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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relating to the affairs of the institution that ought to be preserved and made readily available,” as he wrote in his unpublished autobiography.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 last issue was on conflict and controversy the university has faced over the years. A future issue will focus on Californians abroad and visitors here, and another will present the university’s involvement in agriculture, viticulture and gastronomy.

It is with great pleasure, we now offer to our readers this current issue, The Arts and Culture at the University of California.

The Editorial Board
The Berkeleyan became the Daily Californian in 1897. This cover was designed by Frank Norris '94.
THE ARTS AND CULTURE
AT THE UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

WHEN CHANCELLOR CLARK KERR, ENCOUNTERING a friend from Harvard, asked why he was visiting Berkeley, his friend responded, to see, from the perspective of an Athenian, how they did things at Sparta. In his memoir Kerr says he was both stung and inspired by the observation. Was Berkeley, with its growing academic might in the sciences and social sciences, as culturally barren as Sparta? What could he do to make things different? Over the next several years, as chancellor and then as president of the university, he promoted initiatives to expand cultural facilities and programs, academic and otherwise, throughout the university system.

Since its earliest days Berkeley liked to style itself the “Athens of the West.” After building the first major modern Greek Theatre with donor largesse, the university was still ambivalent about institutional support for the arts. While it strove to make its students cultured only the study of literature was a part of the curriculum.

But a university with poets, sculptors, actors, and dancers as professors, and students majoring in such fields, was probably a little more than even the most visionary had in mind.

Today, as earlier of course, community members flock to each campus to see some of their region’s and the nation’s best performers. Performances and traveling exhibitions are common throughout the enormous university system.

A complete chronicle of the arts and the University of California would be the size of a telephone directory and encompass thousands of individuals, hundreds of academic programs, and scores of facilities. In this issue we have had to content ourselves with only a selection, past and present. In the past there have been many underlying issues that still roil academic and administrative waters: what, for instance, is the proper relationship between artistic practice and scholarship? Some disciplines have divorced into separate departments, such as art history and art practice. In others, they continue to co-habit, sometimes uneasily. What are the boundaries or are there even boundaries between “fine art,” “popular culture,” and “folk art”? In a multicultural society, what sorts of “culture” should the university enshrine and support? In an era of financial stringency what is the future for academic programs and facilities in the arts?

A common thread running throughout this issue is that programs in the arts have emerged and thrived with the inspiration and commitment of individuals, sometimes with benefits unseen in the original conception.

We hope that you, whatever your cultural allegiances and attitudes, will discover both broad and familiar aspects of your own university history here.
John Galen Howard's 1902 theater plan contained several landscape elements that were not built, including new roads and a monumental stair that was a continuation of the "University Axis" along which the Campanile was eventually built. College of Environmental Design Documents Collection.
THE HEARST GREEK THEATRE

Adapted from a Doe Library Exhibit

Text and photographs are excerpted from a current Doe Library exhibit, “The Hearst Greek Theatre at UC Berkeley.” It was prepared by Cal Performances in association with the Department of Classics, the Department of Theater, Dance and Performance Studies, the College of Environmental Design, the UC Libraries, and the Consortium for the Arts at UC Berkeley.

This exhibit was curated by Mark Griffith, professor of classics; Linda Jewell, professor of landscape design; and Laura Abrams, manager of education and community programs at Cal Performances; it was edited by Marti Stephen, and designed by Mary Scott.

The American Outdoor Drama Movement

At the turn of the 20th century, a group of American theatrical professionals, naturalists and wealthy patrons, influenced by Greek artistic and democratic ideals, spawned a national movement to create outdoor performances. These drama enthusiasts built outdoor theaters as a more accessible, democratic alternative to the commercial focus of interior theaters. Facilitated by an ideal climate for such outdoor events, California theaters played an important role in this movement.

In 1894 the natural amphitheater, proposed by Ben Weed as the setting for Senior Class Day, was perceived as a “wilderness” east of the campus. Bancroft Library (UARC PIC 1:1).
But it was the construction of Hearst Greek Theatre that created national visibility for the outdoor drama movement and influenced the building of numerous theaters on campuses and in public spaces across the country. In his 1917 book, *Outdoor Theaters*, Frank Waugh wrote:

Unquestionably the most famous outdoor theater in the United States is the one at the University of California, Berkeley. ... The Greek theater at Berkeley has become a place of pilgrimage. Not less than ten-thousand people go up across the campus and through the eucalyptus grove during every week to delight their eyes with its classic dignity and restful charm.

**The Ben Weed Amphitheater**

When the class of 1894 decided to expand the traditional Senior Class Day activities to include a medieval-based “Secret Court” ceremony, the students searched the campus for a space to present this satirical event. One student, Ben Weed, proposed a natural amphitheater in a grove of eucalyptus that he discovered on the eastern edge of campus. The only change the students made to the space was to cut down a large eucalyptus tree so that the stump could become an altar required for the ritual. With its excellent natural acoustics and delightful setting, the bowl-shaped grove became the location of numerous campus activities and became known as The Ben Weed Amphitheater.

**A Vision of a Greek Theater for the Athens of the West**

The transformation of the Ben Weed site into a permanent, classical Greek theater had several sources. “Athens of the West” had long been a popular phrase that tied the climate,
geography and culture of Greece to the Bay Area region and the university. In 1897 the university initiated an international competition for an architectural plan for the campus. Most entries, including the winning scheme by the French architect M. Emile Benard, responded with schemes that reflected the classic lines of Greco-Roman planning and architecture. The university later hired fourth-place winner, campus architect John Galen Howard, to develop a plan that incorporated the classical lines of the winning scheme.

In 1900 the newly elected university president, Benjamin Ide Wheeler, requested suggestions on campus development. Professor Edward Clapp, head of the Greek Department, recommended a classic Greek theater. Wheeler, having spent a year’s residency in Greece, saw parallels between Greece and his new California home and was receptive. In September 1902 Wheeler announced that University of California benefactor Phoebe Apperson Hearst’s son, William Randolph Hearst, publisher of the daily newspaper, the *San Francisco Examiner*, would donate $42,000 for a permanent theater at the Ben Weed site. In October John Galen Howard presented his initial scheme, a concave band shell, but by December he had embraced the idea of a theater based on classical models such as the theater at Epidaurus. Howard apparently had not yet traveled in Greece, so he probably relied on his travels in Italy and his studies at the Ecole des Beaux-Arts to produce an engaging watercolor of a Greek structure nestled in a tree-covered hillside.

During January 1903 Howard and his staff, which included Julia Morgan, worked out of Howard’s university office on construction drawings for the project. Juggling a budget that eliminated marble and other luxuries, Howard and his staff retained the basic spatial organization and character of the original scheme. Like its precedent at Epidaurus, the inner and

John Galen Howard's watercolor rendering indicated a marble facing, caryatids on the stage wall and a colonnade that were eliminated in the final design, but the finished theater retained his vision of a simple classical geometry juxtaposed against the forested slope. *Bancroft Library (UARC PIC 100:9).*
outer tiers of seats have different slopes. The lower seating is built on a shallow slope around a 50-foot diameter circle, and an aisle (diazoma) at stage level separates the two tiers of seats. A 254-foot diameter semi-circle defines the upper 19 rows of 18-inch-high seats that rise abruptly at a 30-degree angle. The large stage is 122-feet long and 28-feet deep and is surrounded by a 42-foot-high concrete backdrop with Doric columns and five entrances—a monumental central door, suitable for a palace or temple entrance, two additional doors facing the audience, and two side doors.

In February 1903 horse-drawn equipment began excavation and earth-moving to re-shape the natural bowl. Bancroft Library (UARC PIC 1:171).

An Aggressive Construction Schedule

The clearing of trees began in December of 1902, but funding delays pushed the beginning of excavation until mid-February 1903. To have the theater functioning for the 1903 commencement ceremonies, more than 50 men worked overtime and on weekends for three months. Unexpected topographic conditions further delayed excavation and the completion of formwork, so concrete pouring did not begin until April 18. For the next three weeks, horse-drawn carts hauled 50 barrels of concrete each day and the workmen labored into the evenings to complete the concrete. Rather than attempt to complete the stage structure, the workers built a temporary wood platform for the May 14, 1903 commencement, which featured President Theodore Roosevelt.

The Theatre's First Official Use at the 1903 Commencement

On May 10th Howard's staff began the transformation of the construction site into a setting for commencement. Julia Morgan oversaw the installation of colorful banners, a speaking platform, and endless yards of muslin covering wooden frames to create the impression of finished structures. However, commencement was not the first event in the theater. On May 12, the senior class, with a portion of the concrete seats still too wet to use, claimed the temporary stage for their annual Extravaganza. Then, by May 14, all evidence
Just a month before commencement, workmen began moving concrete up steam-powered conveyors and pouring it into the waiting formwork. In the midst of construction are two women in hats and long skirts. Perhaps they are Julia Morgan and Phoebe Apperson Hearst? Bancroft Library (UARC PIC 1:72).

At the May 14, 1903 commencement, President Theodore Roosevelt addressed the audience in a partially completed theater. Bancroft Library (UARC PIC 1:69).
of the Extravaganza was swept away, replaced by flower garlands, a covered platform and other appropriate decorations for a setting worthy of hosting the president of the United States.

**The Grand Opening**

Between May and September 1903, much further work had been done, and the Theatre was ready for its official dedication and first dramatic performance. The *San Francisco Examiner* (not an entirely unbiased witness) in its lavish two-page coverage of the proceedings, reported:

> In the heart of a Berkeley hill lies the noblest theatre the world has seen since the days when Greeks were Greeks. . . . Nature was very good to the day. Perhaps she knew that she was celebrating herself. For Nature planned the great open air auditorium. . . . The people swarmed down from all points . . . and they swarmed in thousands. There seemed to be more women than men, and the color effect of the throng was white and blue and lavender, except for a central division of the outer semicircle, where was gathered the male student body. You would have heard its “Oski Wow-wow” in a tunnel twenty miles distant.

**Classical Drama Lives Again**

*The Birds* was the Theatre’s first production, staged as part of the official dedication ceremony. This appropriately chosen Classical comedy celebrates (and mocks) the demo-
cratic passion for experimentation and exploration. Professors James T. Allen and L. J. Richardson directed UC Berkeley students performing in the original Greek and accompanied by a professional orchestra concealed in the bushes. Despite just two months for production and rehearsal, it was favorably received: “This is the first time a Greek play, in the original language, and in a Greek theatre, has ever been attempted in this country; and the opportunity of seeing such a production was appreciated by the immense audience.” (Isaac Flagg, professor of Greek).

During its first decades, Hearst Greek Theatre was the main stage for both university events of all kinds as well as professional productions. Theatrical and musical productions ranged from student plays to extravagant stage spectacles featuring renowned professionals. Chief campus performers were the University Dramatic Association, the English Club (later called the Greek Theatre Players), the University Chorus and Orchestra, occasional departmental productions, and the annual Senior Extravaganza.

Sarah Bernhardt (Oscar Wilde’s “divine Sarah”) brought her internationally renowned interpretation of Racine’s Phèdre to Berkeley in May 1906 as a benefit for earthquake victims, and again in May 1911. Bancroft Library (UARC PIC 1:191).

Professional performers have included Comedie Francaise superstar Sarah Bernhardt (1906 and 1911), Maude Adams, soprano Luisa Tetrazzini (1912), dance pioneers Ruth St. Denis and Ted Shawn (1916), and the Players Club of San Francisco directed by Samuel Hume and Irving Pichel. Between 1957 and 1969, San Francisco Opera mounted an annual fall matinee in the Greek Theatre.

A Multi-purpose Campus Space

True to the spirit of many of the ancient Greek theaters, which often doubled as sites for democratic assemblies and political rallies, the Hearst Greek Theatre from its inception was not only a performance space, but also a ceremonial gathering place for the university and Bay Area community. At the dedication ceremony in 1903, President Wheeler remarked, “The University has long stood in sore need of an auditorium ample enough for its public meetings and the celebration of its chief festivals. . . .” and indeed the first ceremony there had been the presentation of an honorary Doctorate of Law to US President Theodore Roosevelt on May 14, 1903. From the early “Senior Extravaganzas,” “Pajama Rallies,” and Big Game bonfires (the latter are still held every November), to the more formal annual Charter Day and commencement ceremonies, Hearst Greek Theatre has provided a distinctive site at which UC Berkeley can welcome distinguished visitors and honor its own community. It is also a high-profile site for protestors of university or government policies.

Construction of newer venues such as Zellerbach Auditorium (1968) and Hertz Hall (1958) have resulted in fewer performances in the Greek Theatre. However, large-scale events still take place there. Classical works have included Sophocles’s Antigone in 1965 and Aeschylus’s Suppliant Women in

Extravaganzas," "Pajama Rallies," and Big Game bonfires (the latter are still held every November), to the more formal annual Charter Day and commencement ceremonies, Hearst Greek Theatre has provided a distinctive site at which UC Berkeley can welcome distinguished visitors and honor its own community. It is also a high-profile site for protestors of university or government policies.

Construction of newer venues such as Zellerbach Auditorium (1968) and Hertz Hall (1958) have resulted in fewer performances in the Greek Theatre. However, large-scale events still take place there. Classical works have included Sophocles’s Antigone in 1965 and Aeschylus’s Suppliant Women in

Set design for a production of Euripides’s Trojan Women, in a drawing by Michael Goodman, April 1927. Bancroft Library (UARC PIC 100:20a).
US President Woodrow Wilson on September 18, 1919, the year he was awarded the Nobel Peace Prize. Bancroft Library (UARC PIC 1:100a).

Jawaharlal Nehru (second from left), India's first Prime Minister, with California Governor Warren and UC President Sproul, October 31, 1949. Bancroft Library (UARC PIC 1:163).

UC Berkeley's newly formed Department of Dramatic Art presented all three plays of The Oresteia by Aeschylus in a day-long production directed by Professor Fred Harris (September 1958). Panels along the edge of the orchestra are inscribed with Greek phrases taken from the choral lyrics of the trilogy. Bancroft Library (UARC PIC 1:161b).

Anti-nuke banners adorn the stage as UC President David Saxon speaks at Charter Day, 1979. Bancroft Library (UARC PIC 1:381).
1989. The Berkeley Jazz Festival presented concerts in the 1970s and the 1980s, Bill Graham and Bill Graham Presents have featured such stars as Joni Mitchell, Bob Marley, and Carlos Santana. The Grateful Dead has shaken the august walls of the Greek Theatre in week-long engagements, with tie-dyed t-shirted “Deadheads” lining Gayley Road.

Now managed by Cal Performances, the historic open-air theater retains its unique appeal. With its splendid acoustics and sight lines, incomparable natural setting, and enthusiastic and diverse audiences, Hearst Greek Theatre remains the crown jewel of California outdoor theaters.

At the rededication of the Theatre in September 1957, the San Francisco Opera performed Puccini’s Turandot, starring Leonie Rysanek, with minimal sets but full orchestra, costumes and chorus—the first of a dozen annual San Francisco Opera matinees. Bancroft Library (UARC PIC 1:39a).

The classic Sanskrit drama, The Little Clay Cart (attributed to King Shudraka), in a translation by UC Berkeley Professor Arthur W. Ryder, was performed by the English Club—with a guest appearance by Princess the elephant from San Francisco’s Chutes at the Beach, April 10, 1907. Bancroft Library (UARC PIC 100:47).
The sun sets on Sophocles' Antigone, a Department of Dramatic Art production directed by Takis Muzenidis, with set and costumes designed by UC Berkeley Professor Henry May, October 1965. The wigs, shoes and sandals were a gift of the Greek government. Bancroft Library (CU-36.2, Box 1:2).

FRANK GELETT BURGESS
AMERICAN HUMORIST AND ILLUSTRATOR
1866-1951
UC Faculty, 1891-1894

EDUCATED AS AN ENGINEER, Gelett Burgess taught topographical drawing at the University of California between 1891 and 1894. The next year he became founding editor of The Lark, a humor magazine, and in 1897 he began to publish books of his self-illustrated whimsical writings. He is credited with adding several words to the English language, including blurb. Among his best-known works is Goops and How to Be Them (1900), but perhaps he is best known for a single, whimsical quatrain appearing in May 1895 about a purple cow, which he later regretted as shown in his poem below.

POETS’ CORNER

Ah, Yes! I Wrote the “Purple Cow”—
I’m Sorry, now, I Wrote it
But I can Tell you Anyhow
I’ll Kill you if you Quote it
—Gelett Burgess, 1897

There once was an ichthyosaurus,
Who lived when the world was all porous
When he first heard his name,
He fainted in shame,
And departed a long time before us.
—Frank Norris ’94.
The student artist in 1896. 1897 Blue and Gold.
FRANK NORRIS, CLASS OF '94

Carroll Brentano

BENJAMIN FRANKLIN NORRIS was born on March 7, 1870, in Chicago. His well-off family toured Europe when he was eight, wintered in Oakland when he was fourteen, and moved to San Francisco the following year. He studied art at the San Francisco Art Association and from 1887 to 1890 at the Académie Julien in Paris. In the fall of 1890 at twenty years of age, he became an undergraduate at the University of California. He had enrolled as a special student, never passed the math requirements, joined the Phi Gamma Delta fraternity, and began a writing career. He left Berkeley in the spring of his senior year, 1894, for Harvard where he remained for a year, again as a special student, finishing his first published book, McTeague.

Moving back to San Francisco, he spent the next seven years there or in New York becoming a successful, and famous, writer: The Pit, The Octopus. He married, had a daughter, and died of peritonitis in October 1902 in San Francisco while planning a trip to the South Seas: in imitation of Robert Louis Stevenson’s voyage on the same yacht, the “Casco Bay,” (belonging to erstwhile University of California regent, Samuel Merrill).¹

Norris’s four years at Cal were a mix of frivolity, creativity, and drink. He took only those classes he liked and could pass; mathematics was not among them. French, which he already knew, was substituted. During these years Norris wrote a great deal, but mostly ephemera, and his art work was mostly pen and ink illustrations for the stories and poems he was producing. However, in his junior year as the art editor for the 1894 Blue and Gold, he made at least eight drawings for its pages, as well as illustrating the text of his own play, Two Pair. Even the embellishment of the cover of the yearbook is designated with an “N.”²

According to his biographer, his fellow students, especially his fraternity brothers, laughed at his art work and no modern critic has taken it seriously. But it is, in the context of the usual undergraduate sketches, quite adequate—and does not lack the sophistication one

The Phi Delta Gamma fraternity in 1893. Frank Norris is seated third from right with his foot on his dog. To his right is Harry Wright, co-editor of Smiles. Bancroft Library (BANC PIC Norris, Frank POR 10).

might expect of a former student of a Parisian art school.3

An old friend of Norris’s, Ernest Peixotto, with whom he had attended classes in Paris and with whom he had sketched the armor and weapons exhibited in museums in France, and later in the cavalry barracks in San Francisco, did the illustration for Norris’s 1891 medieval romance “The Jongleur of Taillebois.” Peixotto did the cover for the campus humor magazine Smiles of which Norris was the editor. It was Peixotto’s sister, Jessica, also a member of the class of 1894, who played one of the two female roles in Norris’s Two Pair, written for the juniors’ class day.4

Official historian of the class of ’94 Norris wrote, “With classes as well as nations the happiest are those that have no history. . . . We do nothing because there is nothing to do.” But he mentions the junior play when “we hazarded an innovation, presenting a society farce instead of the purely local comedy farce of preceding classes, which same was not unfavorably received,” (and of which same he was the author)—and “the badger fight,” lost now in the mists of nineteenth-century undergraduate humor.5 Referring, most probably

Ernest Peixotto in his studio, ca. 1895. Bancroft Library (BANC PIC Peixotto POR-3).
to his junior day farce, the *Blue and Gold* gave Norris the tag line “The play, I remember, pleased not the million,” and under “Old Favorites, by New Authors” the ascription “Lay of the Last Minstrel.”

More college humor, written for a public audience, appeared after Norris left the campus. One such article was “Western Types I: The College Man,” in the San Francisco Wave, 1896 (signed with the ridiculous nom de plume of Marmaduke Masters).

Well, to begin with, he is a good fellow, but by that I do not mean to say he is good. He is not good in that sense. In that sense I am very much afraid to say he is a sorry case. He loves his pipe and his glass and is given over to late hours and to riotous home-comings with a great noise of shouting, his pockets stuffed with spoons and beer glasses and individual salt-cellars and small tradesmen’s signs which he hangs up in his room as souvenirs.

Scene from *Two Pair. 1893 Blue and Gold.*

Compared with his eastern counterpart, the western college man, besides spending less time in his rooms (he needs a “wider sphere of action, and goes out of the college precincts to seek it, from Broadway in Oakland to Kearny Street in San Francisco”) and having less money (“The Eastern brother has the long green: the Western man the small brown . . .”), has a different social life:

The Eastern brother gives “teas” to young lady friends in his “rooms,” where his mother is the chaperone, and where his sisters serve the tea and help him receive, all very decorous and solemn. The Westerner orders the matter on a totally different plan; his fraternity is the center of his social life.
at college. He, with his fraters, keeps “open house” on public days (having made a carefully expurgated edition of his room beforehand) and fills the place with a lot of jolly people—girls from the city, and visiting cousins, and even “coeds,” who eat salads and ice cream in the smoking room, and play Virginia reels and popular songs on the rented piano in the back parlor, and who come out into the kitchen to help the Freshmen with the chocolate and
ice cream freezers. . . . The girls have “the time of their life,” and send over sofa cushions and lampshades the next week to show their appreciation.8

At the end: “And his work? Oh, yes, his work; we’d somehow forgotten that. Well, he graduates somehow.”

In another Wave article, “Evolution of a Freshman: Undergraduate Life at the University of California,” Norris explains the two kinds of “rush”:

The fraternity rushing is for the purpose of inducing desirable, gentlemanly, well-groomed fellows to join a particular Greek letter society . . . [several societies] out-rival each other in showing him attention. They ask him to lunch, inquire quietly as to his health, show a flattering interest in his college career, advise him solemnly against the fast set of the other “frat,” give evidence of being tremendously struck with his sister and introduce him to their alumni. After two weeks of this the freshman is putting on his hat with a shoe-horn, and patronizes the president of the college and the Academic Senate. . . . Once the “frat” initiation is over and he is safely pinned to a particular society . . . he suddenly discovers that his importance has evaporated in a single night . . . while any expression or indication of independence or self-importance is met with sarcasm, and riotous approbrium tempered with wit about as delicate as a brick-bat.9

The other “rush” was less a strictly college sport and to Norris, as he describes its method and meaning in “Ethics of the Freshman Rush,” published in The Wave in September 1897, it had a broader and deeper purpose. Although California’s rush had a long history of enmity between the freshman and sophomore classes, this year the rush had resulted in two students being “manhandled”: one had had his face “kicked in” and the other “laid up with a twisted knee.” What annoyed Norris, however, was that the faculty was appealing to the president to put an end to the rush altogether. According to Norris “fighting is a good thing” and not only good, but natural, and not only natural but distinctively natural to the Anglo-Saxon race. “[We are] a fighting race . . . [and] civilization is far from that time when the fighting man can be dispensed with.”

“If the boys of our universities want to fight, let them fight, in Heaven’s name, and consider it a thing to be thankful for. . . . In five years they will be old enough to carry a rifle, and who knows how soon the President of the country may want and call for just that fighting spirit that the President of the college condemns.”10 For the students fighting was better than “knocking themselves to pieces with women and nicotine and alcohol.” His final word: “The life of men in the world is one big ‘rush’ after all, where only the fittest survive and the weakest go to the wall.” Norris makes it specific: “If the Freshman gets only this knowledge out of a cane rush, and learns that in four years he is to be pitchforked out into a place where only his strength of body and mind is to keep him up with the procession, he will have gained more than he can ever get out of a classroom, or lecture-hall, or text-book.”11

This diatribe was written by a young man who had come to the Berkeley campus a few years earlier from an art school and in love with the romantic Middle Ages. After four years as the darling of the Fiji fraternity, he had left them the legacy of a celebratory pig meal otherwise known as “The Norris.” One of America’s greatest novels, his McTeague, was being written at this time, and his protagonist knew neither the text-book nor the cane rush, but only the vicious fighting that led him to a tragic life and a terrible death.12
ENDNOTES

1. Although Norris was only thirty-two when he died ten years after leaving Berkeley, he had written seven novels and has today 168 records after his name in one bibliographical site. For a comprehensive and sympathetic look at the UC Berkeley years see: Franklin Walker, “Frank Norris at the University of California,” in University of California Chronicle, 33:3 (July 1931), 320-49. Walker, author of a full biography and various other works about Norris, wrote this article from written sources and from interviews with many of Norris’s fraternity brothers, his wife, family, and friends. Other useful descriptions of Norris’s early years are the foreword, by his brother Charles, and the introduction, by Oscar Lewis, to Frank Norris of the Wave (San Francisco: Westgate Press, 1931). For more about the Fijis and “The Norris” see: “Frank Norris and his Chapter,” The Phi Gamma Delta, 52:8 (April 1930).

2. Walker includes a list of Norris’s publications during his Berkeley years.
1890-91: six other poems or stories in the Occident in his freshman year.
1891-92: two in The Wave, one in the Overland Monthly, and on campus, in Smiles and the Blue and Gold.
1892-93: one in the Overland Monthly, and Two Pair in the Blue and Gold.
1893-94: three in the Overland Monthly, one in the Argonaut, and on campus, in The Berkeleyan Magazine.

3. Walker, in “Norris at the University,” suggests that “As a follower of Gibson he delighted in drawing statuesque men and women, but they always turned out to be wooden and strangely lacking in proportion,” 341.

4. Jessica Peixotto, often mentioned as a close friend of Norris’s, remained at the university to receive a PhD and to enjoy a very long and illustrious career teaching in what became the sociology department, retiring as a full professor in 1935. Miss Peixotto, although, from her photographs, very beautiful and described by her faculty contemporaries as charming, was ten years older than her classmates and seems to have left no record of her undergraduate life—except her part in Norris’s play.

5. 1894 Blue and Gold, 20 (1893), 28. Norris is listed in the literary division of the Junior Class, 26, and on the editors’ page (designed by him) as “artist.”

6. Ibid., 251, 214.


8. Ibid., 70, 72.


11. Ibid., 337.

12. It is worth noting that while the wretched McTeague exhibits the underside of the “fight,” the protagonist of the novel Norris was writing at the same time, Van derover and the Brute, exemplifies the moral of this article: he is “knocked to pieces” by “women, nicotine and alcohol.”
As an introduction to the history of art instruction at the University of California we reproduce and excerpt from the very first issue of The Berkeleyan, February 8, 1893, a statement by student Harry M. Wright ’94 (a classmate and fraternity brother of Frank Norris). Under the title, “Art in the University,” Wright welcomes the Mark Hopkins Institute to the University of California and points out the blessings that will flow from its establishment—blessings not only to the students but to the state and nation. Wright outlines in his two page manifesto of a century ago nearly all the endeavors that will take place in the following one hundred years: art courses not only in drawing and painting, but in sculpture, ceramics, print making, architecture, and music; courses in art history (even interdisciplinary ones); Extension courses on campus; finally, a museum and an appeal to California millionaires to support it.

Harry Wright on Its Beginnings

[The Hopkins Institute is] “to be hailed as a godsend by friends of art and of the University alike. . . . The University of California, in pursuing this policy, has divided its work according to two definite and distinct aims: 1. to afford that the so-called “liberal” educa-
tion necessary to every cultured man and woman; 2. to give the specialized instruction indispensable to the worker on specialized lines, whether that be natural science, engineering, pedagogy, law, medicine, or art in any of its branches. In both these divisions art should occupy a prominent place; that it has not done so hitherto is only because of the absence of the opportunities now so happily provided. . . . mutual interpretation of [literature and art] one by the other is equally operative in regard to Art and history, or Art and the Ancient Literatures. Prof. [Thomas Rutherford] Bacon's series of illustrated lectures on the painting, sculpture, and architecture of the Renaissance, in connection with his course in the history of the same period, will amply confirm the truth of such a statement. There should be, then, we think, a course of lectures on the history and significance of the successive schools and tendencies in the several branches of the Fine Arts, together with incidental instruction in elementary technical details, and inclusive as well of such lectures as may serve to emphasize the correlation of the Arts with the principles of social and of aesthetic development.

We have reason to believe, from conversation with members of the faculty, that in the near future a series of lectures of this nature will be given in San Francisco as part of the University Extension movement. This is as it should be, and we may further hope that the formation of a faculty of Art in connection with the Hopkins Institute will render possible a similar Art Extension for the benefit of the benighted students in the Berkeley colleges.

But by far the most important results will be attained by the new institution along its own distinctive lines of instruction. Art in California has suffered from the lack of a first-class school, and yet we have produced artists of note both in Europe and the East. Holding this in mind, it is hard to understand why energetic and progressive management, supported
by financial assistance, if necessary, from the Regents, should not make the Hopkins Institute the best of its kind in the United States, and the equal of the European academies. Its instruction should cover, not only painting and sculpture, but such kindred branches as architecture, ceramic art, engraving, and music. The graduates of our University study architecture at the Massachusetts School of Technology and in Europe; our [artists] are educated abroad. . . . Energy, brains, and money will do it, and these should be forthcoming.

Now there is here offered an opportunity for all good citizens who can do more than pay taxes for its support to play a worthy part. Tourists are wont to smile at our claim to any aristocracy worthy of the name. Emerson has spoken of California as "civilized in an immoral way," that is, with no more heroic design than the very commonplace one of finding a short way to wealth. . . . There can be no better answer to the reproach of mammonism and provincialism than to demonstrate our capability of appreciating the higher life by pointing to a collection of the greatest art treasures of the civilized world. This is pleasant to contemplate, but the execution would be far more satisfactory. It remains with our Californian millionaires to decide whether the Mark Hopkins Institute of Art of the University of California shall be not only the school of future but home of past and present masters."

Frank Norris Writes about the Hopkins Institute

After training in Parisian and California art schools, Frank Norris, age twenty, arrived on the Berkeley campus in 1890. He was a major in history and French and as far as we know took no courses in art; although, or perhaps because, the only art instructor at the time (in Topographical and Freehand Drawing) was (Frank) Gelett Burgess who was a personal friend.1 By 1895 Norris was no longer intending to be an artist, and his work for the campus's Blue and Gold, Smiles, the Occident, other Bay Area publications, and the illustrations of his own literary works came to an end.

After 1896, however, among his many articles for The Wave, Norris wrote about the university's own art school, the Mark Hopkins Institute of Art.2 There were reviews of exhibitions at the Institute, and at the San Francisco Art Association, and a sketch of a pupil at the former: "An Art Student." Another is a description of the casting of a large bronze group, the "Native Sons Monument" (also called "Admission Day") by sculptor Douglas Tilden, who was a sometime teacher at the Hopkins Institute.3

Norris's "An Art Student" takes a fully wry look at the callow youth become self-cre-
ated bohemian: “but by Bohemianism he understands merely the wearing of large soft felt hats and large bow scarfs [sic] and the drinking of beer in German ‘resorts.’ His Bohemianism is not dangerous" and his studio is his room at home:

[H]e tries to hide the stationary washstand behind the screens and hangings, and he softens the rigidity of the white marble mantelpiece by hanging a yellow “drape” upon one corner. The room is dirty and cluttered; studies of dusty stone jugs are pinned or tacked upon the walls; flattened paint tubes lie about the window-sills, and there is a strangling odor of turpentine and fixative in the air that mingles with the smell of tobacco and the odor of cooking food from the kitchen downstairs.

On week days he works—and he works hard—at the School of Design—the Art Institute. For the past five years he has been working away here desperately, painting carrots, dead fish, bunches of onions, and, above all, stone jugs. He toils away at these jugs with infinite pains. If he can manage to reproduce truthfully the little film of dust that gathers upon them, he is happy. A dusty stone jug is his ideal in life.4

View of Main Gallery of Mark Hopkins Institute by Arthur F. Mathews. Reproduced from Mark Hopkins Institute Exhibition catalog, 1893.
The results of this toil are meager: "Once in a while you see his pictures—still life 'studies' of stone jugs and bunches of onions—in the exhibits." Notices of these he "carefully... pastes in his scrapbook, which he leaves in conspicuous places in his studio." After years of this, now "nearly... middle aged" and met on the street, he "shows you his latest 'piece.' It is a study of turnips and onions, grouped about a dusty stone jug... He never sells a picture. He has given his life to his work..." and if lucky, takes a job at a newspaper where he "does the pen-and-ink work he once affected to despise." But Norris, who himself gave up easel painting (a huge canvas on a monumental subject he abandoned in Paris in 1890), and then gave up pen and ink illustrations with his departure from Berkeley, in the end gives his sympathy to the poor art student: "All his ambitions are vanished, his enthusiasms dead, but little by little he comes to be quite contented."5

The art public got a fair amount of sarcasm from Norris. His sketch of "The Fast Girl" from his series on "Western Types," The Wave, May 1896, introduces Ida at the art gallery of the Mechanic's Fair. With her "fellar" she is examining the hand-painting exhibit, looking for her mother's contribution of "yellow poppies painted on black velvet and framed in gilt. On this occasion she looked at each picture carefully, her head on one side. 'Of course,' she explained to the fellar, I'm no critic, I only know what I like. I like those heads, those ideal heads like that one,' and she pointed with arm outstretched to a picture of the head of a young girl with disheveled brown hair and upturned eyes. The title of the picture was Faith. 'Yes,' said Ida reflectively, 'I like that kind.'6

Norris did approve of the university's art school in the Mark Hopkins mansion on Nob Hill: "The artists in general are well satisfied with the Hopkins house... The light is admirable, the rooms spacious, and the arrangement of the house affords first-class opportunities in the way of galleries for exhibitions." Furthermore, it "is doing a great work in bringing out native talent, and not only bringing it out but developing it to a very high degree."7

In his article, "The Hopkins Institute: Art Education in San Francisco—Men Who Have Emerged," The Wave, September 1897, Norris names as emerged Ernest Peixotto, Guy Rose, and Eric Pape "who are as good magazine illustrators as any in the country." He explains how the Hopkins Institute had changed: "In the old school its students used to be drilled and drilled in drawing from the antique, and a great deal of time wasted in consequence." But the new director, Arthur Mathews, "has changed all that... and has made the life classes—that is to say, the classes that work from nude models—the all important part of the course." However there was now a problem:

When the life class of the school originally opened the instructors found themselves at first involved in an unexpected difficulty, that is of obtaining
models. There were only one or two professional models known to the coterie of local painters, and the life class soon knew them by heart. For a time the directors were hard put to it to satisfy the demand, but after the first year the wants of the school became known in the "Latin Quarter," and the Italians, as is usual in every art center, began to recruit the corporal's guard of those who earned their living by "posing for the figure." However, the artists who have studied in Paris and worked from all the famous models there are a unit in declaring that the California-bred model, especially the female model, is the best that can be found the world over, in the matter of color, proportion, modeling, and as the painters say "skeleton."

Unlike the artist described in his Art Student sketch, the current product of the Hopkins school is selling his work: "Formerly it was only very well-to-do people... who bought pictures. Now the middle classes are buying, and are more and more willing to pay good prices for good pictures."

In an article for The Wave in November 1897, Norris reviews the works of local artists exhibited at the Hopkins galleries for the Art Association. He is cutting: "It is one of those pictures which neither succeed nor fail, for the reason that they do not attempt anything"; he is laudatory: a painting "is, however, a rather fine failure, and as such, infinitely superior to the tame mediocrity of the [other]"; he is rapturous: "Miss Edgerly has on the walls a miniature on porcelain entitled 'The Singing Nymphs' which is one of the most beautiful subjects conceivable." He is reserved, however, with the famous old masters of the day: "Keith shows a huge landscape in the style of the French school of the early part of this century—vigor and breezy. The sky, however, near the horizon is altogether too deep in tone."

Frank Norris's years as an art critic, like those as an artist, were numbered—as, in fact, were those of The Wave which ceased publication in 1900. In the same year, 1897, that he wrote the reviews of the Mark Hopkins shows, the university yearbook, the Blue and Gold, for the first time included the Institute and its students on two full pages with caricatures of the students and their statement that "To know the Art School is to know life."

A true on-campus department of art did not arrive until 1923. In the short life left to him, Frank Norris wrote and published a half-dozen novels and, as one of only twenty-seven others, was given a marble throne in the Greek Theatre—honored for his writing, not his art.

ENDNOTES

1 Gelett Burgess (1866-1951), became ultra-famous as the author of "The Purple Cow." He wrote it in 1895, before following Norris as sub-editor of The Wave, and after being dismissed from his post as mechanical drawing instructor at Berkeley: a dismissal occasioned by "the success with which a cast-iron likeness of Dr. Henry Cogswell, prominent local dentist, philanthropist, teetotaler and philistine, had been brought down clanking to the cobblestones at California and Market Streets." Gelett Burgess Behind the Scenes, ed., Joseph M. Backus (San Francisco: Grabhorn-Hoyem, 1968), 9.
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THE EVOLUTION OF EXHIBITION HALLS

William Roberts and Carroll Brentano

BACON LIBRARY AND ART GALLERY
1881–1911

Here at last was a commodious and beautiful structure, with oceans of room for books and readers, cream tinted walls adorned with paintings and portraits, iron work, shining with new gilt, and six portraits on the ceiling of the rotunda.
—J. C. Rowell, Beginnings of a Great Library, 1938

In 1877 Henry Douglas Bacon offered his large collection of fine books, paintings, and statues to the university, with $25,000 for a building in which to house them, provided the state made an equal contribution.

The Gallery of Fine Arts, located on the third floor, contained three pieces of sculpture and seventy-one paintings in 1895 illustrative of various periods and schools of art. University Archives (UARC PIC 700:4).

THE MARK HOPKINS INSTITUTE OF ART
1893–1906

“To know the Art School is to know life. To have had Hopkins Institute for your Alma Mater is to have known a new creation—to have left the superficial and to have espoused the real—to have responded to the heart-throb of Nature and to have attained to her deep mysteries! . . . Our first Jinks! Can we ever forget that? The soft, vibrant air made luminous by the warm light of many candles, the incense rising from odoriferous tapers, the rich, oriental garb of the girls, the Celestial attire of the boys, as, marking time with slip-shod shoes, they marched to the dulcet tones of the Chinese gong. Can we forget all these? And the feast and wit that followed: the toasts and songs! Then the dance about the burning floss and the scudding away like frightened spirits!”

—1897 Blue and Gold
Mark Hopkins Institute, Main Gallery, 1894. Photograph by O. V. Lange. University Archives (ff308gv. 1894, v. 1:44).
THE UNIVERSITY ART GALLERY
1934—late 1960s

Built as the campus powerhouse in 1904 at a cost of $62,000, designed by John Galen Howard, this brick building was converted to an art gallery in 1934. The article in this issue, "The Lure of the Exotic" by Ira Jacknis, covers the history of this gallery after the 1934 conversion.

East facade and entrance to University Art Gallery, about 1960. University Archives (UARC PIC 145.5).

THE BERKELEY ART MUSEUM
(Originally known as the University Art Museum)
1970 to the present

This striking multi-story concrete building of 83,000 square feet was designed by Mario Ciampi at a cost of $3,000,000, opened in 1970 as the University Art Museum. The initial gift of $250,000 was part of a donation by the painter Hans Hofmann, along with a collection of his own work.

In the spring of 1980 visitors lined up at the entrance to the University Art Museum to view the blockbuster photography exhibition “Avedon 1946–1980.” Photograph by Ben Blackwell. BAM/PFA.

A banner on the side of the museum, now known as the Berkeley Art Museum, announced the spring 2001 exhibition “Muntadas—On Translation: The Audience” by quoting a phrase from one of Antonio Muntadas’s signature pieces. Photograph by Ben Blackwell. BAM/PFA.

The museum's unique cantilevered gallery spaces, in 2003. Photograph by Ben Blackwell. BAM/PFA.
RUBE GOLDBERG, CLASS OF 1904
AMERICAN HUMORIST AND CARTOONIST
1883-1970

AFTER GRADUATING FROM THE UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA, Goldberg started out as a sports cartoonist for the San Francisco Chronicle, and began working on a comic strip as well. In 1907 he moved to New York after selling a Sunday strip. After some time he was hired by the New York Evening Mail. His sports cartoons grew in popularity, and by 1911 he was producing a Sunday comic strip. Off and on he created new characters and seventeen years later started a daily strip. His last daily strip was in 1939. But he was really at his best with his miscellany pages. Especially memorable were his creations of intricate and absurd inventions, perhaps the germs of which may be seen in his illustrations for the Blue and Gold when he was a student. A few of these are scattered throughout this issue. His editorial cartoons led to his winning a Pulitzer Prize. He co-founded the National Cartoonist Society in 1945 and was its first president. The collection of his original drawings is held by the Bancroft Library.
THE LURE OF THE EXOTIC
ETHNIC ARTS AND THE DESIGN DEPARTMENT AT UC BERKELEY

Ira Jacknis

TODAY, THE GREAT MULTIVERSITY OF THE UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA—famed for its nuclear engineering—is not regarded as a center for the study of textiles and other forms of decorative art. In fact, basketry as a college course is something of an academic joke. For the first half of the twentieth century, however, the Berkeley campus was a national center for such studies. This essay is devoted to illuminating the history of a vanished department, one that has gone under different names—Household Art, Decorative Art, and Design—from its beginnings in 1912, under Mary Lois Kissell, until 1979, with the retirement of its last professor, C. Edmund Rossbach. As the history of this department remains essentially unwritten, this is clearly not the place to offer a comprehensive history. Instead, I will focus on one issue which, because of its centrality, touches on much of the department’s activity. One of the distinctive features of the Berkeley program was its close relationship to ethnic arts, and secondarily, to the university’s anthropology program, which possessed professional expertise concerning them. And of all the artistic media practiced and taught, textiles were by far the most important one. This hitherto untold story may rightly lay claim to being one of UC Berkeley’s great cultural contributions.

THE RISE AND FALL OF A DEPARTMENT

Before turning to the subject at hand, it is necessary to sketch in some basics of the department’s development. Following a brief historical summary, we consider the topics of academic generations, departmental names, the role of gender in a female-oriented department, the academic degrees of both faculty and students, critical vs. applied aspects of the arts, and finally, the role of textiles in relation to other artistic media. Only with a sense of these general contexts can we begin to understand the influence of ethnic arts on succeeding generations of the department’s professors and students.

A Short History

The department considered here was known by several names over its almost seventy-year history. The program began in 1912 as Household Art, joined with Household Science (which focused on human nutrition) to form a Department of Home Economics. As originally conceived, the coursework was meant to occupy the relatively large female enrollment, and, in fact, until its demise, the department was substantially female in its faculty and students. Home economics had originally developed in nineteenth-century America as a social reform movement. It sought to support women’s roles as moral guardians of the family by applying rational and efficient methods to household management. During the first decade of the twentieth century, home economics became a field of academic study. Home economics was, in fact, the primary field for most of the department’s earliest faculty.

The department’s first professor, Mary Lois Kissell (1874–ca. 1944), had an impeccable background for the job. An important but now obscure figure, Kissell had studied at Columbia with Franz Boas and collected Southwestern Indian baskets for the American Museum of Natural History. She had a home economics master’s degree from Columbia (1913). Af-
ter two years at Berkeley, she resigned in 1914 when she saw that President Benjamin Ide Wheeler had little interest in making the Department of Home Economics a serious academic program.\(^5\)

The department’s effective beginning, then, came in 1914 under Mary F. Patterson (1872–1957), an artist, teacher, and social worker trained at the Rhode Island School of Design. The Berkeley program was established as a Department of Home Economics in the College of Liberal Arts and Sciences in 1916, with subdivisions in household art and household sciences. In 1918, it split into two divisions, which became separate departments the following year, still within Letters and Science.

In 1932 the department was transformed by the hiring of Lila M. O’Neale (1886–1948).\(^6\) A former professor of home economics at Oregon State University, she had come to Berkeley in August 1926 to do a master’s on lace, but her exposure to the teaching of anthropologist Alfred L. Kroeber led her to submit a thesis the following year on ancient Peruvian textiles.\(^7\) O’Neale’s doctoral field research with basket weavers of California’s Klamath River region in 1929 was embodied in an innovative dissertation in anthropology in 1930.\(^8\) O’Neale, who brought a cultural perspective to her analyses of textile form, was instrumental in getting the Department of Household Art renamed as the Department of Decorative Art in 1939. Thus it moved from a rather personal and applied program to a more serious academic study of crafts.

Most of the early faculty focused on textiles, but one important exception was architect Winfield Scott Wellington (1897–1979). Commonly known as Duke, Wellington had earned a graduate degree in architecture from UC Berkeley in 1923, before setting up a private practice in the Bay Area, concentrating on residential architecture. Although he continued to design buildings after joining the department in 1937, he spent most of his time teaching interior design, furniture, as well as the ever-popular introductory course, “Survey of Expressions in Materials.”

After World War II, the Department of Decorative Art expanded in faculty and students. One of the leading new professors was C. Edmund Rossbach (1914–2002), hired to teach weaving in 1950. Chicago-born, Rossbach had earned his MFA at the Cranbrook Academy of Art (ceramics and textiles, 1947) before teaching at the University of Washington for three years.\(^9\) During the postwar decades, the art world began to accept the use of traditional craft materials and forms for the creation of nonfunctional works, in effect, blurring the distinction between decorative and fine art. The Berkeley department contained three of the national leaders in this movement. In addition to Rossbach in what came to be called “fiber art,” Peter Voulkos (1924–2002) taught ceramics, as well as sculpture in bronze; and Marvin Lipofsky (b. 1938) brought the glass sculpture movement to the West Coast. Another leader, in a more modern medium, was Willard Rosenquist (1908–94), who had been hired to teach
metal and enamels but became a pioneer of video art. The program obtained its final incarnation as the Department of Design in 1965, the year after it was transferred from the College of Letters and Science to the College of Environmental Design (CED). Just before its official demise in 1974, the department was at its height in faculty and enrollment. The faculty had increased from about eleven regular positions in 1939 to twenty-two, with an enrollment of about 200 undergraduate majors. During its entire time at the CED, the program was in constant administrative turmoil and redefinition, as the college attempted to find a place for it. In 1972, as the university reeled from Governor Reagan's budget cuts, the decision was made to eliminate the program in two years. At that time, each tenured professor was asked to affiliate with another department. The textile program continued under Ed Rossbach until his retirement in 1979.

