McCULLOCH: I'm doing the history of Irvine. Now, you, Dean, were the head of this faculty committee in 1957. Right?

McHENRY: Yes, All University Faculty Conference Study Committee Number One.

McCULLOCH: And you were chairman?

McHENRY: Yes.

McCULLOCH: And Sproul set that up?

McHENRY: Yes.

McCULLOCH: And where is a copy of that? Have you got a copy?

McHENRY: Oh, I'm sure I have. I'm sure it's in the Irvine Library because full sets of all the proceedings of the University Faculty Conferences were furnished to each of the new campuses.

McCULLOCH: Well, I know what you're talking about. In other words, it was the subject of a full conference--two-day conference? Is that right?

McHENRY: Yes.

McCULLOCH: At Arrowhead?

McHENRY: No. It was held at that time at Carmel, at the Highlands Inn--the only time ever to meet other than on a university campus.

McCULLOCH: And did Sproul preside?

McHENRY: Yes.
McCULLOCH: You, then, presented the report and the report was printed, the papers took it up—I remember reading the Los Angeles Times report about it. I think it went all over the state.

McHENRY: Yes, though there was another conference at Arrowhead the same year that you may have mixed with it. This All University Faculty Conference report, while it later became influential, was not publicized at the time. The situation was that the All University Faculty Conference Steering Committee thought that this was the strategic time to study what they called the size and number of campuses, which brought up the whole new campus matter. I suppose more than anyone else, Sidney Cameron of UCLA in agriculture, who was chairman, or co-chairman of it, thought that I, because of some experience we had had together on the Committee on Educational Policy of the Academic Senate, Southern Section, should take the lead in this. Frank Newman, who later was dean of the School of Law at Berkeley, was vice chairman.

McCULLOCH: Now, in preparation for this meeting, did you study the statistics of the Strayer report—did you go back a long way?—how did you prepare for it?

McHENRY: Yes, we went back over the full string of reports that go back—indeed, there was one about 1920 called the Capen Report (Capen was the chancellor of the University of Buffalo)—and then in the 30's there was the so-called Suzzalo Report.

McCULLOCH: What year was that?

McHENRY: In '31...'32—maybe even '30. It was a report headed by then president of the University of Washington.
McCULLOCH: Now, all these reports were available in the library?

McHENRY: They are, yes. They were studies of the future of higher education in California. Then the Strayer Report came after the war.

McCULLOCH: That's right. I remember that one.

McHENRY: And, then, the next one, which was published in 1955, was the McConnell Report--T. R. McConnell, who had been an important leader, and also president or chancellor of the University of Buffalo.

McCULLOCH: At the time. Then he came to Berkeley as head of the Center for the Study of Higher Education?

McHENRY: Yes. He finally retired just a week or two ago; but Mac was head of this report of the study team. And in 1955 the striking recommendation was that no new state colleges or university campuses would be needed within the next, I think they said, ten years. And this was almost directly contrary, it seemed to many of us, to the statistical, to the demographic facts. California had not slackened in growth, and without some additional facilities, I didn't see any possibility of their being able to meet the obligations.

McCULLOCH: Well, the McConnell report you felt was not correct?

McHENRY: No. It was a very bearish report, in the mid-fifties. It said that we needed no additional campuses and no new state colleges. Now, the staff that went on after McConnell went to Berkeley, was doubtful about these conclusions almost immediately. For example, Tom Holy--Thomas C. Holy--who now
living a small town in Iowa—indeed, I saw him when I was
at Grinnell last fall—was the university representative,
or staff member on the Liaison Committee. Almost immediately
on the publication of the McConnell report, he began to look
at the work of the state statistician and the Department of
Finance and began to fear that this would not do. The
staff then published—Tom Holy and his associates—published
a report which was called "The Additional Centers Report."

McCulloch: Where was his office? Where was he located?

McHenry: Well, he was located in University Hall—he was located in
Sproul Hall then. He was located in the Statewide headquarters
of the University of California, and he was associated with
a young man called Brown who represented the state colleges
and the State Board of Education in the Liaison Committee.
You may remember that the forerunner of the CCHE, the
Coordinating Council for Higher Education, was called the
Liaison Committee of the University of California and the
State Board of Education, I guess it was called. It was
this body that supervised several studies. They supervised
the Strayer report. I know they did the McConnell report.

McCulloch: I believe Holy was working for the University under Sproul?

McHenry: He was paid by the University, but assigned to, or seconded
you would say—if you brought back your Geelong language—he
was seconded to the Liaison Committee and the joint work of
the University and the state colleges. This report, which
was in process parallel to our work, and was published
somewhat after ours.
McCULLOCH: Yours was published in '57?

McHENRY: Yes, but it was published in '57 also--the additional centers report.

McCULLOCH: Additional centers report?

