Black kids became very agitated, and they had a lot of trouble keeping things on an even keel that day at the high school. I think that they may have allowed the children to leave early, or had some assemblies and allowed people to speak, so that feelings could come out.

The antagonism toward the white football players was quite intense. Danny discovered that some of the boys on the team that he thought were his good friends became quite unpleasant. This young minister, who had been the leader of that church group of young people, went over there (I don't know at whose request, maybe one of the kids had called him) and spent the day at the high school trying to get these young folks to talk and express their feelings. But we were down at Riverside, and we were not able to get an airplane out of there. I would have come home, but there were no planes flying out that night. I was able to reach the house and talk to our house staff, and asked the ladies that worked there to get hold of this minister and ask him if he would spend the weekend at the house. He was married, but they had no children, and his wife and he had done this in the past; when we had to be gone, they would come and stay there.

So he and his wife came and spent the rest of that weekend at the house. The women that worked at the house, the housekeeper and the cook, were very fine women and wonderful people. They stayed around. Evidently Dan came home from school and he was absolutely crushed by the fact that his friends had turned against him, and by

E. Heyns: what he had seen. Evidently these women comforted him and talked to him, and stayed there until this young couple came. I was very uncomfortable because I was really afraid that something quite unpleasant might happen at the house, because sometimes the house was the target of demonstrations. We'd had some broken windows and firebombs and things like that, had our cars firebombed. In fact I think it may have been at that time that the cars were firebombed. So I was very glad to get home.

Nathan: Do you want to put in the name of this minister?

E. Heyns: Bert Chamberlain. Very fine, handsome young man, and there just couldn't have been a more attractive person for boys to be associated with.

Nathan: I think I have the names of the women who were in your household; maybe we should put those in if you wish to.

E. Heyns: No one could have inherited a more efficient staff: Fran McPeak, who was the secretary; Alma Garrett, who was the housekeeper, and Viola Johnson Bailey. They could have run the White House, believe me. They were experienced and intelligent and loyal and just elegant women. Fran eventually went to work for Garff Wilson in the Public Ceremonies Office, and she was the ultimate in secretaries--discreet and efficient, just a great lady. She and I would get together every morning after Roger had gone off to the office and plan menus and make lists and go over calendars, and do that kind of stuff. She was just a great secretary.

I had a feeling that these people were very loyal and very discreet. You knew they would all of them have rallied around--and did.

Nathan: That's really impressive. You did mention that the house became a target for thrown rocks, and something about water balloons on a rooftop.

E. Heyns: I think that must have been the first year that we were there. There was some kind of a march on the Chancellor's house, and so there was a whole lot of activity out in front of the house, and all of a sudden, as I looked out of the window, I saw these water balloons flying down onto the crowd. [laughs] And, of course the kids were looking back up there, and between the two a little bit of yelling back and forth took place, and pretty soon the crowd dispersed. I honestly think that it just broke up the whole demonstration.

Nathan: And it was your boy up there with water balloons?

E. Heyns: Yes. I don't know how many were up there, but there were at least two. You can imagine how boys would have discovered everything in that house by the end of the first night. They knew where all of the trap doors were. So they discovered that you could get on to the roof of that house, somehow through the attic, I suppose. They were up there throwing balloons.

Nathan: That seems very humane.

E. Heyns: Doesn't it?

Nathan: And there was something about the boy who climbed the fire escape and was carted off to the Berkeley jail?

E. Heyns: Yes, that was Kent.

Nathan: Why was he arrested for climbing the fire escape?

E. Heyns: I think the campus police came by and saw this person on the fire escape, and then they told him to stop and he ran, I think. So they took him in. About 12 o'clock at night the telephone rang--they would bring people to the city jail--with this call, and it said that there was somebody down here who says that he knows you, and he gave his name. So Roger went to Danny's room and said, "Danny, I think we're going to have to go down to the police department, how would you like to go along?" They went down, and Kent and another boy were sitting on a bench and looking very, very frightened. They went in and acted as if they'd never seen them before.

The police officer--they had talked about it, I guess, on the telephone--said, "We can go along with that." They said, no, they don't know them. [laughs] The color drained out of their faces. It ended up well.

Centennial Celebration and Alumni Tours

Nathan: Good. This was also the period of the centennial celebration. Do you remember working with Garff Wilson?

