Other similar wierdness happened during my short time at Barrington. I'll mention just one more example: I befriended a girl who was going a little crazy. She thought she'd been impregnated by the antichrist. He was a co-resident of Barrington. The next day I ran into someone immediately after turning a corner, and thought, at first that his face was a skull. Then it turned into a normal face. He told me his name. He was the suspected anti-christ. I went to visit the girl later, and mentioned it to her. She had candles all over her room. She said she was leaving soon and said she wanted to give me a book. It was Alan Watts' The Supreme Identity. I took the book. I found out later that she set her room on fire that night, and was committed to a mental facility by her family. The book turned out to be the crucial source for the paper that I was writing on the philosophy of time, in order to finish off an incomplete and receive my undergraduate degree. It helped me to make sense of a great deal of my journey through psychedelia, including my time at Barrington.

I wish Barrington had reached out for help from some of the transients like myself who found ourselves drawn there. We probably could have added some more positive magic to a chaotic vortex that was becoming pretty sordid. I know I would have been happy to. At the same time, I'm grateful to the folks there for being tolerant enought to offer folks like me some temporary refuge.

hall entrances as if longing to be one of us.

I did some news reporting for KALX during my days at Cal and one day decided to interview Mr. Harmon about his frenzy to shut down Barrington. I was amazed to find the loudest complainer about the drug scene there had a marijuana plant growing in his window.

I was always pained by the presence of heroin at the house and since I had no understanding of heroin's actual physical addictiveness I was insensitive to the problem. I would say I was one of the "core group" of activists trying to hold on to our home and part of that for me meant getting the heroin out. Later, when I became a junkie myself in the post-Barrington days, I understood why it had proved so difficult to eradicate, as its absence leaves the user completely unable to function in his or her own skin—and this withdrawal syndrome goes on for a very long time.

I still dream of the house of many colours which was the most beautiful, freeing place I ever lived, or ever will. How sad the reality of the current century! How desperate the current youth generation is for a place like Barrington... without even knowing it.

John Davidson

Many thanks for making the Green Book available! I particularly appreciated being able to read about the last years of Barrington.

I stayed at Barrington briefly in the Summer of 1985 (what was termed "Hell Summer" in the book). I was one of the drug using transients referred to. I'd left my co-op in Madison, WI (Nottingham co-op) a month or two earlier and hitchhiked to San Francisco from Missouri Rainbow Gathering on $40 (only had $9 left by the time I got there) to attend grad school at the Institute of Integral Studies. I had no place to stay, hadn't slept (or eaten much) in days, and had some yucky nights trying to survive on San Fran streets. I discovered that I couldn't get financial aid to attend school because of my prior refusal to register for the draft. So I spent my last $2 to flee San Fran to Berkeley by way of the BART.

In Berkeley, I went to the student co-op association, where

- Reality is the result of severe psilocybin deficiency

alized the need to warn Barrington and hoped the statement would relay the message that the U.S.C.A. would no longer put up with the house's antics. A copy of the message was slipped under every door at Barrington. The Board also hoped the statement would deter Donald Driscoll from using the incident as evidence in his lawsuit.[64]

This time, a few non-Barrington Board members circulated a petition calling for a member-wide referendum on the issue of whether or not to close Barrington until a better use for the building could be found. Scott Fitz, a representative of Stebbins Hall, lead the fight to close Barrington. In an editorial in the *Toad Lane Review*, he wrote that "Barrington Hall as it currently exists is not a functional part of the U.S.C.A. Barrington has resisted attempts to solve the problems for years." Fitz cited continued kitchen inspection violations, evidence of illegal subletting, and officials covering up the distribution of acid as reasons for closing the hall. "Even though they love their house, they cannot solve its problems," he said. "The U.S.C.A. has a responsibility to Barrington members who cancelled their contracts, future members and current members to recognize Barrington as a failure."[65] A current manager of Barrington agreed with Fitz, referring to an attitude of denial at the hall. The members, he said, were drilled with the idea that it is the rest of the U.S.C.A. that is losing its values, not Barrington. With this attitude, he thought, Barrington could never change.[66] The Orfali-Potter lawsuit was using U.S.C.A. resources in the courts, and Barrington opponents argued that a definitive action to stop the problems at Barrington would help the U.S.C.A. contest the suit. Giving Barrington yet another chance, it was argued, would only provide the prosecution with more evidence of ineffective U.S.C.A. management. The lawsuit argument was reported to have strongly influenced those who chose to close Barrington.[67]

In the same issue of the *Toad Lane Review*, Evan Steele, President of the U.S.C.A. during the first acid distribution incident and, ex-Barringtonian, argued for the continued existence of Barrington. Steele asserted that the financial impact of closing Barrington for the U.S.C.A. would be tremendous, hundreds of student beds would be lost. He cited the city health inspector as calling the Barrington kitchens "the cleanest in the co-ops." He blamed vacancies on the reputation perpetuated by persecution from the city and the press. The problems, according to Steele, were much different From those of the past. He wrote, "I believe that we should only let outside pressure dictate our actions in times of severe crisis and pressure, and I don't see that environment in the present, or for years." He urged the U.S.C.A. to "not give into mainstream culture which threatens the lifestyle of individuals or societal forces hostile to progressive movements, individual freedoms or any form of dissent. We must defend Barrington's lifestyle as inexorably connected to our own." He implored the U.S.C.A. Board to work with Barrington to instigate change internally, rather than creating a hostile duality of us versus them.[68]

But the U.S.C.A. membership must have tired of hearing Barrington's pleas. The referendum to close Barrington for the spring 1990 semester passed. The members directed the U.S.C.A. to close Barrington for one year, while it was refurbished, so it could reopen with a new group of residents, none of whom had resided in the building. FallCom, a name that ironically predicted the eventual fate of Barrington, discussed possibilities for the building.[69]

With their sentence imposed, many Barringtonians felt betrayed. Some released their frustrations by plaguing neighbors. They threw paint from the Barrington roof onto the skylights of the neighboring apartments and also threw a washer and dryer off the roof.[70] But their time was up, their boost was gone. Or so the U.S.C.A. thought.

All but seventeen Barrington residents moved out in the spring of 1988. Those seventeen men and women protested the closure by staying as legal "holdovers" in the building. The U.S.C.A. issued member contracts for an entire school year,

[64] Ibid.

[65] "Close it: Barrington issue comes to a vote," *Toad Lane Review*, November 3, 1989.

[66] "Letter from David Lavi," *Toad Lane Review*, November 3, 1989.

[67] Ibid.

[68] "Save it: Barrington issue comes to a vote," *Toad Lane Review*, November 3, 1989.

[69] "Special Referendum issue," *Toad Lane Review*, November 3, 1989.

[70] "A Long Strange Trip," *East Bay Express*, December 15, 1989.

thought reports had been greatly exaggerated. Signatures of the needed 15 percent of the U.S.C.A. membership were collected, and Barrington was granted its referendum.[58] Again the Board decision to close Barrington was overturned by the membership, allowing the house to continue operations under the supervision of a hired manager and the Central Level Management Team. Despite all the hoopla about the "acid punch" incident, it was put to rest rather quickly. But by now the patience of the U.S.C.A. and the community ebbed.

Early in 1988, two Barrington neighbors, Sebastian Orfali and Beverly Potter, filed a lawsuit in the state court accusing Barrington of being a nuisance to neighbors, thereby reducing the property values of neighboring buildings. The suit also accused the Barrington members and the Central Office employees of intentionally causing the neighbors distress, and indicted the organization with racketeering charges. They accused the U.S.C.A. of carrying out activities, which included interstate drug trafficking.[59] The neighbors claimed that the Onngh Yanngh symbol and motto as evidence of the "code of silence" taken by Barrington and U.S.C.A. managers to hide their drug operations: "Those who know don't tell."[60] The press loved this story, and the neighbor's lawyer, Donald Driscoll, leaked any information he came across, substantiated or not, to it. Presumably, he hoped to bring as much evidence forward in the case as possible. In this attempt, Driscoll was successful; two other lawsuits were filed by him in the names of Charles Spinoza and Ruth Oscar, Barrington neighbors.

The Orfali-Potter lawsuit gave the U.S.C.A. reason to worry for the plaintiffs were asking for $1.5 million. As the case proceeded, the U.S.C.A. concluded that the individual rights of some members and staff were in danger. The organization hired a well-known civil rights attorney, Ephraim Margolin, to defend it.[61] The new attorney came with a high price tag, and the U.S.C.A. Board voted to raise member rents $40 and mortgage

[58] "Barrington proposes referendum," *Toad Lane Review*, February 9, 1988.

[59] "USCA Executives give update on lawsuit," *Toad Lane Review*, October 4, 1989.

[60] "George Proper."

[61] ""Margolin speaks on lawsuit, finally!," *Toad Lane Review*, October 4, 1989.

One Friday night in March, three months into the standoff, George Proper received a phone call from the security guards asking if they could allow the holdover Barringtonians to have a small, quiet poetry reading. Proper told the security guards they could allow the poetry reading to take place. At six in the evening, all was calm at Barrington. But by eight o'clock, Proper received a phone call telling him to get over to Barrington, since the poetry reading was out of control. As he drove cast on Dwight Way, he saw police cars lining the streets for several blocks. He stepped out of his car and noise from the amplified music almost knocked him down. The police were lined up in front Barrington in riot gear waiting to pounce.

For an hour, Proper tried to negotiate with the partiers. As he walked down the house's halls, people ran through them screaming and yelling. When he asked them to shut the party down they would continue yelling or spit at him. The mood was chaotic. The police presented Proper with the ultimatum of shutting the party down now or leaving and not returning. Proper directed them to shut it down.

In the dining room, the police formed a riot line at one end of the room and the hundred or so party goers stood at the other end-of-the room. Proper and Neil Huston, the U.S.C.A. physical plant manager, stood behind the police line. The confrontation stirred the energies of the Barringtonians. They began to chant, "we want George, give us George," and threw beer bottles in the general direction of Proper, not trying to hit him, he later claimed, but making the statement that they would not give in to the authority of the police. The police started moving in unison toward the partygoers and as they got closer, the partiers panicked and ran out of the dining room into the rest of the house.[76] By this time, the entire southside area of Berkeley had heard that there was a riot at Barrington, and many people rushed over to watch or take part. The police had not secured the rest of the house, so approximately 350 people stormed the building, running through the hallways and breaking anything they could. Outside on the Dana Street side of the building, the residents and rioters began a giant bonfire fueled by Barrington's furniture, which they had thrown down from the roof. The fire department arrived at the scene to put out

[76] Ibid.

the dorms."[53]

The University's Dean of Students, Don Billingsley, also responded to the situation. He sent a letter to Proper urging the U.S.C.A. to act definitively to prevent such incidents from occurring in the future, threatening to remove all University recommendations of the U.S.C.A. as a viable housing option if effective measures were not taken.[54]

Neighbors also used the incident to condemn Barrington and the U.S.C.A. Neighbor Beverly Potter, a woman with a PhḊin organizational management psychology, wrote a scathing letter to Councilman Jelenik, accusing the U.S.C.A. of being a "slum lord" and taking intentional actions to "cover up" the scandal at Barrington. She asserted that the U.S.C.A. was unfit to exist in the Berkeley community, blaming poor central management for the out-of-control nature of Barrington.[55] She later filed a suit against the U.S.C.A. for such charges. Barrington's countercultural lifestyle seriously threatened the U.S.C.A.

In October another Board meeting was called to discuss the situation at Barrington. As expected Councilpersons Dean and Jelnik, Barrington neighbors, and some members of the press attended. The presence of so many community members at the meeting placed a heavy pressure on the Board to act. Some Board members argued that the U.S.C.A., as an autonomous organization, should not give into the outside pressure. But all Board members knew the top had been blown; something needed to be done.

The incident raised questions about the effectiveness of an outside manager at Barrington. There were misunderstandings about who was responsible for the incidents. Was the incident the fault of a few out of control members who spiked the punch or poor management? At the meeting, the Board urged Robert Dick to resign as Barrington's manager. It was difficult for Dick alone to control the actions of over 150 people. He heeded their request and his duties were assigned to the Barrington house

[53]"Board Votes 100% turnover at Barrington", *Toad Lane Review*, November 20, 1987.

[54]Letter from Donald Billingsley, Dean of Student Life, for George Proper, October 5 1987, Student Binder, U.S.C.A. Library, Berkeley, CA.

[55]Letter from Dr. Beverly Potter, Barrington neighbor to Councilman Jelnik, October 20, 1987, Student Binder, U.S.C.A. Library, Berkeley, CA.

They did not protest when the sheriff arrived. They had been defeated. The hall's doors were sealed with plywood.[80]

Tragically, the damage clone by the holdovers and the cost of the pending lawsuit, left the Board with no other choice than to sell Barrington. Businessman Roger Hailstone bought the hall for 2.25 million dollars but failed to rent enough rooms to cover his costs and soon went bankrupt.[81] The bank foreclosed on the property and the U.S.C.A. was again in possession of Barrington. This time they leased the building to Arthur Hoff for 30 years with the option to end the lease after 10 and after 20 years.[82]

[80]George Proper.

[81]Ibid.

[82]Ibid.

die down a bit, but problems continued as the neighbors persisted in their accusations against the hall and now against the U.S.C.A. as a whole.

In February 1987, one neighbor, John Harmon, raised controversy in the press when he accused the Central Level Management of the U.S.C.A., particularly General Manager George Proper, of negligence in dealing with drug problems at the house. Harmon claimed that Proper knew the extent of the problems at Barrington but did nothing about them. Proper's inaction, according to Harmon, had endangered the lives of the students of Barrington. Harmon cited the example of Bill Crooks, a drug dealer with AIDS who formerly hung around Barrington and who indicated on a television news show that he shared needles with at least three Barringtonians. Harmon also claimed that Barrington members and U.S.C.A. managers took a code of silence to cover up the drug activity at the house.[46] He claimed Barrington's Onngh Yanngh symbol and motto were proof of the code of silence. The Onngh Yanngh symbol, a "Y" with an "O" in its crux, was used by Barringtonians to symbolize the spirit of Barrington. It was accompanied by the motto, "Those who know don't tell. Those who tell, don't know." It originally was published in a Barrington Hall newsletter as a joke, but was later converted by Barringtonians into their symbol.[47] When Harmon began accusing the house of having a "code of silence" evidenced by the Onngh Yanngh symbol, house members found humor in pretending that the accusations were true. As viewed by the Barringtonians, Proper, and many others in the U.S.C.A., Harmon's claim was ridiculous. Harmon, they said, was a man determined to shut Barrington down by any means, including making sensational accusations in the press.[48] Harmon fought Barrington for many years, drawing other neighbors into his crusade along the way.

By the end of his management term at Barrington, Cabana had adapted to the Barrington climate and became a member of the Barrington community. So when Robert Dick, an ex-Barringtonian, was hired as the next manager of Barrington,

[46] "Barrington neighbor calls for tiring of general manager," *Toad Lane Review*, March 2, 1987.
[47] George Proper.
[48] Ibid.

Chapter 10

What is Barrington's Legacy?

Despite the strong sense of community among Barringtonians and their ability to thrive on the alternative lifestyle they had over several years created, the Barringtonians could not exist in their cultural bubble for long. The house was located in a densely populated area where people must actively cooperate to live together peacefully. Their house was located in a residential neighborhood where people desired a quiet place to live which could not be found next door to Barrington. The house was a part of an organization whose viability depended on maintaining a good reputation in the community and among members. As much as the Barringtonians thought of themselves as antithetical to it, they were intimately connected with the mainstream culture that surrounded them.