McHENRY: Yes, and that was a very important report because we used it very much in our study because we didn't have an independent research staff of our own, of course, and we had to rely upon the statistics. We were just faculty men taking a part-time assignment, which we took as an overload. There was a man, a lawyer called Thomas S. Dabagh who was an old friend of ours, of Jane's and mine, and he was affiliated with this liaison staff. It was through Tom that I got advance copies of what they were doing, and tables, and statistics.

McCULLOCH: Now, this Tom Holy, did his report set out for the University that there be three new campuses, and, if so, where they should be? For instance, your report laid out very carefully--Southeast Los Angeles, the San Diego area, and then the...

McHENRY: South Central coast, yes, which was this area, and the San Joaquin Valley.

McCULLOCH: There were four?

McHENRY: Yes, we recommended four.

McCULLOCH: Four! San Joaquin which, of course, has never yet come to pass.

McHENRY: Yes.

McCULLOCH: And now they've got a state college in Bakersfield, I know.
McHENRY: Yes, well, what we did was to take the priority list that
the liaison staff was working on. They did a very careful
study of populations of areas and rates of growth and the
like. And there was pressure. For example, at the time of
the additional centers report (being formulated in 1955 to
'57) there was a lot of regional pressure. Bakersfield was
pressing, Redding was pressing, and "Superior California,"
in the far north, was pressing. And, so, the liaison staff
did this careful study, justifying it on the basis of
population domiciled in the region. They said the first
four areas--the ones that needed university centers first--
were (and these they listed). Then they listed the three
that were established, plus the San Joaquin Valley. They
also listed a number of state college priorities. Then they
had a great list of junior college priorities, which called for,
maybe, twenty additional junior colleges. Now, we, of course,
focused only on the University in this little study committee
and we took that priority list and we advocated that the four
be authorized--that the Regents authorize the four. Now, this
might have passed away as just another obscure report to the
All University Faculty Conference except for some unusual
factors. One of them was that Regent Pauley came to the All
University Faculty Conference. It's the only one I've ever
heard of his coming to. We had it on pretty good authority
that Pauley was opposed to new campuses. He just thought
that Berkeley and Los Angeles ought to grow on to forty,
fifty thousand, and so we were extremely apprehensive about his reactions. Another thing—you'll think that I'm skiting—do you know that word?

McCulloch: Yes, indeed, that’s a good Australian word.

McHenry: You will think I'm skiting when I say that the committee was smart enough to write a short report. It was short enough so that an ordinary literate person could sit down and read it in twenty minutes and get the whole story. The "Additional Centers Report" was cautious and ponderous and careful, but we came to about the same conclusions, except they weren't allowed to advocate anything, they just gave the priority list.

McCulloch: Except they also added state colleges and junior colleges, and you didn't?

McHenry: Yes. But we took their priority list and we wrote our own prose. We hadn't seen theirs at the time. We advocated the four new campuses, and we showed in the report—I thought pretty effectively—why Berkeley and UCLA should not grow to forty or fifty thousand. We also put it rather dramatically that they would, unless there was someplace else to go. We advocated the 27,500 limit. I had long been interested in limiting the campuses, and we tried at an earlier period—I say we—a few members of the faculty—to get the limit set at 20,000. The Berkeley faculty pretty well broke that. Then we tried to get it set at 25,000 and again, the same considerations came to work. These old campuses simply could not face the future without the factor of growth. They didn't want to become old, and they didn't want a period of
time where in some departments you might go a decade or more without recruiting a single new member in the faculty. So, there was this overwhelming pressure that broke both those. But in our study and then later on in the "Master Plan," we kept reiterating the 27,500 limit, which was based upon, as you probably know, Sam, an educated guess--where we would be at Berkeley if we set the brakes and worked as hard as we could to get alternate university facilities. We figured that it would take about five years to get them funded and built and ready to receive. And, so, 1960 to 1965 was a period of preparing at Irvine and San Diego and, eventually, Santa Cruz. So the 27,500 limit was never an optimum but always the earliest, lowest practical number.

McCULLOCH: I didn't know that. I'm very interested. Who, Dean, on your committee besides yourself do you remember as helping you particularly on that 1957 report?--besides the ones you've mentioned?

McHENRY: Well, Frank Newman was the key man and the vice chairman in the picture. If I can recall the names now: Kelly of Mathematics at Santa Barbara--I think it's Paul Kelly.

McCULLOCH: I can look them all up. I'm just wondering and prodding your memory of whom you thought pitched in and helped you the most?

McHENRY: Well, Kelly was a very helpful member of the team, and then from Riverside in Physics there was a chap called Robert Wild--Bob Wild. I had to look it up to remember it--who was very effective. Well, my memory fails me, but there are at least four members of the group.
McCULLOCH: All right, now, having got your report, having done it in a short space—that's a good idea because everybody could read it! Publicity, I know was considerable because I read the Los Angeles Times and Sally's folks sent me the clippings of the report. Then, from that point on the Regents had to take over and approve it?

McHENRY: If you don't mind my taking you back to Carmel again?

McCULLOCH: Yes, take me back!