E. Heyns: Of all of the people whose names I would think to mention, in terms of whether or not they had any kind of handle on how to run celebrations or events, Garff's name is at the very top of the list. He was just so imaginative, so well organized and helpful and pleasant. He was just an enormous help to Roger and to me. Always, at every event he was there, the thing was well run; he had marvelous ideas, just a tower of strength. Another person who was very helpful and effective and a good friend was Dick Hafner, who was public information, and was with us on a lot of alumni tours and things like that.

Nathan: How did you feel about going on these alumni tours?

E. Heyns: Dick Erickson was the alumni secretary at the time; he planned them and always accompanied us, and was extremely helpful. At that time that was not a pleasant assignment, because there was so much hostility toward the campus among the alumni. Almost invariably one would run into people who felt their beloved University was being badly run and that things were being allowed here to happen that were the responsibility of the Chancellor. You were always being quite defensive about what you did do, or could do, or couldn't do. Those were often the kind of things that people felt.

Nathan: Did you feel it was important to show the flag and to go?

E. Heyns: Oh, yes, absolutely. I think that Roger made a hundred alumni speeches in the course of the first year and a half or something. He just went to everything that anybody invited him to, all over the state, and I went with him to some of them. Gruelling calendar for making speeches.

Nathan: And so you would mingle afterwards?

E. Heyns: Yes, and of course there were some wonderful people too, it wasn't all criticism. There were always people who were understanding. Interestingly enough, we found that the grandparents of students were often more understanding of what was going on than the parents. I don't know why, whether they had a little more perspective. This was the period of the long hair and the ragged jeans, this was the hippie time--drove parents crazy, that business about the hair. I don't know if you had enough contact with parents of boys, but this was an issue with parents of boys. And then the whole disruption of campus life was very, very hard for parents to accept. I don't know whether grandparents had a little more perspective on it, but we always found that they were not as upset, that they had better relations with their grandchildren.

More on Helpful People

E. Heyns: Some other names of people that were especially helpful to me: Florence Holmes did the flower arranging at University House, and in a house of that size, with that much entertaining, that was a big job. Do you know who she is?

Nathan: I don't think I do.

E. Heyns: She had studied under this Japanese artist, who did some wonderful water colors.

Nathan: Chiura Obata?

E. Heyns: Obata. She had studied with him. She did painting and flower arranging, and just took care of that the whole time we were there, so that there were always beautiful arrangements of fresh flowers.

Nathan: Did you have a cutting garden?

E. Heyns: Yes, and a greenhouse. They planted flowers so that we would have cut flowers all the time. There were people in Buildings and Grounds who had been there for a long time and were wonderful people, and knew this campus and loved it. They were just so cooperative. There was a Mr. Inouye who was our campus landscape architect. One summer we went to Michigan in August and came home. He had created a Japanese garden in the back of the kitchen, where there was a small area that had been used as a place to keep the garbage cans. He just turned that into a little gem of a Japanese garden with some rocks, and some nice little plants.

Mr. Parish was the man that I dealt with when it came to remodeling and painting--I'm not sure what his title was. He was just a wonderful man. You know, having to deal with a lady who's fixing up her house. [laughs] What an assignment! He was so nice. The campus police were our constant friends.

Nathan: Was Bill Beall here at this time? Did you know him?

E. Heyns: Yes, a little. He had been a Berkeley officer before he came to the campus.

Nathan: He was Berkeley's police chief.

E. Heyns: Wonderful man, just a joy to work with. I always felt that the campus police had behaved themselves extremely well during that period; they were so well disciplined and so restrained. We just

E. Heyns: felt that they couldn't have been any better. They had to take a lot of abuse from rather bratty people. They had to work with all those different law enforcement agencies: the city police, the state police, and then the national guard. So it was a difficult assignment. They were very sensitive to the needs of the campus and very professional. I came away with great respect for them.

I also want to add Roger's secretary, Akiko Owen, who was most helpful, dedicated, and cooperative. She never made demands on me and was always thoughtful of our family when planning Roger's schedule. I am enormously indebted to her. She served the University unselfishly and eased our lives immeasurably.

Netsukes for University House

Nathan: Yes, I see. I think you had also mentioned the netsuke collection.

E. Heyns: Yes.

Nathan: Was that in University House itself?

E. Heyns: Yes. One day a very large chest arrived at University House. It was a cabinet with glass on three sides, and it was about the size of this [points to a piece of furniture], a little bit wider, about that height.

Nathan: Around four feet.

E. Heyns: Yes. A very handsome, beautiful--

Nathan: Was it dark wood?