Most Barringtonians did desire to cooperate to keep their community alive; after all, they made actual changes in their behavior. Perhaps, given enough time, these changes would have helped the house adapt to survive. But working against them was their unwillingness to give up the part of their lifestyle that they perceived as their legacy and essential to their identity. They refused to give up their claim to an alternative lifestyle, which included the uninhibited use of drugs. This part of their identity was what those who fought against Barrington objected to. Perhaps the Barringtonian argument of "there are more of

The summer of 1983 saw the beginning of construction at Barrington. The Board hoped to have the hall freshly rehabilitated by the following fall. But when fall rolled around, the project was not complete, and residents were forced to move into a noisy, dusty construction zone with unpainted walls.[7] Residents grumbled as construction continued into the semester. The problems caused by poor planning for the renovations made things worse for Barrington. Members, having moved into an unfinished Barrington, felt their suggestions unheeded by the U.S.C.A. and angrily demanded that their desires be met. The renovations had included painting many of the walls white, thus removing the murals and graffiti that were a source of pride to some residents. The residents saw the renovation as "fixing" non-problem areas instead of replacing what really needed to be fixed. Some old members threatened to trash Barrington if the U.S.C.A. did not make further efforts to renovate the building. Seeing the Barrington threat as uncooperative and destructive, the Board responded with its own threat to kick out any members who acted destructively.[8] An unusual amount of tension began developing between Barrington and the Board.

Barrington's situation was further complicated when, at the end of 1983, its neighbors filed a complaint with the city of Berkeley, accusing the house of being a public nuisance. There is no doubt that many neighbors hated Barrington. They were the non-co-op group most directly affected by "the Barringtonian lifestyle." The neighbors complained that filth, unruliness, drug activity and noise at Barrington plagued them.[9] The outside walls of Barrington were covered with unsightly graffiti. The spray painted words read "terrorist" and "this is Barrington, get used to it."[10] On the sidewalk in twenty-foot tall letters, appeared "LSD," an obvious indication of drug use according to neighbors.[11] When the dumpsters were filled with

[7] George Proper.

[8] "Renovations at Barrington," *Toad Lane Review*, April 18, 1984.

[9] American Arbitration Association Report on the Arbitration Matter of Ellsmere Apartments Claimants and Barrington Hall Respondents, Barrington Hall miscellany, 308W.U592.bar, The Bancroft Library, University of California, Berkeley.

[10] Pictures of the outside walls are found at http://www.barringtonhall.org/.

[11] "Barrington Saved from Shutdown," *Toad Lane Review*, May 10, 1984.

trash, claimed the neighbors, the excess was left to spill over their sides. Noise from a stereo in the downstairs kitchen was reported by them to leak constantly in through the windows of surrounding apartments. Many of the older neighbors (not college students) were disturbed by the huge parties, several every month, which lasted well into the morning hours. Barrington had the reputation among neighbors as a den of drug activity, which attracted "undesirables." One neighbor described Barrington as "a noisy, unsafe, unsanitary, rat trap."[12] Complaints piled high on city officials' desks. The neighbors had most likely been irritated by Barrington for many years. Their frustrations compounded as the unruly Barringtonian behavior grew worse.

Under these circumstance, when, in 1983, one of Barrington's neighbors, the Ellsmere Apartments, filed suit with the City of Berkeley's district attorney in an attempt to shut Barrington down, the city and the U.S.C.A. took the matter seriously. In January 1984, in response to the suit, the City set up an arbitration committee, the Joint Tenants' Council, made up of three Barringtonians, three residents of the Ellsmere Apartments, the U.S.C.A. General Manager, and the U.S.C.A. president, to handle the problem.[13] The Council met several times and arrived at a set of guidelines for how Barrington and the Ellsmere Apartments should interact. Barrington agreed to follow some new rules. First, a restriction on parties to one per month, which were to end at 2 A.M. and be kept completely indoors, was instituted. The radio that blasted music from the Barrington kitchen windows was to be played only within a range farther than 30 feet from closed windows. The Barrington managers were asked to wear pagers so that Ellsmere residents could contact them at all times. The restrictions were agreed to by Barrington with the promise that Ellsmere would drop the suit against them and show more tolerance toward the Barrington lifestyle. A five- member Barrington action group was created to oversee the enforcement of the agreement.[14]

Opinions over the Ellsmere-Barrington agreement differed among co-opers. One U.S.C.A. news writer from the generally

[12] "Barrington may be ridding itself of rat trap image," *Toad Lane Review*, October 1984.

[13] "Barrington saved from shutdown."

[14] Arbitration agreement.

ious problems.[1] The extreme nature of the counter culture at Barrington had not yet become apparent to the U.S.C.A., and after surveying members and discussing the issue, the Barrington Committee, as they called themselves, decided that the root of Barrington's many problems lay in the physical configuration of the hall. In drafting solutions to the problems, they focused mainly on what should be physically changed about the building. The committee thought that if residents moved into a Barrington that was in optimal physical condition, they would have more of an incentive to take responsibility for keeping the house in top condition. For example, they hoped that a reorganization of the kitchen would make more efficient use of the area, and members might be more inclined to take care of it. The committee also viewed the house as not having enough common space. Seeing this as a problem that led residents to move to houses that offered more common space, they opted to convert some suites into study rooms. The problem of a large number of non-residents coming in and out of Barrington was addressed by moving the front door from the highly trafficked Dwight Way side of the house to the less frequented Haste Street side. They also desired to paint over some of the graffitied murals that gave the hall an unappealing appearance. These changes, thought the committee, would improve some of the problems Barrington faced.[2]

While the plan for the physical restructuring of Barrington was in the discussion process, outside influences also began to voice concerns. In January 1983, Barrington's insurance coverage was cancelled due mainly to what the insurance company saw as safety problems. The insurance company was investigating the building to address a lawsuit that was filed against the U.S.C.A. by a former Barrington resident who had fallen down an airshaft in 1981. The safety problems seen by the insurance company included major maintenance problems such as broken doors and stair railing, general housekeeping issues such as trash piled in hallways, as well as the premise's overall appearance. Another element cited as a safety issue by the insurance company was the constant presence of transients roaming in and around Barrington. These street people and other "unde-

[1] Barrington Study Committee, *Toad Lane Review*, November 12, 1982.
[2] Ibid.

kitchen inspection, the house's food service license would be suspended and with two failed inspections, the license would be revoked.[20] The U.S.C.A. could not afford to operate its largest residence hall without food service; too many people would cancel their contracts. The probation placed the heavy burden of being constantly under the watch of city officials and the central U.S.C.A. management on Barrington, especially its managers. This stress did not improve existent tensions between Barrington and the rest of the world.

The Summer of 1985, later dubbed "Hell Summer," brought the U.S.C.A. to the realization that a very serious situation was at hand in Barrington. The house was running at a reduced capacity of 40-50 residents for the summer. Each resident held a suite with a bathroom and several bedrooms. Many of the residents illegally rented out the extra rooms in their suites to transient students and others. By mid-summer, it was clear that around 125 people were living in Barrington, whereas only about fifty were legal tenants.[21] With such a large number of nonresidents in the house, general anarchy reigned. There was no accountability, financial or otherwise, of the non-residents for the house. They consumed drugs and alcohol, made uncontrolled amounts of noise, left the house unkempt and generally ran amuck.[22] The U.S.C.A. took action to kick those subletting out, which was difficult because the organization did no want to infringe on members' privacy by entering their rooms without permission. By the end of the summer, Barrington had been trashed by the summer residents and their illegal guests. The U.S.C.A. could do nothing to recover debts for the damage done by the people illegally subletting and very little to punish the residents.[23] "Hell Summer" further enforced the "do want you want" attitude at Barrington.

In the fall of 1985, rumors of drug abuse in Barrington spread. A sensational *Oakland Tribune* expose on the co-op house accused Barrington of harboring a large number of resident and visitor drug users.[24] In the rather conservative, anti-

[20] Ibid.
[21] George Proper.
[22] "Board of Directors threatens closure," *U.S.C.A. Today*, October 16, 1985.
[23] Ibid.
[24] George Proper

hard.[19] People who never knew Barrington as a student co-operative saw Barrington only as a place where huge parties, outstanding bands and mass quantities of drugs were found. But the drugs brought a seedy element, and under its harmful influence and various others, problems began to arise at Barrington.

[19] "Entertainment in the Co-ops," *Toad Lane Review*, May 23, 1980.

sented several stories about teenagers who ran away from home and found a refuge with sex and drugs at Barrington. One woman even claimed that her daughter had become a prostitute there. PACT asserted that a place like Barrington should not be allowed to operate within a community. They wanted immediate action to be taken by the Board to deal with Barrington. Barrington management denied that runaways were currently being given refuge there, although, they could not account for the past.[29] Given the attitude that pervaded there the previous summer, the accusations were most likely, at least partially, true. Barrington could not deny that these problems had existed in the house. The Board, under pressure from PACT, the Oakland Tribune and their general manager, voted to create another Barrington Action Committee to assess Barrington's problems and its future. They were not yet ready to exercise direct authority to control the house.

Barrington management viewed the complaints of the Board and the Central Level staff as unwarranted. They felt they had not yet been given a fair chance to show that Barrington was improving. To increase satisfaction with Barrington, they suggested that the house's lifestyle be advertised by the U.S.C.A., so it would attract a group more willing to adapt to it. They seemed to want to change their reputation without changing their culture. One Barrington manager noted that there was a difference between changing the bad points about Barrington and changing the lifestyle. The house president said that the Board's efforts would "not infringe on the character of Barrington," indicating the strong loyalty to maintaining the current Barrington philosophy.[30] Unfortunately, some of the bad points at Barrington were perpetuated by the alternative lifestyle. In this case, the sentiment of the house was in direct conflict with attempts to improve the house.

Later that semester, the *San Francisco Chronicle* published an article, which again proclaimed that Barrington had a serious drug problem, only this time heroin was specifically cited as being the main drug involved.[31] After this article, the U.S.C.A. could not relieve public concern. The U.S.C.A.'s insurance com-

[29] "Board of Directors threatens closure."
[30] Ibid.
[31] George Proper.

fifty residents.[12] They were the ones who most actively participated in the house. As a united front, these fifty "owned the house." Often those who enjoyed the lifestyle ran for manager, positions. These managers, wanting to maintain the alternative culture, enforced the rules and passed down the traditions that made this possible. Council members also perpetuated the "freedom at its most" lifestyle. One r Barrington woman went to council seeking a halt to the sexual harassment she had been experiencing from a male resident. After considering the case, the council decided that the male's right to harass the woman was equal to the woman's right to be free from harassment, and the two should work out their differences themselves.[13] Ideally in the co-op system, all members have power and rights. But here, it seems, the ideology of "people doing whatever they want" superceded the rights of all to feel empowered.

This same Barrington attitude was displayed at a city task force meeting attended by neighbors, police officers and Barrington representatives. The non-Barrington community members were complaining about an unacceptably loud party, which had occurred at Barrington. The police had received over 25 complaints and estimated that over 500 people had attended the party. A Barrington representative's response to the complaint was that if only 25 people complained and over 500 people were attending the party, why should 500 people stop what they were doing for 25 people. He claimed the rights of the 500 partygoers were greater than those of the 25 complainants.[14] The representative did not even acknowledge that the Barringtonians could have been disrespectful. Some saw their ideology as unquestionably correct.

Barrington residents came from a variety of backgrounds, but often those who bought into the counter culture at Barrington were for the first time without a parent-like authority enforcing the rules. They were indoctrinated in school and their community with new ideas including the philosophies of socialism and anarchy, and being exposed to many new things, including drugs. They saw Barrington as a place they could control, and therefore, a place they could experiment with these new

[12]George Proper.
[13]Ibid.
[14]Ibid.

once.[34] This worried the U.S.C.A. staff and the city officials. The U.S.C.A. called in resources from the University, the City of Berkeley, and some local drug treatment programs to deal with the Barrington drug problem. Half a dozen in-house heroin dealers were evicted but non-residents continued to be a part of the Barrington scene bringing drugs and the desire to use drugs.[35] In late February, the papers publicized an article about an Oakland man who was hospitalized after a heroin overdose at Barrington.[36] More accusations of drug abuse followed. Three other drug overdoses were reported that semester. Despite the U.S.C.A.'s efforts to combat the drug problem, it continued.

Responsibility to keep drugs and unwanted people out of Barrington ultimately belonged to the residents. Central U.S.C.A. Management could not control all members. Only the residents themselves could change Barrington's habits. As long as apathy or acceptance of drugs was the dominant attitude, the problems would continue. The residents were the people who could everyday enforce the rules and policies. If they did not recognize Barrington's problems, there would be no way for the U.S.C.A. to find solutions for Barrington.

The U.S.C.A. President called an emergency Board meeting to discuss the U.S.C.A.'s plan of action for Barrington. Heroin overdoses of non-residents had been reported. Vacancy rates were higher than they had been for years. Bad publicity for the U.S.C.A. was rampant. Barrington's members continued to blame the current situation on the "general anarchy" that prevailed the previous summer and asserted that the house was regaining control. They insisted that the reputation of Barrington's problems far exceeded its actual problems and begged the Board to allow them to deal with their problems themselves, as a community.[37] But the Board, in its own effort to regain control, voted to close Barrington indefinitely.

The situation was a hot topic among co-opers. Some U.S.C.A. members saw Barrington as a vital part of the U.S.C.A. and thought it was being scapegoated by a media that reacted with

[34]Ibid.
[35]"Barrington saved by members, put on probation," *U.S.C.A. News*, May 1, 1986.
[36]"Expulsion of Barrington heroin users, dealers threatened."
[37]"Barrington saved by members, put on probation."

Chapter 7

What Was the U.S.C.A.?

Barrington Hall was a house in the University Students Cooperative Association, the U.S.C.A. The U.S.C.A. traces its beginnings to 1933 when a group of fourteen students at the University of California, Berkeley, collectively rented a house, purchased food and performed house chores. These students hoped to provide themselves with an affordable place to live during the tough era of the Great Depression. They were following the lead of other students, like those in Ann Arbor, Michigan, who were banding together to sustain themselves by creating cooperative housing.[1] These student groups were part of a worldwide cooperative movement of people who hoped to provide goods and services for themselves more cost effectively by working together.