The reasons for the program's end were multiple and complex, but essentially it was a victim of academic infighting, primarily against the more powerful Department of Architecture and Department of City Planning, but also within its own department. As the CED administration evaluated the program, the craft-based and historical approach of the department clashed with the industrial design orientation of the college. Thus the very strength of the department had hastened its end. The program might have fared better in the Department of Art Practice, where individual perceptions and skills were valued, but that was not to be. Ultimately, Rossbach blamed the university administration for not valuing creative work.

Although there was no longer an autonomous department after 1974, some of its content was taught in a free-floating Program in Visual Design, which around 1977–78 became Visual Studies, a study area in architecture. The new program intended to emphasize "product design" (industrial design), which never really took off, and "communication design" (photography and other forms of graphic design), which did.

Academic Generations

It is possible to divide the history of the department into five periods: (1) the abortive founding, under Kissell, 1912 to 1914; (2) the period as Household Art, under Patterson, 1914 to 1939; (3) the period of Decorative Art, under O'Neale and then Wellington, 1939 to about 1947; (4) the revival after World War II, with the hiring of Rossbach, Voulkos, and the expansion into other media, about 1947 to 1964; and (5) the culmination and end, with the general redefinition of crafts as fine arts, 1964 to 1974.

Linking these periods were successive academic generations. As Rossbach maintains, these were crucial in understanding the department's history. The principal faculty of what may be called the first generation—all hired by a Department of Household Art—were Mary Patterson (retired in 1943), Hope Gladding (retired in 1957), and Lila O'Neale (died in 1948).

The following generation—hired by the Department of Decorative Art—lived to witness the transformation of its identity into design and the shift to a new college. In various comments, Rossbach refers to the "old guard," without ever exactly specifying who they were. He seems to mean the faculty who were already on campus when he came in 1950. Viewed another way, these would be individuals who were hired by a decorative art depart-
ment that was part of the College of Letters and Science. During the last days of the program, in the 1960s and 1970s, these older faculty began to retire: Duke Wellington, Lea Miller, and Anna Gayton in 1965; Lucretia Nelson in 1969; and Mary Dumas, who died in 1971. This earlier group was generally committed to the program in Letters and Science, for instance, favoring written theses over creative work. Furthermore, because they opposed the move into the CED, many did not defend the program when it was challenged.

Although many of the later professors had also been hired by decorative art, they represented a younger generation who generally focused on their own creative art work. It is clear that Rossbach was transitional in many ways between the old and new guards. As we shall see, the earlier generation studied ethnic arts, while the later generation actively incorporated it into its own art.

What’s In a Name?

In a university, the names of departments are vitally important, as they claim an intellectual territory and situate the program in an academic universe. The department’s repeatedly changing names reflect its vulnerability. Never its own master, it must be seen always in relation to other, stronger departments. In fact, it seems that people were continually having problems with the name; despite the fact that it was changed about every two decades, its associations remained negative.20

As in all semantic processes, the meaning of a given term is determined largely from what it is contrasted with. As Nerad makes clear in her study of the Berkeley home economics department, definitions and nomenclature for this field were highly debated and contested, at Berkeley as well as in other schools. The “household” was seen as a place for women, apart from the “real world” of commerce and politics. On another level, “art” was contrasted with “science.” In this context, science dealt primarily with food, which was related to agriculture, a subject of great concern in a land-grant college.

Moving to the next period, the department still concerned itself with art, and thus by implication was allied with the art department. “Decorative” art, however, was contrasted with “fine” art, and thus downgraded. Commenting on the unintended associations of the term, Professor Lucretia Nelson wrote: “‘The name Decorative Art later proved unfortunate, while thoroughly appropriate; to the Administration in its cultural ignorance it spelled only diletante if not effeminate activities.”21 For example, art historian Herwin Schaefer, who was hired by the department in 1956, condemned “decorative art” as a nineteenth-century anachronism.

The final characterization, “Design,” though somewhat vague, related the program to architecture, as it implies the creation of an aesthetic form that is then executed by craftspeople. By the end of the twentieth century, in fact, “decorative art” and “crafts”—the explicit subjects of the Berkeley department—were on the verge of totally disappearing as viable concepts, replaced in common usage by design.22 Schaefer was a leading advocate for changing the department’s name to design, thus associating it with production for industry, and, he felt, linking the history of design with art history, then taught in the Department of Art.22

In the end, Rossbach thought that the program’s name did not really matter, as it would probably have been phased out anyway due to the underlying attitudes in both the college and the university at large.23

Gender: A Woman’s Department?

Throughout its entire history, the program consisted mostly of female faculty and female students, and a subject matter traditionally associated with women.24 Unlike many other
universities, the University of California had a tradition of welcoming female students, if not professors. According to historian John Douglass, “The university had proven exceedingly liberal in the admission of women, who by 1900 represented 46 percent of the student population. In contrast, most colleges and universities in the East remained all male, and even such progressive universities as the University of Michigan and Stanford maintained quotas to keep female students at a magical 25 percent of the student body.”

As Nerad demonstrates, Berkeley’s attitudes toward women in the early part of the century brought gains as well as losses. On the one hand, by being denied equality with men in most departments, they were allowed to operate in “a separate sphere.” Teaching in a primarily women’s department, O’Neale was able to become a full professor in 1940, while that did not happen in anthropology until 1964. On the other hand, even O’Neale encountered resistance to her academic success. According to several of his students and colleagues, Alfred Kroeber was not very supportive of female students, despite his high opinion of many of them. According to George Foster, who entered the graduate program in 1935, “I don’t think Kroeber would ever have given a job in the department to a woman. He never did, in any event. . . . Kroeber was fair with them. He didn’t object to giving them doctorates, but he would never go out on a limb and nominate them for a job.” Although such an attitude was perhaps not surprising for a man born at the height of the Victorian period, it impeded the progress of qualified female scholars.

In 1937, Duke Wellington became the first male faculty member in the Department of Decorative Art. Although he taught interior design, he was trained in the predominantly male profession of architecture. Gender balances in hiring shifted substantially after World War II, with the hiring of Rosenquist in 1946 and Rossbach in 1950. By the early 1960s, as the department expanded its orientation from a focus on fiber to include a broader range of media, men were hired to teach many of these courses: for example, Peter Vouklos on clay (1959), Marvin Lipofsky on glass (1964), William Garnett on photography (1968), as well as Herwin Schaefer on design history (1956).

According to Lucretia Nelson, one of the guiding principles of the department had always been its “bisexual hiring and enrollment aims.” After World War II, a number of male students enrolled in Rossbach’s courses, with another increase in the 1960s, but there were never many. For her courses in the late 1960s and 1970s, Margaret Dhaemers strove for a balanced gender ratio. She found, however, that the students tended to be mostly female, and that because so many more women applied for her classes it was more competitive for them.

With the exception of Rossbach, however, the textile program continued its female focus, and for that reason was marginalized. Architecture professor Joseph Esherick felt that the design department’s roots in the female-oriented home economics program was perceived
as a problem into the 1960s and was a factor in its demise. Although one can only speculate, the fact that so many woman were attracted to the department gave it its strength—capturing a large group of talented professors and students denied other outlets for their academic and creative expression—as well as proving its ultimate downfall.

A Matter of Degrees

Another factor that could not have helped the department in the broader university setting was that almost none of the faculty had doctorates. As time went on, most of its professors did have post-baccalaureate degrees, but they were at the master’s level, and were in some field of fine arts. Befitting President Wheeler’s conception of the department, it seems that the program was concerned more with personal fulfillment than academics until O’Neale’s arrival in 1932. She was the department’s first faculty member with a doctorate. In fact, with the exception of art historian Herwin Schaefer (Harvard, 1944), the department’s only faculty with doctorates were the anthropologists—Lila O’Neale and Anna Gayton and Ruth Boyer (all from Berkeley, 1930, 1928, 1962, respectively).

The department itself granted a master’s, as well as a bachelor’s, from the beginning (the first MA was given in 1916). In this, the department was comparatively advanced, making Berkeley “the first university department to offer a master’s degree in weaving.” Unlike a MFA degree from an art school, however, this was never a purely practical or professional degree. Although students were encouraged to learn craft skills, such as weaving, one had to submit a written thesis based on some kind of research. When the department joined the College of Environmental Design, its bachelor of arts degree was still offered through the College of Letters and Science, but this was shifted over to CED, beginning in 1972 and made final with the phase-out of the department in 1974. Significantly, unlike its sister department of nutritional sciences, the department never granted the doctorate, which served, ultimately, as an indication of its somewhat lesser valuation of scholarship. Like departmental names, degrees were primary forms of identity definition in a university, and both worked to the disadvantage of the program.

Arts: Theoretical and Applied, Fine and Decorative

Although all universities are caught in a tension between the theoretical and the applied, state land-grant universities were founded with a firm root in practical fields such as agriculture, mining, and engineering. Over the years, the Berkeley campus added schools for architecture, law, business, journalism, and optometry, among others. Nevertheless, there was an abiding discomfort with creative fields such as painting and sculpture, decorative art, fiction and poetry, theater, and music.

In its combination of theory and practice, the Department of Decorative Art was firmly within a Berkeley tradition. For most of its history, its sister Department of Art combined practice and history in the same department. Perhaps befitting its status as a land-grant college, the earliest art training at Berkeley had been of drawing as an aid to engineering, and later architecture. For instance, architect Bernard Maybeck had been initially hired to teach drawing. Around the turn of the last century, a more aesthetic approach began to take shape. Eugen Neuhau, who had begun teaching drawing at Berkeley in 1908, became the first chair of the Department of Art when it was founded in 1923. In fact, “This department within the College of Letters and Science was the first studio-practice department in a national university,” with a “teaching philosophy [that] encompassed aesthetics, practice, and history of art in a well-rounded, humanistic, program.” Surprisingly, at a research university, art history came relatively late. Classics professor Oliver Miles Washburn was the first to teach it. At Berkeley since 1907, he received an appointment as Associate Professor of the
History of Art in 1925. Many of the early art professors, such as Erle Loran (appointed in 1936), had historical interests, but the first full-time art history professor was medievalist Walter Horn (hired in 1938). The first doctorate was awarded in 1948, but it was not until 1971 that an independent art history department was established.

Appropriately, the decorative art department combined art practice with historical scholarship. In speaking of the “requirement of matching practice and theory courses,” Lucretia Nelson regarded the guiding aims of the program in decorative art as “a liberal arts rather than professional focus.” In most cases, historical courses were paired with lab sections in which students examined museum specimens in order to learn their techniques. According to one memorial, “O’Neale would describe no textile technique until she could reproduce it with her own hands,” and many of the faculty followed her example.

Over time, however, the stress in the department shifted from the historical to the creative. O’Neale and Gayton definitely stressed the historical. In the 1960s, with the move into Environmental Design and after Rossbach and his colleagues became dominant in the department, practice and creative work became much more important. Ed Rossbach, however, was distinctive in that he genuinely loved both approaches, and many of his students, as we shall see, followed this approach.

Nevertheless, there was a certain disdain for creative, as opposed to critical or historical work. As Lucretia Nelson remarked, “History of Art, Music, Literature were customary, even honored inclusions but not the creative genius itself. Neither William Morris nor Picasso could have been hired by the University of Calif., let alone Ivy League institutions.” Although she was speaking more from her experience during the 1940s and 1950s, this was essentially true during later years, as well.

Even within the sphere of art, some arts were more prestigious and respected than others. As changes in the unit’s name suggest, the cultural and aesthetic status of the department’s subject matter remained contested and problematic. “Decorative arts” or “crafts” have always been seen as less significant than painting and sculpture, if not architecture, another applied art. The architecture program has always had a certain high-art prestige, and not surprisingly, has been a largely male occupation.

The practicality of the department’s subject matter changed substantially over the decades. While household art may have seemed very practical to some, decorative art was treated as a subject of academic study. During the department’s “design”

Ancient Peruvian textile fragment, collected by Lila M. O’Neale, ca. 1931–32. Part of O’Neale’s personal research collection, this piece came to the collection of the decorative art department in 1948, and was then transferred to the Hearst Museum of Anthropology in 1974. Hearst Museum, 16–18645.
phase, however, the development of genres such as "fiber art" and other arts using traditional craft media blurred if not erased the distinction between fine and decorative art.

Textiles and Other Artistic Media

Of the various artistic media, the Berkeley program emphasized textiles, at least up until it expanded and moved into the College of Environmental Design. All the early professors in the department—Mary Kissell, Mary Patterson, Hope Gladding, and Lila O’Neale—were textile specialists; it was not until the hiring of Duke Wellington in 1937 that the department expanded to furniture and interior design. The department's anthropologists (O’Neale, Gayton, and Boyer) especially seemed to have focused on textiles. Even more unusually, of all forms of weaving, it was the container form of basketry that was a particular departmental specialization—from Kissell and O’Neale, who both studied them in the field, to Rossbach, who pioneered basketry as a self-conscious art form. One reason for this focus was the importance of baskets in Native Californian cultures, amply represented in the large collection at the anthropology museum.

As we have seen, when the department expanded after World War II, other media began to be taught: ceramics, glass, metal, calligraphy, photography, video. And increasingly, there was cross-fertilization between the media. For Rossbach, in particular, ceramics was an artistic model. He took clay pots as an inspiration for his fiber containers (i.e., baskets); he helped recruit famed potter Peter Voulkos, whose work he admired; and he and his wife, Katherine Westphal, later studied ceramics. Ceramics were also the field in which the ethnic arts were a key influence. Asian precedence in the medium was long acknowledged, but during the 1950s Japanese influences were felt in American ceramics, as well as in abstract expressionist painting. Realizing this, the department purchased an important collection of Japanese and Korean folk pottery in 1957.

Despite Berkeley's strength in fiber art, the medium always carried a stigma on campus. In response to the feelings common among his university colleagues, Rossbach tried to avoid saying that he taught weaving: "Even the Art Department did not think that weaving should be part of their department because it was not academic." Whatever its local fate may have been, during its six decades the Department of Decorative Art / Design became a national leader in the creation and study of textiles, and we turn now to a discussion of one of the reasons for this excellence.

CAMPUS RESOURCES: ANTHROPOLOGISTS AND COLLECTIONS

It was perhaps inevitable that artists on the Berkeley campus would find their way to the world of non-Western arts, due to the density of local anthropological re-

sources. Several key Berkeley anthropologists were experts in the visual arts, and the campus possessed large collections devoted to anthropology, art, and decorative art itself. These museums exposed arts from all over the world to a vast public through popular exhibitions.

Berkeley Anthropologists and the Visual Arts

The anthropology department at UC Berkeley has had a relatively rich tradition of research on the visual arts, but it waxed and waned during the sixty years of the decorative art department. Strong at the beginning, it suffered a decline before being revived just as the Department of Decorative Art became the Department of Design. Although the aesthetic interests of departmental founder Alfred Kroeber (1876–1960) were primarily literary, his 1901 doctoral dissertation at Columbia was devoted to Arapaho Indian decorative symbolism. His first doctoral student, Samuel A. Barrett, further explored these topics in his 1908 dissertation on Pomo Indian basketry. Both Kroeber and Barrett elaborated an emerging Boasian paradigm regarding the relation of form and meaning in primitive art. They hoped to find clues for reconstructing the possible origins of decorative designs. Furthermore, during his first decade in Berkeley, Kroeber devoted much of his time to the university anthropology museum—with collecting, cataloguing, exhibitions, and administration.

Kroeber’s interest in artifacts, especially archaeological, grew during the teens and twenties. He was attracted by the museum’s rich Peruvian collections gathered by Max Uhle between 1899 and 1905. Kroeber focused on problems of seriation—putting objects in a chronological sequence by stylistic features—which he applied to the Nasca pottery collections. Among the graduate students in the 1920s who worked on the Uhle collections were Lila O’Neale, Anna Gayton, and Isabel Kelly. Kroeber’s interests in visual art were greatly stimulated by his relationship with Duke Wellington, who gradually convinced him of the legitimacy of an aesthetic—rather than merely cultural—approach to these objects. In 1941, Kroeber taught a one-semester course on “primitive art,” which he offered irregularly in later years; in the spring of that year he started a manuscript on American Indian art, with the assistance of former student Katharine Luomala, but it was never finished. Until his death, Kroeber consistently supported the decorative art department.

Without doubt the most important research on art during the Berkeley department’s first half century was the work of Lila O’Neale on the basketry of Northwestern California. Although still focusing on baskets, her research represented a paradigmatic shift, focusing now on ethnoaesthetics and the role of individual creativity. For whatever reason, she was not hired by the anthropology department, but continued to explore these concerns at Berkeley in the decorative art department.

Like other anthropologists of the day, Berkeley professors in the early twentieth century possessed a general interest in material culture, making museum collections as part of an inclusive fieldwork strategy. Yet relatively few published on art or aesthetics. Among later Berkeley anthropologists—including Robert Lowie, Edward Gifford, Ronald Olson, and Robert Heizer—only Peruvian archaeologist John Rowe displayed any substantial interest in visual aesthetics.

The situation changed drastically when William Bascom (1912–81) was hired from Northwestern in 1957 to be director of the anthropology museum and professor of anthropology. A student of pioneering Africanist anthropologist Melville Herskovits, Bascom was known for his work on African art, specifically the Yoruba of Nigeria. During his twenty-two years as director, Bascom fostered an interest in the Bay Area in African art, particularly through his influential 1967 exhibit on African Arts. Between 1966 and 1975, he served as curator of primitive art at the University Art Museum, but except for some curation in
the first few years this position seems to have been more of an honorary one. Because of his almost full-time museum appointment, Bascom did not teach much, and while he did offer a course on primitive art, most of his teaching was on oral folklore. Some students specialized in art on their own, but the principal professor in this field was Nelson Graburn (b. 1936), who joined the faculty in 1964. Known for his studies of ethnoaesthetics, and ethnic and tourist arts, Graburn specialized in the art of the Canadian Inuit.

There were other experts associated with the anthropology museum, chief among them museum researcher Lawrence E. Dawson (1925–2003). Dawson had encyclopedic interests, but focused most intensely on the technique and styles of ancient Peruvian ceramics and California Indian basketry. Starting around 1935, a roster of faculty curators was affiliated with the museum, some in anthropology but many in other departments such as classics, Near Eastern studies, as well as art history. Although a number of anthropology staff and curators served on decorative art/design master’s committees, few of the other curators had any relationship with the department. The most important, of course, were the three anthropology professors in the department (O’Neale, Gayton, Boyer), who were listed, successively, as curator of textiles in the museum. Also affiliated was Duke Wellington, as curator of art (1948 to 1965).

In addition to more principled factors, the departments of anthropology and decorative art intermingled because of a physical reason: from 1930 to 1960 their buildings were adjacent. Reportedly, when Kroeber Hall was being planned, the two departments were to share the new building. But because each required so much space, the Department of Decorative Art moved to Wüster Hall with the architecture school.

Taken as a whole, the arts were a relatively minor area for anthropology at UC Berkeley, as in most of the country’s departments. Except for Bascom, and now Graburn, they were never a central topic of faculty research, and except for Barrett’s and O’Neale’s basketry studies, textiles were never a central topic for Berkeley anthropologists. In recent years, however, a good number of anthropology students have specialized in visual art, most of them students of Graburn’s (many of whom also studied in the design department). Despite their small number, in conjunction with the rich collections, the Berkeley anthropologists played a critical and catalytic role for the campus community of artists.

Collections

Collections on the Berkeley campus are nearly as old as the university itself. In 1873, the first building to open contained natural history specimens. By the turn of the century, these generalized collections were being transformed into specialized museums of vertebrate zoology, paleontology, and botany.

Campus art collections also go back to 1873, although they were displayed at first in the library, Bacon Hall. In the 1920s, graphic art of various sorts was on display in Haviland Hall. The first dedicated display space for the visual arts opened in 1934 in the former campus powerhouse. The building was renovated with funds raised by Albert M. Bender (1866–1941), a San Francisco insurance executive and passionate art patron. Bender, one of the principal patrons of the decorative art collection, also arranged the acquisition of the pair of Chinese guardian dogs that stood outside. Known as the University Art Gallery, the modest-sized structure was used for changing exhibitions, not object storage, unlike the anthropology museum. The Art Gallery had two directors, who also served as curators: art department professor Eugen Neuhaus (1934 to 1946) and decorative art professor Winfield S. Wellington (1946 to 1962). Originally intended as a museum for Asian arts, its first exhibit was Asian, drawn from Bender’s collections.

Between 1960 and 1969, the art gallery was phased out as Clark Kerr made plans for
a major art museum as part of an arts complex. The present University Art Museum, founded only in 1965, opened in its current building in 1970. Because of a founding bequest from abstract expressionist painter Hans Hofmann and the interests of its first director, Peter Selz (from New York's Museum of Modern Art), the Art Museum was heavily focused on European and American fine arts, especially modernism. During the 1960s, it transferred most of its Asian decorative arts to the Department of Design, keeping the Japanese woodblock prints. Even today the museum is relatively weak in non-Western collections.

Despite the general lack of ethnic arts in the art collections, the decorative art professors had two major campus collections to draw upon. The first, and much the larger, was the anthropology museum, founded by patron Phoebe A. Hearst in 1901. The anthropology museum possessed many collections of interest to the art department because of Hearst's passion for areas such as European decorative arts. Its textile holdings were especially rich, including a famed collection of 7,000 California Indian baskets and the roughly 900 ancient Peruvian textiles collected by Max Uhle. As collecting expanded through the 1970s, the earlier emphases in Native California, ancient Egypt, and ancient Peru were supplemented with well-documented field collections from Latin America, Africa, and Asia. By about 1974, the collections amounted to almost four million objects, making the Hearst Museum by far the major museum on the Berkeley campus devoted to human cultures.

In addition to anthropology's museum, the Department of Decorative Art maintained its own collection, which was begun in 1929. The collection grew fairly slowly at first, but it increased rapidly after 1945 and even more so in the 1960s, until it numbered approxi-

Decorative Art Building (1930-64). Designed by campus architect John Galen Howard, this structure was first used in 1909 by the Agriculture College as the Fertilizer Control Building. This is a view of the West Wing, where the weaving classes were held. Photograph by William Ricco, 1964. University Archives (UARC PIC 2000:5).

mately 5,160 catalogued items. It was stored, by medium and then locality, in the Decorative Art Building and its annex, and after the department was transferred in 1964 to the College of Environmental Design, in Wurster Hall (completed in the fall of that year). At this time, the collection was inventoried and its storage and cataloguing upgraded, making it much more accessible and useful. In 1973-74, as the department was phased out, the collection was transferred to the Hearst Museum, although the textiles remained in Wurster as long as Rossbach was teaching, through 1979.
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The largest and most important component of the Decorative Art collection were the roughly 4,000 worldwide textiles. The collection also included ceramics, glass, metalwork, and furniture, and among these treasures were George H. Kerr's collection of about 165 Japanese and Korean folk ceramics. As a self-conscious study collection, the Decorative Art "museum" (if one may call it that) was geographically representative, including Europe and America, as well as chronologically inclusive, ranging from eighth-century Coptic cloth to twentieth-century industrial design.

Although some items were purchased, drawing upon a small fund supplied by private patrons and the department itself, most were donated by the local community, including department stores and manufacturers. Among the donors were departmental faculty—particularly Lila O'Neale, and to a lesser extent, Mary Patterson, Hope Gladding, Mary Dumas, Lucretia Nelson, and Lea Miller—all committed to building up a collection for their students. Other faculty donors were Ed Rossbach, Anna Gayton, and Ruth Boyer. Perhaps the most devoted donor was patron Albert M. Bender, with 589 items from China, Japan, Guatemala, and the United States. Another important collection were the 322 ethnographic textiles donated by Henrietta F. Brewer, a Berkeley alumna who gathered them while doing archaeological fieldwork in the Aegean. O'Neale kept her own collections, primarily 314 Guatemalan and 126 ancient Peruvian textiles, for herself; they were donated to the department upon her death in 1948. The single largest accession (732 items) was from the estate of Dorothy Liebes (1899–1972), a contemporary textile designer and a Cal alumna.

Each object was carefully labeled and catalogued in a separate ledger. Some collections—such as Brewer's and Bender's—had catalogue cards, and files were kept of collector and administrative correspondence. Because the collections were intended to be examined from a material and formal perspective, the entries are fullest for provenience, ownership, date of production, and physical description. There was generally little or no supporting cultural documentation.

The decorative art collection never had a full-time staff, and there was no director other than the department chair. Although it was begun by Mary Patterson, it was Duke Wellington who had the most to do with building up the collection. Instead of a formal curator, faculty with special interests would help select things in their areas of expertise. For quite a while, at least during the design department years, there were student assistants.

In 1963, just as the department was about to move into Wurster Hall, Ed Rossbach summarized the collection's rationale for an assistant to the Chancellor. This bears quoting at some length as it is one of the fullest records we have on the collection and its use:

This department's collection of decorative art objects is a teaching collection. Its purpose is to make available to our students objects of good design, to increase their knowledge and appreciation of the field. Contact with the objects themselves, rather than solely with slides and book illustrations, is considered to be of greatest value in our instruction. The collection provides an opportunity for students to handle the objects, to develop a sense of touch, to appreciate through contact.

The collection must represent the very diverse and broad fields of the decorative arts. In such a vast field, extensive collections in special limited areas have been impossible. Rather, through a selection the department has maintained a varied collection, high in quality and rich in historical interest. Design comparisons can be made between unlike objects. The finest examples of each type are not so essential as in a museum collection, perhaps. The instructors can use an object to point out its excellencies, or to indicate
why it is not the finest. Even fragments and broken objects are useful, in
showing, for instance, sections through a ceramic bowl.72

Rossbach went on to explain that the size and diversity of the departmental collection
had been severely limited by a lack of storage space, which they hoped to alleviate when they
moved into Wurster Hall. Textiles have been stressed, he explained, because of their ease of
storage and interest to the department, but they hoped to expand into ceramics. They tried
to have some areas of strength for research, such as American coverlets and Greek embroi-
deries. The selections were made by knowledgeable staff, although funds were limited, and
the department could not, he explained, take collections with restrictions such as keeping
them together.

Finally, there were other collections available to decorative art faculty and students.
In addition to other Bay Area institutions, primarily the de Young Museum, many faculty
members had important personal collections. Mary Patterson used pieces from her Euro-
pean and Asian travels for classes in her home. Duke Wellington owned a vast and eclectic
collection, with a strength in Southwest and Northwest Coast Indian and Asian material.
His classes were fondly remembered for the use of both his own collections and those of the
department: His “popular classes in materials required the students to examine and handle
the beautiful objects from his ever-expanding personal collection.”73 His lectures were supple-
mented by once-a-week sessions in which “hundreds of items” were brought out for students
to study and handle.74

Later professors continued this practice. Ed Rossbach and his wife, fiber artist Katherine
Westphal, decorated their home with exotic items picked up on their extensive world trav-
els. Beginning on their first trip to Rome in 1956, they started coming home with baskets
until their home was filled with them, “each basket an individual,” in Westphal’s words.75
Lillian Elliott (1930–94), who taught weaving in the department between 1966 and 1971,
had a vast collection of books and ethnic crafts. In addition to many baskets, her holdings
included “a raw silk shirt from Turkey, a sock from Yugoslavia, a Coptic tapestry fragment
from Egypt, a plaited palm-frond puppet from Indonesia, a North African tie-dyed cloth.”
Elliott used such objects in her teaching to illustrate techniques or artistic possibilities.76

These accumulated collections, institutional as well as personal, were shared with
students in the classroom and with the public through exhibitions.

Ethnic Art Exhibitions

An expression of the department’s interest in ethnic arts, as well as a stimulant to it,
were exhibitions. One limited but important venue was the case in the Doe Library. From
June 1941 until her death in February 1948, Lila O’Neale, assisted by Lucretia Nelson, se-
lected a “Specimen of the Week” from the Anthropology Museum, chosen solely for its
aesthetic merits.77 Yet, by far the most active curator in this regard was Duke Wellington.
He was renowned for his many ethnic art exhibitions in Bay Area museums, particularly those
at the University Art Gallery. As an architect who taught interior design, it is understand-
able that he would be drawn to exhibition design. In fact, Wellington serves as an impor-
tant mediating figure between the worlds of Berkeley art and anthropology. While he was
an artist, his architectural practice became secondary after he joined the department in 1937.
When he was not teaching, he spent his time directing the Art Gallery and designing its
shows. Furthermore, he played the key role in amassing the department’s collections; and
both the collecting and exhibiting were aided by his friendship with patron Albert Bender.

Wellington began his exhibition work for San Francisco’s Golden Gate International
Exposition (1939–40), Alfred Kroeber had asked his colleague, along with Lila O’Neale and Lucretia Nelson, to help design the two Andean rooms of the Federal Pavilion. This collaboration marked new ground for both men, with a mutual exchange of disciplinary perspectives. Wellington became an enthusiastic proponent of ethnic arts, while Kroeber became sympathetic to a basically aesthetic approach to the study and display of these objects. The fair was also significant for its display of textiles. In addition to the Andean and other Native American textiles, weaver and designer Dorothy Liebes included them in the decorative arts exhibit in the Fine Arts Pavilion. One impressed visitor was a twenty-six-year-old Ed Rossbach, who was inspired to one day create fabrics like those on display.

Wellington’s campus exhibits drew from both the decorative art collection and the anthropology museum. As soon as he took over as Art Gallery director, Wellington began a series of almost yearly, if not semi-annual, exhibitions drawn from the anthropology museum: Oceania (1945), Eskimo and Northwest Coast Indians (1946), Southwest Indians (1947), Japan (1948), Ancient Andean (1949), California Indian (1950–51), Southwest Africa (1952), Ancient Mesoamerica (1952), Ancient Egypt (1953–54), worldwide pottery (1955–56), and “art objects” from the Hearst collections (1959–60). According to one commentary, “His designs, at least for exhibitions at the Power House, seem to have been display extravaganzas. Objects were chosen for their formal qualities alone and then positioned or grouped for startling visual drama.” If these ethnic subjects were not, indeed, the major focus of the Art Gallery’s exhibitions, they were certainly a key component. Furthermore, they were immensely popular; attendance was in the thousands for shows running from a month to a year, with highs of 14,147 visitors for the five-month Andean exhibit and 17,834 for the year-long Hearst show.

Conversely, these exhibits become even more important when one recalls that for almost thirty years the university’s anthropology museum had no exhibits of its own. When the Department of Household Art was founded in 1912, the museum had just opened its public displays (in October of 1911) in its home on San Francisco’s Parnassus Heights. Probably few of the department’s faculty or students made the trip across the bay from the Berkeley campus. Then, between 1931, when the museum returned to Berkeley, and 1960, after the opening of the current building, the museum’s only displays were teaching exhibits open for just two weeks a year.

The situation was reversed in the early 1960s, as the anthropology museum opened a new building and the University Art Gallery was transformed into the University Art Museum. As the Lowie Museum (1959–92), the anthropology museum was able to exhibit some of its collections in a public gallery. All of its series of rotating displays were relevant to artists; some were devoted explicitly to aesthetic topics: for instance, Melanesian Art and Ritual (1963), Art of the Northwest Coast (1965), African Arts (1967), Australian Aboriginal Art (1969), Huichol Yarn Paintings (1970). Museum annual reports document the extensive use of the displays in design courses. For example, in the spring of 1961 Ed Rossbach took several classes to the Iranian and Peruvian exhibits “to study motives, which they later adapted in their own designs as a class assignment.” Rossbach expressed his “appreciation for this opportunity to study such exhibited work. I feel that this campus is immeasurably enriched by your museum.” Sometimes, this collaboration went further: At least two graduate students curated Lowie exhibits. In 1972 Niloufer Ichaporia Hirschmann arranged an Indian exhibit (an experience documented in her master’s thesis), and Patricia Hickman curated an exhibit in 1975 on everyday Turkish textiles, also the subject of her master’s.

In the mid-1960s, the university began to plan for a new art museum to replace the so-called art gallery. By the time it opened, the design department was nearing its end, and throughout the 1970s, the only non-Western art exhibited in the Art Museum were a few
displays of Chinese and Japanese painting. Even today, the anthropology museum remains the principal campus venue for the display of non-Western arts.

In addition to these large public exhibits, the Department of Decorative Art had its own, more modest, displays, that were intended primarily for teaching and campus audiences. Again, many of the items were borrowed from the anthropology collections. These small shows, mounted in the department’s building, were continued when it moved to Wurster Hall. The younger faculty, however, who were active with their own creative work, curated fewer exhibitions than the “old guard,” relying instead on the Lowie Museum’s more elaborate public displays.

Befitting a department that combined practice and history, the faculty and students of decorative art / design used these collections for research and classroom teaching. Lecture slides were commonly made up from the anthropology and decorative art collections, and objects could be formally borrowed for use in class demonstrations, for which they were signed out and in. And, as we shall soon see, they also became the subject of artistic inspiration.

ETHNIC INFLUENCES AND THE DEPARTMENT

As the faculty and students of the decorative art / design department increasingly turned to creative work in the 1950s and 1960s, they exploited the campus strengths in collections, exhibitions, and expertise about non-Western arts. At the same time, this very strength impelled many of them to become scholars in their own right. This activity has helped define a “Berkeley style” in the recent history of American fiber arts.

An Anthropological Tradition

A striking feature of the department has been its specifically anthropological focus. At the beginning, Mary L. Kissell brought the perspective of a professional museum anthropologist. After a gap in 1920s, this focus was reaffirmed with Lila O’Neale’s appointment in 1932 and carried through until the department’s end. In addition to O’Neale’s doctoral work on California Indian basketry, she was known for her field research on the textiles of Guatemala and ancient Peru. Although Ed Rossbach never knew O’Neale, he recalls that her influence pervaded the department when he arrived, and several of the other faculty revered her as a role model.

It is interesting to consider O’Neale’s disciplinary identifications. Her initial work had been in home economics, in which she had been trained and later taught. But a dissatisfaction with the field had led her to return to school, and her encounter with Kroeber solidified her new orientation. After obtaining her doctorate in anthropology, however, she returned to decorative art as a teacher. Why she did not remain in anthropology is unclear. Perhaps it was due to her desire to contribute to the field of decorative art, or maybe it was because she could not get a job in anthropology (not an easy thing in the Depression and doubly so for a woman, as we have seen). In her research, O’Neale found a way to combine art and anthropology, as she considered the technical and formal traits of textiles as cultural expressions. In this she was applying to the medium the theoretical approaches of Kroeber and his teacher, Franz Boas.

When O’Neale died suddenly in 1948 her courses were taken over by Anna Gayton (1899–1977), who, in 1928, had been the first woman to earn a doctorate in anthropology from Berkeley. Upon her marriage to anthropologist Leslie Spier in 1931, Gayton continued her research, primarily on folklore, without seeking academic employment. Although Gayton had worked with the Peruvian collections during her undergraduate study, she did not know much about textiles. Taking up the challenge, however, she spent the years until
her retirement in 1965 researching Peruvian textiles, primarily those in the anthropology museum. Her courses stressed the cultural contexts of costumes and textiles.

Gayton, in turn, was succeeded by one of her students: Ruth M. Boyer (b. 1918), who taught in the Department of Design between 1962 and 1972. After earning a bachelor’s in art from Berkeley in 1950, she had gone on to complete an anthropology dissertation on Mescalero Apache socialization (1962). Upon joining the design department, she—like Gayton—began to research and teach textiles and other ethnic arts. During the early 1960s, Boyer collaborated with William Bascom on his study of Yoruba weaving, before turning to her own research on Peruvian gourd decoration.

These three women were distinctive, not only for their anthropology training but also in their doctorates. Beside teaching the same courses on costume and culture, all three held, in succession, the position of curator of textiles in the anthropology museum. Clearly, O’Neal—if not Kissell—had started a tradition, which the Department of Decorative Art/Design maintained until its end. These anthropologists were thus a constant resource and example for the artists in the department.

**Faculty Research and Teaching**

At least until the department expanded in the 1960s, almost all the decorative art faculty had an interest in some form of ethnic art, whether from individual experience, travel, personal collections, or study of museum collections. Most of the faculty’s contact with ethnic arts came as a form of personal study. Mary Patterson traveled and studied costume in Europe and Asia; Hope Gladding spent her sabbaticals in Mexico and the pueblos of the American Southwest. Lucretia Nelson, who made analytic drawings for Kroeber and O’Neal, was familiar with the important museum collections from the American Southwest, New Guinea, and Alaska. Lea Miller was influenced by O’Neal to try to replicate ancient Peruvian textiles on the modern loom, and her study of pre-Columbian and ancient Asian gauzes led her to firsthand study with Japanese masters. Mary Dumas loved folk textiles, especially the blue-and-white resist fabrics of China and Central Europe. Duke Wellington designed and supervised the construction of the Kinteel Trading Post at Window Rock, Arizona, which employed Navajo masons. He also juried the Indian arts and crafts shows each year in Gallup, New Mexico. And, as we have seen, within his large personal collection of decorative arts were many ethnic objects.

Ethnic subjects were a recurrent topic of departmental courses. Kissell started out with Household Design of Primitive Peoples (1912–13), followed by Anne Swainson’s Primitive Design in Textiles and Pottery (1922–23). Starting in 1946–47 and for several years after, Wellington taught Decorative Motifs in Oriental Art, the subject of an article in a special architectural issue of the alumni magazine. Almost all of O’Neal’s classes incorporated ethnic topics, among them: weaving and textile design, historic textiles (said to be her favorite), historic costume, textile analysis, primitive and folk textiles, technical analysis of primitive arts and crafts, as well instruction in the anthropology department. The course that was most explicitly devoted to ethnic arts was Primitive Art, begun by Kroeber in anthropology and then taught in decorative art by Lucretia Nelson from 1947 through her retirement in 1969. Nelson, who had taken over the course at O’Neal’s suggestion, expanded it from one semester to a two-year sequence, which she arranged geographically. "Naturally," she wrote, "I approached the subject primarily as design whereas Kroeber treated it more as a phase of culture." During her teaching in the late 1960s, Ruth Boyer focused on folk art. Ethnic arts were also included in more general courses, especially those devoted to the history of a given form or medium. As alumna Nance O’Banion remembered: "Anthropology, folklore, folk art—there was a feeling that these things had a larger purpose. There
was this huge barn door that slid wide open and we had access to them.

Personal interest is one thing; research is another. Among the faculty, that was restricted primarily to the three anthropologists with doctorates, as well as to Rossbach, who shared many of their attitudes. One could make an argument that Mary Patterson or Hope Gladding or Lea Miller did research; the critical question is what they did with the knowledge. Most of the decorative art faculty seriously studied ethnic arts, but few published this knowledge so that it would be useful to others. Instead, their knowledge went into their teaching or creative work.

Rossbach was clearly an important exception among his colleagues. He was transitional between the “old guard” and the newer people, not only in age but in his balance between study and creation. He was one of the few design department professors who consistently published, but unlike O’Neale, for example, his research was secondary to artistic creation, and it was thus more aesthetic than cultural. In the past, the combination of the two approaches had been largely carried out by different people, but increasingly Rossbach embodied both strands in his own teaching and practice. As the older guard began to retire and then as the program was phased out, he himself took over the courses in textile history so that the students could continue to be exposed to the whole range of fiber creation. To accomplish this, he spent a great deal of time in the Lowie Museum, studying and photographing the collection. This unique approach was one of the main reasons that Rossbach was so important in the Berkeley program as well as nationally in the field of fiber art.

Faculty Creative Work

Some of the decorative art/design faculty went beyond a personal interest in exotic arts and incorporated these influences in their creative work. Lea Miller was perhaps the best early example. She experimented endlessly in her attempt to reproduce ancient Peruvian techniques using modern looms. In his architectural practice, Duke Wellington employed a modernist Arts and Crafts style; for one Berkeley home he designed built-in cabinets in a Japanese style, an interest of his at the time. On the whole, though, these creative efforts were unusual because most of the early professors were not active artists.

Certainly the principal artist-professor to succumb to the lure of the exotic was Ed Rossbach. Trained in modernistic design at the Cranbrook Academy of Art, Rossbach’s early
art work was abstract, nonrepresentational, and adapted for industry. After coming to
Berkeley in the 1950s, he began to be influenced by ethnic forms. Much of his work was stimu-
lated by particular examples he found in local collections. Just to take two out of many
examples, African Congo Weaving I and II (1952) were stimulated by a Congolese raffia
weaving in the decorative art collection, and Tule Screen (1954) was inspired by Californian
Indian tule mats in the anthropology museum. Rossbach’s exploration of two discontinu-
ous aspects of weaving was also indebted to ethnic sources; for discontinuous color, he looked
to the tied ikat dying of Guatemala and Japan, among others; and for discontinuity in verti-
cal warp elements, he was inspired by ancient Peruvian practice. In fact, the ancient Peru-
vian collections were the ones that appealed to him the most, which was not surprising, con-
sidering the high value this culture placed on textile art and the many complex techniques
found nowhere else.

Yet the best example of these influences was his creation of “art baskets.” His early
training had been in loomed textiles, but at Berkeley Rossbach began to work in what is now
called “off-loom” fiber sculptures. These baskets were aesthetic works to be viewed and not
used as containers. The roots of Rossbach’s basketry are complex: he had first experimented
with the medium while stationed in the Aleutians during World War II; and he borrowed
the idea of a fiber container from ceramics. Yet, Rossbach was certainly influenced by the
large Lowie Museum collection of California Indian baskets, which he studied with the help
of Lawrence Dawson, and then the increasing basket collections from Asia and Africa. With-
out the university collections and staff, it is highly unlikely that he would have made the
shift to baskets, or at least not with the scope and range of his references. Following his first
basket in 1964, he conducted intensive research that led to an influential 1973 book Bus-
kets as Textile Art, most of whose illustrations came from the Lowie (Hearst) Museum.

Ed Rossbach was always aware of the precedence of historical models for his work. As
he once commented,

I think that inevitably these [historical] roots influence what a con-
temporary basketmaker does. . . . The idea of a basket exists somehow in the
artist’s mind, and that idea came from somewhere. . . . I look, as often as I
can, at ethnic art, and quite consciously derive shapes for my baskets from
ceramic forms and from glass and wooden vessels from various times and
places . . . . Increasingly, in my work I feel inspired by work from others
cultures. I value the associations, and expect them to be recognizable in my
work. At the same time, I value the differentness of my work. Baskets in-
spired by a foreign culture are inevitably different from baskets made within
that culture.102

Another textile professor who took up ethnic influences was Lillian Elliott (1930–
94). Like Rossbach, she had studied at Cranbrook (MFA in ceramics and painting, 1955)
before going into a career in industrial design. Elliott spent most of the last four decades of
her life teaching; she was a lecturer in Berkeley’s design department from 1966 to 1971, and
for several summer sessions thereafter.104 Following Rossbach’s example, she became a major
basket maker. Elliott, who did not use the Lowie collection much because of its relative
difficulty of access, did frequently consult the design collection. She thought that her view-
ing of Oceanic tapa cloth at the museum had caused her work to become looser and more
“airy,” not as tightly woven, a trait that became one of her chief stylistic features. She also
credited her later use of strong color to an exhibition of Korean folk art. Some of Elliott’s
ejrier baskets recalled Japanese works, and her last examples, composed of several kinds of sewn
bark, strongly resembled Native American containers made of the material. While Elliott tended to deny conscious ethnic influences in her own work, she did admit that they came out more in her collaborations with her student, Pat Hickman (see next section).

While the interest in ethnic arts was most dominant among the textile artists, it was also a factor for departmental artists working in other media. As noted earlier, Japan had been a strong model among American potters during the 1950s, and Peter Voulkos's pre-Berkeley work was indebted to this Asian influence. After focusing on bronze sculpture, Voulkos returned in the 1980s to his Japanese interests, which he added to influences from many other cultures: China, Sweden, Italy, Spain, ancient Egypt, Greece, and Mexico. Glass artist Marvin Lipofsky took a more participatory approach, eagerly traveling to factories and studios in more than twenty foreign countries: from Italy, Germany, and Czechoslovakia to China, Taiwan, and Japan. "I try to explore the cultural influences of the country where I am and to incorporate my impression or reaction to the environment, the seasons, the ecology, etc. Sometimes this works and sometimes it does not, but I always try to be influenced by what is around me, even though it might not be obvious to others." Instead of borrowing surfaces and forms, like so many others, he was more interested in these local materials and techniques.

The work of Rossbach and Elliott, as well as Voulkos and Lipofsky, was in the forefront of what became known as the American studio craft movement. Through their example and teaching these Berkeley artists inspired another generation of their students to extend the tradition.

Student Research and Creative Work

Ethnic arts had long been subjects of student research in the Department of Household / Decorative Art. Out of the 221 master's theses submitted between the first, in 1916, and the last, completed by the date of Rossbach's retirement in 1979, at least 57 were devoted to ethnic topics. Not surprisingly, perhaps, most were done during the days of the Department of Decorative Art (when the proportion was roughly half—35 out of 75). Although students have continued to treat ethnic subjects to the present, those topics begin to decline in the late 1960s and become even more sparse (22 out of 146) after Rossbach became the sole textile professor, proportions made all the more striking by the expansion of the program in other areas.