E. Heyns: Yes. It was in pretty bad shape, the wood had been pretty well scuffed up, but it obviously had been an exquisite piece of furniture in its day. And inside of it were a lot of little boxes, like little jewelry boxes, a whole lot of them, and some spiral notebook tablets, and some other papers with a rubber band around them. It was delivered. I came home and there was this thing in the hallway. Alma said that the University had decided that this stuff had to be at University House, because it was so valuable that they couldn't get insurance for it in any of the buildings of the University.

E. Heyns: So, all right, what is it? Alma and I opened the thing up and we started looking at these tiny little carved figures. I had no idea what they were, but then someone from the oriental art department must have called up and explained what they were, and that they would like it if we would keep the whole thing there for the time being. Dear Mr. Parish came over, and I said, "Mr. Parish, can you do something with this cabinet to make it look nice?" So he and I decided to paint it gold, and to put lighting on the inside, and to put some glass shelves, and some velvet and so on. So off they took it, and it came back looking absolutely scrumptious. They did beautiful work in the shop on campus; they had some wonderful wood finishers over there that knew how to strip things and refinish them.

So this chest came back, and Alma and I got out the little boxes and we laid all this stuff out on the dining room table and just sort of picked it over, picked out the things we liked and arranged them in this cabinet. In the meantime I had no idea really what they were. But subsequently I learned that it had been insured for--at that time--$250 thousand. It was a very, very valuable collection of netsukes. Then I did a little reading and found out what they were. But Alma and I have always chuckled about how we played with those as if we had gotten a bunch of lead soldiers.

Nathan: Was this one person's collection?

E. Heyns: Yes, it was. It belonged to someone who left it to the University. Then eventually the whole thing was taken out of the house. It's not there any more.

Nathan: Do you know where it sent?

E. Heyns: I think it must be on campus somewhere. Someone came over and photographed it.

##

Nathan: Were these primarily carved ivory?

E. Heyns: Yes.

Nathan: What a wonderful gift to the University.

E. Heyns: Oh, it was a magnificent gift. We put it in the front entrance hall, right inside the doorway, and people loved looking at it. We kept it there for several years, all the years that we were there after that. There were a lot of people who knew a lot about

E. Heyns: netsuke, a lot of California people who were more sophisticated about that. It attracted a lot of attention. It was a beautiful thing to have right there.

Nathan: There were two people on campus who were really experts on netsuke: Barr Tompkins from The Bancroft Library, and his wife Dorothy who was at IGS. They were very knowledgeable about netsuke, interestingly enough.

E. Heyns: Did they write a book on the subject?

Nathan: Yes--let's see. They did a very elaborate index to a famous book on netsuke, which made the book really usable, available to westerners particularly. Interesting that you would have that connection with a different art form.

E. Heyns: I did get a book. I can't remember the title any more, whether it was the book that they had helped to put out, but I remember getting a book and becoming somewhat informed about them.

Nathan: Did you have much to do with the University Art Museum? Was it still being built?

E. Heyns: It was dedicated while we were there, and had its opening. I wasn't personally involved with it and was not on any of its committees or anything like that.

Nathan: During the centennial celebration certain things were spotlighted, I guess. What a time to celebrate, with all this upheaval!

You mentioned various groups and people who had been supportive; I gather that your husband was somewhat interested in athletics, so that you got to know groups through that interest.

E. Heyns: I don't think particularly. I don't remember that that was a particular area. There were a lot of faculty people whom we got to know, who were wonderful people. Although there was not a lot of time for making friendships; you don't drop in on people much when you live that kind of life, and also you don't make the same kind of friends that you make when you are younger, when your children are the same age. That, I think, is when you make your closest friends. But we certainly made friends with people who are still friends and whom we still see.

Nathan: You've maintained that connection.

E. Heyns: Oh, sure.

Nathan: Thinking of your own experiences as a Chancellor's wife, have you distilled any thoughts that might be useful to future people in your position?

E. Heyns: Well, I certainly know that the role of women and of wives has changed a lot, and even the role of husbands. There are a fair number of women in administrative positions now whose husbands are "the spouse," and I still think that in positions of responsibility people are always more effective if their personal lives are serene and happy. I think they operate better. To the extent that a spouse can contribute to that I think it's a help.

Nathan: Do you ever have any feeling that people were perhaps trying to reach your husband through you, to say things to you that you would carry to him?

E. Heyns: I suppose so. I wasn't very conscious of it. I never felt that I was very much in demand as a message carrier.

To the University of Michigan and on to Washington

Nathan: You did mention going back to the University of Michigan after 1971.