McHENRY: Pauley walked in during the presentation which I gave. Then Newman took over, and then other members of the committee. Then there was an outpouring of faculty noise. Bob Brady, the economist at Berkeley, got the floor and waved his arms around, not about anything in the report, but that the university faculty was burdened with too many committees. And several faculty members got up and spoke on whatever—they made themselves a little speech—at the first opportunity for recognition. They simply got up and made the speech! I thought things were going pretty sadly until it dawned on me what was happening, that at each of these conferences people get ticked off, stand up and speak. But the thing went rather well. The acceptance was good, and then Pauley approached the committee and said, "Won't you sit with me at lunch?" And at lunch his attitude was completely different from that which had been reported previously. He said, "The job of the Regents is to find out what's needed and then to provide it." And he said, "Now, you tell me what's needed to
get this program going. And it's our job to figure out how to get it going." His conversion was very crucial, and a matter of our good luck at having him there. Actually, it was a very narrow miss, because he was bounced off Pacific Airlines at Santa Barbara on the way up. Normally he flies in his own plane with his own pilot; but he had sent his pilot up to Alaska. He said he had some polar bear rugs that he was very fond of and they were getting worn, so he sent his pilot up to Alaska to bring some back! And when he got bounced at Santa Barbara, and was telling us about it, we said to each other, "He'll buy the damn airline!" He didn't, actually. He still rides his own plane.

McCULLOCH: Yes, I know that. I remember he was in an accident coming to that crucial meeting of the Regents about a year or so ago on the question of disciplining the students at Berkeley. They were meeting at the Oakland airport and he was flying, and he hurt himself.

McHENRY: A car accident?

McCULLOCH: No, it was a plane accident. His own plane.

McHENRY: Well, you know, the stiffness in his neck comes from an accident in his early 20's. He was flying an old liberty airplane just after he got out of Berkeley down in Imperial Valley and he hit an electric power line and was in the hospital for the better part of a year. That really got him in the oil business, according to the accounts of it I read in the L.A. Times. He had a hospital bill of several thousand dollars, and he sat there trying to figure out how
he could make several thousand dollars. The Pasadena Board of Education advertised for fuel oil—for the year's supply of fuel oil—his father had been in the oil distributing business and so he knew a little about it. So he got the prices from the wholesalers of oil companies—what would it cost for how many tens of thousands of gallons of fuel oil for the Pasadena system. He added his hospital bill and sent in the bid at exactly what he owed, plus the cost of the oil, and he was the low bidder, and he was in the oil business. And he was even with the world financially.

McCULLOCH: Well, back to the meeting, though. Who invited Pauley to attend?

McHENRY: I think the President normally invited all Regents.

McCULLOCH: Because I know the present conferences have at least two or three there now. Ellie Heller was at the last one, for example.

McCULLOCH: She comes, and Phil Boyd, and occasionally others. But I've never seen Pauley at another one, and I guess I must have attended ten or twelve over the years. But he was there. And then, the next main event that took place during the summer was a conference at Arrowhead on the educational policy of the University. It was the early part of August of 1957.

McCULLOCH: This is, you say, August of '57?

McHENRY: Yes. It was summer of '57 and I'm not sure whether it was July or August, but it was in the summer. This was set up,
this conference, with quite an elaborate agenda under the
auspices of Robert Johnson, who is still in the President's
office. He's a man now in his 60's--early 60's. And
Bob Johnson was given by Sproul a great deal of latitude in
setting it up and it's the only one I've ever heard of
being held in the University's history. It brought together
all Regents, the leaders of the Academic Senate, and the
principal administrative officers of the University.

McCULLOCH: All at Lake Arrowhead?

McHENRY: All at Lake Arrowhead. And I was invited to come give the
essence of this report. Tom Holy was invited to give the
essence of the additional centers report. There was a very
important report on science and technology at San Diego.
They were just edging into the idea of a general campus at
San Diego then. And it was still science and technology
à la Revelle. In the course of this meeting there was
discussion of the new campus program and because of our
short report and so on, Pauley and others kept referring to
"the one in the blue cover," which was the All-University
Faculty Conference. This was the meeting at which Berkeley
and Los Angeles brought in their first campus academic plans.
This was another first in the history of the University. A
year or so before Ed Carter, in the Board, had said, "Where
is the academic planning?" Perhaps as early as '56 or '55.
I was not around the Board, I never attended the full Board
meeting in those days, and so on, but I learned this more
from Clark Kerr and Robert Johnson and others. He (Carter) said, in effect: "Any organization worth its salt ought to have down on paper where it expects to be in five years, ten years, twenty years, even fifty years. And you may have to revise it, but a rough road map is better than none at all."