Befitting the historical strength of the department, textiles were the principal subject. Including O'Neale's own study of ancient Peruvian textiles, master's theses had been devoted to the weaving of Japan, the Philippines, China, Tibet, India, Central Asia, ancient Egypt, Turkey, Greece, Yugoslavia, South America in general, Peru, Guatemala, Mexico, American Indians (Navajo, Pima). Other theses were based on ancient Egyptian jewelry, Persian ar-
chitecture, Taiwanese pottery, African baskets and wall decoration, New Ireland carving, and several diverse American Indian topics (face and body decoration from the West Coast, Eskimo and Northern Athapaskan clothing, Yurok featherwork), among others. The most popular region studied was India (8), followed by American Indians (6), Peru (6), China (6), Japan (5), Guatemala (3), ancient Egypt (3), Central Asia (3), Mexico (2), and Africa (2). Interestingly, Peru, Mexico, and Guatemala were more popular in the early years, during O’Neale’s tenure; India was chosen as a topic more often in the late 1960s and 1970s, as the anthropology museum built up a large and important collection from the sub-continent. Many of the students, in fact, did base their work on campus collections.

A number of students “crossed over” into scholarship, especially in the early years when scholarship was stressed. One such example was Katharine Drew Jenkins (1906–82), who joined her Berkeley genetics-professor-husband while he conducted extensive field work in Mexico. Although she published little of her research, she studied and collected the country’s arts and crafts, especially textiles and their cochineal dyes.108 A more advanced scholar was Ann Pollard Rowe (b. 1947), daughter of anthropology professor John Rowe at Berkeley, whose own father had been director of the art museum at the Rhode Island School of Design. A student of Ruth Boyer, Ann Rowe is a specialist in Andean textiles, both ethnographic and archaeological, the subject of her 1970 master’s thesis.109 Soon after graduating, she became a curator in the Textile Museum in Washington, DC. Other but similar approaches were taken by Niloufer Ichaporia, who collected in India for the anthropology museum and wrote her anthropology dissertation on Cost Plus Imports (founded in San Francisco in 1958) and the ethnic art market; she now works as a food scholar and caterer.

It was not until the shift to creative work in the 1960s, however, that students began to incorporate these forms into their own art. The late 1960s and early 1970s, which proved to be the department’s twilight years, were certainly the height of departmental artistic creativity, for students as well as faculty. Stimulated by the Beats, hippies, and the Peace Corps, many students during this time exemplified the counter-culture’s obsession with non-Western arts and beliefs.110

Many of Rossbach’s students adopted ethnic influences in their work, and like their mentor, most combined their creation with research. One of the best examples was Joanne Segal Brandford (1933–94).111 She earned a bachelor’s from the decorative art department in 1955 and a master’s from the design department in 1967. Her mentor was Anna Gayton; but she studied weaving informally with Lillian Elliott, with whom she shared an office while she was teaching in the department (1967–69). Brandford curated several exhibitions; while research associate at Harvard’s Peabody Museum of Archaeology and Ethnology (1971–78), she organized a traveling exhibition of North American Indian baskets.112 She moved to Ithaca, New York, in 1977 and by 1988 had ceased her scholarly work due to ill health.

Brandford’s career as a basket maker was formed at Berkeley. “As a student at UC Berkeley in the late 1960’s, I learned that basketry was a visible and worthy form of art. And that wasn’t just because of Ed Rossbach. There was an excellent collection of American Indian art, a fantastic resource, and we had access to that.”113 Her first serious work, beginning in 1969, were nets and plaited structures, inspired by reading Sandra Dickey Harner’s master’s thesis on South American knotless netting.114 Her first baskets, a decade later, were simply raffia nets attached end-to-end. In fact, all of her early baskets (1978–86) were nets of some sort, but, as she noted, “of course they are stiff nets.” In 1986 Brandford became interested in frame plaiting (“sprang”) as a basis for her baskets, a style she explored until her death. She claimed a Guatemalan bag with a sprang center, illustrated in O’Neale’s classic monograph, as an influence.115 Reflecting on her career as a scholar and teacher, she felt that she “focused on textile history, on skills and traditions which evolved over many thousands of
years, which even today may occasionally and miraculously survive and flourish. As an artist, I take my inspiration from this rich legacy.”

The work of Pat Hickman (b. 1941), especially those projects done in collaboration with Lillian Elliott, has been heavily influenced by ethnic objects. Hickman had lived in Turkey for five years before returning to write her thesis on Turkish oya embroidery (1977). Later that year Ed Rossbach asked her to teach the textile history course while he was on sabbatical. As she was putting together the course outline she kept thinking about a gut parka that she had seen in a local museum. “I was very moved by the quality of light that seemed to just be inside it. I really was astounded by the beauty of it, the aesthetics of it,” she remembered. So she spent a great deal of time in the Hearst Museum, which has a large collection of gut and skin artifacts from Alaska, examining and photographing the objects. What was meant to be a single class turned into an obsession. She began a series of collaborative works with Elliott, who supplied a basketry framework for Hickman’s gut coverings. Hickman’s growing expertise also led to a 1987 exhibition and catalogue on gut and fishskin objects, both traditional and contemporary.


Quite often Hickman and Elliott were inspired by museum exhibitions. Seeing a show of Japanese helmets at the Asian Art Museum in San Francisco, they were “delighted with the vigor and . . . pleasure” of the forms, which soon seeped into their work. In 1979, they both visited a display at the Lowe Museum of baskets from the Rendille, nomadic camel herders of Kenya: “The rawness and the power of these were qualities that we were interested in trying to get in our own work, very much more than trying to make an African basket. We’re not African basketmakers, and we’re not Japanese basketmakers.” Like all the artists considered here, Hickman and Elliott looked to ethnic arts for their enlargement of the world of aesthetic possibilities rather than for literal reproductions. As Hickman noted, echoing sentiments of Rossbach, “My interest in textile history has really spilled into my own artwork as a reference, as an historical point from which I then go my own individual way.”

One of the characteristics of the Berkeley department has been the fluidity between students and teachers. In her memoir, Lucretia Nelson noted the camaraderie in the depart-
ment, at least during its "decorative art" years. For the textile people, at least, this continued until the end. Ed Rossbach is fondly remembered by his students for his sharing and encouragement of their creative work, and students like Brandford and Hickman went on to teach in the department. In fact, in Cambridge, Brandford taught Hickman and recommended that she study at Berkeley. Hickman then ended up collaborating with Brandford's teacher and colleague Lillian Elliott.\textsuperscript{120} It was the substantial expansion of the program in the late 1960s and early 1970s that allowed an exciting density of interaction between student and student and student and professor. Together they brought to a new level a combination of scholarship and creativity perhaps possible only in a university.

**Comparisons and Conclusions**

Following the "discovery" of "primitive art" by modernist artists of the early twentieth century, a prime subject of artistic inspiration has been the extensive collections preserved in the world's anthropology museums. This essay is thus a case study in "primitivism" or cultural appropriation, a topic that has more often been considered for painting and sculpture than for crafts or decorative art.\textsuperscript{121} One important exception was the Arts and Crafts movement, for which the San Francisco Bay Area was a key locus.\textsuperscript{122}

By way of conclusion, let us consider ethnic influences in a set of increasingly broad contextual circles—the San Francisco Bay Area textile community, the Berkeley art department, and West Coast arts of the twentieth century—in an attempt to ascertain how special or common this case study of the Berkeley design department might be. This leads to the role of museum collections as artistic inspiration, and the nature of art communities in university settings.

**Local Ecologies: Bay Area Textile Programs**

Despite Berkeley's prominence in Bay Area textiles, there were other schools and approaches; some close, others more distant.\textsuperscript{123} The most direct successor of the textile program at the Department of Design was the Fiberworks Center for the Textile Arts, founded in Berkeley in 1973 by department alumna Gyöngy Laky (BA 1970, MA 1971). Not a regular degree-granting institution, Fiberworks offered instruction and acted as a forum and nexus for local fiber art. Historic textiles were still a basic reference, and faculty and students often made appointments to study the Lowie Museum collections. When Fiberworks closed in 1987, it was incorporated into the fiber and mixed media graduate program at John F. Kennedy University.\textsuperscript{124}

The principal regional alternative to the Berkeley style in the textile arts was the one at the California College of Arts and Crafts (CCAC) in Oakland. During the Rossbach period, Trude Guermonprez taught there from 1954 until 1976. German-born and Bauhaus-trained, Guermonprez (1910–76) helped move textiles from functional craft to fine art. In later years she modified her severe aesthetic by adopting graphic elements, but her work was never much characterized by ethnic influences. Tellingly, she never made the move to off-loom sculpture.\textsuperscript{125} After the UC Berkeley program wound down, some of its faculty and students went to CCAC. Here Ruth Boyer taught in the 1970s, followed by design alumnæ Lia Cook and Nance O'Banion. During the 1980s, Jan Janeiro headed the textile program.
Although not associated with the Berkeley department, she exemplified its approach in her interest in ethnic arts, especially Peruvian textiles.

A little further afield, the parallels with the design program at UC Davis are particularly striking. Like the one at Berkeley, it began as part of home economics, in the 1930s. Expanding in the 1960s, the Davis department maintained a strong program in fiber art. Many of the professors have relations to Berkeley, for example, Katherine Westphal, Ed Rossbach’s wife, who taught from 1966 to 1979; or current professor Gyöngy Laky, hired in 1978. Like Berkeley, UC Davis built up a substantial study collection, and many of the weavers have adopted ethnic influences in their work. For instance, upon graduation from Berkeley, Laky spent a year in India, 1971–72. Her experience there stimulated a sense of vibrant color and an interest in gathering materials, especially those that are recycled. Although it, too, suffered through administrative problems, the Davis department proved to be very popular with students and continues to this day.

These were not the only textiles programs and approaches in the Bay Area. A notable and distinctive alternate was Dorothy Wright Liebes (1899–1972), who maintained a studio in San Francisco from 1930 until she moved to New York in 1948. A custom designer of hand-loomed textiles for architects and decorators, she later designed for industry. Although Liebes had little interest in ethnic arts, her use of modern, synthetic materials greatly influenced Rossbach, and, perhaps because of this tie, the design department received some of her studio collection after her death.

Generalizing, one could argue that there was a “Berkeley style” in American fiber arts. Stimulated by anthropology resources, this style freely combined traditional forms and motifs with modern materials and references. As such, it represented perhaps the dominant alternative to the more Bauhaus-inspired, abstract, and machine-oriented styles.

Ethnic Influences in the Berkeley Art Department

The decorative art faculty were not alone in their pursuit of the exotic; they were joined by many of the Berkeley painters. During the 1920s, both Erle Loran and John Haley had studied in Europe, where they were influenced by Cézanne and Picasso and early modernism. Both brought a taste for “primitive art” when they arrived in California (Haley in 1930 and Loran in 1936). Erle Loran was the leading private collector of ethnic arts among the Berkeley art faculty. In addition to painters Haley and Eugen Neuhaus, there were several art historians: Darrell Amyx (classical antiquities), Herschel Chipp (African sculpture, folk art), and James Cahill (Chinese painting). Berkeley collectors were eclectic, but their primary regional focus was Africa. They obtained their treasures mostly in Los Angeles, New York, and Europe, as there were no major Bay Area dealers in primitive art between 1930 and 1960, and while they knew of each other’s activity, they collected primarily for themselves. As Seligman and Berrin note, “During the middle years” of the twentieth century, “most of the people in the Bay Area collecting art from Africa, Oceania, and the Americas were living in Berkeley and were most often connected with the University.”

The art department collectors, however, differed from most of the decorative art professors in several important ways. With the “important exception” of Wellington,
In fact, one could go further to claim that despite their appreciation of these formal qualities, artists such as Loran and Haley were not generally influenced by ethnic arts in their own work. Mainly, they served to confirm their abstract styles, concerned with formal rather than representational issues. Haley was an exception who proved the rule. Primarily a painter, he did acknowledge an appreciation for African adz work in his sculpture, and he once cast in silver an ancient Mexican stone pendant. None of this, however, was typical of his principal work.

The artists in the Department of Design had a genuine interest in ethnic cultures, encouraged by their close anthropological ties. Even though most of them were making nonfunctional objects (“art”), they maintained a keen appreciation for the real uses possessed by their ethnic models. Even more importantly, the work of the design artists tended to be much more direct in their formal borrowings from ethnic arts. Their objects were stimulated by other objects, and did not involve the shifts in medium and dimension represented by painters collecting sculptures. One explanation for these differences was the succession in generations. The creative artists in the design department, younger than the artist-collectors of the art department, were much more likely to have traveled to foreign countries and experienced their cultures at firsthand.

**Exoticism as a West Coast Style in the Arts**

While there may be a distinctive San Francisco Bay Area style in contemporary fiber art, ethnic influences are not restricted to the West Coast. Anni Albers, wife of artist Joseph Albers of Black Mountain College in North Carolina and then Yale University, was perhaps the most prominent example. She had long been influenced by Peruvian textiles, first in her native Germany and later by archaeologist J. D. B. Bird, curator of the Peruvian collections at the American Museum of Natural History. Sheila Hicks, a student of Joseph and Anni Albers, continued these Peruvian explorations, adding to them a wide range of worldwide influences. Also in New York was fabric designer Jack Lenor Larsen. Larsen, however, was born and raised in Seattle, where he had studied and been a graduate assistant for Rossbach at the University of Washington. In addition to Japanese influences, he had studied Peruvian textiles there. Larsen is famous for his many travels, his large art collection, and his interest in ethnic crafts. Still, as Larsen and many others have noted, Pacific Rim influences seem to be more commonplace in California, Oregon, and Washington than they do in the rest of the country.

Ethnic influences are but one stylistic phase of twentieth-century American arts, one that has gone in and out of fashion. Their two central moments were during the Arts and Crafts period (ca. 1890–1915) and the rise of studio art (ca. 1960–80). In between, they were supplanted by the so-called Machine Art, which favored machine lines and synthetic materials. While objects made from traditional craft media may not be as popular as they once were, the story traced here is an important part of the history of modern art.

Throughout the twentieth century, the geographic reference of these exotic arts has also shifted: for the Arts and Crafts Movement, it was primarily American Indians and Japan, which have always remained dominant West Coast influences. For textiles, there was a wider net, but the focus was very much on Peru, in both Berkeley and New York (both of which had major museum collections in the region).

Ethnic influences have also characterized other media, as we have seen for ceramics, as well as other arts. Composers such as Henry Cowell, John Cage, Lou Harrison, Terry Riley,
and Steve Reich have been inspired by various musical traditions of Asia.\textsuperscript{137} In poetry, Gary Snyder is indebted to the cultures of East Asia and Native America. Every one of these artists has had West Coast, and often San Francisco Bay Area, connections.

Although ethnic influences continue today, they are made problematic by the rise of what may be called "identity art," art made by representatives of ethnic groups such as Native Americans, Mexican Americans, Asian Americans. The lure of ethnic arts has an entirely different guise when it involves artists who are themselves "ethnic." All the work reviewed here (Wellington, Rossbach, Hickman) is cross-cultural in the sense that artists in one culture appropriate or assimilate art from another culture, motivated by enthusiasm. What is the role for those who themselves belong to those cultures?

One such example is weaver Kay Sekimachi (b. 1926). Although she has no direct ties to the university, Sekimachi was raised in Berkeley, where she has long made her home. Like other Japanese Americans of her generation, during World War II she was interned in relocation camps. Here she was able to study art with Chiura Obata and Miné Okubo, respectively teacher and student in the UC Berkeley art department. In 1946–49 and 1954 and 1955, Sekimachi attended the California College of Arts and Crafts, where she was trained by Guermonprez in a basically Bauhaus aesthetic—much as Rossbach had been at Cranbrook about a decade earlier. Although deeply imbued with Japanese culture and aesthetics, Sekimachi was not particularly conscious of her indebtedness until she visited her ancestral land in 1975 at the age of fifty. In her later work she invoked Japanese culture and landscapes, and made use of distinctive materials such as antique Japanese paper.

Yet Sekimachi was also open to other cultural influences: Tibetan card woven ropes, Peruvian gauze weave, and split ply braiding. Around 1976 she learned of Indian camel girths, woven in the distinctive but rare technique of split ply braiding. Although several textile scholars were focusing on them at the time, she discovered them from two graduate students in the Department of Design—Betsy Quick and Judith Stein, who had returned from ten months of travel and research in India during 1974–75.\textsuperscript{138} This resulted in a series of small hangings called Variations on Camel's Girth.\textsuperscript{139} Kay Sekimachi is a particularly good example with which to end, as her work reveals the complexity of ethnic influences in the arts. Like many in her generation, she moved away from her early training in Bauhaus aesthetics. While open to a wide range of ethnic influences, she adopted styles from her ancestral culture. These, however, were not automatic, but deliberately chosen at a later stage in her career. Finally, although not a university-based artist, she lived in Berkeley and was subject to many of the same influences affecting its fiber artists. Her art, in fact, was stimulated by this very university community.

Universities, Museums, and Art

When many of the great American museums were founded during the mid-nineteenth century, one of their stated missions was to make their collections available to the art community, especially to those producing decorative art. The archetype was London's Victoria and Albert Museum, founded in 1852, which, in turn, served as a model for New York's Metropolitan Museum of Art, founded in 1869, and others.

At the same time many universities and independent art schools formed collections intended for instruction of one sort or another. There were other, similar textile collections at the University of Washington, the University of Wisconsin-Madison, the University of Minnesota, and the art museums of two of the leading art schools: the Rhode Island School of Design in Providence and the Cranbrook Art Institute in Bloomfield Hills, Michigan. But with the exception of Rhode Island's collection—founded in 1877—these were much smaller,
less diverse, and more recent than Berkeley's. Many universities, of course, had important art galleries, often in the same place as major anthropology museums, Harvard being the prime example. For the most part, however, the kinds of interactions between artists and scholars discussed here were not present.

One factor may be the peculiarly Californian nature of our case. Citing the prominence of UC Berkeley in the local art scene, Paul J. Karlstrom has observed: "In California, more than in New York and other art centers, schools have been and remain the basis for the creation and maintenance of a viable art culture. . . . By providing an institutional infrastructure in which ideas are exchanged and creative experimentation encouraged (not to mention teacher salaries), schools have indeed emerged as the primary patrons of California art and artists." Yet more than a school, the Berkeley textile program was, for the most part, included in the liberal arts at a research university. Rossbach and Elliott both believed strongly that one of the program's great strengths was the fact that students were not being trained narrowly as artists, but were encouraged to incorporate the whole world of human experience into their work. And the artists of the Department of Decorative Art / Design were able to draw upon the rich scholarly resources present in the anthropology museum and department.

In this story, we have traced the formation of a Berkeley tradition, spread through teaching across the generations and fostered by the enduring stimulus of museum collections. Such collections tend to exert a conservative influence, a trend that is reinforced by the process of teaching. Because the collections remain available and must be cared for and studied, successive generations of faculty and students become linked in a common cause, a common set of interests. At Berkeley, the anthropological tradition with roots in Kessell's teaching was re-established by Kroeber and his student, Lila O'Neale, who in turn influenced her colleagues and especially a successor, Ed Rossbach, who, in turn, had his own students. The Peruvian textiles and California Indian baskets that inspired them remain. In fact, it has been argued that one of the key factors in explaining the revolutionary work of Rossbach and his students was the size and diversity of Berkeley's textile collections.

This essay has explored the role of the arts in a university community, a topic that has attracted surprisingly little attention. As we have seen, universities may have unique resources that dramatically affect artistic styles far beyond what their limited number of participants may suggest. The history of American fiber art in the twentieth century—let alone the scholarly study of textiles and related ethnic arts—would have been very different apart from a seemingly obscure academic program that no longer exists.

ENDNOTES

As I have been engaged in this research ever since coming to Berkeley in 1991, I have accumulated many debts. I am particularly grateful to Margot Blum Schevill for collaborative research on this topic and to Rachel Goddard Griffin for her critical research assistance (especially with Bancroft Library sources). For helpful information relating to this theme, I would like to thank the following: Gray Brechin, Grace Buzaljko, Virginia Davis, Lawrence Dawson, Steven Finacom, Jill Forshee, Nelson Graburn, Waverly Lowell, Judith McCabe, Glenna Matthews, Maresi Nerad, Karen Nero, Sheila O'Neill, Mari Lyn Salvador, Mary Stoddard, William Roberts, Barbara Takiguchi, Yoshiko Wada, Katherine Westphal, Susan York, and the following alumnies and teachers of the department: Suzanne Baizerman, Joanne Segal Brandford, Lia Cook, Margaret Dhaemers, Lillian Elliott, Sandra Dickey Harner, Patricia Hickman, Sheila Keppel, Niloufer Ichaporia King, Inez Brooks-Myers, and Nance O'Banion. An earlier version of this essay, "Anthropological Collections as Artistic Inspiration: A California Case Study," was presented at the 2002 annual meeting of the American Anthropological Association.

1. The history of the Department of Decorative Art / Design is essentially unwritten, and unfortunately, the sources are scattered and uneven. Useful but brief is the entry for the design department by Karl Aschenbrenner in the Centennial Record of the University of California, edited by Verne A. Stadman (Berkeley: University of California, 1967), 83. For the department's founding and early years, see Maresi Nerad, The Academic Kitchen: A Social History of Gender Stratification at the University of California, Berkeley (Albany: State University of New York Press, 1999). For its demise, see Hanna Haim Hindawi, "Interviews with Former Chairs Joseph Eschrich, Claude Stoller (Architecture Department), Ed Rossbach, Margaret Dhaemers (Design Department) (master's thesis, Design, University of California, Berkeley, 1996). Records for the early period of the Department of Household Art and then Decorative Art, from about 1920 to 1965, seem to be largely absent, but one key source is Lucretia Nelson, "The Decorative Art Department: Holograph Memoir and Related Papers, 1986" (mss 87/90, The Bancroft Library (BL). Records for the Department of Design, especially concerning its phase-out, are in University Archives (CU-35), BL, and the Environmental Design Archives, College of Environmental Design (CED), both University of California, Berkeley. Key biographical sources are cited below, most importantly the interviews in the Regional Oral History series on fiber arts devoted to Ed Rossbach, Katherine Westphal, Lillian Elliott, Kay Sekimachi, and Gyöngy Laky, in addition to relevant faculty entries from In Memoriam: University of California.

2. For purposes of the present discussion, "ethnic arts" are defined as those art forms that are not from the fine arts tradition of the West; that is, arts from the Pacific, Asia, Africa, and Native North and South America, as well as the folk and peasant cultures of Europe and the Americas. While perhaps not a conceptually defensible category, the term has served in Western art as a real category during the first half of the twentieth century and was used in the teaching of the department.

3. Finding a convenient term of reference for a department that constantly changed its name is problematic. While I have tried to use the applicable term for the period under discussion, at times I refer to it simply as "the department," as it was a continuous academic program from its inception until its demise. Similarly, the Phoebe A. Hearst Museum of Anthropology was known as the University of California Museum of Anthropology from 1901 until 1999 and as the Robert H. Lowe Museum of Anthropology from 1999 until 1992.


5. Nerad, Academic Kitchen, 54–61. After leaving Berkeley, it appears that Kissell was never able to obtain a permanent appointment, but continued her research into aboriginal textiles as an independent scholar, based in New York.

Kroeber actively solicited O'Neale's help as he needed a trained analyst for the Peruvian textile collection. See Lila M. O'Neale, "Design, Structural and Decorative, with Color Distribution Characteristic of Ancient Peruvian Fabrics" (master's thesis, Household Art, University of California, Berkeley, 1927).


The College of Environmental Design had been established in 1959, uniting the existing College of Architecture (which then became a department) with the Department of Landscape Architecture and the Department of City and Regional Planning.


For instance, Rosbach moved into the Department of Architecture in 1974 and retired in 1979; Willard Rosenquist went into the Department of Landscape Architecture in 1974 and retired in 1975; Peter Voulkos joined the Department of Art Practice in 1975 and retired in 1985; and Marvin Lipofsky, who taught from 1964 to 1972, left the university as the program was shutting down.

The best source on the ending of the department is Hindawi, "Interviews." The major views were articulated in two summary reports: "A Report . . . , Ad Hoc Committee on the Department of Design," chaired by University Art Museum director, Peter Selz (and thus known as the "Selz Report"), April 24, 1967; and the "Proposal for Redirection of the Program of Studies in Design for the Bachelor of Arts and Master of Arts Degrees, Department of Design," February 16, 1971, Department of Design records, Bancroft Library (BL).

Rosbach, in Hindawi, "Interviews," 16; cf. Artist, Mentor, 39–43.


A descendant of the department currently exists as the Design Theories and Methods program in the Department of Architecture. Within this broadly conceived field of visual studies are drawing, painting, sculpture, installations, photo-imaging, computer animation, and multimedia.


Hindawi, "Interviews," 3; Rosbach in Interviews, 21.

A great deal of relevant discussion on the problems of departmental names and disciplinary definitions can be found in the Department of Design records, BL.

Nelson, "Decorative Art Department," 2.

As seen in the recent renaming of New York's American Craft Museum as the Museum of Contemporary Arts and Design, and the California College of Arts and Crafts as the California College of the Arts. One might note, however, that many museums still find a use for departments of decorative arts.

Herwin Schaefer, "A Suggested Program for the Department of Decorative Art: Memo to Academic Senate 1957," box 1, folder 1:15; see also his letter to Karl Aschenbrenner, January 27, 1965. Department of Design records, BL.


26 Nerad, Academic Kitchen, 2–3.

27 In 1960, Laura Nader became the first woman hired on the tenure track in anthropology, to be followed in 1964 by Elizabeth Colson, the first woman granted tenure in the department, hired from Brandeis as full professor.


29 In fact, Vouklkos was known as a very macho / male-oriented teacher; see Thomas Albright, Art in the San Francisco Bay Area, 1945-1980 (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1985), 146.


33 For Berkeley’s priority in weaving, see Rowe and Stevens, Rosbach, 122.


39 Rowe and Stevens, Rosbach, 48.


41 According to design professor Margaret Dhaemers, the art department would also not accept a creative thesis; in Hindawi, “Interviews,” 35–36. Anna Gayton was firmly opposed to students’ submitting creative work for a master’s thesis, cf. Rosbach, in Hindawi, “Interviews,” 16.

42 Nelson, “Decorative Art Department,” 2.


According to Lucretia Nelson, Kroeber "was a 19th c. man in his artistic tastes." She credits O'Neale and especially Wellington for his acceptance of purely aesthetic approaches to anthropological objects. Nelson to Buzaljko, "Decorative Art Department."

Kroeber "loyally defended the place of dec arts in a university and helped in our struggles against take over by Art and Arch 'empire builders.'" Nelson to Buzaljko, ibid.


In addition to work with his students on the stylistic seriation of Nasca pottery, John Rowe's principal aesthetic study was his short monograph, *Chavin Art: An Inquiry into its Form and Meaning* (New York: Museum of Primitive Art, 1962).


The anthropologists included Alfred Kroeber, Robert Lowie, Edward Gifford, Ronald Olson, Theodore McCown, John Rowe, William Bascom, and Lawrence Dawson. The other museum curators were Henry F. Lutz (Near Eastern languages) and Darrell Anyx (art).


Among the Graburn students who have studied textiles were Mari Lyn Salvador (Kuna molas of Panama), Niloufer Ichaporia (India), Karen Nero (Pacific Islands), and Jill Forshee (Sumba, Indonesia).


Although most incorporated older collections, the University Herbarium was founded in 1890, the Botanical Garden in 1891, the Museum of Vertebrate Zoology in 1908, the Museum of Paleontology in 1921, the Essig Museum of Entomology in 1940, and the Jepson Herbarium in 1950. See Jean Lang, *The Berkeley Natural History Museums* (Berkeley: Berkeley Natural History Museums and the Office of Vice Chancellor for Research, University of California, 1994).

60 Harvey Hellland, University of California, Berkeley: An Architectural Tour and Photographs (New York: Princeton Architectural Press, 2002), 202–4, cf. 210. The statues have since been moved to Durant Hall, the current home of the East Asian Library.


62 The Art Museum seems to use two dates for its founding: 1965, and 1970, the date when the building and exhibits were opened.

63 Lawrence Dinnean, assistant curator of university [Berkeley] collections, transfers noted in design department ledger, acc. 3032, Hearst Museum of Anthropology (HMA).

64 Ira Jacknis, "A Collection of Collections: The Phoebe A. Hearst Museum of Anthropology, UC Berkeley, 1901–2001," in Donald McVicker, Mary Fr ech McVicker, and Elin Danien, eds., Strange Bedfellows: Museums, Institutes, and the University (forthcoming). See also Albert B. Elsasser, Treasures of the Lowie Museum (Berkeley: Lowie Museum of Anthropology, University of California, 1968); Robert H. Lowie Museum of Anthropology, Held in Value (Berkeley: Lowie Museum of Anthropology, University of California, 1989). As the Hearst Museum collections have been the subject of other research and publication, here we will focus on the Department of Decorative Art collection; it is also the one made by the faculty under discussion for their own use.

65 Although the collection seems to have begun formally in 1929, some of the pieces were purchased around 1915; see ledger for accession no. 3032, HMA.

66 Ed Rossbach to Richard Bender, February 23, 1977, Textile Collections, CED.

67 The final dated accessions were donated by Ed Rossbach in 1978, but some items seem to have come in after. For the final transfer of the textiles, see Rossbach to David Herod, February 12, 1979; acc. 3032, folder: Gifts 1956-present, HMA; Rossbach to Richard Bender, February 23, 1977, Textile Collections, CED.

68 Henrietta Foster Brewer graduated Cal in 1895 and lived in Oakland; she collected archaeological specimens in Greece and Turkey. Her total collection of about 700 items was split up between the University of California, the Honolulu Academy of Arts, Mills College, and the Metropolitan Museum of Art. On Brewer, see research notes in acc. file 3032, HMA; Alfred Neumeyer, Greek Textiles: The Henrietta Brewer Collection of Textiles (Oakland: Mills College Art Gallery, 1943), HMA. On Bender, see Oscar Lewis, To Remember Albert M. (Micky) Bender: Notes for a Biography (San Francisco: Grabhorn-Hoyem, limited edition, 1973). On Liebes, Ed Rossbach, "The Glitter and Glamour of Dorothy Liebes," American Craft 42:6 (1982), 8–12; Clark Kerr to Dorothy Liebes, January 11, 1960, folder: Gifts 1956-present, acc. 3032, HMA. Bender and Brewer also donated to Mills College, Oakland.

69 According to Ed Rossbach; see C. Edmund Rossbach to John E. Jordan, September 26, 1963; acc. 3032, folder: Collections Catalog Card File System, HMA.

70 Miriam D. Plotnicov, who served as departmental librarian and assistant, was very concerned with the collection. She was married to anthropology graduate student Leonard Plotnicov. See her letter to Karl Aschenbrenner, acting chair of the Department of Decorative Art, November 11, 1964; also "Some Thoughts on the Collection and Exhibiting in the Design Department," March 18, 1966, folder: "Collections Catalogue Card File System," acc. 3032, HMA. She was succeeded by student

71 C. Edmund Rossbach to John E. Jordan, Assistant to the Chancellor, September 26, 1963, loc. cit. See also Rossbach to Richard Bender, February 23, 1977, Textile Collections, CED.

72 More than two decades earlier, Lila O’Neale had made a similar argument: “We all feel it a matter of great importance to our students that they have opportunities to handle the textiles of artist-craftsmen. Museum displays are splendid, but appreciations are heightened by actual feeling of things.” O’Neale to Martha W. Beckwith, November 28, 1940; acc. 3032, folder: Gifts 1929–45, HMA.


74 Wellington began to sell off his collection when he became ill in the 1960s; most of his American Indian items went to an out-of-state dealer. Seligman and Berrin, Bay Area Collects, 12.


77 These exhibits had been initiated by anthropology professor Theodore McCown in September 1940. After O’Neale’s death, they were continued by McCown and other museum staff through about 1996 (becoming biweekly in 1944, monthly in 1955, and every two months in 1966).

78 George Creel, et al., Aboriginal Cultures of the Western Hemisphere (San Francisco: Golden Gate International Exposition, 1940). See also UC Anthropology Museum, Annual Report for the Year Ending June 1940, 6.

79 Alfred L. Kroeber to Albert Parr, June 17, 1946; and Kroeber to Harry L. Shapiro, July 3, 1946, Department of Anthropology records, University Archives, Bl.


81 Lowie Museum, Annual Reports, which list specific exhibition titles and dates.

82 Seligman and Berrin, Bay Area Collects, 12.

83 Rossbach in “The Training of Graduate and Undergraduate Students,” Lowie Museum, Annual Report for the Year Ending June 1961, 27. For additional uses of the museum by the Department of Decorative Art / Design, see other issues of the museum’s annual reports, especially between 1961 and 1971.


86 Miriam D. Plotnicov to Karl Aschenbrenner, November 11, 1964; acc. 3032, HMA. See also Hearst Museum annual reports.


91 The sources for these statements are the respective entries of In Memoriam: University of California: Dumas (1974), Gladding (1987), Miller (1980), Nelson (1993), Patterson (1960), Wellington (1980). For Wellington’s jury service, see Seligman and Berrin, Bay Area Collects, 12.


94 Nelson to Buzaljko, in Nelson, “Decorative Art Department.” In the 1950s, modern art historian Herschel Chipp also taught a course on primitive art, the subject of some conflict between the art department and the decorative art department, cf. UC Department of Decorative Art folder, Department of Anthropology records, BL.

95 Among Boyer’s courses were Concept and Expression of Folk Art, and Traditionalism and Individualism in Folk Art, both offered for the first time in 1965–66.


99 Rowe and Stevens, Rossbach, 37.

100 In the George Stewart house, built in 1953, on 100 Codornices Road, Berkeley; photographs in the Wellington collection, CED.

101 Rowe and Stevens, Rossbach, 9, 12, 53.

Lillian Elliott, "Artist, Instructor, and Innovator in Fiber Art," an oral history conducted in 1986 by Harriet Nathan, Regional Oral History Office, BL, 1992; see also Hickman, "Lillian Elliott."

Later Elliott taught at the Pacific Basin School of Textile Arts, Berkeley (1981–86); J.E.K. University, Orinda (1983–90); as well as San Francisco State and UC Davis.


There are undoubtedly more theses on ethnic topics, counted here were only the ones with a specific reference in the title. The count does not include European / American fine or elite arts. The most comprehensive source of thesis titles are the various listings in the Department of Design records, "Theses" and "1960s," CED.

Katharine Drew Jenkins, "An Analysis of the Saltito Style in Mexican Sarapes," (master's thesis, Decorative Art, University of California, Berkeley, 1951). Her collection of research material on Mexican arts and crafts, from about 1950 to 1970, is in The Bancroft Library (mss 83 / 117 e); her comprehensive artifact collection, strong in lacquerware, is in the Hearst Museum (acc. no. 3707).


Joanne Segal Brandford, [untitled interview], Fiberarts, 15:1 (1988), 32.

Sandra Dickey studied the collections made by her anthropologist husband, Michael Harner, among the Jivaros and other peoples of the Ecuadorian rain forest, supplemented by other museum collections; cf. Sandra Ferial Dickey, "A Historical Review of Knotless Netting in South America" (master's thesis, Decorative Art, University of California, Berkeley, 1964). Brandford's netting was also influenced by another Rossbach student: Wendy Yuki Kashiwa, "Reserve Dyeing in Non-loom Constructions" (master's thesis, Design, University of California, Berkeley, 1969).

Brandford, “Artist’s Statement.”


Nelson, “Decorative Art Department,” 3–4; Lia Cook, in Rowe and Stevens, Rossbach, 104–15; Pat Hickman, in Ross and Selik, Joanne Segal Brandford, 2.


Rowe and Stevens, Rossbach, 1-43. Another, related program, was the Pacific Basin School of Textile Arts in Berkeley (1973–86), founded by CCAC graduates.

Hazel Bray, The Tapestries of Trude Guernprez (Oakland: The Oakland Museum, 1982)


“Loran was a discriminating connoisseur. During his first sojourn in Paris in 1926, he began acquiring examples of ethnic art that he found esthetic. Over the years, his acute sense of form led to the development of one of the finest private collections of its kind in America. It is comprised [sic] primarily of Asian, pre-Columbian, Native American, and African tribal art with rare examples of the art of the Northwest coast.” Robert Hartman, Karl Kasten, Peter Voukko, Brian Wall, “Erle Loran,” In Memoriam: University of California (Berkeley, CA: Academic Senate, 1999), cf. Seligman and Berrin, Bay Area Collects, 11-12; Erle Loran, Thomas K. Seligman, Jane P. Dwyer, and Edward B. Dwyer, African and Ancient Mexican Art: The Loran Collection (San Francisco: Fine Arts Museums of San Francisco, 1974).

Seligman and Berrin, Bay Area Collects, 12; for the collections of Erle and Clyta Loran and John and Monica Haley, see James B. Byrnes, The Artist as Collector: Selections from Four California Collections of the Arts of Africa, Oceania, the Amerindians and the Santeros of New Mexico (Newport Harbor, CA: Newport Harbor Art Museum, 1975). According to Seligman and Berrin, other Berkeley artists who collected ethnic arts were Ed Taylor, Henry Schaffer-Simmern, Felix Ruvolo, and Millard Sheets.

Seligman and Berrin, *Bay Area Collects*, 12. For statements by Haley and Loran, see Byrnes, *Artist as Collector*, 9, 15.


Rowe and Stevens, Rossbach, 123–24.

“Our initial number is big enough to speak for itself, well or ill . . . what blows we have to deal shall be dealt with beribboned whip and not with knotted club.” So began the introduction to issue number one of Smiles, of which Frank Norris in his sophomore year was one of four editors. The publication soon ceased.
ABOUT THE MAYBECKS

Zylpha Cockrell

The following excerpt comes from an unpublished memoir written a while ago titled Tales from This Strange Place Called Berkeley by Zylpha Cockrell. She came to the University of California, Berkeley, as the wife of Robert (Bob) Cockrell, professor of forestry, in August 1936 when the university was controlled by its president, Robert Gordon Sproul ("the greatest public relations man known to man") and Monroe Deutsch ("the academic glue that held the whole thing together"). Zylpha and Bob Cockrell first met the Maybecks in about 1949 when they were looking for a lot on which to build a house. Mrs. Maybeck had helped to start the church school for the First Unitarian Church on Bancroft Way and she queried Bob about his activities with the church. When he said that he was on the committee to choose a new site for the church and that the university would be taking over the property in about five years, she suggested that their six acres in Kensington might be just the right spot. It could be available for ten cents a square foot.

—Martha Stumpf

ARCHITECT BERNARD MAYBECK'S ILLUSTROUS CAREER was well known to the campus, since several of his most impressive works are nearby. The First Christian Science Church and the Town and Gown club are on Dwight Way just south of the campus, and the Faculty Club, whose Great Hall he designed, is in the Glade on the campus. His Palace of Fine Arts in San Francisco, which was designed for the 1915 Exposition and later restored, is a national landmark. Indeed, it was his impressive reputation that caused us to walk down the path to our meeting with him that day in 1949 with a certain sense of trepidation and awe.

What we found to our surprise was a couple so down to earth and approachable that we were immediately put at ease. The modest size of the house, the simplicity of the furnishings, and the casual disorder all spoke to their very warm and unpretentious natures. The Maybecks seemed quite interested in us from the start as younger newcomers, whoever we might be, and began by asking how we happened to end up in California. They also had been easterners.

During our conversation we had to chuckle at her pithy comments. While swishing the accumulation of stuff from the chairs to the floor she pronounced, "That's what floors are for!" And, later, "I wouldn't know how to live in a house where the roof didn't leak!" She seemed to punctuate her remarks with an exclamation point, while he finished his with a question mark. Mrs.: "Overstuffed furniture is for overstuffed people!" And when the conversation turned to chairs—Mr.: "Low overstuffed chairs are bad for one's posture, don't you think?"

Her "take charge" way of dealing with things was especially evident when it came to his welfare. Her telephone messages were more announcements than conversations, mostly
ending with a hang-up before any response could be offered. It seemed not so much unfriendliness as an assumption that she knew what she wanted and had no time to discuss it.

Her business astuteness was evidenced by her having bought up many ranches in rural areas of Kensington and west Contra Costa county, and selling them in smaller parcels for housing. Two notable large sales were to the Sunset View Cemetery and to the Unitarian church. Subsequent sales included a restriction that no cemetery could be located on the property and that no liquor or cigarettes could be sold there. Smokers were not welcome in their home.

In addition to our visits to the Maybecks during negotiations over purchasing the church property, one other avenue of insight into their lives and thinking came about unexpectedly in the middle '50's. Our oldest son, home on vacation from college in the east, tried the student employment office on campus for a job. He was told that if any job went begging he might have a chance. One that no one else wanted was at the Maybecks': cutting hay with a scythe plus general cleanup of the lot. It only paid minimum "fair bear" wage, so there it sat. When he heard the name, he didn't worry about the pay even though he was broke. Over he went—although he had never wielded a scythe—and he was not disappointed. What he had hoped for did occur. Every day at 1:00 p.m., as soon as Mrs. had gone down for her nap, out came Mr. to visit. He first wanted to hear all about Harvard and what our son was doing there. Then he spoke at length about his ideas for making the Bay Area more livable and his disappointment about all the money being spent to restore the Palace of Fine Arts. It was only to have been a temporary building for the 1915 Exposition and was made of a material similar to paper mache. Maybeck was interested in the idea of a public transportation ring around the Bay and a more highly developed system of water transit. Europe had been using hydrofoils and light rail for years, which he thought we should take a lesson from. There was also discussion of an interesting new roof design.

Those one-hour Sessions—Mr. went in promptly at 2:00 when Mrs. might arise from her nap—may not have been financially rewarding, but were priceless in terms of interest.

In our dealings with the Maybecks, I was often reminded of striking similarities with my own parents. Each individual in the couple was distinctive and different, yet they worked together well as a team. Mother had a great sense of self—so did Mrs. Both women were determined, competent and well organized. Mr. sat quietly and observed—so did Father. Each man spoke up, quietly, in agreement with and support of his wife. All four had strong feelings about smoking and liquor. My parents knew about Wall Street only that it was there, and I guessed that same was true of the Maybecks. My mother shared in artistic ability with Mr. and in business know-how with Mrs. All of these observations made our experience with the Maybecks that much more interesting and meaningful. In many ways, I felt I learned a bit about myself as well.

And finally, as Mr. Maybeck said, "Had I not learned early in life what of the past to put behind me and leave there, I never could have lived 93 years."
CREATING FROM MINDS AND BODIES
THE SPRING DANCE CONCERT

Roberta J. Park

ON MAY 1 AND 2, 2003, FOUR HUNDRED STUDENTS, faculty, and friends gathered at Hearst Gymnasium to enjoy the Spring Dance Showcase, an event whose antecedents are to be found in a Friday evening performance in 1928 when eighty-seven young women performed "A Programme of the Dance." This article examines the evolution of dance as an educational and cultural experience, as well as an artistic form of expression at the University of California, Berkeley, and the role of the Department of Physical Education in extending such opportunities to thousands of young women and men.

Berkeley's Department of Physical Culture opened in 1888. According to the 1911-12 Register (today known as the General Catalog), folk dancing had been added to the ubiquitous calisthenics exercises that once dominated American college curricula. The numerous physical education classes in summer 1912 offered to help supply the state's public schools with qualified teachers, included Elementary Dancing (folk, rhythmic movements of body and arms, "simple Gilbert series") and Advanced Folk Dancing (both national dances and those of European countries).¹

Upon the creation of separate units in 1913-14, aesthetic dancing (later called "interpretive" then "modern" dance) and a class for Parthena (the annual spring pageant that female students had begun recently) were added to the curriculum.² As the Department of Physical Education for Women grew so did its offerings.

San Francisco-born Isadora Duncan's pioneering work in Europe during the early 1900s had encouraged others to break away from fixed forms of traditional dance like ballet. Elizabeth Selden credits Rudolph von Laban and Mary Wigman with initiating in 1914 a new art form that would attain favor in educational settings. In the United States the new contemporary or "modern" dance was fostered by the creative work of Martha Graham and Doris Humphrey.³ Following World War I, such work would become of interest at a growing number of colleges and universities. At Wisconsin, Berkeley, and other institutions of higher

1928 Programme. Hearst Gymnasium Historical Collections.
learning an extensive number of beginning and intermediate classes would be offered as well as classes in Advanced Techniques and Composition.

The arrival of Lucile Czarnowski in 1923 would bring new opportunities to Berkeley students. In the summer of 1927 Czarnowski began graduate work at the University of Wisconsin where a few years earlier Margaret H'Doubler had created America's first dance major. A biology graduate from Wisconsin, H'Doubler had enrolled at Teachers College, Columbia University and while in New York became acquainted with the new forms of dance. She soon set about defining her own approach. According to H'Doubler, dance was to "base its movements on the laws of bodily motion; its technique must be simple enough to afford to those who have comparatively little time to study the dance an adequate mastery of their medium of expression—the body—and complex enough to prove interesting and valuable to the student who wishes to make the dance his [or her] chosen art." Her ideas regarding the power of dance in the total development of the individual are set forth in her 1925 book The Dance and Its Place in Education.4

The University of Wisconsin's dean of women, commenting upon H'Doubler's classes, declared:

Body and soul were well at home together in that hour of dancing. . . . The delight of responsive nerves and muscles blended with the delight in good music. . . . the dancers were not exploiting themselves. . . . Each expressed as adequately as she could in her own way what the music and the dramatic situation meant to her. . . . One of the most gifted dancers has always preferred to be one of the group rather than dance alone.5

Her colleague Gertrude Johnson wrote in the preface to H'Doubler's Dance: A Creative Art Experience (1940):

Orchesis members during the early 1930s. Hearst Gymnasium Historical Collections.
She more than any other person has helped to remove dance from the realm of... a somewhat aesthetically inclined few among students of any given institution, to its place as an accepted educational, scientific, artistic, and, above all, creative unit in the lives of students.8

H'Doubler's approach was widely embraced by female physical educators, who took seriously their responsibility for the well-being of the general student. (The same commitment underscored the “playdays” and “sportsdays,” in place of intercollegiate contests, which emerged in the 1920s.) In 1926 she and her students had created an extracurricular group they named “Orchesis.” While studying for her MS degree in dance (awarded in 1931) at Wisconsin, Czarnowski had become acquainted with such developments. She also studied at the Bennington School of Dance at a time that Martha Graham was in residence. In 1929 H'Doubler was invited to Berkeley, where she gave several lectures and lessons to the students and a two-week University Extension class that more than eighty local teachers attended.9 Stimulated by her visit, Cal’s students quickly created their own Orchesis club and initiated weekly meetings.