The U.S.C.A. made it through its first years as an organization through the hard work and sacrificial efforts of its members. They pooled their own money and applied for loans from the outside world to purchase a residence in 1934. They soon purchased other houses and increased the membership of the organization. The houses incorporated as a business providing cooperative housing. Throughout the 40s, 50s, 60s and 70s, the U.S.C.A. continued expanding and, by the 1980s, the pop-

[1] Guy Lillian, *A Cheap Place to Live*, University Students' Cooperative Association Library, Berkeley, CA.

ment, as a whole. The cooperative movement originated in Rochdale, England in 1844, where a group of men and women pooled their resources to open a dry goods store at which members could buy needed supplies at or slightly above cost. The Rochdale Pioneers, as they were called, many inspired by the social utopian visions of Robert Owen, hoped to create a means for democratically controlling their own resources and the prices and quality of the goods they purchased. Out of their original idea of democratically working together to maximize benefits, a whole movement was spawned. Today millions of cooperatives exist, providing services and goods to those who need them. Housing, purchasing, marketing, worker, daycare and many other types of cooperatives in hundreds of countries across the world make up the international cooperative movement.[6]

Members of the co-op (short for cooperative) movement were in the past, as they still are today, linked by their adherence to several principles which were valued by the original Rochdale Pioneers. Drafted in 1966 by the International Cooperative Alliance, these principles were known as the Rochdale Principles. The first of these principles was open and voluntary membership. For the U.S.C.A., this principle translated to mean membership open to all people regardless of race, religion, ethnicity or political affiliation. The second principle, member economic participation indicated that each member shared in the ownership of the organization by making monetary and labor contributions. Democratic member control was the next principle of cooperatives. Each member of a cooperative had an equal vote, which gave him/her an equal say in running the organization. Under the fourth principle of autonomy and independence, cooperatives strived to be as independently controlled as possible. For the U.S.C.A., this meant members were allowed to make decisions without any other organization directing their actions. A fifth important cooperative value was education, training and information. Under this principle, the U.S.C.A. tried to provide its members with as much information as possible including how the organization works, decisions made by the organization, how the U.S.C.A. fits into the student and world cooperative movements, and how members can

[6]David Thompson, *Weavers of Dreams*, Davis, CA: Center for Cooperatives, University of California, 1994.

U.S.C.A. as a whole. Also sitting on the Board of Directors were a president, several vice-presidents and a few Central Level staff members. These non-Board Reps provided needed information to the Board Reps, helped direct the organization, and made sure that the decisions made by the Board were implemented. They did not vote on proposed items; only the Board Reps had a vote.[10] Under this system, the power to make decisions rested in the hands of the Board Reps, who were accountable to the members of their respective houses.

Individual houses were governed by a house council made up of the house members in attendance. A certain number of house members, called quorum, must have attended for the house council to make decisions. Quorum for Barrington was the House President, Vice President and eight house members. The house council made decisions affecting the house's financial affairs, such as how much money was allotted for a party, house policy such as the creation of new bylaws, and other aspects of the house. The house council designated what constituted a finable offense for the house. It also decided who was considered a threat and not welcome to the house. The house council provided input to the Board Rep on U.S.C.A.-wide decisions. Minutes for all house council meetings were taken and posted so all house members could see the decisions made.[11] House council represented the voice of the house.

House responsibilities and duties were administered and implemented by house level managers. A House Manager oversaw the operations of the house, helped resolve conflicts within the house, and made sure house members had rooms, keys, furniture and other necessities. A Workshift Manager delegated and oversaw member workshifts. Workshifts were the five hours of chores, which every member was contractually obligated to do. They included cooking dinners, cleaning the house and doing maintenance at the house. A Maintenance Manager supervised a maintenance crew, which maintained the structural integrity of the house. The maintenance crew fixed windows, doors, lights and other broken items. A Kitchen Manager made sure the kitchen facilities at the house stayed clean and met

[10] "USCA Board," *USCA Owner's Manual 1983*, U.S.C.A. Library, Berkeley, CA.

[11] Barrington Constitution.

Chapter 8

How Did Barrington Hall Fit In?

Barrington was a house with a dual identity. First, it was a co-operative house within the U.S.C.A. Members signed U.S.C.A. contracts that guaranteed them certain rights such as the right to live in a habitable, safe environment. The contracts also gave to them certain responsibilities, such as cooperating with other members.[1] But Barrington's identity extended beyond being a house in the U.S.C.A. In its fifty-year history it built its own traditions, style and reputation. The house was purchased in 1935 and from the beginning was one of the most influential houses in the U.S.C.A.[2] It was the largest with 195 members. In the span of half a century, the house developed a unique character. Its culture often mocked traditional University culture. For example, in the 50s, members of Barrington entered a float decorated with a giant tower which looked half like Stanford's clock tower, Hoover Tower (Stanford was the rival of U.C. Berkeley), and half like a penis, entitled "Hoover's Last Erection" in a University sponsored parade. The float mocked Stanford and the occasion, voicing the mischievous nature of its builders.[3]

As Barrington aged, the tradition of counter culture grew. During the 60s, Barrington served as a breeding ground for

[1] Ibid.
[2] Guy Lillian
[3] Ibid.

which became part of the U.S.C.A.'s application to H.U.D. for loan funds. This application included schematic drawings and what Dick Palmer called, "a fairly elaborate justification for the project." The Regents stated in their letter that in the event that H.U.D. gave the loan to the co-op, the University would lease the Haste-Dwight Way property to the U.S.C.A. for what they called a "nominal fee." The nature of that "nominal fee" would prove to be a potentially fatal problem in the near future.

Two or three months passed, during which time D.H.U.D. examined the project, evaluated it, and decided on its answer. On August 15, 1969, Dick Palmer was able to send co-op founder Harry Kingman a letter saying that "we have received a reservation of funds," meaning that although D.H.U.D. was not committed to the project, it had still budgeted the money, "in the amount of $2,018,000 for our housing project." The amount would just about cover the projected building cost plus supplementary expenses such as architects' fees, "We still have some obstacles to overcome in negotiating the lease with the University," the letter went on, "but are optimistic that the project will go through."

Those obstacles were passed off easily in Palmer's "thank you" note to Kingman, but they soon exploded to incandescence and the co-op's optimism about the project began to suffer an occasional lapse. Background on the D.H.U.D. loan and that "nominal fee" is needed. Back at the time of the Ridge Project campaign, the U.S.C.A. had applied for D.H.U.D. funds through the College Housing Loan Program. Cosignature by UC was then required, a situation the lobbying efforts of Harry Kingman and others had changed since then. The University had refused to cosign the Ridge loan and the co-ops had had to rely on the campaign. However, the 1964 endeavors had familiarized the local Housing & Urban Developement office with the workings of the U.S.C.A. and convinced them that the co-op was a responsible group. "So when we went to them" with the apartment project, Palmer recalls, "it wasn't all that new to them. They knew who we were, and what we were doing. We got a friendly reception from the regional director... and his support, I'm sure, in getting the project approved." First to get federal money under the amended loan program, somewhat to the disgruntlement of symbol-minded Berkeley co-opers, was the Ann Arbor, Michigan co-op, which got their loan a year before Berkeley.

In any event, with the loan approved, the co-op could begin negotiations with the U.C. Regents on a lease for the Haste-Dwight Way lot, at which time the true nature of that aforementioned "nominal fee", and the traditional schism between the U.S.C.A. and University of California business interests reared its atrocious image into the light. "The treasurer of the University," according to Palmer, "took what we considered to be a completely opposite position to what we understood the university had.

"A little more background: Cloyne Court had been on the University's Master Plan (for expansion) for many years. That entire block has been an area of proposed expansion. We valued that property... we let them know in advance that we weren't going to give up that property easily. The University did not want to go through a condemnation suit to acquire that property, so they saw the apartment proposal as an opportunity to acquire that property without any pain. The U.C. treasurer took the position that, sure, they would rent us the apartment site for a dollar a year; we would have to give them Cloyne Court for free for that."

The co-op roared that this transfer hardly qualified as "a nominal fee," seeing as Cloyne was valued at half a million dollars. "As far as we were concerned," said Palmer, "that was a breach of faith. We had made an application in good conscience based on an understanding and he was violating that understanding." Palmer and a co-op lawyer had several fruitless meetings with the "intransigent" treasurer, after which an end run around his opposition was begun. Palmer alerted administration members considered favorable to the co-op in an effort to mobilize their support; alumni were also apprised of the situation. A series of letters "on a moral plane" went to the Regents; Dick said that either they'd reneged on a promise, or the treasurer was acting against their intentions.

A heart attack removed the co-op's most formidable administration ally, Chancellor Heyns, from the scene for three full months, during which time the co-op bided its time. They felt that without his presence any attempt to get the issue before the Regents was hopeless. Once Heyns was back in operation,

ate under the co-op aegis. In the late '60s, another apartment proposal, representing the most extensive and largest project ever undertaken by a private Berkeley-based firm, came to the attention of the co-op Board.

The 264-member apartment complex on the south side of the Berkeley campus evolved for the U.S.C.A. over a period of several years and as the result of a much different proposal. That proposal came from a strange source, even compared to the Smyth-Fernwald conflict of a very few years before. An officer of the Associated Students of the University of California, Berkeley's student quasi-government, approached the U.S.C.A. through Gideon Anders, then involved in A.S.U.C. affairs. The idea was that the A.S.U.C. and U.S.C.A. together would attempt to acquire land given over to the Bay Area Rapid Transit project on Hearst Avenue in Berkeley and build apartments for U.C. students on that property.

"As soon as we got into it," Dick Palmer related, "we found that the land was not going to be available for a couple of years, if at all, and there didn't seem much point in collaborating with the A.S.U.C. because of their clouded legal situation with the Regents." The idea of student-run apartments for students struck the proper co-op chord, however, and the U.S.C.A. began examining other possibilities. "It occured to us," said Palmer, "that the University had some grading sites available. We went to talk to R.A. Williams, the Dean of Students, about the possibility of some kind of joint effort with the University on those sites." Preliminary plans for one such site, the lot above Cloyne Court on Ridge Road, had already been prepared, so it was removed from consideration. As the original Barrington had at one time occupied the space, the co-op missed a sentimental chance.

A plot of ground was found, however, between Haste and Dwight Way one block west of Telegraph and a half block east of Barrington Hall. 350 feet by 140 feet, the site was available without any further condemnation of private property. The buildings on the site, the old McKinley High School, the brown-shingle structure then housing the Berkeley Free Clinic, and a number of temporary buildings, had already been condemned by the city to make way for University expansion.

Federal loan funds had been made available to co-ops some

relatively calm. Three days of pitched rock-and-gas battles between students and sundry local police forces over R.O.T.C. classes on campus had relieved the natural springtime tensions of the Berkeley campus. The Cambodia invasion provoked a different reaction, coupled with the murders of Krause, Miller, Scheier and Schroder at Kent State. Berkeley had seen violent street battles before—just a year before James Rector had been killed by Alameda County deputies in the People's Park battle, and members of the San Francisco Tac Squad had chased Barrington residents down their own hallways. Street and campus action exploded again on May 5th, 1970. A squad of Berkeley policemen beat and kicked a phocomelus street kid—born with stubby fingers for arms and stubby feet for legs—on the steps of the Free Clinic, then raided the Clinic itself, smashing the equipment inside. U.C. students and faculty shut the campus down for the remainder of the quarter, and applied whatever resources they could muster to changing America's mind about the Vietnam war. Co-op members, dorm residents, even Greeks, took part.

The basic effect of the spring, '70 confrontations on the U.S.C.A., however, was a loss of seven out of ten contractors from the bidding on the apartment complex. This was, of course, a financial blow to the co-op; competition in bids among reputable companies was severely restricted. There had been ten. The U.S.C.A. had to settle for three.

The lowest bid came from a minority contractor who couldn't raise the bond for the project, as the company had never constructed a building close to the size of the U.S.C.A. apartments, and had neither the resources nor the experience to handle such a large endeavor. After a month of trying to get the low-bidder qualified, the U.S.C.A. gave up and awarded the contract to Williams & Burroughs, the next lowest bidder.

After that final hassle, the large apartment complex rose swiftly. A sign-raising ceremony on the site, adorned with string outlines of the five buildings, blueprints, and a visit by Berkeley congressman Ronald Dellums, brought a group of old and new co-op members together. A multi-colored sign on which the word "student" was most prominent—an emphasis designed to prevent vandalism by nearby Telegraph Avenue street people—was hauled up by a number of Goldsmith's committeemen and

faced each other for the first time without Howie between them. The decision to empty the house was abandoned, as was the general hostility towards C.O. "For a lot of them," says Palmer, "it was the first time they'd ever dealt directly with George or I, instead of hearing what the managers told them." Dick later advised the Board that vandalism was the product of only a few Euclidians—that the mass of members had labored under a Howie-built misconception. For the Board, which had once sat through meeting surrounded by angry Euclidians, this was good news. The house was indeed changed at the end of the year as coeds were brought and most of the old members were distributed throughout the other houses. Euclid settled into ordinary co-ophood; renovated and repainted, except for the rising sun on the living room ceiling which the membership wanted kept. The hall was without its old managers. They had absconded in the middle of the previous term.

The general disaster which befell fraternities and sororities in the late '60s had a peripheral effect that brought Euclid permanantly into the U.S.C.A. The organization benefitted directly on several occasions in that time. The first of these was the Alpha Zeta Delta sorority house next to Sherman Hall on Prospect. Like many other Greek establishments, this house had undergone major remodeling expansions in the '50s and early '60s while the Greek system boomed. A huge mortgage had accrued and with the change in student attitudes, especially those of incoming pledges, financial obligation could not be met.

A "FOR SALE" sign glimpsed on the Alpha Zeta Delta lawn and inquiries were made. Negotiations through a realtor set the extremely reasonable price of $75,000 for the excellent building and property. The land alone was appraised at $72,000, and the sale, while a god-send to the co-op, was a disaster to the sorority, which sold immediately to make necessary funds. It was indeed a good buy. "A fine house, beautiful house, well-maintained," were Palmer's words. "We had some remodelling to do, to bring it up to code. Had a new heating system and everything, well-maintained. Just really a nice place." The sorority was so desperate it even agreed to take a $60,000 mortgage on the house, a crowning excellence on the deal for the co-op. The house opened late in 1969 and was named Davis House, in honor

for two years before the U.S.C.A. picked it up for $115,000. Discussion on the use of the handsome building, located near Davis and Sherman, focused on use of the co-op philosophy. Predictably, no real agreement on the nature of that philosophy was settled. The newest co-op house opened in the fall, named Andres Castro Arms, after the co-op's cook of twenty-five years.

May saw Berkeley host what Mark Gary called "The Great Toad Lane Revival" a "convention" of representatives from a number of co-ops across the nation. Workshops in co-op problems, talks by members of various cooperative organizations, informal meetings with members, a tour of the under-construction Rochdale and a small street riot were featured for the twenty or thirty attendees, who came mostly from western states. Board member John Mausser attended a similar conference, designed for the exchange of ideas, that fall in Toronto, a trip about which some controversy came up. a number of involved members, a minority in a minority, protested that Mausser's plane fare could be better applied to immediate concerns of the houses. The Board took the long-range view and decided to finance the trip for Mausser, who later became co-op President.

The year climaxed on October 9th, with the ceremonial opening of the apartment complex, which had risen with little trouble. Weather problems in the summer had hampered construction, and hassles with wiring and the installation of carpets had caused some inconvenience. There was some question at the decision to allow Rochdale members— restricted to upper division students—to paint their rooms only with permission of the governing council. But the October 9th ceremony saw the opening of a completed, functioning unit—co-op apartment houses built from scratch and specifically for co-op living.

It was quite a ways from that fourteen-man meeting in Harry Kingman's house, though both Harry and Ruth Kingman and several of that first fourteen attended the ceremony. Alumni covering practically all of the thirty-eight years of co-op existence were invited to the opening, held in the center court of the complex which had been named Rochdale Village, after the English town where "co-operativism" had been created. Hal Norton; Doug Cruikshank; Larry Collins; Bill Davis, whose Stiles Hall co-hosted the ceremony; Dan Eisenstein; David Bortin,

it and it was finally accepted...

The co-op took over the J.S.C. once more, on a one-year lease renewable for two more years. They filled the hall with men on the co-op waiting list, and for the first year or so, Euclid Hall, as it was named, worked well under the able management of a student named Gideon Anders. After that first year strange things happened at Euclid Hall.