That's the essence of what Carter was arguing. So he moved, I think in Educational Policy, that the Berkeley and Los Angeles campuses present, within a reasonable time, an academic plan showing where they were going. Well, the two campuses went about it quite differently. At Berkeley, under Clark Kerr's chancellorship (he had become Chancellor in '52, or late '51 maybe) you couldn't tell where the Academic Senate began and the administration ended. His Administrative Council was a merger of an academic and administrative council. They did a tremendously imaginative job of charting Berkeley's course for the future, and that was unveiled by Kerr up there. Then UCLA's report came, and Dr. Raymond Allen didn't have a firm grasp on UCLA or on the faculty and the way it was thinking, and he had given this job almost wholly to Lamar Johnson of the Education Department. Lamar came up with the report which had a lot of boiler plate in it--things he had recommended at various places. And the language was somewhat stilted.

McCULLOCH: And, of course, Lamar Johnson's great field is junior colleges?

McHENRY: Yes. And Allen, you know, had not lived and breathed it himself. He would have to turn to Lamar Johnson for the
answer on various things. Whereas Kerr was the master of
the whole thing. When it was over Carter said publicly
(right out in the open) about these two presentations that
the Berkeley report "is excellent, the kind of thing we need
that will lead us along proper paths. I'm very disappointed
in the UCLA report." He's a UCLA grad--my class, '32,
you know. And, "We'll have to do much better than that."

McCULLOCH: Tell me, was the press covering this report?

McHENRY: I think maybe when you've referred to press coverage, this
may have been the thing that was covered, but I'm not sure.

McCULLOCH: Yes, I think it was. Because it was Arrowhead and it was a
long, two-page article.

McHENRY: Yes, I think maybe the newspapers were there. But from
that day the Regents' eyes were on Kerr, not on Allen. I
always felt that that was when they removed the idea from
their minds that Allen might be presidential caliber. And,
though they thought of Kerr as something of a radical, or
liberal, they began to watch him. And, incidentally,
Sproul didn't make that conference. He wasn't there, at
Arrowhead.

McCULLOCH: Even though he organized the whole thing?

McHENRY: Yes. He was ill. But there was some feeling that he
didn't like the Regents reaching this far into educational
policy and that he didn't like the idea of the Regents meeting
with the faculty. At any rate, he had an illness, diplomatic
or otherwise, that prevented his being there.
McCULLOCH: I didn't know these facts. Well, then, from this point on, now, the Regents wanted these five-year plans, ten-year plans, twenty-year plans and they accepted the Berkeley report. But what did they say, what was their reaction to your report when you made yours?

McHENRY: Well, the reaction at Arrowhead was quite favorable.

McCULLOCH: Were all the Regents there?

McHENRY: Virtually all, yes. And they were quite favorable to the idea of a new campus program. They didn't endorse four new campuses at that time. They weren't sitting as Regents, they were at a conference to which Regents were invited.

The next big event, so far as I was concerned, was in October of 1957, when Sproul had on the agenda of the Regents' meeting the new campus proposal. Now, what committee work there had been in between Regents' committee work, and what staff work that the President's office had carried on, I don't know--between the Arrowhead meeting and the Davis meeting of the Regents. But, at any rate, I got a call from Sproul and he said "It's on the agenda and I'd appreciate it if you would fly up to Davis and speak along the lines that you developed for the All-University Faculty Conference." And I said I would be very glad to. So I flew up the morning of the meeting. I remember the dates very well because of certain other historic events that took place at this meeting. Dr. Allen was going up and so we were seat mates on the plane, the United DC-6, I believe it was.
And he still thought that the presidency was going to be settled in his favor. And I remember his snarling at one stage—and he's a very mild man—"That Ed Carter! Someday I'm going to show him."—resenting and still rankling under the criticism that he (Carter) had administered. We were met at the airport in Sacramento and taken over. And in the Struve Hall Lounge, where some of the All-University Faculty Conferences had been held, the Committee on Educational Policy met that morning, or afternoon—I've forgotten. In due course I was called upon to make some remarks about the four-campus recommendation we had made. It was debated quite a bit and there was general acceptance that new campuses had to be built and that the priority list the additional centers people had put out was correct. The main thing turned on whether San Joaquin Valley was ready for a campus. In the end, Sproul's presidential recommendation was to endorse only three.

McCULLOCH: And what date again was that?

McHENRY: This was the Davis meeting of the Committee on Educational Policy of the Regents, October 17, 1957. Sproul's recommendation was three new campuses, and careful study for later action on the fourth. That finished, I got a ride over to Sacramento and took a plane home. The next day this came up on the Regents' main agenda and they passed it, but the other matter that breathed life into this whole proposal was that Clark Kerr was elected President. And there was a meeting by the Committee of five, and obviously I knew nothing
then and I know now much more about it. Sproul was not at all pleased. He was a member of the committee of five, but the other four--Pauley, Steinhart, McLaughlin, Hager (as I think they were) were so pleased with Kerr that they put it through over Sproul's reservations, not expressed publicly. And we heard on the radio, or maybe Mrs. John Caughey called, or somebody called us, and said "Get on the radio. Kerr's President." And, of course, that was on my birthday, October 18, 1957. It was a fine birthday present. But without dynamic leadership of Kerr's sort, the campus program would never have come into being in the sense that it did, in which you launched instant universities like Irvine, and expensive universities such as San Diego.

