would service more than 20 members, and the summer of '33 was devoted to this end as well. A large effort, sponsored by Stiles Hall, to popularize the new idea of a student cooperative house was begun, with correspondence to high schools and junior colleges telling of the idea. Radio time was also secured. It pays to advertise. A "gratifying" response came in to the propaganda, and the fledgling organization suddenly found itself with no room for all its accepted members. A search for an available house was begun and consumed much time and hassle. The students finally found an appropriate establishment at 2714 Ridge Road—a block from the Founder's Rock at the northeast corner of the campus.

The Sigma Nu fraternity house was part of what was then thriving northside Greek community, but the fraternity was moving and the building was available for lease, and ideally suited for a cooperative house. The students instantly grabbed it—a matter of some relief. Fran Smart recalls one incident demonstrable of how close a call was the rental of the Sigma Nu house. A Los Angeles applicant named Dickson Myers had sent in his five dollar deposit and had been notified of his acceptance. Myers immediately set forth from L.A. and negotiated a night-long journey up the coast. He got to Stiles Hall at eight in the morning, and asked the staff there where he could find the co-op house, as he required slumber. Smart and the others told him that "it wasn't ready yet"—and sent him into downtown Berkeley and the Y.M.C.A. there for some sleep. In the afternoon when Myers arose, he returned to Stiles Hall. Smart and the co-op people were still out, concluding the lease deal for the fraternity house. They came back with joyous exclamations of "We got it." Myers asked what they had gotten, and when he was told "the co-op house," he was naturally aghast. "Do you mean to tell me," he screamed, "that you let me drive all the way up here before you even had a place for me to live in?"

The co-operative spirit was even then at work.

That spirit was forced to further limits. A house is not a house is not a cooperative. Furniture was needed. For that, money was needed and leasing and renovating 2714 Ridge Road had depleted the precious collection Clarksburg and deposits had built up. It was here that the University, beginning on a high note its somewhat erratic support of the Berkeley coopera-

The Green Book
A Collection of U.S.C.A. History

Guy Lillian and Krista Gasper

1971, 2002
Last Edited: March 26th, 2006

co-operative.

No one is sure how the word "co-operative" was first involved, but it is a system with roots in Rochdale, England, where the movement began in 1844. A rather cringeable pamphlet entitled "The Story of Toad Hall" tells in saccharine detail the story of the earliest co-ops; only the philosophy of the co-operative movement has bearing on the Berkeley students' story. That philosophy was started by Peter Warbasse, a philosopher of "co-operativism," in a book called "Cooperative Democracy." Basically the system is based on several postulates commonly known as "The Rochdale Principles." These declared that a cooperative would be based on democratic control, common purchase of the cheapest available produce, open membership, market prices charged, political neutrality, limited interest on any invested capital, and return of savings to members in return for their investment. Warbasse called it "a radical movement of pale pink," for its object was the antithesis of capitalism—service instead of profit. A housing co-op—untried in Berkeley and virtually unique anywhere—would adapt these principles to housing needs. Basically, it meant that students living in the house would control house policy and expenditures. They would be both independent and responsible.

The Berkeleyans sought, at first, limited goals; the first co-op unit was a rooming house on the south side of the campus. According to "Early History of the University Students' Cooperative Association," a reminiscence written by Fran Smart in 1940, Adaison James merits credit for persuading Mrs. Annie Dickson, contacted through one of the local churches, to take on the responsibility of running a cooperative boarding house. Mrs. Dickson's husband had-suffered severe economic hardships in the Depression, yet she was interested in the project and willing to assume some risks to join it. Those risks took the form of renting a larger house than the one her family presently lived in. Mrs. Dickson did the buying and cooking for twenty male students in exchange for meals for her family. The rent for these first coop members was ten dollars a month, which Mrs. Dickson allocated as $9 per student per month for food and the other $20 a month going for the utilities. Workshifts of four hours each week were required for the student residents. These workshifts were all typical duties—cleaning house and kitchen

Contents

I Cheap Place to Live 1

1 1933–1937 5

2 1937–1943 27

3 1943–1954 37

4 1954–1963 51

5 1964–1971 75

II Counterculture's Last Stand 109

6 Introduction 113

7 What Was the U.S.C.A.? 115

8 How Did Barrington Hall Fit In? 121

9 What Were the Problems? 127

10 What is Barrington's Legacy? 153

III Appendix 155

A Memorable Graffiti from Barrington Hall 157

B Reader Responses 159

is discussed here.

Kingman, in 1933, was in his second year as general secretary of Stiles Hall, the University of California Young Men's Christian Association, as well as coach of the Cal Freshmen Baseball Team. He had come to the Y.M.C.A. in 1916 from a stint with the New York Yankees and New York College. In 1931 the death of the then-general secretary had elevated Kingman to the directorship of campus organization. He brought the position an activism that dealth with many problems of his constituency. In recognition of that activism, Robert Gordon Sproul, the President of the University, appointed Kingman to a committee, with three other faculty members, designed to "assist and befriend" incoming freshmen in 1932. Kingman's membership brought him into direct contact with the incredible economic straits that the student body had to navigate.

The Y.M.C.A. itself kept a supply of used clothing on hand for destitute students. Other community organizations—Hillel, Newman Hall (the university Catholic chapel)—provided similar services. Mostly the efforts of these organizations were directed towards finding jobs for the students—insufficient funds were not only keeping potential students away from Berkeley, they also caused many to drop out. In September of 1932 Kingman went on the local radio with a speech called "Students Without Money," which detailed the types of aid available to the destitute. One case he mentioned was of a student who was, relatively, extremely fortunate; he lived with an uncle who paid his tuition and books. Presumably the room with the relative carried board privileges too, and the student had only to worry about extracurricular expenses. According to Kingman, he was asked about his financial status approximately four months into the semester. The student counted his change and said, "I started the semester with three dollars, but I have only about one dollar left." He was fortunate. A case existed at that time of one student who collapsed on College Avenue from malnutrition. Others spent as little as five dollars a month on food. In his radio broadcast Kingman defended the various efforts to support students: "The fact is that relief needs on the California campus have been fairly well met." In addition to private aid there were also University loans—about 70 different funds available at that time—which suffered from the inability

About This Book

The Green Book is a compilation of two sources. The first, *Cheap Place to Live*, was completed in 1971 by Guy Lillian as part of a U.S.C.A. funded project during the summer of 1971. The second, *Counterculture's Last Stand*, was completed in 2002 by Krista Gasper as part of her undergraduate studies at Berkeley.