It was a strange era, the late '60s, and a strange manager, later to be known only as Howie, took over the managership of Euclid. Dick Palmer called Howie an "anarchist." Certainly the anarchist emotion was lively in Berkeley at that time, and the clientele in Euclid was most definitely a group "up" with the times. Howie, a large fellow always seen in a long black raincoat, ran the house with a similarly-minded workshift manager supplementing and abetting his influence.

The house became a haven for an anarchist sentiment totally divorced from politics on any but the U.S.C.A. level. For Palmer, the membership became a huge problem, because not only did the managers foment an attitude of distrust (Palmer called it paranoia) towards the Central Office, they also encouraged a policy of rather a bizarre self-expression. Paint was liberally applied to all surfaces in the house, which the co-op then only leased. Every window in the upper floor was painted black. A rising sun emblem was painted on the living room ceiling, much to the unsettlement of the alumni of the Japanese Students Association. To higher splendors of art, the liberated denizens of Euclid vaunted. A chair was launched, for no special reason, through a dining room wall, and windows began to lose their glass.

The J.S.C. alumni who owned the hall were basically a conservative, idle class group. The mess Howie and his boys were making out of their hall deeply offended them and in addition, an offer from the ever-present G.T.U. on the property came their way. They notified Palmer that the offer would probably be accepted, just before the third year of the U.S.C.A. lease ran out.

> We were faced with the alternatives of buying the building, overbidding G.T.U. or losing it as housing as soon as the lease ran out. The Board discussed

And so on...

The student co-op in Berkeley will be forty years old in 1973. Financially, in the 1970s as always, the U.S.C.A. is on "very thin ice" by any conventional methods of analysis. "That's a very crude rule of thumb which doesn't apply to all kinds of organizations," Dick Palmer protests. "Within our own frame of reference we're in pretty good shape. We have the pattern of a rapidly growing organization, which means we have a very large debt, we're short of cash and always have been. On the other hand, when you examine a corporation you don't just look at its balance sheet, you also look at its potential. And if you look for instance at the avuncular waiting lists and our position in the market place and our rates compared with the rest of the housing market you can see that we're in an extremely advantageous position." The co-op has no problem filling its houses.

But filling them co-operatively is more difficult, as it always has been. Poorer students than the norm rarely attend state universities since the advent of community colleges. A richer segment of the economy lives in the co-ops in the '70s, expecting more amenities, a problem for the still-cut-budget U.S.C.A. Palmer sees the problem of the co-op spirit as far more than the provision of expected luxuries:

> We've failed very badly in member education and member involvement. Most of the people come to the co-op because it's cheap; most people who come here don't know what a co-op is, and don't really care a lot, as long as it's cheap. That's the only way they can get through school, in some cases. The hope is that after they get here they will learn

car seeking to take the activist and the arresting officers from Sproul Plaza found itself hemmed in by a mass of students. They held the car there for several days and nights, and struck the campus in the name of free speech. 1,000 students took over Sproul Hall, the Berkeley administration building. Baffled, Chancellor Strong fell back on what would become the U.C.'s administration's answer to student challenges for the next six years. Strong called in the cops.

A force composed of University, Berkeley and Alameda County police roared onto Sproul Hall. Among the 800 students who refused the opportunity to leave and were arrested was Barrington's Phil Cawthorne. Along with several other active co-op members, he had come down to Sproul on one of its nights of occupation and had gained entrance by scaling a rope hung down from Sproul's second floor. A fellow Barringtonian, waiting to follow him up the rope, was nabbed by the police that then surrounded the building.

The next day, Alameda County deputies, just beginning to ear the reputation which would culminate in the murder of James Rector and the infamous "Night at Santa Rita" five years later, entered Sproul Hall and bundled everyone off for the county prison farm, Santa Rita. They hauled Cawthorne bodily into the Sproul elevator with several other students. At that time, he had no idea of who they were. "Sausalito Police Department," he was told when he asked. "Come on man; don't be naive."

Naïvete on matters of student-police relations would not last long in Berkeley in the 1960's. Cawthorne's case did not come up for trial until the following winter, the early months of 1965. But F.S.M. lit the faces of the U.S.C.A. campaign members like a bomb. While student frustrations and sensibilities were served and gratified by the Free Speech Movement, the U.S.C.A. campaign considered it a potential disaster. F.S.M. interupted the co-op at the height of its efforts to contact and persuade philanthropic foundations, some of whom were conservative and whose attitude leaned feircely towards hostility after the change in overt student attitudes.

That hostility seemed silly when seen in the hindsight of the 1970's, after far more extensive and violent demonstrations would occur on campus. Hal Norton was, at that time, arranging a loan with the Mutual Service Life Insurance Company.

> [They were] a very, very conservative insurance company—small, made up of farmers in Kansas City. A man from the company flew out and talked to us about the orgainization and the future of the organization... one of his concerns was whether or not the University of California was going to survive as an entity in Berkeley... whether there would be a decentralization. The people would stay away, the students wouldn't come, the parents wouldn't send the students... all of that. They were committed to [supporting the project] but they could have pulled out, and we'd have had to go to law to enforce the law... I don't think we could have. The best we could have done was secure damages.

Ted Johnston, as a University official, was the natural candidate to soothe panicky foundation members aghast over the F.S.M. "I had occasion," he recalls, "to have to provide one foundation with a count [of co-op members involved in the sit-in], and so I knew at that point, or at least thought I knew, how many co-opers were involved. The eventual grant that we got from that foundation was substantially reduced from what we expected it to be." Johnston found that U.S.C.A. students did not participate in F.S.M., a dubious discovery considering Phil Cawthorne's situation at Santa Rita and the traditional sense of involvement co-op members always felt in campus situations. Of course, the organization took no official position on the issue—forbade to do so by Rochdale Principle. The pressure to do so was high, but Board members such as Bill Davis successfully objected because of the co-op rules.

On November 20th, the U.C. Regents voted to allow political recruiting on campus, a virtual capitulation to student demands. Student activism had just begun. Phil Cawthorne took the fall of '64, F.S.M. and Stanford skirmishes to the contrary, in stride. But months of court appearances in the next academic season took his time and motivation. Phil left the University in June of '67 and although he remained an off-and-on Berkeley and co-op resident, he never returned to academia.

> that they knew who were on the boards of [philanthropic] foundations or who knew somebody who was.
>
> Bill Davis was a tremendous help in this because he'd been raising funds for years for Stiles Hall and knew a lot of the people involved in foundation grants in the Bay Area. He was, in fact, the influential party in getting us ... the initial grant, the ice-breaker, from the Levi-Strauss Foundation, $15,000. That really got things moving. Nobody wants to give any money until somebody else already has. It was on the strength of that grant that we were able to get others.

Davis also earned credit from the fund chairman by gaining the co-op its largest grant: $260,000 from the Cowell Foundation. Along with Davis, Dick Mollard and Hal Norton paid a personal visit to Max Valund of the foundation and two other trustees. Ted Johnston concentrated his year of efforts on gaining gifts from old alumni:

> I would go to L.A., for example, and call up a guy I hadn't thought about or seen for twenty years, and I'd say, "Hi, Joe, this is Ted Johnston. I'm working for the student co-op. We're building a new building. I'd like to talk to you about it. We're going to have a meeting on this date and would you come?" I was just amazed at how many guys would come.
>
> Dick Palmer had done a lot of photographic work. He'd taken pictures of all the old houses and of what the central office looked like at that point, and the campus. I'd get a group of maybe twenty-five old members together in a room in someone's house somewhere. I'd just begin to show them pictures and talk about the plan and you could hardly keep the guys from giving money to us.
>
> They turned out to be two kinds of people: the guys who were on house council and on intramural teams from the houses, and guys who weren't social at all. It was really so heartwarming to go talk with

of one of its vice chancellors, U.C. proposed to Norton that the U.S.C.A. take over the operation of Smyth-Fernwald and run the dorm complex. This seemed anachronistic next to the three high-rise units, as a co-op. The operating costs for the complex were made available to Norton, who had the U.S.C.A. auditor, Russel Tausig, lend his aid in the analysis of those costs.

The University was serious about the release of Smyth-Fernwald and the co-op decided that serious consideration of their offer was in order, especially in the light of the effectively simultaneous approach from the Graduate Theological Union. If the U.S.C.A. saw fit to accept the G.T.U. offer, then taking over the dorms could only be to the organization's advantage. As said before, the parcels of land offered in exchange for the Ridge Property held no adequate space for a central kitchen. As a dorm unit, Smyth-Fernwald boasted a large kitchen, a dining room building and a separate building with office space. Norton estimated that the dining room could hold better than 1,000 customers and, more importantly, the Smyth-Fernwald kitchen could be adapted to serve as the U.S.C.A. kitchen with little trouble. It was certainly superior to the present C.K. at Oxford.

At the June 16 meeting of the Summer Executive Committee, a group with full Board powers, Norton was authorized to "carry on preliminary negotiations with the University regarding this suggestion." The purpose of these negotiations was to determine the approach the U.S.C.A. should take in wording its proposal for the site to the University. In those meetings, a number of specifics on rent, period of lease, expansion and so forth, were discussed. The proposal was then submitted to the University on the first of August in 1964.

In the meantime, the Executive Committee had decided to postpone the construction of the Ridge project for one year, a delay which would not only allow the U.S.C.A. to save money by renting the dorms and selling the Ridge property to the G.T.U., but would allow modifications to the project if other needs came to be. Because of the delay, a planned rate increase was halved for the coming year.

Dick Palmer had the duty of "Acting U.S.C.A. President" that summer and was also put in charge of evaluating the Smyth-Fernwald idea for U.S.C.A. use. He visited the complex, made

The Congressional action began first. Indeed, attempts by Harry Kingman and other co-op allies to change the National Housing Act, thus making student co-ops eligible for federal funds under the College Housing Program, had not ceased since the partial victory in 1959. The co-signature of the University was still required for a federal loan and U.C. still took the dubious and a no doubt convenient perspective that, as a public institution, it was prohibited by law from aiding a "private source" with University credit. That the three University dorm complexes had just opened may have had something to do with it. Solution to the Housing Bill problem had to wait until after Ridge Project was constructed. If the University did not co-sign a loan, and federal funds were not available, then a campaign to gain construction costs from private sources was necessary.

The Berkeley co-ops had an advantage over many student groups in a fundraising campaign because its alumni had gone on to excel in many fields, some of which were still related to co-operatives or education. Since the late 1940s, an alumni association had led an on-and-off existence. In 1962, it was revived by Dan Eisenstein who plundered the newer graduates. Hal Norton, himself a veteran of the early days of the organization, kicked off the campaign by calling a meeting of various "old-timers" at the office of the Mutual Service Life Insurance in Berkeley, the co-op insurance company whose west coast office was led by Larry Collins. Collins was at that meeting, along with Bill Davis, Bruck Black, a one-time Oxford manager, George Yasakoshi, head of the Berkeley Consumer's Co-op who had come to that job from the assistant manager's post at the U.S.C.A. , and, in addition to some others, Ted Johnston, now a high-ranking administrator in the state-wide university system.

"Hal began to talk to us about the hopes and plans of the student co-op," Johnston recalls, "to build a new facility that would enable the student co-ops to replace the central kitchen that was just not big enough to do the job. There was need of additional housing because of our awareness at that point that the university was going to take the Cloyne property away from us." This awareness was based on U.C.'s announced expansion policies which included the Cloyne block. Years later, Cloyne would figure prominently in the co-op's attempts to finance its southside apartment complex. The "old-timers" were by-and-

gross mis-statement of the Ridge project situation. So irresponsible was the dorms' motion, in fact, that the October 15 *Daily Cal* carried a lead editorial in which the errors were enumerated and the Senate chided for hearing such sloppy, ill-considered words.

A week later, the whole issue was killed for good when Clark Kerr, now president of the entire U.C. system, rejected the co-op proposal as "not feasible in its present form." The same day, the *Daily Cal* carried a story praising the U.S.C.A. by W. Byron Rumford, a state assemblyman and author of the then controversial Fair Housing Bill in California. Save the anger over the Smyth-Fernwald hassle, the U.S.C.A. could now turn to the construction of the new Ridge Project.

The final plans for the Ridge Project were approved soon after the Smyth-Fernwald brouhaha ended. Dick Palmer worked in close conjunction with the architects and contractors. There were no major problems in the construction of the new unit, although minor finish work such as handrails for the stairways were not completed when the first members moved in that fall. It was a unique building, not only because it was the first in Berkeley designed specifically for co-op use, but because it incorporated parking, storage, kitchen, office, living and recreational facilities into one, relatively small package. An article by one-time Cloyne-man Walt Crawford called "Coed Co-op," which appeared in the *California Engineer*, detailed its features. It contained six levels: a garage, a new central kitchen and central warehouse, a central office and project lounge and three floors of living space divided into men's and women's wings. Each wing had a rooftop lounge. The rooms were divided into singles for students with the longest residence in the co-ops, doubles, and triples. It was not the first time in the recent history of the co-ops that more than two persons had to share a room.

It was a unique structure in many ways, but the most attention was paid to the co-op philosophy behind the building. Crawford's article, distributed to alumni as part of a final burst to the fund drive, expressed it thusly:

> The one abiding principle in the whole architectural design of Ridge Project has been to build a unit reflecting individuality and freedom, the antithesis of many dormitories. The disadvantages of

be launched in which the remaining bells were painted blue and gold (visible from the outside) and the tower was barricaded from the inside. The Barringtonian who rolled the original bell over the tower trapdoor was a Sierra Club member and, at the end of the caper, repelled down the side of the tower. Stanford, suffering from the publicity of the incident, had to use a fireladder to get its bells cleaned.

Enormous gags such as this document the wild imagination prevalent in U.C. student life. The Silent Generation's quiet hold on the campus had just about dissipated, but its talented members, or rather those students who came into school as its influence was on the wane, still had enormous effect on the growth of the campus. Of course, regarding the U.S.C.A. , no student member of the co-op had any greater effect than Dick Palmer, an architecture student from Los Angeles.

Palmer became involved with the co-operative at Berkeley through accidental means. Leaving the Army in the late '50s, he applied and was accepted to Berkeley. Having never heard of the co-ops, like the majority of new Cal freshmen, he applied for housing at a University dorm. "Shortly after I applied," he said, "I got a notice from the accounting office saying that I wasn't eligible for admission to the dorms because I was too old. In the meantime, an acquaintance at work mentioned that I might be interested in the co-ops." Palmer wrote a letter of application and, as the U.S.C.A. had no age restrictions (or any other restrictions for that matter), went on to live at Cloyne.

His first two years there were devoted to schoolwork; architecture is hardly the easiest of Berkeley's programs. In his junior year he moved up from the maintenance crew to maintenance manager and was, for one semester, president of Cloyne's council. He also sat on the U.S.C.A. Board of Directors as Cloyne's representative. In those days, Hal Norton, thirty years in the co-ops, didn't take an especially active part in Board meetings. He was silent, according to Palmer, "except when we asked him questions... he gave a manager's report, usually quite involved and mimeographed, at every meeting."

It was through his Board membership that Palmer, in his upper division years, grew closely involved with central level operations.