McCULLOCH: Well, let's pursue this now. He became President on, you say October 18?

McHENRY: He was elected, yes.

McCULLOCH: He was elected President in 1958?

McHENRY: '57. He took office July 1, '58.

McCULLOCH: That's right, 1958. Now, when he became President at what point did the Regents start the site selection and actually move towards the acquisition of land for the three new campuses?

McHENRY: Well, sometime around the first of the year, about January of '58, maybe a little later. The President appointed a committee under the chairmanship of Admiral Charles D. Whelock, then of the San Diego campus. Admiral Whelock lives in
Carmel Valley, is a member of our campus planning committee
and we've been very close all through the years since he retired
at San Diego--so, he's been an active participant here.
We've awarded him an honorary doctorate of Science, in part
for this contribution to the new campus program. He was
chairman; Winston Crouch was a member of the committee;
quite a few Senate leaders--Bob Evans, the campus architect--
and so on. And it was called the Criteria Committee and it
prepared quite an elaborate report with lots of engineering
detail on what you needed for a campus. They were the ones
who came up with the idea of a minimum of a thousand acres.

McCULLOCH: And this was done at what time?

McHENRY: The Wheelock committee did not report until after Kerr was
President, I think. It may have made some preliminary reports,
but I think it may have come in in the fall of '58. But I
remember its meeting after Kerr was President, and meeting
in the north and seeing Winston Crouch and I knew Charles
Wheelock fairly well even...

McCULLOCH: If you were flying up and down, assisting Kerr, at what point
did...

McHENRY: Well, now, I flew up on June 30 of '58. He'd invited me
in Easter vacation. Incidentally, Easter vacation of '58
Jane and I came north with our two youngest youngsters and
the dog, partly because our daughter Sally was expecting and
we thought the arrival time was very close then. And partly
because I had bought some Indian land in Round Valley in
Mendocino County, sight unseen. I entered a bid in one of
the auctions and had acquired it and I hadn't been able to see it before that. It was wet and I couldn't get away, but we were going to drive up on Easter vacation. It turned out to be one of the biggest rainstorms in California history, that Easter. We got as far as Berkeley. We had dinner with the Clark Kerrs and it was then that Clark asked me if I would become his academic assistant. I agreed and then we never got to our land, but we went on back and the baby didn't arrive until later! But I flew up the night before Clark took office and was established in a little office, had a desk in a little bit of an office smaller than this room, and there were four of us in there much of the time.

McCulloch: Was this in Sproul Hall?

McHenry: Yes, Sproul Hall.

McCulloch: When was University Hall completed?

McHenry: About a year and a half later, I'd say. Maybe just a...

McCulloch: Because I remember coming out from Rutgers and you were flying up and back and we had a luncheon at your house. But it was a weekend because you were away during the week.

McHenry: Well, I taught at UCLA half time. I taught Mondays and Fridays. And then after my classes on Monday, either Monday night or Tuesday morning, I would fly north and stay in the Durant Hotel during the week, and then went back in time on Thursday night for my Friday classes. And that was the regular pattern. Incidentally, my office mates in that office for four were Eugene C. Lee, who now is
director of the Institute of Public Affairs at Berkeley; Ed Barrett, who is now Dean of the Law School at Davis; for a while Jack Oswald, who is now returning from the presidency of the University of Kentucky to be Executive Vice President here--we were the four.

McCulloch: That's a very powerful group. Now, did you have much to do with the new campuses in your position, helping Kerr, or not?

McHenry: Yes. Almost immediately, perhaps the first day, Kerr gave me assignments to do and they weren't the kind of assignments that you'd expect a faculty assistant to undertake. He said, "Harry Wellman's going to be Vice President of the University." (A post that had been authorized but never filled before.) He said, "Go over to Giannini Hall and find out what he wants in salary and allowances and entertainment expenses." I'd never heard of any of these things--and so I went over. And I'd known Harry well, we'd been roommates two weeks one time on a General Electric seminar, and I said, "Well, what do you think it ought to be? And when can you leave the agriculture and come on over?" and so on. And Kerr used me for a lot of negotiations, partly because we had been very close personally through the years; and Kerr was very suspicious of the staff that he'd inherited from Sproul. He wouldn't have entrusted it to the most senior of them. But one of the things he said in those early conferences--he was always uncomfortable in that President's office (Sproul's old office), which is now the office of
the Dean of the Graduate Division, by the way--he said, "Let's get cracking on the new campuses." He had known my interest and had read the report, though he hadn't been at Carmel. And, incidentally, there was a Davis conference--an All-University Faculty Conference--that Easter. When we were having dinner with Kerr--the KErrs--and he.

McCULLOCH: This rainy night, you mean?

McHENRY: Yes, and though...No, I would say it was at Santa Barbara. It was at Santa Barbara. And he, as President-elect, was not invited. But apparently Sproul called him the last night, or something, and invited him to come down. Whether he made it, I don't know. Well, getting cracking on the new campuses. I then got acquainted with work of this Criteria Committee.