Additional resources can be found at:

- http://www.barringtonhall.org/ - A Barrington Hall web site run by Mahlen Morris. You can find a lot of pictures and other cool stuff here.
- http://www.usca.org/ - The official U.S.C.A. web site.
- http://ejinjue.org/projects/thegreenbook/ - The Green Book homepage.

Warning: This book is *not* intended to be a definitive, complete and/or accurate reference.

If you have any comments, suggestions or corrections, please email them to jingoro@casa-z.org.

John Nishinaga
Editor

lending me much valuable material from his files. Without them the background for the co-op's birth would have been whole cloth. Also to be thanked are the present Board and staff of the U.S.C.A. for the aid they returned for persistent annoyance from me. Thanks of personal sorts to Marcella Murphy, Gwen Lindgren, and Gail Schatzberg for their impetus and assistance. And a most extraordinary thank you to Carolyn Callahan, who has never even been in Berkeley, let alone been a co-op member, for typing so much of the manuscript without promise of compensation.

I hope that this book will help the co-op as it enters its fifth decade. No living group has been around as long, done as much, or had a more interesting effect on the Berkeley campus and the idea of co-operatives in the United States. I hope new members manage to read it, and become involved in the organization they now own and control. The title of this tome to the contrary: the U.S.C.A. is far, far more than a cheap place to live. It is a life-experience.

Nothing more to write, except to say that I have enjoyed this project, and regard it as valuable to my life, and my career, however either may go.

And to thank the people I lived with for most of my college life, and dedicate this work.

To my brothers and sisters of Barrington Hall. Fall 1969 to Spring 1971.

Guy Lillian III
Co-op Historian

[Editor: Many parts were edited to improve readability. Careful attention was paid to preserve the author's original style and tone.]

Part I

Cheap Place to Live

knew of the Brown story and of the co-op problems, and he gave Collins, Norton and the others a sympathetic ear. He went to one of the creditors' meetings called by Brown—the U.C.S.C.A. has always owed the B. of A. money—listened to the arguments, and finally spoke out in a distinctive German drawl. He pointed out that no money could possibly come from the organization until students returned in the falls at that time the money *would* be forthcoming no matter if Brown was named caretaker/custodian of the U.C.S.C.A. or if the students were left in charge. Mohlenschardt assured his fellow creditors that the students were not out to "bilk" anyone—they were simply desperate. "I for one," he said, "want to support the students' position on this." He convinced the other businessmen who, once they knew the full story, decided to allow the organization time to pay off its summertime debts.

Collins and the other co-op leaders had learned their lesson from the troubles with Brown. Previously they had known nothing about accounting and they provided no reserve funds for depreciation or against the empty summer period. They set out to learn before another near-disaster could come upon them. Along with Lee Poole, the U.C.S.C.A. office accountant, Collins and Norton sought advice from professionals—an auditor was brought in to organize their books on the advice of Dudley Dillard, a Barrington economics major who had run a preliminary audit for the organization. (Dillard later became chairman of the Economics Department at the University of Maryland.) The professional auditors hired returned once a month for a year or so while the co-op leaders learned about the problems—taxes, deterioration and so forth—which any organization would encounter and must learn to command.

Successor to R.O. Brown as buyer/manager of the co-op was a once and future medical student named Ed Beebe. Beebe was known, liked and recommended by Stiles Hall liaison Bill Davis; he worked full-time as co-op buyer-manager for a year, during which time he also raised a family and attended pre-med at U.C. He graduated and, with enough money saved to attend med school, left. Larry Collins applied for the job and was appointed. He also married, in September of that year, 1937.

tive movement, stepped in through the Faculty Advisory Committee. This committee had rendered valuable advice and aid in the advertising campaign. Now it helped the co-op movement to gain a $650 loan from the U.C. Club House Loan Fund with which to furnish the renovated Sigma Nu house. This amount had to do in order to furnich a 48-person residence. As the K.F.R.C. script has Bill Spangle saying to the other co-opers:

> Spangle: Well, six-hundred-and-fifty-dollars is practically all the money there is in the world... but as Janes says, it won't equip this big... building... completely... fifty beds and mattresses...
>
> Janes: And tables and chairs...
>
> Voice: And chesterfields...
>
> Voice: And a kitchen stove...
>
> Voice: And don't forget silverware and towels...
>
> Voice:And how about a washing machine. We've got to keep clean!
>
> Spangle: You *promote* it Rowley... and you can be in charge of the laundry department. But seriously... let's appoint committees for two, and each committee'll be in charge of buying or promoting certain items... like cots and mattresses... floor lamps... dishes and so forth. They can make the rounds of all the secondhand shops...

Smart's article details some of the purchases made at those secondhand stores, mostly located in Oakland. The kitchen range cost $71.61, a library table $1.50, two blinds went for ninety cents, a single chair $3, a Faultless washer and mangle $83.72, and silverware $14.87. They also found 52 old Army cots for $98.43... but which caused much more than a hundred dollars' worth of trouble.

These cots were link-spring arrangements better than six feet long, which while in storage had been coated with a protective petroleum jelly. The 52 cots were brought to 2714 Ridge Road—-the old co-op name of Barrington had by then been applied to the building—late one afternoon and dumped on the steep sidewalk in front of the building. They lay there in the

thousand down payment towards the furniture in the building. Watkins heard about this during the Thanksgiving recess, when the other members of her committee were out of town. Dean Stebbins, contacted in cooperation, assured Watkins that the additional two thousand could be gotten out of the Loan Fund Committee, but the owners of the Inn would have to move their deadline back a ways. The owners did so, the Loan Fund Committee approved the additional money, the crisis was passed. Ridge Road Inn, renamed in honor of Dean Stebbins, opened as a co-op in January of 1936. The opening was a special event—a hundred-person tea party was held on the 26th of the month. The U.C.S.C.A. gained its third house—R.O. Brown, the co-op general buyer-manager, had given invaluable aid to Watkins and the Mortar Board Committee. In 1936, after three years of operation, the co-op organization had grown from 14 members to over 400, counting the many boarders eating at the three halls.

