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A WORD TO OUR READERS

IN 1898 BERNARD MOSES, the university's first professor of history, established the University Chronicle, later known as the University of California Chronicle. He saw that “there were and would be public addresses at the University and documents relating to the affairs of the institution that ought to be preserved and made readily available,” as he wrote in his unpublished autobiography. That Chronicle, appearing quarterly between 1898 and 1933, provided its readers with intelligent and entertaining accounts of contemporary events in the university’s social, academic, and administrative life. Moreover, the Chronicle no doubt assisted in creating and fostering an identity, crucial not only for the campus community but also in mediating the university's dealings with the public.

Today, our institutional identity might appear to be firmly established, but institutional memory is ebbing. Every year thousands of new students (along with faculty members and staff) enter the university’s campuses with little knowledge of the institution beyond its admissions requirements and perhaps its reputation for radicalism in the 1960s. And every year almost as many students leave knowing little more about their alma mater than when they entered. While institutional identity will and must evolve, it should maintain a self-consciousness of its direction by acknowledging its past. Without memory there is no identity; without identity the university is left as a mere collection of disparate buildings and people.

It is with this in mind that we, the Editorial Board, have revived the University of California Chronicle, in spirit if not in content. The new Chronicle, in contrast to the earlier publication, has an historical perspective. We are able to consider the current events of our predecessors in the context of ongoing changes within the university. Embracing this opportunity, our Chronicle, at least initially, is organized around single themes that present an inherently longitudinal view of the university's development. The first issue considered institutional responses to natural disasters and calamities. The second was on women at the university. The third issue was about the university and its involvement with the environment, both on the campuses and beyond. The fourth issue looked at different aspects of the university at the turn of the twentieth and twenty-first centuries. The next issue was on conflict and controversy the university has faced over the years. The sixth issue presented some of the arts and culture fostered by the university. The seventh issue focused on scholars here and abroad.

It is with great pleasure that we now offer to our readers this current issue, From Field to Table: Agriculture and Gastronomy at the University.

The Editorial Board
FROM FIELD TO TABLE
AGRICULTURE AND GASTRONOMY AT THE UNIVERSITY

FARMS, IN BERKELEY? WELL, NO LONGER, but that is the way it began, when in 1868 the still unborn Agricultural, Mining, and Mechanical Arts College, the state’s proposed land-grant institution, was merged with the struggling liberal arts College of California and moved to a spacious site with a view which then became Berkeley, creating the University of California. The College of Agriculture was the first college to be established, soon accompanied by a growing network of experiment stations around the state. Part One of this issue presents various aspects of agricultural research and education at the university, featuring a history of the experiment station at Riverside, founded in 1907 as the Citrus Experiment Station, and celebrating this year its 100th anniversary. We also learn here about an early station founded to experiment with fruit orchards in the Sierra foothills, its demise, and the attempts to rescue it from oblivion in the 1980s. The impact of the university “farm” at Davis, so central in California agriculture and the wine industry in particular, is only hinted at here with a brief piece on two of its star enologists. And from UC Santa Cruz we learn about a program in sustainable agriculture nurtured outside the land-grant college model, which defies the California paradigm of industrial agriculture and has been in the forefront of a growing movement for local foods, organically grown, with due attention to environmental, health, and social justice ramifications of food production.

Part Two turns to the fruits of the fields and describes a diverse range of California cuisine on and off campus, from the culinary world of California Indians to two Berkeley grads widely celebrated for their culinary arts, Alice Waters of Chez Panisse and chocolatier John Scharffenberger. Other articles explore in word and image food and drink for students and faculty on the Berkeley campus, from the nineteenth century’s Dining Association to today’s Crossroads dining commons. Letters, photographs, remembrances, menus, and recipes give a flavor of food consumed in residence halls, at picnics, parties, and banquets, at University House, in the campus cafeteria, and the faculty club. Part Two ends with a beginning; a report from our newest campus at Merced chronicling its grand opening event in 2005, complete with fine food and a light show recalling the agricultural past of the campus setting.

Part Three explores the pleasures and production of food as depicted in art and poetry, featuring painter and UC Davis professor Wayne Thiebaud, poet Jo Miles, and several other California poets connected with our various campuses. Finally, we learn the history of the art in Berkeley’s faculty club and of the Diego Rivera mural in Stern Hall depicting the bounty of California agriculture.

With pleasure, we offer to our readers this varied platter of gustatory and agricultural delights from the University of California. Bon Appetit!
A Berkeley Farm in the 1870s. Shattuck and Racine are both still so named, as is Alcatraz on the right, perpendicular to Shattuck, but the names of the other streets between Shattuck and Racine (De Lima, Eugenie, Baptist, Poirier, and Benton) no longer exist as such. New Historical Atlas of Alameda County, 1878.
PART ONE

AGRICULTURAL RESEARCH AND EDUCATION: APPLES, ORANGES, AND GRAPES

The Citrus Experiment Station at Mount Rubidoux in 1907, the year it was established. The University of California: A Pictorial History, 1968.
In the fall of 1955, the old Citrus Experiment Station Barn, built in 1916, was converted into a coffee shop. The horse stalls became booths, and the original equipment was used as decoration. *The University of California: A Pictorial History*, 1968.
THE FOUNDING AND FIRST ONE HUNDRED YEARS
OF THE CITRUS EXPERIMENT STATION

Jana Shaker

FOR AS LONG AS PEOPLE HAVE SOWN SEEDS and tended crops, freeloading pests have challenged their efforts, using these vegetative congregations as banquets and nurseries. Early agrarians became self-taught botanists and entomologists in their attempts to encourage yields and control insect predators, millennia before academic institutions formalized training in these fields. Biological control efforts followed suit: thousands of years ago, Chinese and Arab farmers manipulated ant populations to help keep their date and citrus orchards pest-free.¹

Over the last two centuries, concerted application of academic excellence in natural sciences, fueled by savvy lobbying and far-sighted legislation, augmented by natural (climatic and terrestrial) conditions, have combined to expedite America’s rapid agricultural growth. California’s bountiful harvests have been the most valuable in our nation since 1948, yet cost now roughly half what they did then (11 percent vs. 21 percent of disposable income).²

California had been a state for twelve years when, in 1862, Congress established the U.S. Department of Agriculture, enacted the Homestead Act that encouraged settlement in the West, and passed the Agricultural Colleges Land Grant Act signed into law by Abraham Lincoln on July 2, 1862. These actions, though overshadowed by the turmoil of the Civil War, would have great consequences for California. The Land Grant Act, often called the Morrill Act for its chief congressional sponsor, made grants of public land to each state for endowments toward the creation of public institutions of higher education. These “land grant colleges” differed from nineteenth-century private and denominational colleges in their utilitarian mission. They “would offer instruction in agriculture, mechanical and practical arts, military training, and other industrial vocational fields to a democratically broad range of students at public expense.”³

The first manifestation of the Morrill Act in California was the Agricultural, Mining and Mechanical Arts College created by the California legislature on March 31, 1866. On March 23, 1868, the University of California was established, replacing the Agricultural, Mining and Mechanical Arts College and the private College of California in Oakland. The College of Agriculture was the first college to be created within the new university.⁴

Though provided with land for endowments, land-grant institutions lacked funding. A quarter century after the Morrill Act was enacted, Congress provided operational funding with the Hatch Act of 1887, allocating $15,000 annually to each land grant college to establish and maintain an agricultural experiment station. Professor Eugene Hilgard at the University of California initially created an experiment station at Berkeley. He then set up four experiment stations by 1890 in the counties of Amador, San Luis Obispo, San Joaquin, and Los Angeles (at Pomona). The university’s Citrus Experiment Station in Riverside opened seventeen years later, after considerable effort, as we shall see.⁵

The nation had entered “a golden age of agricultural science.” Significant breakthroughs in the new fields of bacteriology, virology, genetics, and botany were transforming agricultural practices. Between 1875 and 1890, agricultural leaders, legislators, and farmers had faith that “science could produce miracles” and increase crop production. Problem-oriented research and a massive influx of governmental funding were directed to agricultural interests.⁶
Growers of the Great Inland Citrus Belt

The citrus growers in Southern California worked diligently to get an experiment station in Riverside to assure that their specific needs would be addressed. Although oranges had been grown in California from the time of the Spanish missions, they remained a minor crop until the late nineteenth century. William Wolfskill planted the first orange grove in Los Angeles in 1841 with trees obtained from the Mission San Gabriel. Anson Van Leuven planted the first commercial citrus grove in San Bernardino in 1857. Eliza Tibbetts wrote to the United States Department of Agriculture, shortly after moving from Maine to Riverside, to request advice on citrus suitable for the area. She received two Brazilian navel orange trees from the Department of Agriculture in Washington DC in 1873. These “Washington” navels were better suited to Southern California’s soil and climate than to Brazil’s and flourished, giving a great boon to citrus growers.7

Chinese immigrants provided much of the labor supporting the great inland citrus belt, working as field hands, cooks, servants, and even overseers. By 1894, Riverside’s Chinatown had a permanent population of more than 450 people, with an additional 2,000 Chinese migrant workers during citrus harvest. Many were more familiar with citiculture than their employers; citrus had been grown for centuries in China.8

By the late 1880s the citrus belt extended seventy miles, from Pasadena to Redlands. A land boom, railroads, and promises of “health and wealth” lured thousands to Southern California. In 1895, with Southern California’s citrus a multimillion dollar industry, the Riverside Horticultural Club was formed to pioneer citiculture research.9 Also launched that year was California’s first permanently successful commodity cooperative, the Southern California Fruit Growers Exchange, known as Sunkist since 1952.10 From their inception, leaders of both organizations lobbied for a citrus experiment station.

Citrus Fair pavilion, Riverside, 1883. The first Citrus Fair in California was held in Riverside in 1879. Courtesy of Riverside Public Library.
Launching an Experiment Station

A search to discover who was most responsible for launching the Citrus Experiment Station leads to two key figures, “deans of the citrus industry” John Henry Reed and Ethan Allen Chase.11 For UC Riverside’s College of Natural and Agricultural Sciences’ longtime chronicler, the late Harry Lawton (1927-2005), Reed is a clear standout, if choosing one name above all others to honor. In “The Man Who Founded the Citrus Station,” Lawton tells a captivating story through a cast whose reputations range from national, such as Wyatt Earp, to regional, such as Matthew Gage, Frank Miller and John Henry Reed, whose influence and actions shaped Riverside.

Wyatt Earp, a small player in Lawton’s story, was significant for not gunning down Richard Gird, who was later another big player in the Riverside drama, in 1880 in Tombstone, Arizona. Gird, a self-educated mining engineer, “was leading a group of striking miners down the streets of Tombstone, when Wyatt Earp ordered them to disperse and whipped out a gun on their spokesman. Gird stared quietly at Earp’s brandished pistol, and then calmly turned and walked away, still retaining his dignity.”

Gird had struck it rich in Tombstone with lucky mines and brought his millions to Southern California, created the vast Chino Ranch and became a successful farmer, particularly of sugar beets, and a cattle rancher. He believed in scientific agriculture and was first to introduce the steam plough to the region. According to Lawton, “Gird set out to mold Pomona Valley’s destiny.” Gird’s association with Eugene Hilgard, the founding director of the University of California Agricultural Experiment Station in Berkeley, would again put Gird in the position of spokesman and leader. He and a group of Pomona businessmen opened secret negotiations with Professor Hilgard. Immediately after an evening spent at Gird’s ranch in Chino, while touring Southern California ranches in July of 1889, Hilgard announced that he had chosen Pomona for a field station.12

This announcement came as a shock to indignant growers and other businessmen in Riverside who had been lobbying for a research station. They were certain—with Riverside’s valuable citrus industry fueling the economy of the region—that Riverside was a shoo-in for the site. These growers were advocates of scientific solutions to industry threats, confirmed by an early success of biological control (though not yet called by that name) in the late 1800s, when U.S. Department of Agriculture entomologist Albert Koebele imported the Vedalia beetle from Australia in 1888 to control cottony cushion scale. Within eighteen months the pest was almost eliminated from California, encouraging growers to lobby hard to get scientific assistance from the Department of Agriculture on local problems.13

John Henry Reed, a recent transplant to California and a former Ohio school superintendent, would come to the growers’ rescue as both a knowledgeable advisor on agricultural matters and, more importantly, a leader in the fight for an experiment station in Riverside. Reed had moved his family to California for health reasons, and soon established himself as a knowledgeable self-taught grower. He quickly assimilated all of the literature on horticulture, and before long other growers were seeking his advice on their problems. The Riverside growers felt that their research needs were being ignored by the Pomona Station, known as the Southern California Agricultural Experiment Station. That station devoted its efforts to work on sugar beets, grapes, cereal grains, and “how to restore the native grasses of the Cucamonga Plain,” Gird’s pet dream that was never realized. When the orange growers confronted Professor Hilgard with their complaints at the first Farmer’s Institute ever held in Riverside on May 13, 1895, he informed the growers that the university could not afford to concentrate research on a single-crop commodity. He urged them to “constitute themselves an experiment station” and carry out their own research with his assistance where needed.”14
In less than a week, Reed brought together the most prominent growers in the community and organized the Riverside Horticultural Club. The major achievement of the club, under Reed’s direction, was the first five-year scientific study of frost protection, which established the basic principles of orchard heating and led to the general use of smudge pots.

Reed was a sort of Renaissance man, adept in many areas, who published book reviews, opera reviews, and travel articles. Between 1896 and 1910 he published more than 125 scientific papers on every phase of citriculture. In 1899 in a speech delivered to the Riverside Horticultural Club, Reed urged that the federal government establish an experiment station in Riverside devoted solely to the study of citrus and other subtropical horticultural crops. For the next seven years Reed dedicated himself to securing an experiment station, through lectures given across the state, numerous meetings with government officials, and letters to Washington DC.15

Collectively, the Riverside Horticultural Club and Southern California Fruit Growers Exchange represented influential growers with significant political savvy who possessed an ardent appreciation for the economic benefits of scientific research. “The industry raised pest control standards so that it could market spotless fruit nationwide. In their eagerness for practical scientific advancement and for the most cost-effective way to meet the cosmetic ideal they set for themselves, growers supported biological control. They gave it their enthusiasm, their political weight, and their money.”16

These growers drafted a bill, carried by Assemblyman Miguel Estudillo of Riverside, “which combined the citrus growers’ request with that of another group proposing a plant pathology laboratory to study disease problems in other crops. On March 18, 1905, the legislature passed the citrus experiment station bill along with the university farm bill. Carrying an appropriation of $30,000, the bill provided for a commission of three—Governor Pardee, University of California President Wheeler, and Acting Dean of the UC College of Agriculture E. J. Wickson—to select sites for both laboratory and station.”17

The commission announced its selections on May 21, 1906, for “a new institution with two branches: a citrus experiment station to be situated on twenty-three acres in the heart of the citrus belt on the eastern slope of Mount Rubidoux overlooking the town of Riverside . . . and a pathology laboratory . . . on a one-acre site donated by the Whittier Board of Trade—a more central location close to walnut, lemon, vegetable and berry production.”18 Reed’s first great success for the citrus industry was realized!

Initially, the station was composed of two cottages and a stable, with plant pathologist Ralph E. Smith appointed by the regents as superintendent of the combined Southern California Pathological Laboratory in Whittier and the Citrus Experiment Station in Riverside. Smith arrived at the “Rubidoux station” on August 27, 1906, and immediately set to work on a reservoir. In January 1907 the largest Farmers’ Institute ever held in California celebrated the station’s opening. The regents formally approved the Riverside leases on February 14, 1907. This is the date that has come to be recognized as the official opening of the station.

The Citrus Experiment Station was concerned mostly with soil management, includ-
ing fertilization and irrigation requirements, as well as rootstock-scion relationships, in an attempt to improve citrus fruit quality and production. (The fruit-bearing scion is grafted upon the rootstock, which can be made disease-resistant but produces inedible fruit.) The Citrus Variety Collection for plant breeding, established in 1910, is recognized today as one of the major collections of citrus genetic resources in the world. The regents also created a station in Whittier to focus on entomology and plant pathology, though limited funding and direction and staffing changes prevented significant progress. Despite legislative approval in 1911 of $25,000 for site purchase and a main office and laboratory at Riverside, growers were not satisfied.

Keeping the Station in Riverside: The Fight for the Upgraded Citrus Experiment Station

In 1912 Dean Thomas Hunt led a reorganization of the university’s Agricultural Experiment Station and College of Agriculture. One of the first steps was the formation of a Graduate School of Tropical Agriculture along with a division of citriculture. In January 1913, Professor Herbert John Webber, a nationally renowned expert in plant breeding, attracted from Cornell, took charge of the Citrus Experiment Station and the graduate school. That same January Southern California was struck by a massive killing freeze, which caused great damage to orchards and distress to the growers. The citrus industry, worth more than $175 million, petitioned the legislature for increased citrus research to assist in recovery. Three bills were immediately passed providing $185,000 for land, water rights, and buildings for an enlarged experiment station in Southern California.

Due to declining health, Reed was not able to lead the fight to retain an expanded experiment station in Riverside. In this, his close friend Ethan Allen Chase, owner of the world’s largest orange ranch (more than 3,000 acres), took the lead. After numerous requests to the United States Department of Agriculture for assistance, Chase set up USDA scientist G. Howard Powell on his own ranch with a laboratory to study fruit decay. Powell, a hero to growers, solved one of Riverside’s most pressing citrus problems, spoilage of transported fruit. The Growers Exchange hired Powell as general manager in 1912.

In what became a competition between the San Fernando Valley and Riverside for a reorganized, upgraded experiment station, San Fernando’s clout included a syndicate of powerful development interests in the Los Angeles business community, incorporated as the San Fernando Mission Land Commission, whose holdings included the majority of the valley. Additional clout for San Fernando came from the nearly completed Owens Valley (Los Angeles) Aqueduct with its terminus in San Fernando Valley.

The Riverside Chamber of Commerce formed a committee, including Reed and Chase, to lobby for Riverside. The committee was thrilled when Director Webber recommended a 475 acre site in Riverside. Yet Webber’s recommendation was out-voted two to one by a regents’ appointed faculty committee. Chase rallied growers, packers, and boards of trade throughout Southern California, whose letters, telegrams and phone calls of protest bombarded the regents. Seven of the eight Southern California counties initially under consideration for Ethan Allen Chase. UC Riverside Special Collections Library.
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the site backed Riverside. Riverside was additionally outraged that a growers' committee appointed to further consider the site was composed almost entirely of growers living on the coast. Of the five, only Chase lived in the inland citrus belt. Chase voted for Riverside. The others voted for the San Fernando site.

Webber held firm in his defense of Riverside in testimony before three assembled regents' committees meeting on July 6, 1914. To the same meeting Chase submitted a carefully worded defense for the Riverside site. When the regents met in San Francisco to make the final decision on December 22, 1914, and vote on the site, according to Lawton's telling of events,

It was generally believed San Fernando Valley would be chosen. A delegation of prominent Riversiders, led by S. C. Evans and L. V. W. Brown, took the train to San Francisco to make a final plea for Riverside. Webber defended the Riverside site to the regents, followed by Evans and Brown, who delivered long and eloquent appeals for their community. The regents went into executive session, which was rumored afterwards to have been a “hot” meeting. For nearly two hours, the Riverside delegation waited at the Fairmont Hotel with gloomy faces and sinking hearts.

The Riversiders were stunned when the regents emerged from their session to announce the vote was fourteen to four in favor of their city. Regent James Mills had delivered a masterful minority report supporting Riverside, and Regent Garret McEnery had moved its adoption. A strong argument with the regents appeared to be Herbert John Webber's unwavering stand for Riverside. In recasting Webber's arguments for the regents, Mills asked consideration of the fact that the experiment station director was “the greatest living authority on citrus culture.”

News of the decision reached Riverside late in the afternoon on that mid-December day, “causing wild jubilation among Christmas throngs on the downtown streets. The steam whistle on the electrical plant blew for fifteen minutes. Frank Miller ordered the bells rung continuously in the Mission Inn. The entire community turned out in the streets and danced. John Henry Reed told the Riverside Daily Press that it was ‘the most important day in the history of Riverside.’”

In his dedication address on March 27, 1918, Dean and Director Webber, after enumerating the legislative funding and sites examined, said, “The Regents of the University of California on December 23, 1914, voted to purchase the site offered at Riverside. The final consummation of this purchase was made June 18, 1915.” To say the site was “offered” implies a gentility masking the passionate battles waged by the two finalists, Riverside and the San Fernando Valley (from a list of 167 locations offered for consideration), which ultimately led to this second climactic victory for Riverside's citrus industry.23 In his address, Webber added, “Probably the two men most responsible for the establishment of the Citrus Experiment Station were our townsmen Mr. J. H. Reed and Mr. Ethan Allen Chase. To these men, deans of the citrus industry of the state, this institution and this community owe much.”24

For Lawton, it seemed “likely John Henry Reed had urged Webber to give both of them (himself and Ethan Allen Chase) equal credit, since Chase had taken up his banner and been the community leader most responsible for saving the experiment station. That would have been characteristic of Reed who had long endeared himself to Riverside by sharing credit for his successes with his colleagues.”
Growth of the New Citrus Experiment Station under Director Webber, 1917-1929

Called the “greatest living authority of citrus,” Director Herbert John Webber set the tone for the Citrus Experiment Station with his far-sighted leadership and clever recruitment of outstanding scientists, including many of his former colleagues from Cornell. The new home of the station was built in the mission style with massive, thick walls, overhanging tiled roofs, arched Spanish doorways and open arcades connecting the central building to its wings. The main building and only one of its two wings were erected when first occupied in 1917 by Director Webber and his team. (Nearly a century later, in the 1990s, having been shuttered for years and after a substantial renovation, with retrofitting to meet earthquake standards, these original buildings were renamed A. Gary Anderson Hall and occupied by their namesake’s Graduate School of Management. Some of UC Riverside’s “old-timers,” who relished the campus’ agricultural roots and took pride in the station’s international reputation, considered this a sacrilege.25) Also under Webber’s leadership a director’s residence was constructed, as well as several garages, a horse barn, farm implement barns, and four small greenhouses.

As early as 1916, with the station organized into six divisions—agricultural chemistry, plant physiology, plant pathology, entomology, plant breeding, and orchard management—Webber had assembled what became known as the Citrus Experiment Station’s “original staff.” In 1918, the station included fourteen scientific investigators, six laboratory and field assistants, one librarian, four stenographers, and fourteen foremen, teamsters, and laborers, with a budget of $66,000.26

The station’s pioneering program on biological control began when the Division of Beneficial Insect Investigations was established in 1923, with the transfer of this California State Commission of Horticulture program from Sacramento. Harry Scott Smith, superintendent of

the state insectary and head of California’s biological control effort since 1913, moved with his staff of four from Sacramento to head the new research division in Riverside. “Professor Harry,” an entomologist trained in the Northeast, who had worked on gypsy moth control for the U.S. Department of Agriculture, headed this unit (renamed the Division of Biological Control in 1947) until 1951. It was Smith who introduced the term “biological control” into the entomological lexicon in 1919. Riverside was the first branch of the university with a unit in biological control research and pioneered many of the classical studies in this discipline.

In 1928 the USDA Bureau of Plant Industry was established and took up operations in vacated portions of the Rubidoux lab to conduct irrigation water quality research with emphasis on toxicity of boron to plants. Later, the directors of the Agricultural Experiment Stations of eleven western states proposed another laboratory to conduct research on soil and water salinity control. The Regional Salinity Laboratory was constructed on grounds adjacent to the Rubidoux Laboratory in 1937, and in 1948 these two laboratories were combined, into one of the first federal national research laboratories, the USDA Salinity Laboratory, focusing on basic research and management practices for salt-affected soil-plant-water systems.

Main building and south wing of the Citrus Experiment Station, late 1920s. UC Riverside Special Collections Library.

Undergraduate instruction in subtropical horticulture was offered at the station in very successful summer sessions from 1924 through 1932. Along with station staff, the faculty included members of the Berkeley and Davis campuses. When the UCLA campus began offering instruction in agriculture in 1933, these summer sessions were discontinued.
Webber understood the invaluable role an excellent library serves as a research tool, and consequently he guided the early development of an extensive library. For more than forty years, the chief librarian was Margaret Buvens, whose efforts led to the establishment of the Bio-Agricultural Library (and ultimately, in 1998, to UC Riverside’s state-of-the-art Science Library). Buvens viewed herself as “cook and crew and captain bold” in forming a repository that by 1930 was receiving more than five hundred serial publications annually. During Buvens’ administration, a major collection of rare books on subtropical horticulture and citrus developed which included amongst its treasures the Hesperides of Giovanni Battista Ferrarius, published in Rome in 1646, the earliest printed book on citrus.31

Webber’s Legacy

In 1929 Webber retired as director and dean and was succeeded by Leon D. Batchelor. Webber left an impressive legacy. Although he retired from the university in 1936, he continued serving scientists and growers affiliated with citrusculture through the invaluable contribution, along with co-editor Batchelor, of the monumental two-volume The Citrus Industry, 1943. This classic reference work on the biology and culture of citrus worldwide served the industry well for two decades before Batchelor and Webber took on the second edition, which became known as “the bible of the citrus industry.” (By 1960 technological advances had made some materials obsolete and, at the prompting of the third station Director Alfred Boyce and other colleagues, station scientist Walter Reuther began the massive job of re-editing The Citrus Industry. These five volumes were published over more than a decade beginning in 1968. Chapter editors read like a who’s who of notable station scientists. According to Boyce, The Citrus Industry is the most authoritative source of citiculture worldwide and contributed greatly to the preeminent reputation of the Citrus Experiment Station throughout the world.)32

Webber’s greatest achievement, according to Boyce, was establishing a great research institution, by selecting “staff members of outstanding talent and giving them autonomy in their scientific endeavors.”33 He was committed to serving the agricultural industry. Leo J. Klotz recalled Webber’s first words to him, after being hired as a plant pathologist, “Klotz, you can work on anything you want,” Webber said, and then added, “but I hope you’ll work on something that helps growers.”34

Batchelor, An Optimist at the Helm, 1929-1951

Selected on the eve of the stock market crash of 1929, Leon Batchelor oversaw the expansion of the experiment station during a time of formidable challenges, serving as director until 1951.35 During the 1930s the station’s budget often fluctuated downwards, only once surpassing its peak pre-Depression budget. Fortunately, Batchelor possessed the temperament for making the best of a tough situation. Hired in 1915 as an assistant professor of plant breeding, Batchelor found all major citrus tasks allocated. Assigned oversight of walnuts, an emerging tree crop of significance in California, he made long daily trips to the Whittier lab and other walnut growing areas, without any added pay, long before Southern California commutes became the norm. Batchelor told his young wife, Florence, “I’ve been handed a lemon, but I am going to make lemonade out of it!” He did. Batchelor conducted pioneering research and his extensive publications were quickly recognized as guideposts for the walnut industry. Research in California, supported by studies in Europe and the Near East, established Batchelor’s reputation as a world authority on walnut culture.

Batchelor was one of the first agricultural researchers to recognize the value of statistical methods and good field plot designs. His longtime orchard fertilizer experiments led to
more efficient fertilizer practices in California's tree fruit industry. Despite heavy duties as director of the station, he continued to supervise research projects, including investigations of citrus rootstock and performance behavior of nucellar (asexual embryo development) lines of oranges and lemons. He helped develop an important rootstock for oranges, the Troyer citrange.

Batchelor, as administrator, was decisive in differentiating significant from trivial research problems, or those beyond station capabilities, and he was not easily influenced by outside pressure toward projects he considered marginal for success. He was quick to mobilize station skills toward major problems, as he did when tristeza disease or "quick decline" first appeared in Southern California and threatened to render the citrus industry extinct. He initiated a broad interdisciplinary attack on the disease that eventually led to the determination by H. S. Fawcett and J. M. Wallace that a virus was the causal agent. The discovery of citrus tristeza virus, which had killed more than three million orange trees in California in a twenty-five-year period, was critical to addressing what has probably been the most disastrous disease to ever affect orange trees worldwide.

Howard Fawcett had joined the Citrus Experiment Station in 1918 and headed the plant pathology division from 1920 to 1946. Fawcett was the first to discover a virus disease in citrus. Fawcett's discovery of the psorosis virus opened up a new field of research in citrus diseases and placed the Citrus Experiment Station in the forefront of virology research.35

Another renowned researcher from the Webber-Batchelor era was Howard Brett Frost, who gained Webber's notice while a PhD student at Cornell. Recruited to Riverside in 1913, Frost commenced research that he knew might not bear fruit for decades. (Or even a century: the Gold Nugget, released in 2000, a seedless, sweet tangerine with long shelf life, was the result of a cross made in the 1950s between varieties developed at UC Riverside that dated back to a cross made by Frost.)37 In this labor of patience, knowing that seed to fruiting in citrus was a five- to ten-year process, Frost methodically conducted protracted research of nucellar-seedling lines and was first to report accurately the normal chromosome number of citrus. His discoveries established basic scientific knowledge fundamental to developing new and better fruits and new rootstocks with resistance to recalcitrant viral diseases. Frost is also remembered for his tremendous contribution of two fundamental chapters to the first edition of The Citrus Industry, as well as the development of several high quality mandarin hybrids, including the Kara and the Kinnow.38

By the time Batchelor became director, on the brink of the Great Depression, station research had grown to include almost every crop of importance grown in Southern California, with roughly half of its efforts still allocated to citrus. During the recovery of the 1940s, there was a substantial expansion of land, capital facilities, staff, and operational budget. During Batchelor's thirty-eight years of service he saw the Citrus Experiment Station grow from thirty acres and a staff of seventeen to more than 900 acres, with a staff of over 275 people. Staff were still organized under Webber's original divisions, with one major innova-
tion; in 1932 the Division of Irrigation Investigations and Practice, headed by S. H. Beckett, was established. Under Batchelor's directorship, the north wing of the Citrus Experiment Station was completed in 1931 and the Division of Agricultural Chemistry moved into it from Rubidoux. The Insectary Building and a fifth greenhouse were constructed in 1931, and the Entomology Building in 1932. In 1948 the Entomology Annex and the Faculty Club were completed, the latter developed by the staff using a small war-surplus building. (Subsequently, a newer faculty club was constructed utilizing the funding and sweat equity of campus staff, who were understandably indignant when their faculty club was torn down during the campus construction boom of the 1990s.)

Batchelor will perhaps be most remembered, beyond his scientific contributions, for overseeing the Citrus Experiment Station from its adolescence to maturity, as it gained its reputation as one of the outstanding agricultural research centers of the world. In tribute to his accomplishments, in 1967 the newly completed Batchelor Hall (home now to the Department of Botany and Plant Sciences faculty and staff) was dedicated in his honor.

**Director Boyce: Research on New Crops and New Disease Threats, 1952-1968**

In 1951 Batchelor retired and soil and plant nutrition scientist Homer D. Chapman served as acting director for the remainder of the year. Alfred M. Boyce, an entomologist at the Riverside station since 1927, became director. Boyce had seriously considered leaving the Citrus Experiment Station in the late 1930s when his career appeared stymied. The culprit proved to be Ralph E. Smith, the same person who considered Boyce “his closest friend in the university.” After three years of tenure denial Boyce was at last promoted on the fourth year’s recommendation. Dean Chandler at UCLA considered Boyce’s treatment unfair and thus explained the delay to Boyce despite the “confidentiality of such academic senate matters.” In his autobiography Boyce recorded Chandler’s explanation: President Sproul would not act favorably on a senate committee’s recommendation for promotion unless the report was unanimous. For three years, Smith had given the lone minority report recommending against promotion, not because Boyce lacked the personal qualifications for tenure but because Boyce used profane language, smoked a pipe or cigars excessively, consumed alcoholic drinks even though moderately, and drove university cars at the excessive speed of sixty miles per hour. Though Smith was finally convinced to vote in favor of Boyce’s advancement to tenure he did write a minority report strongly recommending against ultimate promotion to full professor or promotion to headship of the Division of Entomology. Boyce was promoted to full professor four years later, in 1943, and served as division head from 1940 to 1950. He lived in Pakistan and India and traveled through the Middle East with his family while on sabbatical in 1951 before taking over the directorship of the Citrus Experiment Station in January 1952.

The postwar era was one of public and private support that led to the station’s greatest period of
growth, exceeded only by UC Riverside’s present expansion. Southern California agriculture was undergoing a boom in productivity for more than one hundred commercial crops, with more being added all the time, and farm products emerging as a billion dollar industry.41

Threats to the booming industry abounded, and the station responded with important research breakthroughs. When George Zentmyer joined the Citrus Experiment Station as a plant pathologist in 1944, roughly 5,000 acres of California avocados were being annihilated by “decline” disease. Zentmyer began studying this ailment to solve the crisis; his work would span half a century. Before coming to Riverside, while researching development of chemotherapeutic systemic fungicides for the devastating Dutch elm disease, Zentmyer had made a fundamental discovery: the action of the fungicide was through chelation, precipitating or “locking up” trace elements such as zinc that the fungi required for growth.42

Zentmyer confirmed that avocado decline disease was due to root rot caused by the soilborne, water mold fungus Phytophthora cinamomoni. From 1946 to 1993, Zentmyer collected avocado species from their native habitats in Mexico and Central and South America, testing for resistance to P. cinamomoni. For the discovery and commercial introduction of resistant rootstocks, Zentmyer is often credited with saving the avocado industry in California, other areas of the United States, and the world. As the world’s foremost expert on certain types of Phytophthora, which can destroy about 1,000 different tree and crop species worldwide, Zentmyer was elected to the National Academy of Sciences in 1979.43

George Zentmyer in avocado orchard, 1990s. Creative Design Services, UC Riverside.

Zentmyer’s ongoing research efforts, after his official retirement in 1981, allowed the campus community to enjoy his company for another two decades. Zentmyer’s pleasure in people had much to do with his enthusiasm for his work. Although mostly known for his avocado research, he also developed an international reputation for research on cocoa plants, which can develop black pod disease from the related fungus P. palmivora—“a very terrible disease, literally capable of wiping out half of a cocoa plantation.” In an interview
in 2000, Zentmyer said “It was fun to talk to people. Sometimes people don’t understand the science or care about fungi, but most people are interested in chocolate.” Zentmyer died at age eighty-nine on February 8, 2003.

A contemporary of Zentmyer’s, W. P. (Bill) Bitters, was involved in protecting citrus, the agricultural industry for which the experiment station was founded. From 1947 to 1982, as curator of the Citrus Variety Collection, Bitters researched citrus rootstocks and varieties and traveled the world to help the citrus industry survive such terrible threats as citrus tristeza virus. Bitters joined the Citrus Experiment Station as an assistant horticulturist in 1946. The next year he took over the care, maintenance and improvement of the Citrus Variety Collection. Webber had initiated the collection in 1910 and maintained it until his death in 1944, but it had been somewhat neglected by the time Bitters became curator. Bitters was instrumental in doubling the number of accessions of citrus species and varieties in the collection, from 600 to 1,200.

When Bitters began work on citrus tristeza, the vector-transmitted virus disease threatening to destroy citrus orchards in California and beyond, most citrus trees in California were grafted trees on a rootstock called sour orange that was known to be susceptible to tristeza. Bitters was responsible for screening more than five hundred cultivars to determine which rootstock-scion combinations were both resistant to this disease and possessed suitable horticultural characteristics. Among the most resistant and appropriate varieties released to the industry were Troyer citrange and Citrus macrophylla, which continue to be important rootstocks worldwide.

The discovery and identification of a new infectious agent, the viroid, by plant pathologists Joseph Semancik and Lewis Weathers around 1970 also benefited the citrus industry. Viroid molecules are small single-stranded circular RNA molecules comprising a unique class of transmissible, potentially pathogenic, but also potentially beneficial molecules. Their presence in orange trees can reduce tree size, improve yield and fruit size, and cause the tree to produce fruit earlier in its life, all characteristics welcomed by growers. Bitters worked on the "Flying Dragon" trifoliate rootstock, used to dwarf cultivars, making them easier to harvest. This work was facilitated by access to pathogen-free scion maintained by the Citrus Clonal Protection Program, established in 1958 at Riverside, at the Citrus Experiment Station with the mission of preventing disease from spreading through the nation's citrus groves. For citrus, this program has assumed the role of the United States Department of Agriculture; importing and quarantining foreign plant tissue until proven clean of disease before commercial release. The Citrus Clonal Protection Program is the only approved importation facility in the nation for citrus.

In 1953, as the station grew, divisions became known as departments and several were added in research areas demanding increased specialization: Plant Nematology, 1954; Vegetable Crops, 1955; Agronomy, 1961; Agricultural Engineering, 1965; and Biostatistics, 1968, which assumed supervision of the Biometrical Laboratory, established in 1956.

The Interdepartmental Committee on Air Pollution Research was formed in 1953, following the observation that air pollution in the Los Angeles basin was damaging crops. This committee was incorporated in 1961 into the Air Pollution Research Center. The center's research mission has historically focused on atmospheric processes, including the chemical processes involved in the formation of air pollution and the atmospheric transformations of organic compounds, and the subsequent effects on the environment, including on plants. The center earned a worldwide reputation for outstanding research and today, with Research Chemist Roger Atkinson as director, the Air Pollution Research Center continues this work. Atkinson's contributions are wide-ranging: he holds the remarkable distinction
of being a most highly cited researcher in four separate disciplines: engineering, chemistry, ecology/environment, and geophysics, and has been recognized by the California Resources Board and elected Fellow of the American Geophysical Union.31

A New University of California Campus at Riverside

Midcentury was noteworthy beyond research breakthroughs and unprecedented agricultural productivity. In 1949 University of California President Sproul proposed organizing
a College of Letters and Science at Riverside, naming Gordon S. Watkins as first provost. After five years of planning, in 1954 the undergraduate liberal arts college was established. In 1956 Herman T. Spieth was named provost at Riverside, with a title change to chancellor in 1958. Originally intended as a small liberal arts college with a high faculty-to-student ratio, this "Swarthmore of the West" led to affiliations and synergies unpredicted by directors Webber and Batchelor.