> What really got me hooked was the Planning Com-

the U.S.C.A. was trusted as an organization by both its creditors and its members. He had carried the co-op through every type of times: depression, when the students had no money; war, when the university had no students; prosperity, when the students could afford luxuries; academic turmoil, when an organization of students had to survive in an environment with which its members were suddenly at odds. Hal's resignation was sudden, catching the U.S.C.A. almost completely by surprise, but was understood. Hal's law degree had opened avenues he was now free to take. The U.S.C.A. was faced with a problem it had not encountered since before most of its members had been born, the selection of a new manager.

The Board of Directors did the proper Board thing and appointed a committee to select Hal's successor, as Hal had no recommendations. Bill Davis chaired the group and was composed of Tom Surh, then the U.S.C.A. President, and two alumni, Art Walenta of Barrington and Dan Eisenstein, among others. At the time Eisenstein got into the act, the committee had received several applications and split into subcommittees to interview the applicants. Among those they interviewed was Dick Palmer, who initially had not tried for the job because he felt he did not have the qualifications. The Committee thought otherwise. Eisenstein recalls the considerations:

> We had a meeting at which we reviewed the applications and qualifications of all the applicants and decided that Palmer probably was the best choice. Among other things, all of us were impressed with his personal commitment to the co-op, to the co-op as an idea being different from other housing groups; and with his imagination, the fact that he was not just a guy who could make figures come out of a calculator, but had really interesting ideas about the whole purpose behind group living, and the kind of thing you could do with a group living situaton. The fact that he was an architect, the fact that he had worked with Hal and the whole central-office, the fact that he had some familiarity with what was going on in there, because it was a rather involved system...

nounced the whole high-rise idea:

> I thought it was crazy. I was the only Board Rep who thought it was crazy, and I fought it as hard as I could, because I thought that high-rises were stupid. . . nobody would want to live in a high-rise. This prediction was borne out [in the 1960's] when the University found itself unable to fill its high rises but at the time everybody was hot for it.

The U.S.C.A. Ratcliff study gave the same two possibilities for financing the project as had the Progress Report of two years before: the U.S.C.A. could mortgage all of its properties and obtain loans or grants from private sources or the University could aid the co-op through the '58 Housing Act's loan-and-loan-again policy. Neither alternative came to be, fortunately for the U.S.C.A. If the University had ended up financing the 1050-student "New Project" the Wilson land would not become available. It remained off the market and, in the years that followed, it became evident that the co-op had been saved by this circumstance from being skewered on the tusks of a potentially rogue white elephant.

Except for the three units mentioned above, the University's high-rise dorm complexes died on paper. The trio of survivors rumbled with empty rooms and fatally high turnover. Students, once out of the parental bag which could take a period of adjustment, had no truck in the years to come for the *en loco parentis* attitude of the University dorms. Even if the cooperative nature of the "New Project" avoided this pitfall, the architectural sterility of standardized room structure and plasticized recreational areas, common to both U.S.C.A. and U.C. high-rises, rapidly became intolerable to a newly-awakened student population in the early '60's. The Berkeley high-rises were never less than a serious financial loss to the University, and the co-op was lucky that its own high-rise got no further than a table model at Ratcliff and Ratcliff architects.

So there would be no 1050-student unit. However, there was still the incredibly valuable co-op property on Ridge Road; there was still a desperate need for a decent central kitchen and warehouse; there was still a housing need, and to temporarily

meet a bit of that need, the co-op once again turned to the University.

A huge engineering building was planned by U.C. just west of Cloyne Court at Ridge and Leroy, and the rooming houses and so forth located on that lot were purchased in order to make way for the eventual edifice. Officially these places were "slated for destruction. . . sometime in the future." Three of these houses attracted the attention of the U.S.C.A., and the co-op leased them from the University. Forty-seven men moved into these buildings in the spring of 1959, and dubbed them Eisenfitz, Clod-haven, and Ridge Annex.

The "Eisenfitz" name came to be applied to the middle of these three buildings through a process of praise for the three students who, true to the tradition of Bill Spangle and Larry Collins, ran the organization in the summer of 1959. At that time Norton took a vacation in Europe, the C.K. at Oxford was closed and there was no dietician.

Dan Eisenstein, of course, was one of the triumvirate, by then a five-year veteran of co-op life. "I was a Board Rep for seven semesters, three and a half years" he said, in explaining his rise to co-op-wide power. "I was just the guy who cared the most and was around the most and knew the most and therefore was deferred to . . . and I'm garrulous and gregarious. I knew everybody in [Cloyne], I know everybody in the central organization and a lot of people in the other houses."

Another member of the trio was Ted Eisenstat, who shared the "Eisen" title with Dan. A chess and ping pong whiz, he remained in the co-op for about five years from 1955. John Fitz was senior to both Eisenstein and Eisenstat. He entered the co-op in 1952 and left in '56 and then returned later. Eisenstein described him as:

> A Renaissance man. . . a composer, pianist, played the bass, tuba, fiddle, guitar, horn, mandolin, ran a folk-dancing group on campus for a long time. . . ran the hiking club. . . has a masters degree in engineering. . . ran the Unitarian Church's youth discussion group. . . makes his own clothes. . . literally a Renaissance man, competent, extremely bright—and he was also a red-hot. He and I were very close in the

congressmen and subsequently had not gone to Washington to testify, regretted his decision to stay in Berkeley. The bill, as eventually passed, required that the University co-sign any federal loan to the student cooperative. It was a defeat—a hopeful defeat in Norton's lights. Efforts were instituted immediately aimed at the 1959 Congress.

Stymied in Washington, a new avenue towards expansion seemed to open up at Sproul Hall. A conference with Kerr was arranged at which the idea of a re-loan was worked out. U.C. would borrow government money under the College Housing Program which would then be loaned to the U.S.C.A. for its own projects. In July of '58, Kerr wrote Norton of a new policy recently approved by the Housing and Home Finance Agency. This plan made "facilities for the use of cooperatives, fraternities, sororities, and other social living groups" eligible for federal funds "as long as they would continue to be the responsibility and property of the college and university during the life of the loan." The institution would take responsibility for the loan.

Norton and Davis and other Board members worked on a recommendation to be made to the full Board under this plan, which must have been repulsive to many of its members. University responsibility carried inklings of University inspection and control, and since the days when Larry Collins opened doors to Barrington Hall for inspecting Deans, the thought of such a system was naturally repugnant to the students. Even now the University insisted that women's co-ops maintain housemothers with whom Dan Eisenstein had more than one run-in.

"The house-mother was paid by the organization for which she worked," he says, "but she usually thought of herself as a representative of the University and of the parents. I got in a lot of fights with co-op house-mothers, some of whom were very dear ladies, because I insisted on telling them that they were *our* employees... if they didn't like that they could go to work somewhere else." The housemother system at the co-ops, associated with the University's program of approved housing, was doomed by the middle of the 1960's, but much co-op business was to transpire before the "Heidi" trauma was to change student history.

In the meantime, the U.S.C.A. continued to look into the possibilities of the hilltop at Scenic and Ridge. By now it was

> It is rare that the buildings have ever been used in the same manner as the U.S.C.A. uses them, so remodeling is often extensive, the results are sometimes make-shift... As the organization grows in size and maturity it feels an... obligation to provide quarters more amenable to University life...

University life, it would be seen, had little in common with stainless-steel high-rises. The 1960 purchase was much more to the students' liking. The new hall was named after Alexander Morrison Kidd, dubbed "Captain" by law students at Boalt and described by Hal Norton as "a legend in my profession." "He's probably taught more criminal law attorneys in the state of California than any one man." Kidd had been a Faculty Board Rep for the U.S.C.A. for seven years, March '42 to May '49, and had given extremely valuable service. "The Captain," Norton recalls, "never missed a meeting."

No further expansion took place for several years, until the opening of Ridge Project. A campaign office next to Hoyt Hall was bought and opened to aid in the project. In 1963, the 30th Anniversary of the University Students' Cooperative Association, the organization purchased Oxford which it had been leasing for 15 years. Norton consulted ex-member and Alumni Board Rep David Bortin, who had become an attorney, in drawing up the legal papers for the purchase.

The story of the co-ops skips into its fourth decade and the two great expansion projects of the '60's. However, the 1950's are not so easily left behind. Not only did the Silent Generation build an image in U.C. administrators' minds which was in some degree responsible for the closed and comfortable attitude which brought the Free Speech Movement, it also gave student life a lunatic charisma, a madcap, jujube joyride junket aura, that required a decade of intense political activism to overcome.

The story slips back a few years, therefore, to the hot spring of May, 1956. Dan Eisenstein was then house manager at Cloyne Court, one of the foci of activity that epic day, and he remembers the reasons why what happened happened:

> The University did a very stupid thing in the spring of '56. We had semesters then. The winter break for Christmas was from December 20th

Excluded they remained. Senator Payne from Maine made the soon passed motion in the committee to delete the Norton amendment from the Housing Act. As Senator Payne had previously assured one of Norton's Washington contacts that he's support the amendment, senatorial insult was added to congressional injury. Senator Payne could expect no support from the U.S.C.A. in his re-election campaigns, for what that was worth.

Such defeats are the regular byway of most bills in the Senate and Norton and his allies did not give up. A letter writing project through the North American Student Co-operative League was abortive—time was too short once Norton knew that the amendment would be introduced for any effective campaign to get underway. At this point, however, Harry Kingman entered the fight.

Kingman was a lobbying veteran and helped the "Washington team" to move the amendment fight to the House of Representatives. A California Congressman, Harlan Hagen, was approached as a sponsor for the bill. Hagen agreed to do so and a second, more carefully planned letter-writing campaign had begun. The campaigners didn't wait for the bill to be introduced and therefore had more time. Kingman knew many California Congressmen and used his personal influence in support of the amendment. Several American co-operatives gave "immeasurable" aid. Clark Kerr lent his name to the effort with a crucially timed telegram:

> HON. HARLAN HAGAN
> HOUSE OFFICE BUILDING
> WASHINGTON D.C.
>
> UNIVERSITY STUDENTS' COOPERATIVE ASSOCIATION AT BERKELEY, CALIFORNIA HAS QUARTER CENTURY OF SUCCESSFUL OPERATION. ANY REASONABLE PROVISION WHICH WOULD MAKE THEM ELIGIBLE FOR A FEDERAL LOAN, EITHER DIRECTLY OR INDIRECTLY THROUGH THE UNIVERSITY, WOULD BE WELCOMED.

While whooping it up over Kerr's endorsement Norton learned that two other California Congressmen from the proximity of

> At the end of this particular day, in Cloyne, we heard about two or three fraternities having this big water-fight north of us. They'd decided that the thing to do was to go over and attack Cloyne. They'd run out of balloons or something—they were resting. So after dinner we were all worried, and a lot of us went out and stood in front of the house. . . some guys actually stood there with weapons.
>
> There was a cop standing in the intersection of Le Conte and Ridge (which is north of Cloyne and along the route the frats would be sure to take). One lone Berkeley policeman, waiting for whatever was supposed to happen.
>
> Suddenly we got a report from somebody who's been over further north that this big crowd of frat guys had started down towards Cloyne, but had stopped at one of the sorority houses on north-side and had staged a panty raid.
>
> Now we had heard about panty raids from Eastern schools. They had been going on for the previous year or two and had been sort of a fad. But this was the first one we had really had in Berkeley. Gee. Panty raid. Hmmm. What does that mean? Well, are they still coming towards us? Yes.
>
> Then we heard voices. I went down and stood in the intersection, and I saw a crowd of guys about 250, 300, 400 guys walking down Le Roy.[3] They came to the intersection, and they turned, and somebody yelled, "let's go to Stern!" And they went right on past Cloyne. And a whole bunch of guys streamed out of Cloyne to follow them. And they disappeared down the street.

Eisenstein, ever the responsible co-op official, did not follow his hysterical fellows to the University's major women's dorm. He and other co-op honchos had their hands full protecting U.S.C.A. property.

> We sat around, three or four of us, making sure nobody did anything funny to our house. At some

[3] It was about 6:30 in the evening.

don't need a weatherman to know which way the wind is blowing.

Changes came in their attitude, but slowly. Those involved in Berkeley's burgeoning high-rise dormitory complexes looked naturally askance at the U.S.C.A.'s continuous efforts in competition. Usually there was no ill feeling. Relations were open, honest and friendly even if unproductive on the Hearst-Scenic land issue.

The University was not directly involved in the most crucial endeavors of the U.S.C.A. in 1958 which sent representatives of the co-op organization all the way to the United States Congress and signaled a pitch in organizational activity in the external sphere never before reached. Coupled with the continued acquisition of funds for a Ridge-Scenic-Hearst residence complex, the co-op moved in 1958 to amend the National Housing Act of 1950 in order to qualify student co-operatives for low-cost federal loans.

Work on this project was primarily divided between U.S.C.A. Manager Hal Norton and the organization's "founding father," Harry Kingman, now a prominent liberal lobbyist in Washington. Discussions had gone on in U.S.C.A. circles for several months in late 1957 and early 1958 on the conceivability of amending the Act, but "the first concrete step," according to a September Manager's Report to the U.S.C.A. Board, "was taken in March."

At that time Norton attended a Co-operative Housing Conference in Washington, and discussed the co-op's problem with federal officials from the Housing and Home Finance Agency and the Federal Housing Administration. Basically that problem was associated with the newly competitive university dorm program. The 1950 Housing Act required that any non-profit corporation seeking federal funds for a student housing project gain a co-signature on the loan from the University. U.C. wasn't anxious to help finance its competitors. Amending the Act would eliminate the need for a U.C. co-signature.

Norton also let the Co-operative League of the U.S.A. know of the U.S.C.A. 's plan while in Washington. "Although it was never determined that the co-operative sections of the Federal Housing Act completely bar a student cooperative from [a loan]," Norton wrote in his report, "it was the consensus of all

there the mob attacked. "I heard several stories about events in individual sorority houses," Eisenstein recollects. "One guy, from Cloyne, was in a house, and they were running around in an upstairs floor. He had just grabbed a handful of underwear and was running out when the housemother said, 'You! I know your mother!' "

Up and down in the hot May evening the vandalism raged. "This running around, this hassling, and this bringing home of loot went on till about three in the morning." People straggled back to their houses all night. At Cloyne, the scene was boisterous. Nobody was drunk. Hysteria and heat alone had moved them that day.

> These guys came back to Cloyne, old guys, young guys, respectable guys, disreputable guys, mature guys, immature guys, carrying panties, underwear, slips, brassieres... *amazing*. And some very funny things happened. Our maintenance manager, a very stable, developed, mature guy, and somebody else put on a set of this underwear and were dancing around before Cloyne's switchboard, with a crowd of approving fellows around. The house photographer took pictures of them. About three days later they went to see him and, in very quiet voices, insisted he give them the negative and all the prints.
>
> The next morning the house president and some others decided it would be a good idea if we collected all this stuff. We set up a big box and collected over 300 articles of lingerie from Cloyne alone.
>
> The same thing happened all over. The University asked that everyone please bring the stuff back and it was all taken down to the Sproul Hall basement and spread out on big tables. *Thousands* of items of lingerie. The girls were invited to come back and pick up their own stuff.

A huge investigation was conducted by the aghast U.C. administration. Several men were identified for specific acts of malfeasance and suspended from school. A special four-page supplement to the *Daily Californian* was published by the administration and mailed out to the parents of every U.C. stu-

Chapter 4

1954–1963

The “Silent Generation” was in college in 1954. They were post-war students—teenagers at the time of World War II ineligible for the benefits of the G.I. Bill. McCarthy-ism had come, was there, would pass. Eisenhower was president. The peculiar status quo of the conflict sans bloodshed was on the world and people pulled into themselves out of sheer boredom with the outside world.