The opening of Stebbins provided not just another house or more members or sexual integration. It also provided the groundwork for economies and controls in the organization as a whole which would eventually lead to the central kitchen apparatus. The houses still retained their individual cooks. Jacqueline Watkins, in a 1935 article called "Cooperation Goes to College", listed the amount of food one house alone, Barrington, consumed in one semester: ten tons of meat, 30 tons of potatoes, 18,000 loaves of bread, 225 gallons of ketchup, 44,000 eggs, 160 pounds of bacon, 30,000 quarts of milk, 1350 quarts of ice cream. . . and so forth. Co-ordination and purchasing for all this produce was the responsibility of the Corporation Manager, Robb 0. Brown. In the two years that he had been in his position, Brown had done a splendid job. The organization had obtained New Barrington and Stebbins. The embryo of a true central organization had been conceived. Its growth, however, into a truly viable entity is Browns responsibility by less glorious though more critical events.

Barrington was in the midst of a financial crisis even as Stebbins was just entering the organization. In the center of the Barrington troubles was Larry Collins, who had ascended to the managers job in Barrington that January, after a climb up the responsibility ladder from the workshift and assistant

which made Anne Hershey's presence a practical boon. The house obviously needed a cook. There was some debate about whether or not to hire a man or woman for the post—and whether or not a competent pot-and-panner could be found for the salary Barrington Hall could afford to pay. Some discussion revolved around the question of a housemother; the University Mother's Club had been contacted early in the organizational phase of the co-op to make curtains, but the "mother's touch" was a questionable virtue beyond that contribution. Hershey, a business major who would eventually become head of the San Francisco Volunteers for America' solved the problem by telling the co-op of Anne's situation. She was at that time employed as cook by a family in nearby Burlingame, and Willis secured those culinary services for the co-op by moving up their wedding date. This solution not only brought Barrington a cook, it brought Anne Hershey a rent-free room. She became the house cook, and her husband Willis took the equally vital post as house buyer.

Hershey's major tool in that position was also the major acquisition (after Barrington Hall, of course) of the student co-op. Twelve and a half dollars was spent on an old Model T truck, which he drove to the markets in Oakland before dawn every day, to return with fresh produce. The truck broke down on numerous occasions, necessitating seven a.m. rescue-Hershey missions by other co-op members, but it lasted two years, at which time a more reliable truck could be afforded.

The Hersheys and Davis weren't the only "officials" in the co-ops. Bill Spangle had returned from Clarksburg to be named the manager of the house. He was in charge of a houseful of independent men—he also had a serious problem on his hands related to the U.X.A. wood cutting project. As stated before, the students working for the U.X.A. had done so in exchange for points, which could be "cashed in" for produce during the school year. That produce turned out to be too low in quality for even the co-op to use, and the students were stuck with all the firewood chopped during the summer at Dixon. This was a serious problem; the Barrington membership had counted on the U.X.A. produce to help them through this first year.

Again it was the co-op's friend and mentor organization, Stiles Hall, that came to their aid, along with the Faculty Ad-

realizing just what it said.

Bill Spangle's position in the co-op was, socially, much more than just the house manager. He was the resident authority on "cooperativism" and the major voice raised for "house spirit"—which involved attending football games, en masse, and included such extra activities as stopping and dismantling the Dwight Way streetcar at rally times. Spangle did not necessarily approve of such actions. He was head of the largest single social group in the house—men from the Sacramento area and American River Junior College, the same area whence came Spangle. But this group was no clique; others rose to co-op prominence as they gained experience. One of these who felt his fascination with "cooperativism" grow was Larry Collins. He rapidly became entranced with the co-op philosophy. The fascination, prevalent among many at that time, stemmed from the pragmatic qualities offered by the U.C.S.C.A. and from the uncertain era in which it grew. "You get a lot of guys," Collins says, "who are looking around, searching for some kind of an ideal to identify with; I happened to be in that situation during the time I was there so I got hung on the co-op idea." Co-op members were not generally so entranced. Collins has rueful memories of some of his and other enthusiasts' attempts to educate the masses. Like others attracted to the philosophy Larry spent hours researching texts by Warbasse and other "cooperativists" in the U.C. and Berkeley libraries. Barrington's management initiated, in 1936, a series of mandatory seminars or "caucuses" which all house members were forced to attend. At each of these Collins or Dudley Dillard or someone else would rise and read an essay about co-operativism—sometimes in a pretty preachy fashion. As a result these lectures did not go over too well. As they never have.

Inculcation of co-op virtues proceeded on all Barrington fronts. In February of 1936 was published the first issue of the house newsletter/egosheet. Edwin Dolder, the editor, made no attempt in his first "Barrington *Bull*" to pass on the co-op philosophy, but with its second "volume," edited by Jesse Hess, a Warbasse quotation or some other aspect of the Rochdale principles was printed on the front page of every issue. The *Bull*, always a part of Barrington life, would lose its ideological tone (as well as its name—in 1938 the title was changed to *The*

financial burden in campus activities (one of which, the Big C Circus, would later fall because of the student co-ops) such as dances, football games and so forth. Expense was kept far down, of course—as money still dominated the cares of the students, second in importance only to their studies, which promised future independent solvency.

The first year for the student co-op ended with solvency and independence becoming more of a possibility. The applications for both room and board and board only spaces in Barrington Hall had grown beyond the capacity of the Ridge Road house to handle. It was decided during the summer of '34 to lease a second house, at 2498 Piedmont Avenue to the east of the campus. This house was Sheridan Hall, again an old fraternity house whose Greeks had sought less expensive corridors. Fifty-seven roomers plus many boarders could be accommodated at this new location, which was considerably more "luxurious" by 1934 student standards than Barrington had been.