In 1959 the Board of Regents declared that the Riverside campus would become a general campus of the university and authorized the establishment of a College of Agricultural Sciences. The regents also voted to terminate the College of Agriculture and the Agricultural Experiment Station on the Los Angeles campus, pending the provision of facilities to continue the program at other campuses. Thus, many Los Angeles campus staff members and their research programs were transferred to Riverside, including entomological and plant pathological research on ornamental plants in 1960, and agronomic research on turf grasses in 1965.

In 1961 the regents changed the named of the Citrus Experiment Station to the Citrus Research Center and Agricultural Experiment Station indicating the station's broader scope of activities. For Boyce, the word "Citrus" was retained in the title to acknowledge that "the excellence of the citrus research program has gained worldwide recognition and the Station will continue to be the world's leading Citrus Research Center." In 1964 Ivan Hinderaker was named chancellor at Riverside.

Successive campus reorganizations led to the name change of the College of Agriculture to first, the School of Agriculture, and then the College of Biological and Agricultural Sciences. Boyce made it clear that he thought "agricultural" should have preceded "biological" in the new title of the college, reflecting its heritage and reputation. When Boyce retired as dean and director in 1968 he noted that citrus-related research, which had comprised nearly two-thirds of station research at its half century mark in 1957 — was now at about 45 percent, "indicating not a decrease in work on citrus but a substantial increase of research in other crop areas." In the late 1960s, some aspects of nearly every commercial crop in Southern California, including livestock and poultry, were being studied, with nearly two hundred formal projects underway.

The Last Quarter Century: Environmental Science, Biological Pest Control

Associate station director and botanist Mack Dugger became dean of the College of Biological and Agricultural Sciences upon Boyce's retirement. Boysie Day, a weed scientist, became associate director of the experiment station and N. T. Coleman became associate dean for instruction. Shortly after becoming dean, Boysie Day transferred to Berkeley and Dugger assumed associate directorship of the experiment station. Lowell Lewis, a plant physiologist, was appointed associate dean for research, assuming much of the administrative responsibility for the Citrus Research Center and Agricultural Experiment Station. Under Dugger, applied research was broadened and basic research was extended into new areas such as molecular biology, integrated pest management, plant genetics, climatology, and environmental protection. The increasingly urbanizing Southern California landscape, shifting agricultural lands to development, and the repercussions of an expanding population, helped shape the research program of the experiment station.

In 1974 the college was once again reorganized and became the College of Natural and Agricultural Sciences. Dean Dugger, the major architect of new department consolidations, encouraged a high level of the natural sciences on the Riverside campus. The college strengthened agricultural research by developing interrelationships and collaborations be-
tween station researchers and investigators in other disciplines of the biological and physical sciences. Dugger was known for his brevity, for getting to the point. But his bluntness was softened by his southern accent and gentility. UC Riverside biologist Mark Chappell recalled how kindly, paternally, Dugger delivered blunt advice to a gathering of just hired junior faculty in 1980. Dugger’s delivery implied that he was sorry to have to say, “Guys, it’s publish or perish.”

In the 1960s and 1970s Southern California’s rapid urban development ate up prime agricultural land. The orange groves for which Orange County was named gave way to tract housing. As agriculture was forced inland and south into hotter and drier climates, the experiment station directed increasing attention to the problems of growing crops in arid and semiarid regions. New crops were developed for semiarid conditions, including jojoba, better-yielding varieties of sesame, and turfgrass with high tolerance for pollution and salinity. Riverside emerged as the primary research center in plant tissue culture, developing cloning techniques to propagate disease-free plants for many food, fiber, and ornamental species. The citrus industry benefited from years of research by plant physiologist Charlie Coggins on the plant growth regulator gibberellic acid, which delays citrus fruit senescence. Along with another plant growth regulator which delays and reduces abscission (fruit drop) of mature citrus fruits, gibberellic acid led to a significant extension of the harvest and marketing season, especially for navel oranges.

The emphasis on environmental research evolved from a strong foundation in fundamental science. An excellent example of early, uniquely collaborative work was guided by UC Riverside soil scientist Parker Pratt, twice chairman of the Soil Science Department, who oversaw a multimillion dollar National Science Foundation “Areas of National Needs” grant in the 1970s. Researchers from three University of California campuses—Riverside, Davis and Berkeley—elucidated the complexities of the nitrogen cycle in research that was critical to understanding and better managing nitrate pollution, water quality, and crop production, according to John Letey, soil physicist emeritus. Letey thought Parker Pratt was ahead of his time in recognizing that environmental concerns would come to the forefront. At a time
when the Riverside soils group was one of the top soil science departments in the world, Pratt encouraged soil and water research directed to environmental quality as well as crop production. The Soil Science Department evolved into the Department of Soil and Environmental Sciences and today is the Department of Environmental Sciences. This was one of the first departments in the nation, and the first on a University of California campus, to offer an undergraduate degree in environmental sciences.61

Research dating to the 1960s in the emerging field of integrated pest management was pursued with a passion by agricultural experiment station scientists and cooperative extension specialists, many of whom were academic offspring, followers even, of the early standard bearer of biological control, Harry Scott Smith. Integrated pest management was a synthesis of already established methods to make pest management as benign as possible, by incorporating cultural and biological control methods so as to minimize insecticide use. (An example of a cultural control is selective harvesting, to conserve natural enemies which could quickly re-colonize harvested acreage.) Decreasing the use of insecticides increases the likelihood of maintaining, or at least not irrecoverably harming, natural enemy populations. When no biological options are available, use of selective chemicals can assist natural enemies and help keep pest populations below damaging levels.

Agricultural Experiment Station researchers have provided California with numerous successes in integrated pest management of which the following are a few examples. Sometime between 1868 and 1875, Aonidiella aurantii, California red scale, arrived from Australia on citrus nursery stock and by the 1950s had become one of the most damaging of all citrus pests. In their control efforts researchers have introduced fifty-two species or strains of natural enemies, eight of which have become established.62 One of these, Aphytis melinus, became a hugely successful parasitoid (parasitizing specifically the target pest) of red scale, and provided the citrus industry decades of relief from this pest. Outstanding control was maintained until increased insecticide use for management of additional new citrus pests adversely affected A. melinus populations. The problem has been remedied, in part, by growers making seasonal releases of this commercially available parasitoid into citrus orchards to boost resident populations of A. melinus at critical periods.63

In many cases, biological control introductions have provided a permanent solution to a pest invasion. Such was the remarkably successful story of controlling the ash whitefly, Siphoninus philyraeae, which became a bothersome pest of fruit and ornamental trees and shrubs in the 1980s, particularly in urban environments. In addition to the sooty mold ash whitefly honeydew caused on fruit, rendering it unmarketable, this sugary waste showered down on cars parked under infested trees, making ash whitefly a pest for urban residents and fruit growers alike. In 1989 a team of researchers at the Riverside experiment station, led by Tom Bellows and Tim Paine, in a statewide collaboration with the California Department of Food and Agriculture, identified two natural enemies, a tiny parasitic wasp, Encarsia inaron and a very small ladybug, Clistostethus arcuatus, which were effective natural enemies of ash whitefly. In this collaborative mass rearing and statewide release program, the ash whitefly populations were decimated to below noticeable levels, and the ash whitefly problem has been solved with no further human intervention necessary.64

In some cases there is no viable biological control solution to a pest invasion; these are the instances when extension specialists may resort to limited use of selective chemicals for pest control. In 1996, avocado growers in Southern California valued their industry at $259 million dollars annually.65 That same year, Scirtothrips perseae Nakahara, the avocado thrips, invaded California and became a major pest of avocados by feeding damage on young fruit, leaving avocados unmarketable. By 1998 avocado thrips had caused $8.5 million in
damage. With this significant, ongoing threat to their industry, and no biological control options available to the entomologists and extension specialists attempting to solve the growers' problem, the California Department of Pesticide Regulation granted a Section 18 emergency use permit from 1998 to 2004 allowing application of a highly selective pesticide, abamectin, which received registration in 2005. When mixed with highly refined petroleum oil this leaf-penetrating compound does not significantly affect natural enemies and is helping growers achieve pest control through an integrated approach involving chemical and cultural practices that manage the pest while preserving natural enemies of other pests in avocado orchards.66

An environmentally benign approach for managing pests is the holy grail of any pest management program, and the best chance of achieving this goal is by using biological control agents that effectively attack only the pest of interest.67 Biological control research and implementation, the complementary approaches of conserving and encouraging natural enemies populations, augmented by cultural practices, all have been pursued and advanced to great success for more than a century in Riverside. This research is now conducted in excellent new facilities that include the state-of-the-art Insectary and Quarantine Facility, in collaboration with UC Riverside's Center for Invasive Species Research.

Domestic and International Contributions of Other Riverside Scientists

The contributions of one of horticulture's (and agriculture's) heroes is notable not only for significance but duration. Homer D. Chapman's accomplishments span seven decades. He joined the Citrus Experiment Station as an assistant chemist in 1927, and after timely promotions, served as chair of the Department of Agriculture, later the Department of Soils and Plant Nutrition, for twenty-three years. Though retired in 1966 when he reached mandatory retirement age, he continued his professional and public service with vigor until his independence was substantially curbed by the loss of his driver's license at age ninety-nine in 1997.

Chapman pioneered the use of leaf analysis as a tool to diagnose deficiencies and excesses of elements in the nutrition of plants. Although mainly directed to citrus crops, his technique was ultimately applied to virtually all crops. He was among the first to control the supply of nutrients to crops through the use of hydroponics and developed methods for growing fruit-bearing citrus trees in water cultures out of doors. His work led to a great body of information concerning visual symptoms assessments, resulting in leaf and soil analysis standards. While serving as a soils consultant on a United States Agency for International Development project in Chile in 1957, Chapman recognized the need for a compendium on methods

Plant nutrition scientist Homer D. Chapman. Courtesy of Al Page.
for the analysis of soils, plants and waters along with diagnostic criteria for soils and plants. Thus, he co-authored with Parker Pratt a book entitled Methods of Analysis of Soils, Plants and Waters and an extensive edited volume on Diagnostic Criteria for Plants and Soils. Reprinted five times, the latter book serves as the standard reference in the field.

Chapman organized the First International Citrus Symposium held on the UC Riverside campus as part of the University of California Centennial. The symposium attracted more than eight hundred delegates from fifty-three countries. Chapman also edited the symposium proceedings (roughly 1,800 pages in three volumes). Following the symposium the delegates decided that an International Society of Citriculture should be formed and appointed Chapman as the organizing committee chair. Almost single-handedly Chapman completed the task, while serving as the society’s secretary from 1970 to 1986. He is rightfully credited for the society’s popularity and rapid growth. International Society of Citriculture congresses have been held around the world ever since, most recently in Morocco in 2004, with Wahun, China, scheduled for 2008. A World War I veteran who lived in three centuries, Chapman died at the age of 106 on April 4, 2005, preceded in death by his wife of 69 years, Daisy, at age 96 in 1999.

Though we can’t yet know if they’ll be as long-lived as Zentmyer, Bitters, and Chapman, other researchers from the Riverside station are continuing this tradition of making contributions with both local and international benefits. A notable example involves work commenced decades ago by botanist Anthony Hall. In research and breeding efforts begun in 1974 on blackeye pea, or cowpea, Hall recognized that the hardy native African and Californian crop, used as a grain or eaten as a fresh cooked pea, could provide a reliable, nutrient-rich food for West Africa if adapted to tolerate drought conditions during flowering and pod-filling stages. Over the next decades, Hall and his colleagues identified lines of cowpea that matured earlier, thereby avoiding drought, determined the mechanisms whereby heat damages cowpea and bred heat-tolerant lines, and selected lines with superior resistance to pests and plant diseases. Hall and his African collaborators bred several improved cowpea varieties, including “Mouride,” “Melakh,” and “Ein El Gazal” that were introduced in Senegal, Sudan, and other African countries during the 1990s.

Our domestic cowpea industry has also benefited. In 1999, Hall and several UC Riverside collaborators released “California Blackeye 27,” a new semi-dwarf variety bred with heat tolerance traits that produces greater dry bean yields when it is hot during flowering and has pest and plant disease resistance. Most recently, Hall collaborated with UC Riverside colleagues on isolating and identifying a dehydrin gene that gives cowpea lines both chilling tolerance during emergence and heat tolerance at flowering. By combining crop physiology and plant breeding studies, Hall has obtained unique information on crop adaptation to stresses that can be used to improve many crop species. On June 4, 2001, Hall received the U.S. Department of Agriculture’s highest honor for his work, according to Agriculture Secretary Ann Veneman, “promoting health by providing access to safe, affordable and nutritious food.”

Related work on cowpea is now being done by nematologist Phil Roberts and research specialist Jeff Ehlers. The goal is genetic improvement of cowpea, which will benefit both West Africa and the United States. Through traditional breeding and use of genetic molecular markers for agronomic traits and resistance to abiotic and biotic stresses, the researchers will be able to improve cowpea resistance to heat and drought and to pests, pathogens and nematodes. This project, funded by a grant from the U.S. Agency for International Development, matches the work of Roberts and Ehlers with collaborators in the countries of Senegal, Burkina Faso and Cameroon, while providing opportunities for international
students involved in this research.\textsuperscript{70}

Another Riverside researcher, entomologist Joseph Morse, became an international diplomat in his work on the Fuller rose weevil. In the 1980s, upon the discovery of a few eggs of the Fuller rose weevil under the button cap of a lemon destined for export to Japan, Japan immediately banned all imports from California, which would have been disastrous for the citrus industry. Almost single-handedly, Morse dove into research necessary to demonstrate that the "potential for importation of a new pest" was not a threat. As a result of his work Japan reopened its imports. Morse demonstrated both scientific and political skills in coming to the rescue of the citrus industry.\textsuperscript{71}

UC Riverside distinguished professor of botany Arturo Gomez-Pompa has long served the role of diplomat between the United States and Mexico. His contributions to natural resource management have been recognized with numerous international awards, most notably the Tyler Prize, considered the equivalent of the Nobel prize on behalf of conservation, which he received primarily for calling attention to the destruction of rain forests in Mexico and in the tropics around the world. The ecological reserve which Gomez-Pompa founded in 1990, El Edén, in Quintana Roo, Mexico, provides research opportunities for scientists and students in both countries.\textsuperscript{72}

Closer to home, environmental challenges are likely to mount as urban congestion increases. The Inland Empire (Riverside and San Bernardino counties) is the fastest growing urban area in the United States, according to a survey released by the U.S. Census Bureau on April 20, 2006. To respond, the Center for Conservation Biology, launched in the mid-1990s and currently led by plant pathologist Michael Allen, focuses research on threats to natural resources concurrent with rapid urbanization and the by-products of a vast agricultural industry. The program in conservation biology benefits from the land-grant university tradi-
tion of the applying sound biological research to practical problems, along with Riverside's outstanding interdepartmental group in the basic sciences from which conservation biology springs: ecology, evolution, systematics and behavior. 73

Soil scientist notables such as Andrew Chang, William Jury and Albert Page made great strides in the 1990s in understanding the chemistry and life-span of contaminants in soils, the use of organic wastes in agriculture, waste water reuse, and hydraulic and pollutant retention properties of soils. Research collaborations have continued between experiment station scientists and the United States Department of Agriculture. The federal Agricultural Research Service completed construction in 1995 of dramatically expanded and upgraded facilities for the Salinity Laboratory—which had been operating at the Rubidoux Laboratory since 1948—on a new site on the UC Riverside campus. The new facility was renamed the George E. Brown Jr. Salinity Laboratory in honor of former Congressman Brown, a long-term supporter of the lab, scientific research, and UC Riverside. There has been an extensive research cooperation and interaction between Salinity Lab and experiment station research scientists, visiting scientists, post docs and advanced degree students conducting research under cooperative agreements. 74

The Institute for Integrative Genome Biology

New initiatives for the twenty-first century investigate mechanism at the microscopic level incorporating the new tools and approaches of genomic research. While classical genetics focused on the heredity of one trait or gene, genomics investigates genome-wide expression patterns, looking simultaneously at the differential expression of genes and traits relative one to another. This interrelatedness is increasingly acknowledged by scientists addressing research challenges from the cell to the ecosystem.

One of the newest initiatives on campus, the Institute for Integrative Genome Biology evolved Dean Irwin Sherman’s vision of “centers of excellence” in the 1980s to capitalize on the skills and talents of such UC Riverside notables as professor of genetics, and former College of Natural and Agricultural Sciences dean, Michael Clegg, and professor of plant pathology Noel Keen, both National Academy of Sciences members. Unfortunately, Keen was cut down at the pinnacle of his academic achievements on April 18, 2000, at the age of sixty-one. Early in his career he was the first to coin the term “elicitor” for the chemicals that are produced by a pathogen and recognized by the host, initiating host defense processes. Keen’s important discovery about the tertiary folding of proteins opened new doors to the study of the active sites of enzymes and held great significance for the emerging field of biotechnology. Noel T. Keen Hall, dedicated on April 18, 2003, and housing the Core Instrumentation Facility, is a testament to the high regard in which Keen was held by his colleagues. Although he has moved to UC Irvine, Michael Clegg’s work continues through the institute he launched in 2000 with its impressive group of researchers. 75 The institute has been directed since 2003 by Jian-Kang Zhu, professor of plant cell biology and holder of a presidential chair. Zhu’s reputation was established through pioneering research with the model plant Arabidopsis (a mustard relative possessing a small genome), identifying genes and proteins having roles in such abiotic stresses as salt tolerance, drought and low temperature. 76

The Institute for Integrative Genome Biology seeks to foster innovations that will make possible advancements in the quality of life—from greater agricultural productivity and more nutritious foods to improved human health and environmental quality. Research efforts are focused on insect genomics, plant cell biology/genomics, microbial genomics, mammalian genomics and bioinformatics. The institute is built around the Core Instrumentation Facility
that provides researchers and students access to state-of-the-art tools for advanced studies in genomics, gene expression, proteomics, microscopy and bioinformatics.\textsuperscript{77}

The rapid pace of developments in genomics has understandably focused society's attention on the consequences of biotechnology. To advance the wise use of innovations emerging from the genomics revolution, the Biotechnology Impacts Center, led by professor of genetics Norman Ellstrand, in association with both the Institute and the Center for Social and Economic Policy, serves as an "honest broker" forum to identify relevant policy issues, act as a clearinghouse for credible information on those issues, and initiate research addressing potential benefits and consequences of the genomics revolution, encouraging the responsible use of biotechnology in society.\textsuperscript{78}

Operating in collaboration with the Institute for Integrative Genome Biology, the Center for Plant Cell Biology was catalyzed largely by the efforts and vision of its founding director, professor of plant cell biology and genetics Natasha Raikhel. This new center, founded in 2002, brings together the skills and talents of engineers, physicists, and computer scientists, along with plant biologists, plant pathologists and chemists, to develop a comprehensive understanding of how plants function as whole organisms. The nation's first research center devoted exclusively to plant cell biology, it seeks to understand how plants react to stress in the environment, such as drought and poor soil conditions, and to genetically transform crop plants to improve productivity while protecting the environment. Capitalizing on the scientific momentum created by the genome sequencing of two important plants, Arabidopsis and rice, the center seeks to exploit the fruits of the genomics revolution by deciphering the function of proteins within living plant cells in the context of whole plants.\textsuperscript{79}

Fulfilling lofty goals within the framework of the experiment station usually means providing practical benefits to end users. The latest result of the experiment station's century-old mission—applying science to benefit agriculture—was released early this year. In January 2006, station geneticists Mikeal Roose and Timothy Close, with assistance from colleagues in the citrus industry who shared citrus sequence data, announced the development of the GeneChip\textsuperscript{®} Citrus Genome Array, manufactured by the California technology company Affymetrix, Inc. The GeneChip\textsuperscript{®} will enable researchers to determine which genes are expressed in certain tissues under certain conditions. Citrus tissue samples taken in the field and analyzed in the lab will reveal which metabolic pathways are being turned on in the sampled fruit or other plant tissue, providing researchers with important information about such aspects of citrus culture as post-harvest flavor changes. This information might suggest changes in such variables as temperature or humidity that growers could make to maintain ideal taste. The single-use, and relatively expensive gene chip (more than $600 per chip) may lead to the development of a simpler "dip-stick" test (like those that pool
owners may be familiar with, for quick assessment of chemical balance in pool water) that growers will stick into an orange to determine on the spot what adjustments might be made to maximize fruit quality. The new GeneChip® is the most recent high tech example reflecting a century-old mission, to serve the needs of constituents, using the powerful tools of science delivered to the field by cooperative extension specialists.

The Citrus Experiment Station was launched a century ago through the efforts of the citrus growers working with political proponents, supported by state- and federally legislated monies to serve primarily a single commodity industry. The agricultural industry now served by the experiment station has grown considerably beyond the scope envisioned by those who fought for its establishment. Today's Citrus Research Center and Agricultural Experiment Station, with approximately 140 faculty and a budget exceeding $20 million dollars, comprises the heart of the UC Riverside campus, in both size and heritage. Ground-breaking science being conducted by world-class scientists, in newly formed institutes using phenomenal tools, may seem to be leading away from the station's agricultural roots, but are squarely within its founding mission. Collaborations being pursued in genomics and biotechnology will address challenges being faced on environmental and medical fronts, as well as agricultural. We are indebted to those who founded an experiment station in the heart of their fruitful industry.

ENDNOTES

I am indebted to the faculty who shared with me their knowledge of the accomplishments of their colleagues, and who, with prodding, acknowledged their own. Most were surprisingly unassuming about their own achievements. I wish to thank Audrey Pearson of Rivera Library's Special Collections for her time in scanning historic photos, and Donald Cooksey, executive associate dean of the experiment station, for his guidance and suggestions in getting me started on this project. I am particularly indebted to the late Harry Lawton—with whom I briefly worked in 1991 in the College of Natural and Agricultural Sciences Dean's Office—for his devotion to UC Riverside and his diligence in chronicling the history of the Citrus Research Center and Agricultural Experiment Station.
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Out of a world of roots and soils,
Of pumpkins and apples and wines and oils,
Of mysterious entomological toils,
The cow-college baby appears.

1899 Blue and Gold (1898).
A MYSTERIOUS PLANTING:
THE HILGARD EXPERIMENT STATION

Carroll Brentano

WHEN THE FIRST PROFESSOR OF AGRICULTURE of the new University of California, Ezra Carr, was fired in 1874 by President Daniel Gilman, Eugene Hilgard (1833-1916), a German-born geologist turned soil scientist, got the job. In those years, as had been practiced for millennia, the aim of experimental agriculture was experimental, “put it in the ground and see if it grows.” Thus, among the first tasks Hilgard assigned himself on becoming the professor of agriculture was to found an Agricultural Experiment Station, possibly the first in the United States, on the university’s new campus in Berkeley. This was in 1875. Hilgard’s life from 1880 to 1905, “was rich, but hectic. His activities and emotions were consumed by the struggles of the College of Agriculture, and the tribulations of the Agricultural Experiment Station.” For instance, it “grieved him no end” that so few farm boys graduated. In fact, few enrolled. Their fathers, however, were eager for the knowledge that a College of Agriculture could provide on crops, soils, plants, livestock, markets, and all else. These could be provided by Hilgard’s campus experiment station, and, after more funds arrived from the passage of the 1887 Hatch Act, by substations.

“What was really needed in this pioneer period, Hilgard knew, was the systematic field exploration of California’s resources that might be suitable for farming, along with a compilation of available information on crops and methods of culture.” To further these aims Hilgard instituted field experiment stations all over the state in the early 1890s. Aiming to cover all the typical agricultural areas of California, three of these were established at Paso Robles, Tulare, and Pomona, and the fourth, our subject, in Amador County near Jackson, representing the Sierra foothills. (All four were closed within twenty years.)

What came after these “experimental farms” as they really were, in Berkeley’s College of Agriculture and everywhere in the western world by the beginning of the twentieth century, was laboratory science: find out what chemicals will kill the bugs that are eating your crops. Thus, in California, came the death of these outlying experiment stations and the birth, in 1905, of the Plant Disease Laboratory in Whittier, no longer supported by Hatch Act funds but by

state funds. The rest, in the University of California as Ann Scheuring tells it in Science & Service and in the state of California as Richard Walker tells in The Conquest of Bread, is history. So, with all the money, chemistry, and technical initiative that have made California farming so phenomenally successful, why would anyone in the field or the classroom want to resurrect an experiment station? Why indeed? Here's with a small history of that attempt.

The early days of California farming were bountiful quickly and profusely, as based on wheat growing in the thin but fertile soils of the Sacramento and San Joaquin Valleys. But by the waning of the gold rush, as farming of all types, including horticulture, expanded widely, the need proliferated for more and more specific information from the university on how to grow and market whatever was in demand. Our subject, the Foothill Experiment Station, was to test the usefulness of agricultural land at about 2000 feet in elevation and with several soil types. The site, also, as is preferred by the university, must be free. With the enthusiastic patronage of State Senator Anthony Caminiti of Jackson, twenty-two acres were donated and the deed signed by five public-spirited trustees, and six and seven acres each later donated by two local Amador County citizens. Water was supplied by access to the privately owned Amador Ditch, and a road was built and a house for the foreman. The wishes of the donors that the house be built on top of the highest hill, for the view, was respected. A pumping station was built, but as Hilgard typically stated, "It is, however, intended to use irrigation as sparingly as possible, in order to prove what can be done without it in the foothill region."

Charles Shinn (brother of Milicent Shinn, first female Berkeley PhD), Hilgard's appointee as station inspector, in his report of 1893-94, wrote:

The region in which the experiment station is situated is fairly and fully representative of a very large acreage in the Sierra foothills, extending across many counties, and presenting many serious problems to the agriculturist. . . . Now the work of the Foothill Station is to aid the people of this great mountain region to develop the horticultural industries most suitable to soil and climate. The olive, grape, and fig are at home here; so are the peach, apricot, nectarine, prune, and walnut. The range of possibilities is large and interesting. The district is a part of the extensive territory that the most thoughtful
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Californians have long looked upon as certain to attract the attention of homeseekers, and to become a land of orchards and gardens.5

With this enthusiasm the acreage was laid out and planted in beds of fruits and grapevines, some other trees, forage plants, and later on, rows of olive trees. Over the decade of the 1890s, the reports of Inspector Shinn, issued biennially, commented favorably on the growth—or at least survival—of the plantings and the attributes of their products. In 1890-1891 “Peaches and Nectarines are much the same in growth,” but “Cherries have been a surprise. Only six failed in the orchard and have been replaced,” and “The Apricots have grown rather better on plum stock than on apricot but it is too early to determine the relative values of these stocks for this soil.” The 1897 report comments on odd crops like camphor, caper, carob, kai apple, and medlar, “The climate does not suit the tree.” But there was success for mulberries: “Six varieties were planted when the Station was established. They have been so uniformly successful that farmers visiting the place should ask for cuttings to plant for shade and beauty throughout the Sierra foothills.”6

In the later nineteenth century, viticulture was assumed to be an essential California industry and, from his arrival, Hilgard included wine production and research in his plans for the Berkeley campus, its experiment station, and after 1887 for the substations including the Foothill.7 He wrote in 1890:

In planting the vineyard at the station, we have aimed to take advantage of the contour of the ground, by placing varieties demanding a greater heat on the warmest slopes, and those better adapted to a cooler climate on northeast slopes. Thus, for instance Riesling and Bordeaux varieties have been planted on land with a northeasterly aspect, while sherry and port varieties have been planted where they would receive the full benefit of the sun. This, together with the duplication on different soils, has caused the vineyard to be a little scattered.8

Eighty-six varieties were planted at the outset, of which forty were rooted vines and forty-six cuttings, some from the campus station and some imported. Hilgard noted that of both types there were from 3 to 70 percent failures. Ten years later, the news of the vines was good, but not so of the users:
The local demand for the cuttings of wine grapes is at present confined to those varieties which bear large crops. A good deal of wine is made for the local market, but very little finds its way elsewhere, and quantity is the main thing with all growers in this region. As transportation facilities improve, the making of better wine will attract more attention, and the fine collection of varieties at the substations will be more generally drawn upon.

The “fine collection” had to wait sixty years for its day to come; meanwhile, the station was about to be closed.

In his 1900 report to the president Hilgard explained: “Unfortunately, the station representing the foothill region, though excellently well located as regards soil and climate, still remains remote from railway connection, contrary to the reasonable expectations entertained at the time of its establishment.” (The line from Ione to Jackson had never been built.) Foothill was looked upon as an asset in 1894 because it was “in all essential particulars a mountain ranch,” reachable only by a hard wagon ride and unreachable in winter, and so its isolation allowed it to be devoted to “experimental purposes.” And these were the purposes Hilgard cared about most, although in a rather testy transmittal letter to President Wheeler for the 1897-1898 report in February 1900, he stresses the importance of each station to its surrounding community: if you answer the farmer’s questions, they will become supporters of the College of Agriculture. And he was not averse to mentioning the map and data sent to the Columbian Exposition in Chicago and to the Paris Exposition.

Charles Shinn, on the other hand, was still cheerful in 1902, writing that the “demands made by the public... are yearly increasing,” and that so are shipments of plants, seeds, and scions to foreign parts such as the Philippines, the Tuskegee Institute, “to Arizona, Alaska, British Columbia, South America, the Hawaiian Islands, etc.” By this time, the stations, originally financed by the state, were now paid for from the university’s general fund, and
they took from the budget of the central Berkeley station too many dollars for upkeep and staff. “Their [the substations’] chief crime was poverty,” commented a later director. So, in November 1903 the Foothill (or Jackson) Station was closed—along with three others. According to the author of the report of 1918, no one was sorry: “From the reduction of the number of outlying stations to the abandonment of all of them, the central station increased its expenditures from the Hatch funds and was assisted to expansion thereby . . .” Then silence, for the historian, falls.

The experiment station, for the good reasons that it was hardly reachable and of no more scientific interest, was forgotten, but Eugene Hilgard, “world renowned” scientist, as we say nowadays, was not. Fellow soil scientist and colleague, Professor Hans Jenny, set out in the early 1950s to write the first, and so far only, biography of Hilgard. Also, provoked by curiosity, he set out to find the Jackson station, but “At Berkeley no one knew anything about its existence, neither faculty nor administration.” But shortly after that, he, with his wife, Jean, did find it: “an intriguing ghost place, full of horticultural surprises: a road engulfed by untamed olive trees, long creeping grape vines, a wilderness of fruit trees, and a tall coast redwood tree that is not supposed to survive in the Sierran foothill climate.” The house and barn had vanished but “a large circular, below-ground, beautifully bricklaid reservoir was empty and presumably had been empty for half a century.”

Meanwhile, Austin C. Goheen, a plant pathologist working for the United States Department of Agriculture at UC Davis, arrived in 1956 in California at a time when commercial plantings of wine grapes were affected by virus diseases. So he set out to find healthy plants, and what he calls “an interesting story” began with a 1961 visit to a vineyard in West Point where a small crop of Mission grapes was virus free. The owner, a C. T. Smith, told the Davis scientists that his vines came from “a mysterious planting in the woods of Amador County.” With the help of local officials, Goheen found the whereabouts of the mystery site and was introduced to its self-proclaimed owner, Mr. Fantozzi, a stonemason living in Jackson. It turned out that the Fantozzi family had simply moved into the station property and its buildings and gained legal, if “squatters,” rights to it, and thus were hostile to anyone connected to the University of California. Someone else had burned the buildings, and the Fantozzis had left the site. Goheen describes how, after calming the suspicions of the Fantozzis, when
he actually set foot on the place, "by the early 1960's one would really have to know the history of the place to make any sense of it. It was like many abandoned homesteads in the back country of California where the local family could not make a successful living, resulting in a move to town." . . . He deduced "the outlines of the rather elaborately set-out plots. I even found numerous vines still growing in spite of the fact that deer had browsed there for almost 60 years."16

Goheen and a Davis colleague, Carl Luhn, subsequently published the viticultural results of this and another visit. "The discovery, in 1963, of an abandoned vineyard . . . has afforded a rare opportunity for the study of the virus incidence in 110 random clones of grapevines from the 19th century." As commercial rootstocks tend to have viruses, they were hunting for old vineyards where rootstocks had not been utilized. "Therefore, we began searching old vineyards with vines growing on their own roots . . . This search led us to the Jackson vineyard."17 In the 1963 visit and another in 1964, they got 117 cuttings and found them remarkably virus free, and some of the grape varieties better than from more recent collections.

The Jennys, in the meantime, had revisited the site in May 1976 and talked to an elderly Mrs. Kate Fantozzi (wife, widow, sister? of Goheen's interlocutor of 1963) who told them she had grown up there and now owned all thirty-six acres; however, the Jennys were told by county officials that the university—a surprise—still owned the two small donated parcels. Later that year, Professor Jenny informed Vice President James Kendrick of the situation. Jenny, relating this in a March 4, 1988, letter to Dean Gardner, complains that after eleven years nothing had happened. But as Arnold Schultz comments elsewhere, "Thank God for Jean Jenny!" who sent out in 1986-1987 twenty letters to possibly interested people soliciting arguments for buying back and restoring the station. Hans Jenny's own desire would have pleased Hilgard: that the university acquire the twenty-two acres and "looking into the future, initiate a hundred-year-long, low-cost program of soil humus restora-

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variety</th>
<th>Ripe.</th>
<th>Crop per Tree</th>
<th>Average Weight of Fruits</th>
<th>Remarks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ben Davis</td>
<td>Sept. 18</td>
<td>63 lbs.</td>
<td>5 oz.</td>
<td>Showy, but poor quality.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Limbertwig</td>
<td>Sept. 25</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>4 oz.</td>
<td>Many small ones.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lady</td>
<td>Sept. 23</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>2 oz.</td>
<td>Kept well.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rome Beauty</td>
<td>Sept. 15</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>6 oz.</td>
<td>Good flavor and texture; red-streaked, attractive.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wolf River</td>
<td>Aug. 28</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>8 oz.</td>
<td>Large; good cooking; poor Keeper.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall Fippine</td>
<td>Sept. 1</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>9 oz.</td>
<td>Large; fair quality.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bailey's Sweet</td>
<td>Aug. 20</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>7 oz.</td>
<td>Good size.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rhode Island Greening</td>
<td>Sept. 15</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>8 oz.</td>
<td>Good keeper and good for cooking.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Fameuse had 40 pounds to the tree, of good quality, but small. Of the other kinds which bore over fifty pounds per tree in 1902, none bore over fifteen pounds this year.

On the granite soil the following had over fifty pounds per tree:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variety</th>
<th>Ripe.</th>
<th>Crop per Tree</th>
<th>Average Weight of Fruits</th>
<th>Remarks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Violet</td>
<td>Aug. 22</td>
<td>127 lbs.</td>
<td>7 oz.</td>
<td>Good early cooking apple.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arkansas Black</td>
<td>Sept. 25</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>7 oz.</td>
<td>Fine keeper.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missouri Fippin</td>
<td>Sept. 28</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>6 oz.</td>
<td>Small, though well thinned; excellent keeper.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wealthy</td>
<td>Aug. 15</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>5 oz.</td>
<td>Large; green; coarse.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sweet June</td>
<td>July 22</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>4 oz.</td>
<td>Insipid; poor.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gloria Mundi</td>
<td>Aug. 22</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>8 oz.</td>
<td>Attractive summer apple.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hawthorned</td>
<td>Aug. 8</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>7 oz.</td>
<td>Resembles Maiden's Blush.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The last named was the only one of the above that bore well the previous year.

Foothill Substation report on apples grown on two different soils, Report, 1903.
Meanwhile, Berkeley forestry professor Arnold Schultz had gone in 1982 to the station with forestry graduate students, who had become interested in agroforestry. On the basis of their enthusiasm and his own studies, he envisioned an agroforestry center that seemed “the most logical use that can be put there.” Schultz felt strongly about the historic importance of the station, “With the extensive planting of grapes, olives, apples, and other fruit trees amongst the digger pine, blue oak, and manzanita, we can say that Hilgard was the first (academic) agroforester in California.”

Jean Jenny’s letter writing campaign did get some results. A UC Davis history professor, Morton Rothstein, writing from the journal Agricultural History in August 1985, thanks her for the “march around the University’s property.” A property he considered to have “a unique historical value” and would be a fitting locus for a “kind of ‘living farm’” with the necessary historical information for visitors—and perhaps run by the Department of Parks. Another reply, from Walter E. Pittman, a history professor at Mississippi University for Women, says the same thing, adding that the station “should be retained as a monument to a great man.” Carroll Pursell, a historian at UC Santa Barbara, called the station “a valuable cultural resource to the State . . . managed in the public interest. . . . why not [by] the University itself?” In May of 1986, Professor George Martin of the Davis Department of Pomology, expressed interest in the “olive materials” at the Station and could even “envision profitable use” of the site. In March 1988 Arnold Schultz wrote again to Dean Gardner because Jenny had informed him “of your interest in the Foothill Field Station that was established by . . . Director Hilgard . . . exactly 100 years ago.” A concrete, well-thought-out proposal for the station’s use as an agroforestry center was enclosed. The letter ends, however, with a warning note: “I would tread lightly [on the site] though, because the neighbors are hopping mad and the big dogs guarding marijuana plants in the vicinity are very, very, big.” Because of the big dogs mentioned in his letter, or because the university was scared off by possible legal trouble over the site’s ownership, the “proposal” hardly went further.