By fall 1931 Berkeley's Senior Orchesis had an active membership of seventeen; another nine young women were working in Junior Orchesis in preparation for their midsemester tryouts. Chief among the majors represented were public speaking, art, and physical education. Evening sessions focused upon developing a feeling for abstract movement, rapid footwork, quality of movement (e.g., sustained, ballistic), and “toil movements” that emphasized strength and continuity.10 The students chose as their term project “The Joggler of Notre Dame” and, divided into two groups, composed and practiced solo and duo dances. In addition to resolving matters having to do with presentation, they had to contend with the arrangement of the program, lighting, and costume design. Posters announcing the December 3, 1931, evening production declared: “Orchesis, the advanced group working creatively in the dance, invites you to attend their presentation ‘The Joggler of Notre Dame’ an ancient legend in the Christmas tradition.”11

In spring 1932 the thirty-two members focused their efforts around: different waltz moods related to variations in tempo and intensity; the dynamics of movement (e.g., duration, direction change); awareness of body contours; space consciousness; rhythmical accompaniment; and the stimulus of poetry. The semester was enhanced by visits from two of the dance world’s leading figures. Mary Wigman, making her first appearance on the Pacific Coast, was entertained by Orchesis at a formal “tea” in the Recreation Room (no longer existing) of Hearst Gymnasium; a dinner followed at the Women's Faculty Club.12 Several weeks later Harald Kreutzberg and four of his female dancers were likewise feted.13

The fall 1933 Orchesis production was a considerably revised version of “The Joggler of Notre Dame” (most of the original performers had graduated). Saturday's presentation was given for the benefit of the Central Pacific Division of the American Student Health Association.14 The centerpiece of the spring 1934 program was “The Very Sad Unicorn.” Final casting ensured that every student in Orchesis would take part in the program and that no
one was “being featured.” In 1936 the Department of Physical Education for Women (assisted by members of Orchesis) held a reception for Martha Graham following her lecture-demonstration. The next day Graham was “guest artist” at the annual Dance Symposium that had been recently organized by Northern California colleges. One hundred and fifty young women from Berkeley, Stanford, College of the Pacific, San Francisco State, San Jose State, and Mills College participated.  

The lecture-demonstration that Doris Humphrey and Charles Weidman gave in 1937 was followed by the customary “tea” at Hearst Gymnasium. Among many other teachers and invited guests who shared their expertise with students enrolled in classes and with Orchesis was Betty Meridith-Jones, the first full-time student of Rudolph Laban in Britain. (Formerly the Director of Choreography and Ballet at the Berlin State Opera, Laban had relocated to England in 1937 where his work included the relation of movement to education and industry as well as artistic forms of expression.) During the 1950s the noted African American modern dancer Ruth Beckford made several visits. Ron Guidi, who choreographed for groups like the Pacific Ballet and directed his own Oakland Ballet Company, taught from 1968 to 1971.

In the late 1930s Orchesis members participated in lecture-demonstrations for the San Francisco Museum of Art’s annual series of Half-hour Sunday Afternoon Dance Programs, and were part of the demonstrations included in the dance section of the American Association for Health, Physical Education, and Recreation’s annual meeting in San Francisco. They contributed to the annual High School Sports Day that the Women’s Athletic Association conducted for the benefit of several hundred girls from northern California schools; they also engaged in special
events like the Dance Symposium of Northern High Schools and Junior Colleges.\textsuperscript{21}

In November 1934 young women from Stanford, Mills College, San Francisco State, San Jose State, Fresno State, and College of the Pacific had gathered at Berkeley for a symposium on the dance. Attendees noted that in addition to learning new techniques, they had benefited from exchanging ideas and the social contacts they had made.\textsuperscript{22} From this meeting an annual Dance Symposium was created. This lasted through the 1950s. As part of the invitation to the 1936 Symposium, Mills College (the hostess institution) arranged for participants to spend the preceding night on campus. (Costs were: housing one dollar; luncheon 52 cents; registration 25 cents.)\textsuperscript{23} More than one hundred young women, now joined by dancers from the University of Nevada, attended the February 11, 1939, gathering at Berkeley.\textsuperscript{24}

Orchis members, late 1940s. *Hearst Gymnasium Historical Collections.*

In fall 1942 students discussed the desirability of ceasing Orchis activities for the duration of the war but decided to continue because dance had much to contribute to such things as endurance, group cooperation, and "release from nervous tension." The fall 1943 Symposium was held at Berkeley; in 1945 Orchis once again was part of the San Francisco Museum of Art's series.\textsuperscript{25} The 1950s brought further developments—Orchis now included a number of accomplished male dancers and the artistic quality of performances reached new heights. A front page article in the *Daily Californian* declared:

Orchis, the University's modern dance [society], gave a tantalizing preview of what may be expected at its big annual recital next week when it presented three numbers at the last concert of the San Francisco Dance League's 1951 season. . . . One of its numbers, as a matter of fact, received the most thunderous and prolonged ovation of the evening.\textsuperscript{26}
The day after the performance at Hearst Gymnasium, a lengthy Daily Californian editorial was titled: "Orchesis, Modern Dance Group Displays Brilliance in Difficult Art." Of the twelve works included in the program all but one had been choreographed by students and all but one had been danced to music composed for the occasion.

Following the completion of Dwinelle Hall (1952), Orchesis concerts began to be presented in its studio theater (reservations were made through the Department of Dramatic Art). H'Doubler visited again in 1955. By 1959 students and faculty advisers gathered for the annual Dance Symposium were discussing whether the day's events should place more emphasis on "competition" among the participating dancers. That same year the Department of Physical Education joined with University Extension to offer a two-week summer Dance Workshop for teachers, students, and other interested persons. Guest instructors included New York dance instructor May O'Donnell (1959-61), once a member of Berkeley's physical education department, Ann Halprin (1962), Merce Cunningham (1963), and Lucas Hoving (1964).

Disputes and turmoils of the early 1960s disrupted both the campus and modern dance. After extensive debates that followed the fall 1964 "sit in" at Sproul Hall, the faculty of the Department of Physical Education voted (not unanimously) to continue to hold classes—a decision that many students welcomed as these provided a kind of "island of stability" in an otherwise very unsettled world. Influenced by an escalating number of uncertainties and difficulties, participation in Orchesis declined and the group disbanded. The void opened the way for the Department of Dramatic Art, which initiated six upper-division dance courses for the 1969-70 academic year. The Department of Physical Education was then informed by the dean that it was to cease offering Dance Production, an action that disappointed a number of students who enjoyed participating in more advanced classes but had no desire to major in dance or to become professional dancers.

The lack of an extracurricular modern dance group was more than offset by intense interest in folk dancing during the 1960s and 1970s. Betty Casey, author of International Folk Dancing USA, credits Elizabeth Burchenal with being "one of the foremost and earliest leaders" of the folk dance movement that began in the opening years of the twentieth century. In her informative book Innovators and Institutions in Physical Education, Ellen Gerber has stated: "if one single person could be credited with the development of folk dancing in America as a school and recreational activity, it would be Elizabeth Burchenal." Following receipt of the bachelor's degree in English from Earlham College, Burchenal had attended Melvin Ballou Gilbert's Normal School of Dance. (Gilbert, an instructor at the Harvard Summer School of Physical Education, had created "aesthetic dancing" to counter Director Dudley Allen Sargent's complaint that forms then popular did not "develop the arms or trunk." While teaching at Columbia University Burchenal became increasingly interested in the dances of New York's immigrant populations. In 1906 Luther Gulick, MD, director of physical training for the New York Public Schools, persuaded her to take charge of the
Girls’ Branch of the recently created Public School Athletic League. (In this instance “athletic” meant broad-based programs for the many and included dancing as well as games and other physical activities.)

Folk dance quickly found favor among female physical educators. At the University of California it was added to the women’s curriculum in 1911-12; for several years it also was part of the class offerings for men. The July 27-29, 1926, summer school Demonstration of Physical Education Activities Program, one of several such events that took place over the years, included both folk and social dancing. Physical Education 160A, an upper-division course, was established. Its focus was historical, anthropological, with related aspects of European and American folk dance; and methods of teaching dance. Physical Education 160B was organized around the nature and function of rhythm in dance and a comparative analysis of ballet, modern, and jazz dance.

During the late 1930s Czarnowski had spent time in Britain, studying English dance at the Cecil Sharp House, and in Scandinavia and Germany, where she also studied dance. An invited guest of the National Lingiad Committee, she lectured on “Dance and Its Place in Education” at the Stockholm World Congress of Physical Education. In 1939, she received the Lingiad Medal. A founder of the Folk Dance Federation of California, she served as its fourth president. In her capacity as the first chair of its Research Committee she was instrumental in developing the series Folk Dances from Near and Far. She also authored the influential Dances of Early California. An adherent of the importance of giving due consideration to national style and culture, she was widely recognized as a major contributor.
to, and “gracious Lady of,” folk dancing.  

An International House Folk Festival already existed when in 1940 a group of students formed an American Square Dance Group with Czarnowski as the adviser. Starting with twelve couples (Orchesis members and men who had demonstrated an ability to dance and “cooperate”), the number soon expanded to seventy. The project was deemed worthwhile as it met the students’ social and recreational needs and acquainted them with “some of the priceless folklore of our American heritage.” Initially focused on cowboy dances, within a short time the group had changed its name to the UC Folk and Square Dance Group. Over the years it gave demonstrations for local schools and churches, International House, and organizations like the California Music Association. Members who had graduated taught folk dancing in Honolulu, Uruguay, the South Pacific, and elsewhere. By 1959 the name had been changed to the UC Folk Dance Group; membership now exceeded three hundred and twenty. Even more students, faculty, and university employees participated in the popular noon and Sunday dance sessions on the field adjacent to Hearst Gymnasium as well as in special events like those of the Folk Dance Federation of California, often held at the University of California. The classes that formed part of the department’s curricular offerings were equally popular. As folk dance consumed more and more of Czarnowski’s time, modern dance was given over to a series of younger faculty.

Czarnowski retired in 1960 and Frances “Sunni” Bloland joined the Department of Physical Education. A graduate of Boston College, she too had enrolled at the University of Wisconsin from which she earned the master’s degree in dance in 1952. Her initial teaching responsibilities focused on modern dance. Within a short time folk dance was consuming more and more of her time. Her classes often enrolled fifty or more students each; in any given semester she might accommodate more than three hundred in folk dance and two hundred more in her modern and social dance classes. An extremely popular and capable teacher (one of five to receive Berkeley’s Distinguished Teaching Award in 1990), Bloland was well known for her work in Romanian and Balkan dance, which she initiated at Berkeley in 1965.

With the support of a Fulbright Scholarship she spent her first sabbatical leave at the Institute of Ethnology and Folklore in Bucharest, ultimately publishing with Anca Giurcescu Romanian Traditional Dance: A Contextual and Structural Approach. On numerous trips to Romania, Yugoslavia, Czechoslovakia, Greece, England, and other countries she studied dance and its culture, making field trips to country villages,
collecting and describing costumes, and learning other systems of dance notation. Among participants in the several folk dance tours that she conducted to Romania (1976, 1978, 1981) were men and women from Canada and Japan as well as the United States. For many years "Sundi" served as a "master teacher" at important gatherings like the Idyllwild Folk Dance Camp, the Mendocino International Folk Dance Camp, and Brigham Young University, she also was an invited lecturer at similar events on the East Coast, in Alaska, and Europe. Her knowledge and enthusiasm, combined with the then intense interest in other cultures (one of the most popular Berkeley majors during the 1960s and 1970s was anthropology), brought folk dance at Berkeley to new heights.

Bloland had become advisor of the UC Folk Dance Group in 1960, and with her students was often called upon to give performances at local schools, professional conferences, High School Sports Days, gatherings of the Folk Dance Federation of California, and more. The annual syllabi produced by the UC Folk Dancers Festival Committee reflect changing emphases and, doubtless, the particular preferences and expertise of the participating teachers. Serbia and Bulgaria, Scotland, Israel, and Scandinavia were featured in 1971 (the first UC Berkeley Folk Dance Festival); the 1982 program featured American, Hungarian, Turkish, Scandinavian, and "International" dances.38

Enthusiasm for folk dance began to wane in the 1980s as students turned increasingly to other forms of physical activity. At the same time interest in modern dance (always present in the many classes the department continued to offer) again grew appreciably. Soon after she became a member of the Department of Physical Education in 1986, Susanna Li Jue (MFA in Dance from Mills College) began to work with students enrolled in her modern, ballet, and tap dance classes to create a Dance Showcase each semester. Director of "Facing East Dance and Music," a company she created to further the Asian American voice in dance, Li Jue has received numerous awards and accolades for her artistic performances as well as for her contributions to dance and the arts more broadly.

Berkeley's students also have benefited from the contributions of Jason Britton (MFA from New York University's Tisch School of the Arts), who joined the faculty in the 1990s. An accomplished dancer who also has choreographed and participated in numerous dance productions, Britton has taught dance to young children and the elderly as well as those of college age. Both have given hundreds of hours annually to make possible the delightful Dance Showcases in which more than one hundred students from their various classes engage. The fact that both Li Jue and Britton are fine dancers has in no way diminished the dedication they give to students at all levels of performance.

Their words, which resonate with those of former faculty they may never have known, speak for themselves:

Our students in physical education are usually not dance majors or minors. They are everything else. . . . From the physicists to women's studies majors, the premeds to architects and more. From freshman to PhD candidates! I believe that to be one of our greatest achievements. It is one thing to "hook in" those who already love and study dance. . . . It is quite another matter [for those in other disciplines to] volunteer their personal time to rehearse choreography and then find the time and courage to perform in front of an open-to-the-campus audience of hundreds.

I can see the students' excitement grow as dress rehearsal sees them in costume and make-up for the first time. Some of the dancers have never been on a stage unless it was a spelling bee in the third grade. The joys of expression and the excitement of bringing out beauty of technique, form,
rhythm, sequence, and lyricism... [The Showcase] is a "friendly" concert to a "friendly" audience of peers, family, and instructors.

ENDNOTES

The title of this article was inspired by the words (and deeds) of my colleague Susanna Li Jue, Lecturer in Dance, Physical Education Program.
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ILLUSTRATING ARCHITECTURE, 1905-2004

Maryly Snow

On August 22, 1905, John Galen Howard illustrated his first architectural history lecture in the University of California’s new architecture program with fourteen lantern slides. For his second lecture on August 24, 1905, he showed his students forty-eight slides. Every history course he taught was described in the university general catalog as “illustrated by lantern slides.” The lantern slides were at first stored in Howard’s off-campus atelier, where they were arranged by accession number, or order of acquisition, in cabinets or trays undoubtedly maintained by Bessie Sprague, his secretary. In 1908 Howard transferred his library of books and lantern slides to his campus office, along with Bessie, who was appointed as the first “Librarian and Clerk” of the Department of Architecture Library. Eventually Howard used over 4,200 lantern slides during his three-year course on architectural history. Because Howard’s lecture notes are word-for-word typescripts with lists of plate numbers, we are lucky to know exactly which slides Howard used to illustrate each lecture. Nearly all of those early lantern slides can still be found in the Lantern Slide Collection.

We shouldn’t be surprised that Howard used lantern slides. We know he was keenly aware of architectural teaching materials and methodologies. In his June 12, 1901 acceptance letter to university president Benjamin Ide Wheeler, Howard wrote:

I am willing to take up the duties of Professor of Architecture at the University and to establish a school of Architecture there provided I can be assured of adequate support and equipment in the way of drawings, casts, etc., and proper assistants both in the matter of administration and of instruction.

Howard chaired the American Society of Beaux-Arts Architects’ Education Committee and was active in the Education Committee of the American Institute of Architects. He was also a founding father of the American Collegiate Schools of Architecture. Howard’s alma mater, the Massachusetts Institute of Technology, the first university-based American architecture school in the United States, had a substantial collection of architectural instructional media, including 26,000 architectural lantern slides in 1900. Other departments were actively using lantern slides when Howard arrived on the Berkeley campus. Indeed, lantern slides were prevalent in American higher education soon after the invention of photography.

As proof of Howard’s early commitment to instructional materials, in 1903 he asked for an instructional materials budget of $2,575, a huge amount in those days, equivalent to 64 percent of the annual architecture faculty salaries of $4,400. He requested $1,000 for drawings, $1,000 for plaster casts; $500 for photographs; $75 for book binding for the Phoebe A. Hearst Architectural Library. In 1905 Howard wrote to Wheeler proposing some minor modifications to 101 California Hall, so that a “screen would be hung . . . for lantern views.” Wheeler writes back that “a cloth screen wrinkles and does not give good effect. I hope we can vise (sic) some way of having a good stiff screen for California Hall.” Interestingly, a year
THE TREE OF ARCHITECTURE,
Showing the main growth or evolution of the various styles.

The Tree must be taken as suggestive only, for minor influences cannot be indicated in a diagram of this kind.

Lantern slide number 1: Bannister-Fletcher’s tree of architecture. John Galen Howard showed this at the beginning of each semester of his architectural history course, from 1905 to 1927.
later, Howard and Wheeler were still writing each other about the stiff lantern screen.\textsuperscript{11}

In 1909 Bessie Sprague paid campus photographer B. E. White for plates and blueprints, bought “lantern accessories” from J. B. Colt & Co., paid the UC Department of Repairs to “make a photocase,” and purchased items from the well-known plaster cast company, P. P. Caproni & Brother, of Boston. By April 1910 Sprague had expended all but $25.44 of the year’s $1,000 supplies and equipment budget.\textsuperscript{12} A 1916 campuswide lantern slide inventory showed that UC Berkeley owned 26,148 lantern slides, the largest holder of which was the architecture department, with 5,700, or 22 percent of the total.\textsuperscript{13} By this time, the campus boasted at least seven rooms for illustrated lectures: five in Wheeler, and two in California Hall.\textsuperscript{14}

A few of the 4,700 lantern slides John Galen Howard showed in his history course and one of the 27 volumes of the integrated pictorial catalog dating from the 1950s to the 1960s. Photograph by Steven Brooks, 2003. Architecture Visual Resources Library.

Howard wrote to UC President W. W. Campbell regarding the Berkeley Hills fire of 1923:

Members of the faculty organized the students in corps for the placing of our architectural library and other valuables in the recently completed fireproof Mechanics Building Annex, the surest place of safety that could be desired. After the danger had passed, everything was brought back and put in place in the same orderly fashion as before.\textsuperscript{15}

This included the department’s large lantern slide collection, which measured over sixty feet long. As a result of that fire, the Department of Architecture library was eventually able to secure funds for a fireproof library. The 1935 plan shows a substantial slide room, complete with a window, next to the Librarian’s Office. These same plans show the auditorium in the Old Ark as the “Stereopticon Lecture Room.”\textsuperscript{16}

By 1946 images were so critical to the teaching of architecture that the Architecture section of Fulmer Mood’s Survey of the library resources of the University of California begins with the pictorial, rather than the monographic or periodical:
Workers in architecture have constant recourse to various visual and pictorial materials. They examine books because of their illustrations and drawings; turn over the collection of photographs and sets of plates; handle portfolios of drawings, pictures, sketches, and study lantern slides. These browsing, assimilating processes are different from the ordinary study and the ordinary reading of books, treatises, and periodicals. ... Collections of slides must be developed for instructional purposes and there is a demand for the newest, which make available architectural data hitherto unobtainable. At the present time the Architecture Library has about 12,000 slides. ... In conclusion, the architecture collection on this campus earns the rating as one of the better architectural school libraries in this country.\textsuperscript{17}

In 1948 the Architecture Library was the focus of two faculty committees, Lantern Slide Catalogue Committee and Library Reorganization Committee. This marks the beginning of the push to have professional librarians administer both the slide and book collections of the departmental library. This also marks the beginning of the protracted faculty debate over the librarians' realm: classification schemes. We learn from Engineering Librarian Blanche Dalton's 1948 report that a classification scheme had recently supplanted the accession order system, and that "the arrangements of styles is the result of comparing and combining certain features as suggested by Kimball & Edgell, Talbot Hamlin, and Fletcher."\textsuperscript{18} This classification system is the backbone of the system in place today. Dalton's report recommended that the Department of Architecture library, with its collection of slides and photographs, be administered as a branch of the University Library. This was implemented on February 1, 1949.\textsuperscript{19}
Dalton's findings were supported by the arrival of William Wurster as dean of the School of Architecture in 1950. Wurster was an active and tireless champion of libraries and librarians. Arthur Waugh, UC Berkeley architecture librarian 1951-1984, was fond of quoting Wurster's homily, “Librarians are the managers of things and librarians should arrange and manage libraries,” and its corollary, “Librarians are the managers of things and librarians should arrange and manage slide collections.”20 Arrangements for the transfer of the slide collection from the department to the new branch library were finalized at the June 30, 1950, meeting of Blanche Dalton, Engineering Librarian, Marion Milczewski, Architecture Assistant Librarian, and Dean Wurster, and documented in a July 6, 1950, memo.21 Wurster and Dalton also were able to acquire two professional librarian positions in two years. Arthur Waugh was hired as the first professionally trained architecture librarian in 1951. One of his first tasks was to hire a full-time slide librarian. His first hire in 1952, Christine Blaha, apparently suffered the relentless internecine classification battles of the faculty, who also wanted a say in all the minutiae associated with slides: refileing, relabeling, mounting, and circulation. Waugh and his second hire, Librarian Jim Burch, who arrived in 1953, successfully negotiated an agreement between the architecture, landscape architecture, and city planning faculty on refinements to the slide classification scheme, important because it would minimize any problems in the event of a collection merger. In 1950 Wurster wrote to Jack Kent, first chair of city planning, of Wurster’s desire to “have a branch library which would have the subjects of Architecture, City and Regional Planning, Landscape Architecture, Arts, Decorative Arts, and possibly Anthropology. . . . That holds for slides also.”22 However, the various college collections were not merged, as both the faculties of landscape and city planning wanted to retain physical possession of their own slides in their own buildings—which Wurster permitted.
Earlier, the efforts of Professors Raymond Jeans, Warren Perry, Howard Moise, and Harold Stump, members of the Lantern Slide Catalogue Committee, to adopt Jeans' own slide classification scheme, were referred to prominently in the Hitchcock report. But Wurster himself took an active role in the slide library. He asked librarian Waugh to visit the slide collections of the New York Museum of Modern Art, the Metropolitan Museum of Art, and Princeton University, and he corresponded intensively with architecture librarians at MIT, Princeton, and Yale about their slide collections. The classification system originally implemented by librarians Dalton and Burch continued.

Wurster wrote directly to President Robert Gordon Sproul in 1950 requesting $10,732 for the architecture lantern slide project. The request was approved by the regents for $10,000 on November 15, 1950. In his request Wurster wrote, "In my experience at Harvard, Yale, and MIT, I have found the handling of the slide collection to be deplorable." Wurster's inquiry to Hamlin about undertaking the study of the Architecture Library focused heavily on slides: "The slide collection: For years I've been disturbed about slide collections...I want it put under the library system so it will be independent of changing personnel." Hamlin referred Wurster to Henry-Russell Hitchcock, to whom he wrote: "One of the things I really am eager to do is to get the slide collection administered by the library for it always falls into personal angles unless this happens." Initially the funds were intended to create a pictorial catalog to the collection of lantern slides. The funds were later referred to as a special grant to solve the problems of slides in the three departments, and were used in part to fund Hitchcock's library evaluation.

Kodachrome 35mm color film was introduced in 1936, but the architecture faculty remained divided over the issue of lantern versus "tiny" slides as late as 1955. Lantern slides, still known today for their high resolution and clear images, were heavy, cumbersome, and fragile, with color usually added by hand. Thirty-five mm slides are lightweight, convenient, and easy to project, with excellent color stability. However, 35mm slides are too small to be viewed easily without a projector, raising the problem of post-lecture student review. As a result, lantern slides continued to be purchased and manufactured in-house until 1958, and student review of classroom images was facilitated by a mounted photograph collection, begun in 1959 with 151 photographs added that first year.

In 1959 the College of Environmental Design was formed, combining the Departments of Architecture, Landscape Architecture, City and Regional Planning, and Design. In 1960 the city and regional planning slide collection was integrated into the architecture slide collection, with the cost of cataloging, mounting, labeling and housing shared between the departments.

In 1964 the departments that made up the College of Environmental Design moved into Wurster Hall. The departmental libraries of landscape architecture, city planning, and design were combined with the architecture library, a university branch library. The collective library was renamed the Environmental Design Library and remained a branch of the University Library (then known as the General Library). That same year, 1964, librarians Arthur Waugh and Jim Burch transferred responsibility for visual aids (lantern slides, 35mm slides, and photographs) from the Environmental Design Library to the Department of Architecture. Waugh and Burch considered slides to be too time-consuming to process. In addition, the slides were used by faculty to teach their courses, not by students, so the slides did not fit the broader access and use procedures of the Environmental Design Library. When the slides were transferred from the library to the department, the accompanying shift from professional librarian management to library assistant management either met with Wurster's approval or was lost in the shuffle of creating a college and moving into a new building. No memos from Wurster about this change have been found. This deaccessioning of slides and
photos from the Environmental Design Library marks the founding of the "Visual Aids Collection," the predecessor to the Architecture Visual Resources Library.

The Visual Aids Collection occupied two of the three 315 Wurster rooms, which were adjacent to and shared doors with the Environmental Design Library. Visual Aids was managed by a succession of library assistants: Joan Joy, Virginia Beane, and Judy Weiss. In 1975 the library assistant position was reclassified back to a librarian position, thus returning to the slide collection the professional management originally desired by Dean Wurster.

In 1979 librarian Maryly Snow was hired, initiating a new round of change. The collection was opened to graduate students and its slide production system was restructured, changing the turn-around time from three weeks to its present five-day schedule. The various lantern slide collections in Wurster Hall were gathered together for off-site storage. Around 1981 Snow changed the name of the collection from Visual Aids to the Architecture Slide Library and from 1985 to 1987 the Landscape Architecture slide collection was integrated into it, a two-year project funded by CED Dean Roger Montgomery and approved by Landscape Chair Michael Laurie as a precursor to the development of a collegewide slide library. In preparing for the 1999 Wurster Hall seismic project, the Architecture Slide Library transferred the 27 volume pictorial catalog of 1950 to 1964—the one funded by Wurster's special request of $10,000—to the Northern Regional Library Facility.

In 1988 the Architecture Slide Library began scanning slides for its image database, SPIRO, a digital continuation of the earlier paper-based pictorial catalog. Named in honor of Professor Emeritus Spiro Kostof, SPIRO is the acronym for Slide and Photograph Image Retrieval Online. When the Mosaic web browser debuted on the World Wide Web in 1993, SPIRO displayed 10,000 digital images and records. Five years later, in 1999, to reflect its growing digital collection, the Architecture Slide Library was renamed the Architecture Visual Resources Library.

![SPIRO Query Form](image-url)

SPIRO query form. Note the fielded search boxes, most of which are linked to online "look-up tables" to assist in image retrieval.
Today SPIRO contains over 64,000 digital images. Of special significance in SPIRO are the original slides of Professors John Burchard, Dell Upton, Raymond Lifchez, and Joseph Esherick. While SPIRO remains the largest architecture and allied arts image database on the Web today, it represents only 28 percent of the 225,000 35mm slides in the circulating collection, which grows at a rate of approximately 6,000 new slides and 8,000 digital images per year. Approximately 35,000 slides are borrowed annually by 150 borrowers who visit the collection 900 times a year. The collection of 18,000 mounted photographs is still in use for post-lecture review, supplemented by course web pages.

The Architecture Visual Resources Library is funded by the Department of Architecture, and is one of the campus’s eleven affiliated libraries. The Library is staffed by cataloger Library Assistant Jason Miller and Principal Photographer Steven Brooks. A small cadre of work-study student employees scans, mounts, affixes and over-glues labels, presorts and refiles slides and mounted photographs.

Illustrating architecture continues apace. The transition between lantern slides and "tiny" slides is long past. Today 35mm slides seem destined to be replaced by digital images. Exactly when that transition will be complete is anyone’s guess. 2006? 2010? 2015?
ENDNOTES

1 Lantern slides derived their name from the lantern used to project their image. Also known as glass slides, American lantern slides (3.25" x 4.0") are slightly smaller than their European counterparts (3.25" x 4.25").

Howard's verbatim lectures and accompanying list of plates are in the University Archives, while the lantern slides are housed at the Northern Regional Library Facility in Richmond.


3 University of California Lantern Slide Collection, consisting of lantern slides from the Departments of Architecture, Landscape Architecture, City and Regional Planning, History, Library Schools, including the John Galen Howard lecture slides and the Mary Rutherford Jay collection of gardens, is a noncirculating visual resource collection of 37,400 slides stored at the Northern Regional Library Facility (NRLF), Richmond, California (NRLF Call number C 2 963 685). The John Galen Howard lecture typescripts with lantern slide, or plate, accession numbers are housed in The Bancroft Library's University Archives, Faculty Papers 1905-1928, John Galen Howard Papers BANC MSS 67/35, Cartons 4 & 5, folders 357-408.

4 J. G. Howard to B. I. Wheeler, June 12, 1901, Regents' records, 1901, UARC CU-5, Series 1, 8:15, University Archives, University of California, Berkeley.


6 From the MIT president's report of 1875: "The Collections of the Department of Architecture: 378 books, 2240 photographs, 465 card photographs, 660 stereoscopic views, 250 glass slides, 810 drawings, 963 prints & lithographs, 77 drawings from the Ecole des Beaux-Arts, etc., 746 plaster casts, 35 specimens of stained glass, 32 architectural models, 95 lecture diagrams, also tiles, terracotta, and various articles."

7 Caroline Shillaber, Massachusetts Institute of Technology School of Architecture and Planning 1861-1961: A Hundred Year Chronicle (Cambridge: MIT, 1963), 39. The first 26,000 lantern slides were purchased. These were augmented over the years until the collection size reached 50,000.

8 Between 1896 and 1904 the university received line-item requests for lantern slide funds from agriculture, astronomy, civil engineering, economics, geology, Greek, Latin, oriental languages, romance languages, and zoology. Regents' records, CU-5, Series 1, 1901 7:74; 1902 10:97; 1903-1904 17:145; 1904-1905 17:145, Departmental Needs.

9 Betty Jo Irvine notes in her book, Slide Libraries (Littleton, Colo.: Libraries Unlimited, 1979), 25, that the earliest American lantern slide collections date from the 1880s but lantern slide entertainments were common in the mid-1850s.

10 Office of the President, CU-5, Series 1, 1904-1905, 17:145, Departmental Needs, University Archives.

11 Office of the President, CU-5, Series 1, 22:7, John Galen Howard, 1905-1907.


13 The inventory was prompted by a national educational political movement for visual education. As part of California's lobbying for a statewide nonprofit visual education bureau, UC Extension director Dr. J. W. Howarth requested of President Wheeler a lantern slide inventory. Office of the President, CU-5, Series 2, 1916, 91: 271.


15 Office of the President, CU-5, Series 2, 1923:164. Howard's October 6, 1923, letter to President Campbell specifically mentions the "architectural library, lantern slides, and files." Copy in Environmental Design Library history files, Pre-1940.
16 The blueprint plans for the library addition designed by Walter Steilberg '10, are located in CU-5, Series 2, 1935:074, Architecture Library, University Archives.

17 Fulmer Mood, Survey of the library resources of the University of California (Berkeley, UC General Library Photographic Service, 1950), 254-260.

18 The full names of these architectural historians and authors are: Fiske Kimball, University of Virginia; George Harold Edgell, Harvard University; Talbot Hamlin, Columbia University; Banister Fletcher, King's College and London University, from Blanche Dalton's report, March 15, 1948, Environmental Design Library history files.

19 School of Architecture Library Committee, chaired by Harold Stump, October 4, 1949, memo to University Librarian Donald Conley. Environmental Design Library history files 1950s-1960s.


24 Librarian Dalton advises Wurster in her July 31, 1950, memo that $10,732 is needed for personnel and photographic reproduction costs on a one-time basis to organize the lantern slides and contact prints. Memo in Environmental Design Library history files, 1950-52. Dean Wurster's five-page letter to President Sproul, dated August 13, 1950, includes the Lantern Slide Project:

"Section B. Near Future #3: Architectural Lantern Slide Collection Project: in my experience at Harvard, Yale, and MIT, I have found the handling of the slide collection to be deplorable. The Architectural Branch Library under the direction of Mrs. Blanche Dalton with the cooperation of Mrs. Helen Charleston, assistant librarian, have come up with a method of bringing these slides into efficient use by standard library techniques. This will take two years to do—will be non-recurring and the cost will be $10,732 for the years." Page 3 marginalia shows "Closing. Reed $10,000 approved Regents Nov. 17, 1950." Office of the President, UARC CU-5, Series 2, 1950:400, 8/29/50, University Archives.


26 According to Arthur Waugh, the first pictorial catalog of the architecture lantern slide collection might have been pasted up by Bessie Sprague sometime between 1908 and 1927. See his undated draft report to Head of Branch Libraries Miss McFarland, c. 1952, in Architecture Visual Resources Library History files. The second pictorial catalog of the combined architecture lantern slide and 35mm slide collections was created between 1950 and 1960. The catalog consists of twenty-seven volumes of contact prints glued into albums, stored in nine cartons, available for on-site reference at NRRL. In 2004, volume 22 was being re-glued by the Library Preservation Department. Call number NA 200 US5 vol. 1-27.


29 A system for combining the city and regional planning slides with the architecture slides was first proposed by CRP professor Barclay Jones to the CRP faculty in an eight page mimeographed memo, October 23, 1950. The merging of the CRP and architecture departmental slide collections was completed in 1960, according to the 1959-1960 annual report of the College of Environment-
The name of the architecture visual collections has changed over its hundred year history. Nothing is known of its appellation from 1903 to 1964. As part of the Phoebe A. Hearst Architecture Library, it was probably known as the slide collection, or the lantern slide collection. With the move into Wurster Hall and separation from the Environmental Design Library, it was named the Visual Aids Collection (1964-1982). Librarian Snow changed its name to the Architecture Slide and Photograph Library in 1980 (ASL, 1982-2000). By 2000, the collection included 35,000 digital images. The more inclusive name Architecture Visual Resources Library was adopted (AVRL, 2000).

California Digital Library records show the lantern slide collection and the pictorial catalog both housed in Northern Regional Library Facility (NRLF): Lantern slide collection of the University of California, Berkeley College of Environmental Design, NRLF # C 2 963 685, and the University of California Architecture Slide Library Catalog, 1950-1964, NRLF call number NA 200 U55, volumes 1-27.

Not included in the circulating slide collection are several special collections, including the Harold Stump World Architecture Slide Collection of 29,000 35mm slides photographed between 1959 and 1970; the Denise Scott Brown Teaching Collection of 2,000 copy-stand slides from 1965; the William Wheaton City Planning Collection of 950 slides from 1960.

"The Affiliated libraries are typically connected to particular departments, professional schools, and organized research institutes, and are staffed by librarians hired in the university's Librarian series. These libraries are administratively separate from the library system and from each other. The primary mission of the Affiliated Libraries is to support the teaching and research needs of their respective organizations. Their collections reflect these specialized concerns. The Affiliated Libraries have developed in-depth subject emphases and may use their own subject headings and classification schemes. For a complete list of UC Berkeley Affiliated Libraries see http://www.lib.berkeley.edu/AFFIL/

Author at a light table in 494 Wurster Hall, arranging 35 mm slides for conversion to digital format. They will be cataloged in a relational database and the images will become web-accessible. Photograph by Steven Brooks, 2003. Architecture Visual Resources Library.
The Berkeley Art Scene: Years of Change

1930s and 1940s
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THE VISUAL ARTS ON THE BERKELEY CAMPUS,
1868–1958

Karl A. Kasten

THE UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA IS REGARDED among the finest institutions on the planet. The quality of an institution is achieved and sustained by dedicated individuals. Their significant contributions are made not only through research and teaching, but often in more subtle ways—their spirit and enthusiasm for their subject and by their humanity. In this respect the faculty in the arts are outstanding.

The story of the visual arts on the Berkeley campus involves several areas: art (painting and sculpture), the history of art, and decorative art (textile design, etc.). These studies were offered within the humanities, not in the professional schools as is architecture.

In 1869, a year after the university was founded, the Prospectus listed a course in free-hand drawing required of all entering freshmen. Teaching was limited to drawing in pencil, charcoal, and ink. The university was one of the earliest to appoint practicing artists to its faculty and one of the earliest structures on the campus, 1881, was an art museum—the Bacon Art and Library Building. In 1885, a Department of Drawing and Mapping was formed. Nine years later, in 1894, this department was renamed the Department of Drawing and Decorative Art. By 1897, twenty-two courses were offered, including a life drawing class, carving, clay modeling, and some history classes, among them ancient art and historic ornaments.

Later, the Department of Architecture began to list art courses. For example, in 1906 Melvin Earl Cummings was appointed an instructor in modeling (sculpture). He died in 1936. (Many of his works are to be found in San Francisco.)

Also in 1906, Perham Nahl was appointed as an instructor in the Department of Architecture in watercolor and pen and ink. He had studied at the Mark Hopkins Institute (the university’s art school) in San Francisco and with his uncle, Charles Christian Nahl, who was famous for his paintings of the Gold Rush. He had also completed courses at the California School of Design and at the San Francisco Institute of Art, and studied at the Heymann Akademie in Munich, Germany, and in Paris. In 1912, he returned to teach drawing on the Berkeley campus. He is best known for his painting of Hercules opening the Panama Canal, which became the official poster for the Panama-Pacific International Exposition in 1915. Nahl was known for his teaching of art anatomy. The murals in the Heyns Room of the Berkeley Faculty Club are examples of his work, as well as the paintings in the corners of the Kerr Dining Room. In 1929
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he became a full professor of art and served until his death in 1935.

Eugen Neuhaus (c.1882-1968) was a graduate of the Royal Art School in Kassel, Germany, and the Royal Institute for Applied Arts in Berlin. He had become associated with the University of California in October of 1907 when the regents approved his appointment as assistant professor of decorative design at the San Francisco Institute of Art, which was affiliated with the university. The following year he began teaching on the Berkeley campus as an assistant in drawing in the Department of Architecture and severed his connection with the Institute of Art in 1909. By 1915 he was an assistant professor of decorative design. Neuhaus was primarily a landscape, a “purple mountain,” painter, although he also did still lifes.

Neuhaus contributed to the 1915 Panama-Pacific International Exposition as chairman of the Advisory Committee of the Department of Art for the Exposition and as a member of the International Jury of Awards. Eleven hundred works of art were presented, including the art of Matisse and Gauguin. He gave public lectures, later printed in *The Art of the Exposition, 1915*, and *Galleries of the Exposition, 1915*, which were influential in creating interest in the arts in the Bay Area.

It was on Neuhaus's recommendation to university president David Barrows that the Department of Art was established in 1923. Barrows, it is said, with true military fervor decreed the establishment of the department without the usual academic review. Neuhaus became its first chairman and taught studio art, theory, and history.

Ray Boynton (1883-1951) had studied at the Chicago Academy of Fine Arts. Coming to California he started with the landscapes in oils and pastels that had brought him his first formal recognition. As an artist-teacher in 1920, he was appointed to the faculty of the California School of Fine Arts. In 1923 he became a member of the faculty at Berkeley in the newly established art department. He was recognized as an originator and adventurous experimenter in techniques, particularly those useful for architectural decoration. He probably made his first paintings in the true Renaissance mural technique of buon fresco (painting on fresh plaster) and in encaustic. Paintings in these media are to be seen at the Mills College Concert Hall, in the Faculty Club at Berkeley (a buon fresco mural in the O'Neill Room), and at the San Francisco Art Institute. Boynton's paintings in oil, in tempera, and in pastel are in the permanent collections of the California Palace of the Legion of Honor, the Mills College Art Gallery, and the M.H. de Young Museum, and elsewhere.

Neuhaus was succeeded in the chairmanship by Oliver M. Washburn, who had received an appointment as associate professor of the history of art. Washburn, a Greek scholar, taught Art 1A, classical art, and was the chairman from 1925 through 1935. Then Professor Warren C. Perry, who was chairman of the Department of Architecture, took on the added responsibility and was the acting chairman of the art department for three years (1935 to 1938).

One of the results of the Depression era's Federal Arts Project was the creation of the mosaics on the outside walls of the University Art Gallery, done by Dorothy Puccinelli and Jane Berlandina. Marian Simpson, well-known East Bay artist, designed two murals in the Alameda County Court House in the opus sectile technique. Ray Boynton was among the twenty artists commissioned to paint frescoes on the inner walls of Coit Tower in San Francisco.

Nahl, Neuhaus, and Boynton were at that time the more conservative teachers on the Berkeley faculty, but thereafter the practice of art began to change, leading eventually to a confrontation between those who had firmly established ideas of what art should be and those who wanted to adventure, search for the new.

Worth Ryder was a member of the UC Berkeley class of 1907, but he had left in 1906 to study art in New York and Munich, Germany. He returned in 1911 to teach at the Col-
College of Arts and Crafts in Oakland. In 1918 he became curator of the Oakland Art Gallery (now the Oakland Museum of California). He returned to Europe in 1922 for further study of medieval and Byzantine art. By 1926, Ryder had been studying at the Royal Bavarian Art Academy, and his friend, Vaclav Vítalcií, suggested that he study at the Hans Hofmann school of modern art in Munich. In 1927 he left Europe to accept an appointment to the Berkeley faculty as a lecturer in art. The following year he became an associate professor and in 1939 a full professor. For many years his Art 1B course focused on the critical analysis of painting from the middle ages to the present. He was equally skillful in technical criticism in his practice courses and graduate seminars.

One of Ryder's paintings is in the permanent collection of the San Francisco Museum of Modern Art, another hangs in the library in Kroober Hall on the Berkeley campus, and many others are in private collections. The Worth Ryder Art Gallery in Kroober Hall, for student work, is dedicated to him. But his important contribution to Berkeley is the cosmopolitan faculty he encouraged to teach there—people such as John Haley, Chiura Obata, Walter Horn, and Hans Hofmann whom Ryder had arranged to come to California to teach summer session classes in 1930 and 1931. In 1930, through Ryder's instrumentality, Hofmann was invited to have his first one-man show in America at the Palace of the Legion of Honor in San Francisco. After Ryder's death in 1960, Hofmann presented the university with one of his recent paintings to commemorate his friend and former student. In 1963, in gratitude for the summer sessions invitations and the one-man show, he donated $250,000 toward the construction of Berkeley's University Art Museum and made a gift of forty-five canvases to the museum. Hans Hofmann remained in America and opened an influential school of modern art in New York.

Margaret Peterson, who had received her MA at Berkeley and had also studied with Hans Hofmann in Munich and with Andre L'Effdot in Paris, joined the faculty in 1928, a year later than Worth Ryder. Her early work, done largely in egg tempera, was distinguished for form and color quality. She was an inspirational teacher of artists such as Ynez Johnston and Elmer Bischoff, but she left the faculty refusing to sign the 1949 Loyalty Oath.

On Ryder's recommendation John Haley, who was one of the first to study with Hofmann in Munich, was appointed to the department faculty in 1930, and his painting and teaching had an immediate impact on students and other artists of the Bay Area. His influence led to the development of a style of painting that became known as "The Berkeley School" (so named by an art critic, who also designated Haley as the "Father" of that style). It lasted until the introduction of abstract expressionism in the 1950s. It was characterized by a distinctive treatment of space and a free use of tonal color with forms and textures delineated in lines of varying colors. The most popu-
lar media were gouache (opaque watercolor) on paper and the medieval egg tempera technique on panels. Themes were often industrial subjects, landscapes, ghost towns, and mining camps of the West. Students who were recognized as exponents of this style and who later became faculty members were Mary A. Dumas, Karl A. Kasten, and James A. McCray.

In 1932 Worth Ryder and Perham Nahl recommended the appointment of Chiura Obata who was to teach sumi painting. For watercolor painting he gave his students the traditional Japanese materials: the brush, ink of pine soot, colors from vegetable and mineral pigments, and silk and paper as media. His popular classes were interrupted by World War II and by his evacuation to an internment camp in Utah in 1942. He continued to paint and organized art schools for the other internees. In 1945 he returned to California and to his faculty position.

Obata’s publications in book form include Sumie (1967), the standard text on Japanese ink painting, and Through Japan with Brush and Ink. To appreciate his dedication one must see his wall-sized paintings in the colors made from ground coral, malachite, lapis lazuli, and other minerals. Upon his retirement in 1954, President Robert Gordon Sproul said, “Transplanting to the West the art of the East, you infused into the Art Department an element that has given it a singular distinction.” The chancellor of the Berkeley campus, Clark Kerr wrote, “[You] have given pleasure and instruction to countless people throughout California and in many parts of the United States.”