E. Heyns: Briefly.

Nathan: That was another adjustment that you had to make.

E. Heyns: Yes, we moved into an apartment. Not only did we move into an apartment, but both of the two boys were at Michigan--one of them had been living in a fraternity and the other one sharing rooms with a friend--and they moved back in with us.

Nathan: You got to cook breakfast for them.

E. Heyns: Actually, I was so glad to be with them that it was a treat to be there, but it was a little crowded.

Nathan: How adaptable you have been.

E. Heyns: Yes, to go from a house the size of University House to an apartment with three little tiny, tiny bedrooms. But actually it was fun, you know, it was such a change, and such a difference in kinds of demands, and our responsibilities. Like when you're traveling, or something, and you're in a hotel room.

Nathan: It wasn't long until you went to Washington. How was that?

E. Heyns: Well, Washington--did you ever live in Washington?

Nathan: No, only visited, and I don't really know it.

E. Heyns: It's a marvelous place to live. It's a wonderful city: it's exciting and interesting and beautiful. It's a southern town--looks European. There are wonderful things to do in Washington. We lived in Georgetown, which is a beautiful part of the city. It was a wonderful place to live and work, I thoroughly liked it. It was just about the time of Watergate, when we went there, so that whole thing was transpiring in Washington, and you can imagine that it was an exciting time to be there.

Nathan: You went from one storm to the next.

E. Heyns: Yes.

Nathan: Except that you weren't in the middle of Watergate.

E. Heyns: It wasn't our storm. But it was interesting.

Nathan: Did you go to any of the hearings?

E. Heyns: No, I didn't. When we first got there we lived in a hotel for a while, until the house was vacated, and I did go to some hearings--they didn't happen to be any of the Watergate hearings--but I was interested in going up to Congress to visit hearings. It's very interesting to walk down the hallway and see a couple of senators walking toward you. You know, they are real people. They wear ties and shirts just like a lot of other people. [laughs] I always got kind of a thrill out of that. I really loved driving down toward the capital in the morning and seeing the dome of the capital. It was a wonderful thing to be there, you know that this was where the government of the United States was doing its business. The Supreme Court Building--I visited some of those Supreme Court hearings.

It's a great experience; I wish everybody could do it. It would make every young person, I think, feel something about their government, that they might not feel if they hadn't visited. A lot of young people do go to Washington. Did your girls ever go on any trips or anything to Washington?

Nathan: A little bit later, by themselves. That sense of being at the center of power is a very stimulating thing. Did you look up the California senators when you were there?

E. Heyns: I think I one time went to get a pass to go to the House and I had to stop in at the office of the representative. I don't even remember who it was at that time.

Return to California

Nathan: You weren't there terribly long.

E. Heyns: From 1972 to 1977. Then back to California. Fortunately, we never had to pay for moving. These jobs paid for our moving, and I'm eternally grateful, because that would really have put us out of business, I think, if we had had to drag our possessions back and forth.

Nathan: So now you're in Atherton.

E. Heyns: Yes.

Nathan: Are your old California friends still around?

E. Heyns: Yes, and we do have some wonderful friends that we've kept from that Berkeley time.

Nathan: Do you have any papers or collections from those years between 1965 and 1971, that you think you'll do anything with?

E. Heyns: Roger has a lot of papers. They're all in boxes, and they're all up in the attic of the garage. I don't know what he's decided about that, or whether anybody would want to have them. We've never talked about it. I think he has a lot of copies of speeches mostly.

Nathan: Did you make any sort of collections during those years?

E. Heyns: I never did. I'm sorry that I didn't keep a diary, because I wish I had, but at the time I was just so excited about what was going on every day, and it didn't seem like I'd ever forget it.

Nathan: No. To what do you attribute your and your husband's ability somehow to come out of it in good shape, and apparently without bitterness?

E. Heyns: Well, it was mostly a positive experience. Being at Berkeley is a great opportunity. For all the troubles that there were, there were a lot of wonderful things happening on campus. A lot of people were doing their jobs, and a lot of people were being educated, and a lot of research was going on. I guess I always thought it was just a fantastic opportunity. I think Roger would have regretted that there was so little time to do constructive things. I think everybody likes to think that maybe they're building a little bit for the future, but when you are at a place like Berkeley there are so many people doing such important things all around you that your job is to facilitate it for other people.

Nathan: Sort of holding the place together?

E. Heyns: That was the major task at that particular time. That had its own challenge and excitement. It was an exciting time.