In August of the same year, Austin Goheen wrote to Delbert S. Farnham, a farm advisor.
in Jackson, in answer to his enquiry about the station. Mentioning the letter he had written in 1982 to Susan French, the assistant to Robert Mondavi who “was looking for early references to Sauvignon blanc in the California varietal picture,” Goheen notes that the vines he saw and correlated with the archival records (experiment station reports, etc.) he dug up in Davis and Berkeley in the early 1960s were mostly dead when he went back in 1985.24

Under the unlovely title of CODAD, many of these streams flowed together under the administration of a new vice president for Agriculture and Natural Resources—Kenneth Farrell, an agricultural economist from Berkeley, who had lately been working for the bureaucracy in Washington.25 Also in August 1988 he wrote to Jean Jenny, suggesting that since he was now becoming acquainted with the affair of the Hilgard Station, they should meet with this Council of Deans and Directors “before making a final decision as to how to proceed.”26 Enter the big players.

The earnest pleas of some scientists and researchers—who had actually seen and admired the abandoned station—to rescue it for research, or at least for historical significance, have been reviewed. But the worm in the bud must be faced. The University of California was no longer interested. The fact that in 1982 an associate counsel of the university was requested by the regents to give them the legal status of the station, shows the way the wind might blow. Of the three pieces of land making up the approximate thirty-seven acres, the largest, consisting of twenty-three acres, the only one actually planted, was deeded back as originally promised to the Jackson donors if and when the university no longer needed it, to the only donor of the five still alive in 1938, who then deeded it to the town of Jackson. Subsequently, in 1952, an Isadore Orlandi won a “judgement of adverse possession” against the city (presumably they never showed any interest in the property) and then deeded all three parcels to his daughter Catherine Fantozzi. This rather underhanded maneuver explains the Fantozzi hostility to the university, who was the owner still of the two smaller parcels. In 1977 the deed passed to Elizabeth Holcomb (now dead) who paid taxes on all three parcels.27 The regent’s lawyer concluded that “the adverse possession of Holcomb’s claim to the land would not be sustainable against a public agency such as the university, and an action to recover the property would be successful, if initiated.”28

No action was initiated; Vice President Farrell, with the concurrence of “Division Scientists conclude[d] that . . . the site is not adequate for critical scientific research,” although admitting that “acreage, soil types, and topography at the [Hilgard] site may be acceptable for demonstration plots or some limited, applied studies” and that a Sierra Foothills field station, is highly desirable and should be included in the planning for the future San Joaquin campus. Copies of this letter, addressed to Gary Sposito, Berkeley professor of soil science, were sent to six big players in the agricultural hierarchy.29 This official position was perhaps given concrete form by the installation of a sort of memorial plaque honoring the experiment station on Highway 49 near Jackson.

But the Hilgard Station was not yet dead; although Hans Jenny had died in 1991, leaving a legacy to the university of the Pygmy Forest in Mendocino County, Jean Jenny was not giving up. Through the 1980s and 1990s, she was the “tireless environmental activist” for preserving California’s natural treasures and among them the Hilgard Experiment Station.30 So, in 1992, she aroused the interest of University President Emeritus Clark Kerr by mentioning the apples still found on the site.31 Kerr, who was an avid grower of apples, agreed to serve on a self-appointed committee of six or seven community activists, retired professors, and staff members with real commitment to the station, led and cheered on by Jean Jenny. The group drew up lists of possible sympathizers in all parts of the state, encouraged one member, a campus planner, to concoct a new “Proposal” for the use of the station in April
1992. It was not finished nor was it sent out.32

A letter from Mrs. Jenny to Deborah Elliot-Fisk, Director of the Natural Reserve System, in January 1993, after Vice President Wellman had told her that the “consideration of the Station had been turned over to Elliot-Fisk,” gives directions for reaching the site. Elliot-Fisk, with Toby Winer, an assistant vice president, made the trip and wrote their conclusions in a letter, which for no obvious reason was addressed to Mrs. Kay Kerr. It was essentially the *coup de grace* for the Hilgard Station. The letter begins “Vice President Farrell concurs with our findings and recommendations.” The findings were that the Oneto family owned the largest parcel (twenty-three acres), and the university’s two smaller parcels were landlocked, unsuitable for “natural reserve use,” and of “clouded title.” Their recommendation was that, as the Oneto family would not sell their parcel to the university but would buy the other two parcels, “it is our intention to pursue the sale of the parcels.” The letter adds: “We believe that the plaque which commemorates the 100th anniversary of the Station . . . is a more appropriate historical reminder of the Station than anything would be on site.”33 In April 1994 the committee learned that a quitclaim deed had been acquired by the Onetos.

The committee had more meetings in 1994 and 1995 and kept adding to the list of possible friends of the Hilgard site. One sensible suggestion came from Clark Kerr, who mentioned the wine growing families; someone else mentioned a local K-12 school and a Miwok Indian reservation.34 Either these contacts were not made or were fruitless. Now it is eleven years later: Jean Jenny and Clark Kerr have died, the professors and staff people have retired and/or moved away, the preservationists have gone on to other causes. A chapter in the University of California’s history is closed.

---

Memorial plaque on Route 49, near Jackson. Photographer unknown.
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This paper is dedicated to Hans and Jean Jenny, may their memories be preserved and honored.
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14 Jenny’s story includes fascinating bits about Hilgard’s wife, daughters, and life in Berkeley at the turn of the century.

15 Hans Jenny to Dean Wilford Gardner, March 4, 1988, author’s collection. This letter was in response to a request for information from Dean Gardner about the “Hilgard Foothill Experimental Station.” The name Hilgard is used for the first time here, to my knowledge.

16 Austin C. Goheen letter to Susan French, Robert Mondavi Winery, December 9, 1982, author’s collection.
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Letter from Arnold Schulz to Dean Gardner, March 7, 1988, author's collection. A copy of the five-page "Proposal for Establishing a Long-Term Experimental Research Facility for Agroforestry at the Hilgard Foothill Field Station, Amador County," a bibliography, a Schultz biography, excerpts from the 1890s Station Reports and a map of the site are all included.
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"The NRS Transect," the newsletter of the university's Natural Reserve System, 22:1 (2004) has an article about "this world-class soil scientist" Hans Jenny, his gift of the Pygmy Forest, and a brief appreciation also of Jean, who died in 2002.

J. Jenny to Clark Kerr, November 17, 1992, author's collection. She writes: "I'm sure your help would be of extreme importance." Kerr replied on December 2: "Yes I am interested both because of apples and the history of the University of California. I shall get in touch with both Harry R. Wellman and Dean Gardner. . . . Greatly admired the work of Hans Jenny." (Harry Wellman was vice president for agriculture and had been pro-temp president when Kerr was fired.)

The draft proposal, "Planning Study for the Hilgard Foothill Field Station," intended for the College of Natural Resources (as it was then) to consider acquiring the station "as part of its teaching, research, and public service program. . . . [The station] provides an excellent opportunity for the University to develop a research facility with a whole systems approach. That is, a program should be developed which integrates social and scientific endeavors into an interdisciplinary and innovative [course of study]." The author was Dale Sanders; the proposal includes a history of the experiment station and excerpts from the 1890s Reports.

Letter from Deborah L. Elliot-Fisk and Toby R. Winer to Mrs. Kay Kerr, May 26, 1993, author's collection. The Oneto connection is somewhat mysterious; in 1899 Shinn mentions that a Mr. Oneto who owns an adjoining farm has donated one acre to the station.

BETWEEN 1908 AND 1912 the University of California Agricultural Extension Service ran demonstration trains though rural communities up and down California in order to bring its latest findings and advice to as many farmers and their families as possible. In addition to the commonly thought-of agricultural subjects (veterinary science, dairying, field crops, soils, insecticides, horticulture, viticulture, plant diseases, poultry), it also had exhibits on public health and home economics. During this period the trains covered about 7,000 miles, visiting more than 450 sites, and attracting some 170,000 visitors to its exhibits.

College of Agriculture and Agricultural Extension personnel at the California Agriculture Special train. University Archives (UARC PIC 15:392).

The trains were sponsored by the Southern Pacific Railroad, which granted full- or half-fare subsidies to the personnel of the extension service and of the College of Agriculture generally. It also provided transportation of supplies and equipment for the various agricultural experiment stations maintained by the university. Although the Southern Pacific had a bad reputation during this period (cf. Frank Norris's *The Octopus*), it did contribute in this
way to the growth of agriculture in California. Undoubtedly the railroad was also looking forward to the increased business a booming agricultural economy would bring.

The history of later trains is somewhat unclear. In February and April of 1913 there were trains on special topics in both northern and southern California (subsidized in the south by the Santa Fe Railroad) that reached some 20,000 people; it was thought that focus on specific topics was more productive. In 1928 the California Agriculture Special made stops in twenty-four communities. Despite the apparent popularity of these trains in furthering agricultural knowledge and practices throughout California, it seems that after the first four years of activity, these trains ran only occasionally.¹
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TWO GIANTS OF VITICULTURE:
MAYNARD AMERINE AND HAROLD P. OLMO

William Roberts

MAYNARD AMERINE (1911-1998) AND HAROLD P. OLMO (1909-2006), of the University of California, Davis, were two major figures in laying the foundations of the success of the California grape and wine industry.

The California legislature directed the university to establish a program on all aspects of viticulture and enology in 1880. The university’s College of Agriculture had addressed these topics to a small degree prior to that time, with an emphasis on large plantings without regard for best practices, but economic downturns in the 1870s coupled with the scourge of phylloxera reduced the industry to a sorry state. The university’s new program concentrated largely on diseases and insect control. Later, the advent of prohibition reduced the work in these areas to a minimum. The few functioning wineries produced only sacramental and medicinal wines; although there was a market for grapes for making home wines, economic forces conspired to force the removal of good wine-making grapes, replacing them with inferior thick-skinned grapes, which could also be shipped to eastern markets.¹

With the repeal of prohibition, the program in enology needed revitalization. After a degree in plant science from UC Berkeley, Maynard Amerine was hired at Davis in 1935, beginning a long career dedicated to the improvement of the wine industry in California. At that time there was little understanding of the attributes of various varieties of grapes in regard to wine production and no understanding of the relationship of varieties to the climate in which they might be grown. Amerine’s major contribution was to assess vine varieties for the different climatic regions of California and educate the wine industry to the importance of matching these factors to improve the quality of California wine. After the interruption of World War II, when the grape and wine industries again went into decline, Amerine’s findings began to be put into practice on a large scale.

Amerine was also responsible for broadening the public appeal of wine drinking. He began tasting competitions at the California State Fair and other venues. In addition to his hundreds of technical publications and

bibliographies of writings on wine for enologists, for viticulturists, and for owners and operators of vineyards, he addressed the needs of connoisseurs and the general public with such works as *Wine: An Introduction for Americans* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1966), *Wines, Their Sensory Evaluation* (San Francisco: W. H. Freeman, 1976), and *The University of California Sotheby Book of California Wine* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1984). (All of these produced with co-authors or co-editors.)

Amerine helped document his own activities as well as California’s wines rise to pre-eminence in his two oral histories, *The University of California and the State’s Wine Industry* (1972) and *Wine Bibliographies and Taste Perception Studies* (1988), and he contributed introductions for some fifteen other oral histories with prominent California winemakers.2 Amerine’s combination of practical and theoretical scientific knowledge made him a preeminent member of the Davis faculty that has contributed to the emergence of winemaking standards in California.

Harold P. Olmo joined the Davis faculty in 1938 as assistant professor of viticulture, after a BS degree in horticulture, a PhD degree in genetics from UC Berkeley, and a stint with the university’s Agricultural Experiment Station.

Olmo is hailed as a leading geneticist of his era, introducing some thirty new varieties of both wine and table grapes during his long career. Such popular varieties as Redglobe, Perlette Ruby Seedless, and Ruby Cabernet are results of Olmo’s work. He is also responsible for the large Chardonnay plantings in California; production was minimal as the variety was known for low yields before he began to develop the clones in the 1970s that led to its being the most widely planted white wine grape today.

Olmo traveled extensively searching out varieties unknown in California (and the western world generally); his adventures in such places as Afghanistan, Iran, Pakistan, and India in the late 1940s earned him the sobriquet of the “Indiana Jones of Viticulture.” In the mid-1950s he spent a year in western Australia and is generally credited with giving impetus to the wine industry that evolved in that region. These early exploits are documented in his oral history, *Plant Genetics and New Grape Varieties* (1973).3

In addition to his clonal work, he contributed to the practical work of viticulture in the development of new trellising and mechanical harvesting methods. He established the first grapevine quarantine facility at Davis, allowing growers and other viticulturalists to import foreign vines, and he established a grapevine certification program to insure the reliability of selected plants.

The UC Davis Department of Viticulture has also benefited from Olmo’s work: it has a premier collection of grapevine stock for on-going work, and royalties from most of Olmo’s grape varieties have been donated back to the department, where the endowment is used to assist new faculty and graduate students. The Harold Olmo, 1978. Courtesy of UC Davis News Service.
UC Davis library owns his extensive collection of reports, articles, and field notes on grape growing in California and the UC Davis vineyards.4

The work of these two men, Maynard Amerine, enologist, and Harold Olmo, viticulturist, was critical to the reemergence of the California wine industry in the post-prohibition era and to the rise to the preeminent position that California wines now enjoy throughout the world.

The wine cellar at Davis in 1968 included university vintages dating back to the end of prohibition. The University of California: A Pictorial History, 1968.
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Members of the apprenticeship in ecological horticulture course carry just-harvested buckets of flowers from hand-dug garden area of the UCSC farm. Photograph by Robert Scheld. Courtesy of the Center for Agroecology and Sustainable Food Systems. (CASFS).
GROWING A PROGRAM IN SUSTAINABLE AGRICULTURE
AT UC SANTA CRUZ

Patricia Allen and Martha Brown

A FOOD AND FARMING SYSTEM THAT EXPLOITS neither people nor resources and lasts indefinitely has come to be called “sustainable agriculture.” While this concept is familiar and even supported in many American agricultural universities, it hasn’t always been so. For decades, issues such as soil erosion, exploitive working conditions, pest resistance to pesticides, and small farm viability were brushed aside as the price of progress in the industrialized agrifood system. Few thought about sustainability in agriculture until spikes in petroleum prices during the 1970s caused many to question the energy intensification of industrialized agriculture and its attendant problems.¹ Some twenty years later a government report heralded sustainable agriculture as the fourth major era in agriculture (following the horsepower, mechanical, and chemical eras)—and one that could have more profound effects than those of the previous agricultural revolutions.² This did not mean, of course, that agricultural universities joined a sustainability bandwagon, preferring instead to stick to the tried and true perspectives and technologies.

California, however, was an “early innovator” in the development of sustainable agriculture programs. It was in 1985, at a time when the concept was considered heretical within the agricultural establishment, that the University of California held its first conference on sustainable agriculture. The next year, the California State legislature passed the Sustainable Agriculture Research and Education Act of 1986, directing the Regents of the University of California to establish the Sustainable Agriculture Research and Education Program. This systemwide program is complemented by sustainable agriculture programs at individual campuses of the University of California, the nation’s largest agricultural land-grant university.³

And yet ironically—or perhaps predictably—it was outside the universitywide division of agriculture that the first and most diverse program in sustainable agriculture grew. Based at the University of California, Santa Cruz, the work of the Center for Agroecology and Sustainable Food Systems is wide-ranging, including natural and social science research and multiple teaching and learning approaches. It covers a spectrum that includes research (theoretical and applied), education (practical and academic) and public service (with audiences ranging from local school children to international agencies).

Now, nearly forty years since the center’s beginnings, we are at a turning point in the evolution of sustainable agriculture research and education. Organic agriculture has grown from fragile, “fringe” origins to become a multi-billion dollar business, with companies such as Safeway and Wal-Mart starting their own organic product lines. Universities around the country are responding with new undergraduate, graduate, and research programs in organic farming and sustainable agriculture. Nongovernmental organizations and citizen groups are developing community supported agriculture, farm-to-school programs, and farmers’ markets. In the wake of these developments, this article will look back at the way that UC Santa Cruz has helped drive the changes taking place today and consider the challenges the program faces as interest in sustainability grows, as it tells the story of the program’s metamorphosis from a small student garden to a catalyst for the sustainable agriculture movement both within the University of California system and beyond.⁴
Laying the Groundwork: A Farm and Garden at UC Santa Cruz

Beginning in 1967, long before sustainability became part of the vernacular, students at UC Santa Cruz were practicing organic gardening under the exacting direction of British master gardener Alan Chadwick. Chadwick had been brought aboard at the fledgling campus to start a garden project that would help give students a “sense of place” amidst the chaos of construction at the newest of the University of California campuses.

Chadwick brought with him a blend of gardening practices he called “French intensive biodynamic.” He emphasized a craftsman-like approach to soil care, using compost and other organic fertilizers and eschewing anything synthetic. The methods he espoused—creating double-dug or “raised” beds, placing plants close together to limit weed competition, amending the soil with organic inputs—would eventually become standard practice for many organic gardeners across the United States and around the world.3

Some UC Santa Cruz science faculty objected to Chadwick’s approach and advocated his ouster, calling his practices “unscientific.” But the students who were attracted to the Garden Project found in Chadwick an engaging teacher with a missionary zeal, preaching an earth-friendly approach to gardening that inspired his young charges and many others on the campus and in the community. In a 1997 interview with Jim Nelson, one of Chadwick’s student gardeners, writer Christina Waters noted, “Nelson agrees that Chadwick’s offbeat approach to agriculture—one that fell through prevailing scientific cracks—might have threatened some administrators as much as his popularity with students did. ‘He had a huge following at his lectures,’ recalls Nelson of Chadwick’s spellbinding interweaving of poetry, storytelling and philosophy. ‘He would fill the giant hall of Thimann 3, and even that wasn’t big enough. He had to start giving lectures in the Quarry, so many people from town started attending.’”6

Chadwick’s students formed the core of an informal student “apprenticeship,” laboring alongside him to transform a chaparral-covered slope in what was then the heart of the growing campus into a lush, vibrant organic garden. This apprenticeship approach to teaching—in which instructors worked side-by-side with the students, gradu-
ally giving them increased responsibility—would become a hallmark of the training approach used at UC Santa Cruz.

Inspired by the garden’s success, students lobbied for a larger plot of ground on which to put Chadwick’s organic practices to work. In 1972, seventeen acres on the lower campus were set aside for an organic campus farm. Later expanded to twenty-five acres, the Santa Cruz Farm became a demonstration and teaching site for small- and medium-scale organic farming techniques. Faculty and student involvement in the garden and farm grew in the 1970s with courses in organic horticulture and agriculture offered as “practicums” through the Environmental Studies Department, as well as appropriate technology and natural history classes based at the farm. Students took advantage of opportunities provided by the farm and garden to design thesis projects and learn through independent studies. Students and staff planted orchards, windbreaks, and perennial borders, creating a diversified organic farm on the growing campus. They also designed and constructed buildings and demonstration gardens.9

In 1975, the loosely organized apprenticeship that began under Chadwick’s direction was formalized into a full-time, year-round program offered through UC Santa Cruz Extension. With a dedicated work force, the original Garden Project expanded and the farm grew to include tractor-cultivated row crops, as well as hand-worked garden beds, generating enough produce to support a small direct marketing and wholesale effort.

For many years the farm and garden were supported primarily by student fees and volunteer efforts. Student fees paid the salaries of the farm and garden managers and covered necessary materials. Dedicated community members organized a support group named the “Friends of the Farm & Garden” to assist the students and apprentice course members, provide public education, and raise funds, including enough to construct two buildings. This primarily student-, volunteer-, and staff-run initiative, successful in many ways, nonetheless needed a more solid academic and financial footing in order to thrive in the University of California system.

**Institution Building: The Agroecology Program**

In the early 1980s three forces combined to change the role of the farm and garden within UC Santa Cruz. The first of these was a desire on the part of the campus to add academic content to what was seen as a largely recreational program. The second was declining campus financial support as reduced enrollment and tax cuts shrank the pool of student fees and discretionary funds that had long supported the project. The third was increasing public concern over the environmental and social consequences of the conventional food and agriculture system, and the recognition by the Santa Cruz Environmental Studies Department of the possibilities for wider academic application of farm and garden activities.

To develop this potential, in 1981 the Environmental Studies Department hired plant ecologist Stephen Gliessman. He created the Agroecology Program, which attracted the attention of a philanthropist, Alfred E. Heller. In 1983 Heller funded an endowed chair (the first at UC Santa Cruz) in agroecology, held by Gliessman. His arrival marked the beginning of a formal emphasis in agroecology in the environmental studies curriculum. He developed undergraduate classes and attracted graduate students from the United States and abroad to study agricultural ecology. With no school of agriculture on the campus, the Environmental Studies Department served as the institutional home for agricultural research and education, while the farm and garden offered an organic testing ground for studying agroecosystems. Some of the program’s early research examined such topics as polycultures—planting a diversity of crops—versus conventional monocropping systems to compare the differences
in pest damage and productivity; and allelopathy, the ability of plant species to affect the growth of other plants, as a weed control option. Other projects tested alternatives to synthetic pesticides and fertilizers, including predatory insects to control pests, cover crops to control weeds, and compost to build soil nutrient levels.

As Gliessman explained, “The underlying principle of our work is to understand better the ecological processes of natural ecosystems and apply our findings to what are largely manipulative agricultural systems. There is a tremendous need and opportunity to develop and promote agricultural practices that are environmentally sensible, economically feasible, and socially responsible.” Developing an agricultural system based on those three tenets formed the mission of the Agroecology Program. It was the first University of California project to focus specifically on what would come to be known as “sustainable” agricultural and food systems, and to pursue research, teaching, and outreach in organic production techniques. The program also reflected Gliessman’s ties to and interest in agroecosystems in other countries, particularly in the tropics. He sent graduate students to Mexico and Costa Rica to conduct research on centuries-old farming systems and was invited to teach courses at international universities. Visiting researchers arrived from China, Brazil, and Mexico to work with Gliessman on basic research in agroecology.

While the Agroecology Program was becoming more established academically, its “practical” aspects were on less solid footing. The Environmental Studies Department covered Gliessman’s salary and the endowed chair provided a small amount of research funding, but funds were still needed to continue the operation of the farm and garden programs. Kay Thornley, a student at the time, volunteered to write grants to find funding. Together, Gliess-
man and Thornley developed a vision for a program that would serve both University of California students and a much broader audience composed of farmers, gardeners, and the general public. They were able to secure sufficient grant funding to establish a program that kept the farm and garden apprenticeship and other efforts operating and included a major outreach component of publications and instructional programs for a broad audience.

In 1984 the Agroecology Program hired social scientist Patricia Allen, who initiated some of the nation’s first work on social issues in sustainable agriculture. Allen was connected to small farm and direct marketing projects as a result of her prior position as coordinator of the Small Farm Center at UC Davis. She continued to work with these groups, integrating sustainability into programs and projects from which it had been absent. In order to bring greater attention to the subject of sustainable agriculture, it was Allen who conceptualized and spearheaded the first University of California systemwide conference on agricultural sustainability in 1985. At UC Santa Cruz, she worked with faculty to establish a working-group seminar that focused on special topics in sustainable food systems. Reaching out to an international audience, in 1986 Allen and Gliessman held the first international conference on sustainable agriculture at a University of California campus, marked with the publication of “Global Perspectives on Agroecology and Sustainable Agricultural Systems.” Allen continued to develop social science research and education projects, and consideration of social issues began to be integrated into many of the program’s activities.

As interest in organic production expanded in the 1980s, growers in the area began to look to the Agroecology Program for answers to farming questions that more traditional extension services did not address. Entomologist Sean Swezey was hired in 1989 to develop the Farm Extension Project and began working with other researchers and local, small-scale growers on their farms to analyze the transition of a conventional production system to organic farming practices. “Steve [Gliessman] put together the team to work with local growers because he recognized a need,” says Swezey. “It was the first attempt by the University of California system to formally assist organic growers with coop-extension style services.”

The first of the program’s off-campus efforts focused on strawberries, a major crop of the region. Grower Jim Cochran worked with program members to compare conventionally and organically managed strawberries on land recently cropped in conventional Brussels sprouts. This study of a farming system in transition was the first of what was to become a major feature of the Agroecology Program’s research efforts.

From left, Sean Swezey, Steve Gliessman, Joji Muramoto, Carol Shennan, and Jim Cochran (strawberry grower and research cooperator) at Swanton Berry Farm. Cochran was one of the first growers to collaborate on organic farming research with the Agroecology Program. Photograph by Jennifer McNulty. Courtesy of UC Santa Cruz Public Information Office.
As the research and undergraduate education aspects of the program developed, the already well-established Apprenticeship in Ecological Horticulture grew from a dozen students a year in the early 1980s to thirty annual participants, under the direction of instructors Orin Martin, Olivia Boyce-Abel, Jim Nelson, and Dennis Tamura. The apprenticeship catered to a nontraditional student audience—most already held a bachelor’s degree and were looking for practical skills to apply in a variety of settings.

Unlike most traditional college agronomy programs, the apprenticeship offered a unique blend of classroom and hands-on training that emphasized learning by doing. Students received intensive training in organic soil management, crop planning, greenhouse skills, orchard care, pest and disease control, and small-scale marketing. The apprenticeship was clearly meeting a need for this kind of training since every year it received far more applicants than it could accommodate. Graduates of the program went on to start their own organic farms and gardens, teach in school and community gardens, work in international development programs, and start organic landscaping companies. Some returned to school for advanced degrees; others got in on the ground floor of the organic food industry.

Apprenticeship instructor Nancy Vail teaches harvest skills to members of the 2001 Apprenticeship in Ecological Horticulture course at the UCSC Farm. Photograph by Jon Kersey. Courtesy of UCSC Social Sciences Media Lab.

Despite the extent of its work, the Agroecology Program lacked secure funding until 1985 when the University of California Office of the President provided stable, permanent core funding through a line item in the university budget. Although the systemwide Sustainable Agriculture and Research Education Program (SAREP) was initiated in 1986, the Agroecology Program at UC Santa Cruz retained its importance. A 1989 academic external review extolled the program and stated that it was unique in three ways: 1) it is the only research and education unit at a major research university dedicated to research in agroecol-
ogy; 2) it is the only such program to address the socioeconomic dimensions of agricultural sustainability; and 3) it is independent of the established research traditions of agricultural experiment stations. This review provided an important endorsement of the program’s critical role within the University of California.

Expanding the Framework: The Center for Agroecology and Sustainable Food Systems

By 1990, sustainable agriculture was gaining increased attention as the social and ecological costs of conventional agriculture mounted and the organic food industry expanded. A federal Organic Foods Standards Act was proposed to create a nationally defined standard for organic and a federal list of allowable materials. Little by little, universities began to respond to the interest in sustainability, developing sustainable agriculture programs at many of the nation’s largest land-grant universities.

Although gratified by this growing interest, Allen and Gliessman raised concerns over the direction research efforts were taking under the rubric of “sustainability.” In a 1990 Agroecology Program newsletter article, Gliessman wrote: “Rather than viewing sustainable agriculture as a system that encompasses environmental, social, and economic considerations, many of the efforts now in place have focused solely on substituting one type of farm input or practice for another. A number of new programs have been established around the country, many of which have the word ‘sustainable’ in their title, but most of which suffer from what I call this ‘input-substitution’ narrowness.” Gliessman published his perspective on sustainability in his 1990 book, Agroecology: Researching the Ecological Basis for Sustainable Agriculture.

To address this concern over the narrowing of the definition of sustainability, in 1990 Allen organized a conference, Sustainable Agriculture: Balancing Social, Environmental, and Economic Concerns. She sought to reverse the narrowing trend by broadening the concept to explicitly include important issues of social needs and human welfare. Allen wrote, “A major challenge to implementing sustainability is not only to resolve differences in how the concept is defined and consequently in how its goals and policies of action are structured, but to recognize how social and ethical issues factor into the equation.” In an effort to encourage thinking and discussion about the need to integrate social and environmental issues in sustainability, Allen invited chapters and produced an edited volume, Food for the Future: Conditions and Contradictions of Sustainability, the first book to articulate the social aspects of sustainable agriculture.

While working to incorporate social issues in sustainable agriculture, Agroecology Program members also recognized the urgency of finding environmentally and economically viable ways for growers interested in organic farming to make the transition from conventional management. In order to provide much-needed information to these growers, program researchers initiated a suite of “conversion projects,” building on the work with strawberries they had begun in 1987. The projects teamed Agroecology Program and UC Cooperative Extension entomologists, plant pathologists, soil ecologists, and agricultural economists to study changes in crop yield, pest and disease populations, beneficial organisms, soil fertility, and costs and income as local artichoke, strawberry and apple growers converted their operations from conventional to organic practices. The work eventually expanded to include studies of organic and conventional cotton production in the Central Valley.

A number of factors marked these projects as unique to the Agroecology Program: they examined “whole systems” rather than isolated factors within the farming system; they took place on local farms rather than agricultural experiment stations; they focused on small- and medium-scale growers rather than large, corporate farms; and they included
the growers as integral parts of the research team. According to Sean Swezey, "These relationships [with growers] are now commonplace throughout the land-grant universities across the country. However, that wasn't the situation in the late 1980s—that's one reason the program was unique." The 1990 hiring of Jim Leap—an experienced organic farmer from Fresno—to manage the Santa Cruz Farm also enhanced the program's link to the local farming community.

The program worked with the community in other ways as well. For example, Allen and Deborah Van Dusen developed the Santa Cruz Food Security Project to address food security issues, such as hunger and access to nutritious foods, by teaming with local organizations. Gliessman and environmental studies professor Jim Pepper initiated the Agriculture and Community Program that focused on strategies to preserve farmland and examined farm worker housing issues in Santa Cruz and Monterey counties in an effort to inform policymakers of threats to agricultural sustainability in the region.

Recognizing the Agroecology Program's major role in addressing both environmental and social issues in agriculture, the Kellogg Foundation chose the program as lead agency for the California Alliance for Sustainable Agriculture [CASA]. Led by Gliessman as principal investigator and Allen as steering committee member, this two-million dollar project united a diverse group of university programs and nonprofit organizations to work together with a goal of redirecting agricultural practices and policies onto a more environmentally sound and socially equitable pathway. The consortium's work culminated in CASA's Call to Action, which laid out a series of strategies for promoting sustainable agriculture and food systems.

Acknowledging the interdisciplinary and whole-systems scope of the program's work, beginning in 1989 various review committees and campus leaders recommended that the program's name be changed to reflect its interests in environmental and social aspects of sustainable food and agriculture systems. In 1994, the Agroecology Program was renamed the Center for Agroecology and Sustainable Food Systems. Shortly thereafter, under the direction of Dean William Friedland, the campus decided to invest in the further development of the center by creating a newly funded 50-percent-time director position. This commitment of university funds marked a major contribution by UC Santa Cruz to the center's future.

In 1997 agroecologist Carol Shennan was hired as the center's director and professor of agroecology in the Environmental Studies Department. Shennan brought an interest in agroecosystems and landscape ecology and developed a focus on intersections among agroecology, environment, and community. This approach involves examining landscape-level processes in agroecosystems, such as nutrient cycling and water quality impacts, and the mechanisms needed to implement more ecologically sound production systems without disadvantaging people who have limited power or access to resources. Shennan's experience in working with divergent groups in agricultural landscape management complemented her academic expertise.

The creation in 1995 of the PhD program in Environmental Studies provided graduate students the option to specialize in agroecology and sustainable agriculture. Students also worked with the center through internships or independent studies developed in collaboration with faculty in a variety of campus departments, including Community Studies, Education, Environmental Studies, and Latin American and Latino Studies. Gliessman's 1998 textbook, Agroecology: Ecological Processes in Sustainable Agriculture, and its accompanying lab manual were the first resources for teaching about ecological concepts and principles as they apply to the design and management of sustainable agroecosystems.

Along with serving undergraduate and graduate students, experiential education remained a major part of the center's work through the 1990s. An increasing number of
international apprentices, including students from Asia, Africa, Canada, Europe, Mexico, Israel, Palestine, and Central America, joined participants from our country for the annual apprenticeship training program. Although its focus remained teaching basic organic farming and gardening skills, the apprenticeship evolved to reflect trends in the sustainable agriculture movement. The staff added training in community supported agriculture (CSA)—an innovative marketing approach that connects growers and consumers and is particularly appropriate for small- and medium-scale organic farmers. A series of talks on social issues in sustainable agriculture was also added to the curriculum, as students sought information on social justice aspects of the food system. With more restaurants turning toward specialty crops and organic produce, the program initiated a series of cooking classes to help increase apprentice knowledge of the “farm-to-table” connection.

Expansion of Research and Education Programs

Over the past several years, the Center for Agroecology and Sustainable Food Systems has expanded and deepened its commitment to multidisciplinary research, relevance to the community, and dedication to social justice. Much of this work has been supported by Congressman Sam Farr, who helped obtain U.S. Department of Agriculture funds to expand the reach of the center’s work in California’s Central Coast region. This multiyear funding made possible an ambitious ongoing suite of center research projects to document land use and water quality; examine the effects of alternative production, marketing, and research efforts on both ecological sustainability and social conditions for growers and consumers; and identify barriers to the development of a healthier Central Coast food system, both ecologically and socially.

In addition to expanding empirical social science research on campus, the Farr funding also enabled social science staff to expand efforts to reach beyond the university. For example, Allen and assistant professor of Community Studies Julie Guthman, along with the California Sustainable Agriculture Working Group and the California Food and Justice Coalition, initiated the Activist Researcher Consortium as a way for activists and researchers to share ideas and collaborate on projects focused on the social issues of sustainable food systems. Locally, center staff and students helped develop a Santa Cruz County Food Forum and worked with students in their efforts to bring local, organic, socially just food to campus dining halls. An active participant in both university and nongovernmental efforts in sustainable food systems for many years, Allen collaborated with environmental studies professor Margaret FitzSimmons on a study of programs and priorities of alternative agrifood institutions in California in 2003, and in 2004 published an analysis of alternative agrifood movements and programs nationwide, *Together at the Table: Sustainability and Sustenance in the American Agrifood System.*20

Patricia Allen’s 2005 book analyzes the work of alternative agrifood movements in the United States *Courtesy of Penn State University Press.*
The center continues its commitment to local growers. For example, Marc Los Huertos was hired in 1999 to conduct water quality monitoring research, measuring nitrogen and phosphorus levels in rivers, streams, and irrigation ditches to determine the effects of farming practices on water quality, with the goal of helping growers manage nutrients in their farming systems to reduce runoff from agricultural fields. Directed by Shennan, this landscape-oriented approach to addressing sustainable agriculture questions has led to collaborations with faculty in the Department of Earth Sciences and has garnered additional grant funds from the State Water Quality Control Board to increase work with local growers.

Efforts to help organic growers received a boost in 2004 as Gliessman, Shennan, and researcher Joji Muramoto were awarded a competitive grant from the U.S. Department of Agriculture to fund on-farm research projects in Santa Cruz and Monterey counties designed to improve organic production techniques while protecting natural resources. Commenting on the grant, Shennan noted, “Organic farmers face the same production challenges as conventional growers, but the research community has overlooked their needs. With one of the oldest university-based organic research and training programs in the world and one of the pioneering academic programs in agroecology, UCSC is in a good position to help fill in the gaps of scientific knowledge.”

In response to requests for training materials from college farms and other education programs that had long recognized the apprenticeship as a model for teaching organic production skills, in 1999 instructors took up the challenge of putting the program’s more than thirty-five years of training experience down on paper. Center staff members coordinated by Albie Miles and Ann Lindsey teamed with seven invited authors to document the curriculum of the six-month training program. The result was the training manual Teaching Organic Farming and Gardening: Resources for Instructors (2002). Miles also headed an effort to develop an online sustainable agriculture curriculum for California’s post-secondary schools, now available on the center’s website.

The efforts of center staff and faculty over the years had collectively produced a University of California program of high academic standing as well one that is valued by growers, gardeners, nonprofit organizations, children, and others. The most recent (1999) academic external review of the center found that it was a unique resource and one of the most renowned sustainable agriculture programs, both domestically and internationally. The reviewers credited the social science dimension of the center for providing much of its “national and international reputation and appeal,” and called the Center for Agroecology and Sustainable Food Systems the University of California’s “most accomplished sustainable agriculture program in terms of instruction, research, and outreach.”
Moving into the Future

As the center moves into the next era, it will continue to focus on cutting-edge research, education, and public-service programs. For example, it is conducting basic and applied research on ways to conserve nutrients on organic farms, minimize the impacts of farming on surrounding ecosystems, and manage pests and diseases with organically acceptable techniques. It is at the forefront of research on social issues in the agrifood system, with current fields of study including perceptions of and priorities for social justice in the agrifood system, farm-to-institution programs, food-system localization efforts, gender issues in agrifood systems, priorities and pedagogies in sustainable agriculture education, and consumer interests and preferences. The center plays a lead role in the evolving field of farm-to-college programs, with staff working to spread the model of locally sourced organic food for campus institutions—combined with sustainable food system education—throughout the University of California system and beyond. Building on nearly four decades of training organic farmers and gardeners, center members continue to develop and improve education programs that offer students and apprentices experiential training combined with classroom work and to share these programs with educators nationwide.

As the Center for Agroecology and Sustainable Food Systems continues to move forward, however, new realities require shifting some of its focus and abilities. Most importantly, the California state budget situation has meant substantial cuts to the center’s budget. The result has been the elimination or significant reduction of some programs and an amplified search for extramural funding. Extramural funding is only available for certain kinds of activities, which means that its priorities will be inevitably shaped more by the priorities of funders than by the mission and priorities of the center itself.