McCULLOCH: Who was the chairman of that?


McCULLOCH: The man who's living here now.

McHENRY: In Carmel. And, then, before very long there was a lot of jousting with the state colleges. That sort of interrupted this development of new campuses. The state colleges kept talking about how they could open up here, there, and everywhere. And there were two meetings of the joint boards, the Regents and the members of the Board of Education.

McCULLOCH: Was Heilbron the Chairman of the Board at that point?

McHENRY: I think he may have been. At any rate, they came together...well, one meeting. I think both of them were held in Alumni
House at Berkeley, on the Berkeley campus. At one of them Simpson, the Superintendent of Public Instruction and Kerr crossed swords. Simpson is a mild man and, of course, he's a Regent of the University. And he just read what had been prepared for him, and he said, "There's urgent need for eight new state colleges." And Kerr flared up and said, "That's the very kind of expansionism" (and so on) "that has put higher education in such disarray." It was widely covered in the newspapers: "Tempers Flare At Joint Meeting," and so on. Then, from that there were various other repercussions. One of them was that an Assemblywoman, Dorothy M. Donahoe of Kern County, made up her mind that there ought to be some kind of a master plan. She then began to prepare for introduction to the legislature, when it met in '59, a resolution which called for the liaison committee to draw up a master plan for higher education. We began to work inside the University on the first version of a statewide academic plan. And there were references to the new campus program. It was in those days that I was working most closely with such men as Gordon McKinney-- these are University-wide senate educational policy people-- Lynn White, Chuck Smith--Charles Smith who is now dead and was Dean of Public Health--and various others. We began to sketch these campuses a little bit in terms of southeast Los Angeles--Orange, south central coast and San Diego--La Jolla area.
McCULLOCH: Now, you worked on this, say, through 1959, and then came the master plan? At which you were a member of the university team? Dumke was on this for the state colleges? I've got to copy the master plan. The state colleges I know had their projected campuses. They printed in this report the projections, up to what date?

McHENRY: To 1975.

McCULLOCH: So, was there disagreement? How did the master plan jell? I'm going to talk to Dumke at some point for his side of it, in terms of the new campuses they projected. Was there any disagreement of the type between Kerr and Simpson?

McHENRY: No. When we got down to it, under the leadership of Arthur Coons, we were able to agree quite readily. I've forgotten how many state colleges we advocated, but it may have been six or seven, and the three university campuses, and that was the package. It was agreeable to both sides.

McCULLOCH: Yes, that's what I thought. Well then, we are now up to 1960 and the master plan was passed in the spring, and you were made Dean of Campus Planning. Was it July 1, 1960 you took over?

McHENRY: Well, I think that's so. I think my title--my administrative title--was Academic Assistant to the President, for two years, and then it became Dean of Academic Planning.

McCULLOCH: Oh, Dean, of Academic Planning, not campus planning? I've got that wrong.

McHENRY: The full title was University Dean of Academic Planning.
McCULLOCH: And in that position Dr. Robert Tschirgi succeeded you, and then after Bob Tschirgi left to go to San Diego, they didn't really have a Vice President? I suppose that the closest is the Vice President of Academic Affairs, is it? Angus Taylors's position?

McHENRY: Yes, though he tends to work on, shall we say, more minute and specific things. We dealt with, I'm sure, (both Tschirgi and I) some immediate problems and so on. But our main job was to take the long view.

McCULLOCH: So, you were concerned, as Dean of Academic Planning, with the long-range plans of each of the old campuses, Davis, Berkeley, Los Angeles, Santa Barbara, and Riverside, and you were also concerned with the planning of the new ones, is that right?

McHENRY: That's right. But the amount of time and attention and possibility for influence varied widely with the competence of the leadership, or the existence of leadership on a campus. If it hadn't been appointed yet, as it hadn't in two places, Irvine and here, then I had to work a good deal on it and pay much more attention to the detail of negotiations with the Irvine Company with the Cowells, and so on.

McCULLOCH: Well, now, let me interrupt here because this is primary to the story of Irvine. To what extent were you involved in the site selection committees, then the actual negotiations with the Irvine Company, and finally, the purchase of a thousand acres? Not purchase. Gift. Excuse me!
McHENRY: Well, I wasn't deeply and primarily involved. The land and money and so on were handled by the Treasurer and the Vice President for Business and Finance. I was privy to the discussions a good deal. But my part of it was more an assignment of academic specialities among the campuses.

McCULLOCH: Did you have anything to say, for instance, when the advisory committees were set up for the new campuses. Whose notion was that? Yours or Clark Kerr's?

MCHENRY: I think I suggested it to Kerr originally.

McCULLOCH: That a cadre of specialists from the old campuses should help in the planning of the new?

MCHENRY: Yes.

McCULLOCH: John Galbraith, for instance, was the Chairman of the Irvine Academic Advisory Committee?