Nathan: It's interesting that your presence was recognized, and I've read many positive things about you; people felt that you were serene and supportive and welcoming. It's very nice to know that you're seen that way.

E. Heyns: Yes, it is nice to know. And I think that probably people as heads of departments, people as deans of colleges, do play that kind of a role, in setting some kind of ambience or atmosphere. I've always been impressed with what a department head could do to a department to bring about harmony and good feeling. I'm sure you've experienced that yourself in your relationships on campus. I think we're all social creatures to an extent and like to be in an organization where people get along together. Being in a University has to be the best job in the world, don't you think?

Nathan: Yes, I do.

E. Heyns: Young people every year coming in, all healthy and beautiful and smart. Such a joy, and such promise.

Nathan: Are there any other names of people that rise in the back of your mind?

E. Heyns: I told you about these wonderful women who were in the Section Club; you gave me their lists. I don't want to single out anyone of those people, because I don't want to leave anybody out, but these are the kind of people that make a university what it is. These people really, as I look at their names--these all happened to be wives of people on campus--they genuinely loved this place and cared

E. Heyns: about it, and their lives centered around it. I think the Section Club at that time was kind of the glue of the faculty. It brought people together from different disciplines and helped people to make friends. It's a big University, and young people coming here often made their friends through the Section Club. Did you ever belong to the Section Club?

Nathan: No, I didn't, but of course I have friends who did, and who still do, and who enjoy it immensely--especially the one that reads plays. Certainly a great big impersonal university needs activities of that kind.

University as a Privilege

Nathan: Are there any other thoughts that come to you about your years here, or earlier, or later?

E. Heyns: I think I've talked myself out.

I greatly admire people of real distinction and accomplishment. I have always thought that great scholarship and devotion to learning is almost man's highest achievement--that and artistic ability. In a great university like this there are a lot of people in that category. I don't know whether that comes out of the fact that going to the university was a real privilege in my generation, or to the background out of which I came.

Do you think that your children felt that going to the university was a privilege? Were they impressed with it?

Nathan: I think that it was a great adventure to them. They grew up knowing that this was something that probably they would do, all things being equal. They were impressed certainly by some of the possibilities available in a university, but whether they thought it was a privilege, I don't know. It's a very interesting question.

E. Heyns: I'm sure that our sons took it for granted that they would go. Why they chose a university rather than some other place, such as where their friends went, in our case I think it was going home for them to go to Michigan. They had played around that campus as children; they had hung around the field when the band was practicing on Friday night. They had sold parking spaces on our front lawn during the football season.

Nathan: Did it do your lawn a lot of good?

E. Heyns: Well, our lawn had suffered from bicycles and a few other things, like too many softball games.

No, I don't think they thought it was a privilege, I think they thought that was just part of life. This respect for learning was especially true of my generation. It came very much from my family--from my father's family and my mother's family. This was their real ambition for their children. They spoke very reverently of professors.

Nathan: Did the rest of the members of your family go to college?

E. Heyns: Yes.

Nathan: That was a great accomplishment.

E. Heyns: My father and mother did not, however. They were of the generation that went to work very early. My parents were immigrants. So they did not get to college.

Nathan: It's interesting that the immigrants now, let's say the Southeast Asians, value education so much. We seem to be getting the benefit of their intensity now.

E. Heyns: You know that was true all during the sixties too, when we would walk around the campus during vacations and at night--we often took walks. In all the libraries and in all the laboratories you'd see oriental students that were there working at night, over the holidays and over the weekends. Couldn't help but notice them. And they're so talented.

Nathan: Yes, they are impressive.

I want to thank you for providing this session in the Heyns memoir. Your first-hand experiences, and your positive views of the University and its values are illuminating and helpful. This has been a great pleasure.

Transcribers: Daryl Glen, Elizabeth Eshleman, Johanna Wolgast
Final Typist: Keiko Sugimoto

TAPE GUIDE -- Roger W. Heyns

TAPE GUIDE -- Esther Heyns

INDEX -- Roger W. Heyns and Esther Heyns

UNIVERSITY HISTORY SERIES

Documenting the history of the University of California has been a responsibility of the Regional Oral History Office since the Office was established in 1954. Oral history memoirs with University-related persons are listed below. They have been underwritten by the U C. Berkeley Foundation, the Chancellor's Office, University departments, or by extramural funding for special projects. The oral histories. tapes and transcripts, are open to scholarly use in The Bancroft Library. Bound, indexed copies of the transcripts are available at cost to manuscript libraries.