A second factor in reshaping the center’s priorities has been the increased legitimacy of sustainable agriculture in university programs nationwide. Where once UC Santa Cruz stood virtually alone in pursuing the study of agroecology and sustainable food systems, now land-grant universities such as Ohio State, Iowa State, and North Carolina State have developed large research farms and programs focused on organic and sustainable agriculture. Each of these campuses can bring far greater resources in terms of staff, faculty, students,
facilities, and equipment than will ever be possible at UC Santa Cruz, which does not have access to university land-grant resources. Accordingly, the center needs to complement, rather than duplicate, the work of these new efforts and focus on the areas in which it can make unique contributions. As it adapts its programs, however, the center’s mission remains holistic, interdisciplinary, and progressive: to research, develop, and advance sustainable food and agricultural systems that are environmentally sound, economically viable, socially responsible, and nonexploitive, and that serve as a foundation for future generations.

Web Resources

Agrifood Studies Working Group:
http://www2.ucsc.edu/cgiirs/research/environment/afsrg/index.html

Agroecology:
www.agroecology.org

Center for Agroecology and Sustainable Food Systems:
www.ucsc.edu/casfs

Community and Agroecology Network:
www.communityagroecology.net

Environmental Studies at UCSC:
http://envs.ucsc.edu/

Life Lab Science Program:
www.lifelab.org

Program in Community and Agroecology:
http://envs.ucsc.edu/undergraduate/pica_brochure.pdf

ENDNOTES


3 At UC Berkeley, the Center for Sustainable Resource Development conducts research in natural resource management, integrated pest control, and global sustainable management strategies; the Center for Biological Control conducts research and offers classes in pest management and biocontrol; and the Department of Environmental Science, Policy and Management, Division of Insect Biology offers graduate research, courses, and international short courses in the United States and Latin America in agroecology, biological control, and sustainable agriculture. UC Davis’s College of Agricultural and Environmental Sciences houses the Department of Agronomy and Range Science, which offers research and classes on sustainable agriculture as well as a specialization in sustainable production practices. The UC Davis Student Experimental Farm offers research and practical education on sustainable agriculture and organic gardening.

4 Space limits have forced us to omit mention of many of the people and activities that were integral to the development of the UCSC Farm & Garden, the Agroecology Program, and the Center for Agroecology & Sustainable Food Systems. Our apologies to those who are not mentioned by name.
For a more detailed history of the Garden Project, see Martha Brown, “The Farm and Garden Projects at the University of California, Santa Cruz,” *Chronicle of the University of California*, 3 (Spring 2000), 29-41.


Later additions to the farm facility have included a laboratory, classroom, greenhouses, offices, and most recently, a soil and plant facility.


Sean Swezey, personal communication, September 2005.


The work on apples eventually expanded to central and northern California, leading to the university's first major organic production publication, *Organic Apple Production Manual*, edited by Sean Swezey, Paul Vossen, Janet Caprile, and Walt Bentley, and published by the University of California Division of Agriculture and Natural Resources in 2000.

Swezey, personal communication, September 2005.

*Call to Action* (Santa Cruz, CA: California Alliance for Sustainable Agriculture, 1996).

In his role as professor of Environmental Studies at UCSC, founding director Gliessman continues to lead a dynamic program in agroecological research, education, and outreach. He has initiated two new efforts, the Community Agroecology Network and the Program in Community and Agroecology; see Resources for more information.


Albie Miles and Martha Brown, *Teaching Organic Farming and Gardening: Resources for Instructors* (Santa Cruz, CA: Center for Agroecology & Sustainable Food Systems, 2002).
PART TWO

CALIFORNIA CUISINE

A Recipe for Western Mono Manzanita Cider

Manzanita berries were pulverized and a cider made by allowing water to percolate through the mass.

In gathering manzanita berries the ground beneath the bushes was cleaned with a flat stick and a brush of straight twigs. The berries were beaten off the bushes with a long stick, swept together with the brush, winnowed, and placed in burden baskets.

In pulverizing manzanita berries the fine meal was winnowed from the coarse, allowed to fall on the rock, swept into the mortar hole with the soaproot brush, and deftly removed with the fingers.

In making manzanita cider the meal was moistened thoroughly in a large deep coiled basket, then piled high in a small openwork winnowing basket, which was set on two sticks over a watertight basket. The meal was carefully patted and shaped into a smooth, high, rounded cone. The water to percolate through the meal was poured slowly from a small basket into the hand and allowed to trickle from the little finger onto the pile of meal.

The cider collected in the basket below was drunk fresh.

TODAY, ONE CANNOT DISCUSS FOOD IN CALIFORNIA without thinking of “California cuisine,” popularized by chef Alice Waters and her Berkeley restaurant, Chez Panisse. This culinary style calls for fresh and local ingredients, cooked with minimal preparations. Yet, ironically, its dominant models are derived not from California itself but from Mediterranean Europe, which has a similar climate. What, however, of the original California cuisine, the foods eaten by the aboriginal inhabitants of the state before Euro-American settlement? In fact, for over a century anthropologists at the University of California have endeavored to document and analyze this culinary world.¹

Diversity, both natural and cultural, has long been the dominant feature of Native California.² In fact, what is now the state of California was not a natural Native region. Along its borders—to the north, east, and south—lived populations whose cultural centers lay outside the state. Only in the central region, the great interior river valleys to the coast, lived societies with a distinctive Californian lifestyle. This geographical diversity was mirrored in a cultural and linguistic variation. At contact, there were at least one hundred

distinct ethnic groups, numbering more than 310,000 individuals, the most densely settled region on the continent. While communities were usually small, they ranged in scale from fifty to five hundred people; and while generally egalitarian, some were stratified into rich and poor, noble and commoner. Nor have these cultures remained static during their more than 13,000 years in the region. For instance, the common staple of acorns was not widely exploited until 4,000 to 1,000 years ago, depending on the area.\(^3\)

Parallelung this cultural diversity was a culinary one. While the acorn was something of a regional staple, it did not play the same role as the buffalo on the Plains or corn in the Southwest. Foods taken from the natural world will clearly vary as the environment changes—from dry southern deserts to dense northern forests. Native cultures in what is now the state of California may be grouped into three regions with centers outside the state—the Northwest, the Great Basin, and the Southwest—leaving central California as a unique area. These four regions also have corresponding gastronomic bases: salmon in the Northwest, pine nuts in the Basin, desert and domesticated plants in the Southwest, and acorns and seeds in central California.\(^4\)

Because of its fundamental and holistic nature, food has long been a critical subject of anthropological study. Simultaneously natural and cultural, it unites the physical/biological side of humans with the social/symbolic aspects. Food has remained at the center of anthropological study of the aboriginal peoples of the region. This essay traces the subject of California Indian food as studied by anthropologists at the University of California—primarily at Berkeley but also at other campuses—since the founding of the department and museum of anthropology in 1901.\(^5\)

**First Impressions (1850–1901): Before Alfred Kroeber**

Our first descriptions of California Indian foods by non-Indian writers are stray comments in accounts by explorers and other travelers, followed by those of settlers. During the mission period, there was a conscious effort to change the food habits of the Native population, but this paled in the face of the more massive trauma that followed in the wake of the Gold Rush. Almost without exception, during this initial period when observers described Native Californians’ food habits, it was to castigate them, finding yet one more reason to marginalize Indians as uncivilized.

Food, a basic cultural expression, was naturally at the heart of American settlers’ views of Native Californians. As a mode of subsistence, farming was commonly believed to be inherently superior to hunting and gathering, and Natives were derogatorily referred to as “Diggers,” for their customs of digging for roots and bulbs. For instance, T. Butler King, in his official report on conditions in California in 1850, described the state’s Indians as “the lowest grade of human beings. They live chiefly on acorns, roots, insects, and the kernel of the pine burr; occasionally they catch fish and game. They use the bow and arrow, but are said to be too lazy and effeminate to make successful hunters. They do not appear to have the slightest inclination to cultivate the soil, nor do they attempt it.”\(^6\) To many settlers,
Native Californians were little more than animals, obtaining whatever was available. According to the *San Francisco Bulletin* of 1857, they fed “on roots, snakes and insects, and on the grasses of the fields like beasts.” The animal comparison was underlined by accounts of hunters eating blood and innards; when whites sampled such staples as acorn mush or bread, they found them uniformly unpalatable. In fact, Native peoples were skilled hunters and gatherers who carefully cultivated wild plants and animal resources, and some, in the south, were indeed farmers. Still, compared to Anglo-Americans, they did consume a wider variety of foods and ate foods that the new settlers did not. Attitudes toward foods thus became part of the ammunition used to suppress and exterminate the Native populations of the state.\(^9\)

The situation changed in 1877 when Stephen Powers, a journalist sponsored by the Smithsonian Institution, published the first systematic commentary on Native Californian cultures. A pioneer in what he called “aboriginal botany,” Powers frequently supplied good, basic descriptions of culinary practices. For instance,

> It is surprisingly what a number of roots, leaves, berries, and nuts, the squaw will discover. She will go out in the spring with nothing but a fire-hardened stick, and in an hour she will pick a breakfast of green stuff, into which there may enter fifteen or twenty ingredients. Her eye will be arrested by a minute plant that will yield her only a bulbous root as large as a large pea, but which the American would have passed unnoticed.\(^9\)

Around the same time, Native Californians were being described by historian and author Hubert H. Bancroft. Although based more on compilation and less on observation, Bancroft’s several volumes on Native peoples summarized much of what had been written about them up to that point.\(^10\)

During the last quarter of the nineteenth century, American anthropology became a professional discipline, centered at the Smithsonian’s Bureau of American Ethnology (beginning in 1879) and Harvard’s Peabody Museum (from 1866). Frederic W. Putnam at Harvard, who would also become the first director of Berkeley’s anthropology museum, conducted field research on the state’s ancient cultures during the federal survey led by George Wheeler, 1876–78. By the end of the century, anthropologists were beginning to systematize what was then known about Native American cultures. Using cultural comparisons, these scholars tried to delineate the continent’s basic cultural regions. Food, which they considered under the category of “subsistence,” was one of the critical criteria for the classification of peoples. In a materialist era, the tangible—if not indeed edible—was naturally of great concern to scholars. Faced with the problems of classifying diverse artifacts, American museum anthropologists of the time—for example, Otis T. Mason at the Smithsonian and Clark Wissler of the American Museum of Natural History—divided the continent into regions such as the salmon area, maize area, bison area, and the like. When considering foods, Mason characterized California and the rest of the Pacific Coast as a fish and nut region.\(^11\)

With the exception of scattered observations, the Powers volume, and Mason’s brief remarks, the study of California Indian food essentially did not exist before 1901. At the University of California (founded in 1868), there was no place for it in the curriculum. The College of Agriculture did not consider the subject because Native peoples of the state were thought, mistakenly, to lack farming; the biologists and geologists who did field research in the state did not consider humans; and the historians saw no evidence of written history among the Indians.\(^12\) A new discipline was required.
The Foundation (1901–1925): Alfred Kroeber’s Survey of California Indians

The scholarly study of Native food customs in California had to await the establishment of a department of anthropology, founded by patron Phoebe A. Hearst in September of 1901. This area of research became the specialty of the department’s first professor and curator, Alfred L. Kroeber (1876–1960). Kroeber had been trained by famed anthropologist Franz Boas at Columbia, where he obtained his doctorate in 1901. One needs to remember here that 1901 was quite early for the teaching of anthropology anywhere in America.13 Berkeley had the first department west of Chicago; its only predecessors being Harvard, Pennsylvania, Columbia, and Chicago—all of which had begun only in the 1890s.

As anthropology professor until his retirement in 1946, Alfred Kroeber came to define and then dominate the study of California Indians. Because so little was known, he set out to systematically document and describe the region’s Native cultures. Kroeber’s own field research focused on the Yurok of the Klamath River region, but he also conducted important studies among the Mohave, Pomo, and Yokuts. In 1903 this work was formally organized as the Ethnological and Archaeological Survey of California. This project drew upon the efforts of several generations of graduate students. Among the first group of students and colleagues were Pliny E. Goddard, who taught along with Kroeber until 1909; Samuel A. Barrett, the department’s first doctorate in 1908; and Edward W. Gifford, who joined the university museum in 1911.

In the face of what was widely believed to be an inevitable extinction—culturally, if not physically—Kroeber defined his basic mission as cultural documentation and salvage. The department’s anthropologists were motivated by their desire to produce a baseline description of Native customs before western contact. To overcome their lack of written documents, Kroeber and his colleagues created their own: artifact collections, sound recordings, photographs, written observations of behavior, and oral history testimony. Another clue to the
past was the present distribution of cultural traits, and throughout his life Kroeber focused on geographical issues of mapping and regional delineations.

Their productions were very descriptive, but in its time such an approach represented a radical departure from existing scholarship. As we have seen, until Kroeber there had been no serious scholarly attention to Native California. More importantly, these anthropologists were motivated by an ethic of cultural relativism. They treated Native cultures as inherently complex and sophisticated, as deserving of respect and scholarly attention as the achievements of the ancient Greeks or Shakespeare.

By 1910 Kroeber had completed the bulk of his fieldwork on California Indians, and by 1917 he had essentially finished his manuscript for the *Handbook of the Indians of California* (1925). This summary volume became the definitive overview of the state's Native cultures. It was structured by tribe, with several concluding regional and comparative generalizations.

Naturally, the foods and food practices of the California Indians were dominant topics of this research project. On the one hand, Kroeber carefully described specific tribal customs. For example, among the Yurok, he noted: "The old custom was to eat only two meals a day and theory made these sparing. Only a poor fellow without control would glut himself, and such a man would always be thriftless. Most men at least attempted to do their day's labor, or much of it, before breakfast, which came late. . . . The evening meal came toward sunset." On the other, he sought to make regional generalizations: "Plants appear to have furnished a larger part of the diet than animals in almost all parts of California. Fish and shellfish were probably consumed in larger quantities than flesh in regions stocked with them. . . . Of game, the rodents, from jack rabbits to gophers, together with birds, evidently furnished more food the seasons through than deer and other ruminants." 15

While the University of California was at the center of this research, it was not alone. Kroeber had both collaborators and competitors. Among the former were independent scholars such as Philip S. Sparkman, shopkeeper and student of the Luiseño, and anthropologist (and later president of the University) David P. Barrows, who researched the Cahuilla. The university also made use of the research and collections of Roland B. Dixon, sponsored by the American Museum of Natural History, who did fieldwork among the Maidu and Shasta in the northern part of the state.

Kroeber’s competitors were associated with Chicago and Washington. Among these were Dr. John W. Hudson, a retired physician turned independent collector and scholar. At first, Hudson studied the Pomo, who lived around his home in Ukiah, Alfred and Theodora Kroeber, at their cabin, Sigonoy, near Orick, Humboldt County. Photographer unknown, 1931. HMA.
Mendocino County, but between 1900 and 1905, he conducted field research and collected throughout the state, funded by the Field Columbian Museum of Chicago. Another leading Californianist was C. Hart Merriam of the U.S. Biological Survey and later the Smithsonian. Although trained as a naturalist, he became increasingly interested in Native peoples of California and spent the last years of his life in Berkeley. Kroeber had problems with the idiosyncratic linguist John P. Harrington, of the Smithsonian's Bureau of American Ethnology. Geographically, Harrington emphasized California's coastal peoples, such as the Ohlone (Costanoan) living around the San Francisco Bay area, and the Chumash, residents of the Santa Barbara region. All three of these scholars compiled a great deal of information on California Indian food, but for varying reasons, none of them were as effective as Kroeber in publishing their research. Consequently they had relatively little influence on the study of the subject until their archives were made available in recent years.

Kroeber's California research was part of a broader investigation of Native American food customs. The comparative approach, popular in the late nineteenth century, was soon superseded by the intensive study of individual cultures, but food remained at the center of investigation for many researchers. Among the classics of early culinary anthropology were Frank Hamilton Cushing's 1885 study of Zuni corn and the collection of Kwakiutl recipes published by Franz Boas and George Hunt in 1921. Due to Kroeber's fundamentally comparative interests, however, until recent times Californian food was never documented in such an intensive study.

**Mapping and Monographs (1925–1935): Alfred Kroeber's Second Survey**

In the mid-1920s and 1930s, Kroeber sent out a second generation of students to research Native Californian cultures. Students such as Anna Gayton, Cora Du Bois, Julian Steward, and Philip Drucker were part of the Culture Element Distribution Survey, an attempt to comprehensively map Native cultures of western North America. Working under the stimulus of statistics and mathematical modeling, Kroeber instructed his students to note the existence or absence of discrete cultural traits, reported as pluses and minuses, and published in the *Anthropological Records* series. One problem with this methodology, noted by the students themselves, was that such an atomistic approach ignored the systematic holism of Native cultures. A list of traits could not capture how the different aspects of a culture were related to each other, nor what they meant to their subjects.

Yet the field work generated a great deal of new data, with reports from many groups not previously contacted by Kroeber and his first generation of graduate students, or in more depth for those, such as the Pomo, that had been. At the same time, however, most students also compiled more discursive tribal ethnographies, which naturally highlighted food. Although treated most fully under headings of “food” or “hunting” and “plant gathering,” the topic of food was also spread throughout these cultural accounts; for instance, birth and puberty food taboos were considered under the “life cycle.”

In striving for comprehensive documentation, Alfred Kroeber and his students have given us our best descriptions of California Indian food, but there is much they did not consider, especially in regard to cooking and eating behavior. One of the principal reasons is that so many of them were doing salvage or memory ethnography. That is, they were interviewing people, especially elders, about customs from former times instead of observing and talking about current practices. Some important traditional food practices did survive during the first half of the twentieth century and could be observed, as, for example, in Barrett and Gifford's 1933 account of Sierra Miwok acorn processing. In general, however, Native food systems had substantially changed since contact, and most anthropologists did
not want to describe such creole, or mixed, customs.

Another limiting factor is that many of the Berkeley students in the 1930s were in the field for only a few months over the course of one or two summers. One of the exceptions, Cora Du Bois, who was assisted by linguist Dorothy Dernetrocopoulou, spent many months among the Wintu over several years between 1928 and 1932. Du Bois attempted to produce more social descriptions of actual food behaviors and customs. For instance, in describing the cooking of acorn bread, she wrote (in the telegraphic style of the survey): “For baking, large center pit dug with series of smaller ones around it. Batter allowed to bake all night. One woman appointed to remove bread (sau) in the morning. All gathered then with much merrymaking and hilarity except on part of baker. The bread black in color; its darkness a measure of its palatability. Successful cook requested to bake at dances or meets, a mark of distinction in which women took pride.” The example of Du Bois, who did some of the best culinary ethnography, also calls attention to the predominance of male ethnographers, who tended to interview men. Because women did the great bulk of the collecting and processing of plant foods and most of the cooking, much information went unrecorded.

As he moved beyond cultural presences and absences, Kroeber began in the 1930s to consider more deeply the relation of culture to geography and the environment. In this, he was stimulated by his conversations with Carl Sauer, Berkeley geography professor from 1923 to 1957. In turn, Kroeber’s example encouraged students such as Anna Gayton and Julian Steward to analyze how social organization might be functionally related to environmental factors.

As Kroeber’s career lengthened, however, his approach to culture came to seem more old-fashioned. In this period, from about 1925 to 1945, anthropology was adopting a more integrative approach. In the British tradition, food was important in the functionalist studies of Bronislaw Malinowski in the Trobriand Islands of the South Pacific and his student Audrey Richards among the Bemba of East Africa. In America, the so-called “culture and personality” school, which followed during the 1930s and 1940s, focused on how attitudes
toward food were developed in particular cultures and how food affected people’s social and psychological relations. These methods were predicated on observation of cultural practices. While that would have been possible in Native California, because Kroeber and his colleagues defined authentic culture as occurring only in the pre-contact past, different concerns and different methodology were employed.

The Discovery of History (1947–1960): Robert Heizer and Sherburne Cook

After Kroeber’s retirement in 1946, the study of California Indian cultures, including their cuisines, was carried on at the university by archaeologist Robert F. Heizer (1915–79) and his colleague Sherburne F. Cook (1896–1974), a physiologist turned demographer. Both men focused on the ecological aspects of the subject, and both made important contributions to ethnohistory.

A Berkeley graduate (PhD, 1941), Robert Heizer sought to develop areas neglected by his mentor, most especially the accumulation of a systematic regional collection of archaeology. From 1948 through 1960, he directed the University of California Archaeological Survey, which vastly expanded the anthropology museum’s collections from prehistoric California and Nevada. Much of the work was salvage, stimulated by the state’s rapid population growth and subsequent land development. Beyond accumulating collections, Heizer’s main goal was to establish a basic description of the aboriginal cultures of Californian prehistory. In his later life Heizer became an ethnohistorian, using written and visual sources to reconstruct the history of California Indian peoples following white contact. For instance, he spent a great deal of time editing C. Hart Merriam’s ethnographic papers, which had been donated to the anthropology department in 1950.23 And it was Heizer who firmly established the extent of the systematic genocide of the nineteenth century, which has become the foundation for all subsequent work in this area.24 In the wake of the Second World War, this became a resonant theme. While Kroeber was certainly familiar with at least some of these facts, he chose to ignore them.25

These historical themes were picked up by Heizer’s friend and colleague Sherburne Cook, who focused on demography and population trends. Cook had studied history before shifting to biology, and soon after obtaining his PhD in physiology from Harvard, he joined the physiology department at UC Berkeley, where he taught from 1928 until 1966. While noted for his research on cell biology and vitamins, Cook had a parallel career as an ethnohistorian. At Berkeley, he collaborated with anthropologists Robert Heizer and Alfred Kroeber, geographer Carl Sauer, and Latin American historians Leslie Byrd Simpson and Woodrow Borah. His later work was profoundly interdisciplinary, and he made important contributions to archaeological methods, the estimation of aboriginal Native populations, the determination of diet from chemical residues in bones, and the study of post-contact changes in Native health. His innovative use of sources included mission records, censuses, newspapers, and manuscripts in the Bancroft Library at UC Berkeley. Until Cook’s research, most anthropologists avoided such archival analysis in favor of reconstructions of aboriginal cultures based on oral testimony.

In his 1941 study, The Mechanism and Extent of Dietary Adaptation Among Certain Groups of California and Nevada Indians, Sherburne Cook produced the best single description of how Native Californians changed their eating habits in the years following their contact with Euro-Americans. Applying a rigorously scientific method to his documentation, Cook considered both the “factors governing the availability of white food” and the “factors governing the availability of Indian food.” He dealt also with the problem of taste and the role of social factors. His finding, for example, that an aboriginal diet had endured longest among the
more rural, poorer, less educated, and older population has remained a valid generalization, as has his note that the old ways have been retained for use in ceremonies.\textsuperscript{26}

Overall, however, these postwar years witnessed the gradual but substantial decline in the study of food and cuisines in anthropology. With the expansion of the discipline, anthropologists moved to other concerns, such as peasant societies, and political and economic systems. One could imagine the continuing relevance of food for such research, but it was not to be. One reason perhaps, as Sidney Mintz has argued, is that in the small-scale societies studied by anthropologists, most of the production and preparation of food was performed by women and most of the early investigators were men.\textsuperscript{27} Even female scholars were reluctant to study the subject out of fear of not being taken seriously.

**Cultural Survivals and Reconstruction (1960–1965): Theodora Kroeber and Samuel Barrett**

Despite this discovery of history by Heizer and Cook, just as Alfred Kroeber died, in 1960, his earlier ahistorical work was revived and extended by two of his close associates—his wife, Theodora, and his first doctoral student, Samuel Barrett.

In 1961, Mrs. Kroeber published *Ishi in Two Worlds*, a best-selling volume that recounted the story of Ishi (ca. 1860–1916), the last Yahi Indian and apparently the last Native Californian to live his life essentially outside of western culture.\textsuperscript{28} Having finally lost his family, in 1911 Ishi wandered into the town of Oroville. For the last five years of his life, he resided at the university anthropology museum in San Francisco. In telling his story, Theodora Kroeber was encouraged by Robert Heizer, who had compiled many of the original archival and
out-of-print sources. Like Heizer but unlike her husband, Theodora Kroeber acknowledged the genocide of Californian Indian peoples. At the same time, however, her complex work combined direct archival sources for the period between 1911 and 1916 with imagination and historical reconstruction for Ishi's previous life.

This mixed style applied to her discussion of Ishi's food. While she was able to draw on contemporary accounts of the changed diet Ishi adopted during his life at the museum, she had to resort to ethnographic reconstruction in order for her readers to get a sense of what Ishi's life was like before he was discovered. In this she was anticipated by her husband, whose photos she included in her book. In 1914, Alfred Kroeber and a party of his colleagues took Ishi on a trip back to his homeland in Deer Creek, Tehama County. A highlight of the trip was the production of about 150 photographs in which Ishi, stripped to a loincloth, acted out his former lifeways. Along with staged fishing and rabbit hunting was a dramatic sequence of deer butchering. It appears that Ishi has killed the animal with his bow and arrow, but an account by his friend, the physician Saxton Pope, reveals that on this trip, Ishi was unsuccessful with his bow and arrow. The deer must have been shot with a rifle so that Ishi could then be photographed removing an arrow from the deer's side before proceeding with the skinning and butchering. There is a long tradition of such posing and staging in ethnographic photography—Edward S. Curtis being perhaps the most famous instance—but it is usually not perceived until years later.

Samuel Barrett, who adopted similar methods in his film work, was even more reactionary. In the 1950s, Barrett had returned to his alma mater to direct a massive film project for the Lowie (now Hearst) Museum (ca. 1957–65), which extensively recorded California Indian food customs. The four food-related films by the American Indian film project

Staged photo of Ishi pulling an arrow from a deer. Photograph by Alfred L. Kroeber; Mill Creek area, Tehama County; May 1914. Published by Theodora Kroeber in Ishi in Two Worlds. HMA 15–5706.

Like Theodora Kroeber with Ishi, Barrett resorted to cultural reconstruction to depict Native customs. While some traditional food practices were still current, they were becoming more and more circumscribed. Barrett brought out old baskets from the museum for his main actor, Kashaya Pomo Essie Parrish, to use in her acorn processing and cooking, insisting that only the old ways be documented. In one of the films (*Beautiful Tree*), however, there is a concluding depiction of contemporary food practices: grinding acorns with a meat grinder, using a sink and metal pails. This was the exception that proved the rule, as the filming of this innovative practice was due to the insistence of David W. Peri, a Bodega Coast Miwok anthropology student who worked as a production assistant.33

Although seemingly independent, the projects of Theodora Kroeber and Barrett actually shared many important features. Both were rooted in the early thought of Alfred Kroeber; they knew him intimately and were bound by his view of cultural authenticity and survivors. According to this position, Indians were only authentic in their state before western contact. The paradox was that since they could not know this state directly, they had to reconstruct it by various means, visual as well as verbal. For both, this action was justified by their popularizing mission. They were seeking to make anthropological scholarship accessible—and literally, sensible—to a broad public.


In the decade following the death of Alfred Kroeber, the study of California Indians—
cluding their food—began to change in several important ways. First, the field moved largely from the anthropological subdiscipline of ethnography, based on observation and interviews, to archaeology, based on excavation. More importantly, like much of the larger discipline of anthropology, there was a substantial shift from a Boasian tradition of cultural description to a new emphasis on cross-cultural comparison and explicit theoretical analysis. In the Californianist realm, this took the form of a concern with ecological adaptation. Underlying these trends was an institutional shift of the study of California Indians to other University of California campuses, most notably UCLA and UC Davis.

At UC Berkeley, the department lacked a Californianist ethnographer following the death of Edward Gifford in 1959. During these years, with the gradual cessation of his archaeological excavations, Robert Heizer increasingly focused on his ethnohistorical research, and until his death in 1979 guided all students interested in California Indians.\textsuperscript{34} The next ethnologist to research Native Californians was William S. Simmons, who taught from 1967 through 1998. Although trained as an Africanist, during the 1980s Simmons began to focus most of his research on California Indians, especially along ethnohistorical lines. None of this, however, was directly on food, and no Californian ethnologist has since replaced him.\textsuperscript{35}

There is no clear explanation for this decline in Californianist ethnography, but several factors suggest themselves. On the one hand, many anthropologists believed that acculturated Indians had lost most of the cultural features that had made them distinct. At the same time, the rise of the civil rights and Red Power movements led Native communities throughout North America to oppose the anthropological control of their representation. One anthropological response to this new situation was a shift from participant-observation in contemporary Indian communities to historical reconstruction, an approach pioneered by Robert Heizer. Scholars began to mine the extensive field materials of C. Hart Merriam

and John P. Harrington, as well as that of Kroeber. At the same time, archaeology was going through its own challenges. Marked perhaps by the formal end of the University of California Archaeological Survey in 1960, there was a gradual decline in university-sponsored research in favor of research carried out by contract archaeologists, funded by governmental agencies and construction projects.

The theoretical thrust of much of this Californianist research, in both ethnology and archaeology, was toward human ecology. Such a perspective was natural, coming in an era that witnessed a growing sense of environmental crisis, eloquently described by authors such as Rachel Carson, Stewart Udall, and David Brower. And, as Bean and Blackburn observe, interest in the environment had been stimulated by the extensive anthropological research of the 1950s relating to the settlement of Native land claims; this dealt largely with questions of aboriginal territories, land use, and population. For the most part, this activity was centered outside of Berkeley, although it was stimulated by the work that Berkeley graduate Julian Steward had conducted in the Great Basin while a postdoctoral fellow at the university from 1933 to 1936.

In ethnology, this ecological approach was developed by Lowell J. Bean (b. 1931), currently the senior scholar in California Indian studies. Trained at UCLA, Bean was awarded his anthropology doctorate in 1970 for a dissertation on "Cahuilla Indian Cultural Ecology." For most of his professional career (1966–92), he taught at California State University-Hayward, where he is now professor emeritus of anthropology. Bean has worked principally with the Cahuilla of southern California, since 1958, but he has also done field work among the Pomo, Luiseño, and Serrano. In addition to interests in social organization and religion, he has published much on ethnobotany and cultural ecology. Bean's Temalpakh (From the Earth), which he wrote in collaboration with Cahuilla elder Katherine Siva Saubel, is an exhaustive account of how one people classify and make use of their plant world. Bean was also one of the pioneers in considering the role of human-set fires in increasing local plant yields.

At the same time that interest in California Indians declined at Berkeley, it expanded at other University of California campuses. To some extent, this merely followed the gradual establishment of anthropology departments throughout the system, including Davis (1962), Riverside (1963), Los Angeles (1964), Santa Barbara (1964), San Diego (1968), and Santa Cruz (1968). In many of these schools, anthropology classes had been taught for a while, often in combined social science departments, before becoming independent programs. But to a great extent, these additions also reflected the national expansion of the discipline of anthropology during the 1960s, appealing as it did to the maturing baby-boom generation.

In many ways, the campus with the most active current interest in Native Californians is Davis. At Davis, as in most of the university's anthropology departments, the only professors who concentrated on California Indians were archaeologists. Although its first professor—and the first UC Davis anthropologist to work in California—was a linguist, David L. Olmsted, he was soon joined by archaeologist Martin Baumhoff in 1957. In fact, Baumhoff (1926–83), a Heizer student, was a pioneer of the ecological approach, used in his doctoral dissertation, "Ecological Determinants of Aboriginal California Populations" (accepted in 1959 and published in 1963). Here, Baumhoff considered the quantity and quality of food resources (acorns, fish, game) as causal factors for the size and organization of Native societies in the state. His study was notable for its integration of ethnological and archaeological perspectives.

At Davis, again like most campuses, anthropology shares its concern with Native Californians with the field of Native American studies. Most Native American studies programs,
like the one at Davis (1969), began in the late 1960s, with the rise of a political consciousness among American ethnic minorities. While most programs are provisional, somewhat under-funded, and often included in larger ethnic studies departments, at Davis the program gained departmental status in 1993, making it "the only such department in the UC system." While noted for their interdisciplinary nature, Native American studies programs, at least in California, have rarely dealt with issues of food. This may be due to a concern for more contemporary problems deemed more urgent (although the crisis in contemporary Native American food practices is now attracting attention).

Many of the California campuses focus on Natives of their surrounding region. In the south, for example, there was a natural focus on the local Chumash in the Santa Barbara area. Thomas C. Blackburn, professor emeritus of anthropology at California State Polytechnic University, Pomona, has spent much of his career working with the John P. Harrington papers, housed at the Smithsonian's National Anthropological Archives. His colleague, archaeologist Travis Hudson (1941–85), was curator of anthropology at the Santa Barbara Museum of Natural History. Blackburn and Hudson collaborated on an important five-volume work on Chumash material culture (1982–87), which included a comprehensive discussion of food-related objects.

This period was marked by several trends. First, although the basic cultural description of the Kroeber period was supplanted by a more analytical approach, it maintained his interest in the role of the environment. Moreover, it revealed a view of aboriginal peoples as more active in forming their environment than his earlier image of a relative Native passivity in the face of abundant food resources. Finally, while the ecological analyses of the 1960s and 1970s were a direct response to similar work in contemporary American anthropology, it was not until the following decades that similarly innovative analyses of food in culture would be applied to California.


The past two decades have seen an explosion of interest in the cultural study of food, as well as in the specific discipline of anthropology. The study of cultural symbolism in food by Claude Lévi-Strauss and Mary Douglas in the 1960s was followed by the more materialist analyses of Marvin Harris, Jack Goody, and Sidney Mintz. Today, nutritional anthropology is an active scholarly specialty. Anthropology has also joined with folklore, history, and journalism in a new interdisciplinary field which may be called foodways, represented by periodic conferences at Oxford University, the journal *Gastronomica* and the magazine *Saveur*; and popular writers like Waverley Root, Alan Davidson, and Raymond Sokolov.

At the same time, there has been a remarkable cultural revival among California Indians. This, too, has taken many forms—from assertions of treaty rights and renewed political recognition to a ceremonial revival. Some events, such as the so-called "Big Times," are open to Native and non-Natives alike. Here Native foods like acorn soup and roasted salmon are offered in conjunction with the sale of arts, including food-related items like baskets and carved wooden paddles for stirring the acorn mixture.

This activity was encouraged and widely broadcast by Berkeley author, editor, and publisher Malcolm Margolin (b. 1941). As founder of Heyday Books, Margolin has made use of university resources while remaining fiercely independent of it. Since 1987, Margolin and his magazine *News from Native California* have played a critical role in fostering a renaissance of contemporary California Indian culture. He has acted primarily as a catalyst by publicizing and offering a forum for Native activities. In this, he has taken a decidedly nonacademic approach in his writing and publishing, trying to appeal to Natives and a
general educated readership. For many years, News has published the writing of Beverly R. Ortiz (b. 1956), who is completing her anthropology doctorate at UC Berkeley. Among her long series of articles on crafts and skills are many on food.53 With Julia Parker (Kashaya Pomo), Ortiz has written perhaps the best single book on California Indian food, *It Will Live Forever: Traditional Yosemite Indian Acorn Preparation*.54 Recently, News published a special issue on food, and there are plans for a Native cookbook.55

One of the most important trends of recent years, one supported by *News*, has been the rise to prominence of Native authors and artists. Two such pioneers were David W. Peri (1939–2000) and Kathleen R. Smith (b. 1939). A founding editor of *News*, Peri (Bodega Coast Miwok) had assisted Barrett with the American Indian Film Project. An artist and cultural consultant, Smith (Dry Creek Pomo/Bodega Miwok) was working on a Native cookbook. In the late 1980s and early 1990s, Peri56 and Smith57 published a series of evocative essays about California Indian food from a Native perspective. While Peri had some ties to the University of California, so far most Native commentators on food come from outside the academy.

This recent interest in food and cuisine has been matched by a related one in environmental management. (In fact, for many years Ortiz has worked as a park ranger.) One of the current leaders in the field is M. Kat Anderson, of the Plant Sciences department at UC Davis. A 1993 graduate of Berkeley's College of Natural Resources, Anderson has devoted her career to exploring the role of Native Californians in “tending the wild.”58 Through intentionally set fires, pruning, and harvesting practices, they were able to increase the quality and yield of plants used for food and materials. This line of ecological research, a refinement of the
insights from the early 1970s, is appropriate to the Davis campus, home to the university's College of Agriculture.69

In Californianist archaeology, as well, environmental concerns have continued to the present.60 In fact, some of it directly contradicts popular ethnographic theories. Kroeber's views of a relative abundance of food resources in the region has recently been challenged. Opposing the view that Native Californians were effective managers of their habitats, some archaeologists have argued for a more precarious view of resource fluctuation and scarcity. In fact, these scholars claim that in some instances the actions of aboriginal peoples caused the decline and even extinction of plant and animal populations.61 The question remains unresolved, but one might note that these two positions are contradictory only if each is held as a complete explanation.

At Berkeley, archaeology has taken a more historicist road. Although Heizer died in 1979, he was not replaced until 1987, when Kent Lightfoot joined the faculty. With a specialty in the contact and mission period of California, Lightfoot's work is an example of the extension of archaeology into historical times, thus blurring disciplinary distinctions between ethnology, archaeology, and history. In an expansion of Cook's research project, Lightfoot has reconstructed how Native food customs changed during a period of forced acculturation.62

My own work as curator at the Phoebe Hearst Museum has been part of these recent trends. Coming to Berkeley in 1991, in the midst of the Native cultural revival, I applied my long-standing interest in the anthropology of food to its Californian incarnation. This led to a major exhibition that I curated: "Food in California Indian Culture" (1997–2000), the first topical exhibit at the Hearst Museum specifically devoted to this important subject.63 Accompanying this show during its first year was a display of the work of Native American photographer Dugan Aguilar ("Nuppa—Acorn Soup," 1997–98). This work has also led to the development of a related teaching kit for elementary/secondary school students and an anthology of classic writings, Food in California Indian Culture.64

The contributions of Ortiz and myself differ considerably from earlier scholarship. Much of the previous literature on the subject has tended to focus on descriptions of ingredients and gathering procedures, often from an archaeological perspective. More recent work, based on observations and testimony from the cooks themselves, offers us a better sense of what might be called "cookbook information," such as how foods were (and are still) prepared, who cooked and served, and how and when meals were eaten. If most of the earlier research may be called "nutritional" (the science of nourishment or feeding), one might consider the more recent work to be "culinary" (of the kitchen and thus of cooking) or "gastronomic" (the arrangement or laws of eating; literally, of the stomach).