Until 1972, after retiring, Obata was acting as a tour director—taking Americans on regular visits to the renowned gardens and temples in Japan so that they could view art treasures. An Imperial Award was bestowed on the artist in 1965—the Kungoto Zuihosho Medal for promoting goodwill and understanding between the United States and Japan.

Erle Loran had attended the Minneapolis Art School. He became fascinated with a Cézanne landscape he had discovered at the Walker Art Center. During the years from 1926 to 1930, after he won a scholarship that provided for extensive study in the museums of Europe, he arranged to take residence in the Cézanne studio in Aix-en-Provence, where his research led him to locate and photograph many of the landscapes that that master had painted. His subsequent writings, based on this research, led to his being recognized as an international authority on the form and technique in the paintings of this great pioneer of modern painting. Upon his return to Minneapolis he began to paint in a personal style that reflected the understanding he had achieved through his analysis of Cézanne and his treatment of line, color, and space in painting. Loran’s work won numerous awards in oil, watercolor, and gouache paintings, and in printmaking. In 1936 he joined the University of California faculty at Berkeley and became one of the leading exponents of “The Berkeley School.” The work of this group reflected Cézanne’s concepts but placed a greater emphasis on linear and textural qualities, flat planes of color, and shallow “picture box” treatment of space. Loran, together with his colleagues Worth Ryder, Margaret Peterson, and John Haley, led the
way out of a provincial attitude toward art and into the modern era. They recognized the importance of abstraction in the works of Cézanne, Gauguin, Picasso, Kandinsky, Klee, and other European artists. They proceeded to develop a program that broke away from antiquated academic art instruction and led to the avant-garde movement in California. It was that program that eventually established the art department as a leading institution in the art world.

In 1943 Loran’s book, *Cézanne’s Composition*, based on the research he had done in Europe, was published by the University of California Press. It was an immediate success, and it enhanced the stature of professional artists as teachers within the realm of academe.

In 1952 Erle Loran was appointed chairman of the art department and his policies furthered its national recognition. He was instrumental in adding distinguished professionals to the faculty such as Felix Ruvalco, Joan Brown, David Park, and Peter Voulkos. His roster of students would include well-known names such as Sam Francis, Ynez Johnston, Jay DeFeo, Richard Diebenkorn,


Chiura Obata sketching. *Courtesy of the author.*

Now the rest of the university faculty began to be concerned about whether this curious and unstable search for the new art really belonged in a university, not to mention in the College of Letters and Science. Two professors resolved this conflict. One of them was Worth Ryder and the other was the philosopher Stephen Coburn Pepper, whose field was aesthetics. He had become chairman of the art department (1938 to 1952). While Ryder wanted a curriculum based on practice, Pepper became the great champion of a balanced program of studio practice, theory and criticism, and the history of art.

Walter Horn, the first bona fide art historian to join the faculty, was appointed in 1938 on the recommendations of Ryder and Bernard Berenson. At that time the art department was composed of three sections: studio, aesthetics, and art history. Horn proceeded to develop the history section with distinguished scholars, such as Otto J. Maenchen, Svetlana Alpers, and
Hershel Chipp. In addition, Horn developed a magnificent art history library. A PhD degree in the history of art has been offered since 1948.

In 1930 lithography and intaglio printmaking were introduced, and recently digital art became a part of the program. In 1951 an All-University Art Exhibition was organized and traveled to the four campuses that had contributed student work (Berkeley, Davis, Los Angeles, and Santa Barbara). In 1958 the art department was divided into two sections with co-chairmen: Hershel Chipp in history and Karl A. Kasten in studio practice. Two years later, the Department of Art History was formed and the art department became designated as the Department of Art Practice. Sculpture remained under the Department of Architecture and was taught by Jacques Schnier, Peter Voulkos, and Richard O’Hanlon until the program became a part of the art practice department in 1958.

The Department of Decorative Art was established in 1914. The faculty dealt with the design of functional and decorative items, such as furniture and textiles. The faculty has included Lucretia Nelson, Hope Meldeau Gladding, Mary A. Dumas, Tex Guilling, Mary E. Patterson, Winfield Scott Wellington, Jacques Schnier, and Ed Rossbach. This department was a forerunner of the Department of Design in the College of Environmental Design. (See the article on decorative art by Ira Jacknis in this issue.)


"Model" by Hans Hofmann, 1927. Courtesy of the author.
Editor's Note: Sources used in this article include James A. McCray's article in Verne Stadtman, ed., *The Centennial Record of the University of California* (Berkeley: University of California Printing Department, 1967), 79, and from *In Memoriam: University of California* (Berkeley, CA, Academic Senate), see also
http://sunsite.berkeley.edu/uchistory/archives_exhibits/in_memoriam/
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LEARNING AND UNDERSTANDING
THE "CONVERSATION OF THE BLADES"

Roberta J. Park

IN 1971, A NEW COURSE APPEARED in Berkeley's General Catalogue. According to the description, this included the mechanics of movement in staged combat; analysis and practice of related skills in dramatic scenes; choreography of physical conflict. One reasonably might assume that this was part of the expanding offerings of the Department of Dramatic Art, which a short time earlier had added several courses in dance to its curriculum. That assumption would not be correct. "Theory and Practice of Staged Combat," a 3-unit lecture/laboratory class, was offered by the Department of Physical Education.

How did it come about that a department that is usually thought of as teaching only exercise and sports skills (a fundamental misconception) would offer such a course, and what were the consequences for students, the university, and the arts in general? To answer these questions, it will be useful to first look briefly at the three decades that preceded the 1962 appointment of Julius Palfy-Alpar, whose expertise in fencing as both a sport and an art had been instrumental in creating the course.

Although fencing had been taught previously, it was the arrival of Frederica Bernhard (who joined the faculty of the Department of Physical Education for Women in fall 1930) that made it an integral part of the curriculum. A graduate of Sweet Briar College, Bernhard had been recommended to Director of Physical Education for Women Violet Marshall as an outstanding teacher of tennis and corrective gymnastics; she had no experience with fencing, however. Wanting to extend her department's offerings, Marshall urged her to become prepared in the sport. In a May 18, 1930, letter Bernhard replied that she had begun taking

lessons in New York (where she then resided) and was "writing to Irene Williamson at Mills College, to see what arrangements may be made to continue." Over the next eleven years Bernhard often would return to New York City in the summer and continue her lessons. An exacting teacher, she became very well versed in the fundamentals of the sport. She was also a highly competent tennis and aquatics instructor who insisted upon the highest standards of professionalism in the Red Cross life saving and water safety instructor courses that she regularly taught.

In 1937 Bernhard had favorably reviewed Julio Martinez Castello's *The Theory and Practice of Fencing*, stating that although the written word could never substitute for lessons under the direction of a well-qualified teacher, fencers would profit from its "clear explanations." Her one regret was that instead of retaining the internationally recognized traditional French terms the author had translated these into English. Her *Syllabus for Elementary Foil Fencing* (1939) was written for women enrolled in elementary classes at Berkeley. *How to Fence: A Handbook for Teachers and Students* (1956), which she wrote with Vernon Edward, was dedicated to René Pinchart (director of the New York Fencers Club and five times coach of the United States Olympic Fencing Team).

By the mid-1950s Frederica Bernhard's contributions were described thus: "[H]er varied assignments, she has consistently demonstrated a high level of professional competence and devotion to duty. Her services to professional and community groups have been extensive and valuable... She is a highly competent teacher of fencing—one of the foremost in college work in the United States. Her leadership in this area is nationally recognized. She was the first Chairman of the Fencing Committee of the National Section on Girls and Women's Sports, has written several articles on method, equipment, etc. [and] has been most generous in serving as adviser and consultant to others in inaugurating and conducting the sport." For more than twenty years she also coached members in Women's Athletic Association's fencing team. WAA fencers engaged in a variety of social as well as sporting activities and occasionally entertained the several hundred girls who were invited to the annual High School Sports Day that the department had initiated in 1924 with a fencing scene from a famous play. Appropriately attired for the occasion, in 1955 they performed the bout between Hamlet and Laertes.

WAA fencers performing bout between Hamlet and Laertes, Room 220, Hearst Gymnasium, 1955. *University Archives (UARC PIC 28A)*.

Fencing classes became coeducational in 1960, the same year that Bernhard received from the Amateur Fencers League of America the trophy it had named for her in recognition of her many and devoted contributions. (Henceforth this was to be awarded annually
to the woman who best “showed skilled and controlled technique in fencing competition.”) In early 1962 Bernhard indicated her intention to retire. In anticipation of her leaving, the department engaged a Mr. Pillar as fencing instructor, but he passed away unexpectedly.

Carl Nordly (chairman of the Department of Physical Education), thereupon, wrote to Lincoln Constance (dean of the College of Letters and Science) indicating his desire to appoint Julius Palfy-Alpar and increase the department’s fencing offerings. In this letter Nordly stated: “We have had some discussions with Professor Travis Bogard (chairman of the Department of Dramatic Art) in regard to a physical education class in dramatic fencing and stage movement, an area in which Mr. Alpar has had experience. . . . I had the opportunity to see his contributions to a stage production recently in San Francisco and was favorably impressed. This prompted me to discuss with Professor Bogard a dual appointment.” Such an appointment did not occur but within a short time Alpar was voluntarily devoting hundreds of hours to working with students in dramatic art as well as to the UC Fencers Club. In addition, he taught a total of twelve foil, saber, épée and sailing classes each semester.

Shortly after his appointment fifty-four-year-old Julius Alpar succeeded in having a section of “Theatrical Fencing” added to the several hundred half-unit activity courses that the Department of Physical Education offered. At the request of the Department of Dramatic Art, the College of Letters and Science Executive Committee approved this as a requirement for the dramatic art AB major. Alpar already had prepared students for combative scenes in Moliere’s Don Juan (directed by Professor Robert Goldsby) and Shakespeare’s Hamlet (directed by Professor William Oliver) when, in a 1963 letter to Carl Nordly, Department of Dramatic Art chairman Travis Bogard wrote: “Mr. Alpar has given every indication to us of being a superior instructor. He works eagerly in his fields of drama and fencing, knows a surprising amount about drama with which he works, and is clearly able to create interesting projects which enhances our program. . . . The students who this year have worked in his course have spoken of him with enthusiasm. . . . In talking with him, I have been continually surprised by his knowledge of literature. His analysis of the fencing match in Hamlet, for instance, is startling in its originality.”

Creating compelling combat scenes was not the only benefit that students, faculty, and the university received. It seems that over the years there had been several concussions, torn ligaments, broken bones, and other injuries, “not to mention . . . accidents that ha[d] resulted from inexperienced use of swords.” This changed rapidly thanks to the expertise and dedication of Julius Palfy-Alpar.
By the time he reached mandatory retirement age in 1975 (a requirement that no longer exists), Alpar had collaborated with faculty and students in Coriolanus, Malatesta, Romeo and Juliet, King Lear, Cyrano de Bergerac, Peer Gynt, and some dozen other productions. In 1970 he taught in the San Francisco Opera Company’s Summer Merola Program and gave a presentation at the California State Fair. He also helped with productions for the Marin Shakespeare Festival and the American Conservatory Theater (e.g., Hamlet, Twelfth Night, The Relapse). Otherwise not complimentary about the ACT’s 1968 production of Hamlet, New York Times critic Clive Barnes wrote that the duel between Hamlet and Laertes “was by far the best staged I have ever seen.”

In a 1971 letter Professor Oliver was equally, if not more, laudatory than his colleague Travis Bogard had been: “I have seen him accomplish amazing results as a fencing or dueling coach in our various productions... often training absolutely green actors in a very short time to execute extremely difficult sword play with great competence and ease. He has blocked some of the best dueling scenes I have ever seen in the theatre. ... [He] has blocked duels for me in Hamlet, Romeo and Juliet, and The Recruiting Officer... [and assisted] in other plays whenever I had a difficult bit of violent action. I have nothing but praise for his work.” Oliver considered Alpar’s ability to teach drama students relevant aspects of wall scaling, throws, falls, and other acrobatic feats equally impressive; and wrote of Alpar’s book Sword and Masque (1967): “It is without doubt better than any other book dedicated to the subject.” In the section on “Theatrical Fencing” Alpar observed:

Theatrical styles of fencing differ from combat or competitive fencing in several respects because the aim of the bout is different. In competitive or combat the bout is personal, with one participant trying to defeat the other. The theatrical bout is an attempt to establish the illusion of such a bout in the minds of the audience. ... The fencers on stage are partners rather than opponents and safety must never be forgotten. Any action depicting wounding or killing must be executed with the utmost precaution since the actors almost never wear masks or protective armor.

He went on to distinguish how techniques differed for Greek bronze swords (not effective for thrusting), Roman swords (sufficiently strong for both cutting and thrusting), the sixteenth century rapier and buckler, and other weaponry.

Alpar had given fencing lessons to a number of leading sportsmen and actors, and in the foreword to Sword and Masque the famous mime Marcel Marceau wrote:

I thank Julius Alpar, whose pupil I still remain, for bringing the love of fencing to my soul. [He] is not only a great fencing master, but a man of stature whose warm personality and pedagogic knowledge I will always remember. I recommend those who want to practice this noble art to receive their first lessons from an artist like Julius Alpar. He makes me remember the moment when Cyrano de Bergerac said before he fought his duel a l’hotel de Bourgogne against Valvert:
Elegant comme Céladon,
Agile comme Scaramouche,
Je vous préviens, cher Mirnydon,
Qu'à la fin de l'envoi je touche.\textsuperscript{16}  

The book contains photographs of Berkeley students practicing with such things as net and trident, rapier and cloak, halberds, and daggers in front of the west side of Hearst Gymnasium, Adam Paul Kovacs (1952 Olympic champion and a member of the Hungarian Olympic and World Championship saber teams from 1936 to 1958), Marceau, actor Robert Goulet (to whom Alpar also had given lessons) and the handsome Maestro Alpar in immaculate fencing attire. In two hundred and fifty pages he had provided a remarkably compact yet astonishingly thorough account of the history of fencing, combative techniques of foil, saber, and épée (he was very proficient in each), and theatrical fencing as well as a summary of Olympic and World Championship winners arranged according to nation.

Who was this remarkable man? And how did he become such an authority about fencing as both a competitive sport and a theatrical art? Julius Palfy-Alpar had been born in 1908 in Hunyad-Kristyór, Transylvania (at that time part of Hungary). His father was a descendant of German settlers; his mother's ancestors, the ancient "Palfy" family, included a number of noblemen. Following graduation from high school in 1927, he attended the Officer's School of the Hungarian Army at Békés-Csaba. The army needed sports instructors and Julius decided to enter Toldi Miklos Royal Hungarian Sports Institute, from which he graduated first in his class in 1935. He subsequently received the master's degree and the diploma Maître d'Armes and Sports Instructor. He was an accomplished all-around athlete (having placed second in interterritorial competitions in the 400, 800, and 1500 meter runs in 1927).

Fencing, the sport in which he would achieve his most outstanding successes, was fundamental in the training of officers but proficiency in a wide range of other sports also was required. He won the army's individual ski championship three times (1932, 1935 and 1939) and was a member of its Ski Biathlon Team and Modern Pentathlon Squad (fencing, shooting, swimming, running, horseback riding). The government sent him to Austria to acquire skills in alpine skiing and mountain and glacier climbing. Upon graduation from
the Royal Hungarian Sports Institute, he became a staff member at the Hungarian Military Academy, attaining the rank of captain. He also served as Maitre d'Armes for the Hungarian Athletic Club and the Hungarian Officers' Club, and was one of the coaches for his country's team that won the saber competition at the 1936 Berlin Olympics. While in Budapest, he had worked as fencing director for the film *Mayfair*. However, it was the fencing lessons that he gave to Marcel Marceau and their subsequent friendship, Alpar maintained, that encouraged his interest in theatrical work.¹⁷

In 1945, as Soviet forces began occupying Hungary, Alpar and his wife Eva fled their native country. He obtained a position as director of sports at the Recreation Center the United States Army had occupied at Garmisch-Partenkirchen (site of the 1936 Winter Olympics). There he was placed in charge of providing a range of sports activities for troops and officers. According to the Center's manager, he gave valuable instruction in twenty-two sports from June 1946 to September 1947 and also served for a month in the medic's post giving first aid to one hundred and fifty cases.¹⁸

Upon leaving the Recreation Center he spent a year in Coblenz with the Tenth French Division, where he worked with épée champion Maitre d'Armes Devineux. He also taught fencing at the Racing Club of France, where he had considerable opportunity to compare the French style of foil fencing with the Italian style, which he had learned as a young man in Hungary. In 1949 Alpar and his wife relocated to Canada, where he became Maitre d'Armes at the University of Toronto and coached a number of successful collegiate competitors. He also taught for the New Play Society, a theatrical school in Toronto, and the Royal Conservatory of Music. In 1960 he became chief instructor at the San Francisco Sports Academy.

An exacting yet kind and considerate teacher, he was greatly admired by his colleagues in Berkeley's Department of Physical Education and by students who were struggling with the social upheavals and military involvements of the 1960s and 1970s. While he staunchly refused to advise another person how and what to think, Alpar's wide experiences with several cultures, the turmoils of a Europe devastated by World War II, and the occupation of his country by a foreign power offered enlightening perspectives to which the vast majority of individuals in the United States had not been exposed.

Hundreds of Berkeley undergraduates and graduates enrolled in the numerous classes he taught each semester. Many who had started as beginners went on to attain considerable
proficiency in his more advanced classes. He brought the UC Fencing Team (sponsored by the ASUC) to a high level of proficiency. Several individuals qualified for NCAA events and women as well as men qualified for the Western and US National Championships of the Amateur Fencers League of America. In 1976 he received a Distinguished Teaching Award from Berkeley's Committee on Teaching.

Recalled part-time after retirement to teach fencing for the Department of Physical Education, Alpar also continued to assist the Department of Dramatic Art with its productions (e.g., Sartre's *The Devil and the Good Life* in 1977). A few years earlier he had introduced fencing to a small group of youngsters at the California State Orientation Center for the Blind in Albany. From this experience he developed the ingenious idea of devising a series of straight, slanted, and semi-circular templates that could be put together in different configurations and utilized for teaching children how to form all the letters of the alphabet.19 His small book *Creating Letters With Symbols* was favorably commented upon by the California State Department of Education.

This was a project that he would continue to pursue during his long retirement. He remained active with various community groups as well as physically active, as one might expect of a man with his professional and personal history. Shortly before he died in February 2001, just three months short of his ninety-third birthday, Julius Palfy-Alpar was photographed demonstrating how a fencer parries an opponent's blade. His opponent was a member of the Kensington police force who was visiting the Alpars's home as part of a safety for senior citizens program.20
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THE SHAKESPEARE PROGRAM
AND THE PERFORMING ARTS AT BERKELEY

Hugh Macrae Richmond

SINCE THE TIME OF PLATO'S REPUBLIC and the Poetics of his pupil Aristotle, art has been identified as an imitation of life. Compared to the normally two-dimensional art of painting, or even the mostly static three-dimensional art of sculpture, drama (and, to a much lesser extent, its later permutations in film and video) can use forms of artifice more closely corresponding to the actual conditions of the lives of its audience, with vital human bodies in three-dimensional physical spaces. These spaces may also approximate to the settings of actual experience, or even utilize surviving historical settings of actions when these are recreated on location—as with any performances of Shakespeare's divorce trial in Henry VIII in the Blackfriars theatre, which occupied the identical space where Queen Katharine of Aragon originally confronted her judges.

What has become fully explicit in modern training programs ranging from language skills to jet piloting, is that such imitation of reality can provide an intrinsic part of effective learning, using artificial situations and mechanical "mock ups" to approximate and anticipate the challenges of "the real thing." Modern sociology typically invites neophytes to imagine themselves in hypothetical situations in which to learn by experiment through acting out their options. Moreover, the celebrated psychologist Irving Goffman (once a faculty member at UC Berkeley) has asserted in his seminal work, The Presentation of the Self in Everyday Life, that all social interaction is acting. His avowed precedents for detailing this intersection of daily experience and dramatic artifice lie in such famous assertions by Shakespeare as are found in Jaques's speech in As You Like It:

All the world's a stage,
And all the men and women merely players;
They have their exits and their entrances;
And one man in his time plays many parts. (2.7.139-42)

Similarly, the tragedy of Hamlet invites the hero and his audiences to explore the distinction between the harmless acting in a feigned reality and those fatally irreversible actions taken in earnest. My ultimate point is simply that education and theatre are not just supplementary, they are deeply interrelated, even interdependent. The very role of teacher in any discipline necessarily involves the planning and staging of
learning experiences. Perhaps all teachers should take an introductory course in acting (or in Shakespeare, at least).

The Shakespeare Program, at Berkeley specifically, was developed in response to the vast size and impersonality of an undergraduate lecture course in the major plays of Shakespeare, in which dynamic individual interaction by students with the material or the instructor seemed unlikely, not least because of the almost total absence at that time of usable theatres and even of film-projection facilities on campus, to provide direct theatrical experience to students. In 1964 I taught this class to 400 students, and it became clear that procedures for such huge courses needed drastic rethinking to ensure the appropriate educational outcome of a significant student appreciation of the Fine Arts in general, and particularly of those involving performance. Our use of new, more authentically theatrical procedures was incremental and financially modest, as it was initially necessary for these attempts to be largely self-supporting.

It was soon apparent that any use of performance for intensified understanding of Shakespeare's texts required diverse procedures for which only minimal facilities and funding then existed. We had to develop means for the rental and projection of major feature films of Shakespeare productions; the co-ordination of course schedules and activities with local professional productions; the recruitment of professional actors and directors from such distinguished resources as the Royal Shakespeare Company, the Oregon Shakespeare Festival, A.C.T., and the Berkeley Shakespeare Festival; the use and even creation of video documentaries of performances; etc. Modest student fees and then tiny administration grants helped to institute these innovations. Additionally, presentations were diversified by a series of prominent actors such as Mark Rylance and Mel Gibson. Demonstrations and workshops were also given by professionals: R.S.C. actors including Susan Fleetwood and Mike Gwilym; and stage directors Patrick Tucker (R.S.C.), Dakin Matthews (California Shakespeare Festival), and William Glover (Oregon Shakespeare). Such approaches were further diversified by a range of distinguished lecturers from various departments of UC Berkeley itself, such as Louise Clubb, Stephen Greenblatt, and Norman Rabkin, and scholarly visitors such as John Wilders of Oxford University (consultant for the BBC TV Shakespeare series), Laurence Ryan (Professor of English at Stanford University), and Stanley Wells (Director, Shakespeare Institute, Stratford-upon-Avon).
However, such exposure to the professional theater and to researchers into its nature did not provide the full interactive experience offered by direct participation. A more active mode for undergraduates was introduced which used dynamic options to replace minor mid-terms and quizzes—such as writing a Shakespeare sonnet, or staging Shakespeare scenes. The first of these options proved so successful that several collections of sonnets were published (see the appendices for examples). Later, on the model of a traveling Elizabethan company of players adapting to circumstances, many experimental performances were given to the public on Wheeler Hall Steps, at the Faculty Glade, in the Maude Fife Room, at the Lawrence Hall of Science, and even (appropriately, if ambitiously, with the “Greek” setting of *Pericles*) at the Greek Theatre, which now seems suitable only for pop music. Literary essays remained central to the Shakespeare Program since it remained embedded in the English major, but writing now included use of diverse and professional formats such as theater reviews, actors’ notes, and script writing. However, the deeper student involvement in the presentation of course materials fostered a marked increase in effective writing skills generally because criticism was based on direct, personal experience not abstract theory.

As student interest in performance evolved, satellite courses were attached to the main lecture course, offering formal credit for study of Renaissance analogues and source materials (Rabelais, Erasmus, Machiavelli, Cervantes, Lope de Vega, and others), and for the staging of full-length student productions. The latter even won international recognition because the productions ultimately included useful video recordings of rarely staged plays: *King Henry VI, King Henry VIII, Pericles, The Two Noble Kinsmen*, etc. These performance options were successfully extended to related texts in the other courses, in comparative literature and medieval studies, with *La Celestina* of Rojas and *The Second Shepherds’ Play*, and even to (supposedly) non-dramatic literature such as Milton’s *Paradise Lost* and Pope’s *The Rape of the Lock*. Some of these productions were so unusual that they are now cited in scholarly works (e.g., the Oxford University Press edition of *The Two Noble Kinsmen*; the Lang
performance script of Paradise Lost; and the Manchester University Press performance study
of King Henry VIII).

Students become so deeply involved that, as a direct consequence of the program, many
are now distinguished university teachers of Shakespeare (e.g., Eric Nicholson, at SUNY,
Purchase), founded repertory theaters (e.g., James Reber, the San Jose Repertory Theatre),
or performing companies (Jeff Borgesson, a founding member of the internationally famed
Reduced Shakespeare Company). Gregory Hittelman's documentary film, Willful Infringe-
ment is currently (July 2003) featured in the San Francisco Museum of Modern Art's “Ille-
gal Art” exhibit. Winners of Distinguished Teaching Awards are among those faculty who
have been involved in supervising or applying resources from the program: in English, Pro-
fessors Stephen Booth, Alan Nelson, Jackson Burgess, William Nestrick, and Hugh Rich-
mond; in dramatic art, Warren Travis, Barbara Bush. Dr. Paul Shepard (of media services)
won a Distinguished Berkeley Staff Award for his directorial work on stage and video with
the program. The director, Hugh Richmond, has been invited to work at all levels (from
dramaturg and lecturer to trustee) with the Berkeley Shakespeare Festival and its succes-
sors, the California Shakespeare Festival (now Theater), as well as with the Santa Cruz
Shakespeare Festival, the Oregon Shakespeare Festival and the Shakespeare Globe Theatre
of London.

Soliciting patronage for rebuilding the Globe Theatre. Sam Wanamaker, Hugh Richmond,

Such outcomes are less crucial than the vitalization of Shakespeare studies for large
numbers of undergraduates. Coupled with associated courses, the program has affected 250-
400 students per year. It has received very favorable approval ratings from around 90 percent
of students enrolled, which is close to the best ratings of even small classes of thirty students or less on campus. This level of appreciation remained consistent for twenty years, as verified by research surveys funded by the UC Berkeley Council for Educational Development, which also indicate high memory retention and sustained interest in Shakespeare by ex-students ten years after the courses. Once firmly established, the program received numerous grants from many sources, on and off campus, including $102,000 from the National Endowment for the Humanities to make its methods and materials available in video programs, such as Shakespeare and the Globe, now in national distribution by Films for the Humanities (Princeton, NJ). Graduates from the program regularly send financial contributions to the campus to ensure the continuation of its operations and initiatives.

The program helped to set up a new summer course in 1997 at the rebuilt Globe for American Shakespeare students, scholars, teachers, and performers. This course involved the participation of distinguished scholars and teachers (Andrew Gurr, Velma Bourgeois Richmond, Lisa Jardine, Emrys Jones, J. R. Mulryne, and Barbara Everett), directors (Louis Fantasia and Piers Ibbotson), musicians (Philip Pickett's Globe ensemble), and actors (Mark Rylance and Toby Cockerell—Henry V and Princess Katharine in the Globe Henry V of 1997). However, a precedent for this course had already been established in 1996 when a student production of Much Ado was transferred from UC Berkeley to the stage of the rebuilt Globe in London, with the assistance of Louis Fantasia's expertise in the development of the Globe project (and earlier classes in Southwark). A performance was recorded and edited by Berkeley's Media Center staff, led by Director Audrey Ichinoe, and it provided the core of a Berkeley video documentary about the use of the rebuilt stage called Shakespeare's Globe Theatre Restored (distributed by T.M.W. Media, Venice, CA). This documentary provides a key resource for the annual course now operating for American Shakespeareans who wish to work on the Globe stage, and for any other students of the rebuilt Globe. The Globe course initially included, and has since been partially staffed by University of California and other doctoral students, who have used this activity in their research about the significance of the restored Globe stage. The initial opportunity to participate in a full Elizabethan-style performance of a Shakespeare play before a large invited audience at the Globe marked the high-point of the Shakespeare Program's artistic achievement for the Berkeley undergraduates involved. They will not readily forget the lessons learned under these truly dramatic circumstances.

The academic strength of the program as part of the English major (if not more broadly) remains its diversification of academic methods, such as the kinetic use of performance for instruction by professionals and the students themselves. But this approach leads to better writing, because it involves the most intense preparation and thoughtful awareness: the obligation to present one's understanding of a text to a live audience of 200 people is a unique reinforcement for study. Moreover, this reinforcement is not confined to Shakespeare scripts or even texts originally written in English. The methods have been applied to foreign drama such as Rojas' La Celestina, Moliere's Misanthrope, and Racine's Phedre; and it has proved rewarding with speeches from Plato and St. Paul, Erasmus and Cervantes. The value of the approach reaches far beyond English studies and can be used equally well to heighten student participation in the teaching of foreign language and literatures. One of the program's assistant directors, Linda Lees, staged Menander's The Girl of Samos for the UC Berkeley classics department, before going on, after her PhD, to become a theatre director in New York.

The program has thus provided a model for the current structure of the revised drama curriculum at Berkeley by encouraging joint productions with the Department of Dramatic Arts, by such foreign language disciplines as classics, Spanish, Italian, German, and French. The program has sponsored performances in foreign languages (a Spanish performance from
La Celestina and a Tagalog version of Milton's Paradise Lost). Thereby, it demonstrated that the student staging of literary material can be as dynamic a factor in foreign language instruction as it has been in English courses. This concern is currently being applied to work with the Hispanic population, which will soon become the majority in modern California, using the program's previous experience with Spanish cultures in two conferences (in Los Angeles and Oakland) called "Shakespeare, California, and the Spanish Connection."

The program's numerous performances of Shakespeare have been both live and edited for video, with many of the latter being broadcast on public television, while four are in national distribution, the two on Shakespeare and one each on Chaucer and Milton. The program staged the first production ever in California of The Two Noble Kinsmen (the last play associated directly with Shakespeare), and the first fully staged production ever of Paradise Lost, in its originally intended play format. It also made an educational video documentary about the historical recreations of Tudor costume, music, and dance, seen at the Renaissance Faire of Northern California. Many of the videotapes produced are unique and unprecedented, such as a performance of the surviving music of Milton's Comus, the video version of the Spanish classic, La Celestina, and a modern dress version of John Webster's The White Devil. These videos and other recordings of professional performances are available from a variety of sources and are used in instruction and in scholarly research throughout the United States and abroad (some copies are in the New York Public Library and the Stratford-upon-Avon Shakespeare Centre). The UC Berkeley production of Shakespeare's King Henry VIII led to a stage history of the play published by the Manchester University Press, while the script for the performances of Paradise Lost was published in 1992 by Peter Lang.

Indeed, such performances led to numerous other scholarly and critical publications and to the founding of two university facilities: the Shakespeare Film Library, a teaching collection based on the Extension Media Center of UC Berkeley, which served all eight campuses from 1979 until video cassettes made it redundant; and a Multicampus Research Group with over a hundred active participants: the University of California Shakespeare Forum, which organized annual conferences and frequent research and pedagogical training sessions.
statewide and year-round from 1980 to 1999. Some of these meetings involved many hundreds of expert Shakespeare teachers, noted scholars, committed students, and famous performers, such as our international congress on *Hamlet*, honored by the participation of Mel Gibson, the star of Zeffirelli's film of the tragedy. Members of the Forum, such as Reginald Foakes and Hugh Richmond, also worked closely with the International Globe Centre on the rebuilding of Shakespeare's original Globe Theatre near its original site in Southwark; on creation of the California Shakespeare Festival's new theatre at Orinda; in restoring the Joseph Wood Krutch Theater on the Kerr campus of UC Berkeley; and with many other cultural organizations. During its twenty years of operation the program has encouraged the development of analogous groups across the United States, including Cal Poly State University, San Luis Obispo, and in the State University of New York at Purchase (under Professor Eric Nicholson).

The program has earned recognition in numerous journals, including favorable notices in professional publications and such national organs as *The New York Times*. Staffing, facilities, and resources are sustained by skillful interaction with routine campus scheduling and by co-operation with other units with relevant resources. Thereby the university acquired a major pedagogic and research facility for a very modest budget. Indeed, the sales of its four video documentaries, about Chaucer, Shakespeare, Milton, and the restored Globe Theatre in London, have reached a combined total of over 9,000 cassettes, grossing an income of $900,000, of which $300,000 has accrued in royalties and grants to the UC Berkeley Shakespeare Program. The original NEH grant stipulated that royalties should be applied to further analogous projects, which continue to evolve, such as the recent conferences in Los Angeles and Oakland, "Shakespeare, California, and the Spanish Connection." This latter project led to a keynote presentation of Shakespeare Program documentaries to the national conference of the Association for Spanish Golden Age Theatre at the Chaminas Festival of Spanish Drama in El Paso, Texas (February 2000). It also secured the addition of Lope de Vega to the California Board of Education's list of recommended authors. The program developed local implications of this theme by staging a performance of one of the first plays written and performed in Spanish in California, a version of the "Los Pastores" tradition written by Padre Florencio Ibanez at the Soledad Mission about 1803. A further video documentary is in progress (2003-4), deriving from these projects. It will also draw on the discovery of surviving Renais-

sance theatres in Madrid, as presented at the International Shakespeare Conference in Valencia in 2001. The video presentation shows the development of Anglo-Spanish interaction by demonstrating the affinities of Shakespeare and such great Spanish artists as Lope de Vega, Calderón de la Barca, and even Velázquez, as well as Ibañez. So the interaction of the Shakespeare Program with the fine arts and with the strengthening of language skills and multicultural awareness continues into the new century.

APPENDICES

APPENDIX I. Productions Staged by the UC Berkeley Shakespeare Program
(Program Director Hugh M. Richmond)

1976 Shaw: *The Dark Lady of the Sonnets* (Video only)
1977 Shakespeare: *Love's Labor's Lost* (Live & Video)
1978 Shakespeare: *The Two Noble Kinsmen* (California Premiere: Live & Video)
1979 Shakespeare: "Plantagenet Women" (derived from *Henry VI & Richard III*) (Video only)
1980 Shakespeare: *A Midsummer Night's Dream* (Live & Video)
1981 Shakespeare: *The Merry Wives of Windsor* (Video only)
1981 Shakespeare in Production: "Merry Wives" (Video only)
1982 Fernando de Rojas: *La Celestina* (Video only)
1982 Shakespeare: *Pericles* (Live & Video)
1982 Producing "Pericles" (Video only)
1983 Shakespeare: *Romeo and Juliet* (Video only)
1984 Shakespeare: "Political Women" (derived from *Richard II*, *Henry IV*, *Henry V*) (Live & Video)
1984 The Renaissance Faire (Video only)
1985 Milton: *Paradise Lost* (World Premiere: Live & Video)
1985 Shakespeare & the Globe (Video; Distributor: Films for Humanities)*
1986 A Prologue to Chaucer (Video; Distributor: Films for Humanities)*
1986 Milton: *Comus* (Music Video only)
1986 Milton By Himself (Video; Distributor: Films for Humanities)*
1986 Shakespeare: *The Two Gentlemen of Verona* (Live & Video)
1988 Shakespeare: *Measure for Measure* (Live & Video)
1990 Shakespeare: *King Henry VIII* (Live & Video; S.F. Bay Area Premiere)
1991 Webster: *The White Devil* (Live & Video)
1992 Shakespeare: *The Comedy of Errors* (Producer: S. Booth; Live & Video)
1993 Shakespeare: *The Tempest* (Live & Video)
1994 Shakespeare: *Cymbeline* (Producer: Stephen Booth)
1994 Milton: *Comus* (Live & Video); *Pyramus & Thisbe* (Live & Video)
1995 Shakespeare: *Love's Labour's Lost* (Live & Video)
1996 Shakespeare: *Much Ado About Nothing* (U.C.B. & Globe UK; Live & Video)
1998 Shakespeare's Globe Theatre Restored (Distributor: TMW Media)*
1999 Shakespeare: *Antony and Cleopatra* (Producer Alan Nelson, Live only)
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2002 Shakespeare: Twelfth Night (Producer Alan Nelson, Live & Video)
2002 Florencio Ibanez, Los Pastores (Trans. H. Richmond; Live & Video)
[2004] Shakespeare and the Spanish Connection (Video; in preparation)

Most videos are in Moffitt Library. Starred items* are in national distribution.

APPENDIX II. Joint Projects of the UCB Shakespeare Program and Other Organizations, Regional, National, & International


4 Reception and Media Demonstration with Globe Centre at Shakespeare Association of America, arranged and hosted by H. Richmond, Austin, Texas, April 14, 1989.

5 “Teaching Shakespeare: New Approaches.” with M. Allen, UCLA; R. Benedetti, Cal Institute of the Arts; H. Richmond, UCB; P. Stewart, RSC; H. Swander, UCSB; R. Cohen, UCI; L. Fantasia, Globe; Huntington Library, September 9, 1989.


9 “A Night with Shakespeare.” Del Campo High School’s Shakespeare Marathon, S. Waramaker, H. Richmond; Sacramento, April 19, 1990.


13 World Premiere of Zeffirelli’s Hamlet, Warner Brothers, Globe Centre, and 300 California Shakespeare teachers (high school, college and university), with Derek Jacobi, Glenn Close, Mel Gibson, etc.


17 Reception and Presentation about the Globe Rebuilding with the Globe Centre at the Shakespeare Association of America, Atlanta, April 1-3, 1993.
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18 "Shakespeare and Medicine." Conference of UC Shakespeare Forum at UC Medical Centre San Francisco, October 8-10, 1993.


22 "Using the Third Globe." Session led by H. Richmond at the International Shakespeare Congress Shakespeare performances produced by L. Fantasia, (Globe Centre U.S.A, Western Region), with A. Gurr, and T. Hawkes, Los Angeles, April 1996.


26 "Shakespeare and Performance." Annual summer courses for graduate students, senior Shakespeare teachers, actors, and directors, taught using the restored Globe Theatre in London, 1997–.


32 "Performing Measure for Measure." Post-Production Seminar with H. and V. Richmond, California Shakespeare Festival Theatre, Orinda, August 17, 2002.
APPENDIX III. Some Berkeley Sonnets

i. The Dark Lady Replies to Sonnet 138

If words were arrows and thy pen a bow,
I would have suffered death a thousand times.
A true heart soaring high hath been brought low,
And made to beat in time with thy rude lines.
Why should'st thou think that I speak not the truth?
Judge not so harshly in thy righteous rage.
Hearts free of all resentment keep their youth,
And grow in strength with ev'ry year of age.
O, tell me not that I have been unkind;
Inquire into thine own embittered heart.
We often our own faults in others find;
Discover thy dark self in thy black art.
So, if thou wilt my Will back to me give,
Rise up from these low thoughts, and let us live.
—Bonnie Brasel, 1972

iii. Against Mr. A. L. Rowse's Naming of the Dark Lady

My dark, false love thou boldly claim'st to know,
And would'st discover her with eager pen,
Though I, much wiser, chose no name to show,
Preferring seasoned silence even then.
But thou, untempered by discretion's grace,
In thought most rude, in action rash, unfair,
Would'st raise thy upstart will to chiefest place,
Pressing thy point when wiser would forbear.
Thus thou, aroused by passion for a name,
Hast set thy pen to willful arguments
Which gull the innocent and fix thy claim,
Unwittingly, in willful ignorance.
Yet simple truth and tale in part agree,
Proving that both our ladies false may be.
—Patricia White, 1973

ii. In Praise of the Literal

Above my mistress' nose, on either side,
Her eyes are firmly fix'd in her face;
Her lips, which smile when pleased or satisfied,
Beneath this self-same nose hold to their place.
This sonnet may, at this point be attacked
For lack of simile and metaphor;
For dealing slavishly with concrete fact;
But since I'm neither bard nor troubador,
Poetic standards don't apply to me.
I won't say: "It's like that," or "It's like this."
I'll see a thing and tell you what I see,
Refusing to indulge in artifice.
So here's the truth, no versifier's lies—
My mistress' eyes are—like my mistress' eyes.
—George Wallace, 1977

iv. Ending

No worthy education comes from this,
Just weary groans from out the mind's abyss.
It's almost dawn—'I've been at it too long;
Hunting through night-hours the elusive Muse,
And nowhere can I find her—she's footloose,
Unless she's drowned, the termly tests among;
Or died near-senile, aged by long misuse.
No! She is gone for spite, I've no excuse—
I am a fool to give her such abuse.
But (what a miracle!), I'm nearly done
Without a help from her, that wandering one.
Yet still alone in tests I'll spend this day:
And just where she will be, I sure can say—
Out whoring with my memory, far away.
—Sarah Armstrong, 1974

* These are from a sequence of anthologies in the 1970s; however, I did continue to get sonnets for another twenty years—more than a thousand, I guess!

—H.M.R.
A Gentleman of the Faculty

Drawing by Rube Goldberg '04. 1904 Blue and Gold.
COLLECTING THE MOMENT—THE BERKELEY ART MUSEUM

Lucinda Barnes

ARTISTS WILLIAM WILEY AND ROBERT HUDSON created happenings; poets Gary Snyder, Richard Brautigan, and Robert Duncan recited from their works; and the avant-garde Anna Halprin Dancers performed in celebration of the inauguration of the Berkeley Art Museum in November 1970. It was a multidisciplinary contemporary art extravaganza heralding a radical new building and an ambitious cultural enterprise, which within a matter of months would also include the Pacific Film Archive, together, known today as BAM/PFA.

The museum opened its distinctive 100,000-square-foot space of cantilevered concrete galleries with “Excellence: Art from the University Community,” an exhibition of some six hundred works of art from the cultures of Asia, Africa, Europe, the Americas, and Oceania. They were brought together from the museum’s own collections, the collections of the Lowie Museum of Anthropology (now the Phoebe A. Hearst Museum), and those of the Los Angeles and Santa Barbara campuses, as well as from the private collections of individuals associated with the University of California system. This exhibition included the cornerstones of the BAM collections today—historical Asian paintings and works on paper; European old masters and nineteenth-century paintings and prints; American works of the nineteenth century ranging from folk to landscape traditions; and twentieth-century art from the Abstract Expressionist era to the present. The latter was led by the gift made in 1963 by the internationally renowned artist and teacher Hans Hofmann that in essence made the new museum possible—forty-seven paintings and a cash gift of $250,000 to build a new museum.
"Excellence"3 established the benchmark for a progressive university art museum, demonstrating the centrality of the visual arts of the past and of the moment to a scholarly and socially attuned community. As a center for visual culture bringing together art and film, the new museum claimed a position squarely in the avant-garde—an arena of new thought and innovative techniques—while operating within a context of historical and cultural reflection. The museum intended to "provide students opportunities for immediate and continuous contact with works of art," the founding director, Peter Selz, wrote.5 At a time of political and social ferment—in 1970 the Berkeley campus, like campuses around the world, was entrenched in demonstrations and conflict associated with the antiwar movement—the museum looked to art’s power to resonate across time. Selz wrote, "The contemplation of works of art from all periods of history, from all cultures of mankind, can lead to a greater understanding of our own problems and place them in a universal context."6

Selz acknowledged the difficulty of establishing a new museum in late-twentieth-century America, when the country’s major museums had been in existence and had been developing collections for the better part of a century. The cost of building a new collection could be prohibitive.7 However, as “Excellence” demonstrated, a new art museum at Berkeley could still stake out meaningful territory in several key ways: enhancing collection foundations set in place by a range of distinguished works of art donated to the university in the past century (old masters, nineteenth-century European and American art, Asian art); gleaning from scholarship and research that was a strength of the university (Asian art, Baroque art, and art of the modern era), and focusing on contemporary culture and the art of the moment.

In the years just prior to the museum’s inauguration, Selz set about aggressively adding significant works to the collections, through donation as well as purchase, ranging from a world-class seventeenth-century Rubens oil sketch to a huge meditative painting by Mark Rothko, selected from the artist’s studio; from a delicately detailed Ch’ing dynasty landscape
by Wu Hung to a winged figure drawn by the Venetian Baroque master Giovanni Battista Tiepolo. Major modern paintings by Joan Miró, Willem de Kooning, Helen Frankenthaler, and Sam Francis were purchased and donated. Contemporary works by artists such as Joan Brown, Robert Arneson, Jean Tinguely, and Pol Bury were acquired from a flurry of radical art exhibitions that had been presented at the University Art Gallery on the Berkeley campus in the years just before the opening of the new museum. 8

A collection does not grow and take shape in a straight line, but rather, moves into the future while continually gaining dimension in the past. With each addition or shift, the cumulative character of a collection changes. Looking from the vantage of the permanent collection, the present accounting of the museum’s history will unfold in a similarly nonlinear fashion. We will scan in multiple directions, picturing the whole from a variety of overlapping and intersecting details, as if in a kind of Cubist time and space.