Adams, Frank, "Irrigation, Reclamation, and Water Administration," 1956, 491 p.

Amerine, Maynard A., "The University of California and the State's Wine Industry," 1971, 142 p.

Bierman, Jessie, "Maternal and Child Health in Montana, California, the U.S. Children's Bureau, and WHO, 1926-1967," 1987, 246 p.

Bird, Grace, "Leader in Junior College Education at Bakersfield and the University of California," Two volumes, 1978, 342 p.

Birge, Raymond Thayer, "Raymond Thayer Birge, Physicist," 1960, 395 p.

Blaisdell, Allen C., "Foreign Students and the Berkeley International House, 1928-1961 " 1968, 419 p.

Blaisdell, Thomas C. Jr. (in process), Professor Emeritus of Political Science.

Chaney, Ralph Works, "Paleobotanist, Conservationist," 1950 277 p.

Chao, Yuen Ren, "Chinese Linguist. Phonologist, Composer, and Author," 1977, 242 p.

Constance, Lincoln, "Versatile Berkeley Botanist: Plant Taxonomy and University Governance," 1987, 358 p. (est.)

Corley, James V., "Serving the University in Sacramento," 1969 143 p.

Cross, Ira Brown, "Portrait of an Economics Professor," 1967, 128 p.

Cruess, William V., "A Half Century in Food and Wine Technology," 1967, 122 p.

Davidson, Mary Blossom, "The Dean of Women and the Importance of Students," 1967, 79 p.

Dennes, William R., "Philosophy and the University Since 1915," 1970, 162 p.

Donnelly, Ruth, "The University's Role in Housing Services," 1970, 129 p.

Dornin, May (in process), University Archivist.

Ebright, Carroll "Ky", "California Varsity and Olympics Crew Coach," 1968, 74 p.

Erdman, Henry E., "Agricultural Economics: Teaching. Research, and Writing: University of California, Berkeley, 1922-1969," 1971, 252 p.

Evans, Clinton W., "California Athlete, Coach, Administrator, Ambassador," 1968, 106 p.

Foster, Herbert B., "The Role of the Engineer's Office in the Development of the University of California Campuses," 1960, 134 p.

Gordon, Walter A., "Athlete, Officer in Law Enforcement and Administration, Governor of the Virgin Islands," Two volumes, 1980, 621 p.

Grether, Ewald T. (in process), Dean Emeritus, School of Business Administration.

Griffiths, Farnham P., "The University of California and the California Bar," 1954. 46 p.

Hagar, Ella Barrows, "Continuing Memoirs: Family, Community, University," 1974, 272 p.

Hamilton, Brutus, "Student Athletics and the Voluntary Discipline," 1967, 50 p.

Harding, Sidney T., "A Life in Western Water Development." 1967, 524 p.

Harris, Joseph P., "Professor and Practitioner: Government, Election Reform, and the Votomatic." 1983, 155 p.

Hart, James D., "Fine Printers in the San Francisco Bay Area," 1969, 86 p.

Hays, William Charles, "Order, Taste, and Grace in Architecture," 1968, 241 p.

Heller, Elinor Raas, "A Volunteer in Politics. in Higher Education, and on Governing Boards," 1984, 851 p.

Heyns, Roger W., "Berkeley Chancellor, 1965-1971; The University in a Turbulent Society," 1987, 180 p.

Hildebrand, Joel H., "Chemistry, Education, and the University of California," 1962. 196 p.

Hotchkis, Preston, Sr., "One Man's Dynamic Role in California Politics and Water Development, and World Affairs," 1980, 121 p.

Huff, Elizabeth, "Teacher and Founding Curator of the East Asiatic Library: From Urbana to Berkeley by Way of Peking," 1977, 278 p.

Huntington, Emily, "A Career in Consumer Economics and Social Insurance." 1971, 111 p.

Hutchison, Claude B., "The College of Agriculture, University of California, 1922-1952," 1962, 524 p.

Jenny, Hans (in process), Professor of Plant and Soil Biology.

Johnston, Marguerite Kulp, and Mixer, Joseph R., "Student Housing, Welfare, and the ASUC," 1970. 157 p.

Jones, Mary C., "Harold S. Jones and Mary C. Jones, Partners in Longitudinal Studies," 1983, 154 p.

Joslyn, Maynard A. "A Technologist Views the California Wine Industry," 1974, 151 p.

Kendrick, James B. Jr. (in process), Vice-President, Agriculture and Natural Resources, retired.