My work attempts to apply the perspective of contemporary culinary analysis to the rich accumulations of museum and archival collections. This retrospective approach has become a dominant theme in the study of Native peoples, especially at the University of California. With the Berkeley anthropology collections now over a century old, these holdings are drawing new attention. Artifacts have been photographed, documents microfilmed, wax cylinder recordings transferred to tape, and photographs digitized and placed on the Internet. All of this has made these collections much more accessible to the descendants of their original Native subjects, allowing them to determine how they wish to be represented. Furthermore, as the product of successive generations of scholars, these rich materials may also form the basis for the exploration of disciplinary histories, as this essay shows.65
Conclusion

The story that we have narrated in a Californian context mirrors larger trends in American anthropology, as well as in the broader study of food, particularly that from a cultural perspective. Food went from a fundamental concern at the beginning of American anthropology in the late nineteenth century to a minor interest in mid-century. Its recent explosive attraction has undoubtedly coincided with a more general appreciation of food in the culture at large.\(^6\)

This greater culinary sensitivity has called forth much new work on Native American foods.\(^7\) The greatest interest has been devoted to agricultural groups in the Southwest. Among the hunter-gathering peoples, the harvest of Minnesota’s wild rice has been commercialized, and now bison is being farmed on the Plains. Of the distinctive Native Californian foods, only the salmon—and to a lesser extent shellfish such as crabs, clams, and abalone—have become widely consumed by the non-Native population, and most of these are found in the Northwest as well (with quite similar species on the East Coast and Europe). California has been left out of the array.\(^8\) The Slow Food movement and its cultivation of heritage foods has not yet had a perceptible impact on the subject of California Indian foods, but this is sure to change in the coming years. In fact, one of the main reasons for a renewed interest in Native foods, from both Native and non-Native, is the concern for nutrition, obesity, and health, and the realization that Native practices were much healthier than most current diets.\(^9\)

In considering the principal themes in this history, one must first realize how fundamentally anthropologists changed common views of aboriginal cuisines, replacing a prejudiced view of animalistic habits with one of sophisticated knowledge and custom. Next there has been an enduring interest in geographical and environmental issues, as well as the persisting dominance of a Kroeberian paradigm of salvage and historical reconstruction. On the other hand, among the discontinuities are some relatively recent developments: a use of historical sources and a focus on specifically culinary issues, as well as the expression of previously muted voices of women and Native people.

This story has also revealed the importance of regional issues. Like regional scholarship across the humanities and social sciences, particularly that concerning Native Americans, the study of California has been localized within the region. This has meant that most scholars have been affiliated with the University of California and in particular its Berkeley campus; but especially in more recent years, also at Davis. Almost all have been anthropologists, but less so recently, and while there has been a general shift in subdisciplinary focus from ethnology to archaeology, recent years have seen a revival of interest by ethnologists. At the same time, it should be clear that the narrative recounted here actually serves as a trace of the entire history of anthropology as a university subject in the state, especially during the first half of the twentieth century.

As the present volume of the Chronicle demonstrates, the University of California has made important contributions to the study—and even production—of agriculture and food, subjects for which the state has become world-renowned. In this history, however, the aboriginal contributions have been obscured. Even when discussed, the diverse and sophisticated range of Native foods has been pejoratively reduced to “acorn mush.” All current inhabitants of the state have much to learn from the example of these indigenous foodways. Bread and wine need to share the table with acorns and manzanita cider.
ENDNOTES

This essay was stimulated by my editing of the anthology Food in California Indian Culture (Berkeley: Hearst Museum of Anthropology, 2004). Accordingly, I repeat my indebtedness to the many colleagues and friends cited therein, as well as Margaret Dubin. It also grows out of my participation at a conference held in March of 2005 at the Pacific Regional Humanities Center, UC Davis, “Beyond Consuming: Food, Wine and Culture in the Pacific United States,” where I spoke about “The Original ‘California Cuisine’: Foodways of the California Indians.”

1 It is important to emphasize that this essay can serve only as an overview of the study of California Indian culture and food customs, summarizing and simplifying a vast and complicated subject. For further bibliographical references the reader might start with the citations in my Food in California Indian Culture.

2 For a useful general overview of Native Californian cultures, with an excellent chapter on their food, see Robert F. Heizer and Albert B. Elsasser, The Natural World of the California Indians (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1980), 82–113.


4 See Jacknis, Food in California Indian Culture, 8–9.


8 Cited in Rawls, Indians, 190–95.


10 Among Bancroft’s works on California Natives was The Native Races of the Pacific States, vol. 1 (San Francisco: A. L. Bancroft, 1883).


12 This sweeping generalization must be qualified with notice of John C. Merriam, professor of geology (1894–1920). As part of his paleontological investigations in the state, Merriam actually did research on the ancient prehistory of its Native inhabitants, and was on the original advisory board of the Department of Anthropology. None of his research, however, considered Native food customs. On the other hand, collections of Native Californian artifacts did exist as part of natural science collections in South Hall; see Ira Jacknis, “A Museum Prehistory: Phoebe Hearst and the Founding of the Museum of Anthropology, 1891–1901,” in “The University at the Turn of the Century, Then and Now,” Roberta J. Park and J. R. K. Kantor, eds., Chronicle of the University of California, no. 4 (2000), 47–77.
13 For further information on the founding of the department and its context, see Jacknis, “A Museum Prehistory.”

14 Because of the world war, however, the federal government was not able to publish it until 1925. Alfred L. Kroeber, *Handbook of the Indians of California*, Bureau of American Ethnology Bulletin, no. 78 (Washington, DC: Smithsonian Institution, 1925).


18 The exact details of Du Bois’s Wintu fieldwork are vague because her field notes have not been located.


23 The Merriam collection on Californian ethnography was transferred from the UC Department of Anthropology to the Bancroft Library in 1977 and 1979. See C. Hart Merriam, *Studies of California Indians*; edited by the staff of the Department of Anthropology of the University of California (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1955).
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AN INTERVIEW WITH
ALICE WATERS, BERKELEY RESTAURATEUR

Hannah Hoffman

UC BERKELEY HAS BEEN A CATALYST FOR MANY GREAT THINKERS: Nobel Prize winners, brilliant innovators, and generation after generation of new students eager to make a difference. Alice Waters is an innovator who once called Cal home. Not long after graduating from Berkeley, she founded Chez Panisse restaurant in Berkeley, which has become the exemplar for California cuisine worldwide. Her love of good food and her inexhaustible passion have excited the palates and educated the minds of children from elementary school to Yale and all those who have been lucky enough to taste her food. I have known Alice Waters for most of my life (my mother was pastry chef at Chez Panisse, and I literally grew up in the restaurant’s kitchen). Writing this article as an undergraduate student of foodways in the Department of Anthropology at Berkeley, I was particularly interested in her formative influences at Berkeley and elsewhere. During a phone interview on March 13, 2006, and by attending her lecture at the Goldman School of Public Policy, I learned how Alice Waters, a student at UC Berkeley in the tumultuous sixties, became Alice Waters of the famous Chez Panisse.¹

Alice Waters, born on April 28, 1944, grew up in Chatham, New Jersey, and moved to Southern California for her last year of high school. Beginning her college career at UC Santa Barbara, she transferred to Berkeley with a group of friends in 1964, on the eve of the Free Speech Movement. Soon a personal and cultural transformation for Alice Waters began.

How does one get inspired to cook? Cooking was not something that she learned or became passionate about at home, although fresh garden food was always available to her growing up. It was a meal in France that sparked her curiosity, began her personal culinary journey, and was soon to change foodways in the Bay Area and beyond. Of her meals in France, she says, “I experienced a major realization: I hadn’t eaten anything, comparatively speaking, and I wanted to taste everything.” She describes her life-altering meal

Alice Waters, 1967. Thirty-two years later Alice Waters was Berkeley’s alumnus of the year. Photograph by Warren C. Goines. Courtesy of the author.
in the Chez Panisse Menu Cookbook:

I've remembered this dinner a thousand times: the old stone house, the stairs leading up to the small dining room which seated no more than twelve at the pink cloth-covered tables, and from which one could look through the opened windows to the stream running beside the house and the garden in back. The chef, a woman, announced the menu: cured ham and melon, trout with almonds, and raspberry tart. The trout had just come from the stream and the raspberries from the garden. It was this immediacy that made those dishes so special.

This meal was a truly transforming experience for Alice Waters. She came back to Berkeley from her junior year abroad and started cooking. She describes an emotional reunion with food, with a desire to eat what she wanted to eat and to recreate what she had experienced in France. But it was not just France that sparked her desire. Alice was involved in the Free Speech Movement at Berkeley, which had an impact on her decision to open a restaurant:

No question the Free Speech Movement inspired the restaurant! I felt part of a counter culture. What Mario Savio was saying, I absorbed, as it reflected what I felt about food and my life. . . . I was very idealistic, I wasn’t intimidated. We all felt that we could change the world.

As a student, Waters lived off campus with roommates and worked as a waitress at the Quest, the revolutionary little French restaurant in Berkeley with only three menu choices on most nights. The Quest’s set-menu format became a model for Chez Panisse’s menu. As an illustration of the changing tastes of Bay Area cuisine, she remembers serving chicken Marengo at Quest, supposedly the last meal that Napoleon ate at the Battle of Marengo, made of breaded chicken, browned in butter, baked in a tomato sauce with olives.

There was not the restaurant culture, as we think of it today, in Berkeley in the sixties. With few local models, to start the Chez Panisse journey she channeled her French food experiences. She was lucky, Waters recalls, to have the books of British cookery writer Elizabeth David “as my first books about food.” David is credited with bringing French and Italian cooking into mid-twentieth century British homes.

So, in 1971, naive and inspired, Alice Waters opened Chez Panisse in an old apartment house on Shattuck Avenue. Buying foods from local farmers, Monterey Market in Berkeley, and Chinatown produce markets, she began her quest to change the way people eat by feeding them locally grown, organic, fresh, and simple food.

Waters believes that food is valuable and how we feed ourselves is one of the most important issues of mankind. “[Food is] one central thing about human experience that opens our senses and our consciousness to the world.” Learning to be conscious about food can start at any age. However, Alice focuses much of her energy on young people. She feels passionately about the eating habits of college students around the United States and at Cal. “It is pretty shocking, I think they don’t understand the consequences of the decisions that they make. They need to really open their minds to what they put in their

maws. As an active member of the Slow Food Movement, Waters agrees with its founder, Carlo Petrini, that food should taste good, respect the environment, and promote social justice; farmers and farm workers should get paid fairly.

These are the issues that she feels should be in the minds of college students when they decide what to put in their bodies. She argues that there is a huge cultural problem with the way college students are eating: “The food they choose, fast, cheap and easy, is destroying everything. It is okay to waste. Food is now available twenty-four hours a day in a uniform fashion. What could be more destructive of biodiversity than that narrowing of perspective being imposed. It’s frightening.” Waters believes that there should be a curriculum at the university level to educate students about these issues, create a space to experience a garden, have dorm cooking, and have good food in the cafeterias. She has started a program at Yale, where her daughter Fanny attended college, called the Sustainable Food Project that has changed the way many college students are eating.

As Mario Savio did, Alice Waters is calling for a revolution—one that she calls a “Delicious Revolution,” that teaches students from a young age about good food, pleasure, eating together, and how to cook. The Delicious Revolution is taking place in the Edible School Yard at the Martin Luther King Jr. Middle School in Berkeley. The garden allows the children to grow their own food, cook it in a real kitchen, and share it with each other, an experience that Alice Waters believes will enhance the relationships they have with other people and the food that they eat. “When you share food with someone, you see them in a different way, with care and consideration.”

That fateful trip to France that Alice Waters took while attending Cal has had far-reaching consequences on foodways and on the broader society: as she envisions her mission, “Changing the way that people eat, one meal at a time.”

ENDNOTES

1 Alice Waters, “Changing the World, One Meal at a Time,” Food Politics Lecture Series, Goldman School of Public Policy, March 15, 2006. Unless noted, all quotes in this article are from this lecture or from our interview on March 13, 2006.

2 Waters referred me to her first book for this account, which she felt was best represented there. Alice Waters, Chez Panisse: Menu Cookbook (Toronto: Random House, 1982), ix-x.

3 Slow Food is a movement founded in Italy that promotes and lobbies issues of taste, culture, environment, and universal values. http://www.slowfoodusa.org.

4 http://www.yale.edu/sustainablefood/overview.html.
AN INTERVIEW WITH
JOHN SCHARFFENBERGER, CHOCOLATIER

Hannah Hoffman

JOHN SCHARFFENBERGER is a man whom the city of Berkeley, and now the world of chocolate fanciers, associates with gourmet chocolate. He is the founder and chief executive officer of Scharffen Berger Chocolate Maker, which recently was sold to Hershey's Chocolate after establishing a reputation as one of the foremost makers of gourmet chocolates. How does one become a chocolate maker? What inspires such a product? A bit of curiosity, some talent, financial means, a taste for something superior, and a desire to make a change are what led up to the making of the delicious chocolates that came from this Berkeley graduate of the class of 1973.

Speaking with Mr. Scharffenberger by phone in March 2006, as he was running last-minute errands at a plant nursery before a trip to the Dominican Republic, shed some light on the makings of such a career, as well as a glimpse into the influence of a Berkeley education.

John Scharffenberger spent his formative collegiate years at UC Berkeley in the 1970s. A student of cultural geography, he “invented” his own major, something that current students have an opportunity to do in Interdisciplinary Studies, but a less usual option in the seventies. Scharffenberger described his coursework as “studies of agricultural history, the ecology of agriculture, and the historical impacts on natural systems.” Add food technology to that, and Scharffenberger was unknowingly on his way to making delicious things.

Mr. Scharffenberger was interested in the history of the land and how humans participate in agriculture. While attending Cal, he worked as a

John Scharffenberger in the chocolate factory. Courtesy of Scharffen Berger Chocolate Maker.
live-in gardener at the Claremont Hotel and was able to play, and create, in the dirt, as he was pursuing his studies. Berkeley still has influence in Scharffenberger’s career path; there are classes that he still draws on for his work. He recalls that in the seventies, there was such a broad range of plant pathology to study, and “it was a pretty active intellectual area to be in.” He still uses knowledge from his tropical agriculture and geography courses, specifically California geography. These were courses, he recalls, that sometimes made him “scratch his head” forging new ideas and trying to understand the complexities of his studies. Challenged by what he was learning, he graduated in 1973 and began taking grape growing and wine classes at UC Davis.

On his own land in Mendocino County he began to grow grapes. However, growing grapes made Scharffenberger antsy, wanting to do more. The industry was product driven and he wanted to produce. “I got to know wine by tasting. I learned what I liked and noticed a lack of it here. I love champagne; I wanted to make what I liked.” He researched the history of champagne both in California and in France (with on-site training in France), all the while learning how to apply technology to the process. He found an opportunity to produce his own product by taking advantage of an ignored geographic area in Mendocino County called Anderson Valley. In 1981 John Scharffenberger became the first sparkling wine maker to use only Anderson Valley grapes. He had the training and the desire to make a superior product that, several years later, actually played a role on the world political stage. On May 31, 1988, Scharffenberger Cremant dessert sparkling wine was created for and served at the Reagan-Gorbachev summit meeting in Moscow. Served during the dessert course, Scharffenberger’s wine was used to toast the end of the Cold War.

In 1995 Scharffenberger sold his sparkling wine enterprise “looking for something else, food.” Well, “looking” paid off. He ran into his friend and former doctor, Robert Steinberg, and together they began to build yet another California culinary treasure. It was perfect timing. Scharffenberger says, “At the time, all the good chocolate was imported. I wanted to make what I liked to eat.” So, from champagne to chocolate it was.

The two friends made chocolate in their home kitchens and began to introduce their product to friends. By the year 2000, Scharffenberger and Steinberg moved from vintage equipment in a warehouse in San Francisco to a state-of-the-art facility in Berkeley on Heinz Street. Keeping with what is important to John Scharffenberger, they aimed to create a sustainable product in the spirit of what his “generation grew up with.” He drew on the many summers he spent in summer schools at UC Santa Cruz with Alan Chadwick working with biodynamic practices—nonchemical, compost-based farming and production—in Chadwick’s campus garden. “When you can do something good, you should!” he tells me. With cacao, he had an opportunity to do good while producing a superior commercial product.

Mr. Scharffenberger’s overall policy on how to maintain an ethical position while running a commercial business is to pay attention to “how commercial behavior affects others. You do your best, you can never be perfect, but you should do something good when you can.” He supports sustainable cacao farming on small farms around the world. With ecological practices, he believes he can help the planet and sustain the cacao trees for longer periods of time than other commercial growers. This promotes a healthy farm, as well as long-term jobs for the farmers who work hard to provide a high quality ingredient for the famous Scharffen Berger Chocolate. Why is Scharffenberger back in Berkeley? “It’s a good spot, and the chocolate should be made where people live.” John Scharffenberger is proud of his Berkeley education, and his success is an example of Berkeley grads making a positive impact on the world and on our palates.
THE REGENTS v. TEMPERANCE

Carroll Brentano

MOST OF CALIFORNIA SOCIETY, from the Gold Rush days, was never far from the corner bar or brewery. Likewise, the wine producers, from the 1860s on, were an integral part of the economy. It was not until "the drought of sanctity," as Richard Walker calls it, that Prohibition (1919-1934) closed four-fifths of the state's wineries. Although "Italians [vintners] sold wines to the churches and the pharmacies, and grapes to everyone else," it is evident from the cartoons and illustrations in the Blue and Golds of the era that drink was as much a part of campus life as it was before and after prohibition. Meanwhile, community groups were looking at the university with a jaundiced eye. Here is a sample of their indignation from the Report of the Secretary of the Regents in the Annual Report of the President (Benjamin Ide Wheeler) to the governor of the state:

1912 Blue and Gold (1911).

On December 20, 1912, a delegation appeared before the Board as representatives of the following organizations: [the list includes six Protestant church organizations, the Women's Christian Temperance Union, two other women's groups, and the Anti-Saloon League]. This delegation presented a petition to the Regents regarding questions of temperance. The petition was referred to a committee of the Regents consisting of Charles S. Wheeler, A. L. Scott, and James K. Moffitt.

On March 11, 1913, the Special Committee on the Temperance Petition presented the following report, which was approved by the Board: "The petition which your Committee is called upon to consider makes two requests of this Board, which we state in their inverse order."

The first request was to define the powers, if any, that the regents or the president or the faculty hold over the students. What authority over their own conduct do the students have? The second request:

We petition, advise and urge that you pass a rule that no alcoholic, vinous or malt liquors be allowed at any function, social or otherwise, given in the name and by the authority of the University of California, or any department thereof, or of any organization officially bound thereto, or of any company
of persons, governed by or officially related to the Board of Regents, Faculty or Student Body of the University of California.

1914 Blue and Gold (1913).

The committee first of all noted that although the Board of Regents had under the constitutional provisions of 1879 all authority over the students, that power had been vested in the faculty who could lay down the rules of conduct; and even if the regents wished to exert their latent authority, they had never done so.

No formal set of rules governing student conduct has ever been adopted by this Board. . . . It has been the feeling of the regents that the manhood of California represented by the young men at the University could be best encouraged and developed, not through mandatory and prohibitory regulation, but rather by an appeal to the best instincts of the students—to their loyalty.
to the University and its interests, to their respect for public opinion, and to their sense of obligation to the taxpayers of the State whose beneficiaries they are. Hence it is that no formal set of rules governing student conduct has ever been adopted by this Board.

Admitting that, of course, “acts of misconduct” had been committed and “brought down upon the offenders various forms of disciplinary punishment,” the remedy employed for several years has been “to entrust to a committee of students, representative of the student body, the investigation and trial of student offenses.”

Since the petitioners offered no specific cases “of actual student excess” but wanted the board to rule that the “mere presence of alcoholic, vinous or malt liquors at all University functions [be] a disciplinary offense.” This would of course “be foreign to our present system of student government.” Furthermore, “the occasions which the request of the petitioners would cover are not numerous.” The senior men have an annual dinner, as do the juniors, and the sophomores, a smoker, as does “the Boating Association... the Engineers, the editorial staff of the Daily Californian, and the fraternities give occasional dinners. At such dinners table wines are usually, though not invariably, served.”

It was noted that indeed earlier in the year the Associated Students had passed a resolution, March 8, 1912, openly declaring “their position as opposed to the use of liquor by any student organization . . . that the use of intoxicating liquors be barred from all banquets and smokers and other functions of the various student organizations of the University.”

Although, notes the regents’ committee, “it is probably true that but one of several student functions which have occurred since the resolution was passed has yielded directly to the sentiment expressed in the resolution,” it is their belief that the student body’s attitude is today “well in line for a voluntary and satisfactory solution” to this question by the students themselves. Therefore, to grant the petitioners request would “mean the abandonment of the system of student control . . . to attempt to accomplish, by prohibitory rule, what

The ALTA VISTA WINES are distinctly CALIFORNIAN and are not masqueaded under a foreign label for selling purposes. They are known by numbers and named after the district in California in which the grapes are cultivated. The use of foreign names, such as Sauternes, Margaux, Chateau Yquem, etc., apply to that species of wine originally grown in the mother districts of the Old World, transplanted in those districts of California, where climatic and other conditions are similar. The ALTA VISTA WINES sell on their superior California merits.
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1906 Blue and Gold (1905).
our young men may be relied upon to do voluntarily."

Thus the result would be "subterfuge and clandestine drinking bouts, and would call for a system of espionage, with attendant student resentment and insubordination." Since the committee saw the cause of temperance flourishing and making steady progress with the student body, it "does not believe it would prosper similarly under enforced prohibitory regulations" . . . and it holds therefore that it would be "unwise and inexpedient for this Board to pass such a rule as petitioners request."²

That this Student Affairs Committee dedicated itself to the principle of university loyalty, as did President Wheeler, was demonstrated on another occasion. In 1914, "Organized citizens mounted another of their attacks on the terrors of saloons and the evils of drink. After discovering that a student publication was advertising liquor, they began a campaign against the advertisement of sin." When the Student Affairs Committee prevailed upon the editor to withdraw the ads so as not to bring down adverse criticism upon the university, especially so near to an election, the ads were withdrawn.³

ENDNOTES


2 *Annual Report of the President of the University, 1912-13* (Berkeley: University of California, December 1913), 137-42.


A toast at Zeta Psi fraternity, about 1896. *University Archives (UARC ALBUM 15:2).*
WHEN THE UNIVERSITY FIRST OPENED for students there were few dining opportunities, if any, on the campus or even in Berkeley. The first short-lived dormitories appeared in 1873, originally intended for student clubs, when the university built eight small cottages on the new campus, six below Dana Street as dormitories for men and two near the present site of The Faculty Club for women. Since there were few women students in those early days and none who entertained the idea of living "on the campus," the upper cottages were appropriated by some bachelor faculty members for living quarters. Professor John LeConte, who was Acting President of the University during 1869-70 and President again from 1875-1881, occupied one for several years. It later served as the cook-house for the original Faculty Club and it is part of the clubhouse to this day ... having been raised to the second floor ... and ... is now guestroom 209.

Since one of the cottages had been destroyed by fire, the LeConte abode was commandeered and given by The Regents to establish a "cooperative" restaurant ... [A] few faculty colleagues subscribed sufficient money to equip a kitchen and dining room. The organization was known as the Dining
Association, and was established primarily for students, but a small room was set aside for the use of professors. The project was a success; it paid its way.

The use of the facility by faculty members increased. During the decade of the 1890's, the Association undertook to hold evening meetings, frequently at the old California Hotel, a rather posh establishment on Montgomery Street in San Francisco. These were “banquet” affairs (dinners at sixty cents, cigars a nickel) at each of which several learned papers were presented.¹

Soon after the beginning of the new century it became apparent to all concerned that the old Dining Association cottage was too small for the number of members who took their meals there—and it was sorely lacking in the amenities of a proper gentleman's club.²

Without dormitories, where did those early students live and take their meals? The 1877 Blue and Gold (1876) lists student residences: Women usually lived at home in Berkeley, Oakland, or San Francisco, while a few lived at the Ladies Club House or the Young Ladies Club. The men, too, lived at home in the Bay Area, but many reported other places:

---

¹ "1895 Blue and Gold (1894)."
the first fraternities (Chi Phi Hall, Zeta Psi Hall), boarding houses (Amyx’s, Atkinson’s, Berkeley Farm, Bryant’s, Carnall’s, Carroll’s, Mrs. Chamberlaine’s, Mrs. Clarke’s, Dibble’s, The Home, Mrs. Rountree’s, Mrs. Squire’s, Mrs. Wertz’s), club houses as mentioned above (Cheney’s, Club House 1, 2, and 3), and the Berkeley Hotel, or Ivy Cottage (a boarding house or one of the original cottages?). Several Eating Clubs are also reported in that issue of the Blue and Gold.

Since the campus administration provided no dining facilities on the campus for students until 1929 (except for the brief life of the Dining Association) the students themselves organized eating facilities. Those who lived in a nearby boarding house or fraternity or sorority ate there, as they did in the early days of the university. Others who lived at home or in an apartment took their own lunches to campus, bought sandwiches at local cafes and restaurants, or if they also belonged to a fraternity or sorority, they made it a point to have lunch in the house to maintain their fraternal ties. Originally, women used the “Ladies Room” of North Hall, and by the turn of the century, Hearst Hall opened. It was used both for informal meals and for
banquets. An informal use of Hearst Hall is reported here:

By eleven o'clock, each morning, the big kitchen in the rear begins to fill with noise and co-eds. The clatter of spoons and tongues announces the preparation of the Tribes' lunches. Here Greekess meets Greekess over the saucepan and the virtues and vices of opposing candidates are "fricasseed" amid the interruptions of a "panoche" recipe on the part of some hair-brained Freshie who, as yet, is more interested in candy than in handsome class presidents.\textsuperscript{3}

Stiles Hall was where both the YMCA and the YWCA had meeting rooms and lunch discussions until the YWCA moved to its Cottage in 1920. Besides lunch meetings, during the Depression the "Nosebag Club" was created for brown-bagging college women. "Board members and an intrepid group of friends provided tea, cookies, and warmth of spirit to co-eds who brought their lunches from home and found a cheerful spot in which to eat and visit."\textsuperscript{4}

When Stephens Student Union opened in 1923 it provided clubrooms for men with their "Tap Room" on the second floor, and on the floor above were the clubrooms for women, with a smaller terrace. There was also a little cafe upstairs called the "Co-op" that served sodas and other items commonly sold at a fountain but with no meals. (The students' Co-op started as the student store originally in North Hall selling books, supplies and notions, and continued in Stephens occupying the basement and the first floor.) However, some campus banquets were held in Stephens.
Finally, in 1929 the first dormitory, Bowles Hall, was opened for men, with its own dining room and kitchen staff. The next year International House opened for both men and women, also providing meals. In 1938 a central kitchen was created in Oxford Hall by the Student Cooperative Association to accommodate various residential cooperative residences. In 1942 the university opened its second dormitory, Stern Hall for women only, with meals provided, and the five Fernwald-Smyth residence halls with a dining commons high up the hill on Dwight after the Second World War. It was at that time that a cafeteria was developed in Stephens to supply lunches for the Fernwald residents who could not make it up to the

Students on east balcony of Stephens Hall, 1928. Photograph by George E. Stone.
University Archives (UARC PIC 10Y.28).
noon meal between classes. The first dining commons on campus appeared in 1948 in temporary buildings from Camp Parks (see Kantor in this issue), and at the same time the first campus commissary was established to supply their food, as well as to the faculty clubs, International House, and Cowell Hospital.

The sixties began the boom of twelve new student dormitories within Units I, II, and III, and with the completion of the new student union across from Sproul Hall, a new dining complex opened with three restaurants (see Nakada in this issue). Since then the eating places have changed to suit new student tastes and demands, and new residences have added new dining commons as needed (see LaPean in this issue). Restaurants and cafes on avenues, Telegraph on the southside, Euclid on the northside, and Shattuck to the west, have continued to come and go, but they, too, have been quick to respond to changes in taste among the faculty and students over the decades, currently reflecting the even greater diversity among their patrons.
The twelve o'clock class of gourmets in the Stephens Union Co-op. 1940 Blue and Gold.
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UNIVERSITY FOOD SERVICES AT BERKELEY, 1959-1982

Lynn H. Nakada

ED B. HENDRICKS’ CAREER IN UNIVERSITY HOUSING spanned four decades, starting with his first job as family housing manager at Chico State University in 1946. From 1959 until 1982, Ed worked at UC Berkeley, first as residence halls manager of Unit I (when it first opened), then assistant director of residence halls, and lastly director of Housing, Food Services, and Child Care. During Ed’s tenure, this author was a resident assistant for three years as a student, and later she worked for a time as Ed’s assistant director of Housing Services.

Since his retirement from UC Berkeley in 1982, Ed highlights his life with extensive travels, visits with long-time friends, and cherished times with family and loved ones. Shunning the “electronic age,” Ed doesn’t use email. The following piece on his recollections was written with information obtained through a written questionnaire and several hand-written letters and telephone conversations. Throughout this interaction, the author was reminded of Ed’s sense of humor, charm, and quick wit. You could always count on Ed to crack a few corny jokes!

Ed recalled that he really wasn’t interested in the food services profession until it became a part of his job responsibilities. He didn’t know a thing about food service, but he had excellent managers at the higher level—Joan Raftery, Jane McClurg, and Bill Halliday. He tried to stay out of the way and let them manage. He believes he succeeded in doing that.

When Ed came to Berkeley, Stern Hall, Bowles Hall, and the Smyth-Fernwald residence halls had already been providing food service for their residents. When Unit I opened in 1959, Smyth-Fernwald became family student housing. International House and the ASUC-run Bear’s Lair were also operating food service operations independent of the program he oversaw.

The staffing pattern in the residence halls food service operation consisted of a food service manager (who was often educated and trained as a dietician) and assistant food service manager at the larger units. They were assisted by cooks, busboys, dishwashers, and student workers. At one point, Ed managed 350 full-time and 1200 student employees. They served 20,000 meals per day in the residence halls, on campus, and through catering. The commissary, run by Bill Halliday for years, provided quality control for food products consumed in all operations. They even had two butchers!

The on-campus Dining Commons in the Student Union originally had a sit-down restaurant, which was not too successful so was eventually closed. Otherwise, it was traditional cafeteria-style dining, with a very successful operation run by Joan Raftery and Agnes Bierwagen. Catering services, managed by Evert Goff, were also provided to the entire campus community. UC Regents’ meetings, for example, were often catered by the campus.

In the residence halls dining commons, students had served dinners for five days a week, Monday through Friday, at most facilities. A “cycle menu” was repeated every twenty-one days. Cafeteria lines were used for breakfast and lunch, and beverage services were limited.
An early custom involved these served dinners. A graduate assistant (resident assistant who was a graduate student) would escort the head resident, or "housemother," down to the dining area. Students stood at their places until the head resident was seated. Once everyone was seated, meals were served.

Another custom, held in the women’s-only residence halls, were Sunday afternoon "high teas." Hosted by the head resident, using silver tea service bought for this purpose, these teas were held in the lounges and open to all women residents.

On occasion, there were themed meals or special occasion meals. This often involved the residence hall associations (student governments) encouraging semiformal dress for steak dinner nights or special decorations for theme menus such as Hawaiian luauas or barbeque.

The involvement of students on food service committees resulted in significant changes to the dining experience. The policy of having served dinners was eliminated after student input, since there was declining student interest (and because of rising costs). To add variety to having milk, lemonade, coffee, and tea at lunch and dinner, soft drink dispensers were installed. Bowles Hall, the all-men’s residence hall, demanded and received peanut butter at all meals!

In our conversations, Ed described his lasting memories of several key events during his tenure at Berkeley. One was the establishment of a New York-style deli in the on-campus Dining Commons. When the idea was initially mentioned to Vice Chancellor for Administration Bob Kerley, he said they should go to New York to see how it was done. He didn't need to say it twice, so Ed and his two senior food service managers, Jane McClurg
and Joan Raftery, went to New York. Ed says he went along for the ride! Upon their return, they opened the deli in the Dining Commons.

Also memorable were the preparations for a famous presidential visit. When President John F. Kennedy came to Berkeley in 1962 to deliver his Charter Day address in Memorial Stadium, advance word to the Food Service director was that he would want a small filet and frozen daiquiri for lunch. After searching high and low for the ingredients and glass to serve the daiquiri to the president, Kennedy wanted a beer and a hamburger.

Ed recalled in some detail the campus strike in spring 1972. Chancellor Albert Bowker announced that he would no longer pay union rates for maintenance work. He didn’t think he should pay the union scale for changing a light bulb. All hell broke loose, and the campus building trades went on strike. The food service union employees went on strike to support the campus workers. Vice Chancellor Bob Kerley called Ed and Joan Raftery to his office in California Hall and told them to figure out how they were going to feed the residence halls students in Units I, II, and III, and Bowles, Stern, and Manville Halls.

It was decided that all the residents would be fed at two locations—Units I and II. For two weeks, office personnel, all managers, and senior staff handled all job tasks so that students could be fed three meals a day. These substitute staff were working very long hours—usually twelve hours every day. Vice Chancellor Kerley made an announcement at his own staff meeting that he needed to provide them some relief and that if he did not get some volunteers, he would make assignments.

That announcement resulted in deans, top level administrators, and all kinds of volunteer help. Ed recalls coming in on a Sunday to see how things were going, and Dean of Men Jim Lemmon was on the pot and pan detail. With sweat pouring off him, he said, “Hendricks, I don’t know what you’re paying this guy, but it isn’t enough!”

The union also thought they would be more effective if they could shut down the garbage pick-up from the residence halls. Several student volunteers from Unit I—both men

North balcony of dining commons overlooking Strawberry Creek. Photograph by Dennis Galloway. University Archives (UARC PIC 11M:26).
and women—came to Ed's office and offered to haul the wet garbage away. (This author was one of the haul-away team.) They carried garbage to dumps all over the Bay Area and perhaps as far north as Sacramento. They would never tell Ed where they were taking the garbage. But he believes that was the big factor in not shutting down the residence halls, and all were very grateful to these students. In the end, the food service employees stayed out on strike for two weeks, whereas the campus strike lasted about five weeks. Ed believes, at that time, that was the longest strike ever against a university.

Finally, Ed recalls that he resisted significant pressure to allow private industry on campus. He took some of his food service managers to Ohio State University and the University of Cincinnati to view their McDonald's operation. After their visit, they took the stance, which Ed feels was appropriate at the time, that university food services staff should be able to do as good a job, maybe better, than private industry that would merely be working toward a profit. That would still be his stance in 2006.

Dining commons, about 1960. Photograph by ASUC Photography.
University Archives (UARC PIC 11M:5).
CAL DINING, 1980s-2006

Shawn LaPean

COLLEGE AND UNIVERSITY DINING PROGRAMS have evolved over the last half century from programs about mere sustenance to programs that enhance the living and learning environments of students in both the residential and on-campus settings. Fifty years ago there were only a few dining commons, serving breakfast, lunch, and dinner in our residential compounds. In most settings, women and men did not eat together. There was a choice of two entrées and a side starch item like mashed potatoes or rice and vegetables. Soon, salad bars made their way into dining programs but the majority of foods served in the dining commons did not change for many years.

By the 1980s across the country, college and university dining programs were being called upon to change, to become more service-oriented and to provide a larger variety of food choices in a myriad of settings. College dining programs paralleled what was happening in the restaurant business.

Changes came in the form of menu upgrades, adding a little pizzazz with ideas like potato bars. Perhaps the biggest changes to campus dining occurred when branded food concepts came to campus food services, most notably student unions. The first Kentucky Fried Chicken on a college campus was at San Diego State University. More followed on that campus which started an evolution or revolutionary process where nearly every major college or university today has a branded food concept somewhere on its campus. Student customers liked having known brands serving recognizable foods.

At the time, availability of name-brand foods solved some immediate issues, but their appeal waned over time. Campus food services suffered from customer burnout. It was crystal clear that students simply did not want to eat the same thing day after day and were looking for more choices.

In residence hall dining it developed that students wanted to use their meal plans at the retail food services on campus that used brand names rather than in their dining halls. For a while, in fact, it looked as though the residential dining commons could be on its last legs. While name-brand foods created a new atmosphere that students first enjoyed, they began to tire of them. In the late 1990s a new version of residential dining emerged: “exhibition cooking,” or basically made-to-order cooking. Two entrée choices were being replaced by many choices. Station menus abounded that held an ethnic appeal, Asian, Indian, Mexican, Middle Eastern, American. Of course some staple items like salad bars and pizza remained.

At the same time that choices were increasing, the Berkeley administration began to design a new dining commons, the Crossroads, created to appeal to the demand for greater variety. Opened in 2003, Crossroads replaced what were called Unit I and Unit II dining commons. The old dining commons used what appeared to be endless stainless steel in a straight-line format. Crossroads, however, has brought restaurant-quality foods to a dining commons. There are nine stations, all in differing sizes and shapes each serving up at least two entrée choices, many side items, and a bountiful salad and dessert bar. The idea is that if you create better food, students will tend to “hang out” more, thus providing for a better living and learning environment and campus cultural experience. In fact, Crossroads has become an evening-time equivalent of a student union with over 2,500 students using its
services and seating areas from dinner time until 2:00 a.m.