Early Patrons

As is true of most museums, the collections of the Berkeley Art Museum began as the result of gifts—the first gifts made to the University of California, in 1870, just two years after the university was established. Two generous patrons, Henry D. Bacon and F. L. A. Pioche, donated through gift and bequest nearly seventy works of art. Bacon also provided funds to establish the university’s first art gallery, which opened in 1881. It was the era of the nation’s earliest museums—the Metropolitan Museum and Boston’s Museum of Fine Arts in 1870, the Philadelphia Museum of Art in 1876, and the Art Institute of Chicago in 1879—founded for the public good and communal improvement. 9 A handful of progressive universities began to collect works of art and establish galleries and museums for the display and study of art as a core component of their educational missions. Yale University established an art gallery in 1832; Princeton’s museum was founded fifty years later, and Harvard’s famed Fogg was established in 1895.
Many of the first gifts of art to the University of California were classical works, such as a fifteenth-century biblical landscape painted by an artist from the circle of the Flemish master Joachim Patenir, or historical scenes like Emanuel Leutze's heroic depiction of American Revolutionary troops Washington Rallying the Troops at Monmouth (1853–54), a companion piece to his signature work, Washington Crossing the Delaware, in the collection of The Metropolitan Museum of Art. Donated to the university in 1882 by Mrs. Mark Hopkins, the Leutze is on semi-permanent display in the Doe Library.10

Contemporary paintings were also among the earliest gifts from Henry Bacon, such as Albert Bierstadt's Yosemite Winter Scene.11 By the early 1870s, the German-born American artist had built thriving studios in New York and San Francisco, having become internationally known for his scenes of the West envisioned as a hopeful and determined destiny, an American Eden.12 On a visit to the Yosemite Valley in January 1872, Bierstadt made studies that led to Berkeley Art Museum’s painting.13

Old master paintings, prints, and drawings and nineteenth-century European and American paintings came into the university's art collections through the first half of the twentieth century by means of gifts and bequests. Among the many works donated by Phoebe Apperson Hearst was Théodore Rousseau's enormous landscape, the glowing Forest of Fontainbleau (1855–1856).14 A vast collection of eighteenth- and nineteenth-century Japanese woodblock prints also came to the university during this era. The quality and scope of these donations was certainly impressive, but it was a somewhat random course of growth until the Hofmann gift in 1963 provided the means to finally build a major art museum on the campus.15 It was to be a museum appropriate to care for and exhibit the most extensive public collection of Hofmann’s own work as well as future acquisitions and the collections that had evolved over the past century.
What role did UC Berkeley play for Hofmann, who was intimately tied to the New York art scene and who, from the early 1930s to the late 1950s, ran a famous art school in New York and Provincetown, Massachusetts? In fact, Hofmann began his teaching career in America with an invitation to teach at Berkeley and later claimed, "If I had not been rescued by America, I would have lost my chance as a painter." That crucial opportunity offered by Berkeley later inspired his extraordinary gift to the university.

Hans Hofmann was born in southern Germany in 1880. He cut his teeth as a young artist in Paris in the first decade of the twentieth century, the moment of the invention of Cubism. It was one of the century's most dynamic periods of cultural energy and innovation. While in Paris, Hofmann met Matisse, Picasso, and Braque, and developed a friendship with Robert Delaunay. Cézanne, too, would make an indelible impression on him. Later, in Munich, he met Vassily Kandinsky and followed that artist's revolutionary aesthetic theories.

From 1915 to 1930, in the years between the world wars, Hofmann established a school of modern art in Munich that attracted young artists from around the world. Among them were Worth Ryder and Glenn Wessels, both of whom later taught in the art department at Berkeley. It was Ryder who invited Hofmann to come from Germany to teach in 1930 and again in the summer of 1931, when his work was shown in Haviland Hall on campus and at the California Palace of the Legion of Honor in San Francisco—his first exhibitions in the United States.

From Berkeley, Hofmann went to New York City, where he established an art school in 1933. Over the next twenty-five years he influenced an astounding array of young artists, including Burgoyne Diller, Helen Frankenthaler, Lee Krasner, Red Grooms, Alan Kaprow, Wolf Kahn, Louise Nevelson, Alfred Jensen, and Larry Rivers. The critic Clement Greenberg referred to Hofmann's Greenwich Village school as a vortex of influence in the burgeoning art scene of the 1930s and 1940s, "a major fountainhead of style and ideas for the 'new' American painting," or Abstract Expressionism.

Through his teaching and writings, Hofmann became a crucial conduit of modernist ideas and practice. He was known as a convincing teacher of Cubist principles, particularly the practice of suggesting multiple views of objects in space through overlapping planes of transparent color. Inspired by Kandinsky's approach to abstraction and theories about the spiritual in art, he emphasized artistic experience and the creative impulse. In 1958, after more than forty years of teaching, Hofmann closed his schools to devote himself full-time to his own work. By that point he had achieved international recognition as a painter, in addition to wide respect as a teacher and theorist. The Whitney Museum of American Art mounted a touring retrospective in 1957, and six years later the Museum of Modern Art in New York organized another major exhibition that toured internationally. When Hofmann

Hans Hofmann: Imperium in Imperio, 1964; oil on canvas; 84 1/8 x 52 in.; Berkeley Art Museum Collection, gift of Hans Hofmann.
designated the bulk of his work to Berkeley and to a new museum, although eighty-three years old, he was a powerful, energetic painter and at the height of his abilities. His gift included a number of earlier works, but concentrated on his late signature style, with several major canvases fresh from his studio. Hofmann continued to paint until his death in early 1966.

Collecting for the New Museum

The Hofmann endowment secure, in 1965, after a national competition, the Bay Area architect Mario Ciampi and associates Richard Jorash and Ronald Wagner were selected to design the new museum. Peter Selz, a former curator at MoMA in New York, was hired in 1964 to direct this new enterprise. An energetic program of contemporary exhibitions—“Directions in Kinetic Sculpture” and “Funk” among them—took shape in the University Art Gallery, which housed the museum’s activities until the completion of the new building. Selz also organized a series of annual exhibitions, “Selection,” that highlighted the range and scope of the museum’s now rapidly growing collections: between 1965 and 1970 nearly thirteen hundred works of art were added.17 The “Selection” exhibitions offered the university community and the public a sneak preview of the museum-to-be. They also marked a new phase of collection development: building upon the fortunate but random growth of the previous century, from this point on, the collections continued to mature with intentional direction.

Among the acquisitions of the late 1960s were several major Baroque works such as Giovanni Battista Caracciolo’s The Young Saint John in the Wilderness (ca. 1623). Like his contemporary Michelangelo Caravaggio, Caracciolo painted his holy subject as if an inhabitant of the world of the flesh. Diego Francesco Carloni’s large wood sculpture Saint Joseph and the Christ Child (ca. 1715), carved in the style of southern Germany and Austria, where the Italian-born artist worked most of his career, and elegant, potent drawings by Giovanni Battista Tiepolo and Giovanni Guercino were also added to the collections. Peter Paul Rubens’s dramatic oil sketch The Road to Calvary (ca. 1632) was among the most important acquisitions of the time and, according to Svetlana Alpers, the specialist
in seventeenth-century art history who began teaching at Berkeley in the early 1960s, "one of the most beautiful as well as one of the most technically interesting of Rubens’ late oil sketches. . . . [one that] reminds us that in the best Rubens works, the dazzling technical accomplishments are yoked to a full persuasive presentation of a significant human drama."

During these years, a number of Ming and Ch‘ing dynasty Chinese paintings were also added to the collection. Works such as A Scholar Instructing Girl Pupils in the Arts (n.d.), by the master figure painter Ch‘en Hung-shou, marked the beginning of what has become one of the stellar collections of Chinese painting in North America. James Cahill, the well-known scholar of Chinese painting and former curator of Asian art at the Freer Gallery in Washington DC, came to Berkeley in the mid-1960s to head Asian art historical studies. Almost immediately, he established a group of supporters and patrons who helped the nascent museum collect major works of Asian art, particularly Chinese paintings dating from the Sung, Yüan, Ming, and Ch‘ing dynasties.¹⁹

Professor Cahill often said that the paintings themselves are the best teachers,²⁰ and he used the museum’s growing collections and his own collections as primary resources. In 1971 Cahill organized the first in a series of pioneering exhibitions for the museum, "The Restless Landscape: Chinese Painting of the Late Ming Period," the outcome of a graduate seminar he led. The exhibition and catalog "Shadows of Mt. Huang: Chinese Painting and Printing of the Anhui School" (1981) also resulted from a graduate seminar. One of Professor Cahill’s graduate students was Patricia Berger, who now heads Chinese art historical studies at Cal and who continues to use museum collections as core teaching resources.²¹

Indian and Southeast Asian works of art have also provided primary teaching resources. Professor Joanna Williams, who since the 1960s has taught Indian and Southeast Asian art history, has frequently incorporated these collections in her curriculum. In 1998 and 1999 the museum significantly enhanced its holdings in this area with the addition of the Jean and Francis Marshall Collection of Indian paintings and drawings, with examples of narrative painting and portraiture from the early fifteenth into the twentieth centuries. In addition, the museum has recently added an array of Tibetan paintings and objects as part of a vast collection of art, film, artifacts, and books and manuscripts that was donated to Berkeley in 2000. The collection was amassed by Theos Bernard (1908–1947), the American scholar of Hindu philosophy who has also been referred to as the “White Lama” of Tibet.²² The Bernard-Murray Collection of more than seven hundred articles of Tibetan art and culture is shared by BAM/PFA, the Phoebe A. Hearst Museum, and the East Asian and Bancroft Libraries.²³

The Berkeley Art Museum collection houses a panorama of the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries, including a concentration of early American paintings in the folk tradition that covers genre painting, architectural scenes, mourning pictures, and portraiture, such as the itinerant painter John Brewster Jr.’s Boy in Green (ca. 1795–1805).²⁴ In the second half of the nineteenth century, a growing number of European and American painters moved their primary “studio” activities outdoors and into nature. Rousseau’s Forest of Fontainbleau (1855–56), from the 1920 bequest of Phoebe Hearst, demonstrates his interest in the light and form of the countryside and can be seen as a precursor to Impressionism. Thirty years later, the Paris-born Paul Gauguin left behind his middle-class life and family in the French capital to join a community of artists in a remote village in Brittany, where he painted Still Life with Quimper Pitcher (1889).²⁵

**Photographic Collections**

British pioneering photographer Francis Frith traveled to the Middle East during the 1850s and captured archeological and architectural images such as The Hypaethral Temple,
Philae (1857) that documented what many feared was a rapidly decaying culture. Parisian Juan Laurent established one of the earliest photographic studios in Spain, where from the late 1850s to the 1890s he created a vast archive of photographic views of that country. And during the 1870s, American artist William Henry Jackson worked with the U.S. Geological and Geographical Survey of the Territories to extensively document the western and northern territories. His photographs of Yellowstone, such as Crater of Grand Geyser, Yellowstone (1872), were instrumental in the decision by Congress to make it our first national park, in 1872—the year of Bierstadt’s Yosemite Winter Scene. Frith, Laurent, and Jackson are represented in a major gift. Working from nature was one of Hans Hofmann’s core principles, as well. Legend has it that when Hofmann saw Jackson Pollock’s early work he advised that he “work from nature.” Pollock replied, legend also has it, “I am nature.”

From Hofmann On

Beginning with the circle around Hofmann and the moment of Abstract Expressionism, Berkeley Art Museum collections have developed with particular emphasis and strength in international art of the present moment and the recent past. “Excellence” included key paintings by Mark Rothko, Clyfford Still, Ad Reinhardt, Helen Frankenthaler, Willem de Kooning, Sam Francis, Adolph Gottlieb, and David Smith. A critical Pollock drip painting, Number 6, 1950, was then a loan, and a dream for the museum’s collections. It was donated in 1995 and has become a cornerstone of the museum’s twentieth-century collection.

Many of the Abstract Expressionist-era works in the museum’s collections are characterized by monumentality, also a defining quality of the building itself. Clyfford Still’s Untitled (1955), a vertical abstract canvas featuring flame-like swathes of color, and Mark Rothko’s signature expanse of colored zones hovering ambiguously over one another in Number 207 (Red over Dark Blue on Dark Gray) (1961) are among these commanding works. Helen Frankenthaler (who as a young artist studied with Hofmann) developed a distinctive staining process, influenced by Jackson Pollock’s energetic drip technique, that is visible in her monumental Before the Caves (1958). In Voltri (1962), David Smith, one of the foremost sculptors of the Abstract Expressionist era, welded together large steel shapes, creating a cutout in space.

A discussion of large-scale works of art at the museum must include Alexander Calder’s landmark sculpture The Hawk for Peace (1968), 18 which greets museum visitors at the Bancroft Way entrance. Calder’s huge black stabile, which was noted at the time of its installation in 1969 as the most monumental public sculpture in the Bay Area, was commissioned specifically for the new museum building in memory of Calder’s brother-in-law, Kenneth Avarand Hayes, class of 1916. The museum’s sculpture garden also hosts large sculptures by Peter Voulkos and Mia Roosen Westerlund. Several sculptures from Bancroft Way entrance to the museum with The Hawk for Peace by Alexander Calder (1968). Photograph by Ben Blackwell, date unknown. BAM/PFA.
the garden recently have been relocated to other sites on the Berkeley campus: Linda Fleming's pyramidal construction *Lumber* (1990), located in front of Wurster Hall; Fletcher Benton's *Steel Plate Drawing #14* (1987), on the plaza outside the Free Speech Café, at Moffitt Library; and Richard Hunt's *Outgrown Pyramid #1* (1973), at the North Gate of the campus. Arnaldo Pomodoro’s huge bronze globe *Rotante Dal Foro Centrale* (1971) will be reinstalled at the west entrance to the campus.

Following on the expanded dimensions that characterized Abstract Expressionism, the museum continued to add large-scale works, such as Jay DeFeo’s enormous painting *Origin* (1956). DeFeo was at the center of the San Francisco Beat scene in the 1950s. Soon after completing *Origin* in her Fillmore Street apartment, she began her famous eleven-foot, one-ton painting *The Rose*, which consumed the next eight years of her life. Another signature large work is Jonathan Borofsky’s *Hammering Man* (1976–1983), an eighteen-foot-high silhouetted figure whose moveable arm “hammers” endlessly. Human scale takes on a huge persona in Borofsky’s works. The artist refers to his hammering men (even larger outdoor versions can be seen in Seattle, Los Angeles, Frankfurt, and Japan) as workers who “imply the fate of the mechanistic world. At its heart, society reveres the worker. The *Hammering Man* is the worker in all of us.”

Exhibitions

A familial relationship between exhibitions and collections has existed from the inception of the museum. The early University Art Gallery exhibition “Directions in Kinetic Sculpture” (1966), the first comprehensive survey of kinetic art in the United States, and “Funk” (1967), which defined a movement in its formative stages, initiated what are now longstanding scholarly and archival relationships the museum has developed with various artists, including key figures in the history of Bay Area art Joan Brown, Robert Arneson, William Wiley, and Bruce Conner. The Berkeley Art Museum organized Wiley’s first comprehensive museum exhibition in 1971, and he is represented in the collections by thirteen works from throughout his career. Brown, who taught in the art practice department from 1974 until her death in 1990, is another artist represented by a signature body of work, from
Fur Rat (1962), a sculpture that was included in "Funk," to The Bride (1970), the painting that often greets museum visitors in the central atrium. In 1998 the museum co-organized with the Oakland Museum of California a major retrospective of Brown's work.32

Already signaling the museum's present stance in the areas of new technologies and new media, "Kinetic Directions" featured innovative sculptural works that incorporated movement, propelled by mechanical, magnetic, or air-driven means. Works by such artists as Jean Tinguely, Pol Bury, Len Lye, and George Rickey were acquired from the exhibition. By the mid-1970s the museum was exhibiting and acquiring contemporary works that pushed material boundaries even further. An ethereal disc (untitled) by "light and space" artist Robert Irwin and Dan Flavin's florescent Monument for V. Tatlin, both from 1969, used industrial materials and techniques to create effects of light that activated the space between the viewer and the object.33 Eva Hesse's enigmatic and majestic works, structured by working latex and plastics, characterize an early branch of Minimalism in which artists explored primary qualities of form and material through processes that emphasized the situation of change, the final work being a kind of "anti-form." In 1973 the museum hosted Hesse's memorial retrospective exhibition. Six years later, the artist's family donated Aught (1968), one of her most significant works, along with a number of the artist's test pieces. Hesse is one of many women artists who have been featured in BAM exhibitions and collections, Louise Bourgeois, Joan Brown, Theresa Hak Kyung Cha, and Rosemarie Trockel among them.

Berkeley was one of the first American museums to show and collect video art, today a mainstay of both the BAM and PFA exhibitions and collections.34 In 1977 the museum commissioned video artist Frank Gillette to create Aransas, a six-channel installation that over the course of viewing reveals and elaborates upon the haunting landscape of South Texas near the Gulf Coast, each location (and each monitor) representing a relationship between natural time and the observer's sense of time. Among the more than sixty video installations and film-based works now in the museum's collection, Diana Thater's RBG (2000) is another technologically mediated observation of nature.

Conclusion

A focus on novel approaches to the art of our time and of the past continues to define the Berkeley Art Museum exhibition and collection programs. In 2003, artist Fred Wilson, a Consortium for the Arts resident on the Berkeley campus, worked with students from various departments and staff from both BAM/PFA and the Phoebe A. Hearst Museum to create an installation drawing upon the collections of both museums, entitled "Aftermath." Once again as in 1970, America was at war. In this installation that visually resembled a ruin site or archeological dig, Wilson aimed to remind us of the horror and chaos of war by evoking what is left when the conflict has ended. Among many objects the viewer encountered was
a nineteenth-century Japanese figure in wood, a pair of shoes from Bosnia, Jean Carpeaux’s nineteenth-century bronze bust representation of the continent of Africa, and an enormous pre-Columbian beer container.

Wilson’s provocative installation derived its energy from reconsidering objects that have been collected with a particular intent and allowing them to emerge from time-bound contexts in new alignments and contexts. Wilson shows us that while the art of our moment propels us forward, it can enliven the art of the past, which in turn enriches our consideration of the present. As Peter Selz proposed three decades earlier, art offers the potential to elicit thinking, dialogue, and understanding across time and culture. Reflecting on “Aftermath,” I am reminded of a quote by Hans Hofmann: “Through a painting we can see the world.”

A UC Berkeley student examines Asian art from the BAM Collections. Date of photograph unknown.

Sherry Goodman, director of education, gives a tour of the collection exhibition “Images and Ideas” to high school students, 1994. BAM/PFA.
ENDNOTES

A number of colleagues at the Berkeley Art Museum and Pacific Film Archive have been extremely helpful by amplifying information and suggesting avenues of investigation. I would like to thank Stephen Gong, Lana Buffington, and Lisa Calden for their thoughtful suggestions; Dara Solomon, curatorial assistant for collections, for her valuable assistance with tracking down many details; and Judy Bloch, BAM/PFA’s editorial director, who managed the project.

1 From its inception to 1996, the museum was known as the University Art Museum, and popularly as UAM. The Pacific Film Archive (PFA) was officially a curatorial department of the museum from 1971. In 1996 the name change to University Art Museum and Pacific Film Archive (UAM/PFA) reflected the increasing conception of the organization as consisting of two major aesthetic components, art and film, and strengthened by the interplay between the two. In 1996, at the behest of an anonymous donor, the word Berkeley was added to the name, to reflect the role of the museum and film archive in our university and city communities. The name is now University of California, Berkeley Art Museum and Pacific Film Archive (BAM/PFA).

2 For a history of the Pacific Film Archive, see Lee Amazonas, “Guerilla Cinematheque Comes of Age: The Pacific Film Archive,” in this issue. “Commitment,” by Constance Lewallen, details the Berkeley Art Museum’s unique and ongoing commitment to radical new art and the MATRIX Program for contemporary art.

3 Founding museum director Peter Selz noted that “excellence” was a defining standard for Cal. See the Excellence, 1970, n.p., catalog of the first exhibition to celebrate the opening of the museum.

4 BAM itself represented a unique blend of characteristics for museums of the time. Among the handful of academic museums actively engaged in showing and collecting historical as well as contemporary art were the Sheldon Memorial Art Gallery at the University of Nebraska and the Allen Memorial Art Museum at Oberlin College. In the early 1950s the Allen had initiated a novel exhibition program focusing on young artists and began to collect contemporary art, looking to The Museum of Modern Art in New York as a model (see Anne F. Moore, in Lucinda Barnes, “New Voices 94,” Allen Memorial Art Museum Bulletin, 47:2, 1994, 3). Kirk Varnedoe has written that, from its early days, MoMA’s collecting strategies followed “the notion of a torpedo through time…a forward-moving collection that would always have its ‘nose’ in the present and immediate past, and a ‘tail’ in the receding past.” See Modern Contempory: Art at MoMA Since 1980 (New York: The Museum of Modern Art, 2000), 12.

5 Peter Selz, Selection 1966: The University Art Collection (Berkeley: University of California, Berkeley), 1.

6 Ibid.


8 The University Art Gallery is also referred to as the Powerhouse Gallery or the Barrow Lane Gallery.

9 The first public art museum established in North America was the Wadsworth Atheneum, founded in Hartford, Connecticut, in 1842. (The first public museums in Europe were established in the late eighteenth century.) In the 1882 catalog of the Bacon Art Gallery, the gifts of art to the university were termed “noble.” It was stated, “It is earnestly hoped that now a beginning has been made in cultivating the aesthetic tastes, in addition to the general intellectual discipline, of those embracing the various educational advantages offered at Berkeley, future years may witness constant accesses to this important department.” “Catalogue of the Bacon Art Gallery,” Library Bulletin No. 4, Sacramento: State Printing, 3.


11 This painting entered the university’s collections in 1881. In addition to the Bierstadt, other contemporary works donated by Bacon include two Yosemite landscapes by F. H. Shapleigh. In the context of the present discussion, it is interesting to note that Bierstadt studied in the mid-1850s in Düsseldorf with Emanuel Leutze, among other academic painters.
12 Bierstadt is frequently noted as having referred to Yosemite as the American Eden. In *Landscape and Memory* Simon Schama explores a broad cultural sweep of this late nineteenth-century attitude toward culture and nature (New York: Vintage Books, 1996), 7–10.


14 Mrs. Hearst amassed a vast collection of archaeological and anthropological objects that ultimately formed the Phoebe A. Hearst Museum of Anthropology at UC Berkeley. See http://hearstmuseum.berkeley.edu for more information about these collections.


16 A museum of art and culture had been part of the university’s early plans, especially during Phoebe Apperson Hearst’s tenure as a regent. After her death in 1919 an art gallery was to be part of a multi-building plan in her memory, but ultimately funds for the gallery were not made available. During the 1950s Chancellor Clark Kerr led an effort to develop the creative arts at UC Berkeley by enhancing both the curriculum and cultural life on campus. An idea for a university art center evolved into a plan for a major art museum. Later as president, Kerr and Professor Eric Loran of the art department negotiated the lead gift from Hofmann. See Travis Bogard, Betty Connors, Jacquelynn Baas, Robert W. Cole, and David Littlejohn, “A Place for the Arts,” *Berkeley at Mid-Century: Elements of a Golden Age* (Berkeley: Berkeley Public Policy Press, University of California, 2002), 101–138.

17 Three exhibitions in this series were organized, in 1965, 1966, and 1967, each with an illustrated catalog.


19 BAM’s internationally distinguished collection of Chinese paintings has evolved in large part from the recent acquisition of key works from what is historically known as the Ching Yuan Chai Collection, a stunning panorama of paintings amassed over fifty years by Professor Cahill and the Cahill family. These collections spanning virtually every period of Chinese painting over the last nine hundred years were the focus of BAM’s recent exhibition “Masterworks of Chinese Painting: In Pursuit of Mists and Clouds.” The exhibition is touring nationally.

20 BAM/PFA’s website contains several video interviews with Professor Cahill. See www.bampfa.berkeley.edu/exhibits/masterworks/.

21 Many other former Cahill students trained from these objects have gone on to distinguished careers and have in turn taught and laid the groundwork for succeeding generations of scholars. Among them are Scarlet Jang at Williams College, Stanley Abe at Duke University, Stella Lee at New York University, Richard Vinograd at Stanford University, and Julia White at the Honolulu Academy of Arts.


23 Bernard traveled in Tibet in 1937, collecting art and artifacts and filming and photographing his journey. He is thought to be the first American to seek spiritual guidance in Tibet. Through his popular books and lectures he became a widely known personality in America in the late 1930s and 1940s. In 1947, while traveling through India to Tibet, in an area of Hindu and Moslem conflict, Bernard was mistaken for Moslem and killed by a Hindu mob.

24 A longtime collector of early American art, former Stanford University professor Bliss Carnochan and his family began giving major works to the museum in 1972, and he has indicated that his entire collection ultimately will come to the museum.

25 In 1994 the museum received, in addition to the still life, a portrait of a Breton woman and a rare set of lithographs by Gauguin.
The museum’s collections of photography range from a significant body of daguerrotypes and images by the earliest practitioners of the medium all the way to the present. In the last three years these collections have been markedly amplified with a multiyear gift now totaling approximately one thousand photographs largely focusing on such late-nineteenth-century images as those mentioned in the text in addition to significant early-twentieth-century works by Margaret Bourke-White, Laura Gilpin, Imogen Cunningham, and Dorothea Lange. The Bancroft Library Pictorial Collection at UC Berkeley includes extensive photography collections, with particular emphasis on Ansel Adams, Dorothea Lange, Eadweard Muybridge, Carleton Watkins, and Edward Weston.

Cited in Jeffrey Potter, To A Violent Grave: An Oral Biography of Jackson Pollock (New York: G.P. Putnam’s Sons, 1985), 77. Although Pollock was never a formal student of Hofmann, his wife, the painter Lee Krasner, was, and is credited with introducing the wild young American painter to the seasoned European master in 1942.

Listed as catalog number 340 in the unpaginated exhibition brochure, the title of this work was simply The Hawk.

University of California, Berkeley Office of Public Information press release, July 8, 1969. In addition to this Calder sculpture, the collection includes a signature hanging mobile from 1952, Nine Elements, and several of the artist’s diminutive but lively circus toys from the first decades of the twentieth century.

From a 2002 interview with the artist conducted by Ann Curran, cited in http://www.borofsky.com/interview.html. The museum’s dialogue with scale continues with recent acquisitions such as Gay Outlaw’s Black Hose Mountain (1998), which rises in a mass of black garden hoses filled with white plaster and stacked repetitively; David Ireland’s simple but architecturally scaled chair, which speaks with near-Biblical authority as implied by its title, Ex Cathedra (1998); John Zurier’s expansive color-field painting, Einmal (1995), and Rigo’s Lunatics and Other Imperialists (2001), a lunar landscape inhabited by displaced images.

Bruce Conner is also represented in the Pacific Film Archive collection with a number of films, including Crossroads (1976), preserved on 35mm in 1996.

"Joan Brown" was curated by then BAM/PFA director Jacquelynn Baas and Karen Tsujimoto, curator at the Oakland Museum of California.

For a more thorough discussion of the museum’s involvement with Conceptual art, see Lewallen’s “Commitment,” in this issue.

For a discussion of curator David Ross’s pioneering video art exhibitions at the museum, see Lewallen, and for PFA’s video collection and program, Amazonas.

Quoted in Emily Farnham, “Hofmann: Abstraction as Plastic Expression and Notes Made in Hofmann’s Class,” (Provincetown, MA, 1999), 34.

Rube Goldberg illustration in 1904 Blue and Gold.
TRADITION, COLLABORATION, EXPERIMENTATION
PRINTMAKING AT UC DAVIS

Kathryn Stine

THE LABORIOUS PROCESSES OF ETCHING A METAL PLATE, carving a wood block, or preparing a lithography stone represent just half of the effort involved in printmaking. The actual printing can be just as, if not more, intense an endeavor; it is a dialogue relayed often between an artist and a printer, always between a printer and a plate, block, or stone. Despite, or because of, the intricacies and demands of this practice, there are always willing art students attracted to this seemingly arcane medium, whether they are drawn by the craft involved in the process, the potentials of reproducibility, or the material tactility of ink on paper. From the 1960s on, significant and influential Bay Area printmakers at UC Davis have passed on this discipline, and new developments in both technique and theory are being implemented and interpreted by the students and faculty of today.

Prior to the early twentieth century, the ability to reproduce text or images on paper had been considered largely a popular art form, meant to disseminate information to a broad audience. It has also been considered a secondary medium in the service of the higher arts, as prints were made to stand in for well-known paintings. Because the methods used to print images on paper were relatively inexpensive, this allowed a growing middle class to afford art, albeit subordinate in desirability to the original pieces. In the twentieth century, however, printmaking began to come into its own as a fine art, both in theory and in practice.

Artists such as Marcel Duchamp, and later Andy Warhol, turned the concept of mechanical reproducibility on its head by including store-bought items and mass-produced media in the canon of fine art. This type of appropriation, which draws upon (and often critiques) the popular and commercial aspects of printmaking, has continued to engage artists to this day and reflects the current bombardment of images that we encounter on a daily basis through mass media and advertising.

Concurrently, artists were developing and expanding the labor-intensive practices of etching and lithography. In 1927 Stanley William Hayter opened the graphic arts studio which would become Atelier 17 in Paris. His studio became the site of experimentation in the field of intaglio where artists were directly involved in manipulating the printing of the plate, not for exact, predictable reproduction, but to create a printing matrix that could evolve from print to print. Although internationally known, Atelier 17 also had a direct relationship to printmaking in the Bay Area.

Painter and UC Davis professor, Roland Petersen, was one of many artists to study with Hayter. During his time at Atelier 17 he developed an interest in viscosity printing, a technique that involves layering applications of several colors of ink on an intaglio plate, each of which contain a different ratio of pigment to oil (binder), or are of a different viscosity. Because this technique produces unpredictable results and is considered more painterly, it seems a logical step for Petersen to have taken. This kind of experimentation in inking the plate had a natural relationship to his early paintings, which deal with color relationships and the physicality or materiality of paint. Petersen was one of few artists teaching viscosity printing on the West Coast when he introduced this technique at UC Davis.
In 1956 Petersen joined the UC Davis faculty, recruited to the new art department which then was in its early stages of autonomy, and, until 1958, a major in studio art was not offered. Throughout the early sixties, the department grew to include many influential Bay Area artists, and its reputation, based on the teaching and exhibition records of these professors, would become national. Other painters, also engaged in varying degrees in printmaking, Wayne Thiebaud, William T. Wiley, and Roy DeForest joined the faculty, in 1960, 1961, and 1965.

In Northern California the 1960s and 1970s were a time of recognition, reintroduction, and reevaluation of older, time consuming, craft-based practices of printmaking, namely etching and lithography, both of which denied the instant gratification of Warhol's screen printing. These techniques were picked up not just by individual artists, but also supported by a new crop of fine presses and printmaking studio workshops—such as Crown Point Press, and later, Magnolia Editions and Trillium Press—where artists would be able to experiment and collaborate with master printers to produce fine print editions.

Of the painting faculty at Davis in the 1960s and 1970s, most worked with fine presses as a way to expand their creative output. For these painters and draftsmen, printmaking presented opportunities for experimentation with line and color. Following printmaker Roland Petersen, painters William T. Wiley and Wayne Thiebaud had experimented a bit with printmaking on their own. However, it was through their collaborations with fine presses that they began incorporating printmaking in their work.

Collaboration is just as important in the classroom as it is in the studio. The complexity of the procedures involved in printmaking, in addition to the potential hazards of the processes and keeping a printmaking lab in working order, usually requires a technician who works with professors, assists in teaching, and delegates responsibilities to student workers and volunteers. This creates an atmosphere where shared knowledge and responsibility coexist with the solitary activities of making art. The camaraderie found in a print studio often adds to the popularity of printmaking among students.

Linda Katzdorn has been in charge of the UC Davis printmaking lab for the past fifteen years, assisting countless students, collaborating with professors Thiebaud, DeForest, and Petersen and more recently Tim Berry, Conrad Atkinson and Squeak Carnwath. During her time at Davis there has been a shift in the faculty, due to the retirement of those professors hired in the early sixties, as well as a shift in the variety of printmaking techniques: commercial digital technologies, usage of less hazardous materials, and a growing emphasis on the digital. There has been consistent demand, however, for printmaking classes—averaging between three and five offered each year and at least one course offering a quarter. Katzdorn routinely has up to a dozen student volunteers working in the lab.

When Katzdorn was hired, the department was
seeking a candidate who was an active, working artist and who would therefore bring conceptual as well as technical expertise to the job. Katzdorn's own work rests upon her assertion that printmaking "lives in a space between painting and sculpture." She is primarily interested in intaglio and, due to a background in metalsmithing, treats her plates as "bas relief sculpture" before printing. Since printmaking is treated as a "primary medium" in her work, as it is in the tradition of Hayter and Petersen, this has "informed the [UC Davis] studio and the work that comes out of it."11

In the early nineties there were no longer any printmakers left on the permanent faculty, when, after thirty-seven years of teaching at Davis, Roland Petersen retired. In 1992 the well-known British artist Conrad Atkinson was brought in to chair the art department and became a "staunch supporter"12 of an active printmaking department. He himself would teach intaglio, while part-time and visiting faculty would continue to teach the other printmaking techniques.

As the "old categories [of art making] are breaking down,"13 printmaking, a practice that has always existed in between mediums, remains a space for experimentation where students and artists negotiate across disciplines. Two years ago Professor Atkinson introduced a new course in the printmaking department focusing on digital reproduction. This course familiarizes students with digital processes and gives them an opportunity to challenge traditional conventions. Printmaking is also likely to figure into the nascent UC Davis Center for Technocultural Studies, an arts initiative begun several years ago which will encourage interdisciplinary study in the fields of visual culture, digital studies, hypertext-hypermedia studies, and artistic intervention and site-specific performance.14

Nonetheless, the relationship of printmaking to visual, media, and digital culture does not negate the importance of teaching its more traditional, craft-based techniques. It is rare for students to use digital technologies in isolation, as the hand inevitably works its way in. According to Linda Katzdorn, "digital imaging as a final product is not happening; it is used as a working tool."15 Similarly, Conrad Atkinson likens his argument for the teaching of intaglio, and other traditional techniques, to the arguments made for teaching Latin, it "fosters mental discipline."16 The efforts of printmaking students gives them an appreciation for the process itself. In addition to working within the tradition of experimentation of the UC Davis art department, this respect for process is a benefit unique to printmaking.

Atkinson teaches painting in addition to printmaking, but his own work is not always defined by expected parameters of media-specificity. He uses printmaking as a means of incorporating imagery onto sculptural objects, such as screen printing onto ceramic "land mines" and embroidering appropriated images onto men's suits. He is currently working on an exhibition in collaboration with a curator in New York. By faxing his images to the gallery to be further processed by a graphic designer he introduces a cycle of translation to the work. Atkinson will work back into the resulting images, ultimately creating wallpaper (a traditional commercial output of printmaking) for the gallery walls.17 While the process used in this back-and-forth sequence of reproducing, working into, then reproducing again are directly informed by printmaking, the actual means used (faxes, using digital imagery) represent a distinct departure from inking a metal plate.18

Increasingly, students are also exposed to the potentials of using digital technologies in printmaking. Innovations in acquiring, manipulating, and printing images continue to impact the relationship between photography and printmaking, and introduce an immediacy to the process. This can range from outputting a high-quality, archival pigment-based (as opposed to dye-based) digital print on the EPSON 10000 printer, which is available for their use in the Davis printmaking lab, to using PhotoShop as an intermediary composing tool for creating imagery shot onto a photolitho plate. While these new tools are useful and
undoubtedly popular among students, Linda Katzdorn states that printmakers have been using photo-based techniques for years (in silk screening, photoetching, and photolithography) and are in a sense "ahead of the game," by already having a familiarity with using photography as a step in the creation of a print.

ENDNOTES


2 Roland Petersen studied at Atelier 17 first in 1950 and subsequently in 1963 and again from 1970-71. Archana Horsting, the daughter of UC Davis sculpture professor Ruth Horsting, also studied at Atelier 17. She went on to co-found the Kala Art Institute in 1979, a printmaking, photography and book arts studio workshop in Berkeley.


4 From the author's conversation with Linda Katzdorn on February 27, 2003.

5 Richard Cramer, from the University of California History Digital Archives, http://sunsite.berkeley.edu/uchistory/general_history/campuses/ucd/departments_a.html#art


9 Tim Berry, a master printer, is the founder of Teaberry Press.

10 From the author's conversation with Linda Katzdorn, February 27, 2003.

11 Ibid.

12 Ibid.


15 From the author's conversation with Linda Katzdorn, February 27, 2003.


18 From the author's conversation with Conrad Atkinson, February 21, 2003.

19 From the author's conversation with Linda Katzdorn, February 27, 2003.
GUERRILLA CINEMATHEQUE COMES OF AGE
THE PACIFIC FILM ARCHIVE

Lee Amazonas

This whole thing is put together with spit, chewing gum, good intentions, cooperation from the film community and overhead paid by the Museum. I'm not over-budget or under-budget because I haven't got a budget.

—Pacific Film Archive founder Sheldon Renan in a February 1971 interview

FOR AN INSTITUTION WITH SUCH A JERRY- BUILT INCEPTION, the Pacific Film Archive (PFA) has not done too badly for itself as it progresses through its fourth decade of existence. The numbers tell a small part of the story: a permanent collection of over 10,000 films and videos (stored in temperature- and humidity-controlled vaults); a study center whose holdings include more than 7,600 books on film history, theory, criticism, and reference, 150 international film periodical titles, over 95,000 clipping files, 36,000 film stills, and 7,500 posters; and an exhibition program of approximately 500 film presentations each year serving an audience of over 50,000 viewers from the Berkeley campus and around the Bay Area.

Beyond statistics, it is the magnificent array of programs the Pacific Film Archive offers that provides a broader understanding of this vital institution. Many audience members and professionals throughout the film archive community would agree that the exhibition program at PFA is among the most richly varied and comprehensive shown anywhere, presenting avant-garde and experimental film, classic Hollywood, international cinema (from Iran to Finland to China to Brazil), video art, silent film, ethnographic film, and more. Aside from the many programs curated at PFA, many of these are collaborations with other institutions or selections from film festivals or traveling programs.

An active member of the International Federation of Film Archives (FIAF), the Pacific Film Archive is recognized throughout the world of cinemathques and film institutes for its commitment to film preservation and collection development. Filmmakers, scholars, and enthusiasts nationwide have the PFA library information line on speed dial. The library and year-round film programs are also UC Berkeley’s surprisingly low-profile gem, a resource for students, faculty, and staff (although they are not always aware of it) to use whenever the need or desire strikes.

Sheldon Renan in his office at the Pacific Film Archive. Photograph by Dennis Galloway. Date unknown. BAM/PFA.
While the Pacific Film Archive is the product of many personalities and forces, the principal founder was Sheldon Renan. The author of a book on underground film, Renan arrived in Berkeley from New York City in 1966 seemingly for the express purpose of establishing a film archive. By the end of the year he was exhibiting films on campus, the proceeds intended for the still unnamed institution. At the same time, lecturer, critic, and force of nature Albert Johnson (who would be involved with many major film festivals and organizations over the next three decades) programmed films for the campus's Committee for Arts and Lectures. He was assisted by Berkeley student Tom Luddy, who also operated the F. W. Murnau Film Society out of the University YWCA, wrote film notes for one repertory theater (the Cinema Guild), and was program director for another (the Telegraph Repertory Theater). The three men eventually combined their programming efforts.¹

Meanwhile, the San Francisco Bay Area was already infected with cinemophilia. One of the first repertory film theaters in the country, the Cinema Guild (also known for being an early setting for Pauline Kael to develop her incisive writing style) began operation in Berkeley in 1950 (in living rooms and basements before getting a theater in 1952). The San Francisco International Film Festival launched its inaugural program in 1958; Film Quarterly was given new life by the University of California Press and editor Ernest Callenbach that same year. (Both the festival and the journal continue to flourish.) The year 1961 was busy for Bay Area cineastes: the Cinema Guild's second Berkeley venue opened, the seminal avant-garde film distributor Canyon Cinema came into being in an independent film-maker's backyard, and the San Francisco Cinematheque began operation (as Canyon Cinematheque).

At the same time, college courses and programs in film studies grew, nationally and locally. San Francisco State College, now University, was seventh out of the 100 largest universities in number of film courses taught in 1963 and 1964 (UCLA was second).² The San Francisco Art Institute, which began offering cinema courses in 1947, established a film department in 1968. That same year, the New York Times reported that 60,000 students were enrolled in film courses nationwide, double the 1967 number.³ Berkeley's own Film Studies Program did not begin until 1976, but faculty in a variety of language and literature departments (William Nestruck in English, Bertrand Augst in French, among others) developed courses in the previous decade to meet the growing academic interest in cinema. Nation-wide, film societies had proliferated: from about 200 in 1950 to 4000 in 1964, most of them associated with colleges and universities.⁴
Finally, the late 1960s was certainly the time for an individual with a passion to act first—just do it—and think about the details (and the funding) later. This is exactly how the Pacific Film Archive came into being.

Renan had envisioned an archive under the aegis of a fine arts museum, similar to what he encountered at New York’s Museum of Modern Art, whose film department included an archive, a study center, and an exhibition program. He approached the San Francisco Museum of Art (now SFMOMA), which had a film program in the late 1940s. He was turned down, as he was at the Oakland Museum. The newly appointed director of the University Art Museum at Berkeley, Peter Selz, however, accepted Renan’s idea. Selz’s recent employment at MoMA in New York likely acquainted him with both the possibilities and the challenges of such an arrangement.

The world of film archives is a diverse and occasionally contentious one in terms of philosophy, priorities, and structure. While the Film Department at MoMA was a ready model for the many former New Yorkers involved in this effort, PFA’s formative years were most influenced by the ardent and mercurial founder and secretary-general of the Cinémathèque Française, Henri Langlois. Exceedingly generous with people he liked and trusted, Langlois had been instrumental in helping a number of European archives get off the ground since the 1930s. Renan and Langlois met in 1968; very soon, Selz and Langlois signed a document in the form of a contract, but with language that suggested nothing more binding than a shared set of goals.

Langlois came to Berkeley several times, assisting Renan and the fledgling archive with advice, the loan of films from the Cinémathèque’s fabled collection, and introductions to filmmakers and funding sources. The greatest impact of Langlois and the Cinémathèque was not material, but of spirit: the creation of a place where cinema patrons, artists, students, and critics could watch the widest range of the world’s films in the best technical and environmental conditions, that would also be a center for study, discussion, and exchange. The Cinémathèque was the place where future French New Wave directors (François Truffaut, Jean-Luc Godard, Eric Rohmer, among others) received their film education, especially in the Hollywood genre films that influenced their work. Accessibility became PFA’s watchword, as well.

Henri Langlois. Date of photograph unknown. BAM/PFA.
In 1967 Renan was appointed director of the Pacific Film Archive—the idea now had a name—and a national advisory board that included Susan Sontag, Andrew Sarris, and Ernest Callenbach was appointed. Starting in September film programs were on a weekly schedule at Wheeler Auditorium (and occasionally in a lecture hall in Dwinelle). As the Archive’s existence was quite unofficial as far as the university was concerned, the year’s budget, $800, was appropriated from the art museum’s publications allocation. The films shown were not unlike today’s programs at PFA: avant-garde and experimental, international, and classic cinema. In 1968 Luddy put together a Jean-Luc Godard retrospective (including a premiere), with the director introducing his films and even holding office hours on
campus for a week. The following year, Fritz Lang appeared with many films from his long career. Lotte Eisner, critic and biographer of Lang, also made the trip to Berkeley for this series (which had to be moved to an off-campus theater when a projection booth fire temporarily put Wheeler Hall out of commission). The organization that was put together "with spit, chewing gum, and good intentions" was gaining an international reputation before it even had an address.

Meanwhile, the political and social tenor of the times was reflected by some of the series and events PFA put on in partnership with Albert Johnson's Committee for Arts and Lectures, with titles such as Upheaval Film Marathon, Strange People Film Marathon, ASUC Strike Benefit. Berkeley's cinema lovers did not let the occasional inconveniences of upheaval keep them from Wheeler's doors. In spite of tear gas and fire hoses brought in by police against a student demonstration in April 1970, an audience of 500 attended an Ingmar Bergman film.

Another key staff member came to PFA as it prepared for its grand opening, Willard Morrison. While officially the projectionist, he also served ex officio as programmer, manager, and technical specialist in the early years. Renan often described him as "one of the three or four most knowledgeable people in 16mm in the United States," and Morrison's extensive collection of 16mm international classics was acquired by PFA and the Film Studies Program in the early 1980s, principally for study use by Berkeley students.

On January 22, 1971, PFA ended its peripatetic existence when its new home opened in the Berkeley Art Museum's brand new building with a three-day series of international and experimental cinema. For the record, Akira Kurosawa's Dodesukaden was the first film screened. It also caused the first PFA near-calamity when the reels arrived labeled—and numbered—in Japanese. While help from the Asia Center was hastily sought, Renan regaled the audience with anecdotes from film history, a practice he continued whenever the evening's entertainment was not going as planned.

The early 1970s marked a period of transition for the Pacific Film Archive. Tom Luddy, the Berkeley student who had programmed films for PFA in the 1960s, came back as program director in 1972 (after a stint working for a New York distributor of international films). He was appointed PFA director and curator in 1975 and remained until early 1980. In 1973, with PFA established and settled—if not funded—Sheldon Renan left to try his hand at film producing and screenwriting (He has since been involved in a wide range of film, media, and technology projects.) While the programming ethos did not change, Luddy's growing network of film contacts throughout the world generated a long and distinguished list of film artists who visited PFA during his tenure. Silent film performers, contemporary avant-garde filmmakers, film noir cinematographers, directors of the French New Wave as...
well as auteurs from Senegal, Vietnam, Hungary, and Hollywood helped make PFA a gathering place, as the founders envisioned, for those who love film.

In 1974, for example, archive audiences were treated to visits by the French director Agnes Varda; experimental filmmakers Stan Brakhage and Kenneth Anger, whose contrasts in style and content demonstrate the breadth of territory in the avant-garde; veteran Hollywood director Nicholas Ray and up-and-comer Martin Scorsese; the author William Burroughs; Lotte Reiniger, an experimental animator whose career spanned seven decades; and the actress Jane Fonda. Then, as now, a PFA program might look at the entire career of a director such as Douglas Sirk or Nicholas Ray, with the difference that, in the 1970s, these film artists were still alive and came as honored guests.

After Luddy left in 1980 to embark on his producing career, Lynda Myles, the director of the Edinburgh Film Festival, took over leadership of the archive. Due to monetary and structural factors, this was a crucial period for PFA's survival. Myles, together with the small staff, succeeded in keeping PFA alive while maintaining standards in the programs. However, within two years Myles also began a career in film production and left.