Sheridan's first members had another advantage besides the house. The Hersheys, Willis and Anne, who had been responsible for much of the success of Barrington's first year, moved to the new house in order to get it ready for its opening. They did such an extraordinarily fine job that it caused divisions of a sort to arise in the still new organization. Anne and Willis had arranged for beds to be put in prior to the entrance of any students—so there was an immediate "luxury" the cot-scouring pioneers on Ridge Road had done without. The beds were even made when the first Sheridan members—a young man by the name of Hal Norton among them—walked through the doors. Veterans of the opening pains of Barrington felt a bit slighted. They hid their no-doubt good natured resentment behind a righteous sheen of "co-operativeness"—the Sheridan men had had "too much" done for them and this was bad for their cooperative spirit. Fran Smart expresses this dandified feeling aptly and revealingly: "it seemed to take a little longer for these new members to acquire the feeling of 'belonging' to the cooperative group... the hardships which the early members of Barrington experienced proved beneficial in making the boys feel themselves an integral part of the unit."

Actually the location of Sheridan Hall had as much to do with the membership's alleged "snooty" attitude as the con-

down at bed time. The upstairs rooms featured a more unique sort of arrangement. There the beds were built into the wall itself, and covered with a rotatable drum. Spun towards the outside the bed was accessible from the room. Turned inwards, presumably by an occupant, the drum hid the mattress from the rest of the suite—but exposed the bedded to the elements, and a respectable drop to the pavement below if a toss or turn became to violent. Barrington never recorded any fatalities from this amazing sleeping arrangement—which is fairly amazing in itself. Apparently those early co-operators were as skilled as they were daring.

The most significant physical aspect of the New Barrington, as it was known for some years, was a rotunda near the center of the building running from the kitchen/dining room/lobby level straight up to the roof where it was capped by a skylight. According to David Bortin, "a waterbag could be dropped from the third floor down to the bottom, and it was very dangerous to walk on that first floor." Despite this quality the rotunda, which was flanked by closed stairways, was a serious danger to the house—it was a veritable chimney—and one of the primary reasons it was later leased to the Navy.

But the house did not burn down in the 1930's and the rotunda was indeed invaluable for the recreational purposes Bortin described. Collins mentions that the waterbagging practice soon spread its soggy tentacles outward onto Dwight Way. "One of the things that guys used to enjoy doing," he says, "was waterbagging the dinky (streetcar) as it would go by. We developed all sorts of devices for doing this, and then we began to take in the general public: any pedestrian on either side of the street would get it if they didn't watch out. Finally the police would come along. In those days the guys didn't get uptight about it, they just quit." Rapport with the Berkeley Police Department has not, of course, remained on so congenial a level. Thirty years after Collins entered the co-op Berkeley initiated a statute against the throwing of waterballoons (bags having given way to progress): a waterballoon thrown from the Barrington roof *through* a policecar window is said to have been the clincher.

Barrington began in those early years certain weird traditions—unique to the house but common in kind to those developed by

ument was drawn up to be presented to the governing board, which was then composed of Spangle, Eastman, and the two house presidents, listing some alternative types of organization along with advantages of each. The general advantages of organizing were also given; they included not only the limitations of individual liability but also the central "coordination of the houses in setting rates or placing members", "a common buyer so as to reduce food costs", and "to keep the houses from drifting apart", an ambiguous statement.

Four different methods of organization were given, but only one was given more 'than one line of treatment: "the inter-house organization which would be a corporation". Barrington and Sheridan would continue to operate independently in their "internal set-ups" and member relations, but neither house would be financially responsible for the other's debts and the membership would be protected from unlimited liability. The Board of Directors would assume titular liability for all or the organization's debts.

The incorporation idea was approved in November of '34. Doug Cruikshank, who had been elected as Barrington's council president, was now elected to the presidency of the U.C.S.C.A. Board. Spangle was general manager. The legal work for the incorporation required the help of a senior law student at Boalt Hall, the U.C. law school; Cruikshank visited him often in getting the papers drawn up. When, they were signed by the Board of Directors the U.C.S.C.A. became a non-profit organization under the laws of California. The seven signers included Cruikshank, Spangle, and a young accountant/economist named Dudley Dillard from Barrington, Eastman and two other Sheridan members, Smith and Thomas Blakeley, and Fran Smart of Stiles Hall, the only non-resident member of the Board. Later a faculty representative was appointed, on request, by the President of the University.

The U.C.S.C.A.'s second year passed, and a change occurred in the management of the student co-ops, one that would have a sensational, almost fatal, but ultimately highly beneficial effect on the co-op. A non-student named R.O. Brown was hired as general buyer/manager of the organization. A one-time Cal football player, Brown was married and had been a building contractor before taking on the U.C.S.C.A. duties. An inde-

the postwar world. There was no political activism of the overt, physical sort—the only violence of any significant sort occurred at football games, when Cal students reacted to their team's usually disgusting performances by ripping up seats and hurling them onto the field.

The housing shortage caused by the veteran's return was not solved by Cloyne Court and Ridge House alone. Board members of the U.C.S.C.A. sought other means to put up all the applicants. Bill Davis, by then eight years married and still Stiles Hall representative to the Board of Directors, was involved in one abortive project dealing with surplus Navy barges then in mothballs at nearby Port Chicago. These barges had stainless steel kitchens and facilities ideal for a floating co-op. The first deck had a huge mass hall, the second quarters for the men, with officers' or managers' rooms at one end. "We got awfully excited about this." Davis said, "We learned that we could get these things for nothing... We went up and inspected them two or three times with the head of the U.C. Naval department, Captain Bruce Canaga, who was very much interested... Our idea was to bring them down and board them at the Berkeley Yacht Harbor somehow. We would hook-up facilities, water and so on, and run these things as long as we needed them in order to get over this critical housing shortage." Norton and Davis figured out that the co-op could run the barge-co-ops for $35 per month per person, room and board. It was also figured that disposal of the barges after the crisis was over would be no trouble. They could be sailed out to sea and scuttled, if need be.

The deal itself was scuttled because of an uncooperative, indeed competitive, attitude on the part of the University. U.C. had just built a veteran's center in Richmond and officials feared that the co-op barges would siphon applicants from it, and put pressure on city officials. They in turn pressured the co-op with such city type weapons as fire protection and drummed-up sanitation objections, all of which could have been solved. The barge idea never came off.