Dan Eisenstein came to Cloyne Court in 1954, a “red-hot” escaping from a claustrophobic secondary existence. On his first day in Berkeley, Eisenstein visited every building on campus to acquaint himself on the locations of bathrooms and so forth. “This is my home,” he said. Not every new Cal student had such lyrical feelings, but it was generally true that they were another new generation in the university’s history. Great events like World War II and red scares had grazed but not punctured their consciousness. The Depression, the state of life which had given birth to the USCA and to the college generation of Hal Norton and Bill Davis, was, for some, a childhood memory. For many more it was a fact of pre-birth history.

The co-op was twenty years old and had several houses, each with a life of its own. Eisenstein recalls them:

> Oxford was the haven of the communist part of the co-op. Oxford was the anarchists. Oxford was the home of the Tibetan Brigade. When Tibet was invaded by China, and it army wiped out, some guys

the 15th, the longest Board meeting to date, and recommended by a seven to five majority that the organization stand up for its principles and not sign the oath. In actuality, the co-op principles per se had little bearing on the question of the pledge. Neutrality in political matters is one of the basic Rochdale doctrines, but nothing of a specific political nature was involved. The co-op had a choice between obeying its members' sense of outraged ethics or the retention of a tax exemption and status as a non-seditious institution. On November 1st ballots were distributed to the eight co-op houses—Oxford, Ridge House, Cloyne, Barrington, Sherman, Stebbins, Hoyt and Buena Vista, which was still in use. Not surprisingly the membership did not share the defiant spirit of the Board. Each house but Sherman gave a better than 60% yes vote to signing the loyalty oath, and at that Prospect House the majority—52.9% or 27 out of 52 girls—voted to sign. Better than 70 of that 86.4% voting of the U.S.C.A. membership was in favor of the action. Accordingly, the then-President of the U.S.C.A. Board, Manley Horowitz of Barrington, was formally instructed to sign the oath for the organization.

Despite this, the U.S.C.A., and Cal students generally, remained opposed to any sort of loyalty oath. Sentiment to officially act against California's Assembly Bill 1215, an anti-sedition property tax measure that came up the next March, therefore must have been strong, but as the aforementioned Rochdale Principle stated, and the U.S.C.A.'s twelfth bylaw reinforced, the organization forbade itself from taking part in any political question to which it was not definitely related. As the co-op did not enjoy a property tax exemption, Bill 1215 could not be officially opposed. Part of the reason the U.S.C.A. didn't forget its statutes—and very rarely did so—was Bill Davis, Y.M.C.A. Board Rep:

> I always did take the position on the Board that I think that the U.S.C.A. as an organization has no business getting involved in a partisan way on issues that are not directly related to its life as a cooperative organization. There are always people who want to breach that principle, who felt there was some mitigating reason, always some great pressure, some tremendous need for us to abandon that prin-

Hal, who had recently gained his law degree, had guided the U.S.C.A. through some difficult times in his twenty years with it. He had built its property holdings in a continuous attempt to insure future co-op growth. In 1995 Hal began negotiations with the University on possible development of the organization's most important piece of real estate: the property adjunct to Ridge House on which the carriage-house central office was then located. The University's involvement was almost a prerequisite for any construction on the site.

First of all, U.C. owned the property next to the U.S.C.A. lot, a block long slice across Hearst Avenue from the campus. Plans were underway to build a five hundred car garage there. The U.S.C.A. had, since it obtained its property in 1946, sought to convince the University of the efficacy of low-cost student housing on the Hearst site which would take in not only the University and U.S.C.A. properties but that of the Wilson family on Scenic Road which adjoined both.

According to a Spring 1956 *Prospectus* published by the U.S.C.A., the University had discouraged the organization from its idea, saying that the property was "ear-marked" for future University dorms. U.C. later changed its mind and decided to invest in high-rise block units on the south side of the campus. "Because of the immensity of the University development," said the *Prospectus*, "the decision was no doubt a wise one, but this does not imply that the north side property is undesirable for housing." With some bitterness, the study mentioned the lack of encouragement given the co-op by the University. However, "while no change has been made in the University plans, the U.S.C.A. has been invited (a) to assist the University in its attempt to solve the parking problems, if possible, and (b) to make specific counter proposals for the use of the Hearst Scenic property."

The *Prospectus* was such a counter-proposal, and after delineating the increased need for student housing, the study gave three proposals for the U.S.C.A. use of the three Hearst-Scenic-Ridge properties of the U.C., the co-op and the Wilson family. "Our thought," it said, "is that the land. . . could be developed in three stages, ultimately accommodating 1070 students." In the first phase out of the University property adjoining the Ridge land would be made available to the co-op for construc-

cated only one lot down from Stebbins Hall, the U.S.C.A. paid $50,000 for the land and furniture as well as the building. It was eventually named Alice G. Hoyt Hall in honor of that lady's massive aid to the co-op. Hoyt Hall would be the last physical addition to the U.S.C.A. for six years, and the last permanent one until 1960. But with Hoyt's purchase the U.S.C.A.'s financial assets reached close to $600,000 as opposed to $250,000 liabilities—booming health for an organization like the co-op. An experimental coeducational house was set up at Hoyt that summer.

That same year, 1953, the Backstrand-Levering bill was passed into state law after a vote in its favor by the California people. It stated that any non-profit organization claiming local or state tax exemption had to file a statement saying that it did not advocate the violent overthrow of the state or federal government, or advocate support of a foreign government against the United States in event of hostilities.

It was a loyalty oath, in other words, and it split Berkeley like a dry stick.

A state campus such as Berkeley considers whatever scholarly independence it can goose away from the governing administration invaluable; it was a seat for every political opinion known, and a loyalty oath was repugnant to many of its faculty and administrators, and most of its students. McCarthyism's poisons had not avoided the campus as they seeped down through the levels of American life, and many members of the U.C. bureaucracy and faculty believed that such a measure was a rightful weapon for the state in its fight against sedition: U.C. was then split, and it was not a friendly schism. Accusations were leveled of communist or fascist sympathies, reputations were slandered, and it was feared that damage to the University's academic reputation would be inevitable.

The U.S.C.A. felt the wrench of division, as well, as its members debated the oath issue for months on end in 1954. As a non-profit organization it was liable to lose a year tax exemption if it failed to sign the loyalty oath. The first two weeks of March howled with the issue in the organization. A "fact finding" committee was appointed by the U.S.C.A. Board to ascertain the sentiments of the membership at large. The findings of this committee were discussed at a hearing held on March

In the meantime, Norton kept exploring possibilities for Ridge Road development. Possibilities would keep on coming. However, they would not assume a tangible, architectural form for some years until the latter part of the 1950's. During those years, student life at Berkeley changed almost unperceptively. By and large the Silent Generation label was an apt one.

Dan Eisenstein, self described "red-hot," rose quickly in the Cloyne hierarchy and in his personal involvement in the U.C. campus. In the middle '50's the Vice Chancellor for Student Affairs at Berkeley was Alex B. Sherriffs, a man who would later become Governor Ronald Reagan's educational policy director for the entire state. Sherriffs would often pay visits to student living groups and extol the virtues of student involvement in a type of campus life. He deplored apathy.

"Of course," says Eisenstein, "he didn't mean to get involved in politics. He didn't mean challenge the power structure. He meant go to football games." Twice a month Eisenstein, a Cloyne manager, would visit Sherriffs and try to get across a student view, usually without success. "When the place blew up... Sherriffs was very surprised." As silent the U.C. students may have generally been, the lack of understanding, and of the capacity to understand, on the part of the administration was demonstrative of the most un-silent schism that was to come.

Student life in the '50's was still dominated by the Greek system, by fraternities and sororities and the beer-and-parties approach to education they represented. Plunked in the middle of the largest Greek colonies in Berkeley were several co-op houses. Sherman, up on Prospect, did not have it too bad—it was a fine house. The "queen of the co-ops" had no specific rivalries or feuds. Cloyne, however...

Cloyne Court had three neighbors in the 1950's. Higher on Ridge Road, above La Loma, was Newman Hall, the University Catholic Chapel. Considered an "architectural gem", it was a beautiful brown shingled building filled with exquisite woodwork. The University recognized its excellence so it subsequently purchased and immediately demolished Newman to make way for a vacant lot full of concrete chunks, broken glass and weeds, as it remains even today. Across the street from Cloyne was the fraternity house of Cal's Phi Kapa Psi chapter. Eisenstein described the Cloyne-Phi Kapa Psi relationship as

tion to this was Bill Davis, who felt that segregation from the community as a whole would be detrimental to the Japanese, as well as to the whole student body.

> Some of us took the view that since the relocation had opened the local ghettoes up and gotten the Japanese out of their traditional occupational limitations that we shouldn't rebuild these things back into society—take advantage of the relocation. But there were interests in the Japanese community that took another point of view. They felt that the Japanese kids needed a place to meet other Japanese kids. They also said that they would make an effort to see that the clubhouse was not a segregated place, that people who weren't Japanese could go there. But as it turned out it became at the end a segregated unit.

The return of the house, however was a gesture of good will which would help the U.C.S.C.A. over one of its most aggravating situations a score of years later. The 1948 hassles were settled with its return and quickly forgotten as troubles with a more direct effect on the co-ops appeared in the closing years of the '40's.

In 1948 the hysteria of the McCarthy era was just building up steam, and though rightwing paranoia made itself felt on the U.C.S.C.A. in a small way, it permanently changed the organization. Years later a loyalty oath controversy would split the co-op as it split the campus and country, but in 1948 a conservative California legislature passed a law prohibiting the use of the title "University of California" in the name of any private organization. Reactionary Berkeley administrators pushed the co-op to drop the title, just as Stiles Hall, which called itself the University of California Y.M.C.A., came under pressure, Norton and the co-op Board resisted these demands. They felt that they were idiotic and that submission to these forces would compromise the co-op principle. However, the issue was recognized as little more than a "damned annoyance" and, like Stiles Hall, the U.C.S.C.A. made the change, through amendment of the Articles of Incorporation. Now the organization was simply the University Student's Cooperative Association... which,

> Cloyne had a fellow in the house named Sammy Moreno, a little Mexican guy, a Spanish major who had just come back from the Army while I was there, had been in Cloyne before the Army, in '53. He weighed about 122 pounds... but he was the boxing coach at Cal while he was still a student. He'd been champion of his division, or something, in the Army—but didn't look it, a little skinny guy.
>
> This Beta jock came over with about twenty of his fellows. He was met by about twenty of our fellows in the middle of the volleyball court, and he was making a huge ruckus about this. Sammy stepped in front of him and said, "really, you should just go home and quiet down since you're really not getting anything done here." The guy took a swing at him and Sammy hit him. And they carried him home and he woke up, I guess, at home. He was asleep before he hit the ground. One of the few times that anybody ever hit anybody from the Betas.

Tales of such classic David-Goliath confrontations, of course, are legend. Another more clandestine skirmish between the contrary living groups is somewhat more original. Again, Eisenstein articulates and begins with background:

> Cloyne Court had stoves which have grease traps in them, which we took out in back and emptied into grease buckets. These would be picked up by the tallow company periodically and taken off to be rendered into something. One night in summer of '56 or '57 a few people took this can of grease and spread it on the Betas' driveway. They then had only one driveway, very steep, which was next to Cloyne. And the grease slowly oozed down onto the sidewalk. The vandals retired to a Cloyne room overlooking this mess to observe what would then occur. It was after midnight.
>
> One of the things that they saw happen was a car trying to pull into the driveway and just spinning its wheels. This guy finally looked out of his car, saw that there was grease on the sidewalk, let out a howl,

> university population was going down drastically, yet the student co-op agreed to take over that house and operate it. I think they felt pretty good about it. They felt they-were rising above prejudice even in the middle of wartime.

A renewable lease was taken on the Clubhouse, which the U.C.S.C.A. dubbed Lexington Hall and filled with 31 men at first. After 1943, until the building was returned to the Japanese in 1948, Lexington became a women's hall. Hal Norton's future wife became its manager.

The crunch on men's housing made itself fully felt in 1943. The owners of Sheridan Hall, from whom the co-op had rented the house for nine years, decided to close the hall. David Bortin lived there at the time, and described the residents' reaction as one of resignation:

> It was clear that it just wasn't economically feasible to keep it open, and I think that the only choice available was to put it on central kitchen. Most of the people who were loyal to the house felt that something in violation of Sheridan's traditions would be worse than having it close.

The U.C.S.C.A. let the Sheridan lease lapse and the Piedmont house passed from the co-op fold.

Bortin, a rare new Cal student, moved down to Barrington in the summer of '43, the last summer in the 1940's the house was to host co-op members. Officials from the city, the national government and the U.C.S.C.A.'s own central level were conspiring to get this potential financial white elephant—the building even looked like a white elephant to the lyrically minded—out of the U.C.S.C.A. for the duration of the male student dearth. The central co-op board was of course anxious to accept the offer of the Navy, working through the Home Owner's Loan Association, to lease Barrington for seven years. According to Bill Davis, then in his fifth year as Stiles Hall representative on the co-op board, several loyal members of Barrington were dead set against leaving the hall. "The fellows... figured that they could figure out *some* way to keep the place afloat, without going down the tubes financially. They also resented the collusion between the co-op officers and the city officials." The

Board had, at that time, but four applications for the house in the coming year—and, of course, the house was in desperate need of repair. The Navy's proposed yearly rent was, according to Norton, minimal at $640—but they promised to completely renovate the hall, and save the house from condemnation by the city.

City authorities *were* in fact the best friends the co-op central level and the Navy had in their campaigns to get the hall rented. The building inspector of the city of Berkeley was a man named Harry Cobden, who had the heat on the co-ops over the condition of Barrington Hall. As said before, the building was a tremendous fire hazard. The inner rotunda would act as a veritable chimney in case of any fire; wind would suck through the building and control would be impossible. There were no fire walls. Cobden's pressure on the board to do something about the house was welcomed by Norton, Davis and the others, and Davis believes that the leaders exaggerated Cobden's objections to the Barrington loyalists: "but it was perfectly evident," he says, "that if we didn't get those guys out of there, get this thing leased to the government we were going to lose Barrington Hall."

The argument convinced the faithful. Reluctantly those who wished to remain in the co-op moved to Oxford, the only remaining men's house except for Lexington, which would soon convert to female residence. A decade of student-owned and controlled housing closed with Barrington Hall. The organization had, to say the least, come a long way. It had begun with fourteen students in a loose group. It had grown to 60, to 120, to almost 400, doubled that, lost almost all of its men, came down to 325. It had learned the basics of administration and accounting. It had purchased property to secure its future.

At the beginning of its second decade the U.C.S.C.A. entered a stasis in expansion, as it waited for World War II to end and for the new situation in student life, still unknown, to come.

these women. The co-op met the increase by re-opening its first hall, 2714 Ridge Road, this time as a woman's house. The 36 woman membership decided to name the old Barrington Kingman Hall, and held a party at the opening. Harry and Ruth Kingman were special guests. The co-op would operate Kingman Hall until June of 1946.

The early years of the 1940's brought a considerable turnover in the co-ops, both in the membership and the management. Larry Collins left the U.C.S.C.A. in 1940 to be replaced for a relatively short period by Lee Poole, the co-op accountant. Hal Norton and Gordon Miner, the Barrington manager, applied to the Board for the buyer/manager's position. Norton's experience as manager of two houses, Sheridan and Oxford, and as a long-time member of the "triumvirate" of co-op leaders (Collins and Poole were the others) gave him in high enough esteem to win him the job. Miner went on to operate his own aluminum foundry in Long Beach.