The year Luddy became director, the weekly Avant-Garde/Independent Film program was introduced. The new assistant curator, Edith Kramer (formerly manager of Canyon Cinema and film curator at SFMOMA), took charge of this program. The commitment to new conceptualizations of cinema that had been shown from the start was now a permanent and integral part of PFA exhibition (as well as its collection). Kramer, who took a brief leave, returned to assume the directorship in 1983, a position she still holds.

The past twenty years reflect the core values of the Pacific Film Archive's early days and reveal an expansion of programs into new areas. While preservation was always an Archive goal, the first preservation project was completed in 1987. Also under Kramer's watch, PFA has been a venue for many film festivals: San Francisco International (starting in 1984), Margaret Mead, Human Rights Watch International, San Francisco Asian American International, Women of Color, San Francisco Video Festival, and others. A number of collaborations with the wider Berkeley community (Berkeley High School and the Berkeley Historical Society, to name two) have also been initiated.

In 1986 Kathy Geritz took over the avant-garde program (which she runs today as Alternative Visions), and Kramer appointed Steve Seid in 1988 to begin a weekly Video Art
program. These programs give current experimenters in moving picture media an unparalleled forum to show their work and engage their audiences in discussions of ideas and techniques. Ever-evolving notions of what is experimental have a place to develop and see the light of day.

Japanese cinema is another programming emphasis from the early years that has continued to flourish. Just as the Japanese collection contains the works of filmmakers not normally seen outside of Japan, the programming has sought to introduce new directors and genres. Both the collection and the exhibitions today are under the curatorial supervision of Mona Nagai. Whether edgy films depicting restless youth of the 1960s or cinema of the World War II era, these programs always bring to the screen bodies of rarely seen work about which little is known, even in the cinema studies community. The films of internationally renowned directors Seijun Suzuki, Yasuzo Masumura, and Nagisa Oshima were shown at PFA long before most filmgoers in the United States were aware of them. Today’s audiences have the opportunity to explore the works of young filmmakers in the “neo-eiga: New Japanese Cinema” programs.

Berkeley classes held film showings at PFA as early as 1976, when lectures and screenings by visiting instructors such as film historian Yvette Biro and the late critic Raymond Durgnat enriched the exhibition program. (Class screenings on PFA’s schedule are open to the public.) The Film Studies Program began holding regular class screenings at the Archive in 1979, with Albert Johnson’s courses, Images of Blacks on Film (later, Images of Minorities in Film) and Third World Cinema. Johnson continued to offer these popular programs until his death in 1998. Collaborative relationships with instructors and departments have grown in recent years; Film 50, an introductory film survey developed by Marilyn Fabe (the first instructor hired specifically for Film Studies), plays to sold-out audiences of students, BAM/PFA members, and community members fortunate enough to get a ticket.

PFA’s librarian and curators of avant-garde film and video have all taught university courses, some for several years. In addition, students can gain experience as interns in the library and as student curators for the avant-garde program. Curatorial interns organize annual programs that feature the work of student filmmakers. (The Women of Color Film Festival is also a student initiative.) Often in collaboration with the Consortium for the Arts at UC Berkeley, PFA sponsors artists’ residencies, which bring filmmakers for screenings and meetings with students for periods of one day to two weeks. This is a more formalized version of Godard’s 1969 visit, but inspired by the same notion of bringing together artists, audiences, and students. The yearly “How to Read a Film” workshops give high school teachers the background and the tools to bring cinema and media awareness into their curricula.

Chantal Akerman at the Pacific Film Archive, December 1, 1976. Photograph by Harry Dahlgren. BAM/PFA.
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Preservation and the Film Collection

One of the great pleasures I’ve had was discovering what a funky playhouse the Archive vaults can be—a treasure trove of odds and ends, some real rarities, a jewel or two, and a lot of obscure stuff. It is a place where, for me, every day is Christmas. . . . [Its collection] is a wonderful mirror of PFA’s overall mad, eclectic passion for film.

—Russell Merritt, introducing “A Potpourri of Puppet Pleasures,”
June 6, 1995

A film collection is often the result of happenstance and a curator’s ability to convince a potential donor that an archive’s vaults would make a better home for a film than the owner’s garage. A grant occasionally helps an institution’s acquisitions, but even the wealthiest organizations are unable to buy the films they want. Nevertheless, collections are shaped by the tastes and preservation priorities of the people who manage them.

Once PFA had a permanent home and a place to store films, the acquisitions began. The basis of the West Coast Avant-Garde collection and a large number of Japanese films arrived during 1971. These two are still among the most significant collections at the archive, frequently requested for viewing by local and visiting scholars.

The most explicit assertion in the agreement signed by Selz and Langlois states PFA’s promise “to protect the films of independent California filmmakers and to contribute to their spreading, their preservation and protection.” (The “spreading” had already begun, from the very first screenings Renan arranged in 1966. He had, after all, written one of the first books on experimental cinema.) The 1960s had seen a surge in works from West Coast (often Bay Area) experimental filmmakers such as Bruce Conner, Chick Strand, Bruce Baillie, Gunvor Nelson, and Larry Jordan. Many of these artists saw the Pacific Film Archive as a safe haven for their material as well as a venue for their presentation. Deposits of pre-print elements, films, and videos from makers and grants from funding agencies have produced a major and unique collection.

The Japanese collection, the largest outside of Japan, did not simply appear on the doorstep (although this has happened on occasion). Spurred by love of Japanese cinema, a desire to see PFA reflect film art of the entire Pacific Rim (a factor in the institution’s naming), and Langlois’s opportune advice, Renan solicited major Japanese distributors operating in California and convinced them that a permanent California home for their prints would benefit everyone.

Soviet silents (including rare examples of Russian Eccentric cinema), seminal 1970s video art, films from Eastern Europe and Soviet Georgia (pursued and acquired by Tom Luddy during his tenure), and rarely seen animation are among other major concentrations found in PFA vaults.

An essential—and costly—part of collection management is preservation. While this was part of PFA’s mission from its inception, it was not until 1987 that the Archive was able to undertake its first preservation effort. The final reel of the 1919 La Tosca, identified for PFA by Langlois in 1976 and not known to exist elsewhere, was very preservation-worthy as it starred one of Italy’s most renowned silent-film divas, Francesca Bertini. This reel was made from volatile cellulose nitrate, as were virtually all films manufactured before 1950, a fact that presents archivists with their greatest challenge in terms of time and choosing which films to save. Videotape has an even shorter shelf life, and experimental work in that medium requires timely attention.
Thanks to the active interest of prominent film directors, some production and distribution companies, and the occasional cable television station, the late 1980s and early 1990s witnessed a surge of public awareness of film preservation. (This interest appears to continue in the form of the rerelease of restored versions of films, the yearly announcement of the Library of Congress’s additions to its National Film Registry, and the not infrequent feature stories on the fragility of some part of the American artistic heritage and how it is being saved.) PFA received its first grant for preservation in 1990, and since then many projects have been funded and completed, protecting the major collections of film and video, as well as irreplaceable individual works such as La Tosca.

The Library and Film Study Center

There are many wonderful reference libraries in the East Bay, but none so acutely specialized as that run by the angels at the Pacific Film Archive. I called the other day asking for the name of a half-remembered early ’60s science fiction film; all I could recall about it was that it involved the Van Allen radiation belt catching on fire. “Let’s see, Van Allen radiation belts...” says the librarian, flipping through some kind of miraculous index. “Here it is! Voyage to the Bottom of the Sea, 1961, Irwin Allen.”


The PFA Library and Film Study Center opened in 1972 as part of the original conception of the Pacific Film Archive. Begun by Linda Artel (who also started the Children’s Film Program in the same year), the library is the largest of its kind in Northern California and among a small and select group of such facilities located anywhere. The noncirculating holdings contain both rare and standard books and periodicals from many countries—a Russian cinema encyclopedia that is one of a handful of sets available anywhere outside of Russia, issues of journals that stopped publication long ago, sometimes after very few editions. Distributor catalogs—past and present—help in the increasingly difficult search for film print availability. Nearly a thousand exhibitor manuals and pressbooks provide primary source material for researchers of film production history, business practices, advertising, slogans, and graphic design. And, growing by about one file drawer every few months, the overstuffed clipping files are chock-full of articles, pamphlets, documents, flyers, and other printed material, all meticulously organized and cross-referenced by film title, person's name, subject, and film festival or cinematheque. Some of this material is gradually being made available on the Internet as it continues to be painstakingly transferred into digital format through the grant-funded CineFiles project.

The film and video collection and access to the holdings of the study center are open to the entire campus community as well as to filmmakers, scholars, programmers, critics, and others with film-related research needs. (Some services cost a modest fee.) The film information service, which answers all questions great and small about cinema, is available to anyone with a telephone. A documentary filmmaker may need to find all extant battlefield footage shot in Belgium during World War I or a Hollywood actor may need to find all films—fiction and nonfiction—that deal with autism to prepare for a role. A query may come from a doctor organizing a conference who needs to know what films concern plastic surgery and how can she obtain them (and, by the way, also obtain the rights for public showing), or a historian employed by a major bank seeking out footage of the founder as well as information (and prints) of the films he financed. Sometimes, the question comes from friends settling a bet (in what film did Mae West say “come up and see me sometime” and
did she actually say it?).

Berkeley professors use the library's resources to research their publications or find prints they need for use in their classes. Students from Berkeley and all Bay Area film schools use the study center to prepare for exams and research papers. They are not always film majors—students in economics, history, art, psychology, business, ethnic studies, sociology, and the languages often choose projects that involve the historical, aesthetic, technological, theoretical, business, or social aspects of film and filmmaking. Sometimes, students need a little guidance from the reference staff ("I need to write a paper on Asian-American women in film and it's due tomorrow").

PFA staff also uses the library when preparing future programs, cataloging films, or conducting research for film notes for the Berkeley Art Museum and Pacific Film Archive bimonthly publication. Many grants and a phalanx of interns and volunteers help the small library staff, headed by Nancy Goldman, keep the whole operation going.

The Film-Going Experience

Watching films in the "best possible conditions" means many things, although not necessarily the comfort of the seats (deemed, until recently, the hardest in the Bay Area). From the start, Renan felt that critical to the design of a theater were good sight lines. The floor was pitched at just the right angle to ensure that everyone seated had an unobstructed view of the screen, regardless of individual differences in height. To eliminate one major source of audience noise and distraction, food and drink were—and remain—prohibited. (One student wrote of PFA as a place "where the word popcorn is never spoken and lives are sometimes turned around.") The curatorial staff tirelessly seeks the best possible prints in their original formats, and the projectionists who examine and show the prints are famously perfectionist. Head projectionist Craig Valenza has practiced his art at PFA since its very early days. The theater ushers are alert to any stray beam of light or unidentified hum that might invade the audience's cinema experience. A 1988 renovation and 1991 installation of Dolby Surround-sound system (both the gifts of donors) further improved the conditions for viewing. In 1999, seismic realities caught up with PFAs George Gund Theater causing a move to a new 222-seat facility across the street. The same high technical standards prevail in the new (and temporary) space with the added benefit of comfortable seats.

An important element of a successful cinematheque or film institute exhibition program is the film note. In the heyday of the film club, it was not uncommon for a one- to three-page essay to accompany the evening's showcase. These notes sought to educate the audience about cinema beyond the film at hand. Formal, if considerably shorter, film notes in a monthly calendar began at PFA in 1973. As brief as these were, they managed to add elements of film history and criticism to the necessary plot description and credits. Luddy's experience as Cinema Guild film notes writer no doubt informed the tone of PFAs descriptions. He frequently brought in outside filmmakers and critics, Yvette Biro, Raymond Durgnat, Errol Morris, and Jean-Pierre Gorin, among others, who produced richly conceived short notes. The film notes have developed into an art form all their own. Educating the reader is important, but so is producing a piece of critical writing that engages and even entertains. Editor Judy Bloch has been guiding the notes in this direction since 1980.

A glance at some of the special events that took place at the Pacific Film Archive will add understanding of the wide range of audiences that call PFA home. Special evenings were not only about films and presenting their makers in person. Sometimes the event organizers went beyond sight and sound to reach audiences. A 1978 screening of Les Blank's Always for Pleasure (a film exploring the New Orleans cultural propensity for a good time) was accompanied not only by live Cajun music, but also by "smellaroud”—the pungent
fragrance of Louisiana red beans and rice cooking in the wings. Called “aromarama” the following year for Blank’s *Garlic Is As Good As 10 Mothers*, the technique remained the same.

Two PFA events in 1993 give a glimpse of the range of sensibilities, from the solemn to the playful, that fit agreeably within the archive’s mission. Venerable Italian director Michelangelo Antonioni was honored with the Berkeley Citation in a ceremony at PFA presided over by the chancellor. Three months later, counterculture legend Wavy Gravy held court as free ice cream was given away in the lobby and a program of psychedelic music films from the 1960s screened in the theater.

The live entertainment was not always listed on the program. On more than one occasion over the years, Albert Johnson was known to finish his introduction to a Fred Astaire or Vincente Minnelli musical with his own soft shoe and serenade. Other times, noncinematic concerns informed the evening’s event. “The Spanish Civil War on Film,” a series observing the conflict’s fiftieth anniversary in 1986, was inaugurated by a visit by several surviving—and voluble—veterans of the Abraham Lincoln Brigade. The reminiscences and spirited discussions that followed—both inside and outside of the theater—confirmed that Berkeley was still the home of political contrasts and debates. As eclectic as programming is, there are times when the evening’s entertainment drew a very different crowd: “Elvis Citings,” a compilation program from 1990, and the 1994 “Bowling: Life in the Fast Lane,” it is safe to say, introduced new audiences to PFA.

A regular visitor but special event himself was William K. Everson, film historian, New York University instructor, and collector. Everson made the first of his semiannual visits to PFA in 1973. Both beloved and admired, Everson shared his vast collection and his detailed and idiosyncratic knowledge of all aspects of film history with PFA audiences until his death in 1996.

Silent films have been shown at PFA since Langlois lent treasures from the Cinémathéque’s collection during the Wheeler and Dwinelle Hall days. While live musical accompaniment may not have been a dependable feature during the prehistory, it has been
a requisite part of a silent film program for most of PFA's existence. Sometimes the piano accompanist will view the film ahead of time and create a score from existing and original elements; other times the pianist will improvise as the film plays for the audience. On occasion a silent film showing will be the setting for an extraordinary event. The 1990s saw a number of unusual harmonic configurations: a theremin trio (for the Soviet science fiction film Aelita), a one-man band, and a group with fanciful historical instruments such as the marxophone and the pocket clarinet. The “Unsilent Film” series, with the help of a grant, commissioned composers to create original film scores and perform them at Archive screenings. And PFA has been one of the few places outside Japan where audiences could experience benshi, the Japanese narrative art for silent films. One of the few present-day benshi practitioners came for a short series in 1989 and an extensive program in 2002.

The best “events,” however, may not be planned. While the PFA presentation of a newly restored print of D. W. Griffith’s Intolerance at the Castro Theater in January 1990 was special in terms of venue and Wurlitzer organ accompaniment, it was the audience reaction to this 1916 spectacle that made it a memorable night. The emotional and vocal responses of the sold-out house to every chase sequence, breathtaking shot, or shift in fortune for a beloved or despised character is still recalled by those who were present. For many, it was the first silent film they had ever seen. The evening’s success inspired an occasional series of PFA programs at the Castro over the next few years, “The Movie Palace Experience.”

The late 1960s may have been the right time—maybe one of the only times—for an organization such as the Pacific Film Archive to arise and become a permanent university institution, given the insurgent methods used to bring it about. It was also a time when film societies flourished, art and repertory houses appeared even in mid-size cities, and academic attention to the cinema grew beyond the neglected corners of more established disciplines. But that does not mean that cinephilia is a phenomenon of a past, more visually literate time or that there has been a “decay of cinema.” Edith Kramer summed up the perspective that has informed PFA’s programming from the earliest Sheldon Renan days of “let’s put on a show”:

Edith Kramer, awarded Officier dans l’Ordre des Arts et des Lettres. Presented by Emmanuel Delloye, Cultural Attaché, January 23, 2000, BAM/PFA.

Ever since I’ve been in this business somebody is saying, “Film is dead.” [But] there are still experiments going on, and people still doing original things, wonderful things, with the medium that have nothing to do with the business of film. I really have no patience with predictions of “this is the end” or “there are no good films this year.” The people who say that are not looking at cinema the way we are looking at it.

It is not the business of film, but the sheer enjoyment and astonishment of film in its many forms, that keeps the Pacific Film Archive moving forward and looking back at the same time.
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"ONE OF THE HOTTEST NEW JOURNALS AROUND," burred the New York Times early on about *Representations*—now 20 years old. A University of California Press brochure announced the new quarterly in February 1983. It featured a bright red cover by renowned book designer Wolfgang Lederer. The color of sirens or red flags, the rakishly tilted title and shifts in font, the aggressive elegance gave way on the inside to an academic manifesto, a preview of the first year’s contents, and a list of fifteen Berkeley faculty from six departments comprising the editorial committee. On the back were blurbs from a cultural studies pantheon: historian Natalie Zemon Davis, philosopher-historian Michel Foucault, anthropologist Clifford Geertz. The signals were obviously mixed. The flashy exterior was belied by the heavy academic prose (“The aim of *Representations* is to transform and enrich [an] understanding of cultures . . . which is theoretically sophisticated but with a high degree of social, historical, and textual specificity”); the table of contents for the year was diffuse, not to say incoherent, and the endorsers hedged their bets. What was being represented here?

To begin with, it was the heyday of interdisciplinary “breaking out,” as the New York Times piece had it. This was partly undertow from the 1960s. Conservative critics liked to blame “Tenured Radicals,” together with foreign agents, particularly from the Left Bank and British redbrick universities. But conspiracy theories disguised, more or less deliberately, the fact that the widening of access and the diversification of interests in higher education had put pressure on disciplinary boundaries while at the same time producing new waves of specialists. In the humanities and the “softer” social sciences such as cultural anthropology or historical sociology the rise of interdisciplinary interests was by and large an earnest response to these crosscurrents, not the junior rebellion that antagonists and enthusiasts sometimes wanted to imagine. It gave rise to publications such as *Representations* and institutions such as the Townsend Center for the Humanities at Berkeley—they created trading zones where scholars could exchange insights and expertise. University presses, provosts, and deans sponsored and subsidized these initiatives; no doubt, with reasons of their own, from leverage against tribal departments to recruitment and fund-raising, but radical politics was certainly not among them. In any case, academic disciplines in the modern university have never been so deeply rooted as it suits rebels and traditionalists, who should know better, to believe.

“Culture” was a keyword, a conjuring word too, in this period of disciplinary cross-wiring—the word or its derivatives appeared six times, second only to “representations,” in the two hundred-plus words of the inaugural *Representations* brochure. It was not a stretch for students of texts, artifacts, or historical documents to agree that they had been talking Culture all along or to think there was much to be learned from extending the conversation. The fuzzy terminology was, if anything, an asset. Cultures could be high or low, formal or informal, canonical or under construction, medium-specific or multimedia. Oedipal-bashing of the notion of culture by anthropologists who blamed it for dodging the complexities and complicities of ethnographic work was itself a kind of cultural ritual; critical theory on the ideological functions of culture as a screen of false consciousness and a tool of political
domination actually inflated the sense of its power. For humanities scholars used to jibes about ivory towers it was good for the professional ego to suppose that culture made the world go round.

Literary studies were particularly susceptible. Chronically caught between literature's self-importance and criticism's second fiddle, they faced yet another bout of identity crises in the 1970s and 1980s. The old school of New Criticism, insisting on the formal properties of great literary texts and the genius of canonical authors, had invited a pendulum swing—at least two swings, as it happened, one destabilizing form formally through close analysis of the play of language; the other contextualizing it in the political and social interests that ran through and beyond literature. Literary critics divided along these faultlines, but they also sought alliances with a mix of entitlement and anxiety that charmed or put off people in other fields. Nine of the fifteen members of editorial board listed in the inaugural brochure were literary scholars, seven of them from English.

This is very general. Close to home, *Representations* was "Reps" and its story a very local tale. In one version that made the rounds it was Berkeley vs. the East, Yale in particular. There was something to this, but not much. A new wave of literary critical theory, so the story goes, first hit American shores in the East with a surge of Continental imports, especially French and "deconstructionist"; Berkeley, aspiring to the big time, countered with an historically inflected, contextualizing criticism and its own Continental, Michel Foucault. Even in the academic world the development of "schools" is not quite so formulaic and ingrown as this.

Self-consciousness about the East Coast certainly existed, but it was not doctrinal. The academic networks were thickest and the graduate programs had real (and imagined) prestige there. Catherine Gallagher and I were the only California natives on the Reps board; she was the only Berkeley PhD; I have an MA in history from Berkeley, purging the taint having been a Stanford undergraduate, but my PhD is from Harvard. By the 1980s the balance was shifting to bring Berkeley's own brand of "campanilismo," the world as seen from a Campanile, more in line with reality. David Lodge's hilarious 1975 academic novel *Changing Places* had already sent up Berkeley as an obligatory destination on the peripatetic circuit of literary studies conferences, lectures, and seminars. Berkeley scholars were welcoming visitors and meeting at far-flung congresses, institutes, centers, and airports but not used to gathering together across departmental lines at home. The gap was noticed by mostly younger tenured faculty in departments top-heavy with senior scholars who imagined themselves forever young in California. At dinner parties and in the cafes and the gourmet ghetto of post-political Berkeley it became clear that We Could Not Go on Meeting Like This.

The early files in the large archive that *Representations* has amassed suggest both eagerness and suspicion about crossing the boundaries of a highly departmentalized culture. The earliest item in a "Prehistory/Proposals" folder is a letter on English department stationery by Stephen Greenblatt, a rising star in Elizabethan literary studies:

Most of us have been touched in recent years by what Clifford Geertz has called the blurring of genres or by the refiguration of our own disciplines under the pressure of advanced work in other disciplines. In some cases, this blurring has led to what that term implies: confusion, the loss of stable boundaries, inept dabbling in imperfectly grasped materials. But in many other cases a sensitivity to the methods and achievements of other disciplines that intersect with one's own has led to powerful and original advances in the interpretation of cultural institutions and artifacts. It seems to me that much is to be gained from fostering this sensitivity and at the same time subjecting it to criticism; I think, moreover, that given the strength
and the diversity of Berkeley and other universities in the area, we are in a quite favorable position to do so.

At least twenty faculty, three from the Santa Cruz campus of the university, accepted the invitation to meet on October 16, 1980, "to discuss what, if anything, we might do to profit from each other's work."7

I don't have very exact recollections of the early meetings beyond bright people sizing one another up without looking too conspicuous or shocked by others' disciplinary proclivities. The files are incomplete for the few sentences on work in progress solicited for the October 16 meeting; these were distributed and three papers from the group discussed in French department library on December 2 and 9. On January 13, 1981, a group met at the house of Paul and Svetlana Alpers on Hawthorne Terrace a few blocks up the hill on the north side of the Berkeley campus to discuss historian Lynn Hunt's paper on the radical iconography of the French Revolution and, as Steve Greenblatt's note confirming the occasion reminded us, "to consider Where We Are to Go from Here."8

A journal was only one possibility. In a list of talking points "The Berkeley Institute for Cultural Studies" would have been centered in Berkeley, with outside "affiliates or friends," a largely informal exchange of seminars, courses, or discussion groups, and a public presence in forums with visitors, conferences, and a journal.9 This plan sounds like a mix of the contemporary academy and the eighteenth-century salon. Non-joiners were skeptical and opted out; literary people alternately relished in and fretted about the clubby exclusiveness and the prospect of departmental energies being sapped, particularly in English. The Big Business of departments such as History or Political Science could hardly be bothered about a piddling boutique operation.

The first formal proposal for an as-yet unnamed journal is dated February 8, 1981. It would be

organized around a broad problem rather than a particular academic topic, field, or disciplinary method . . . because it is increasingly the case that established disciplinary rubrics and procedures are being put into question. . . . We would like to develop a forum in which this kind of question and questioning would be addressed from the point of view of various academic perspectives. No such journal now exists.

The draft went on to admit that "this is to speak too quickly and too vaguely"—with good reason; it did not secure the grant it was written for.10

The next round of proposals made up for that. The notion of representation had surfaced early on with multiple valences—standing for a constituency; arguing a position; taking something or someone's place. Cultural performances and productions arguably did all that, though those in the group who were inclined to think in terms of form and structure worried about representation as just another distorting mirror while the more material or history-minded thought that representation smacked of formalism. Only in the plural did the idea really click. "Representations" fudged differences, but it was straightforward enough in signaling resistance to abstract theorizing or interpretative orthodoxy.

A "Pre-History/Proposals" file contains the yellow sheets of an undated rough-draft proposal, with Svetlana Alpers' name written beneath Steve Greenblatt's as co-editors; the file includes copies of a more finished text with various, mostly small emendations by members of the group. An abbreviated proposal (March 31, 1981) in a letter to Alain Henon, journals editor of the University of California Press, seems not to have been sent until May 26, 1981, accompanied by a list of suggested referees to vouch for the project. The most
“representative” lines declare:

The heart of the matter for us all is the problem of representation, considered both in relation to the objects of our study and the mode in which we conduct it. The principles on which a set of stable correspondences were posited between image and object, symbol and reality, representative and represented, have eroded. If this erosion has led to a crisis of theory of disciplinary self-definition, it has posed possibilities of a renewed empirical engagement which need not be at the expense of methodological sophistication. We propose to found a journal, called Representations, to print the best of this work.11

Heady pronouncements like this rarely get work done, but this time the devil did not turn up in the details. The group arrived at working expectations that, with only occasional tinkering, have functioned remarkably well over the years. This near-miracle was largely due to the fact that a journal was an extension of a group used to talking and reading with one another, all at Berkeley and all assuming that an editorial board would be something like a

With co-chairs (in chairs) Stephen Greenblatt, professor of English, and Svetlana Alpers, professor of art history, are members of the editorial board of the new journal, Representations. Left to right: Paul Alpers (English), Frances Ferguson (English), Randolph Starn (history), Paul Rabinow (anthropology), Michael Rogin (political science), Joel Fineman (English), Steven Knapp (English), Thomas Laquer (history), Catherine Gallagher (English), and Walter Michaels (English). Other board members, not pictured, are Lynn Hunt of history and R. Howard Bloch and Denis Hollier of French. From California Monthly, 92:4 (March-April 1983), 5.
collective or cooperative; everyone expected to pitch in, to demand the best from ourselves and potential contributors, and to agree that we could disagree without disbanding. After some experiment, usual practice was for submissions, solicited or not, to be read by two members of the board and, with positive readings and comments or “yellows” as they came to be called after the color of the comment sheet, read and discussed by the whole board. A two-thirds vote, normally of those present except in particularly controversial cases, was required for an imprimatur, though there was an informal, one-time “Fineman Exception” (after Joel Fineman) for anyone who thought a piece was so important as to preempt a negative majority too benighted to get with it. Articles were accepted outright or, more often, with recommended or required revisions suggested by the board’s discussion and reported to the author in a letter drafted by board members with a particular interest or expertise but usually sent out over a co-editor’s name. Rejection letters were standard or “friendly,” which meant with more or less encouraging comments. There was no “unfriendly” category, however tempting it may have been to invent one.

Evening meetings kept up the informal sociability that had brought the group together in the first place. After 1987 the board ordinarily met twice a month for two hours at lunchtime around the long yellow oak table in the miniature conference room at the Townsend Center’s first office on the third floor of Stephens Hall. The evening meetings came to be reserved for wine and cheese, sometimes for take-out food, over papers offered for discussion by one or another board member. It was understood that these essays would be published—if their authors decided that the discussion was encouraging enough. Not everyone did. All of us had the uneasy experience of explaining to friends whose papers we had solicited why their papers were being rejected or sent back to the drawing boards. For all that, with a few exceptions, some bond that was easy to see but hard to explain very well linked a group of people who were not good at hiding their light under bushels.

Beginning in 1984-85, Barrett Watten, the brilliant poet, critic, and editor who became associate editor responsible for producing the journal, took telegraphic notes at editorial meetings. (A graduate student assistant, Tom Judge, handled the editorial chores during the first year.) Together with other papers in the archives, particularly readers’ comments and correspondence with authors, they fill in and complicate the story of two currents of literary-historical scholarship associated with the journal—not to mention the academic teapot tempests that the board often faced or created. Practitioners and critics, especially critics, have written extensively about New Historicism and New Cultural History. The paper trail behind-the-scenes will not necessarily change the picture very much, but it does show how much the labeling of critical “schools” flattens out different voices and particular cases and how much rather ponderous intellectual genealogies are made up after the fact. The board shied away from manifestos on method and never published a statement of principles. It was not for want of trying. Group lore converted the failure into a virtue of running circles around theory police and disciplinary border patrols. In fact, the board was not good at programmatic statements, but the reasons for this went beyond the lame, grant-writer’s prose of the failed or rejected drafts in the archives.

There was, after all, no way for the group to represent all its differences. Evasion was a positive gesture. The annals of scholarship are littered with proclamations of new movements, all of them eventually turned conventional and all bound at the hip with the propositions they were rejecting. The cross-hatching of intentions and forms of attention was a problematic one that proclamations in the journal were not going to make better and would probably make worse. Despite the bow to history in the name, New Historicism was a literary critical subculture, with its main constituencies in the Renaissance or nineteenth-century branches of English departments; it had parasitical uses for history as a convenient ally
against the cult of the self-sufficient work of art. New Cultural History was a cover for the importation of literary critical interests into history as a counter to the literalism of historians. A standard criticism of New Historicism by literary critics had it stuck in a diluted cultural materialism; a standard criticism of New Cultural History from historians, if they were in the least interested, was that it was all too literary and theoretical. A declaration of solidarity would have missed what a perceptive Italian reviewer described as the “pleasure of intellectual work,” not to mention the role of happenstance. The “new cultural history” was named, a little tongue-in-cheek, over lunch at an Indian restaurant in Berkeley; “new historicism” was Steve Greenblatt’s stab at a catchy title for a paper en route to deliver it in Australia.

However leery of guidelines, the journal generated and continued to attract a repertory of critical strategies and topics. You knew a Representations piece when you saw it. Some earmarks of the Reps style sprang from wanting to counter the viscous predictability of academic argument with unexpected connections and contexts. There was a predilection for the arresting anecdote and for asymmetrical juxtapositions of things that turned out to have everything to do with one another: so, at random from the early issues, History as Sorcery; Male Hysteria; Nineteenth-Century American Literature and the Gold Standard; Medieval Fables and Freud’s Jewish Jokes; Elizabethan Literature and Tobacco. The aim of being theoretically literate but not literally theoretical, empirical without being square, was a driving basso continuo under whatever particular object, text, or case at hand. This in-betweenness extended to cultural politics and led to accusations both of copycatting out of pinkish fellaor travelling in the culture wars of the 1980s and early 1990s. Without being prescribed, topics tended to cluster: the “politics” of the human body; collective memory and commemorations; art as representation; authority in science; the Old World and the New. Special issues were commissioned to board members around these topics.

Thinking globally and acting locally was sloganeering but not just a slogan in Representations’s first slice of time, though no one on the editorial board would have put it so crudely then. The clearest sign that the journal had arrived was the flatterying tribute of a parody issue, Mreprsentations (sic), by Berkeley graduate students in 1990. Whether there could be life after parody would be a representative issue for the future of the journal.
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One of the crucial early supporters of *Representations* was then-UC Berkeley provost Robert Middlekauff, a distinguished historian of Colonial America and former Marine with tough-minded views about academic work.


Most materials are filed in the *Representations* office, 228 Wheeler Hall; rejected papers, from 1983-95, are in deposit in the law school library at Boalt Hall on the Berkeley campus.

In a file "Representations; S. Greenblatt," the Wheeler archives includes acceptances from Hayden White, Jim Clifford and Margaret Brose at UC Santa Cruz; an undated checklist in Greenblatt's hand for the first meeting lists Charles Muscatine, Paul Alpers, Stephen Greenblatt, Frances Ferguson, Walter Benn Michaels, Catherine Gallagher, Joel Fineman, Steven Knapp, Svetlana Alpers, Thomas Laqueur, Randolph Starn, Leo Bersani, Howard Bloch, Lynn Hunt, and Michael Rogen.

"Representations; S. Greenblatt."

"Representations; S. Greenblatt."

This proposal was evidently sent to the Pahlavi Foundation, as I remember, on the recommendation of Howard Bloch; the Foundation's losses were soon immeasurably greater than the would-be journals.

"Pre-History/Proposals"; the suggested referees were Natalie Zemon Davis, Stanley Fish, Michael Fried, Clifford Geertz, Gerald Graff, Geoffrey Hartmann, Alvin B. Kiernan, Rosalind Krauss, Michael Walzer, and Hayden White.

In the mid-80s some 25-30 articles were typically accepted out of as many as 400 submissions; in 2001-02 there were two acceptances "as is," three "with recommended revisions," ten "with required revisions," and five authors were invited to rework and resubmit their essays. Between 1999 and 2002 the number of submissions had settled to an average 165, with an acceptance rate between 6 percent and 9 percent.
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COMMITMENT

Constance Lewallen

FROM ITS EARLIEST YEARS the Berkeley Art Museum demonstrated a commitment to radical new art of the region. Assemblage was the dominant form of expression among Beat artists of the 1950s; Bay Area assemblage, dubbed Funk by Berkeley Art Museum director Peter Selz in his eponymous 1967 exhibition, was characterized by a combining of found objects and urban detritus in such a way as to suggest decay. With its sexual and political overtones, assemblage also served as an antidote to the consumerist and conformist fifties. Beat artists, who included Bruce Conner, Wally Hedrick, and Jay DeFeo, among others, stayed underground during the Eisenhower years, but the experimental literary and art movements of the Beat era laid the seeds of the cultural upheavals of the sixties and the emergence of a new avant-garde.

It was, however, the Vietnam War that defined the consciousness of the late 1960s and the 1970s. In the waning years of the sixties, it sometimes seemed as if a whole generation was in battle against a morally bankrupt United States government and the corporate establishment it held responsible for the protracted military involvement in Vietnam, the first telegenic war. The fulcrum of protest against inequality at home and the war abroad was the University of California, Berkeley, the scene not only of countless antiwar demonstrations but also of the Free Speech Movement, the 1969 third-world student organization strike, which met with violent police action, and conflicts over People’s Park.

Significantly, Berkeley’s art museum was one of the major sites to recognize and bring to public view radical changes in the visual arts. Young Bay Area Conceptual artists, like their contemporaries in other parts of the world, were devising entirely new genres of artmaking—performance, video, installation earthworks—that emphasized process over result. If the war did not directly influence the new forms of artistic expression that emerged, it brought into focus attitudinal shifts and alternative life styles. The San Francisco Haight Ashbury neighborhood bordering Golden Gate Park became identified with the hippies and their youthful longings for harmony and freedom, as well as their sexual and drug experimentation. The well-publicized 1967 Summer of Love served as a clarion call to youth everywhere, and those with artistic aspirations moved to the Bay Area to attend one of its many art schools or universities.

At issue among vanguard artists was the nature of the art object as a commodity. Working in forms that were emphatically and deliberately noncommercial, these artists also gravitated toward the use of materials in their raw state to express their disgust with modern society’s disregard for and destruction of nature through war and pollution. In response to this new zeitgeist, Berkeley Art Museum curators Brenda Richardson and Susan Rannels presented “The Eighties” in 1970, soon after the museum moved into its new building. Richardson and Rannels asked a group of artists to address in their works what the world would be like in the 1980s. They came up with an array of oddities, including Wayne E. Campbell’s latex room titled Table the Problem; James Melchert’s wishing well consisting of a sheet of Plexiglas covered with water drops and money suspended over the heads of viewers; and, emanating from a wooden box, William Wiley’s faint, tape-recorded voice repeating over and over, “This is the eighties, this is the eighties.”
Much of the art in the show looked as if it were still in progress, and some of it was. The artists agreed to spend time in the galleries, working, talking to visitors, and encouraging them to present their own ideas, artwork, poetry, or music in a designated “free space” marked by a neon sign. Depending on the day, one might see typewritten statements about the future tacked onto the wall, or latex sculptures representing deformed bodies, or a tombstone with images of flowers and the words “Rest Assured” etched into it. As one of the artists commented, “You kind of get the public to come in every day to see what’s happening, instead of to come to see what has happened . . . that’s what we need for the eighties.”

The decision to blur the distinction between gallery and studio, spectator and artist (observer and participant), art and life came out of several long and freewheeling conversations among the artists and foreshadowed an attitude that would become de rigueur as the decade progressed.

The most infamous piece in the show was Terry Fox’s *Defoliation*, performed on opening night. To express his anger over the U.S. military’s scorched earth policy in Vietnam, Fox used a flamethrower—the type used in Vietnam to cremate plants—to burn a section of star jasmine plantings on the Berkeley campus.

This was my first political work. I wanted to destroy the flowers in a very calculating way. By burning a perfect rectangle right in the middle, it would be like someone had destroyed them on purpose. The flowers were Chinese jasmine, planted five years ago, which were to bloom in two years. It was also a theatrical piece. Everyone likes to watch fires. It was making a beautiful roaring sound. But at a certain point, people realized what was going on—the landscape was being violated, flowers were being burnt. Suddenly, everyone was quiet. One woman cried for twenty minutes. . . . So, then, the next day, when these people came to have their lunch there, it was just a burned-out plot, you know. I mean, it was the same thing they were doing in Vietnam, but you burn some flowers that they like to sit near.

Many of the artists who participated in “The Eighties”—Fox, Howard Fried, Paul Kos, Mel Henderson, Melchert, and others—became leaders of the avant-garde of the seventies that would break radically with the art of the past. Richardson continued to include Conceptualist work in her exhibition schedule, including, in 1973, a one-person exhibition by Fox. “The main installation and activities occurred behind a muslin curtain, so that unless viewers looked through the windows from an exterior balcony, only shadows were visible. Fox made a large drawing of a rib cage on the floor, and a channel that he filled with water from his mouth, one drop at a time.”

Over a series of days, Fox performed other actions with simple objects and elemental substances.

Fox’s show had a strong impact on Theresa Hak Kyung Cha, a young Korean-born student who created an extraordinary body of work while still at Berkeley. Her video works, artist books, and performances
reflected the influence of the Bay Area avant-garde, and also expressed Cha's own condition of cultural and linguistic displacement. After Cha's untimely death in 1982 at the age of 31, the Cha family established the Theresa Hak Kyung Cha archive at the Berkeley Art Museum, which served as the basis for the retrospective exhibition "The Dream of the Audience: Theresa Hak Kyung Cha (1951–1982)."7

In 1975 the museum presented nineteen performances over a nine-week period in the series Performance/Art/Artists/Performers, organized by guest curator Carlos Gutierrez-Solano. Among these were Splitting the Axis by Darryl Sapien and Michael Hinton, and performances by Richard Alpert and Linda Montano.8 Throughout the decade, performances and installations by such leading Bay Area Conceptualists as Tom Marioni, Lynn Hershman, and Paul Cotten took place. (Cotton, dressed as Astral-Naught Rabb-Eye, had performed an unscheduled work at the opening of the museum, the first appearance of this character who made several subsequent appearances.)9 In 1979, chief curator David Ross established regular weekend video screenings, the first program of its kind in a museum setting, featuring video pioneers Ant Farm, Juan Downey, William Wegman, The Kipper Kids, and Joan Jonas, among many others.

The museum's MATRIX series of moderately scaled individual exhibitions, established by director James Elliott and curated by Michael Auping (1978–1979), Constance Lewallen (1979–1987), Lawrence Rinder (1987–1997), and since 1998 by Heidi Zuckerman Jacobson, has featured among its international roster local Conceptual artists of the first and succeeding generations. Jim Pomeroy, Paul Kos, Tom Marioni, Howard Fried, Doug Hall, David Ireland, Nayland Blake, Lewis de Soto, Lutz Bacher, Theresa Hak Kyung Cha, and Jim Campbell, among others, have participated in the program. Fried, Cha, and Kos were given large-scale exhibitions at the museum, in 1983, 2001, and 2003 respectively.

The exhibition program at the museum has always been broad-based, reflecting the diverse interests of the campus and Bay Area community. Modern masters such as Franz Marc, Marsden Hartley, and Juan Gris have alternated with exhibitions of national and international avant-garde artists, including Eva Hesse, Dan Flavin, Richard Avedon, Neil Jenny, Jonathan Borofsky, Francesco Clemente, Elizabeth Murray, Rosemary Trockel, James Lee Byars, Jay DeFeo, Joan Brown, Komar and Melamid, Wolfgang Leib, Shirin Nashat, and Fred
Wilson. Groundbreaking group shows—“Andre Buren, Irwin Nordman: Space as Support,” “Anxious Visions: Surrealist Art,” “The Independent Group: Postwar Britain and the Aesthetics of Plenty,” “Made in U.S.A.: An Americanization in Modern Art, the ’50s and ’60s,” “In a Different Light” (an examination of gay sensibilities in contemporary art), “The New Child: British Art and the Origins of Modern Childhood, 1730–1830”—by a succession of talented curators, including David Ross, Mark Rosenthal, Sidra Stich, museum director Jacquelynn Baas, Lawrence Rinder, and James Steward, have added depth to the overall program and contributed to its reputation for innovation and excellence.10

Tom Marioni: Studio, performance, November 5, 1980. Photograph by Ben Blackwell. BAM/PFA.

ENDNOTES

1 *Free*, 1970, the unpaginated ring-bound catalog that documented the show.

2 One of the three meetings, which took place on March 4, 1970, was tape recorded and documented in *Free*.

3 While sources differ, it seems that this took place in Faculty Glade.


6 Cha received four degrees from UC Berkeley: a BA (1973) in comparative literature, and a BA (1975), MA (1977), and MFA (1978) in art practice. She was greatly influenced by professors James Melchert (sculpture/performance) and Bertrand Augst (film theory), and by screenings of foreign and experimental film at the Pacific Film Archive where she worked as an usher from 1974 to 1977.

7 After opening at BAM/PFA in the fall of 2001, the exhibition toured to several museums in the U.S. and Europe and to Ssamzie Space in Seoul, South Korea, the first major presentation of Cha’s work in her native country.


9 *Space Time Sound*, 187.

10 Current programming follows in this tradition under the directorship of Kevin E. Consey, with a committed curatorial team that includes Lucinda Barnes, who joined the museum as the first senior curator for collections; Heidi Zuckerman Jacobson, Phyllis Watts MATRIX Curator; and the author, Constance Lewallen, who is senior curator for exhibitions.
THE FACULTY FOLLIES

Martha Stumpf

ONE YEAR AFTER THE BERKELEY FACULTY CLUB WAS FOUNDED in 1903 the follies began. Currently called The Faculty Club Christmas Party and held on three successive nights in early December, the entertainment consists of holiday songs by the Monks moving around the Great Hall and adjoining dining rooms, a musical skit on an appropriate theme, and a grand finale of an audience enhanced rendition of the Hallelujah chorus. The Monks, the cast of the skit, the musicians, and most of the audience are members of the Faculty Club—but by no means all. Except for the all-male Monks, diversity of age, gender, and profession rules the day. But year in and year out, the butt of the playlet’s jokes are sure to be the regents, the president, the chancellor and whatever dean has done something noticeable (dumb) during the past year.

The Faculty Club kept no files on such events, and it is only recently that records have been retained. We thank Jim Cahill, Cyril Birch, and the deceased Jim Hill so that we can now date the records back almost forty years. Now it is Jack Coons who keeps the current collection.

Quoting from a program, let’s set the scene:

6:00 P.M. The Sherry Hour. As the Campanile bells toll the hour, Friends of the Faculty join together for memorable evening.

6:30 P.M. As the Campanile bells toll half past the hour, the Yule Log and Candles are lit and the Spirits come forth in our Medieval Hall under the knowing gaze of a Fatherly Moose.

7:00 P.M. As the singing monks from a nearby retreat enter the Great Hall, the Master to the Feast commands the Boar’s Head brought forth and the Dinner Feast to begin.

The Monks chorus, which is still led by the “Prior,” Milton Williams, sings Christmas carols throughout dinner and after the play. The 77th annual party’s program, “As the Fortune Cookie Crumbles,” was created and directed by Cyril Birch. Since then skit titles have ranged from “Cantata Regulata,” “An Evening at the Old Alhambra,” “Dan Destry’s Dilemma, or Publish or Perish or Both,” “The Year of the Big Freeze, or Baby It’s Cold Inside, Too,” to the current one, “Parodies Lost—or, Get Thee to a Nunnery.”

Designed by James Terman.
Courtesy of the author.
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And now for some lyrics reflecting the times and the problems Berkeley faced over the years.

**WHEN BERKELEY REALLY RULED THE ROOST**
(To the tune of “When England Really Ruled the Waves”)
by James Cahill, 1967

When Berkeley really ruled the roost
In Governor Warren’s day,
The Legislature and Regents both
Decreed the we should sign an oath
That we’re as pure as they;
As the sole effect of that decree
Was to drive off the faculty.
Yes, many good men went away
Upon that ignominious day.
(Chorus: repeat last two lines)

When Berkeley shook with FSM
In the days of good Pat Brown,
These worthy folk grew rather gruff
Because we weren’t severe enough
In chopping students down—
At last they gave their anger vent
By chopping down our president—
Yes, Berkeley’s honor went astray
Upon that ignominious day.
(Chorus: repeat)

When the Legislature grants
The money that we need,
And gets it through its collective nut
That anything that’s badly cut
Will very surely bleed—
As bright will shine old Berkeley’s rays
As in the gloriest of days.
(Chorus: repeat)

**OH, REAGAN**
(To the tune of “Tit Willow”)
by William James Hill (Jim Hill), 1972

On the branch of a tree on the campus he sat, Singing, “Reagan, Oh, Reagan, Guv Reagan.”
And I said to him, “Hitchy-bird, where are you at, Singing Reagan, Oh, Reagan, Guv Reagan?
All the students are quiet, their banners are furled; Richard Nixon assures us all’s right with the world.”
But right back in my teeth, lamentations he hurled: “Oh, Reagan, Oh, Reagan, Guv Reagan.”