Kingman, Harry L., "Citizenship in a Democracy," 1973, 292 p.

Kroeber-Quinn, Theodora, "Timeless Woman, Writer and Interpreter of the California Indian World," 1982, 453 p.

Landreth, Catherine. "The Nursery School of the Institute of Child Welfare of the University of California, Berkeley," 1983, 51 p.

Langelier, Wilfred F., "Teaching, Research, and Consultation in Water Purification and Sewage Treatment, University of California at Berkeley. 1916-1955," 1982, 81 p.

Lehman, Benjamin H., "Recollections and Reminiscences of Life in the Bay Area from 1920 Onward," 1969, 367 p.

Lenzen, Victor F., "Physics and Philosophy," 1965, 206 p.

Lessing, Ferdinand D., "Early Years," 1963, 70 p.

McGauhey, Percy H., "The Sanitary Engineering Research Laboratory: Administration, Research, and Consultation, 1950-1972," 1974, 259 p.

McLaughlin, Donald, "Careers in Mining Geology and Management, University Governance and Teaching," 1975, 318 p.

Merritt, Ralph P., "After Me Cometh a Builder, the Recollections of Ralph Palmer Merritt," 1962, 137 p.

Metcalf, Woodbridge, "Extension Forester, 1926-1956." 1969, 138 p.

Meyer, Karl F., "Medical Research and Public Health," 1976, 439 p.

Miles, Josephine, "Poetry, Teaching, and Scholarship," 1980, 344 p.

Mitchell, Lucy Sprague, "Pioneering in Education," 1962, 174 p.

Neuhaus, Eugen, "Reminiscences: Bay Area Art and the University of California Art Department," 1961, 48 p.

Neylan, John Francis, "Politics, Law, and the University of California," 1962, 319 p.

O'Brien, Morrough P. (in process), Dean Emeritus, College of Engineering.

Olmo, Harold P., "Plant Genetics and New Grape Varieties," 1976, 183 p.

Olney, Mary McLean, "Oakland, Berkeley, and the University of California, 1880-1895," 1963, 173 p.

Pepper, Stephen C., "Art and Philosophy at the University of California, 1919-1962," 1963, 471 p.

Porter, Robert Langley, " Physician, Teacher, and Guardian of the Public Health," 1960, 102 p.

Richardson, Leon J., "Berkeley Culture, University of California Highlights, and University Extension, 1892-1960," 1962, 248 p.

Robb, Agnes Roddy, "Robert Gordon Sproul and the University of California," 1976, 134 p.

Selvin, Herman F., "The University of California and California Law and Lawyers, 1920-1978," 1979, 217 p.

Shields, Peter J., "Reminiscences," 1954, 107 p.

Shurtleff, Roy L., "The University's Class of 1912, Investment Banking, and the Shurtleff Family History," 1982, 69 p.

Sproul, Ida Wittschen, "The President's Wife," 1981, 347 p.

Stevens, Frank C., "Forty Years in the Office of the President, University of California, 1905-1945," 1959, 175 p.

Stewart, George R., "A Little of Myself," 1972, 319 p.

Stewart, Jessie Harris, "Memories of Girlhood and the University," 1978, 70 p.

Struve, Gleb (in process), Professor of Slavic Language and Literature.

Taylor, Paul Schuster
Volume I: "Education, Field Research, and Family " 1973, 342 p.
Volume II and Volume III: "California Water and Agricultural Labor," 1975, 519 p.

Towle, Katherine A., "Administration and Leadership," 1970, 369 p.

Underhill, Robert M., "University of California: Lands, Finances, and Investments," 1968, 446 p.

Vaux, Henry J., "Forestry in the Public Interest: Education, Economics, State Policy, 1933-1983," 1987, 337+ p.

Waring, Henry C., "Henry C. Waring on University Extension," 1960, 130 p.

Wellman, Harry, "Teaching, Research, and Administration, University of California, 1925-1968," 1976, 259 p.

Wessels, Glenn A., "Education of an Artist," 1967, 326 p.

Wilson, Garff B., "The Invisible Man, or, Public Ceremonies Chairman at Berkeley for Thirty-Five Years," 1981, 442 p.

Winkler, Albert J., "Viticultural Research at UC Davis, 1921-1971," 1973, 144 p.

Witter, Jean C., "The University, the Community, and the Lifeblood of Business," 1968, 109 p.

Woods, Baldwin M., "University of California Extension " 1957, 102 p.

Woolman, Marjorie J. (in process), Secretary Emeritus of the Regents, University of California.