When Norton became manager it was late '41. The coming war already had taken its effect on the U.C.S.C.A.: the turnover of the membership referred to above. Fewer men were going to school. Norton wasn't worried about this decline; "it was apparent," he says, "that we would be able to keep the organization going with women but not necessarily would be able to fill all of our units."

The unit the organization would have the most trouble filling was Barrington, of course. The decline in male applications was felt most desperately there. However, the U.C.S.C.A. had opportunity to rid itself of a potential white elephant, while simultaneously gaining improvements, on the house for future co-op use. The United States Navy expressed an interest in leasing the house for the organization for a number of years to house workers from the Richmond shipyards. Bureaucratic red-tapery with local Naval representatives and Washington approvals became involved, as well as membership resistance, and the deal didn't come to a head until 1943. In the meantime the organization turned its attention to handling the positive aspect of the 1940's membership fluctuation—the increase in women applicants.

Purchasing houses had been begun with Barrington. It continued with the next addition to the roster of co-op houses,

Chapter 3

1943–1954

The co-op, in the last two years of World War II, waited for the G.I.'s to return home and again fill their houses with students, but they didn't simply mark time. Although the male population of the University—and, therefore, the U.C.S.C.A.—was at its lowest in history, the co-op still found opportunity and reason to expand its facilities. It is interesting to note that the only non-Berkeley house ever operated by the U.C.S.C.A. was done under wartime conditions, and by a Board of Directors chaired and mostly composed of women. (Not only were several Board Presidents women, one was a freshman.) Whether the Buena Vista unit opened on Baker Street in San Francisco is merely a reaction to the needs of the time or a reflection of the organization's consistent desire to gain more houses, expand itself is a matter of pure conjecture. The question itself is reasonable: the U.C.S.C.A., then strapped for funds, opened a house thirty miles from its central office, with its own kitchen and chef, of course, servicing an entirely different clientele—medical students from the U.C. Med Center and some Hastings Law School attendees. The house lasted as a co-op unit for thirteen years, resold in 1957 as a financial burden to the organization, inadequately maintained.

The co-op's central office had been located in Barrington Hall on Dwight Way, but with the arrival of the Navy Hal Norton had to move his office. A small building near Telegraph Avenue on Bancroft Way, the southern boundary of the Uni-

signed as an idea-exchange with members of other west coast co-ops. J. Stitt Wilson, who had been the first socialist mayor of Berkeley, spoke, along with a cooperativist named Robert Brady. The actual conference exceeded the hopes of the hosts; at the Pacific Coast Conference, as it was finally called, The Pacific Coast Student Cooperative League was founded by the 70 attendees from six universities and colleges. A temporary board of directors was chosen; Louanne Bartlett of Stebbins was named to chair it. Hal Norton assumed the secretary's post. The group decided to establish its headquarters in Berkeley, ask a dime per year dues of each member, and meet yearly-in Oregon in 1940. The P.C.L. also decided to apply for membership in the Co-op League of America.

The influence of the U.C.S.C.A. had thus spread. It had attained some business maturity. That summer of '39 the owners of Barrington Hall, the Cerone family, approached the U.C.S.C.A. Board with an offer. The building itself had become a liability to the Cerones and they were anxious to be rid of it. The offer was unique. From a total price of $45,000, the family wanted five thousand dollars down, with the remainder to be paid in exactly the same way as Barrington's rent had previously been paid. There was no argument that it was an invaluable deal for the co-op, as even then the building and land was assessed at being worth $78,000. But the board was reluctant to take such a vital step without general membership approval. They arranged for a postcard poll to be taken of the members, putting to them the question of whether or not the, group should buy Barrington. The response was affirmative; the deal was made. As the organization did not have the full five thousand dollars on hand to make the down payment, a two thousand dollar option was paid, and the rest sent in by the first of September.

According to Hal Norton the purchase of Barrington Hall was the true beginning of the viability of the University of California Student Co-operative Association:

> That was the *real* beginning, because with *that* behind us... that meant we had had laid the foundation, economically and financially,, on which to support future expansion. With the appreciation of real estate it was possible for us always to refinance Barrington to secure funds to buy another unit.

by Hal Norton to ascertain the economic viability of the organization still made the same report to the co-op board as they had for years: "You're bankrupt. You just don't know it." What the accountants meant was that the co-op's ratio of assets to liabilities was still less than two-to-one—in fact, it was the obverse. By any sane standard of finance, the organization was doomed; bankrupt. But the U.C.S.C.A. was not a capitalist organization. It survived despite itself, and by planning on a future where construction could occur.

One of the qualities in its favor was luck—or so it seemed from the price Mrs. Ellis asked for the Ridge Road property. She wanted $37,500. The co-op leaped to the purchase. They had to expend an additional $16,000 on renovations—part of which went to converting the old carriage house in back into a central office facility. When the renovations were done 51 men could be accommodated in its rooms, and of course many more as boarders.

Among the early roomers at Ridge House, as the new buy was called, was David Bortin, returned from a stint in khaki to try life in the co-ops again. The number of old friends met astounded him. "I was amazed," he said, "at how many people I knew in Berkeley...and so I did decide to come back to Cal." Bortin did not remain in Ridge House more than one semester. After that he lived in Oxford again, for a little while, before moving to the 1946 addition to the co-op houses, Cloyne Court.

The Cloyne Court Hotel had stood on Ridge Road between La Loma and Leroy for several decades, servicing an older, professorial clientele. As with many of the co-ops, Cloyne came to the U.C.S.C.A.'s attention because the building's maintenance had deteriorated beyond the owners' capacity to take care of it. Sale was the only way out for them, and cheap sale at that. The co-op always had plenty of cheap labor available to renovate the houses and was usually anxious to buy. Cloyne Court was another good purchase, anyway. A large building, it could house 150 men and board many more—its suites were clustered around several small stairwells—which would alleviate noise problems and aid privacy. It had an expansive courtyard, a fairly large kitchen, a lobby with a switchboard, and beautiful landscaping. Best of all it had an incredibly cheap price tag for a four-storied hotel: $115,000 plus $10,000 for the furnishings—

experiment convinced the board that a central kitchen was advisable in the organization by making possible a central control. Therefore, when the huge Oxford Arms apartment house at the west face of the campus came up for lease, a C.K. to feed every house but Sheridan, which still employed its own cook, was part of the plan the co-op had for the site. Oxford was leased before summer of 1938, and Hal Norton, then Sheridan's manager, was asked to get the building in shape to house 112 roomers and feed 600 co-opers. That summer Hal organized a crew to renovate the "pretty well run-down" building and add the central kitchen facilities. (Barrington already had a bake shop). The building had been around since the turn of the century and was in poor shape. Norton and his men did all they could—but never was Oxford Hall in its long and gore-filled history to receive University accreditation as approved housing. Approval by the university required things that Oxford's physical plant was just not capable of handling. Oxford's reputation as a house of another-sort-of-ill-fame did not follow its opening by much.

In the Fall in which Oxford began operations, under Norton's management, the U.C.S.C.A. took steps aimed at solidifying the various co-ops under a single aegis. The depression, while its presence was still felt, was no longer a desperate problem for U.C. students (after all, there was a co-op now); "co-operativism", the ideology, simply wouldn't do to keep the members united. Among other ideas to draw the organization together Collins and the others began an all-co-op newspaper modeled after Barrington's *Barbarrington*. Volume I Number I of *The U.C.S.C.A. News* appeared on October 24th, 1938, "a publication," claimed the lead article, "designed to create greater unity of purpose and action among the five houses of the co-operative association." Ed Wright, the editor, also handled the *Barbarrington*. That first issue featured a pretty standard newsish fare. Stebbins had a new housemother, Mrs. Eloise Dyer. Atherton chose its name insisting that no "House, Hall, Lodge, etc" follow its single-word title. *The Women's Home Companion* asked for photos from Stebbins to be used in an article on co-ops. Barrington defeated Bowles Hall, the University's castle-like dorm on Piedmont Avenue, in football, and also bought a set of new curtains. "That the council was contemplating napkins embroidered with little birds and flowers

> lord about people who were themselves the landlord.
>
> It was a very delicate diplomatic thing for Hal. On the one hand he did not want to lose the tenants. On the other hand these kids who were moving into the house were cleaning it up and building up, because the place needed constant maintenance and Cloyne had not had any in years. There was a lot of hammering going on in addition to the beer busts and the 24-hour bridge game—and so it was a delicate thing at that point, making the transitions that needed to be made.

Haas, the first Cloyne manager, had been chosen by Bortin and other members of the co-op personnel committee. Shortly after co-op people began to move in, replacing the previous residents, a council was elected in the age-old living group manner, and Cloyne Court was underway as a co-op. There was some discussion about renaming the building "Poole Hall" after Lee Poole, was one suggestion. The name "Collins Hall" was put onto a house constitution, but Cloyne Court remained the official title.

"Everything in 1946," Bortin recalls, "was veterans." Indeed the U.C. campus had grown a wartime low of about 20% men to a postwar total of almost three-quarters male. Bortin estimates that 80% of these men were attending school on the G.I. Bill. "It was really a veteran's campus. A very heterogeneous campus in other respects. But that was the great golden age of the Ordinary Great Building American Middle Class. That was the great time when college education became the norm. Before World War II it wasn't. Before then it was the privilege of either a financial elite or an intellectual elite where the motivation for college was so strong that they overcame all kinds of obstacles in order to get it. This was where the co-ops had their inception in the 30's, to enable that kind of person, who otherwise couldn't possibly manage it, to go to college. With the G.I. Bill college became the norm."

Another thing besides G.I. experience the '46 students shared was a general earnestness about school—that much remained unchanged since 1933. Politics was, as always, a common Berkeley activity, with the dominant mood divided between a "Back-to-Normalcy" conservatism and radical ideas on the shape of

pendent and "hidden" man, he had a gift of foresight and an eye for expansion of the system. It was primarily through his efforts that the organization gained its first real estate, and financial permanence.

The Lafayette apartment house, largest in the city of Berkeley, was located at 2315 Dwight Way, two block on the west side of Telegraph Avenue., Berkeley's major by-way. A trolley ran on tracks up and down Dwight; it was truly in the center of town. These apartments, located in a huge wood frame building spanning the block-width between Dwight and Haste, were owned by the Cerone family, whose sugar interests were very extensive in the area. Cerone was anxious to get rid of the Lafayette Apartments. Built in 1906 to harbor earthquake refugees from San Francisco, the wood frame itself shipped over from the stricken city (charred beams are still—in 1971—found there occasionally) was in sad condition. The owners were very willing to lease it to the U.C.S.C.A.

The building, despite its worn condition, was nonetheless a windfall. It could handle 200 live-in residents and any number of boarders. Like Sheridan, it had its own cook and kitchen. The large number of residents would double the capacity of the U.C.S.C.A.—or better, since the first hall, Barrington, was felt to be superfluous in the light of the new acquisition. The lease with the Sigma Nu owners was allowed to lapse and one—with very liberal terms—was arranged with the Cerone family. The new Barrington (it was decided that the name was worth the transfer) would require a great deal of alteration and maintenance—it was in violation of several articles in the city codes in its present state. The U.C.S.C.A. would earn its low rent by taking care of the rejuvenation of the building. Spangle and the other Ridge Road co-opers—excepting people like Doug Cruikshank who left—either graduated or in order to work—moved the co-op the two miles across campus and city to the hall's present site.

It is time for the story of the U.C.S.C.A. to focus inward onto a personal story, for anything that involved the co-op involved Larry Collins during the next few years of co-op history. Collins, like Cruikshank, had come to U.C. Berkeley from U.C.L.A. to finish his education, and like almost every other Cal student in July 1935 was immediately socked in by the ubiquitous financial disaster. There were no jobs, in other words. Collins got around this problem with a busboy's job at Ingram's Chow Parlor on Telegraph Avenue; hauling and washing pots and dishes brought him two daily meals. He did not toil alone. Another student, by the name of John Merchant, sloshed and schlepped alongside him. Merchant, who later went on to become a dentist, told Collins about Sheridan Hall, where he then lived, and Collins' interest was excited. The reputation of "those communist houses up in Berkeley" had reached him in L.A., and meeting a member of this strange organization intrigued him. Collins looked up Bill Spangle, the manager of Barrington Hall, and got a rundown on the group and the idea from him. "Well," he remembers saying, "sounds like you guys have a good idea." He asked Spangle about the possibility of acquiring a room-and-board job at the new house. Spangle conferred with Bill Davis, who had also moved, and finally offered Larry the job of running the night clean-up crews for his room and board. That a minor job like this was considered worth a full compensation is an indication of the amount of work the new Barrington was turning out to be.

The conversion job—Lafayette Apartments to Barrington Hall—was just underway when Collins joined the group. In 45 apartments the kitchens were removed and on the ground floor these apartments were knocked away altogether to prepare a lobby area. The building was, as said before, pretty rundown. Its exterior, though, featured all the "classic gingerbread": frescoes, columns. The interior was much the same way, with turned spokes on the stairway banisters, clear redwood paneling on the walls (which suffered from a cheap varnishing job), handsome and intricate cornish work. Each apartment door was inlaid with translucent glass along which inebriated or simply high-spirited members would from high time to high time rake their keys on a dead run back to their suites. Once back to those suites—which contained for the most part three rooms, two doubles and a single—these members may well have risked death to find sleep. The beds in new Barrington were not designed for the fidgetty.

Basically the beds were or two types. In what had been the living room of the old apartment, in what was now a room for two men, a wallbed, fronted by mirrors, could be folded

dition of the hall when they moved in. Sheridan sat on the corner of Dwight Way and Piedmont Avenue, at the southern end of what was then a thriving fraternity row. These co-op members lived in another atmosphere than did the Barringtonians, whose house was flanked by Newman Hall, the University Catholic Chapel, and the immense Cloyne Court Hotel, which catered to a professorial clientele, And their attitudes were correspondingly different. In the early 40's Sheridan would become a political power base much as were the frats before that. Its members, according to David Bortin, whose life in Sheridan began a long history of involvement in the Berkeley co-op movement, were very active in student government. A President of the Associated Students of U.C. was elected from Sheridan, and another aspirant moved there in order to consolidate a political base prior to his own election. In Borton's phrase, "Little Gentlemen" thought of themselves as members of a co-op movement first. The reason for this sense of identity was not altogether ideological; as leaders who preached "cooperativism" to the membership always found, the theory never held much fascination for the great mass of students. Rather, the sense of involvement with a new and different system of living—a sort of socialism, a kind of quasi-communism—brought the two co-op houses and their memberships together far more than circumstantial advantage enjoyed by Sheridan split them apart.