He flew down from the tree and he straightened his tie,
And sang, “Reagan, Oh, Reagan, Guv Reagan.”
And repeated to me and to all passers-by:
“Reagan, Oh, Reagan, this Reagan.
I had learned to expect the economy axe.
When it fell irrespective of obvious facts.
Now it isn’t the budget, it’s me he attacks.
That Reagan, Oh, Reagan, Guv Reagan.”

Now I feel just as sure that as I’m sure that my name
Isn’t Reagan, Guv Reagan, Guv Reagan,
That the Hitchy-bird felt that the name of the game
Was Reagan, Oh, Reagan, Guv Reagan.
So I said, “Ronnie’s bite’s not as bad as his bark.”
He replied: “Have you ever discussed this with Clark?
I feel just like a Noah who’s lost his last Ark.
Reagan, Oh, Reagan, Guv Reagan.”
UNTITLED
(To the tune of “We’ll Be There”)
by Jim Hill, 1977

When our affluent alumni contemplate their bank accounts,
And decide they have a buck or two to spare,
And the Chancellor’s [Bowker] mail is loaded down with checks in large amounts,
And the gold is doled out yonder, we’ll be there.

When the gold, etc.

When Old Jerry [Brown] realizes what is going on at Cal,
And his praises for the campus fill the air,
And he chews out legislators for depressing our morale,
And it’s higher expectations, we’ll be there.

And it’s higher expectations, etc.

When the big foundations hear about alumni loyalty,
And they open up their coffers with a flair,
And the faculty is rescued from the bonds of poverty,
And it’s caviar at Narsai’s, we’ll be there.

When it’s caviar, etc.

Smiles, Volume 1, Number 5,
December 18, 1891.
ALTERNATE VISION
(To the tune of “Men of Harlech”) by Cyril Birch, 1983

Each defense that man’s invented
Somewhere can be circumvented—
What’s one thing that can’t be dented?
Bureaucratic prose.

Fill the air with jargon’s clamor
Fear no foe’s ballistic hammer
Stouter than a suit of armor
Our protection grows.

Speeches and directives
All are most effective
While we sleep our verbiage keeps
The enemy from reaching his objective.

Weighty words and deathless phrases
Flowering like a million daisies
In impenetrable mazes
Blossom like a rose.

Processed themes and theses
Rich as processed cheeses
Launched on high will choke the sky
And scatter hostile missiles to the breezes.

Academic formulations
In recycled propagations
 Guarantee the peace of nations
Foiling all our foes!
WAS IST LOS, ALAMOS
(To the tune of “Across the Alley from the Alamo”—Greene)
by John E. (Jack) Coons, 2003

They ran a tally at Los Alamos
And all the Feds rallied for a Berkeley roast
Made the Wen Ho dally seem a friendly toast
When the Feebies came to pry.

Oh, please I can explain that missing bomb.
We lent it out for Ollie Stone’s sitcom.
It’s gotta be here somewhere in the lost and found.
Gonna show up by and by.

Compete, Feds say—it’s honest
And keeps us all alert
The eyes of Texas are upon us
Toot, toot! We’re Longhorn dessert.

Away we’ll sally from Los Alamos
Ave atque vale to the buffaloes
Bishop Berkeley said it, Baby. Westward, ho.

It’s okay, Cal grabs the tab.
We’ll make bombs at Berkeley Lab.
Let’s give it a boom!

DEBRIS
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ORAL HISTORIES OF MUSIC AND THEATER
AT UC SANTA CRUZ

Randall Jarrell

THE UNIVERSITY LIBRARY'S REGIONAL HISTORY PROJECT was established in 1963 by founding chancellor Dean E. McHenry and university librarian Donald T. Clark to document the history of the town and the University of California at Santa Cruz. The project is the smallest and youngest of the university's three oral history programs (Berkeley and Los Angeles being its predecessors), employing two half-time senior editors and occasional interns and student assistants. Elizabeth Calciano, the project's director during its first decade, worked with the Library's fledgling Special Collections department in collecting and preserving Santa Cruz County archives and historic photographs, and in identifying individuals whose recollections could contribute to the region's economic and political history. She conducted a number of interviews documenting the Cowell Ranch (the site of the new campus), the history of coastal dairying, lumbering, the fishing industry, blacksmithing, apple growing, and UC Santa Cruz institutional history.

During recent years, the project has enlarged its subject coverage and conducted interviews on the fine arts and culture at the university and in the community. This article highlights our efforts in documenting this history.

Prior to the opening of UC Santa Cruz in September 1965, the town of Santa Cruz was a sleepy, working-class retirement community and resort destination, best known for the Beach Boardwalk, the Big Dipper roller coaster, beaches and magnificent redwoods, and as a premier surfing locale. In the early 1960s this small community became a way station for the counterculture; a small cluster of poets, musicians, composers, writers, and craftspeople settled here, drawn by the beauty of the environment and the opportunity to live well and inexpensively. Soon a bookstore and coffeehouse were established and became gathering places for a growing artistic community.

In 1963, as the university began building its campus, faculty and staff (and, in 1965, students) arrived. Over the years student enrollment has grown to over 14,000 and the campus has played a major role in reviving and transforming the local economy and in creating a rich cultural environment. The city of Santa Cruz's population has more than doubled to 50,000 and is a demographically diverse, middle-class community with sophisticated wide-ranging cultural tastes and is now a different kind of tourist destination. Summer visitors come to Santa Cruz, stay in a bed-and-breakfast inn, take a day hike at Henry Cowell Redwoods State Park, or spend the day at the beach. They can attend a concert of contemporary music at the Cabrillo Music Festival or an innovative production at Shakespeare Santa Cruz. For local residents there is a year-round calendar of locally produced concerts and plays.

University faculty and local citizens have worked together as initiators, participants, and audiences in supporting the Santa Cruz County Symphony, the Cabrillo Music Festival, Shakespeare Santa Cruz, the New Music Works, and various chamber music and theatrical activities. For a city of its size, Santa Cruz has grown a remarkably lively and eclectic arts community during the last forty years. The partnerships between town and gown have resulted in a proliferation of arts organizations.
"George Barati: A Life in Music" (Regional History Project, UC Santa Cruz, 1991), is the oral history autobiography of the late Hungarian cellist, composer, and conductor. This volume illuminates his archive (which he donated to the University Library) and traces an important period in the county's musical life. Barati had an international career as a conductor and was the maestro of the Honolulu Symphony before he settled in Santa Cruz. He was the director of the arts center at Villa Montalvo in Saratoga, California, and in 1970 became the conductor of the Santa Cruz Symphony which he helped to guide from its humble beginnings into what is now a first-rate regional orchestra. Barati was a co-founder of the local Cultural Council, and was also involved with the Cabrillo Music Festival where his compositions were performed. His memoir also provides insights into the vicissitudes of regional arts development.

Ernest T. Kretschmer's two-volume memoir, "Reflections on Santa Cruz Musical Life" (Santa Cruz, 1992, 2000), chronicles the evolution of local classical music activities from 1962 to 1999. Known as "Mr. Music," Kretschmer has been a singular figure as a supporter and benefactor. When he settled in Santa Cruz there were two modest concert series in Watsonville and Santa Cruz which presented recitals by visiting musicians. His dream was to live in a community where he could hear lots of music: he sought out musicians and like-minded citizens and created fundraising strategies for classical, contemporary, and experimental music organizations. He was a co-founder of the Cultural Council, which he describes as a "United Way for musical activities," the first such entity in California for promoting and funding regional arts. Over the years, the Council has developed a comprehensive vision for the county, funding everything from elementary arts education to a variety of concerts and performances at Cabrillo Community College, UC Santa Cruz, and in the community.

Kretschmer's memoirs include recollections of the early years of the Cabrillo Music Festival, of which in 1963 he was a co-founder with the late composer Lou Harrison. The festival has fostered contemporary orchestral works by major American and European composers, and has mounted more than sixty-five world premieres of works in the modern canon. It is the oldest new music festival in the country and has been described as a venue for "innovative programming... with a focus squarely on compositions so new that their ink is barely dry." Kretschmer gives his impressions of the evolution of the festival and its distinguished musical directors, including Dennis Russell Davies and current artistic director and conductor Marin Alsop, a protegee of Leonard Bernstein.

Kretschmer was a supporter of the Santa Cruz Symphony (where he is an emeritus board member) as it has come into its own during the last four decades. He also discusses two now defunct but notable efforts—the Barati Chamber Ensemble and the Crown Chamber Players.

Two other memoirs have information on local music history. One, Harold A. Hyde: "Recollections of Santa Cruz County" (Santa Cruz, 2002), includes recollections of county musical life in the 1950s, the origins of the Cabrillo Music Festival, and the founding of the
Cultural Council. In "Kenneth V. Thimann: Early UCSC History and the Founding of Crown College" (Santa Cruz, 1992), Thimann gives the history of the Crown Chamber Players (1974-1990) guided by pianist and musical director Sylvia Jenkins, which, over twenty years, has presented an array of exceptional concerts traversing the chamber music repertoire.

"Audrey Stanley: The Genesis of Shakespeare Santa Cruz" (Santa Cruz, 2003) focuses on the early history of this well-known summer festival, which critics now place in the first tier of Shakespeare productions in California. Professor emerita Stanley was the founding artistic director and brought to the festival a background as an academic and theatrical director. She was the first woman to direct a play at the Ashland Shakespeare Festival and had experience with the Berkeley and Colorado Shakespeare Festivals prior to establishing the Santa Cruz festival. She describes the people involved in the early history of the festival, including Cleo Barber, a Shakespeare connoisseur and the widow of Shakespeare scholar Professor C.L. Barber, Professor Michael Warren, the festival's textual consultant, and founding board president Karen Sinsheimer. In this town-gown enterprise these founders envisaged the local community as co-producers of the festival.

In 1981 Stanley arranged for Will Gears' Theatricum Botanicum to bring its production of The Taming of the Shrew to the university's Quarry Amphitheater. This event was instrumental in the launching of Shakespeare Santa Cruz a year later. Stanley commented: "Why have another Shakespeare Festival? Undaunted, going for the most difficult tragedy of the lot [King Lear], we opened our season. ... What effrontery, what impudence, but at the same time, it stimulated people's imaginations that we could do the most wonderful comedy and the greatest tragedy."

During its early seasons, Shakespeare was a modest summer event, with a mix of students, faculty, and amateur and professional/equity actors. Stanley's connections with Britain's Royal Shakespeare Company enabled her to bring actors Tony Church, Julian Curry, and Paul Whitworth to take part. Stanley was no antiquarian in her approach to Shakespeare: she drew upon her rich background in melding academic textual scholarship, innovative modern stagings, world-class Shakespearean actors, and highly talented local people, to create a singular festival.

An array of seminars, lectures, and ancillary public events have been scheduled for audiences interested in understanding the nuances of each season's offerings. The plays themselves are staged in the outdoor Festival Glen, where audiences sit under the redwoods, and in the performing arts theater.

"Karen Sinsheimer: UCSC, 1977-1987" (Santa Cruz, 2003) is the oral history of the wife of former chancellor Robert L. Sinsheimer. Her commentary includes her role as the Festival's founding board president and her thoughts on why and how she brought together diverse constituencies to make of the Festival a successful town/gown endeavor.

For information about the Santa Cruz Regional History Project's interviews, see the website at http://library.ucsc.edu/reg-hist/index.html
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ANDREW IMBRIE AND ROY HARRIS: ORAL HISTORIES IN MUSIC

Caroline Crawford

ORAL HISTORY TECHNIQUES have rarely been applied in the field of music: the study of music having focused until now largely on structural and historical developments. Yale and Rutgers have had major oral history programs devoted to the documentation of classical and jazz music and musicians over the years. UCLA and UC Berkeley have been able to document musicians active in the California cultural scene and take life histories with a number of composers representing the extraordinary diversity of musical styles and languages of the twentieth century in this country. This very diversity has at times resulted in controversy and even alienation between composers and audiences, as composers searched to apply individual visions to inherited traditions, to find a path between contemporary and traditional musical languages—serialism, minimalism, neoclassicism, and back to some extent to neoromanticism in the last decades. The battle of styles was perhaps inevitable, and, to quote a recent article in the New York Times, “The polemics on both sides were dismaying.”

The composers in the university oral history series were asked about their musical philosophies, the development of their musical language, their processes of composing, and their ideas about the nineteenth-century European heritage. They discussed their experiences studying with such signal teachers as Nadia Boulanger, Roger Sessions, Arnold Schoenberg, and Darius Milhaud, among others, and forays into fields as different as contemporary classical music, electronic music, jazz, and film.

Here, as two very distinct voices in twentieth-century American music, excerpts have been selected from the oral histories of Andrew Imbrie and Roy Harris. Imbrie was born in Princeton, New Jersey, in 1929 and was on the faculty of the University of California, Berkeley, from 1949 to 1991. Harris was born in Lincoln County, Oklahoma, in 1898 (he died in Santa Monica, California in 1979), and served on the faculty of UCLA from 1961 to 1973. Harris’ style has been described as “a strong melodic and rhythmic speech that is indigenously American . . . a type of modal symbolism akin to Greek ethos with each particular mode related to a certain emotional state.” The excerpts refer to the composing process, the question of personality in composition, and of a composer’s commitment to communicating with the listener.

Andrew Imbrie was asked about a quotation from liner notes on one of his

recordings: “Although a university composer by background and temperament, Mr. Imbrie obviously thinks music is an expressive, communicative art—certainly a welcome attitude at a time when much of new music that emanates from campuses seems aimed at small select audiences of peers.” Imbrie responded:

Of course I think music is an expressive art, but many other university composers think so, too. . . . The composer and the listener have to meet each other halfway, and it’s a question of how much you will demand of your listener. I believe it ought to be possible not to talk down to your listener, but just to say what you have to say. The music can be complex, but by the use of adequate phrasing, adequate motivic clarity and all these other things, you ought to be able to make an impact on the listener if he’s willing to listen and not daydream. If he thinks of music as just something to accompany his daydreams, then he’s not going to understand it. Some listeners don’t want to be challenged in this way. They want something that’s very familiar and so they think that anything that isn’t familiar is therefore not “expressive.”

When I write my own music, I try to be myself and not imitate somebody else. Some pieces are easier than others. I think some of them, for example my late quartets, are perhaps more complex than certain other pieces I’ve written. I do think that different pieces have different personalities, if you like. We try to write individual pieces that aren’t just clones of other pieces we’ve written, and I think the pieces we write tend to take on their own character. At least for me—I don’t plan this in advance, but for any piece that I’m writing, it begins to take on its own character as I go along. I realize that there are certain problems that I have to solve and the way I solve them influences the impact the piece will have.

The question to Harris is similar: “You’ve said that a lot of people who read and understand what they read cannot hear music or understand what they hear, and that there are few literate musicians in that sense.” Harris replied:

You have to know what you hear. You can’t know what the values are in a piece of music if you can’t hear the piece of music. You can’t know what the values are in a painting if you can’t tell red from green or yellow, or if you can’t tell an apple from a dog’s eye.

Music is a very special vocabulary. Fortunately, many people do not have to know what they hear to be moved by it if the music is good. This is one of the reasons which makes me think that traditional music is important in the sense that Jung thinks that tradition is important. People can hear things without knowing what they hear. They can be aroused to an emotion which is similar to that of the composer who wrote the work if the composer wrote it in very clear and eloquent culture patterns. But if he wrote it in experimental patterns in which he himself didn’t know quite what he was doing—he was just trying this, that and the other—then it doesn’t communicate.

[What I write is] peculiarly mine. So I had what the historians called a profile. I had a personality or a profile. . . . That is something which one forms without knowing it. It is the configuration of his face or the color of his eyes. He has nothing to do with it. It sort of gravitates into this. It coagu-
lates. The worst thing a man can possibly do is try to set out and get one for himself. It certainly cannot be a self-conscious process. I am as sure of that as I am of anything. [When I started to compose] I knew what I heard inside myself. My whole struggle was to try to clarify the notation of the thing which I was hearing inside my own subconscious. That’s the whole process. Sometimes it is a very slow process, sometimes it is very fast. But I don’t want to become self-conscious in my own writing. I just want to write. I think it is extremely dangerous for a person to decide what kind of a personality he has because he may have several others which are more important. I feel that the mind should be a kind of very clever mechanism which helps the subconscious do what it wants to do. I don’t think that the person’s life should be governed by his mind.

I feel that each work has to be started as though you had never written a work. You will have all kinds of technique at hand. Your problem is not to have the technique. Your problem is not to use it when it doesn’t fit. That is a subconscious thing. There has to be that fresh beginning on each piece. It has to be as though you were going on your first big adventure.

These oral histories, besides being vivid cultural portraits, help to promote understanding of the composer’s work, the musical climate in the times they lived, the range of choices the composer has, and the creative process.

“Well, We Should Smile!”
Faculty Hymn

Music by: Andrew Imabara

We pledge allegiance to the Regent of the

Faculty Hymn. University Archives.
Drawn from Memory: A Self Portrait
Eugen Neuhaus

Eugen Neuhaus was long associated with the Department of Art at UC Berkeley; his tenure included a few years as head of the department. He was born in Germany and, after his apprenticeship as a house painter (his uncle Karl's idea of Neuhaus's desire to paint), received his art education at the Royal Art School in Kassel and at the Royal School of Applied Arts in Berlin. While doing his obligatory service in the German army after his graduation in 1903, he met and married a young woman from Sacramento, perhaps the main reason for his coming to California in 1904.

After a short sojourn in Sacramento, he established a studio in San Francisco, soon destroyed in the 1906 earthquake and fire. During this period he became acquainted with William Keith and other artists of the era, although he does not dwell as much as one would like on these friendships. Neuhaus moved his studio to Monterey where he was based for several years.

Neuhaus became involved with the Panama-Pacific International Exposition of 1915, even judging art works exhibited there. This activity provided greater contact with the University of California and his first wide recognition by the public. He conceived the idea of giving a lecture on the art of the exposition, and the university's Department of Drawing (as it was then known) sponsored the lecture. Astoundingly the lecture hall was so full, and there were so many people trying to get in that poor Neuhaus himself was unable to enter the building! A second, also unsuccessful attempt was made to present the lecture; the third time it was scheduled for Harmon Gymnasium, and it proved so successful that it was repeated several times and was also issued as an enlarged, illustrated published work.

Neuhaus had given drawing courses at the university, with the status of instructor, beginning in 1910, but the added stature brought by his popular lectures also brought him an appointment as assistant professor and increased teaching responsibilities. This established a permanent association with the university that would con-
tinue until his retirement at age 70 in 1949.

*Drawn from Memory*, for better or worse, is composed primarily of miscellaneous incidents from his career: an amusing story about some bootleggers he met while painting in the El Sobrante area of the East Bay, a story about the trials and tribulations of traveling with a group of students on an art tour in Russia, and the like. There are short comments on some of the artists he came in contact with in the Department of Art at the university, but it is woefully short on information about the department, its growth and development.

The book does conclude with a section of his views about art that helps the reader understand the man a bit better. It’s an easy and enjoyable read, but anyone wishing to know more about Neuhaus will have to supplement this with other materials. There is a short oral history, “Reminiscences: Bay Area Art and the University of California Art Department,” from him done in 1961 by the Regional Oral History Office, which contains a capsule history of the department in an appendix, and there is an obituary article in the university’s *In Memoriam* series in 1964. A small collection of Neuhaus’s correspondence and papers is held in the Bancroft Library. These will flesh out Neuhaus’s activities and accomplishments in a way that his own reminiscence does not.

—William Roberts

**Berkeley Landmarks, Revised and Enlarged Edition: An Illustrated Guide to Berkeley, California’s Architectural Heritage**

Susan Dinkelspiel Cerny


This is the second edition of a book much prized in its first, 1994, edition. Of the 247 official Berkeley landmarks (as of this printing), 31 or one-eighth are on the University of California campus. Of the 300 pages of the book, 34 are devoted to the campus.

The text is preceded by an introduction giving us the history of the Berkeley Architectural Heritage Association and an explanation of the City of Berkeley’s landmarking process. Each of seven geographical sections is preceded by an historical essay with archival photographs and maps, and each “landmark” in the section is given a paragraph of architectural description and historical significance. Nearly all are accompanied by either an archival or current photo. The campus landmarks all have been desig-
nated as such by the National Register of Historic Places, the City of Berkeley, and/or the Campus Inventory.

At the back of the book are helpful biographies of architects, a bibliography, and three alphabetical indices: one general, one of the buildings by name, and one of architects.

Minor errors do exist: on page 281 Frederic Law Olmsted is wrongly credited with the plan for the university, in 1865 only the College of California was intended. On page 279: William Hays died in 1963 not in 1937. Nonetheless, it is an excellent and useful book, covering Berkeley's buildings toe to top, geographically and chronologically—from Ocean View to the Thorsen House, with, on page 148, President Theodore Roosevelt.

—Carroll Brentano

**CLARK KERR MEMOIRS PROJECT**

Clark Kerr's memoirs were published by the University of California Press, volume 1 in 2001 (reviewed in our last issue) and volume 2 in 2003 (to be reviewed in a future issue). These books have given us valuable insights into the thought of one of the premier educators of our times and into the vicissitudes of the University of California during periods of growth and controversy. In preparing his memoirs Kerr called upon many of his associates for assistance with various aspects of university administration; this not only informed his own work but has lead to the publication of six of a total of eight shorter works on these specific aspects of university history. The first three are reviewed here.
The Academic Senate of the University of California: Its Role in the Shared Governance and Operation of the University of California
Angus E. Taylor

Budget Reform and Administrative Decentralization in the University of California
Loren M. Furtado

Berkeley at Mid-Century: Elements of a Golden Age
Essays by Verne A. Stadtman, Lincoln Constance, John R. Whinnery, Travis Bogard, Betty Connors, Jacquelynn Baas, Robert W. Cole, and David Littlejohn.

Angus Taylor came to the Department of Mathematics at UCLA in 1938; he became the vice president—academic affairs in 1965, and he served as the chancellor of the Santa Cruz campus in 1976-77. As a faculty member and as vice president he had much interaction with the Academic Senate and became intimately familiar with its operations. In The Academic Senate, he traces a number of controversies from the so-called faculty revolution of 1919 (he calls it the “Berkeley revolution”) and difficulties during the Depression to discussion of the lectureships of Eldridge Cleaver and Angela Davis much more recently. The University of California’s Academic Senate has been one of the more powerful in the country, and it’s good to have this history of its genesis and its actions.

Loren Furtado came to the university after World War II as an accountant; in 1960 he was appointed university budget officer and participated directly in the reorganization of budget processes in the implementation of decentralization of various responsibilities from the Office of the President to the campuses. He retired from the university in 1979 as assistant vice president and director of budget, planning and analysis. In Budget Reform Furtado divides his studies into two parts: budget policies and their reform at the university, and decentralization and administration of business affairs. The latter section charts the administration of the university from its inception, through the administration in the “one university” era under Robert Gordon Sproul, the administrative survey conducted by the Public Administration Service, and finally the appointments of campus chancellors and the decentralization of responsibilities under Clark Kerr. Perhaps not the most exciting of topics, but invaluable for those needing to know where decisions were made.

The essays in Berkeley at Mid-Century cover a number of topics, beginning with an abridgement by Verne Stadtman of his centennial history of the university. This is followed by lengthy essays on strengthening the Colleges of Letters and Science and of Engineering, the first by Lincoln Constance (dean of the College of L&S from 1955 to 1962), the latter
by John Whinnery (dean of the College of Engineering from 1959 to 1963) and Marian Gade. The final section, "A Place for the Arts," documents the building of the Berkeley Art Museum, Zellerbach Hall and Hertz Hall, and chronicles the expansion of arts related programs such as Cal Performances. There are several contributors to this essay: Travis Bogard, Betty Connors, Jacquelynn Bass, Robert W. Cole and David Littlejohn.

—William Roberts

John Galen Howard and the University of California, the Design of a Great Public University Campus
Sally B. Woodbridge

John Galen Howard was a monument on the Berkeley campus from the time he settled here in 1902 until his final teaching in 1929. He designed our best monuments, including Hearst Mining Building (1902-7), Doe Library (1907-11), and the Campanile (1913-14), and he was himself a monument as founding director and professor at the Architecture School. He was a Yankee born in 1864, descended from a John Howard who had settled in Plymouth around 1630. He was a graduate of the celebrated Boston Latin School and for three years a student of architecture at MIT, at that time the best architecture school in America. When forced to leave his studies to earn his living he was a draftsman for the distinguished Boston architect Henry Hobson Richardson, later for the most important firm in New York, McKim Mead and White. McKim loaned him the money to study at the École des Beaux-Arts in Paris, where he was a prize-winning student. He returned to New York in 1893 to open a modestly successful practice in partnership with an engineer, Samuel Cauldwell.

Howard first visited Berkeley in 1899 when he was chosen a finalist in the Phoebe Apperson Hearst competition for the great new Campus Plan. He admired the site—"the views are an inspiration." He talked with Regent Reinstein, the moving force of the competition, and with various faculty members. His final submission won only fourth prize, but the winner, Émile Bénard of Paris proved so cranky when he came to Berkeley at the end of 1899 that he was set aside. Howard went to see Mrs. Hearst in Washington and got the job of designing the Mining Building as a memorial to her late husband. Later Howard proved so adept at handling the situation in Berkeley and in Paris that at the end of 1901 he was appointed supervising architect for the campus. Thus all major buildings were his designs until he was dismissed from that position at the end of 1924.

Now at last there is a full-scale biography of Howard, by Sally Woodbridge of Berkeley, who has published widely on Bay Area architecture, and it includes some discussion of all his significant buildings. She has combed the extensive archives of his letters to illustrate his attitudes, as when he wrote home from Los Angeles during 1887-8, the year he spent as a journeyman architect, "I am constantly shocked and disgusted with the low tone and degradation of thought and speech which is nearly universal." She also records his meeting architects Ernest Coxhead and Willis Polk at that time. She recounts the details of his successes at the École des Beaux-Arts and explains the curriculum there; she summarizes the origins of the university and the development of the international competition for the campus plan; she tells a good deal about his social and family life, even his attempts to write epic poetry about artists he admired; and she tells something of the development of the Architecture School and of the difficulties that arose late in Howard's career because of his insistence on exclusive control over campus buildings. He worked well with Mrs. Hearst and with
his fellow Yankee and fellow autocrat President Benjamin Ide Wheeler, but Mrs. Hearst died in 1919 and Wheeler retired the same year; the next administration was less sympathetic. But for all this information, the creative personality and the reason he was so admired as a teacher remain hidden behind the stern photographic visage of this man fully six feet tall who moved among the giants of Berkeley in his day.

In explaining the buildings, Woodbridge gives many revealing quotations from Howard's writings and also some from contemporary critics but her own analysis tends to be superficial. We are told the cost of each building and the essentials of its program, the materials used and some remarks on the exterior design and decoration. For the Campanile that is sufficient and here we have a bonus of five of Howard's drawings for it. The Campanile is essentially colossal sculpture but the Hearst Mining Building and the Doe Library are masterpieces of interior spatial organization. They remind us that, at its best, architecture is a four-dimensional art: the spaces must be observed in sequence, they must be walked through and around.

The excitement of visiting the Hearst Mining Building, now beautifully restored, cannot be imagined from the text and illustrations in this book. It is nice to be given the story of the Guastavino family's system of the tile vaults used for the pendentives and the tunnel vaults over the aisles of the top floor of the Memorial Hall, but they are only part of the means of achieving this extraordinary vision of geometry in structure and space, where the arches on the massive facade are enlarged and converted to delicate linear forms in three dimensions inside the Hall. Woodbridge mentions the familiar comparison with the domical vaults of Labrouste's reading room in the Bibliothèque Nationale (1858-68) but that hall is relatively dark. Probably more important for Howard's experience in Paris were the newer metal and glass buildings in Paris, such as Eiffel's department store Au Bon Marché (1876) and the grand Salle des Machines of 1889, which have vast skylights.

What appeals specially to the modern aesthetic is what Howard did with his steel, glass, and tiles: he stripped them of all ornament, giving us bold forms of solid geometry constructed with ordinary industrial elements. The supporting piers are not columns but sets of four standard L-beams riveted together and spaced slightly apart so that as we move around we see the piers as semi-transparent. The
large beams that support the upper floors are trusses of small standard steel elements also riveted together, a direct statement of structural engineering. The floors and the massive interior walls are brick, a simple material from the earth. Howard explained more than once what he considered appropriate for a building to house mining engineering as distinct from his designs for the library and for California Hall, with its sophisticated distinction of planes in its granite walls and its elaborate copper ornament on the roof. He was working on the details of these three buildings in the same years.


The original design for what became Doe Library (after Mr. Doe’s unanticipated gift) was drawn in Howard’s New York office in 1902 in conjunction with his early work on the campus plan. It called for separate reading rooms (and duplicate collections of reference books) for men and women, and between them the top of a grand stairway coming up from the front hall. By the time construction started in 1909 common sense had prevailed, as William Hays, Howard’s principal assistant, explained in his Oral History. President Wheeler was a strict Baptist, as was Hays, but in a planning meeting Hays put it to Wheeler that “if these young people are going to get into trouble it will not be in a reference room of a library, will it?” So Howard designed the unified Reading Room, the grandest Roman space in the East Bay, and leading to it on the ground floor a hallway of processional character established by piers clad in marble, with Doric details, and then after necessarily narrow staircases a lofty Book Delivery Room, brightly lit by skylights, with walls articulated in the Corinthian order (in plaster), the introduction to the vast plaster-vaulted Reading Room. This is a monumental axial sequence of spaces, with classical decoration obscuring a steel frame, but the illustrations in this book do not explain it. The miniature plans show the condition a decade ago, not the original, and the only interior photograph is a low axial view
of the Reading Room emphasizing the modern lampshades that resemble inverted feeding troughs; yet the University Archives has an excellent series of photographs made for Howard in 1911, showing the building as he wanted it to be seen.

Doe Library may seem aesthetically the opposite of the Hearst Memorial Hall, but Howard was not an eclectic in the Victorian sense. In 1862 Sir George Gilbert Scott had drawn the design for new government offices in Whitehall in Gothic style, but Lord Palmerston insisted on Italian. Scott tried Venetian Byzantine, but Palmerston insisted on "ordinary Italian," and Scott grumbled that he had to buy "some costly books" to help him invent an Italian facade. Howard was instead deeply sensitive to the "Classical Language of Architecture," as John Summerson has called it. The robust facade of Doe Library is an ingenious improvement on the facade of the library of the École de Médecine in Paris (1878), which also faces north to give the upstairs reading room good light. Howard expanded the window area (beautifully revealing the interior space in the evening when the lights are on), and he divided the colonnade into two units, with doubled columns at each end of each unit, and a broader interval in between that allows for an expanded central doorway below it. In these same years he also revealed his sensitivity to vernacular traditions in the shingle style of the original Architecture Building (now Northgate Hall) and the log cabin of Senior Men's Hall, signs of his versatility that need further study.

The design and production of this book is deplorable. Many of the illustrations in black and white are cloudy gray; a few keystrokes in Photoshop could have fixed that. The eight pages of color illustrations, on the other hand, are souped up in saturation to resemble cheap picture postcards. At a mere 8.5 by 10 inches this book is too small by current standards for
a significant architectural monograph; a drawing such as the 1897 map of the campus (given to contestants for the new campus plan) is too small and too faint to read. The color photograph of the Hearst Mining Building hall on the dust jacket is nice (though it does not show the full height of the hall) but it is not repeated inside the book. The color photograph of the south end of California Hall (wrongly called the North elevation) is worthless, being obscured by trees; a southeast view would show the grandeur of this fine building. Some of the color details are reduced to postage stamp size, scarcely larger than that detail appears in the general view of the building. There are some good unfamiliar illustrations, such as those of Wellman and Hilgard Halls, but too many others are of trivial interest. Worst of all, the page layout, with a narrow column of text and enormous outer margins, makes many photographs too small and leaves vast amounts of empty space. Often there are extensive captions in the margins, helpful for browsers, but they have observations not in the text, probably overlooked by some readers, and sometimes they are placed on the page opposite the illustration.

Looking back 25 years, we must compare Loren Partridge's 65-page booklet “John Galen Howard and the Berkeley Campus: Beaux-Arts Architecture in the ‘Athens of the West’” (Berkeley Architectural Heritage Publication Series, 2). Although less comprehensive in coverage, it has more significant data, more incisive analysis, and a better selection of illustrations; unfortunately it was very modestly presented. All in all, it must be said that we still need a good book on the architecture of John Galen Howard.

—David H. Wright

The Campus Guide: University of California, Berkeley
Harvey Helfand

In 1896 Frank Norris wrote about plans for the university in Berkeley:

Struck off en bloc, complete and trim as a battleship, a wonder, accommodating a thousand and more students, standing there on the foothills and looking out into the Golden Gate, a little marvelous white world of stone and marble, a thing for tourists and guide books, a thing for the entire nation to be proud of, an ideal college. (The Wave, October 31, 1896.)

Harvey Helfand's Campus Guide is a superb publication. Although indeed a guidebook (it is published in a series of campus guides nationwide), it is far more. Rigorously researched, fully illustrated with photographs and maps, and thoughtfully organized, it is not only of use as a companion to walking tours of the university campus, but is also a necessary starting point for an understanding of the history and meaning of the university itself—a virtual encyclopedia. As a sample, six consecutive entries in the index list Theodore Bernardi, Bicentennial, Big C, Big Games (ten citations), Frederick Billings, and Rose Bird.

With a degree in architecture from Cal, Harvey Helfand has had two careers: one in the Berkeley campus planning office and the other as a photographer. The Campus Guide shows off both.

The 360-page book is organized into ten walking tours, starting from the "classical campus core" (where any architect's or Old Blue's heart is). It then moves counterclockwise around that center from northeast to southwest, and then in a broader circle around the periphery including Strawberry Canyon, the Southside, and Downtown Berkeley. Most buildings are given their dates and architects, and important buildings on the campus periphery
(such as Maybeck’s First Church of Christ Scientist) are extensively described. For Telegraph Avenue there are contemporary and archival photographs.

The text is careful to give the setting, the narrative history, the physical description, and the uses of each building or complex, and to do this in a way that is neither didactic nor celebratory. The style is comfortable; it is pitched to an educated and visually interested reader and is never cute. There are notes to each chapter and a substantial, and formal, bibliography (twenty-eight oral histories are cited). A course in the history of Berkeley, town as well as gown, could easily use this as a self-contained textbook.

Opposite the title page is a photograph (by Helfand as are all the photographs) of sunset over the Golden Gate and the campanile in the foreground, almost in silhouette. Not an original shot, but one of the best. However, on the next page, the table of contents is set off by three well-chosen but quite uncommon choices: Sather Gate’s bronze head piece, the mosaic violinists of the old Power House, and the rather Egyptianate pylons of Edwards Stadium. Sculpture, painting and architecture.

There are provocative bits of history as well; did any readers know about “Mother” Tusch and “The Hangar” or “Shrine of the Air”? It was a rooming house, used by air cadets of World War I. From it, just before its demolition for the student center, relics, souvenirs of two wars, and the wallpaper, signed by illustrious pilots, were sent to the Smithsonian Museum.

However, it is the description of each physical part of the whole that is the backbone of a guidebook. Here Helfand does not stint, neither with the meticulous recapitulation of the history of each individual building—why it was built, for whom and by whom—and its sitting, nor with its intended use (the interior plan), then its exterior with architectural details carefully described, then a bit of its subsequent history (what great man lectured or event took place within it), and finally its later history. For example, it proved to be too small and the department moved elsewhere. This method is as true for the brilliant (Hearst Mining Building) as for the pedestrian (LeConte).

Are there any complaints? The author is at times too kindly toward blotches on the Cal escutcheon: South Hall should have been cited as the ugly building it is and the move to save it for its sentimental longevity should have been quashed. And perhaps, in the same direction, the photograph on page 85 of the Moses/Stephens court is taken from an angle that makes it look a lot bigger (and nobler) than it is. In the end, our author really is an “old blue”—his love of the Berkeley campus may be smiled at, but it surely helps to make the Campus Guide the superlative work that it is.

—Carroll Brennano
Eight years ago, in July 1995, the Regents of the University of California voted to end affirmative action at the University of California. In November of the following year California’s voters passed Proposition 209, ending formal affirmative action in hiring, admissions, and outreach programs at all public institutions in the state of California.

Two books by former law students spotlight the events at UC Berkeley’s Boalt Law School, the flagship law school of the university, where Proposition 209 was met with fierce student protest. *Silence at Boalt Hall* by Andrea Guerrero and *The Diversity Hoax*, edited by David Wienir and Marc Berley, are reflections of the same tumultuous political moment at Boalt in 1997, the year after the affirmative action ban went into effect.

Both books are rooted in the raw personal experiences of the authors, members of opposing political camps who produced two very different types of work. *Silence at Boalt Hall* is a scholarly informative work, in stark contrast to *Diversity Hoax*, a collection of opinions and grievances. Together, they illuminate a contested vocabulary of the affirmative action debate, in which words such as silence, tolerance, balance, diversity, and merit have gained contradictory meaning and legitimacy. Here, these words have two lives: one for fashioning rhetoric and legislation, and one that represents the culmination of decades of civil rights struggles for equal life opportunities.

*Silence at Boalt Hall* mines numerous interviews with students, faculty, and administrators at Boalt. Guerrero skillfully interpolates this personal testimony with well-documented legal, statistical, and historical data to examine the defining events that unfolded in California over the past decade as affirmative action was dismantled. Chapters 1 and 2 explore the history of ethnic and gender diversity among Boalt’s student body and faculty. Here Guerrero describes the national political environment and legal framework that made the way for early affirmative action efforts and the evolution of these prototypes into full-fledged affirmative action admissions programs by the early 1990s. This history is valuable for revisiting the underlying rationales for affirmative action as a tactic in hiring and admissions policy at the law school, and how causality of the problem was conceived and corresponding solutions were created. Here you can see the effects of legal blueprints that shift discourse about affirmative action from one of addressing past and current social inequalities to one of promoting a healthy learning environment that approximates the ethnic makeup of the
world outside of the academy. Chapter 3, “Dismantling Diversity,” traces the origins of the anti-affirmative action movement. Chapter 4 looks at how the administration and student activists at Boalt and other law schools struggled to maintain a commitment to diversity in the absence of affirmative action. The fifth and final chapter, “Listening to the Silence,” revisits the climate at Boalt Hall after Proposition 209, examines the ongoing debate about the legitimacy of standardized tests as primary criteria in admissions processes, and concludes with a discussion of the complex series of rulings that have unfolded in the University of Michigan affirmative action case, Grutter v. Bollinger.

The Diversity Hoax, published in 2000, is a collection of twenty-seven essays and opinions submitted by Boalt students in response to David Wienir’s request for submissions in 1997-98:

How healthy is the marketplace of ideas here at Boalt? Do you have fair opportunity to share your ideas in the classroom? Does expression flow freely in an environment tolerant of diversity, or does the climate of tolerance at Berkeley paradoxically inhibit true diversity of opinion? Has political activism within the classroom silenced important student perspectives?

With two exceptions, the responses collected here bemoan a repressive political environment at Boalt Hall, where students with more conservative politics feel silenced, uncomfortable, and unpopular within a more vocal and progressive majority. They maintain that the political commitments of their fellow students created an environment at Boalt that was hostile to learning and to diverse voices in the classroom. The editors who, ironically enough, call on the traditions of John Stuart Mill, Henry David Thoreau, and Martin Luther King, Jr., to bolster their position, write: “In too many awful scenarios, PC Racism prevails.” Like many who attack affirmative action, they appropriate and distort a civil rights liberation discourse of fairness and justice to make their case.

From 1996 to 2001 the student body at the University of California has expanded by approximately 17 percent overall, while the pool of enrolled African American students has contracted by 17 percent. Latino/Chicano and African American graduate student enrollment has dropped 23 percent from 1996 levels, with a drop of 12 percent at the undergraduate level. Even while the ban on affirmative action has led to sharp drops in numbers of African American and Latino students matriculating at the graduate and undergraduate levels of the university, students, administrators, and legislators continue to develop new strategies to promote “diversity and full access.” These are the bellwether terms used by university president Richard Atkinson to describe the desirable makeup of the student body in lieu of explicit affirmative action policy. At Boalt Hall, fourteen African American students matriculated in the fall of 2002 in contrast to twenty in 1996 and zero in 1997. In March 2003, the director of admissions, Edward Tom, said in a telephone conversation, “We are working hard to overcome the negative message that Proposition 209 sent out to communities of color.”

The Supreme Court recently confirmed the constitutionality of affirmative action in higher education in the University of Michigan law school’s Grutter v. Bollinger case. In light of the impending vote on Proposition 54, University of California regent Ward Connelly’s “racial privacy initiative,” it is useful to revisit the present and historical issues and legal precedents that underscore language in the public discourse of race and racism. Silence at Boalt Hall is a rich piece of scholarship that effectively accomplishes this and reminds us that equal opportunity in higher education is a critical ongoing struggle.

—Nadine Wilmot
LETTER TO THE EDITOR

The following, dated February 21, 2003, was sent to the Editorial Board from Mr. Ray Colvig, now retired after twenty-seven years as chief of UC Berkeley's Public Information Office.

The new issue [Number 5] of Chronicle of the University of California is packed with terrific stuff—and you and your team are to be enthusiastically congratulated! I was especially interested in Reggie Zelnik's essay because of the writing I have been doing. Your piece on the bank burning is also fascinating, and it leads me to ask a question. Was it at the time of that UCSB incident that Gov. Reagan made his infamous observation: "If it takes a blood bath, let's get it over with. No more appeasement."? (Later he weasled out by saying that it was only meant to be "a figure of speech." No one thought it was a figure of speech.) I ask partly because I'm sometimes still asked to be interviewed by media people on things that happened at UC in the past. A year or so ago, Reagan became ill and a TV crew showed up to ask me about Reagan and UC. I mentioned how his off-the-cuff remarks would sometimes send out shock waves, citing the "blood bath" comment as an example. I said that people often related it to Berkeley, but that my recollection was that he said it in reference to UCSB. (He was interviewed outside The Ahwanee Hotel, where he was speaking to a group of agricultural leaders.) [Editor's note: Lou Cannon, writing about Reagan as governor, also ascribes the remark to the Santa Barbara affair.]

Another question... I noticed on page 40 of the current Chronicle a photo of Mario Savio on the steps of Sproul Hall. The credit line says University Archives (UARC PIC 24B:14). I was surprised that the photographer was not given credit. This and a lot of other excellent pictures were taken during the FSM by Don Kechely, who was employed at the time as an assistant editor of California Monthly. At some later time, Kechely left and eventually became the public affairs director at College of Alameda. His negatives sat unused for several years at Alumni House. Dick Corten, while he was still editor of the Monthly, showed me some prints and allowed me to borrow the negatives and make 8X10 copies of many of the best shots. These were for our use at PIO. But whenever we loaned a print for publication, we always included an instruction to credit Don Kechely. (He didn't ask for this, and I haven't talked to him in many years. But he took the pictures and he definitely should get credit.) I sent a set of those prints to Archives in the 1980s (again with the credit line on the back). I don't remember ever getting an acknowledgement. That's not a problem, but the credit is.

With all best wishes,
Ray C.
Rube Goldberg illustration in the 1904 Blue and Gold.
PUBLICATIONS OF INTEREST FROM
THE INSTITUTE OF GOVERNMENTAL STUDIES

Chapters in the History of the University of California

• Three Faces of Berkeley: Competing Ideologies in the Wheeler Era, 1899-1919, Henry F. May
• The University in the 1870s: William Hammond Hall and the Original Campus Plan, Kent Watson
• The University and the Constitutional Convention of 1878, Peter Van Houten
• California's Practical Period: Cultural Context of the Emerging University, 1850s-1870s, Gunther Barth
• The Origins of the Chancellorship: The Buried Report of 1948, Eugene C. Lee
• Equally in View: the University of California, Its Women, and the Schools, Geraldine Joncich Clifford
• History at Berkeley: A Dialog in Three Parts, Gene A. Brucker, Henry F. May, and David A. Hollinger
• “A Western Acropolis of Learning”: The University of California in 1879, Roy Lowe

Supplements to Clark Kerr's memoir, The Gold and the Blue

• The Academic Senate of the University of California: Its Role in the Shared Governance and Operation of the University of California, Angus E. Taylor
• Budget Reform and Administrative Decentralization in the University of California, Loren M. Furtado
• Berkeley at Mid-Century: Elements of a Golden Age, Essays by Verne A. Stadtman, Lincoln Constance, John R. Whinnery, Travis Bogard, Betty Connors, Jacquelynn Baas, Robert W. Cole, and David Littlejohn
• The Rise and Demise of the UCSC Colleges, Carlos Noreña
• The Global Campus: Education Abroad and the University of California, William H. Allaway
• Documentary Supplements to The Gold and the Blue, Clark Kerr, ed.
• Turning Points and Ironies: Issues and Events—Berkeley, 1959-67, Ray Colvig

To order, please call the Berkeley Public Policy Press at the University of California, 510-642-1428
A group of students in The Ark from the album of Penelope Murdoch, Class of 1912. University Archives (UARC Album 2).
OTHER ISSUES IN THE CHRONICLE OF UC SERIES

* All articles beautifully illustrated with many old photographs * Book reviews * Resource reports

**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, Parthenia 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.)
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