With the advent of exhibition cooking it became apparent that a change in staff and training was necessary. Exhibition cooking took a much higher level of training and skills than the generic menus of the past. College dining programs have always had dieticians to review menus, but few if any college dining programs had chefs—trained and educated chefs. In fact, until just recently, there were only a handful of chefs on staff at a scattering of colleges, mainly in the Ivy League.

Now nearly every college or university of any size has hired chefs to manage recipe production and the training of culinary staff. Currently, UC Berkeley has four chefs, one in each dining hall, and an assistant director/executive chef to manage the research and development process for all food items that make their way to our menus. All chefs have a degree from a certified culinary academy. Many chefs in the food business compete with each other at regional and national competitions. Cal Dining’s chefs, in their first year together as colleagues, took first-place and gold medals in 2005 in a competition with ten other college teams, including Harvard University and the University of Massachusetts, Amherst.

![Cal Dining chefs](image)

Cal Dining chefs have garnered over ten medals in nationwide culinary competitions in the last two years. From left to right, Associate Director Chuck Davies, Assistant Director/Executive Chef Ida Shen, Foothill Executive Chef Conrad Huth, Crossroads Executive Chef Annie Gary, and Cafe 3 Executive Chef Michael Sarenas. Photograph by Melissa Barnes.

Dining at Cal continues to be very diverse. Besides Cal Dining, which is mainly residential, among other entities on campus providing meals to students are the Martin Luther King, Jr., Union and International House. Both are large operations with off-campus partners providing food services.
Cal Dining serves over 20,000 people daily through a mix of on-campus retail and residential food services and a number of new businesses not usually associated with a campus food services operation. For instance, we have a large produce market twice a week on upper Sproul Plaza, an online grocery store for students living in apartments, and late-night dining in three out of four residence hall complexes until 2:00 a.m., five nights/mornings a week.

Cal Dining also recently added the first national branded concept to Cal’s campus. In August a Peet’s Coffee and Tea was opened next to Crossroads serving gourmet coffee and tea products.

The future of the food service industry is evolving and so is the food service at Cal. Cal Dining is working to bring the first, and to date the only, certified organic salad bars to our residential dining commons. The appeal of organics is another way to say “fresh,” something every diner expects today. We are restructuring our food business to accommodate more nutritional outreach and education to ensure that the current obesity epidemic does not spread to our college-age students. Not that a student won’t be able to have pizza, but they will know that they shouldn’t eat it every day. Our chefs are also working on new ethnic food menus that will have the appeal of off-campus restaurants. Students that know ethnic foods want real flavor profiles that meet their demands.

All of these items are merely attempts to keep students interested and engaged with their fellow students, faculty, and staff here at Cal. Student tastes have changed as the food industry has, but in today’s internet-like climate of immediate gratification it is important that any college dining program provides more than basics, more than sustenance, but a thriving restaurant food business that continually reevaluates what their customers are asking for and how to deliver it day after day, year after year. Only by providing students a place to eat, with food they like and in an environment they feel comfortable in, can we create an atmosphere that allows students to go beyond the classroom, to grow with their comrades and become a person ready to take on the world.
WHERE SHALL WE EAT?
Al Fresco, Home, Banquets, and beyond Sather Gate

Carroll Brentano

AL FRESCO ON THE CAMPUS

Labor Day, 1920

Every four years, beginning in the 1870s, February 29 of Leap Year was called Labor Day on the Berkeley campus, and the men students performed some necessary work on campus like clearing the paths on the hill to the Big C; the female students provided and served the food. This year, Agnes Edwards, class of 1921, included in her weekly letter to her parents (now published by her daughter and reviewed in Chronicle issue number seven), a description of the day and of the annual circus that followed in the evening.


March 1, 1920. . . . It rained all Sunday night, & in the forenoon of Labor Day too, but the men worked anyway. . . . As it was raining the lunch was served in the bottom part of Hearst Hall, the Women's Gym. Each table was a complete unit, serving beans, bread, hot dogs & mustard, & ice cream, & pie. I & another girl had the beans, & by the time we got thro' I felt as tho' I didn't ever want to see another one. They used the big gallon cans of Van Camps, & heated them in big vats. Then when they bro't them to the gym the fellows formed lines & threw them down along the lines—we thought someone would get killed certainly, but no one did. Of course the cans were so hot that it was really the only way to handle them. The men were so dirty when they came in—some of them just caked with mud. It was a regular stampede for food, too, & lots of them came back several times. Because of the rain, there weren't nearly as many as were expected, & so there was a great deal of food left. I had two great big pieces of pie with lots of ice cream. . . .
We were all very glad that it cleared off for the circus. Bessie & I went over about 8 o’clock & had to wait about 15 minutes before we could even get in, the crowd was so dense. . . . There was one very large tent where most of the booths & sideshows were, and a sort of platform where there were boxing & wrestling stunts. . . . It was lots of fun at the booth—we all wore white aprons & little white bands around our heads. . . . I worked in the booth for my hour & had all kinds of fun, and then went around to some of the sideshows which were put on by the different fraternities & societies.¹

The Presidents Picnicking

The Sprouls and the Trumans at the Commencement Luncheon in Faculty Glade, June 12, 1948. University Archives (UARC PIC 4:437).

AT HOME

Christmas Dinner, 1917

Freshman Agnes Edwards was a guest of a Berkeley family, the Seagraves, on Christmas day, 1917. She didn’t join her family at home in Brawley because of the expense of the train trip.

We had dinner at about 5:30 I think. The colored cook came to the door &
said “Dinner is served”—real class, you see. The table was so pretty—a great bunch of holly in the center, & 4 candles with red shades, and red favors, and such beautiful china and silver. Of course Sarah, the cook, waited on the table. First we had a clear soup. In little cups with two handles with slices of lemon in it. It was good too. Then we had roast goose with dressing and creamed celery and spinach (but no potatoes, wasn’t that funny?) And tiny little biscuits. It was awfully good & I ate two helpings. . . . Well, about that time, [Sarah] bro’t in a bottle of wine & filled our glasses—it looked nice—a clear pale yellow. And when Mr. Seagrave toasted Horace Allen & my brother [both in the army at that time] of course I had to drink some. But I’d rather have medicine any time—it was bitter as could be. So altho’ I knew it wasn’t very nice of me, I couldn’t drink but a couple of swallows. It was a variety made here on the coast & supposed to be very light & of course I knew it wouldn’t hurt me, but how they can call that darned stuff good is more than I can see. After our goose, for salad we had half of an avocado (alligator pear) filled with French dressing, which is nothing more or less than pure olive oil with some vinegar & a lot of seasoning in it. I didn’t enjoy that at all, because I can’t bear olive oil and the pears, which are very expensive, haven’t any taste at all. But I ate it of course, and I suppose there must be something wrong with me not to like it. Then we had plum pudding with brandy burning all over it—it looked so pretty, and hard sauce. And then, of course, after dinner coffee and candy. Then we went in the living room & little Marshall took the things off the tree and passed them around.²

Coping with the Depression

In his 1992 memoir of his life and career, from Cal student to professor of sociology to first vice chancellor of the Riverside campus, Robert Nisbet has a chapter called “Coping with the Depression” as a student:

Things improved the second semester at Berkeley [1932]. Four of us, all friends, rented one of the Euclid Apartments at Hearst and Euclid for forty dollars a month, ten dollars apiece, and did our own cooking. The apartment had a living room and dining room, each with a pull-down wall bed. Almost all studying was done of course at the library, three minutes away. Food was cheap at the small grocery up the street—bread eight cents a loaf, five cents when day old, carrots a penny a bunch, a lamb chop, when splurging, a dime, and so on. My principal memory is of a concoction we dignified by the name of Red Bread which we had almost every lunch. It consisted of a large can of tomatoes (twenty cents) and a finger-crumbled loaf of day-old bread (five cents) cooked until the contents simmered. To it was added a green salad, that is, one head of lettuce (three to five cents) and a shredded bunch of carrots (usually one cent). The happy result of this mode of living was a food bill for each of us that never reached ten dollars a month.³
AT BANQUETS

In Hearst Hall


In Berkeley Hotels

On October 14, 1917, Agnes Edwards was one of the initiates at her new sorority, Alpha Gamma Delta:

The banquet was at 7 at one of the Berkeley hotels. There were over forty girls, all in evening clothes—and that means real ones like you see in the pictures—and tables were beautifully decorated with red and buff ribbons and roses. Red, buff and green are the Sorority colors. We had a swell banquet too—fruit cocktail, consommé, sand-dabs (they are a small fish) fried in butter with julienne potatoes, roast chicken, dressing and mashed potatoes, tomatoes stuffed with something which was awfully good, ice cream and cake and black coffee. I haven't drunk either coffee or tea since I've been here—feel very proud of myself.4

Agnes describes another banquet, this one for the initiates of the succeeding year, on March 10, 1918:

We had initiation yesterday afternoon—initiated 8 new girls into Alpha Gamma Delta. Of course we all wore white then. But in the evening we had our banquet down at the Shattuck Hotel, & all wore evening dresses. Some of the girls have very wonderful dresses but I imagine I'd feel very queer in them, because there isn't very much to them. . . . The table was very pretty. It was set for 44 & was decorated with red and buff roses with the green leaves and asparagus ferns, & long red and buff ribbons down the center. We had good eats too—grapefruit first, turtle soup, creamed crabs legs (they're fine) roast chicken, asparagus with mayonnaise dressing & ice cream & black coffee. . . . This is a great place up here—I'm afraid if I were to live here always, I'd be too fat to walk, but would have to waddle.5
On Charter Day, 1918

At the Alumni Association Charter Day Banquet, 1918, celebrating the 50th anniversary of the university’s founding, the speakers were President Wheeler, Professor William B. Sloane (Columbia), and Professor Henry Morse Stephens. Maude Cleveland, Class of 1909, sent this poem from France where World War I was in progress and a Cal Ambulance Corps was serving.

CHARTER DAY 1918

I think of you this Charter Day especially,  
Here in Lorraine I see  
The wide blue California sky  
Above the sweet acacias’ gold.  
And I recall the academic line  
And words of those who taught us there  
To love and serve the world.  
Within the everlasting sound of guns  
Here where the white flare flames at night  
To guide the avion home,  
Here where men die and women weep,  
The orphan children of another land  
Tug at my skirts  
Or catch my busy hands  
To bow the face of their Americaine  
And claim another kiss.  
Dear Alma Mater there across the world  
Loving and serving them  
I think of you today.

MAUDE CLEVELAND ’09  
Written in Paris
In Stephens Student Union, 1940

Prytanean Initiation Banquet in Stephens Union. 1940 Blue and Gold.

**MENU**

- Crab Cocktail
- Roast Beef
- Peas
- Glazed Potatoes
- Rolls
- Toasted Almond Ice Cream
- Coffee

**PROGRAM**

- Shangri-la
  
  Toastmistress
  Loraine Lunt

  **SPEAKERS**
  
  Ruth Knaus .... The Courtyard
  Edith Stout .... The Vista

  Musical Entertainment
  Mrs. Virginia Treadwell King

  Guest Speaker
  Mrs. Ruth Norton Donnelly
  "The Inner Sanctuary"

On Charter Day, 2000

Charter Day Banquet, 2000. Alice Waters, '67, was honored at this banquet as 1999 Alumna of the Year.

BEYOND SATHER GATE

Garff Wilson's memoir Color Them Blue and Gold published in 1988 has a chapter called "The Campus—Then and Now" with several sketches of popular off-campus eateries.

Stand with me today on the north side of Bancroft Way at the spot where Telegraph Avenue ends. . . . [1]If the year is 1927 . . . north of the Bank is an alley which leads to the most popular restaurant of the era. The Black Sheep. It occupies the second floor of an old residence blocked from view by the stores in front of it. The restaurant is the work of a prodigy named Fritzi. In the early years of her restaurant, she was the universal genius: she planned the menu, cooked the food, welcomed the customers, took their orders, served the food, then took their money when the checks were paid.
Fritzi's Black Sheep was a gourmet's delight and attracted the cream of the campus elite. The Department of English had a permanently reserved table at noontime. The wittiest, brightest members of the department gathered here for lunch. . . . Who was there? "Bull" Durham, "Bud" Bronson, Ben Lehman, Jim Caldwell, and others. We felt they truly were a galaxy of stars. When Fritzi's first restaurant was razed to make way for Sproul Hall, a new Black Sheep was designed and built on the south side of Bancroft across from the campus.

[Just before Sather Gate] . . . we pass Barney's Beanery—an absolutely unique eatery which could not exist today. It was restricted to MEN ONLY. Females were never admitted, and so far as I recall, they never grumbled or protested. . . . The menus were usually hamburgers, hot dogs, ham and eggs, and other routine "grub." But the men loved the place and filled the wooden booths which were lavishly carved with initials and remarks.

[In 1947] on the west side of Bancroft [before the student center was built] one of these establishments is "upper" Jules Creamery, a popular hamburger and malted milk emporium with booths on one side of the room and a long counter on the other.

[Just before Bancroft] we reach another wonderful gathering place named The Varsity. When we enter it, a candy counter confronts us. On our right is a soda fountain. Beyond are booths for sandwiches and light meals. But past the soda fountain is a spacious arch which admits us to an adjoining room lined with booths which encircled a DANCE FLOOR! Any evening we can drop in, after study is over, grab a booth, order a coke, listen to a combo or the jukebox and, if we feel like it, pull our girl friends onto the floor and dance!9

ENDNOTES


2 Moremen, 53.


4 Moremen, 28-29.

5 Moremen, 81.

BERKELEY'S FACULTY CLUB—THE VIEW FROM THE BAR

Paul Parish

THE FACULTY CLUB was formed to give the mostly male, largely bachelor faculty a place to eat and meet. When the university was founded, there really was no city of Berkeley. There was a fishing settlement down at the bay, but the uphill area wasn't settled at all. By 1902, when Maybeck's Great Hall was completed atop a site beside Strawberry Creek that showed pottery-and-charred-bone evidence that Native Americans had camped and eaten here, there still wasn’t much going on up in this area, not even the Claremont Hotel (which wasn't built till 1915). A dining room thus constituted the core of the future club. The Chinese cook, known to history only as “Old Louie” still has his portrait in one of the corners of the Kerr Dining Room. (See Schafer in this issue.) In a magnanimous gesture to a club that did not accept women, Phoebe Apperson Hearst donated the first fine, large cook-stove to the new building.

It’s no surprise that the new club (which supplanted a rudimentary Dining Association) was a hit and that members soon asked for a new wing with a billiard room (now the bar, which is the room I've tended for the past quarter of a century) downstairs and living quarters above (now reconfigured into the Seaborg Room). Changes and additions over the years have led to the result that food operations sprawl like the building itself, which lumbers across a hillside like a Berkeley version of Hogwarts School. Feeding guests in the Seaborg Room, for example, involves carrying everything by hand down one staircase, up another, making two left turns, five right turns, about fifty yards in all from kitchen to table.

Like the club itself, which has roughly 1700 members whose various needs and wants run the show, the history of food operations is a complex and rambling one. The original mandate was to provide good food for the membership at the least cost, and finding that happy medium has been the task of managers ever since—especially since the club also has an extremely wide range of special occasions to provide for. The biggest divide is between ordinary fare and festival food, which nowadays means in practice, lunch versus everything else.

In the early days of the club, students made up about half the horde of lunch-eaters, according to Gil Paltridge, author of A History of The Faculty Club at UC Berkeley, but shortly they were siphoned off by cheaper eats elsewhere, and the club became tonier, a gentlemen's club. Although the club remains private, with special discounts and privileges for members, during the entire time I've worked here the food services have, in fact, been open to the public. At lunchtime, in particular, the club runs a loose confederation of feeding operations, with a cafeteria, a dining room with menu service, and private banqueting operations all working at the same time. It looks more like a lunch room than a club, for we then feed several hundred people, from every category of university employee—professors, gardeners, librarians, secretaries, plumbers, mail-folk, the hard-hats working on the many construction sites. It is sometimes hard to tell by their clothes what role a person plays on campus, especially since the faculty started abandoning tweed coats and ties in favor of jeans or corduroys.

The great majority of people are obviously meeting to talk things over, either getting together as friends or putting their heads together over some problem. Brown-bagging used to be welcome, but no longer. The Great Hall still belongs to people eating off trays, though
Luncheon in the Great Hall of the Faculty Club, 1946. Photograph by Hagel. University Archives (UARC 102:9).

some of the tables in there have been bespoke in the past—Chemistry sat at the big refectory table under the moose-head, Physics at the small table to the east, and so on.

I have been asked to write from personal knowledge about the food at the Faculty Club over the last twenty-five years, where I've been the waiter/bartender at lunchtime and have certainly seen a lot of BLTs come and go; I've also heard a lot—bartenders hear a lot—about the days before my time, and being a curious fellow, I've encouraged members to tell of the
deep-fried ham-and-cheese sandwiches (called Monte Cristos) that preceded my era, so I can also recount some legendary material as well as quote some scholars to the purpose.

But reader, be warned: memory of food is subject to tremendous inaccuracies. One wonders if the remembered madeleine of Proust’s youth had half of the qualities that he describes in his famous book, since the surge of emotion that overcame him belongs to imagination as much as to memory. Even if I were absolutely convinced that the BLT of 1989 tastes the same as it does today, you’d be wise to doubt me. I think the lettuce has improved, and maybe the tomato is less mealy in February, and perhaps the bread (we use sourdough toast now, and then I’m sure it was a sweet sandwich loaf), and yet... I have only about 75 percent confidence in most of what I’m about to say about the food itself.

Caveat number two: some of the old dishes have remained in demand twenty years after they disappeared from the menu—such as the “Tuna Town,” which is nothing fancier than a mound of tuna-fish salad on a large bed of lettuce, decorated with tomatoes, olives, cucumbers, croutons, et cetera. I’ve had to teach twenty succeeding salad chefs how to make it, since I know I’ll need at least one on the last Thursday of every month, when the GAG group (Gracefully Ageing Gentlemen) gather at the rectangular table in the bar to compare notes on their sailboats, grandchildren, leaking roofs, intractable neighbors, and the likelihood that anyone will ever surpass Cole Porter as a popular songwriter.

When I started working at the Faculty Club, the manager, Richard Wherry, had formerly managed a Denny’s, and though he was himself a good cook and understood fine dining—he had a great respect for the superiority of a spinach salad to anything made of lettuce—he ran the club in keeping with the way things had mostly been at midcentury. That is, the Faculty Club served as the main place where faculty and staff had lunch on campus. Hundreds of people had to be fed lunch there every day, which means there was a huge rush at noon; it was a mess hall.

During his regime, however, the food revolution hit—it was time. The first steps here at the club were tentative ones. The executive chef had been not a restaurant worker at all when the manager saw talent in her and trained her; she was a wonderful cook, but did not have the training to avoid the occasional embarrassing mistake. He even took me and “gave me a chance.” I was to run the salad bar for a summer. I had some taste, and my curried pasta salad (with steamed broccoli and toasted cashews, with a couple of baked bananas mashed into the curried vinaigrette) was pretty yummy, but I made a lot of mistakes. One day I put anise seed and a pinch of cinnamon into the coleslaw, which I thought was delicious, and better than normal coleslaw, but coleslaw lovers complained in large numbers. It was time to professionalize.

Somewhere in the late eighties the board went for it and brought in a new chef, Sheila Marquez, who had trained under the celebrity chef Jeremiah Tower at the Santa Fe Bar and Grill. Under the new regime, the walk-in refrigerators (which had been crammed to the ceilings with boxes of produce and pans of leftovers) were airy and tidy, and the shelves boasted ingredients I’d never seen before nor even heard of—baby squash, with the flowers still hanging off the end, mesclun salad greens, baby arugula, hazelnut oil, walnut oil, raspberry vinegar. And they built a new pantry and installed a new pastry chef, who produced at least two fabulous desserts every day: perhaps a fruit tart, or a boule de neige, or pot de crème, or a cake covered with macaroon buttercream or a sheath of marzipan, or the chocolate Queen Mother’s Cake, my favorite.

Good food takes time, of course, and there were disasters of timing under the new regime, since everything took longer to get together and onto the tables, especially since making the salads became a cook’s job rather than a waiter’s, and there weren’t enough
hands on deck if several separate private parties had to be served at the same time. Things might have gotten smoothed out. The bigger problem was the cost: after a few months it became clear that the expense of working this way was monumentally greater than what the board had bargained for, that the members would not stand for a raise in prices that would make possible this level of preciousness, and something less than perfection had to be settled for, so a new chef with high, but not quite so high, standards came in to split the difference. On the other hand, we never went back to the old ways.

Since 1995, when the board brought in Felix Solomon as manager, everything about the club has steadily and systematically improved: the furniture, building, and grounds are now regularly kept up after decades of deferred maintenance; the halls are now galleries for rotating art displays; accounting procedures have been rationalized; hotel rooms and public spaces have wireless internet access and satellite TV. And the cooks now are professionally trained. The current chef, Carl Cheney, is the most imaginative and best-rounded we've ever had. He does vegan for fun but can entertain any cuisine, and he lets staff cook their home food. Soukchain's curried entrees (for the cafeteria line) sell out within an hour every Friday. Juan's empanadas were a hit on the Kerr menu, and so are his chile rellenos. Carl changes the menus seasonally, using absolutely fresh produce, all from local providers. Nearly half of the produce is organic. Last summer, on August 30, the large platters on the salad bar offered Thai Green Papaya Salad, Rice Pudding with Mango and Chocolate, Grilled Peaches, Italian Grilled Vegetables with Fresh Mozzarella, a Sweet Potato Salad, and Roasted Beets with Fennel. The only thing on the salad bar that comes out of a can is a bowl of mandarin oranges.

In my mind certain simple meals and dishes remain tied to the people who ate them under my care. Professor Paltridge, author of the club history, usually ate in the bar and almost always had a BLT for lunch, with potato salad. There's a certain Spartan valor in eating a plain lunch, since the ordinariest food belongs to lunch, and former chancellors Mike Heyman and Al Bowker consider a ham- or garden-burger about the right sort of thing for a break on a working day. Almost the sweetest part of my job was to hear the great philosopher Joseph Tussman, who came into the bar regularly and in cheerful tones lamented his
side’s loss in the war between wisdom and knowledge; he rarely had more than a bowl of soup and a cup of coffee. But my memories of the people eating the club’s food must form another document! Back to the food.

Let’s look at a twenty-year comparison in salads. In 1986 the most singular was called “The Spanish Sea”: a bed of lettuce, topped with a scoop of cottage cheese and a sprinkling of shrimp, surrounded by tomato wedges, all dressed with Thousand Island dressing. (It was awful.) In 2006 we find “The Hawaiian Napoleon,” which hides two fresh-seared ahi tuna steaks under fried won-ton strips amidst a slaw of Napa cabbage, cilantro, sprinkled with macadamia nuts and sesame seeds. (It’s delicious.) Of course, there are members of the Old Guard who resist such innovations: see above my comments on the “Tuna Town” still being ordered by senior members. But the new additions are popular among most members, young and old.

Some traditions continue: we still have clam chowder on Fridays, white on three Fridays in the month, and red on the remaining one. The brass plaque in the Elberg Room says “If change isn’t necessary, it is necessary not to change.” To which we can add a corollary: “If taste changes, change is necessary.” No one misses the Monte Cristo, dusted in powdered sugar.

One change to the good is that club members who want a drink with a meal no longer have to resort to keeping a bottle of wine in a private locker in the basement. The club has long been fully licensed, and boasts a fine cellar with a wide selection of good wine at a reasonable markup. And though I don’t serve many apple margaritas or blue drinks, members can now get a wide range of cocktails at the bar. No one misses the dusty lockers.

I have talked largely of lunch, which is my bailiwick. Dinner service is more limited, but the early-bird dinners (5-6 p.m.) are delicious and extremely good value, and before an event at Zellerbach Hall or a basketball game, the Kerr Dining Room is full to bursting in the evening. From the checkered tablecloths and perky diner-style waitresses of the fifties we’ve graduated to dark linens and quietly efficient servers. The kitchen now knows that salt is not the only spice, and the lamb chops can be ordered as pink as one desires.

I have always wanted to serve at one of our specialty dinners, such as the one when the boss cooks an Indian banquet (Felix grew up in New Delhi and he really can cook) or when Carl’s hip chef-friend does a vegan feast that everyone raves about afterwards. A special case of these is the winemaker’s dinner, which is a sort of lecture-demonstration, part of the continuing education of the faculty; the chef dreams up a fine meal tailored to the wines of Mondavi, say, or Hafner, or Rosenblum, which the winemaker is on hand to discuss as he serves a different wine that “goes with” each course.

I have served at awards banquets and at our lovely Mother’s Day brunch. I’ve helped out at the enormous wine-tasting buffets (platters of crab and prawns, carving stations for large joints of meat, pasta stations, salads of several kinds, vegetables and casseroles in chafing dishes, coffee, tea, desserts galore), when the hundreds of members who have been on the glade visiting the booths of a lot of wine merchants (whose wares can be bought by the case at warehouse prices for home cellaring) come inside to settle down, visit, eat, and contemplate their order forms.

Maybe the biggest crowds of all come to eat before and after home football games. After all, the stadium is close, the food is good, so is the company, service is quick, the price is right. There are full bars ready to go whether Fortune smiled or frowned, and if you’ve found a parking place, why fight your way back to the car when you won’t be able to move for an hour anyway?
Unquestionably the grandest member event of all is the annual Christmas party. There've been over a hundred now. For these extravaganzas we pull out all the stops and stage a medieval feast extending over three nights. The hall is hung with medieval banners and swags of evergreens, the east window is filled with faux stained glass, the moose wears an earring and makes a speech; a chorus of members dressed as monks enter carrying a boar's head and parade among the diners singing Christmas carols throughout the meal, and after dessert there's a ludicrous skit starring a former chancellor and other dignitaries. In addition to the superior ingredients used in such meals (wild boar, for example, one year instead of turkey), the technological advances pushed by Felix Solomon with the support of the board have made possible a vast improvement in such events. Scientific temperature control is now a possibility; new ranges, convection ovens, rolling hot-boxes that will hold hundreds of plates ready-to-serve guarantee that food stays warm but does not over-cook, meat is tender, delicious, hot; and stuff that should be cold is cold.

Thus some things remain the same—the effort to please as many of our diverse membership and custom as possible—while change is introduced along the way.

Let's end with one anecdote about memory and change. As I have said, it would be a mistake to believe with more than 50 percent certainty anyone's account of a meal one had over twenty years ago. These things melt away in the mind. My favorite example of this involves former Vice Chancellor Mac Laetsch, one of the great benefactors of the Faculty
Club, inasmuch as he is responsible for getting management to put in an espresso machine. He once received, in a stately ceremony led by Carol d’Onofrio in full academic regalia, a massive silver spoon curiously inscribed, for somehow upgrading the quality of the soup served at the club, but he can't remember exactly whether it was that he lobbied for there to be soup every day, or a different soup every day, or perhaps a choice of soups every day.

My investigations and the effort involved in writing this piece find this to be a nearly universal problem—people cannot remember what they ate when, unless it is linked to some ritual event, either something unvaryingly regular (if it was Friday, it would have been clam chowder) or else something entirely singular (it was the year Paul danced in the Christmas skit, and the Sproul Associates had roast pheasant, with an apple cider sorbet as a palate cleanser). Such recollections are suspect, since the better they make the story, the more probably they represent imagination rather than memory at work.

All that we can say for sure is that food has been, and remains—along with wine—a matter of great interest to members and all those who share the amenities of the Faculty Club at Berkeley. And despite the vagaries of memory I can attest that the food continues to get better, in quality, value, and variety. But this is my opinion. Why not try it for yourself? Drop by at lunchtime—and be sure to come into the bar, have a drink, and share your memories.

Paul Parish, on duty in the Faculty Club bar, 2006. Photograph by Ann Lage.
SHARING, EATING, AND PLAYING:
THE ANNUAL HIGH SCHOOL SPORTS DAY

Roberta J. Park

The following sentences open the 1955 report of the General Chairman of High School Sports Day, an annual event sponsored by the Women’s Athletic Association and Women’s “C” Society from the 1920s through the 1970s.

The theme of the day was “Sports Parade.” Approximately five hundred people, including high school students, their advisors, University students, and faculty members attended. The weather was beautiful until the lunch hour, when the skies became overcast and a cool wind began to blow. The day’s activities began with registration in the Arcade [of Hearst Gymnasium], where each school was presented an envelope with all the paraphernalia they would need for the day. The high school girls were then taken by members of the Reception Committee to Room 251 for chocolate and donut holes, and the faculty members were directed to the terrace for coffee and donut holes.

Each year approximately one hundred California high schools were invited to send five members of their Girls’ Athletic Association (accompanied by a female faculty advisor) to the Berkeley campus for a day of sharing through sports, dance, and lunch on North Field. Well before six a.m. W.A.A. officers and “C” Society members would gather, along with a large collection of loaves of bread, bottles of peanut butter, cheese, lettuce, tomatoes, and other items, to prepare the more than five hundred sandwiches and other consumables that would be distributed at noon. Following the nine a.m. general welcome the visitors were given a lesson in two—sometimes three—physical activities of their choosing by W.A.A. and “C” Society members. Typical offerings included tennis, basketball, volleyball, fencing, swimming, table tennis, riflery, and modern dance. (By the 1970s field hockey, softball, and track had replaced table tennis and riflery.) The 12:30 to 1:30 p.m. lunch period, during which Cal students mingled with their young guests and told them something about the university, typically included opportunities for folk dancing (later, frisbee contests), meeting new people, and chatting. Campus tours, recreational swimming in the Hearst Gymnasium North Pool, and recreational volleyball on the Hearst West Field filled the time before the guests’ departure for home around three p.m.
FINES DINE OF CAMPUS FOR A GRAD STUDENT
IN THE SPROUL YEARS

J.R.K. Kantor

Arriving in Berkeley in June of 1955 as a Korean War veteran, being startled by
the beauty of the campus below my rooms, applying to graduate school at Berkeley and
being rapidly accepted, taken on by the Bancroft Library as a student assistant to page
books and to engage in cataloguing projects—all these things now resound in memory,
fifty years later. At that time only grad men students were taken on at the Bancroft—they
had "a much freer schedule"—and there were then but five of us. In those palm days, too,
the Bancroft was open many, many more hours than at present: Monday through Thursday,
eight to five and seven to ten; Friday, eight to five; Saturday, nine to five; and Sunday, one
to five. Amazing! So we lucky grads had a healthy pattern. I was, at first, assigned to work
on Thursday evening; later I was picked to assist the chief librarian, John Barr Tompkins,
who always worked the Monday evening shift. So it was necessary that I be on the job by
seven, having eaten my dinner; as I lived way up on Panoramic Hill, I found the campus
cafeteria the place for my meal.

With the invasion on campus, in 1946, by the bumper crop of World War II veterans
on the GI Bill—enrollment increased by 35 percent—there was an immediate need for
dining facility, and a World War II wooden building was shipped from Camp Parks in
Alameda County to the campus and set up in the southeast quadrant, the present site of
the broad plaza between Hertz, Wurster, and Kroeber Halls, none of these yet built. This
happy venue remained in use as a cafeteria for thirteen years, until the completion of the
Student Union complex at Sather Gate and the opening of the new cafeteria.

I happily consumed those dinners in the campus cafeteria; after all, in my own shared
living quarters up on Mosswood Road, with its three-burner kerosene stove and its ice box,
we had quite limited means for cooking. Now I would relish the perfectly fried eggplant, and
lo and behold! the smashing rice pudding. Who was behind those stoves? I would think.
How did such elegant dishes come to be available to students on the Berkeley campus? I
didn't know then, and alas, I don't know now. But they were, and are, memorable to this
emeritus. And I am most grateful.
WHEN I ENTERED CAL IN 1952 AS A FRESHMAN, traditions had become firmly established at Stern Hall, ten years after it first opened. It was the first official university-owned women's dormitory and architecturally a stunning and most modern building for the campus, set among the eucalyptus on the hill near the Greek Theatre. Stern was a place unlike any I had seen before. The large drawing room to the right of the entry had huge windows across the west wall looking out on the campus below and San Francisco across the bay. To the left of the entry were two offices, a library and a beau parlor. Yes, even at that time it was an old-fashioned expression, but it was in the beau parlor where we could entertain a boyfriend in semi-privacy—the door was always part-way open. Beyond were three stories of rooms for ninety students, both single and double rooms, and a suite above for the housemother. Opposite the entry was a grand curved staircase leading to the dining room below.

Today the drawing room is far less glamorous—no black and white cowhide rugs, silver tea service, ashtrays, and only a few of the original leather-covered tables and chairs, but it is still imposing and the grand piano is still there. Rosalie Meyer Stern's portrait, a gift of her daughter, Elise Stern Haas, hangs in the drawing room, now called the lounge. Mrs. Stern's gift in honor of her husband, Sigmund Stern (class of 1879), who was a San Francisco businessman and benefactor of the university, provided the funds for nearly half of the total cost of the building. Her granddaughter, Rhoda Haas, was among the first resident students in the class of 1946. Some of her classmates recalled she covered the ceiling in her room with phosphorescent stars.

During the war some of the first Stern Hall women picked crops on the weekend to help
the war effort: “We rode in trucks to the tomato fields or the walnut groves on Saturday and Sunday and had a lot of fun while we picked. We returned with sore muscles and stained fingers.” They remember having had to turn in their ration coupons for meat and sugar. They credited Mrs. Gilmore, the housekeeper, for planning the excellent meals. She had a connection to UC Davis to get meat, butter, cream, and more. “The food was excellent by any standard, but for that it surpassed what most people were able to obtain. Everyone loved to come to Stern Hall to dinner. President Sproul, or Vice President Deutsch, or the Deans of Women were guests about once a month, and we sometimes invited faculty to dinner.” These reminiscences were compiled and written by Vlasta Nosek Gufrey ’44, after Stern Hall’s fiftieth anniversary reunion on October 31, 1992, in an unpublished manuscript dated October 17, 1993.

In the fifties, every day we met at six in the drawing room before dinner. As soon as the head hasher at the foot of the stairs in his spotless white jacket hit the chimes announcing dinner was ready, the housemother descended first, along with those who were going to sit at her table. Then the rest of us followed. Mrs. Blumberg, our housemother, was as perfectly groomed and dignified as Mrs. Stern or Mrs. Sproul, both occasional visitors to Stern Hall.

At the foot of the large red-carpeted spiral stairway facing us before turning left into the dining room is a mural by Diego Rivera, *Still Life and Blossoming Almond Trees*. Rivera originally prepared it for a place in Mrs. Stern’s Atherton home. A later article in this issue tells the story about the mural. The abundant orchard Rivera depicted looked just like those I grew up with in the Santa Clara Valley and I could almost smell the blossoms and fruit each time I looked at the mural.

Ahhh. Then we turned into the dining room, where we sat at black-lacquered tables for four (a few for six) to be served by our favorite hasher. Of course, we waited for our housemother to be seated, before we pulled out our chairs.

Our wonderful meals were prepared in our own kitchen, and we often had some treat. My favorite was a grand popover with strawberry jam or grilled half-grapefruit with brown sugar and a cherry on top. I learned that at Stern Hall we did not have hamburger patties, but rather, Salisbury steak. The ubiquitous parsley sat on every plate. Sometimes we had Blue Bowl Stew with its bright collar of mashed potatoes around the rim. Desserts like our meals were usually simple, except for special meals like the birthday dinner once a month or other meals with a special theme. Sunday dinners at one were also formal, and hosiery and heels were expected. It was also in the dining room at dinnertime that pinnings were announced by the passing of a lighted candle from table to table until the lucky girl blew the candle out. She had been given a fraternity or club pin by her boyfriend as a token of true love but not yet an engagement. But when one of us became engaged, a twenty-five pound box of See’s candy appeared at the head table, and the housemother (who had wrapped it with fancy ribbons and paper) then read the announcement, sometimes as a poem that the student had written, to the laughing and clapping and sighs of her friends to the news.

Before home football games we usually had make-your-own sandwiches, with celery and carrot sticks, at lunch out on the patio off the drawing room. And later, who can forget the frozen orange at football games? Or the Crunchy Munchy man on campus between classes? “Crunchy-munchy, good after lunchy.” Or Jule’s for coffee?

Stern Hall today has been expanded several times to now house 267 women and 7 live-in staff. It is surrounded by a huge student housing complex, Foothill, stretching from the Greek Theatre to the opposite corner of Gayley and Hearst, that accommodates 800 students with a dining commons for them and also for the residents of Stern Hall and Bowles Hall. The gorgeous old dining room I remember is now used only for special events, like weddings and receptions. Nevertheless, Stern Hall still retains the qualities Mrs. Stern requested of her architect, that it be “homelike and casual, and at once, elegant and dignified.”
Eat more Ice Cream

National Ice Cream is so pure and wholesome, so easily digested and assimilated, that it is often the first food allowed convalescents.

M. E. Jaffa, Professor of Nutrition, University of California, says:

"In the case of the sick or convalescent, there is no better method of administering fuel—another name for calories—than by ice cream, in that it contains both milk-fat and sugar, two of the best sources of energy available to the body, in addition to the two vitamins so necessary."

National Ice Cream is the richest portion of milk in its most delicious and tempting form. It is one food that combines, in a most unusual manner, rare palatability and high food value.

There are several reasons why you should always ask for "National Ice Cream" by name.