The 1946 run-in with U.C. was a low incident in the history of encounters between U.C.S.C.A. and the University whose students they served. The University itself was just beginning to move in to the student housing/field with the Richmond center

Chapter 2

1937–1943

1937 was a quiet year for the student co-op. Collins was involved in the co-ops latest acquisition, an "annex" of Barrington Hall on Atherton. The food for this 24-man house, which ran for five years, was shuttled from the nearby larger house. In early 1938 an experimental central kitchen was begun there which lasted till summer. A truly organized central organization revolved about the axis of common purchase and distribution of food—and the young group needed that central planning. Collins as buyer/manager, took steps during that period to cement the U.C.S.C.A. to other cooperative endeavors—with the burgeoning Berkeley co-op. He spoke at a three-day camp held in Hayward during one summer on "Youth Facing Life Under Capitalism". In 1938 the idea of a central kitchen had occurred to him after visiting a co-op canneries in Washington and meeting a man at one of these, "an old socialist from 'way back", who was willing to supply the U.C.S.C.A. with cheap produce. This agreement was the first knotting of the student co-ops' ties with other cooperative movements in the United States, some of which Collins went on to work with and lead. After leaving Cal Larry worked for the government, the Berkeley Co-op and finally the Mutual Service Life Insurance Corporation, of which he is now west coast director.

Expansion had been the key word in the first five years of the co-op's life, and finding new houses to take the still growing number of applicants remained a high priority. The Atherton

which, although minimal, was a challenge to the co-op. Cash reserves were low thanks to the purchase of Ridge House. For the first time a major appeal to the U.C.S.C.A. alumni was made, to help the co-op pay the $435,000 down payment. A month's effort produced $30,000 in personal loans—an indication of the financial vitality of the U.C.S.C.A. Most perplexing of all, Cloyne Court had already established residents—professors and professors emeritus who had lived there, with their families, for years, and whom the U.C.S.C.A. was not anxious to summarily evict. Not many of these people had an immediate place to move. Secondly, their rent helped the organization over the financial hump represented by the $125,000 cost of the building. None of the old residents were evicted therefore, and when fifteen co-op men moved into Cloyne Court in August of 1946 they moved into the finest accommodations ever enjoyed by co-op members.

David Bortin was one of that privileged vanguard, who moved in among the private tenants. The students that first semester were served the same fare in the same manner as the rest of the denizens—on tables covered with white tablecloths, and so forth. Bortin remembers his fellow Cloynefolk well. "I waited tables on these people and I found many of them fascinating. One of them was Professor Stratton. He was the man who ruined his eyesight in an experiment by putting on glasses which inverted everything in his eyes, and after a couple of weeks got so he perceived things as being right side up that way, then took off the inverting glasses, and everything looked upside down to him. This was a landmark psychological experiment in his day: Stratton was then in his 90's; according to Hal Norton, he and his wife were the last of the early Cloyne residents to leave. He was not the only noted faculty member at Cloyne Court. A Professor Ballantine, "the father of California corporation law" was there, and gave the new management, led by an ex-sailor named Myron Haas, no end of trouble with his complaints. Said Borton:

> You can just imagine a bunch of college kids moving into a place that had been quiet resident apartments for older professors and their families. . . the kind of noise level changes that occurred, the amount of complaints there were, threats to call the police. . . and here they were complaining to the land-

was stoutly denied by the members of that august body." Most important of the stories in that issue, obviously, were reports on interactivities of the U.C.S.C.A. with other cooperatives: Barrington invited East Bay Co-operatives to hold meetings in the Dwight Way house, and an arrangement had been made with the newly founded U.C.L.A. co-op for Barringtonians to sleep there the weekend of a Cal-U.S.C. football game. Future issues dealt strongly with the relationship of the student organization with other co-ops; Collins was doing his job, a task which would find frustration later.

Norton found that his job was more difficult that he had expected. Financially, Oxford showed a definite deficit throughout the final months of 1938. In January of 1939 he reported that "The first four months of operation a net liability of $503.67 had built up, but that another four thousand dollars was due to the organization from the opening of the hall." *The Oxford Accent*, the new hall's house newspaper, reported on January 24th that new boarders were the answer to Oxford's problems. By March 20th, the *Accent* reported, a profit of $5 had been built up. Oxford's financial doldrums were past.

That same issue of the *Accent*, however, found it necessary to editorially point out that the economic problems of America as a whole were far from solved. The author of the piece indicated the "forces of reaction" which had taken over Germany and Italy, and spoke of the fears of a second world conflict. That a reminder of the outside conditions had to be made is indicative of the change in student mentality that had come about in the five and a half years of co-op existence. No longer was the economic shambles of the western world an immediate part of student lives.

Oxford's first year was capped with the U.C.S.C.A.'s annual senior dinner on April 24th, an event which was supposed to be the first annual such affair. Robert Gordon Sproul, the President of the University, made the principal speech; Collins and Harry Kingman, who was soon to retire from Stiles Hall, also spoke. It had been a successful year, not only for Oxford, but for the U.C.S.C.A. as a whole.

From June 13th through the 15th Barrington hosted its first large-scale conference for other cooperatives. At first called a Western College Co-operative conference, the meeting was de-

versity campus, was appropriated for central office use. With the organization of the co-op bureaucracy a paid staff had become necessary, but it consisted mostly of part-time workers, secretaries and a warehouse manager, in support of Norton, who kept the co-op books and assembled the whole apparatus.

The board of the U.C.S.C.A. had also undergone change. Prior to the start of the war, the manager and president of each member house had served on the governing body. Just as the war began Joe Bort, the President of Barrington Hall, suggested a plan where each house elected a number of representatives according to the house population. The Board members increased in number as the Board, presumably, sustained its democratic auspices.

The single event which stands out in the U.C.S.C.A. in '44 was a fire that began one night in the living room at Stebbins Hall. Nobody was hurt seriously, but the entire facade of the building was damaged. Renovation improved the public facilities at Stebbins—a whole new living room had to be constructed.