Wurster, William Wilson, "College of Environmental Design, University of California, Campus Planning, and Architectural Practice," 1964, 339 p.

Multi-Interviewee Series

Blake House Project (in process)
Includes interviews with Mai Arbegast, Igor Blake, Ron and Myra Brocchini, Toichi Domoto, Eliot Evans, Tony Hail, Linda Haymaker, Charles Hitch, Flo Holmes, Clark and Kay Kerr, Gerry Scott, George and Helena Thacher, Walter Vodden, and Norma Willer.

"Centennial History Project, 1954-1960," 329 p.
Includes interviews with George P. Adams, Anson Stiles Blake, Walter C. Blasdale, Joel H. Hildebrand, Samuel J. Holmes, Alfred L. Kroeber, Ivan M. Linforth, George D. Louderback, Agnes Fay Morgan, and William Popper.

"Thomas D. Church, Landscape Architect," Two volumes, 1978, 803 p.
Volume I: Includes interviews with Theodore Bernardi, Lucy Butler, June Meehan Campbell, Louis De Monte, Walter Doty, Donn Emmons, Floyd Gerow, Harriet Henderson, Joseph Howland, Ruth Jaffe, Burton Litton, Germano Milano, Miriam Pierce, George Rockrise, Robert Royston, Geraldine Knight Scott, Roger Sturtevant, Francis Violich, and Harold Watkin.
Volume II: Includes interviews with Maggie Baylis, Elizabeth Roberts Church, Robert Glasner, Grace Hall, Lawrence Halprin, Proctor Mellquist, Everitt Miller, Harry Sanders, Lou Schenone, Jack Stafford, Goodwin Steinberg, and Jack Wagstaff.

"Dental History Project, University of California, San Francisco," 1969, 1114 p.
Includes interviews with Dickson Bell, Reuben L. Blake, Willard C. Fleming, George A. Hughes, Leland D. Jones, George F. McGee, C.E. Rutledge, William B. Ryder, Jr., Herbert J. Samuels, Joseph Sciutto, William S. Smith, Harvey Stallard, George E. Steninger, and Abraham W. Ward.

Disabled Students Project (in process)

"Julia Morgan Architectural History Project," Two volumes, 1976, 621 p.
Volume I: "The Work of Walter Steilberg and Julia Morgan, and the Department of Architecture, UCB, 1904-1954"
Includes interviews with Walter T. Steilberg, Robert Ratcliff, Evelyn Paine Ratcliff, Norman L. Jensen, John E. Wagstaff, George C. Hodges, Edward B. Hussey, and Warren Charles Perry.
Volume II: "Julia Morgan, Her Office, and a House"
Includes interviews with Mary Grace Barron, Kirk O. Rowlands, Norma Willer, Quintilla Williams, Catherine Freeman Nimitz, Polly Lawrence McNaught, Hettie Belle Marcus, Bjarne Dahl, Bjarne Dahl, Jr., Morgan North, Dorothy Wormser Coblentz, and Flora d'Ille North.

"The Prytaneans: An Oral History of the Prytanean Society and its Members,"
Volume I: "1901-1920," 1970, 307 p.
Volume II: "1921-1930," 1977, 313 p.

"Robert Gordon Sproul Oral History Project," Two volumes, 1986, 904 p.
Includes interviews with Horace Albright, Stuart LeRoy Anderson, Katherine Bradley, Dyke Brown, Natalie Cohen, Paul A. Dodd, May Dornin, Richard E. Erickson, Walter S. Frederick, David P. Gardner, Vernon Goodin, Marion Sproul Goodin, Louis Heilbron, Clark Kerr, Adrian Kragen, Robert S. Johnson, Mary Blumer Lawrence, Donald McLaughlin, Dean McHenry, Stanley E. McCaffrey, Kendric and Marion Morrish, William Penn Mott, Jr., Herman Phleger, John B. deC. M. Saunders, Carl Sharsmith, John Sproul, Robert Gordon Sproul, Jr., Wallace Sterling, Wakefield Taylor, Robert Underhill, Garff Wilson, and Pete L. Yzaquirre.

"The Women's Faculty Club of the University of California at Berkeley, 1919-1982," 1983, 312 p.
Includes interviews with Josephine Smith, Margaret Murdock, Agnes Robb, May Dornin, Josephine Miles, Gudveig Gordon-Britland, Elizabeth Scott, Marian Diamond, Mary Ann Johnson, Eleanor Van Horn, and Katherine Van Valer Williams.

9/87