MCHENRY: My recollection is, but I'm not positive, that I took the name from a committee that existed of the southern section of the Senate for Santa Barbara many years before. I think it was called Academic Advisory Committee. At any rate, I can remember writing Kerr a memorandum that the new campuses are going to require this form of help; they can't have their own senates. And we don't want, after the Riverside experience, (in which I participated some as a faculty member at UCLA) we don't want UCLA dominating Irvine, or Berkeley dominating Santa Cruz, because we want to build something different--we don't want peas in a pod--and they'll just want to make us over into junior-grade institutions of their type. So, the President made these appointments
and he tended to appoint people, but we had to go through, I think, the Committee on Committees to get a panel. But one of the things that we did early in the Kerr regime was this: When we made a request for a panel of names, we insisted on having nearly twice as many as there were...

McCULLOCH: Ah, that's an interesting point...

McHENRY: If there were to be five, we asked for nine names; if there were to be seven, we asked for at least eleven. So that the President had some discretion.

Now, on the physical side, there was a time when I did search through the area. There had been this study that had been made of site selection, and the Regents, both in the north and the south, spared no expense. They spent about $100,000 in both places surveying all of the northern region and surveying all of the Los Angeles region. Bill Pereira had been zeroing in on various places. There was a certain amount of apprehension about going into the Irvine Ranch. When you put a compass on the spots that were proposed, you immediately saw that they were so close to the ocean they couldn't serve this vast population. The University was not represented in the San Gabriel Valley at all, which was one of the most populous parts of this territory. A couple of times I went down and looked at properties that were in the San Dimas hills and tried to get something that was midway between Orange County's vast population growth and San Gabriel Valley's population growth. I remember once when maybe some embarrassment was caused by one of these excursions of mine. Regent Boyd spoke to
me about it, saying "I understand you visited...and so on. Some group down there that was talking about getting together about a thousand acres that would, of course, enhance the value of land around it if the University took it." He said that if it ever came to a vote on that, "I wouldn't be able to do it because that company that owns it is a subsidiary of Security First National, or something, of which I am a director." That's the only mention that was ever made. I never knew whether he was criticizing me for taking an interest in this, or whether he just wanted to make clear why he couldn't vote.

McCULLOCH: ...Conflict of interest?

McHENRY: Yes. Then I remember one time after the site had been pretty well determined and negotiations were almost complete with the Irvine Company, Earl Bolton and I, in a little rented Corvair, went all around and tried to find the boundaries of the Irvine campus. We rented a Polaroid camera—the first time I had one or used one, I think it was a Polaroid. We rented a camera at any rate, and took pictures from various angles. It was nothing but a barley field. We kept trying to find a tree, and then we got over to that old ranch house and there were Queensland oaks, I think they were, a string of them kind of scrawny. We got behind those and took some (I think they were in bloom) and took some pictures and then we found out afterwards that they were off the campus, but they were in an inclusion area.

McCULLOCH: Then they are included if they are in an inclusion area.
McHENRY: But it was an interesting experience and we went all over that area and, of course, it wasn't very promising. At one stage when we were discouraged—Clark Kerr and I were discouraged—with the sites that Warnecke had come up with in the north and Pereira in the south—at my suggestion, he brought William Putnam, who is professor of geology at UCLA.

McCULLOCH: He taught me at UCLA. I took geology.

McHENRY: Have you seen the beautiful book that was published after his death? It's called just Geology. I've got a copy—magnificently illustrated—but Bill was awfully anxious to get involved in new campuses. He was awfully anxious to start geology at Santa Cruz, by the way. He felt somewhat out of place at UCLA when it became so urban. And at my suggestion he was commissioned by Kerr to review both the Warnecke report and Pereira report and to look for ways in which better sites could be found. And it was as a result of Bill's pushing and mine that in the final version of the study in the north there was a special study of the possibility of a site somewhat between Los Gatos...oh no, Los Altos and Saratoga...was defined...Monte something or other...it's where the Kaisers actually have a cement plant up on the hillside which might have blighted it to some extent. But they rang in an extra one there, trying to get nearer the centers of population and away from the University of Santa Clara and San Jose State, while the
Almaden site had this disadvantage of being too close to competition. I remember Bill Putnam's saying of the present Irvine site: "The least the Irvine Company could do is give us a room with a view." He wanted it up so he could see the ocean.

McCulloch: Well, there was a story, and I haven't been checking on it too much, where they wanted to move the site where they've got that cemetery now, you know, but the cemetery buried some bodies in there, and it wasn't possible to get that area about two miles just up the road. We would have then looked over onto the ocean.

McHenry: Well, he had a site marked in what he called the "San Joaquin Hills," which is, I think, somewhat south of UCI.

McCulloch: San Joaquin Hills?

McHenry: Yes...that he thought about and was pushing for, but, at any rate, it didn't work out.

McCulloch: Bill was? Bill Putnam?