Preparing for the inevitable influx of ex-G.I.'s in early 1945 turned out to be more difficult than Norton and the others figured; no houses seemed to be for rent in Berkeley at that time. A house did come on the buyer's market that provided not only a good co-op unit but territory for expansion. Located atop a site above Euclid on Ridge Road, this large handsome house was the property of a millionaire builder's widow named Ellis who allowed her son, a teacher of biology and botany at the University of Kansas, to use the building when he wanted. She handled the family business and it was from her that the house was bought.

The house itself was a good find at a time when the influx of men was on a steady rise, but the land that went along with it gave the purchase the status of a godsend for the co-op organization. Containing 13000 square feet overlooking the U.C. campus and San Francisco Bay, the property was, except for the relatively small Ellis building and a small carriage house behind it, undeveloped. In such a great location development—in terms of new housing—was inevitable.

The U.C.S.C.A. was obviously in no position financially to construct a building of its own in 1945. Accountants brought in

The business aspects of the co-op, despite the Barrington real estate, were still dangerous by any conventional standard. The ratio of assets to liabilities in a solid business, according to those standards, is two to one. In the co-op's case that ratio was exactly the reverse. This situation wouldn't change for decades.

Certainly it did not change in 1940, a transition year for America as well as for the student co-op, a year marked by no special events save general growth away from the Depression towards something else. Assistant manager of Barrington Hall that year was Ted Johnston, a transfer to Berkeley from Santa Ana Junior College, who had in 1939 been the Barrington workshift manager. The next year, 1941, he was manager, and forced to deal with serious problems in the wood frame building then ending its 35th year of existence and its fifth year as a co-op.

The building had gone over to the U.C.S.C.A. in almost as poor repair as it had been in 1935. even though co-op members had put in much effort: adding a student store, a lobby, and a concrete floor for the building's smaller dining room. The wood frame was unchanged, of course—and the waterbaggers' paradise, the central open rotunda, also remained. A haven for practical jokers, the hall was a fireman's terror, and the possibility of a catastrophic fire was the house manager's greatest fear. "I used to walk in the alley on the east side of the building," Johnston recalls, "sometimes at night, really concerned because sometimes there'd be a fire in somebody's wastebasket—somebody's mattress would catch on fire. I think that was the thing that concerned me more than anything, was that the old building frame could just go up, burst in flame, and have a lot people lose their lives and all their possessions." Bill Davis recalled that some house members kept coils of rope under their beds as emergency escape measures.

Another problem that beset Barrington was four-legged. Rats attacked the Barrington and U.C.S.C.A. warehouses—both located on the ground floor of the building.

Such troubles were not new—but a University-and-U.C.S.C.A.-wide problem had appeared which heralded the start of a new era for University life and the student co-op. The war in Europe had already affected the American economy, and began to affect the enrollment at colleges. The ratio of women students to men steadily increased—as was the demand for housing for

Sherman.

Located on Prospect Street near the California Memorial Stadium, in the midst of the fading Berkeley Greek colony, Sherman Hall was a sorority house whose owners were selling out. The house was an incredible bargain for the co-ops. The full purchase price was $21,000—for a good house in one of the best locations available—plus some six thousand dollars the U.C.S.C.A. paid for an addition to the building and renovations. The real estate acquisition of the business had a valuable property in Sherman Hall. The increase in women's applications had a solution, too. The new house could room 47 and board 80. The co-op increased its women's houses substantially during this time, leasing in 1943 a small, 16-woman house the Board named Rochdale, after the foundation place for the world co-op movement. The house lasted but two years the lease was dropped in 1945.

In 1942 the state of California, in the grip of war hysteria—recalling the erroneous report of Japanese bombers buzzing San Diego on December 7th, 1941—began the Japanese Relocation Program, the low mark in America's relations with its minorities. Under the program west coast citizens of Japanese ancestry, forced to leave their homes, were placed in quasi-concentration camps east of the state. Berkeley had a large Nisei community, U.C. students many of them. The primary Japanese organization on campus was the Japanese Students Club located in a two-story building on Euclid Street around the corner from Stebbins. The students were stuck with a building they could not use—a financial liability compounded over the relocation troubles. The student co-op had ties with the Japanese Students, mutual members and dealings with the administration. George Yasa-koshi, who would become assistant manager of the U.C.S.C.A. in the late '40's and later head of the Berkeley Consumer's Co-ops was among these common members. The co-op heard the J.S.C. problem and agreed to take over the rent. David Bortin remembered the feelings of the Board members:

> The student co-op felt pretty noble about it; maybe they *were* pretty noble, to undertake to relieve them of that house and that obligation at a time when nobody else was willing or able to do it. The whole

and turned around and went off to park somewhere. First event.

Second event: walking down the sidewalk from the direction of campus comes a guy who is totally nude. It is now one in the morning. Totally naked. This is pledge week.[1] This guy, totally naked, walks along the sidewalk, holding his hands over his vital place, and he suddenly sees this huge flood of grease on the sidewalk. And he looks at it, and he looks around, there's nobody visible and he goes back about ten feet and he runs and leaps and *misses*. And he falls naked into this pool of grease. And he rolls around and gets up and staggers off down the street. The street is quiet again.

The next morning the Betas spent three hours burning off the grease.

The Cloyne war with the Betas went on for years, continuing after the University bought the house next to Cloyne and the frat moved into a more modern structure across the street. On one famous night in the mid-60's, some inebriated Betas fired a pistol at Cloyne's roof where the flares set an empty sleeping bag on fire and threatened a fatal conflagration. Complaints to the Dean of Men got nowhere, just as did reports of gunshots aimed at Cloyne and the horrible murder of several pet chickens by drunken Betas. "Boys will be boys," the Dean, it is claimed, would intone. "Back when I was in a frat. . . ."

Far from regarding the Betas as a joke, Cloyne-men were anxious to end the Greek menace across Ridge Road and, indeed on more than one occasion, they suggested to the Board that the U.S.C.A. buy the Beta house and evict the tenants. This act of justice never came to be, but nevertheless the Betas were moved in the late '60's and the feud ended when Berkeley's immensely wealthy Graduate Theological Union purchased the building from the national Beta Theta Phi organization. Cloyne's arch-enemies moved across campus to south-side and were never heard from again.