National ICE CREAM
Pleasure in Every Taste

Oakland: Phone Oakland 16

1925 Blue and Gold (1924).
ENTERTAINING AT UNIVERSITY HOUSE
AND CALIFORNIA HALL

Although more than half a century has passed since Ida Sproul so meticulously planned the many wonderful dinners and receptions at University House [described in the following pages], this grand home still remains at the heart of an ever increasing number of campus events and activities. Indeed it is a great honor for the Chancellor and myself to reside here at UHouse where we greatly enjoy the many opportunities we have to welcome faculty members, staff, students, alumni and friends of the university to this historic setting. Ideally located in an elegant garden setting on the north side of the campus, University House is truly a jewel in the crown of the many architectural treasures on our beautiful Berkeley campus. Over the years, countless illustrious personages and many generations of our Cal family have gathered in this special place to celebrate the remarkable accomplishments of this great public institution of higher learning. It is with much affection and pride that my husband and I anticipate the exciting and memorable events that will continue to take place here at University House during our tenure and for many decades to come.

Mary Catherine Birgeneau, 2006

The Sprouls at Home
Agnes Roddy Robb, the administrative secretary of Robert Gordon Sproul, University president, 1930 to 1958, gave an oral history in 1976.¹ She was asked about the Sproul family at home:

The President's House was a home for 28 years. The children grew up and all three were married while it was still their home. Both the President and Mrs. Sproul felt the house should be maintained as a private home rather than an official building, but on the other hand it was also to be used for the benefit of the University and the state. The Sprouls were generous in their entertainment. Except for special occasions, such as the Charter Day, Big Game Luncheon—when Stanford played at Berkeley—the Senior Tea, etc., the dinners and luncheons were small elegant affairs, with the guest list very carefully chosen in reference to the honoree. Incidentally, in the case of a foreign person, a typical American menu was selected rather than trying to copy the native food.

The house guests were many and distinguished. The Charter speaker and his wife were always invited. Most accepted the invitation. President Truman declined, saying “Mrs. Sproul, I wouldn't think of inflicting us on you and your family. There would be a secret service man under every bush. Your kitchen would be invaded, and every morsel tasted. Thank you very much, but we'll stay in a hotel.”

The interviewer asked Agnes Robb about presidential dinner parties:

¹
As Mrs. Sproul said to me, "At our parties, the men all went this way and the ladies went that way, and finally they got together. They always had some socializing." But they didn't drink very long; dinner was served on time. She was great. Promptness was very important; dinner was such a time, and that's when they had dinner!

The family were not part of the official social life. Mrs. Sproul was very careful; her parties were selective and they were relatively small. They weren't enlarged by members of the family or the office staff. She felt very definitely that they didn't belong, and I agree with her. That's different from most of the campuses where secretaries of the office are much more a part of the social life. I agreed the Sprouls were right; they should not fill places with the staff.

Mrs. Sproul was a charming hostess; she did most of the preparations herself. She did her own marketing. Like the Rockefellers. The children had to work at times. For Charter Days, I know she used to get peas by the hundred pounds, and then she'd pay the children 15 [cents] a pound to shell them . . . Both of them were careful in the selection of guests; it would be a congenial group, matching interests rather than just titles or departments.

The interviewer asked about elegance, was the dress rather formal?

Yes, and there were formal invitations. When Prytanean would have use of the house, Mrs. Sproul was always the hostess. The house wasn't loaned for an organization; she was the hostess and invited the membership. That's the way it was set up, because the theory was that this was their home and you would treat it as a home, not an official place. She provided the food. Conditions have changed, both here and at Los Angeles, and I presume on the other campuses, where the house is just loaned and you bring your own food, or at least you pay for it. But that was not their policy. It's an old fashioned theory.

Dinner in University House, October 19, 1949, the Sprouls honoring a friend's ninetieth birthday.
University Archives (UARC PIC 14G:30).
Ida Sproul’s Party Notes
Mrs. Sproul made these notes after each occasion and kept them on numbered pages in a spiral notebook, on pages 1 to 86 (the Senior Tea of June 8, 1958, was the last). The annual events were: Charter Day, Senior Tea, Freshmen Reception, Big Game (if in Berkeley) luncheon; exceptional events were lunches or dinners for important guests. Six of these pages are reproduced here.\(^2\)

Nov. 11
Armistice Day - Tea after Army-Navy game. About 53 came of very short notice. Should make it a real nice party and ask people sooner.

Nov. 22
Big Game - Riffee Luncheon - about 25 came - Regents invited and a few friends.

Feb. 4th
Charter Day - 45 came - went well. Nichol's, Murray, Butler, Speaker, Wills Coother, House guests.

May 12
Senior Reception - Coffee 7.00
Tea ½ a
Ice cream 10 gallons
Cream 3 quarts

Ordered 2500 sandwiches - about 1000 too many - about 570 came.
May 23. Charter Day. Bishop James Edward Freeman of Washington, D.C., was the speaker of the day. He arrived Monday evening and left for the race on Tuesday evening. We had 54 guests at luncheon. It was very hot the morning of the race and as the exercises were held in the Memorial Gymnasium for the first time, and we had been in the President's House, Bishop Freeman was a delightful guest. Full of interesting stories about personal affairs in Washington. We had, Mrs. Marshall, five maids, Katherine Hakkenson and our own staff. We served a delightful pear cocktail, lamb chops, kidney, bacon and sausage (the sauces with mustard and the small Whale try June Dairy Farm meat), kielbasa hot sausages, rice, gilly peas, ice cream, home made cookies and coffee. We wrote: 2 dozen tea spoons, 1/2 dozen forks, 1 dozen knives, 1/2 dozen preserving spoons, 2 sets of pepper and 2 platters.
Senior year: About 500 people came. We were a little short. In May, the next year, we planned to cut our bread to 1/2 bread instead of 1/2 from two slices of bread. We had Mr. Rotheram, Katherine, our staff, and four extra waiters. We used the basement as the student's place to play pong. They didn't have to order

for free unless it is Planning Seminar that they can't go out in the garden. Mr. Rotheram had 15 loaves of bread, 2 loaves of rye, 4 hill rice sheet cakes. Cut from Mrs. Cook. 5 dozen 1/2-cut, cut in half, and jellied with cinnamon brown sugar (very popular). 2 coconut cakes made at home. 1 melon cut from Drake and Cookies made at home. We came out first about eight in the cake. I had brought 12 loaves of bread and we had to go out and buy three more. We came out with any cheese left over. We should never have done fancy sandwiches next year. Open face like we used to have. We wanted open face.
Saturday - Big Game Luncheon: 46 People
Nov. 21, 1942
We served cold ham, turkey, olives, relay cranberry jelly, rolls, green salad, tumble pie and coffee. We had our staff, Mrs. Hathlund and 3 outside maids. It went off extremely well.
Luncheon was set for 12 o'clock. Next time we might try to change the hot dish, perhaps a casserole or even a spinach soufflé. Also we could have more ice cream.
Lunch for King Paul and Queen Frederica of Greece. Wednesday, November 11, 1953, 12:30 p.m., President's Home.

We had a luncheon for 65 people in honor of Their Majesties. The King and Queen of the Hellenes. We used one big table (our dining-room table), seating 22 people and six small tables in the drawing room. We mixed the plans into the hall. Mrs. Abate did the flowers and they were beautiful. We served fresh fruit, cocktails, breads of chicken with mushrooms and sherry wine, broccoli ring with carrots, tarts, white rice, coffee ice cream with cream de cacao or bitter sweet chocolate grated on top, home-made cookies and new black coffee. Their Majesties were simple, friendly and charming — altogether delightful and enchanting. It was the first time royalty has ever entertained in the President's House. After the luncheon there was a beautiful evening in the Greek Theatre in their honor.
Friday, March 9, 1956

Luncheon at home for President Hiroshi Itokawa and his wife at official party. The day was beautiful and the party visited the cyclotron and the library and then had luncheon at the house. So people came to lunch—we served fruit cocktail, mince pie with creamed oxtail legs, carrots, rolls, jelly, white wine (Veau), and then ice cream, home-made coffee and coffee. It was a good thing the Minister of Foreign Affairs sat next to me (Mr. Exc. Gustavo Martins), as he could not eat anything with much spirit. Practically the whole luncheon was made with Veau. I quickly had Veau (on maid) being done. Those plain shrimp I had bought for an emergency and also another desert. Being Friday, I thought I should stick to fish. Since disappointments was ambassador Claire G. Borchardt became ill the day before our luncheon and was unable to come. The party goes by plane at 1 pm for Colorado Springs and New York.
The President and Chancellors at Christmas
From Agnes Robb's oral history:

In the last several years the President and Mrs. Sproul had a Christmas party at the President's house. By this time the staff had reached a sizeable number so the list was confined to the immediate personnel located in Sproul Hall. The included staff served from the office telephone exchange of Mr. Corley's, Mr. Pettit's, Mr. McAlfery's offices and the President's clerical staff. Mr. Sproul took great glee in preparing some fancy "slug" as a rare treat. (It was a most informal affair—someone would volunteer to play the piano—and all kinds of carols and Christmas songs were lustily sung, the chief baritone being the President with Mrs. Sproul the gracious hostess.) Some 60 or 70 guests enjoyed the party and the President could identify almost each one.3

At least two of the Berkeley chancellors coming later to the same house and offices in California Hall, provide reminiscences of Christmas celebrations in the form of two recipe collections for the occasions:4

Creative Cookery from the Office of the Chancellor, Christmas Recipes, date unknown. Courtesy of the Chancellor's Office.

**Marc's Bourbon Truffles**

2 cups cream
1-1/2 lb chocolate
2-1/4 lb butter
3 oz bourbon

Boil the cream, pour over chopped chocolate, add blended butter and bourbon. Stir to incorporate. Put in refrigerator overnight. Scoop and roll to desired size. Then dip in chocolate. Roll in unsweetened cocoa, coconut, toasted chopped nuts, etc. Don't stint on ingredients. Always use the best!

Submitted by: More Maroock
University House Chef

**Dirt Cake**

1 (7 oz) pkg of instant vanilla pudding
3 cups milk
1 (8 oz) pkg cream cheese, softened
1 (16 oz) container of Cool Whip
1 (16 oz) pkg. Oreos cookies (crumble a few at time in blender or food processor)
1 small pkg. greyhoy worms
1 (1/2 cup) dry flower pot, broiled, and flowers on top

Bake together pudding and milk. Blend cream cheese and Cool Whip. Add to pudding mixture and mix well. Put a layer of crumbled Oreos in flower pot, add some pudding and worms and continue layering. Top layer of "dirt" is Oreo cookies with worms coming out. Place flowers in dirt. Use tree for dish it up. Serves 15 to 20 people. Who will never forget this dessert. Believe me.

Submitted by: Ana Victoria Castillo

**BBQ a la Baggan**

2 quarts Kentucky Barbecue Sauce
1/4 cup horseradish sauce
1/2 cup of mayo
6 lbs. meat (beef, steak, etc.)

Mix 2 quarts of barbecue sauce, 1/4 cup horseradish sauce, and 1/2 cup of mayo together. Cook meat until about half way done. Bake meat with sauce frequently until done.

Submitted by: Vice Chancellor Daniel Baggan, Jr.
**Favorite Fare of California Hall**, December 15, 1988, cover and two pages of the contents. Courtesy of the Chancellor's office.

---

### Jackson's Arresting Fruit Cocktail Cake

1 box of cake mix—spice, or use your favorite mix  
1 lg. can of fruit cocktail  
1 stick of margarine or butter  
1 c. of sugar  
1 c. of milk  
2 c. walnuts or pecans  
9 x 12 baking pan

Mix cake according to directions on box. Add walnuts or pecans. Drain the juice from the fruit cocktail and save. Add fruit to cake mix. Flour baking pan and pour in mix. Bake at 350 to 400 degrees till done.  
When cake is done prepare the glaze. In a sauce pan melt the butter or margarine. Add the sugar, milk, and fruit cocktail juice. Bring to a boil. Pour over cake and serve while still warm.

James Jackson, U.C.P.D.

---

### Linguini with Turkey Tails

8 – 10 turkey tails  
1 large peeled yellow onion  
salt and pepper to taste  
1 16 oz. pkg. linguini  
16 oz. jar of marinara sauce  
parmesan cheese, optional

Place turkey tails, onion, water, salt & pepper in a crockpot. Cover. Let simmer while you go happily to work at the Chancellor's Office. When you arrive home in the evening, cook linguini just until al dente according to package directions. Drain and place on large serving platter. Arrange turkey tails on top of linguini. Pour heated marinara sauce over the turkey tails. Sprinkle with parmesan cheese. Serve with french rolls, a fresh green salad, and a nice burgundy (served at room temperature). Enjoy!

Sharon Johnson, Academic Personnel Office

---

**ENDNOTES**


2 These notes, now preserved in the University Archives, were provided in copies to the Chronicle by Mrs. Robert Birgeneau, to whom the editors offer warmest thanks.

3 Robb, Oral history, 93.

4 Copies courtesy of Mrs. Birgeneau.
THE GRAND OPENING FOR UC MERCED

Ana Nelson Shaw

Celebratory dinner for the 2005 grand opening of the UC Merced campus. Photo by Mike Karibian. Courtesy of UC Merced Communications.

AFTER SPENDING MOST OF A DECADE working toward a University of California campus in Merced, campus planners had a lot of people to thank when the campus finally opened. They did it with one enormous party, christened “Launching the Future,” underwritten by Pacific Gas and Electric Company.

On August 31, 2005, more than 1500 people found seats in a terraced basin just below the academic buildings. Wine donated by E&J Gallo Wineries and soft drinks started the evening, followed by a dinner of tri-tip, salad, vegetables, scalloped potatoes and rolls, catered by local culinary icon Fernando Palomino. Legislators, university and community leaders, and other friends of the campus offered thoughts and thanks and then introduced an uproarious performance by political satirists The Capitol Steps.

Crowning the evening’s events, a multimedia presentation and light show brought in the sights, sounds, and history of the surrounding area. The presentation started with the geologic formation of the Sierra Nevada and continued through the agricultural development of the San Joaquin Valley as scenic and artistic photographs displayed on two large screens. A brief history of the campus came next in the narration, set to the music of “The Red Pony” and other compositions by Aaron Copland. The show culminated in a lighting of the campus buildings and a triumphant fireworks display.
Stained glass windows in the Great Hall of the Faculty Club. Faculty Club, University of California at Berkeley, Bernard Maybeck, 1995.
WAYNE THIEBAUD’S FOOD FOR THINKING

David H. Wright

FRENCH PASTRIES ANYONE? Or do you yearn for one of the scrumptious sundaes displayed on a shell? That was the apparent message when in April 1962 Wayne Thiebaud’s paintings were displayed at the Allan Stone Gallery in New York for the first time and suddenly became the talk of the Art World. The show sold out, at the reasonable price range of $150 to $1200, and buyers included the New York MoMA, the Hartford Athenaeum, the prominent MoMA curators Philip Johnson and James Thrall Soby, and other notable collectors. It was a time when Warhol, Rosenquist, and Lichtenstein had just been “discovered” as leaders of an emerging movement, defined later in 1962 by a seminal exhibition at the Sidney Janis gallery, where it was called the “New Realism.” Its practitioners were sometimes labeled “kitschkniks.” The direction of the movement was not yet clear, and there was an air of expectation among the New York intelligentsia.

Thomas B. Hess, the Executive Editor of Art News and eminence grise among critics favoring modern art, put Thiebaud at the top of his column of “New names this month” in his April issue, writing:

Thiebaud paints straight social realism. He reveals what the richest country in the world has developed for the affluent, middle class, split-level orgy—aerated chocolate cream fillers, dense nut jellies, horrible soft drinks brewed from tasteless giant fruits, chemical vitamins forced into neon-vegetable coloring. . . . Looking at these pounds of slabby New Taste Sensation, one hears the artist screaming at us from behind the paintings, urging us to become hermits: to leave Gomorrah where layer cakes troop down air-conditioned shelving like cholesterol angels, to flee to the desert and eat locusts and pray for faith. He preaches revulsion by isolating the American food habit. . . . Thiebaud’s pictures are in the best sense caricatural. . . . This is major social criticism made visual.

Such absurdity is what can happen when a critic approaches a painting determined to tell it what it means. Instead he should look at a painting carefully, and ask it what it means. Brian O’Doherty was a little more sensitive in the Times, recognizing the “frankly luscious style” of Thiebaud’s brushwork, but he commented on the “layer cakes, all placed in orderly rows, as regimented as the people who eat them,” considering this “a comment on the comfortable desolation of much American life, as seen through the stomach.” He concluded that “Thiebaud is a definite, if minor, original . . . the wordless poet of the banal.”

Among New York critics, only Max Kozloff, who bought one of the paintings in that exhibition, fully understood Thiebaud. Before the exhibition closed he wrote in The Nation, acknowledging the subject matter by calling him the “poet laureate of the coffee break,” but putting Thiebaud in the great tradition of still-life painting, following Manet and Morandi, doing what some consider “pure painting,” detached from subject matter, concerned rather with composition and brush work. He concluded, “I do not know whether it is ‘pure’ or ‘impure,’ but I do know that contact with it has enriched my inner and aesthetic life.” Then
two months later, in a general review of the season, he characterized Thiebaud as “a ‘straight’ painter whose wonderful hedonism mocks his iconography,” and two months after that, writing his “New York Letter” for Art International, he said that “Thiebaud’s coagulated matière lends a delightfully specious plasticity to his subjects.” Kozloff was aware of the cynical implications others read into Thiebaud’s subject matter, but he responded directly to the visual qualities of the paintings.

Meanwhile the popular press weighed in. Early in May of 1962, Time ran an article on “The Slice of Cake School,” giving Thiebaud two paragraphs, and Lichtenstein, Warhol, and Rosenquist one each, in that order. And in July Life ran a similar article. There was plenty of chatter about Thiebaud, but very little understanding.

Then in July the De Young Museum gave Thiebaud a small exhibition and he wrote a statement for the San Francisco Chronicle, which the paper explained they were publishing instead of a review.

At present I am painting still lifes taken from window displays, store counters, supermarket shelves, and mass produced items from manufacturing concerns in America. I try to find things to paint which I feel have been overlooked. . . . My interest in painting is traditional and modest in its aim. I hope that it may allow us to see ourselves looking at ourselves.

Commenting on his style, he said “I have used a kind of head-on directness,” and he wrote directly, in a painter’s language:

The tradition of sustaining the picture plane interests me; . . . my surfaces are activated and brushed heavily to try and keep them visually available.
The heavy linear activity formed by ridges of paint helps to “lock in” the planes and make them “flatter.”

I depend upon line a great deal. My pictures are painted and drawn in several intense hues, one over the other, to make them as lively and strong as possible.

The space inference that I want is one of isolation. Ultraclear, bright, airconditioned atmosphere that might be sort of stirred up around the objects and echo their presence. For this reason uninterrupted single colored backgrounds are used and this allows the brush marks to be seen and play their role.

Commenting further on his impasto brushwork he wrote:

It alludes to the tradition of illusionistic painting. In my case an experiment with what happens when the relationship between paint and subject matter comes as close as I can get it—white gooey shiny sticky oil paint spread out on the top of painted cake to “become” frosting. It is playing with reality—making an illusion which grows out of an exploration of the propensities of materials—an approach to “actualism.” And while it is clearly in the line of “trick of the eye” painting where the artist is like a magician, I would like to show my hand and expose the trick.

It is rare for a painter to write such a substantial statement about his work. Reading it, with the paintings in mind, a sympathetic critic—as Kozloff—will understand that for Thiebaud the cakes and pies are not “subjects,” they are objects to be depicted, and the true subject is the process of his painting, most conspicuously the thick strokes and the outlines of oil paint in saturated colors, but also, as implied in Thiebaud’s statement, his studies of ordered geometry in an indefinite space. In that sense he frequently verges on abstraction with his repeated series of cylinders, wedges, and the like. But in the New Yorker that fall, Harold Rosenberg, the leading spokesman for abstraction, dismissed Thiebaud as a “competent painter” who depicts his rows of foods “instead of the more ordinary rows of trees and shrubs.”

Also in the summer of 1962, Thiebaud was included in an important exhibition at the Pasadena Art Museum, “New Paintings of Common Objects,” and the Los Angeles critic Jules Langsner, writing for Art International, remarked that Thiebaud used “the common object as a point of departure for painterly treatment. A hot dog or slice of cream pie by Thiebaud bursts with juicy pigment, a succulence that brings out the properties of paint more than it does the food.” But in Art Forum the English critic John Coplans, then based in California, complained that “the sense of crisis precipitated in Lichtenstein’s painting is totally missing in Thiebaud’s paint act; . . . he lacks the guts and the total commitment of the others in this group.” Coplans, like Hess, was looking for ideology, not paintings.

It is intriguing to realize how this forty-two-year-old dedicated assistant professor on the Davis campus suddenly found such fame thrust upon him. Thiebaud was born in Arizona in 1920, but almost immediately his family moved to Long Beach, where he grew up, except for two years when he was twelve and thirteen his devoutly Mormon parents
tried ranching in southern Utah; when that failed they returned to Long Beach. In high school he was an enthusiastic member of the stage crew for theater productions and learned to draw cartoons. He was good enough to work briefly in the Disney animation studio. He took a course in commercial art in a trade school; he tried various jobs in this area until he joined the Army Air Corps in 1942, where he was soon assigned to making cartoons, posters, and the like for the Air Corps. In 1945 he worked on documentary and training films for the Air Corps. After his discharge he tried to break into cartooning, but had to take various jobs in commercial art.

In 1946 he got a job doing layout designs and cartoons for the Rexall Drug Company in Los Angeles and a colleague there, Robert Mallary, who became a noted abstract sculptor, led Thiebaud to expand his intellectual horizons and think in terms of fine art. Two years later he had a painting accepted in a local group show and another one the year after that. Then in 1949, with the help of the GI Bill, he enrolled at San Jose State College, and the next year switched to California State in Sacramento. He was given so many credits for his professional experience that he spent much of his time studying the history of art and other academic subjects. He graduated in 1951, at the age of thirty-one, and began teaching at Sacramento Junior College, while starting his master's degree. He was a devoted teacher and active participant in every kind of art activity in Sacramento, including public art projects and theater productions.

But the Sacramento art scene was very limited, and therefore, to broaden his outlook, in 1956-57 he took a leave to spend the year in New York, working in commercial art, while visiting all the galleries and joining the discussions at the Cedar Bar and the Eighth Street Club. He knew and particularly admired Willem de Kooning, also Franz Kline and Barnett Newman. So when he returned to Sacramento he was working with more expressionistic brushstrokes, and he had learned more about abstract design. He exhibited as much as he could in Sacramento, gaining local recognition, and he was aware of the Bay Area figurative movement. He particularly admired Diebenkorn and in 1960 repeatedly studied his solo exhibition at the Legion of Honor.

Also in 1960 he was appointed assistant professor at UC Davis, joining an outstanding department, with superior students, and having time and encouragement to do his own work. About this time he began to concentrate on still lifes of ordinary objects, sandwiches, pies, toys, and gumball machines, objects painted from memory, with nostalgic childhood associations. In 1961 he was sufficiently confident of his new work to mount an exhibition of it, first in Sacramento, then in San Francisco, but he had no sales. Undaunted, he took his paintings to New York and approached Allan Stone, with the recommendation of his friend Robert Mallary, who had shown there. Stone was puzzled; he had rejected Warhol because he did not like his handling of paint, but he decided to give Thiebaud a chance the next April. It turned out that this very personal work could be perceived to fit the expectations of an uncomprehending New York art world.

The next year, partly to detach himself from what was coming to be called Pop Art, he started to concentrate on painting the human figure, using the same brush and color techniques and the same spatial compositions he had used for his still lifes. That produced the remarkable Girl with Ice Cream Cone, which draws on all his experience in commercial art.

She fills a large canvas, essentially at life size, displayed symmetrically, sitting in her bathing suit on an undefined receding surface, bathed in a photoflood lamp from above, holding the ice cream cone in front of her open mouth, looking directly at the beholder, but suspended in time. The model is his wife, Betty Jean, a handsome woman, but no Hollywood
Detail of *Girl with Ice Cream Cone*, 1963 (Hirshhorn Museum). Photograph courtesy of the author.
starlet. She is recognizable but this is in no sense a portrait; a photograph of her standing in front of this painting shows that Thiebaud has made her face considerably narrower, and has generalized her features slightly. The harsh light casts shadows, but in different directions, as convenient for the composition, for Thiebaud is playing games with the system of glamour photography he knew from Hollywood. There is an inexplicable backlight on the contours of her right cheek and arm (as in Hollywood), but more than anything else, those contours are exercises in applying thick outlines of paint in highly saturated contrasting colors. The receding edge of the right cheek was painted in black but then given a thin line of bright blue; the shading of the top of the shoulder is bordered by a brilliant red line; the dark blue bathing suit strap has arbitrary framing lines of bright red, and this is also true of the shaded side of the cone—an emphasizing technique common in posters and billboards. And of course thick white paint is molded elaborately to become ice cream. This canvas can be seen as an emblem of American lifestyle, but the real subject is the application of brilliantly colored paint to canvas.

For the next two years, one of them on leave with a University of California fellowship, he concentrated on the human figure, leading to a special exhibition at Stanford in the summer of 1965, repeated in New York in April 1966, but attracting little critical attention, despite a very perceptive article in Art News by Diane Waldman. Some of these paintings are American emblems, such as a black football player in full uniform, sitting on a vestigial bit of bench, hunched forward, with his face in shadow. But for most of these paintings he had friends posing for him, and they must be recognizable, if slightly generalized in details.

The most elaborate of these shows five figures sitting on chairs on a very shallow but undefined white stage, with a dark background just behind them; all appear dressed for a cocktail party. In the front layer near the middle two women seated on bright blue Thonet chairs face outward in three-quarter view; very close behind them and closer to the edge of the canvas two men on brown straight back chairs face inward in three-quarter view, and exactly between the women, but in a plane behind the men, a younger man on a blue Thonet chair is seen in profile facing right. The space is so compressed that several chair legs are omitted for convenience. A photoflood lights everyone consistently from the right.

Thiebaud set up this group on a white drop cloth against a white wall and photographed them to guide his work, but he painted them individually, making many changes, including replacing one woman's dress. One assumes these are two middle-aged couples and a younger male relative, and one would expect to recognize them on the street, but no one shows any expression and no one looks at anyone else; all are suspended in time. Since the painting gives the figures at essentially life size, the painting has so powerful and disturbing an effect that one may forget about the interplay of colors and impasto. This seems one time Thiebaud pushed too far what is both an implicit concern with subject matter and a refusal to engage with his subject. Indeed he made no more paintings in this vein, though he has occasionally made some true portraits of friends and family members, and these have some appropriate animation. It should also be noted that in these same years he made delightfully intimate and delicate pencil drawings of family members, a dog, etcetera, and that no matter how formidable and remote other figure paintings in this group may be, because the poses were developed by the models themselves, moving around the studio until they and Thiebaud decided they had found the right pose, these paintings can have strong expression from body language, almost as in a statue.

In the next years he continued to make some still-life paintings comparable to those that had established his reputation, some with more complex compositions, but he also began to paint landscapes, such as a simple high view of an orchard with mountains in the
distance, a mysterious steep ridge forming the diagonal of the canvas, or an imposing bluff almost filling the canvas. Then in 1973 he set up a second home and studio on Potrero Hill in San Francisco and began a series of city views inspired by his neighborhood. At first they seem almost recognizable, but they quickly became studies of impossibly steep streets rendered in flattened perspective. They are fantasies of city scenes, organized by severe geometry and rendered with the same bright colors and impasto brushwork as in the still lifes. He also made a few bird’s-eye views of freeways, with vast tangles of access ramps, belching smokestacks, and heavy traffic—once time when it seems reasonable to find here the kind of comment Hess tried to apply to those lyrical still lifes.

Then in 1995 he began a series of bird’s-eye landscapes of farms and rivers inspired by the Sacramento Delta where he has lived for so long, giving him a new opportunity to work with bright colors and impasto in rendering natural forms. As usual, he works from memory images, mixing points of view—trees in profile but fields almost like a map—imposing order on his areas of bright color almost as in an abstraction. Indeed, in conversation with Steven Nash in 1999, as he was preparing the great retrospective exhibition at the Legion of Honor, Thiebaud revealed that he did occasionally make a purely abstract painting as an exercise, but that he did not consider them satisfactory and would never show them. That is a key to his style. His absorption in the process of applying oil paint to canvas is obvious on close inspection, but with that insight it is easier to see how ever since 1961, Thiebaud has organized the shapes on his canvas with clarity and balance.

Thiebaud’s standing in the American art world presents a curious puzzle. He is widely respected by serious painters, and widely loved in Middle America, but he is ignored by the art establishment in New York and Los Angeles, the only newsworthy centers. The recently established Kemper Museum of Contemporary Art in Kansas City, Missouri, organized a comprehensive retrospective exhibition of Thiebaud in 2003, including five paintings recently bought by the Kempers, two of them already given to their museum. On the other hand the New York MoMA has exhibited the still life it bought in 1962 only three times, briefly, soon after the purchase, then in the summer of 1967, and then in the Member’s Dining Room in the spring of 1987. The Pop Art gallery in its new installation includes thirty-four early paintings by Warhol, two by Lichtenstein, one by Rosenquist, and eight works by others of that era. The Whitney Museum bought a 1963 Pie Counter in 1964, and it has traveled to many exhibitions, but it has been seen in New York only in four temporary installations. The Guggenheim, as expected, has nothing. The Wadsworth Atheneum has exhibited its 1962 acquisition only once, shortly after the purchase. Neither the Norton Simon Museum of Art in Pasadena nor the Los Angeles County Museum of Art has any painting by Thiebaud. When the excellent 1985 retrospective exhibition organized by the San Francisco MoMA traveled, it went no further east than Columbus, Ohio.

The problem, of course, is that Thiebaud does not fit into any of the categories used by writers of textbooks and generators of public information, and he is not a part of the glitzy big-money scene of dealers and collectors in New York. His prices are certainly not modest, but they are not headline news. In 1997 a Bakery Counter of 1962 brought $1.7 million when a Warhol soup can went for $3.5 million, but in 2002 a 1962 Toy Counter failed to sell when it was offered with an estimate of three to five million, while a Lichtenstein of the same date went for $4.6 million. Still, when the great retrospective exhibition organized at the Legion of Honor did come to New York in 2001, Michael Kimmelman wrote a sensitive and very favorable review in the Times; he likes and admires Thiebaud, and had included him in his series of interviews with artists walking through museums (New York Times, August 23, 1996). Nevertheless, on a national scale, Thiebaud is below the radar screen.
In Oakland the Museum of California normally has a fine early still life and a San Francisco view on display. In Sacramento the Crocker Art Museum has several paintings, including key examples given by Thiebaud. In Berkeley the University Art Museum bought a color lithograph in 1968 and has received three more works on paper as gifts, but has no paintings, and their prints are not normally exhibited. The new de Young Museum is exhibiting three paintings, including one of the best of the recent Delta views (owned by a trustee), and has four more paintings in storage. But the San Francisco Museum of Modern Art is the leader, always showing part of its comprehensive collection, which includes a superb Sunset Streets of 1985, bought that year partly by public subscription, and Flatland River of 1997, bought in 1998.

Does this mean that Thiebaud is merely a regional painter? His still-life subjects are national, but his landscapes are regional. He has honorary doctorates from several regional art schools, but he also has national honors, including the National Academy of Design and the National Medal for Arts bestowed by President Clinton in 1994. Furthermore, in recent years the three national art museums in Washington have recognized Thiebaud's importance. The National Gallery made a special point when celebrating its fiftieth anniversary in 1991 to acquire the outstanding Cakes of 1963 and had to tap four different funds to get it. The Smithsonian American Art Museum received a 1961 Three Sandwiches as a gift as early as 1976 but bought a 1962 Jackpot Machine in 1995 and recently encouraged three more gifts to make a more balanced collection. The Hirshhorn Museum already had three early examples from the founder's bequest but bought a San Francisco street scene in 1980 and the all-important Girl with Ice Cream Cone in 1996—when James Demetrion (UCLA, ABD 1961) was director.

One clue to Thiebaud's character and success is certainly his devotion to teaching, which he has continued part time, even after his retirement in 1995. He was named Faculty Research Lecturer at Davis in 1972 and was given another teaching prize there in 1988, and in 1981 he was named Distinguished Art Studio Teacher of the Year by the College Art Association. He has held many visiting teaching appointments and explains that his success comes from his telling his students all his secrets. Analogously, it is not just that the Bay Area audience is familiar with Thiebaud and his subjects, but that this audience is less obsessed with the latest pronouncements of Art News and Art Forum, or the latest dealers' advertisements, and more willing than elsewhere to take the time to look thoughtfully at paintings. That is what reveals Thiebaud's qualities.
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1912 Blue and Gold (1911).
EATING AND DRINKING WITH POETS

Carol Nash

IN BROWSING THROUGH VARIOUS COLLECTIONS and anthologies of California poets, I was struck first by how so many of them were influenced by the natural wonders of the state. Mentions of food and drink appear most frequently as metaphors for the wider subject matter or as descriptions of an activity that leads to considerations of love or loss. As used, for example, by George P. Elliott (1918-1980) in his poem, “A Day Off”:

Dear, wash some celery, butter some bread,
Broil a couple of chickens, and put in the salt;
And I’ll go get some olives and sharp cheese,
Wine, paper napkins, pop for the kids, grapes,
And pack a camp-chair in the car for Jo
If she’ll come; and we’ll spring-trespass again
On the Water District’s fenced, pleasant fields.¹

But the poem is not about food or drink, but rather the joys of escape from the domesticities of mundane life into the wilderness of meadow grass, butterflies, and good conversation.

Eating and drinking are part of a full life, and the poet Josephine Miles (the “Jo” in Elliott’s poem), for one, uses the conviviality and community that accompanied breakfasts, lunches, dinners, picnics, and parties as a springboard for telling observations about the human experience. For instance:

BREAKFAST

Robert keeps in his parlor
A beautifully wrought casket
With a lady in it
Of Chinese descent, and a bouquet of orchids.

In his backyard he grows
Plots of chard,
And plucks it
Fresh as desire for dinner and breakfast.

Much comment
On the Swiss chard, its freshness, savor,
Sweetness, suitability, seems to prevent
Any comment on the orchid bouquet.²
Here food is a way to escape talking about something best left unsaid. But “Luncheon 2” comes at a forbidden subject more overtly:

We met for luncheon to exchange views,  
Soviet authors and ours, two Armenians  
And a writer of children’s stories,  
Beef stew and jello, but no shared language.  
So we say, Pasternak? No, no, their anger.  
Gogol? More kindly, shake hands.  
Sroyán? Aha! You happy people,  
He walks among the pomegranate rows.

Dear friends, we exchange cards,  
Minor titles and their authorship.  
How much we know each other, drink our tea.  
Then comes the tardy interpreter, checks all round  
In Russian, and then asks us,  
Why did you drop the bomb on Hiroshima?

Alone, except for the company of a black and white pigeon, a little cheese and a few glasses of white wine, James Schevill’s narrator finds peace in the play of light and solitude:

WALLACE STEVENS AT EASE WITH MARBLE CAKE

Last weekend I spent the afternoons  
sitting in my garden at home,  
at ease in solitary situation.  
I drank a glass of White Burgundy  
and watched my neighbor’s pigeons.  
A black and white is an old friend  
I call Marble Cake. Sitting near him,  
with a little Kraft’s Limburger Spread,  
pouring myself a second glass of decent wine,  
that big, fat Marble Cake moves around,  
strutting, keeping his sharp eyes on me,  
doing queer things to keep me awake.  
Marble Cake, my fat Pigeon Master,  
teaching me the drift of imagination at ease,  
how the grace of sound reflects  
a still point in time dancing in the light,  
where imagination reveals a proud presence  
transforming the commonplace into points of brilliance.
Born into the life of a Mexican farm worker, Gary Soto’s narrator dreams a dinner of homely food—radishes, celery, potatoes—shared with a nameless stranger from another culture. Along with the indulgence in food and wine, he sees freedom from toil as a defiance of authority and the reckless speed of a car. But even in the dream, the inevitability of where he is takes over if only in the last lines:

THE ESTONIAN COMES TO DINNER

Again I dream the frying pan
Is endless, the tomatoes fat,
The cheese blunt as women on barstools.
I am yours. I take you
To my mouth, the suggestive
Radish at hand, the celery
Clutched like a microphone.
I speak, and important people take note.
I say there’s nothing more,
This plate and abused napkin, that wine
Whose memory is deeper than mine.
Estonian, let’s show off tonight,
And suck these bones dry, into
Fine slivers that give off light.
When we eat, let panic rule.
Let cop cars circle the block
And dogs turn on their leashes, crying.
Far off, in the countryside,
Let the cows go to their knees
And hens flutter like books
Thrown from speeding cars.
But we are not going anywhere.
The table is here. The pear that
Was once rain is at hand.
The bread is at hand—the butter,
The potato baked twice
And poked with many eyes.
Let the day end, and us begin,
The fork, the knife, the plate all useless.⁵

Gary Soto in his garden, 1996.
Courtesy of the author.
Too often when the subject of a poem is concerned only with food and drink, the result is doggerel or a bouncing rhythm that betrays whatever seriousness may lie behind it. George Sterling’s verse is a good example in “The Abalone Song” or “Ballad of the Grapes,” which uses classical myth to excoriate Prohibition:

O Sadducees and Pharisees
Who harass the divine,
Now harken with reluctance
How Daphne made the wine!

The Ballad continues on for seventeen more stanzas, which allude to mythical gods of the vine, as in stanzas eleven and twelve:

O fumes of Bacchus that betrayed
The spirit of the grape!
O unseen incense that arose
Around that lyric shape!

A dream she was of pagan days
Lost now to righteous man,
When through the vineyards of the Greek
Rippled the rout of Pan.