McHenry: Bill Putnam. And then, of course I always did think that Bill Pereira had a conflict of interest working simultaneously for the Company and for the University. But that seems to have worked out satisfactorily. And you'll be interested that one of my early thoughts about how Irvine could get started, even without buildings, was the possibility of using one of the dirigible hangars. Spectacular classes held in this vast barn, and so on!

McCulloch: Of course now they're used all the time with the Vietnam war--hangars with helicopters.
McHENRY: But they were almost in disuse at that time. There were a few helicopters around, but it seemed to me that it was a good public relations thing—that they were so eager to start a university that they started in this vast barn, and so on.

McCULLOCH: Dean, was your appointment and Dan's announced at the same time?

McHENRY: No. I was appointed considerably ahead, at least six months ahead. I'm not sure when Dan was appointed, but I was appointed in July of '61. And Dan was six months to eleven months later, I would say. I'm not positive of his, but Herb York was appointed at San Diego before I was.

McCULLOCH: So it goes York, McHenry and Aldrich?

McHENRY: Yes.

McCULLOCH: Well, let's see, I've got only a couple more questions here. The site selections. That interested me a lot. You literally toured around in a car with Earl Bolton? And Bill Putnam helped you? And you did want a site that looked over the ocean, but we never got it?

McHENRY: Putnam was strong for that. I don't remember ever expressing any great, strong feelings about it. But Putnam felt that he was very much worried about the winds, the dry hot winds, which some people call "Santa Anas," other people use the Spanish word "santanas." And Clark Kerr from the very first time the Irvine Ranch was mentioned as a site, said, "Oh, it would be awful in those 'Santa Ana' periods." There was a good deal of feeling that there were these hot winds, and if you got over the other side looking at the ocean,
you'd be free from them. That was one of the main considerations--you'd be freer from them. They'd be less drastic. Actually, do they affect the campus?

McCULLOCH: No. It's a windy campus, actually, like San Francisco--with the breeze from the ocean. We have a constant breeze from ten to twenty knots in the afternoons, and the "Santanas" when they blow aren't too bad. And we're air-conditioned, as you know, so we don't feel them.

McHENRY: Yes.

McCULLOCH: We don't feel them. We're just about out of tape here, and I've got about two more questions. When you were appointed--you say in '61--I can't recall now, but I've got the date written down in my notes with Dan's appointment. What about the academic plan? Irvine's plan? It developed with John Galbraith as Chairman, and that committee, who acted as the budget committee. (They were the ones that I saw--some of them--when I was appointed.) Ivan came down to help Dan and they drew up their master plan about the same time? Yours was ahead then, was it? Your master plan?

McHENRY: It might have been a little bit ahead, but it was relatively more unconventional and consequently it required more time to persuade the Regents to accept the College plan. Incidentally, as you probably suspected, it was I who put Kerr up to Hinderaker's appointment.

McCULLOCH: A very fine appointment, a very fine appointment. And he was the one who recruited me and brought me down. In the
sharing of information, however, you as Chancellor and Dan as Chancellor--did you follow closely--did you get a copy of the Irvine master plan with all of the maps in it and so on that Pereira, Hinderaker and Alrich and that group drew up?

McHENRY: Well, I think so, because, you see, I continued for a year--for two years, I guess--as University Dean of Academic Planning. I didn't leave that title until '63. You see, in '61 there was nothing down here and Kerr had me stay in Berkeley. In '62 (in June), the bond issue was defeated. We moved here--Jane and I moved up here in July, and we didn't know whether there was ever going to be a Santa Cruz campus because we had just been beaten in the bond issue. But in November when it came, we of course swept the state, and we carried Santa Cruz County better than two to one, and we were the highest county in the state. But we weren't the last time in '66.

McCULLOCH: Since you continued as Dean of Campus Planning until '63?

...then you watched the development of Ivan and Dan working out our master plan?

McHENRY: Once Dan was appointed, I dropped out of the picture, because, obviously, I was in charge of a sibling here, and I shouldn't be throwing any weight around about Irvine.

McCULLOCH: I was thinking in terms of comparing your plans against the Irvine plans, against the San Diego, all of which were so very different...in concept...I mean, very exciting...the differences...
McHENRY: Well, Dan and Herb and I talked about these things every time we got together, which was once a month. But I found myself, particularly at a forum at Riverside that first year after Dan was appointed...we were asked to discuss our campus plans, and so on, and I remember one time trying to define the difference between Santa Cruz's approach to planning and resources, and so on, and Irvine's. And I saw Dan get riled. He thought I was meddling in Irvine's business, and so on. And, of course, I had drawn the description for the University-wide plan and I was just trying to explain the difference that the University-wide plan made, that we weren't going to duplicate, that they were going to do more like urban planning and we were going to do more like rural planning. But Dan's reaction was obviously "Well, if anybody's going to speak for Irvine, I'm going to speak for Irvine." And, so, I was very careful after that encounter never to try to explain anything about Irvine--let somebody else do it.

McCULLOCH: Well, that really winds up what I wanted to ask you. And that just runs the tape out too!