The middle '50's also contained the definitive event of the

[1]A time when frats sometimes forced prospective members to prove themselves worthy of the Greek name through such idiot stunts.

and the "temporary" Smyth-Fernwald dormitory complex to supplement Bowles Hall. But throughout the thirteen years of co-op existence the organization and the University had kept a wary eye on one another. While administrators such as U.C. President Sproul and Deans like Ed Voorhis and Lucy Ward Stebbins had given great aid to the group in its fledgling period, other, more visible members of the U.C. bureaucracy looked at the co-op askance. As the University system had no chancellors at that time, these men held great influence, and owing to their own pre-Depression background were inclined, at the start of the U.C.S.C.A., to withhold their trust of what must have seemed to be a most radical and socialistic organization. Norton and the others "couldn't get in any doors"; only because of the large amount of faculty support, Hal says, was the U.C.S.C.A. of the '30's—and even the '40's—able to pass the bureaucratic gauntlets relatively unscathed.

Members of the agricultural economics department and the law school were, in Norton's words, "responsible in part for the growth of the U.C.S.C.A." Many famous members of these and other departments served on the co-op Board by presidential appointment—on the request of the co-op members. Among them were Alexander Kidd, who never missed a Board meeting in his time on it, and William Lloyd Prosser, a law professor recognized as the international authority on tort law. These men are examples of the outstanding talent that sat in the faculty seat on the U.C.S.C.A. Board—and helped the organization through its bureaucratic hassles. Later Monroe Deutsch, Provost of the entire University system would sit on the Board, and later still Clark Kerr would change the bureaucratic view of the co-op through his influence. But in 1946 the University's attitude towards the U.C.S.C.A., while not hostile, was one of tolerance. As Ted Johnstone, now a University official pointed out from his both-sides perspective, the officials could have applied enough pressure on the city to shut down the organization had they wished.

Dissention of a sort erupted in the co-op two years after the barges incident, when Lexington Hall ceased to be a viable co-op and the Board decided to return it to the liberated Japanese. There was some controversy about whether the Euclid building should reopen as an ethnic clubhouse. Among those in opposi-

relatively friendly. Across Cloyne's backyard, over-looking the co-op's asphalt volleyball court, was the house of the group that made the relationship with the Phi Kapa Psi's that way: Beta Theta Phi, or the Betas, as they were simply and affectionately known.

The source of the hatred that enjoyed a fifteen-year bloom between Cloyne Court and Beta Theta Phi is a matter of supposition. The Betas were by and large an athletically oriented frat—much of Cal's football team lived there. Though Cloyne excelled in certain intramural sports through individual members, the diminutive stature of most of the co-op denizens won the disgust of the more gargantuan Betas. The lack of racial or ethnic considerations in the choice of co-op residents was also a matter of some rancor. In their terms, as quoted by Dan Eisenstein, "the Betas had two things going for them: these were a lot of jocks in the house, and they couldn't stand kikes, wops, niggers or chinks. They were thoroughly insulted by the fact that right next to them was a house full of kikes, wops, niggers, chinks, and *Japs* too."

Eisenstein describes Cloyne's encounters with their muscle-bound neighbors graphically:

> Periodically the Betas would have parties, and would get very drunk and would litter our volleyball court with broken glass. It wasn't broken till it got into our volleyball court—it'd break when it hit. Beer bottles in those days, the returnable kind, were big strong beer bottles that made nice glass chips. We'd spend the next morning sweeping glass off our volleyball court. Nice fellas, the Betas.
>
> We'd have lots of fights, physical ones, with the Betas. We had a bigger waterhose then they did. One advantage: firehoses. We could stand in the volleyball courts and *fill* their rooms with water. One point I remember well. A jock of some sort lived in an upstairs room. He left his window open. He went away and we had a water-fight. Nobody went up to shut that window. When he came home there was a foot of water on his floor. He got very upset and he and some of his friends came over to try to do something about this.

since students from local schools such as Laney and Merritt Colleges sometimes lived at the co-op, was probably a more apt title anyway.

May of '48 produced a financial bargain for the U.S.C.G., in the form of an offer from the Cerone family. They offered the residuum of the co-op's lease on Barrington Hall, which still had some years to run, for $16,000. The purchase meant no end of good things for the co-op and was quickly made. Though the house was still in the hands of the Navy, complete ownership meant that the hall could be regained and reconverted back to co-op use a full two years sooner than expected. The fully renovated house was again changed from apartments to a co-op and residents moved into the house in September of 1950.

The Barrington renovation was handled by a San Francisco architect named Timothy Krueger. Highly respected in his profession, he had been engaged by the Navy to redesign the building, yet had worked with Norton as much as with his official employers. The result was a hall that seemed built for the co-op when it came back into its hands. The woodpanel exterior had been replaced by fireproof white stucco. The chimneylike rotunda in the center of the building, bane of fire inspectors and joy of waterbaggers, was gone; two curved walls in two warehouse closets and many soggy memories were all that remained. The three residential floors now had firedoors in the middle of their block-width long hallways, The roll-drum and foldout beds were gone—to the relief of Norton, Davis, and others who wondered how fatalities had ever been averted while the roll-drum beds were in use. 148 roomers and thirty boarders came into the physically improved facility—which, to the dismay of its old alumni, never renewed the pre-war traditions. It was a different generation, however: veterans being joined by students who, like them, had been children during the depression and shared their desire for security. It was at this point in the history of American campuses that engineer domination came into being. Seriousness about studies was again the keynote of a student's life, though finances were generally in better shape.

One further purchase, one further change in the U.S.C.A. houselist was to occur before the beginning of the organization's third decade. In the spring of 1953 the Campus Inn, a building with space for 63 women, came onto the market. Lo-

tion of several large buildings: a 500 student dining hall, a 310-student double-roomed dorm, a central office, warehouses and, most importantly, a central kitchen. Nobody had ever been satisfied with the cramped, unsanitary hole-in-the-wall at Oxford.

"In fact," said the report, "University and City officials have constantly been exhorting, even admonishing us, to implement our frequently affirmed promises to erect a new kitchen." The second stage of development would involve the demolition of Ridge House to clear the way for another dorm unit for 230 students, and would take place totally on the present U.S.C.A. property. Stage III of the plan was the most uncertain part of the plan. Requiring purchase of the Ridge-Scenic Wilson land, it called for dormitory units for another 530 students and another 500-man dining room.