The co-op now consisted of two houses, over 100 live-in members, and as many boarders. Bill Spangle managed Barrington and was, in effect, general manager of loose organization already known as the University of California Student's Co-operative Association. A Barrington veteran named Ken Eastman was manager of Sheridan. Money was being spent—the organization was growing. Complexity was on the geometric increase with every new member. The leaders of the U.C.S.C.A. turned in the organization's second year, to the legal questions of membership liabilities In the group's debts. Obviously a legal set-up was needed besides the loose "general partnership" that existed *de facto*. Under this system one house could be held responsible for the debts of the other; the group's liabilities could be charged to every member, an untenable situation. The liability of the individual member had to be limited; even the green young businessmen managing the U.C.S.C.A. saw that. A doc-

any living group anywhere. Unique to the times though, was a house rule that a phone call from the Bureau of Occupations—presumably a job possibility for a house member—took priority at the switchboard over a long distance call from one's mother across country. Any man with a new haircut had to go around the hall saying "Vincie Rinctums" to anyone he met; otherwise he got ticked on the head with a forefinger. Again the times were responsible—the idea was that any man who could afford a haircut didn't belong in the U.C.S.C.A. The office of the House Fink, an institution which remained an honor worthy of much campaigning every co-op year for the next twenty, was initiated. The Fink had the job of jester, or clown, among printable duties; he could violate the otherwise sacred serving order, for instance.

House traditions and recreations were not restricted to 2315 Dwight Way and environs, of course. It is claimed that members of the hall in the late '30's were responsible for destroying a vaunted Cal tradition, the Big C Circus. Held every four years, the Big C Circus featured a parade down Telegraph Avenue full of floats built by various living groups, classes, and other subcategories of the student community The parade preceded a carnival/sideshow in Edwards Field. For one of these circuses Barrington decided to enter a float. One must understand two facts about Cal student life and current events to appreciate the Barrington contribution. First, Berkeley and Stanford University were then, as always, involved in a sports rivalry. Second, Stanford's Hoover Tower had just been raised in honor of Stanford's most famous graduate. The Barringtonians, full of Cal spirit, gathered together all the trash—tin cans and the like—that they could find, stapled it all together into a vaguely phallic shape, balanced their sculpture on a flatbed truck, labeled it *Hoover's Last Erection* and rode this creation past the unamused gaze of Robert Gordon Sproul and the Berkeley administration. A member of that administration subsequently cancelled the Big C Circus.

Collins himself took little or no part in the construction of the famous float. But he saw the parade. In fact, he stood on the curb of Telegraph Avenue with his girl friend–whom he would later marry–and her mother. This latter lady was "slow on the uptake" and read the label/title slowly to herself before

visory Committee. Again advertising was brought into play to liquidate the surplus wood. Members of the U.C. faculty and other Berkeleyans were notified that the firewood was on sale at retail prices, and their response was enough to get all the wood, and all the U.X.A. points, converted into needed cash. The U.X.A. did provide lots of carrots, however.

Barrington Hall was not, though, simply a business enterprise. College students lived there and the building was unique for the fact that they controlled its operations as well. Bill Davis, the Stiles Hall "liaison" with the house, also served as house advisor, dealing with the standard curricular and extracurricular problems as they were brought to him. He also did quite a bit of talking to University officials, particularly Dean of Students Ed Voorhis, who was, according to Davis, largely responsible for the organizations success with the University Clubhouse Loan Fund. Faculty members would also come over and talk with the membership after being contacted by Davis or another member. Einerson of the Astronomy Department and a paleobotanist who showed slides of his discoveries in that field while in the. Gobi Desert were only two.

Pressures on the student body at that time were, of course, mostly financial, but the campus was Berkeley and Berkeley has never been far from controversy. Douglas Cruikshank was, in 1933 and '34, a student engineer transferred up from U.C.L.A. He became very active in the co-ops and in the Berkeley campus, and recalls one incident of a political nature which occurred while he was there. A student group wanted Eugene Debs, the main Socialist of the time, to speak on campus. Predictably, the first reaction from the lower echelons of the U.C. administration was a groan of Negation. Fortunately, the U.C. system was then blessed with Robert Gordon Sproul in its presidency. Sproul understood the political desires of students and recognized the necessity for dealing with them honestly. He allowed Debs to speak with the promise that he himself chair the discussion and that opposing views be given equal time to speak. "As I recall'," Cruikshank said, "it was no great thing when the event came off."

Aside from politics, and far more common, as well as far better suited to the climate of the decade, the student body as a whole found recreation and relief from its academic and

Barbarrington, and would undergo many such changes till the first name came back into style to stay) as would the Barrington managers. They found that the members were far more interested in liberal causes such as the trade union movement than in the ideological basis of their own organization. Sheridan members were part of a U.C. board which began a fair employment program, Fair Bear; Barrington supported this program, by hiring chefs from the union, after an intra-house debate that aroused far more interest than the cooperativism caucuses ever did. The co-op organization moved beyond itself for the first time—but simultaneously enlarged itself. A woman's hall, Stebbins, opened on Ridge Road in the early months of 1936.

The genesis of Stebbins Hall had its source in the activities of a man who would later become one of the U.C.S.C.A.'s most valuable benefactors, as well as one of the greatest educators in the history of the University of California, Clark Kerr. In 1935 Kerr was a graduate student directing a Works Progress Administration survey of the existing cooperatives in California. Another graduate, Jacqueline Watkins, handled the northern division of the project, and gathered information about the U.C.S.C.A. in the course of this duty. At that time, of course, there were two all-male houses. Watkins suggested to the Mortar Board Alumni, graduates of the senior honor society, of which she was a member, that they sponsor a women's co-op—a worthwhile project to draw the membership of that group together. The M.B.A. were enthusiastic and appointed Watkins as chairman of the committee of eight to househunt, a task they began in the fall of 1935. When the Ridge Road Inn, located near Euclid on Ridge Road, was offered for sale in the midst of an otherwise hapless search, the M.B.A. had its building. A thousand dollar rental deposit was secured from the University Loan Fund with the help of the U.C. Dean of Women, Mrs. Lucy Ward Stebbins. The University Y.W.C.A., sister organization to Stiles Hall, was utilized to collect applications and keep in touch with applicants after the need for a women's co-op was known; it was as intense as that for a men's unit had been three years earlier. Better than 130 applications were received for an 82-roomer capacity—which suddenly ceased to be a certainty. With a most uncooperative attitude the owners of the Ridge Road Inn suddenly demanded an immediate two

gutter. Each new member as he arrived at the new co-op was escorted to the Ridge Road gutter and invited to chose—and clean—his own cot. Fran Smart describes the experience of scraping, wiping and generally persuading the oily stuff off of the beds as a "fortunate thing, for it gave each of the members who had to do this work a feeling that he really was a part of the house and belonged there." The cooperative spirit again raised its elbowaching head.

The only new items bought by the students were mattress pads, which became quite lumpy in time and extremely uncomfortable, at least according to Bill Davis, a young Y.M.C.A. staff member who lived in Barrington Hall from the outset and would become one of the most important figures in the history of Berkeley's student co-op.

Davis' quasi-official position with the nearly-founded student co-op was that of advisor, or "House Papa," but he was actually not very much older than his charges. Bill had been to the University in 1924 from two years in junior college. Graduating in 1931, Davis spent a year at the Boalt Hall Law School before joining Stiles Hall in '32. Put into freshman orientation and relations work by Kingman, he was involved in other aspects of Y work until the opening of Barrington Hall. "My home was in Long Beach, of course," he says, "and I was single, so it was a natural thing for me to move into Barrington." In addition to Davis' own financial considerations, Stiles Hall felt that it would be a good idea to have an on-the-scene liaison with the new co-op which could still need help. Davis aided the co-op in a potentially uncomfortable situation. Rochdale principle and common liberal thought required that the co-op practice racial desegregation in the house – and of course nobody objected when a black man applied for residence. Some concern was voiced about how well he would "fit in", so Davis arranged a meeting on a Long Beach corner with the black to talk the organization over. The anxieties proved foundless, of course, and there was no hassle involved. Another black member of the early Barrington was Thomas Berkeley, who later opened the finest interracial law practice in the city. Davis moved in with the first members when the co-op opened in August 1933.

Also moving in with the first batch was a young couple, Willis and Anne Hershey. Fran Smart spoke of the problem

house manager's posts. The spring semester of '36 was a milk run—but at the end of that semester, in the middle of May, the house officials discovered that they hadn't enough cash to meet the various financial commitments during the summer. Summertime has always been an economic crisis period for the student co-op, as can be expected for a college living group. Since that summer of '36 the organization has laid away money during the year to offset the lack of incoming funds during this dry period. But prior to then the rents had not continued for two years running—or at least expenses had not been so high. Also, the house was behind on its accounts payable for things already consumed. Barrington was in trouble.

The U.C.S.C.A. manager, Brown, decided to take a vacation just as this crisis was realized He had withdrawn money beforehand from the co-op account—his right as manager—to take this vacation, and the membership was none too pleased. The managers of the halls concurred with the other student leaders. "There are certain responsibilities a manager's supposed to exercise," says Collins, recalling the students' objections, "and if you don't have enough money to pay your bills you don't take money in advance and go off on a vacation. You stick around and try to solve the problem." The decision was made by the co-op board to fire Brown. Hal Norton, since February, the manager of Sheridan, delivered the message to Brown on behalf of the board.

This crisis was bad enough. The students had to come through with the necessary money to tide the U.C.S.C.A. over the summer, and the organization was not materially richer for being rid of Brown. The ex-manager did not help matters. Bitterly, he organized a meeting of the creditors of the U.C.S.C.A. at an Oakland hotel. To these men he proposed that they foreclose on the co-op by demanding their payment while the organization had no funds. Then they should appoint him as caretaker over the group and he would get their money back for them. It was, by the time the students knew of Brown's plans, the middle of the summer. School would be in session and students would be arriving in less than a month. It was the most critical moment in the life of the organization.

The students ran for help. The manager of the local Bank of America branch at that time was named Mohlenschardt, who

Introduction and Acknowledgments

This history of the University Students Cooperative Association (U.S.C.A.) was funded through a grant by the Berkeley Consumers Cooperative to the U.S.C.A. aimed at financing a student project for the summer of 1971. Mark Gary, then President of the U.S.C.A. Board of the Directors, suggested to the Board that a history of the organization would be suitable, and the job was assigned to me on the first of June. Composition was completed today, December 19th, 1971.

My idea for this book was to write a *biography* of the U.S.C.A. rather than a *history*, concentrating on individual members' stories and recollections, and avoiding as best as possible a strictly organizational perspective. A series of interviews with co-op pioneers and veterans in the Bay Area was initiated with this aim in mind. To a man, I found those co-opers I talked to—usually with the aid of Marcella Murphy, co-op vice-president—generous with information and impressive in their enthusiasm for the organization and its precepts. I want to thank each of them—Doug Cruikshank, Bill Davis, Dan Eisenstien, Harry Kingman, Dick Palmer, Dave Bortin, Larry Collins and Hal Norton—for their assistance and the glimpse each gave me into the nature of the co-op. I only wish that time and money had permitted me to contact more co-op alumni, several of whom I spoke with but did not formally interview. My apologies to them, and to the book—they could only have added richness. Too often I found the "organizational perspective" the only available viewpoint.

I want to express special gratitude to Harry Kingman, for

Chapter 1

1933–1937

It began where a lot begins, in Berkeley, California. But its beginning came when much was ending, in the 1930's. It always was a different sort of thing. The collegiate generation of the early 1930's was faced with unique problems. As with practically every other group of Americans, the Depression of those times had severely cramped the economic viability of its members. The college students of that time could be divided, therefore, into two extremely general groups: first, the well-to-do, whose fathers had economic positions in the society unthreatened by the Depression; second, the far more extensive group, poor students who lived in enforced frugality and survived by superhuman determination.

This latter, larger group imposed a great responsibility on the schools that they attended. Programs of student aid were begun on every major college or university campus but they were handicapped for the same economic reasons that their students were handicapped. The University of California at Berkeley was, in 1930, the major educational institution of the state. The 16,000 students attending Berkeley fit, of course, into the two general categories mentioned above. But, as a large state institution, the University had more resources to draw on than many private institutions. It had its own Y.M.C.A., for example, which itself had a resource no other institution could claim: its director, Harry Kingman. Kingman was an unduplicatable man of many accomplishments, by no means the major of which

of most students to repay them and from being solely available to undergraduates. There were also some emergency loans available, as well as 200 University scholarships which averaged at about $225. These scholarships reached less than a third of the qualified students. Kingman listed more scholarships as the most urgent need of student aid.

Among Kingman's targets as a member of Sproul's freshman advisory committee were the men of the class of '34. Kingman met with these students often in late 1932, seeking a long-range solution to the financial problems then faced.

Most Cal students didn't have uncles living in town who were willing to pay for tuition and supply room and board. Most lived in cubbyholes at rooming houses and, as said before, scrounged for meals. Loans and scholarships and jobs were all very well, but they could only aid individual students, one at a time, and did nothing to alleviate the general conditions. Life, for the U.C. student, was still one of extreme deprivation. With his freshmens, Kingman began to seek out something different. He gathered students together into meetings with Professor Ben Mallory, of the Vocational Education Department, an authority on co-operatives. Kingman had had an idea, which he passed onto the students. Fourteen students gathered one evening in the house owned by Harry and Ruth Kingman in February of 1933.

This gathering was dramaticed in 1938 as an episode in K.F.R.C.'s "Pageant of Life" radio series. As-reconstructed by a scriptwriter, Kingman's pitch to the students went thusly: "Now: you must represent... what shall I say... the *underfinanced* portion of the student body... Why can't conditions be improved, for hundreds of students like yourselves... by throwing your resources together. Living together! Eating together! Working together! Buying on a mass basis."[1]

A co-operative endeavor, in other words, was suggested, and the fourteen freshmen agreed that it was worth trying. Among them were Bill Spangle, Willis Hershey, and Addison James, each of whom assumed leadership in what rapidly became a major project—not only for them but for the University Y.M.C.A. Kingman appointed one of his staff, Francis A. Smart, to half-time activity aiding Spangle and the others in setting up their

[1] *The Pageant of Life #7*, Tuesday Sept. 20, 1938, Station K.F.R.C.

and aiding Mrs. Dickson in fixing the meals. When the co-op boarding house opened in March, 1933 ten students joined as charter members. Twelve more men joined before spring semester ended.

At the end of that semester the cooperative effort branched in two. The number of students involved had grown, and the emphasis grown away from day-to-day survival to preparations for the future. Students sought to stock up provisions during that summer of '33 to keep their co-op alive for the year that followed, by working at manual labor outside of Berkeley, in two groups, one chopping wood in Dixon, California and the other at various jobs at Clarksburg, a city on the Sacramento River. The Clarksburg camp opened in May, at which time the men involved moved into the bunkhouse which had been provided by the various farmers in the area and began cleaning it up. These farmers had been contacted by the Stiles Hall associate general secretary, Ralph Scott, who had explained the aim of the camp. The bunkhouse was centrally located among the various farms in the area, and was furnished with equipment loaned by Pacific Gas & Electric. Bill Spangle, whose home was in Sacramento and was therefore familiar with the area, managed the Clarksburg camp. As each new man arrived at the camp he paid Spangle a $2 deposit for operating expenses. Each man provided all linen and personal items.

Spangle's duties were several. Not only was he sole cook, he also aided the students in finding jobs. He was successful in this task, as some members earned over $100 during that summer with which to continue their schooling.

The Dixon woodcutters were involved in a task which had an ongoing aim—the benefit of the whole group of co-opers instead of just individual members. Their project was connected with the local office of the Unemployment Exchange Association, or U.X.A., which the students had visited often while planning the organization of the first co-op. The students who cut wood at Dixon for the U.X.A. worked not for money but for points to be applied toward room and board expenses in the following year. They were so adept at swinging their axes that their productivity became a danger to the organization later.

The co-op boarding house had been an avatar. The group's aim all along had been to establish a student-run house that