And winds up in the contemporary world:

Now months may come and months may go
And men know joy and care,
But when that wine goes twelve per cent
May you and I be there!¹

One of the more explicit uses of food as a foil for a serious subject is Czeslaw Milosz’s beautiful poem, “Campo dei Fiori,” in which the eternal is juxtaposed with the temporal. The narrator remembers, amid the bustle of life in the plaza, the martyrdom of Bruno in that place, which interrupted only briefly the merchandising of the self-renewing produce that sustains human life. From there he recalls the devastation of Warsaw during World War II:

But that day I thought only
of the loneliness of the dying,
of how, when Giordano
climbed to his burning
he could not find
in any human tongue
words for mankind,
mankind who live on.
Already they were back at their wine
or peddled their white starfish,
baskets of olives and lemons they had shouldered to the fair,
and he already distanced
as if centuries had passed
while they paused just a moment
for his flying in the fire.

The poet's words have made eternal both the death and the life of humankind, yet he sees a redemption as well:

Those dying here, the lonely
forgotten by the world,
our tongue becomes for them
the language of an ancient planet.
Until, when all is legend
And many years have passed
On a new Campo dei Fiori
Rage will kindle at a poet's word.7

I think it safe to say that other poets—William Stafford, Ann Stanford, Rosalie Moore Brown, Philip Levine, Al Young, Lawrence Ferlinghetti, Ishmael Reed, to name only a few—at some time in their work acknowledge the inevitability of human appetite.

ENDNOTES
All of the poets featured by Carol Nash have some relationship with the University of California:
George Elliott taught at Berkeley and wrote a collection of poems called From the Berkeley Hills (1969); Josephine Miles was professor of English at Berkeley from 1940 to 1978; James Schevill was born and raised in Berkeley, the son of a professor of Romance languages, and returned to his home town after retiring from Brown University; Gary Soto has taught at Berkeley and Riverside; George Sterling was a Northern California bohemian poet of the early twentieth century, whose papers are archived in the Bancroft Library; and Czeslaw Milosz was a Nobel prize-winning professor of Slavic Languages and Literature at Berkeley from 1960 to 1978—ed.

1 A Western Sampler: Nine Contemporary Poets (Georgetown, CA: Talisman Press, 1963), 125.
3 Ibid., 215.
6 Dana Gioia, Chrysss Vost, and Jack Hicks, eds., California Poetry: From the Gold Rush to the Present (Santa Clara, CA: Santa Clara University; Berkeley: Heyday Press, 2004), 40-42.
PATHS TAKEN

Leonard Nathan

WHAT A PLEASURE IT WOULD BE to write a piece on the poet Josephine Miles (1911-1985) as I had just been asked to do. No strings attached—short or long as my needs dictated. But as I thumbed through her Collected Poems, I began to have a few reservations. I also remembered how sly her apparent transparencies still seem to me, how elusive and elaborate were the simplicities of her art. And soon enough I decided to shorten up my aspirations. At my age, easy does it, persistence must do the work of ambition.

So I chose a short sharp, well-managed poem called "Paths" as follows:

Going out into the fields of learning,
We shake the dew from the grasses.
All is new.
The paths we make through the wet grasses shine
As if with light.

They go where we take them, where they go.
Slow wings unfold, scarcely any
Motion happens but our heavy seeking.

Ant labors, hopper leaps away: too early for the bee,
The spider's silk hypotheses unfold
Tenacious, tenable.

In the first stanza we are invited to go out on a picnic, a hunt, or perhaps a kind of marathon in which the participants, excluding ourselves, are, so it seems, bugs. And right at the outset, we must be careful not to allegorize them, turn them too quickly into semi-human actors on a stage no bigger than that of a flea circus. For there are risks of turning the poem into a flat version of itself; of turning it into a literary version of a Chinese fortune cookie or a tiny dry abstraction.

If we want to experience "Paths" more fully, we must be a little patient. We must slow down, so as to give some sense of balance between bugs as humans, and humans as bugs. For the latter, of course, we must look to the brief catalogue in the final stanza of the poem. In passing through the lit fields before us, we seem almost to be directing a scene from an old movie: extraordinary lighting, violent action, and silence. We have here the characterizing of our human bugs—their wildness. Each of them has something special to offer for food or shelter or effective means of escape: there is the kick-boxing prowess of the grasshopper, the spider’s capacity to transform elements from its own body into lethal instruments, the mighty thrust of the tiny ant, the accidental absence of the bee, whose very silence promises a later, perhaps richer sweetness.
As we have already learned from the beginning of the poem, “Paths” is about or seems to be about a quest, and if we stop there we would have again merely a piece of the poem. But “Paths” offers more, much more to its attentive reader. Above all, it offers endless variety of creatures and creaturely cunning, using even comic charm. If we witness the curious business of life and death, how much effort and ingenuity to produce, maintain, and advance lives by bugs, we are bound to be amazed.

And here we are reminded perhaps that this is an allegory of something beyond mere bug pilgrims, moving by instinct. Miles was a great teacher and loved her students from the beginning: those students who were part of the great enterprise of gathering knowledge. She had a special affection for undergraduates, those confused, those ready for a great adventure, those who could be helped by her and her poetry, or those just able to keep steady—as of a poem or perhaps all the parts of a sonnet by Shakespeare as a study of life itself.

It is no accident that Miles puts the spider and its web at the center of her poem. The tenuous but tangible fragility of the web reflects (is a metaphor for) the values students must possess to gather the sweetness of the world promised by the bee.

Leonard Nathan and Czeslaw Milosz, 1996.
*Courtesy of the author.*

**ENDNOTE**

ART AT THE FACULTY CLUB AT BERKELEY

Phyllis Brooks Schafer

THE ART AMASSED AT THE FACULTY CLUB over the past century varies greatly in its quality and impact, but four works of art are tied in a seamless way to the structure and history of the club: the stained glass university insignia in the Great Hall, the Nahl murals in the Heyns Room, the Boynton fresco in the O'Neill room, and the four “cooking” pictures (also by Nahl) in the corners of the Kerr Dining Room. More recent additions to the Faculty Club collection came in 2003, with a gallery in the O'Neill Room of donated pictures by distinguished members of the Berkeley School (1930-1950), including Chiura Obata, Worth Ryder, Karl Kasten, and others. The gallery was dedicated on the eightieth anniversary of the founding of the Art Practice department by Eugen Neuhaus in 1923.

This article, excerpted from the pamphlet *Art at the Club,* illustrates but a selection of the art at the Faculty Club.

The California Cooking Pictures

Perham Nahl, professor of art, painted the four California cooking pictures specifically for the corners of the Kerr Dining Room (built in 1915). He probably did them about 1917, the date on the last in the series. . . . Beginning with the Native American cook in 1717, he goes on to portray the kitchen on a Spanish ranch in 1817, and a proper Yankee kitchen in the Berkeley of 1877. The final 1917 picture shows Old Louie (no other name has survived), from 1894 the cook first at the faculty’s Dining Association and then, after 1902, at the new Faculty Club.

Native American cook, 1717. Photograph by William Roberts.
Spanish ranch kitchen, 1817. Photograph by William Roberts.
Stained Glass

From the early days the members of the Faculty Club sought to brighten the somewhat austere redwood walls. . . . No one knows just when the series of glass panels were installed in the windows of the Great Hall, but the ones on the north side, towards the terrace and Faculty Glade [honoring the U.S. Military Academy, Brown University, California, Cornell, and Oxford] . . . are the oldest. Later another five were installed on the south side, towards the club’s central hallway: Stanford (a redwood tree), Columbia (a crown), Harvard (three books), and Yale (one book), with the last, installed by George Stewart in the sixties, honoring his alma mater, Princeton (small book and chevron). The other universities seem to have been chosen because of similar loyalties of early members of the club.

The California insignia (a star in the center of a shield) reflects an early form of the University’s Great Seal, a star with rays of light symbolizing the discovery and dissemination of knowledge. The Stanford design was created for the purpose of this project and approved by Stanford at a time when Stanford had no accepted crest or symbol to be used.
The Boynton Fresco

Ray Boynton (1883-1951) produced the fresco mural in the O'Neill Room in 1929. This long-time faculty member was a pioneer of the use of classical fresco technique in the Bay Area. . . [Restored in 2000 by Karl Kasten], the fresco now truly glows again. . . . The picture itself, a strangely untilted perspective view from between the Library and Wheeler Hall up to the Campanile and the Berkeley Hills beyond, recalls the art deco, ocean-liner style so typical of the 1920s and 1930s. In the upper right-hand corner we see the end of the stadium, and straight ahead is Bacon Hall, now long gone. The iconography is simple: two naked, classically inspired figures, male and female, carry lights—the sun and the moon—to echo the motto on the university seal, “Let there be light.” Their great size vis-à-vis the buildings implies the dominance of human endeavor in the campus setting. . . . All humanity is represented in the two giants, themselves shedding light on the scene.

Boynton fresco detail. Courtesy of the author.

ENDNOTES

1 Phyllis Brooks, Art at the Club (Berkeley: The Faculty Club, University of California, 2001).

2 http://www.universityofcalifornia.edu/graphicresources/history.php
A LITTLE KNOWN BUT STRIKINGLY VIBRANT MURAL by Mexican artist Diego Rivera reposes in Stern Hall, a university residence for women high on the hill above Founder’s Rock on the Berkeley campus. The mural depicts an orchard in full bloom. While field hands work among the trees white with blossoms in the background, three children reach for the fruits of a bountiful harvest, piled high in a basket in the foreground. The placement of the mural in an arched recess above an antique sideboard creates the illusion that the basket itself rests on the sideboard with the children apparently reaching out from the orchard scene to partake of the colorful fruit.

The Rivera mural was commissioned by Rosalie Meyer Stern in 1931 for her home in Atherton on the San Francisco Peninsula. The wife of then Levi Strauss & Company president Sigmund Stern and mother-in-law and grandmother to future generations of Levi Strauss executives, Rosalie Stern was a patron of the arts as well as a Berkeley campus benefactor. In 1942 she donated funds for Stern Hall, the first woman’s residence at Berkeley, and later, at her death in 1956, the mural was bequeathed to the university and moved to Stern Hall, where it was placed at the foot of a spiral staircase just outside the Stern Hall dining room. Stern Hall residents passed the Rivera fresco depicting the fruits of California land and laborers each day as they descended the staircase for meals.
The story of the creation of the mural and the role of Rosalie Stern's grandchildren as models for Rivera is told in three oral histories with her descendants: her daughter Elise Stern Haas, wife of Walter A. Haas, Sr.; and her grandchildren Walter Jr. and Peter, two of the reluctant models.

Elise Haas, in her 1972 oral history, recalls how her mother met Diego Rivera and Frida Kahlo in 1930 at a dinner party in San Francisco when Rivera was in town to produce two better-known murals, one for the Pacific Stock Exchange Luncheon Club and one for the School of Fine Arts, now the San Francisco Art Institute. It was an unlikely mix, the Mexican Marxist muralist only recently back from a trip to the Soviet Union, the Stock Exchange, and the cream of San Francisco society. Rivera's way was paved in part by Albert Bender, a prominent patron of the arts in San Francisco who was close to Mrs. Stern and who had promoted Rivera's work for several years in the West Coast art world.

Frida Kahlo apparently made a stir at the dinner party, enough so that Elise Haas remembers details of the occasion more than forty years later:

Lucienne Bloch, who had helped Rivera with the fresco that was done, as I remember, for Rockefeller Center—Lucienne, I think, helped him mix his colors or assisted him in some way years before. She was at dinner and was seated next to Diego. Frida, with her black hair, her Mexican dress, and her black eyebrows, which went straight across her forehead, resented Diego's attention to Lucienne, and kept rolling up little bread balls and throwing them at him during dinner.1

Mrs. Stern soon got the idea of asking Rivera to do a mural for her country home in Atherton. He agreed and accompanied the family to Atherton, living with the Sterns for several weeks while he designed and executed the mural. Elise Haas describes the ride with Rivera, her mother, and "maybe Frida" through the blossoming orchards in what was then agricultural countryside south of San Francisco:

In those days there were vast fields of fruit trees, which were then in blossom. It was when the Japanese had this tremendous industry down there. He also saw a mechanical plow for the first time. When we got down to my mother's home, the gardeners were turning up earth to put in a new lawn. All this he must have retained in his inner eye.

Mrs. Haas continues,

He asked my mother on the way down what she wanted him to do. She said, "I would not presume to dictate to an artist. Anything you want, Mr. Rivera." So he made a sketch of three children behind a wall, a bowl of fruit in the center, a little girl to the right, a little girl to the left, and a boy standing behind the fruit bowl. In the background were flowering fruit trees, gardeners digging in the soil, and a mechanical plow.

Elise and Walter Haas and their three children had moved down to their own house in Atherton to watch the work progress, and when Walter Sr. saw Rivera's sketch, he suggested that their children be used as models for the portraits. Rivera, despite his reputed dislike of "gringos," particularly of the capitalist class, was apparently "most amiable" and
expressed delight at the suggestion. However, as he and his assistant, the artist Matthew Barnes, began to prepare the plaster and sketch in his ideas, not a word was said about having the children pose. After a week in residence the Haases said goodbye to Rivera and went back to San Francisco so the children could return to school. But Rivera was now ready for his models:

He turned to my mother and said blandly, “I would like the little girl to pose for me now.” Well, my mother rang me up after we were home, and I said, “Good heavens, we were there a week. Couldn’t he have done this sooner, when it was convenient?” I said, “There’s no trouble about bringing Rhoda down, but the boys are back in school.” My mother said, “I think you’ll be sorry if you don’t do it,” and of course I realized that she was right. The next day I took Rhoda down. She posed, and in an hour and a half he had the most wonderful likeness of her.

Rhoda was five at the time. Her older brother, Peter, at age twelve was reluctant to serve as a model. So then, Mrs. Haas recalls, “I resorted to bribery, which I had never done before, and I bribed Peter to go down the next day with me.” The bribe worked:

He is the boy behind the bowl of fruit, and my daughter is the girl to the right as you face the fresco.
Her imaginary companion, which she had at the time, called Dega... was the rather dark-skinned child to the left, probably a Mexican child.

The imaginary playmate is an intriguing figure in the fresco. Diego Rivera paints her as darker skinned than the two Haas children, with mestizo features. A recent historian of California's citrus industry finds significance in Rivera's portrayal of "Dega," especially when considered in tandem with the other murals painted in San Francisco at this same time: "A mestizo child is among them, reaching for an equal share of the fruit... By showing the mixed children reaching for the bowl, Rivera envisions a future where all will grow up together on nature's engineered abundance."2

But young Walter Haas, then fifteen, was not thinking of these broader social issues at the time. As his mother recalls,

My son Walter absolutely refused to have anything to do with it. But when he found that both his brother and sister had had their portraits done, he changed his mind. There was no place for him, so he's one of the gardeners.

Walter A. Haas, Jr. (class of 1937) and Peter Haas ('40) both later served as president of Levi Strauss & Company in turn; both were also generous benefactors of UC Berkeley, as was their sister, Rhoda Haas Goldman ('46). Walter Haas and Peter Haas recorded their oral histories in 1995 and 2003, respectively. Each is firm about his reluctance to sit for his portrait. Calling Rivera "that son of a gun," Walter recalls his impatience:

I remember he had me in a kneeling position, and he was very insensitive to the fact that I was a young boy and I was very uncomfortable and hot and it took forever. I was afraid to move—I remember it very well—I was just uncomfortable. I don't remember it very favorably. He had me posing there forever."3
Peter Haas also has strong memories of the event:

In the original scheme of things Rivera overlooked my brother Walter. My mother was quite upset about that and insisted that he get Walter’s likeness in there, so he ended up appearing in the mural as one of the laborers in the orchard, which was certainly okay. But a crisis was overcome because he was in the picture.

I guess my brother and I both chafed at having to sit for our portraits. Diego Rivera’s wife, the painter Frida Kahlo, appeared on the scene now and then, I guess I was about eight or nine [he was actually twelve]. And of course Frida Kahlo was an artist in her own right. She was also the most voluptuous woman I had ever seen. Maybe I really hadn’t seen many. But her charm kind of eased the pain of sitting there for a few hours for my portrait. Her appearances on the scene made life a little more interesting for this young boy.

The fresco was the smallest mural Rivera ever painted. As Elise Haas describes, it was in her mother’s “so-called outside dining room,” painted in a recessed arch with a sideboard beneath it. Her mother was “wise enough to find out that this fresco could be made on a steel frame, so that if the house were ever destroyed it could be moved.” And moved it was, when Rosalie Stern died, with the help of the head of the Department of Architecture at Berkeley, William Wurster, who had been the architect for Stern Hall and was a favorite of the Sterns and Haases. Elise Haas recalls:

Well, we were living in an apartment. There was no space in our country house for it, and none of my children seemed to be interested. After consultation with Bill Wurster . . . and with his approval, I persuaded her to bequeath it to the University of California, to Stern Hall, the dormitory she had given. After her death in 1956, the architectural department moved this mural, which now stands at the foot of the stairs at Stern Hall, and really looks much more beautiful there, because you get a perspective on it as you come down the stairs. Bill put a narrow arch above it, which he tilted in such a way that you could see the entire fresco as you come down the stairs.

Since the opening of the adjacent Foothill residence hall complex several years ago, the Stern Hall dining room has been closed and the women of Stern join the Foothill residents for meals in a larger dining complex. The spiral staircase descending to the mural and former dining room is little used and the residents seem only vaguely aware that an artistic treasure is in their midst. The mural received broader public display when it was exhibited at San Francisco’s de Young Museum in 1995, as part of Facing Eden: One Hundred Years of Landscape Art in the Bay Area.

Still Life and Blossoming Almond Trees is one of four Diego Rivera murals in the San Francisco Bay Area. Others are Allegory of California at the City Club of San Francisco (formerly the San Francisco Stock Exchange Luncheon Club), The Making of a Fresco Showing the Building of a City at the San Francisco Art Institute, both completed in 1931. In 1940 Rivera returned to San Francisco and executed Marriage of the Artistic Expression of the North and of the South on this Continent, commonly known as Pan American Unity, created at the Golden Gate International Exposition on Treasure Island and now installed at the City College of San Francisco.
ENDNOTES


6 For information about other Rivera murals in San Francisco, see:
   http://www.cityclubsf.com/new_art_and_arch.htm
   http://www.riveramural.com/
   http://www.sfai.edu/page.aspx?page=34
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The Conquest of Bread: 150 Years of Agribusiness in California
Richard A. Walker

UC Berkeley geography professor and former chair of the geography department, Richard Walker, has written the best comprehensive overview of California agriculture ever published. Readers who want to know about one of the most important sectors of California's economy should turn to this book. Others interested in California but with little or no interest in agriculture can benefit by learning not only about agriculture but how the sector ramifies through inputs and the handling of food beyond the farm gate.

The Conquest of Bread will undoubtedly be controversial; I doubt it will be welcomed in commercial agriculture circles or the major intellectual and scientific think-tank of the agricultural segment of the University of California (the Division of Agriculture & Natural Resources [DANR], the Agricultural Experiment Station, and Co-operative Extension). Nor will many critical researchers who have faulted California agriculture and the university's enthusiasm for production agriculture be completely happy with this book.

This is because Walker, while comprehensively mining the extensive literature, supportive or critical, manages to find points of disagreement with most of us who have studied California agriculture, this reviewer included. Knowing how attached we often become to our analyses, there is reason to believe that some critical writers will be unhappy with aspects of the book.

The enthusiasts for California agriculture as it presently stands will dislike the book because Walker makes no bones about the character of California agriculture: it is agrarian capitalism, although the short form is agribusiness (p. 12), and its primary actors are not "farmers" but "growers" (p. 6). Moreover—and this will irritate many people—Walker rejects the idea of biological exceptionalism that depicts agriculture as different from most sectors of our economy.

The argument upon which Walker's analysis rests is not only that agriculture in California is capitalist but that it was so from the onset of the American period and, in this respect, differs significantly from agricultures in other states. Moreover, he contends that, given certain distinct differences, California represents (once again) the shape of the future.

California agriculture, however, does not replicate the forms of economic organization found in other sectors. What characterizes most sectors is the continuing drive toward economic concentration, with the destruction
of many competitive (and relatively small and medium-sized) firms; in industry after industry, after some period of development, a handful of giant corporations emerge as dominant. Although there are many large corporations and family-based corporate entities in California agriculture, there is no great concentration in a handful of producers; concentration is notable less in agriculture than in input and financial firms and those companies that add value after production passes beyond the farm gate.

While this may bring some cheer to production agriculture’s supporters—“see, we’re not real capitalists” and dismay to critics who support the arguments about transnational corporations and their dominance—Walker is fully cognizant of the problems and deficiencies of California’s agricultural systems.

Several factors are critical in the emergence of the state’s agriculture. First, California was settled late from what became the dominant American mainstream and was therefore not burdened with either residues of European agricultural social organization or the U.S. eastern and midwestern experience. Secondly, California has attracted entrepreneurial populations that had imbued that American cultural norm: get rich and do it fast. Third, the people it attracted were prepared to experiment with adapting their experience with the peculiarities of growing plants in an esoteric Mediterranean climate with considerable variations in different regions. Finally, they were not weighed down with “the way it was done back home” but embraced the application of science to the problems of production.

In this last respect, the University of California arrived on the scene in a timely manner and was fortunate to recruit Eugene Hilgard as its main builder. Hilgard was followed by others who, over time, recognized that the construction of a powerful constituency to support the agricultural sciences could be developed with growers.

It was through this liaison that the university (as embodied in DANR) became an integral and uncritical part of California’s agrarian capitalism to the point that, to this time of writing, DANR has resisted committing resources and personnel to the growth of the fastest growing sector of agriculture worldwide, i.e., organic. Even where, after many a battle, “sustainability” became the mantra of many, DANR has continued its hostility to fostering a critical internal university program furthering sustainability, heavily supportive of organic research.

Walker does not address the university specifically in his book, but he surfaces it over and over in various contexts to illustrate how the university became a primary scientific machine for agrarian capitalism.

I had the pleasure of reading this book in galley-proofs. Considering the breadth of coverage, examining system after agricultural system, commodity after commodity, from inputs to output handling, to finance, to the ways in which labor has been handled, I was amazed at the comprehensive coverage of California’s hundreds of commodities in a scant 305 pages of text and Walker’s skill with an enormous literature. Asked by the publisher for some words as to my reaction to the galleys, 1 characterized the book as “magisterial.” In this second reading, I cannot find a word that better subsumes my reaction. I should also comment on the unusual readability of the book. Stylistically, Walker manages to make his disagreements with the many researchers he cites unusually pleasant; this introduces an informal note that contributes to readability.

Readers may be puzzled by the title of the book. Their curiosity will not be assuaged until they come to the final short chapter (or begin reading at the end). Walker took his title from a book written by the Russian utopian Peter Kropotkin in 1892. Walker concludes by returning to the issues Kropotkin raised over a century ago:
What we see in California agribusiness is just such an unrestrained, naked form of market society... This has been particularly telling in the ferocious exploitation of harvest labor, but equally has agribusiness drained and poisoned waters; forcefully reengineered and fed the plants and animals; and changed forever the landscape of the Golden State. What can we do to stop the juggernaut that cuts through people and countryside alike, while still enjoying the benefits of plenty from the land? How to halt the conquest and still make enough bread? I don't pretend to have the answer to that, but at least in the world of today we are again free to ask the question as Kropotkin’s generation hoped to do. And maybe we’ll hit on a solution that has more of a grain of Kropotkin’s utopian vision in it (p. 305).

—William H. Friedland

Science & Service: A History of the Land-Grant University and Agriculture in California
Ann Foley Scheuring
Oakland, CA: University of California, Division of Agriculture and Natural Resources, 1995. 260 pp., illus.

If our readers, wine lovers and patrons of Chez Panisse as they are sure to be, want to venture further into the myriad backwaters of California, they would do worse than put this book, and another reviewed here, Richard Walker’s The Conquest of Bread, on their bedside tables—all you ever wanted, and needed, to know about your home state. Both books are histories: chronological from the Gold Rush, which marks the beginning of agricultural statistics (and 1862, date of the Morrill Act, founding land-grant colleges) until the 1990s, based on a weighty load of annual reports from every farm-related quarter, illustrated with old photos of enormous and scary looking tractors, rows of plants stretching away to the horizon, and here and there a soil-stained man, farmer or scientist, bending over a furrow.

Both books do, in some parts tell the same story: the victory of the agriculturist, be he scientist, college dean, farm advisor, Extension staffer, or the farmer himself, triumphing over nature’s evils—bugs, droughts, floods, disease—and man’s ignorance, cupidty, and laziness. Or be it Congress, state legislature, university hierarchy, or even recalcitrant farmer, always refusing the needed research money. However, Ann Scheuring’s story is being told from the point of view of the agricultural part of the University of California (called the University Farm, the Farm School, the College, the Division of Agricultural Sciences, Agricultural & Natural Resources, today) as it grew, prospered, moved (most significantly from Berkeley to Davis), spread from one end of the state to the other, and became three-headed. These three: the campus teaching units (Department, College, Division), the Experiment Station, and the Extension Service (now Cooperative Extension) shared faculty, staff, students, and facilities in bewildering progression as their popularity and funding rose and fell.

Scheuring not only tells this broader story but gives us also the names of men (few women) who labored in the labs and fields and barns to produce the thousands of reports on bovine diseases, pest control, soil management, marketing techniques, and paragraph after paragraph of battles won in the long and costly war to feed California and the USA, and to do it better than it ever had been done before. It is a heartwarming and mind-numbing tale
but told adroitly and stylishly, and in the end the reader is willing to give the agriculturists of *Science & Service* at least two hurrahs.

—Carroll Brentano

### The Vinegar of Spilamberto and Other Italian Adventures with Food, Places and People

Doris Muscatine  

In 1948 a young Yale PhD, Charles Muscatine, joined the faculty of the English Department at Berkeley. His specialty was European vernacular culture in the late Middle Ages, with a particular focus on Chaucer. Soon after arriving at Berkeley, he was forced to confront the issue of the loyalty oath, adopted by the Board of Regents in 1949. Charles Muscatine was one of the thirty-odd faculty members who refused to sign the oath, doubtless influenced by his wife Doris, who told him that if he signed, she would divorce him. After the regents terminated his employment in 1950, the Muscatines moved to Middletown, Connecticut, where Charles joined the faculty of Wesleyan University. Two years later, after the oath was nullified by the California Supreme Court, they returned to Berkeley. Charles pursued his academic career with distinction, while also making significant contributions to the campus administration. He served as chairman of the faculty committee charged with making recommendations for improving the curriculum after the Free Speech Movement crisis of the early 1960s. Doris in these years was raising a family while being active in local Democratic politics.

Six years before the FSM movement roiled the campus, an event occurred that transformed the lives of the Muscatines. Charles won a Fulbright Fellowship to Rome, thereby inaugurating a forty-year love affair with that country: its people, its terrain, its history, and above all, its gastronomic delights. It may have been during that year in the Eternal City that Doris realized that she had a talent for describing foreign places and people. Her chapter in *The Vinegar of Spilamberto* on that year (1958-59), is filled with vignettes of Roman restaurants visited, and their food and wine described in rich and succulent detail. She collected recipes from these establishments ranging from the most elegant and expensive to modest, hole-in-the-wall trattorias. These recipes were published in her *A Cook’s Tour of Rome* (1964), one of several books that she wrote about food and wine in subsequent years.
Travel books about Italy are legion, but Doris Muscatine’s recent book reveals qualities of her writing and her insights that are distinctive. The vivid detail by which she describes a meal, a place, a street scene, that she experienced forty years ago would suggest that she had a prodigious memory, or that she kept a meticulous diary, or both. A luncheon in Forte dei Marmi on the Tyrrhenian coast included “salami, ham, olives, pepperoncini, stuffed hard-boiled eggs, little meat balls, tuna salad, stuffed peppers, broiled tomatoes topped with cheese . . . and a dish of garlicky braised baby artichokes” (p. 26). The Muscatines possessed a remarkable talent for forging and nourishing friendships with Italians of diverse backgrounds, from prominent statesmen, writers, and artists to chefs, waiters and donne di servizio. These friends were invaluable sources of information about food, wine, lodging, and sites to visit. In 1972 their friend Carlo Cipolla told the Muscatines about a recent archeological discovery of two Greek bronze statues, forged about 2,500 years ago, and buried in the sand off of the coast of the Ionian Sea. That information inspired them to travel to Calabria to see the bronzes, and Doris to write a chapter describing that experience: “the giants of Riace.” The title of Doris’s book, The Vinegar of Spilamberto, refers to a trip that she made to Modena, a city in the Lombard plain noted for its production of balsamic vinegar. After tasting some examples of aceto balsamico, Doris did research on the history of its production, and described the transformation from a local vinegar of modest dimensions to a global gastronomic enterprise. A chance encounter in the early 1960s with an Italian couple, the Urbani, led her to explore the complex world of truffles and to write a concise history of what their friend, Carlo Cipolla, described as “the perfume of nature” (p. 199).

In describing a recent summer’s residence in the Chianti region of Tuscany, Doris wrote, “We knew that we would be back in that area many times in the future” (p. 171). Sad to report, she will not make that journey; she died earlier this year from complications of a fall. She will be sorely missed.

—Gene Brucker

Maybeck’s Landscapes: Drawing in Nature
Dianne Harris

The Donnell and Eckbo Gardens: Modern California Masterworks
Marc Treib

Maybeck’s Landscapes is the first in the series Berkeley/Design/Books, devoted to study and publication of material held in the College of Environmental Design Archives. Bernard Maybeck (1862-1957) donated his personal and professional papers and drawings to the Department of Architecture at the University of California at Berkeley in 1956. They are now a prized part of the CED Archives.

Maybeck is at once the most beloved and misunderstood of early twentieth century San Francisco architects. He was trained as an architect at the École des Beaux Arts in Paris. He organized the elaborate International Competition for the Phoebe Hearst Architectural Plan for the University of California campus in 1898-1899. Yet his fame has been as an Arts and Crafts architect with emphasis on the work in simple materials. His champions
appeared late in his life when university teaching had vehemently rejected rigorous Beaux Arts theory and design. The connection between these two aspects of his work is generally ignored.

Maybeck's French training is fundamental to understanding his landscape work as well as his architecture. As Dianne Harris points out, in late nineteenth century France, the profession of landscape architect had not truly taken hold. Architects were responsible for most aspects of what now is referred to as site planning, and planting design was left to horticulturalists. Harris underscores the significance of Maybeck's Beaux Arts education. Many facets of his work which she claims were innovative and attributes to his love of the California climate and landscape derive directly from Beaux Arts teaching. These include the approach to the site, the integration of inside and outside, courtyard plans, the use of water, pergolas and trellises, and keying colors to the local light conditions. Surprisingly, Harris does not comment on Maybeck's meadow in the foreground of the panoramic view across San Francisco Bay from his Berkeley home.

Many of the drawings in Maybeck's Landscapes were included in two exhibits at the university's Berkeley Art Museum: "Bernard Maybeck Drawings" (1998) and "Roma-Pacific: The Phoebe Hearst International Architectural Competition and the Berkeley Campus, 1896-1930" (1999-2000). The catalog of Roma-Pacifica was cancelled, making this new publication even more important. The drawings themselves are works of art, and they are well illustrated in this volume. The overall design and quality of printing retain their special character.

Maybeck's Landscapes will delight all who cherish Maybeck's work. A significant number of the illustrations are published here for the first time, and many of the projects were never built or have been altered or demolished.

The second volume in the Berkeley/Design/Books series is by Marc Treib, professor of architecture and series editor. The Donnell and Eckbo Gardens: Modern California Masterworks is devoted to single gardens by Thomas Church (1902-1978) and Garrett Eckbo (1910-2000). El Novillero, the Donnell garden near Sonoma, from 1948, is the better known of the two. It is part of a 4,000-acre working cattle ranch and still owned by the family who commissioned it. Little has changed. Remarkably, the views south to San Pablo Bay and surrounding hills are nearly intact as well.

By contrast, almost nothing remains of the 1959 Eckbo garden, also known as the Alcoa Forecast Garden, in the Laurel Canyon area of Los Angeles. This was Eckbo's own garden, designed for Alcoa's Forecast program. Unlike the Donnell garden, Eckbo's was on a modest scale in post-World War II suburbia. His joint venture with Alcoa demonstrated the potential of aluminum as a material for use in garden design. Alcoa used the garden for advertising and promotion, and Eckbo, in return, was paid for design, materials, and construction and received royalties on designs which were marketed. Ironically, the Eckbos left Los Angeles four years later for Berkeley where he took over as the chairman of the Department of Landscape Architecture in 1963.

Treib places both gardens in the contexts of the designers' broader careers. He also shares construction photographs and correspondence, documenting the evolution and context of the designs. Church's strength as a designer was in the creation of place. This was developed to great advantage at the Donnell Garden hilltop site. His work began with the landscape painter's foreground, middle ground, and distant view. The approach to the site is crucial to the appreciation of Church's gardens, and his skill was such that the visitor cannot imagine any other way. By contrast, Eckbo's gardens were exercises in creating spaces within spaces. The gardens were configured for specific uses, much as the rooms
within a house. In retrospect, the Donnell Garden has a timeless quality, while the Eckbo Garden was of its time.

Treib's assertion that these are two of the three great gardens of the mid-twentieth century may be an exaggeration, but both are extraordinarily interesting. The book documents both gardens well and demonstrates the depth and significance of the CED Archives material. It is highly recommended for its portrayal of two pivotal designers in this important era of California landscape design.

The CED Archives and William Stout Publishers have announced three forthcoming books in the series. These include a volume on the suburban parks of Robert Royston by landscape architects Reuben Rainey and J. C. Miller, a commentary on the houses of Joseph Esherick by Marc Treib, and a biography of Greenwood Common, the unique showcase of modern design in the Berkeley hills, by the archivist, Waverly Lowell. All will draw on material in the CED Archives and will interest not only a local, but an international design community.

—Margaretta J. Darnall

**Soup of the Day**
Frances Starn

Food, academia, and infidelity form the basis for this charming novel set in Clelland City, a thinly-disguised Berkeley, with its one hundred fifty restaurants, twenty bakeries, thirty delicatessens, eighteen wine importers, a housing shortage, and a failing local newspaper, where “everybody on the block is either giving or receiving therapy.” In the style of an eighteenth century novel with its sentence-long explanatory chapter titles, Starn delves into the midlife crisis of a professor of English under attack by a former student, the difficulties of his wife (who volunteers at the Souper Kitchen with somewhat unstable coworkers), the thoughts of the young, blond reporter, and the observations and discoveries of the new editor of the Clelland Klaxon.

Wry comments on personal and cultural foibles, not to mention culinary pretensions, in Clelland City add to this lighthearted story, in which, as might be expected, everything comes right in the end. This depiction of a certain social milieu, one that Berkeleyans will immediately recognize, affords us a delightful few hours of easy reading.

—William Roberts
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Number 1. Alarums and Diversions: Disasters at Cal  (136 pp.) Sold out.

Number 2. Ladies Blue and Gold
Women at the University of California: as faculty, staff, philanthropists; “farmerettes” at Davis and Prytaneans at Berkeley; in sports, music (Cal Band, Treble Clef, Partheneia pageants), boarding houses, a black sorority, Asian clubs, the YWCA; as suffragettes and faculty wives; in the gym and the teachers’ placement bureau; from their first appearance as students in 1870 to their limited role as faculty members a century later; of personal triumphs of Julia Morgan, Helen Wills, and Josephine Miles; and the reminiscences of less well-known coeds over the years. (186 pp.)

Number 3. West of Eden: The University and the Environment
The natural setting of the campuses of the University of California and the university’s involvement with the environment in California: the Natural Reserve System; the Farm and Garden Project at UC Santa Cruz; the travails of Strawberry Creek at UC Berkeley; John Muir’s friends in the university who helped found the Sierra Club; others who worked to Save the Redwoods, others who had Sierra peaks named after them, others who have helped to Save the Bay; and the ecological problems when designing new campuses in the past and the new Merced campus. (152 pp.)

Number 4. The University at the Turn of the Century: Then and Now
Aspects of the University of California at the turn of the twentieth and twenty-first centuries: inaugural addresses, the Bancroft Library, the University Library in 1900 and 2000, the physical campus in 1900 and 2000, athletics then and now, the 1895 track team (the first to compete on the East Coast), major anthropological and archeological undertakings, changing administrative structures, summer sessions, and the university’s broader role in education in the state. (210 pp.)
Number 5. Against the Grain: Conflict and Controversy
In the 1960s the university was known as enraged, embittered, and embattled. But much happened before and after those years: Faculty revolted against the president and the regents, students agitated for their high moral rights and low-level fun; women demanded new curriculums. Free speech and civil rights have remained bones of contention for over one hundred years; the essence of most disputes has been authority vs. freedom. Struggles on the campuses of Davis, Irvine, San Diego, Santa Barbara, and Berkeley are included. (160 pp.)

Number 6. The Arts and Culture
In 1868 the University of California began with an academic focus on traditional fields such as literature, history, mathematics, and practical studies like agriculture and mining, but has since become intimately connected to the fine arts. On its campuses the university now teaches and has facilities for a wide variety of the arts: the Greek Theatre, art in the 1890s and during the twentieth century, the Mark Hopkins Institute of Art, the evolution of exhibition halls, architecture, printmaking, performing arts, music, dance, fencing, the art museum, film archives, ethnic arts and the design department—all and more in this issue. (214 pp.)

Number 7. Changing Places: Scholars Here and Abroad
Internationalism has always been a part of the University of California. Foreign students and visiting faculty have long found a home at Berkeley, and our faculty and students have conducted research and participated in programs around the world. Presented here is a mixture of new and old accounts, both serious and humorous, from foreign visitors and our university people abroad. Although Oxford University appears often, other accounts relate visits to Asia, Europe, and Africa. What did foreign students or faculty find in Berkeley to startle or delight them? International House, Cal Band trips, Extension programs, global fieldwork, and various other programs illustrate attempts by the university to promote exchange and through it, internationalism. (155 pp.)
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