Funds for this project would come from three sources: mortgages on the constructed buildings, loans from alumni and funds borrowed on the present U.S.C.A. property. The reason Hal Norton had always sought to purchase buildings was now evident.

Needless to say this specific plan fell through, or rather splattered against the iron will of the University bureaucracy. U.C. went ahead and built its multi-storied parking structure. The Wilson property was still untouched and the expansion-minded Norton kept it constantly in mind. He figured it into many of his ideas on what to do about the housing shortage and the critical central kitchen situation.

While Oxford's kitchen had been fairly adequate for co-op purposes in the early 1940's, when membership had been lower and some houses still had their own cooks during the student-starved years of World War II, it became obvious in the early and middle '50's, as students began to swell the U.S.C.A., that some new facility was needed. Summer semesters at the University were a special pain. During the middle 1950's, the U.S.C.A. kept Stebbins and Cloyne Court open and brought the C.K. operation to Cloyne, a bad necessity at best, since the cooks and dietician were moved against their will and several of the larger kitchen machines could not be moved at all. In the late '50's the every-summer-move practice was abandoned and work-shifts were sent down to Oxford to help prepare the meals.

3rd, which recommended that as little publicity be given the issue as possible by the U.S.C.A., and that all statements from the Board on the issue go through the co-op's public relations committee or a special committee set up by the Board for this purpose. Most importantly, the fact-finders recommended that a plebiscite be held of the entire membership as soon as possible.

Bob Shephard, a co-editor of the *U.S.C.A. News*, spelled out in the March 10th issue the "dire implications and consequences" waiting for U.S.C.A. members if the oath went unsigned: "We count among the majority of our members science majors—students of chemistry, physics and engineering who hope in the next four years to be working for the government. Quite a few are already working in the government radiation, atomic energy, and microwave labs here on campus. A goodly number are criminology majors who look forward to steady positions with state or federal offices such as the F.B.I.. . . few, if any of us, could afford to be labeled as members of a subversive organization." Shephard did not advocate signing the oath, but diagrammed the alternatives a membership plebiscite would be offered: "whether or not to sign, and if the decision is not to sign, whether or not to fight the case in the courts."

A special Board meeting to discuss the issue was called at Ridge House on March 11th. At that time the deadline for signing the pledge was believed to be March 15th, but at the meeting Professors Prosser, Kidd and Kragen of the Boalt Hall Law School advised the Board that a decision could be put off until November 1st, four and a half months after the U.S.C.A.'s fiscal year closed. The directors agreed in enormous relief that the issue could wait until fall for a decision; in the meantime, the legal brains of the organization, including Manager Norton, who was then in his third year of law school, were to continue to look into the law's procedures and demands. Not until the following October did the oath again command the attention of the U.S.C.A. Board.

Its return to the public eye, however, was marred by even stormier controversy than the previous March. The Board met on October 14th, and although it was still agreed that the membership as a whole should decide the question, the directors felt an obligation to the organization and themselves to make a recommendation. They argued the issue until 2:15 the morning of

> started raising money to go to Tibet to fight the Chinese. Sherman was the Queen of the co-ops. Pretty girls at Sherman. Stebbins and Hoyt, a brand new place when I got there, were sort of not much anything. They were just around. They weren't exciting places to live... people went into them not out of choice. Cloyne was exceptional. Cloyne was not like Oxford, Cloyne was not like Barrington, Cloyne was not like Ridge.

Unlike many of the other houses, the brown mammoth near the crest of Ridge Road had an older, more experienced population. It was most of the Korean War veterans in the organization.

> By and large these guys... got into things like engineering, instead of history or political science. When I came to Cloyne, the average age was around 23 and about 25% of the house was graduate students. We had the highest grade point average on campus almost every year for the first four years I was there. We won the University intramural sports championship three out of the first five years... There was an awful lot of house spirit. There was a lot of real feeling that this was *our* place and we were all very involved in it and very proud of it.

The membership had developed a distance from the leaders of the U.S.C.A.

> The co-op as a whole had exactly the same problems as the co-op does now: nobody trusted the central organization, nobody knew much about the central organization. The whole operation rotated around Hal Norton. Hal Norton and Bill Davis were simply the central mass around which the flags waved. They'd been there all along and a lot of kids tended to defer to them. It was obvious that Hal was devoting his entire life to the organization, with a hell of a lot less compensation than he could've gotten elsewhere.

> ciple in a given situation... I have on occasion on the Board argued against the U.S.C.A. taking a position on an issue that my own organization, Stiles Hall, would take a position on... I think that when you have a consumer's organization with a certain job, and it gets involved in partisan issues not related to its job in a pretty direct way, then you run the risk of dividing your constituency—of alienating somebody, losing somebody, and making your job difficult... and under certain circumstances you could wreck the organization.

It was 1954. The co-op had two decades of age; with little fanfare, the organization slipped into its third... a time of maturation for the U.S.C.A. and the student body it served.

dent. A fine was planned against all males at the University to pay for damages. In the regular *Daily Cal* story on the Panty Raid Uprising, only a few students were named. Among them, singled out for praise, was Dan Eisenstein. He didn't take part in the Panty Raid; he tried to save the co-op from damage, but he certainly understood what was going on.

Even in 1956, even with a such an anti-political event as a panty raid, a schism had appeared. Even with a great educator like Clark Kerr at the helm of the University, the U.C. administration had shown itself absolutely ignorant of the emotional state of the student body. Incoming years would demonstrate its monumental ignorance of the student mind and conception of self. It was a non-political era, in 1956, but the portents were there. As the U.S.C.A. built, and planned, for projects that would come to be in the 1960's, so the crisis of understanding built without plan to the explosion that would come.

"It was a very tense time," Eisenstein said of May, 1956. He could have been speaking of the entire decade in which the Silent Generation held sway over Berkeley. "Have you ever been in the Midwest before a thunderstorm? Sultry, hot oppressive... you can feel the electricity in the air. This feeling in the air was the same thing we had before the panty raid." Before the '60's began, too, he might add, "and it scared me a little bit."

decade for the college generation: The Great Panty Raid of 1956. But the story of that sweltering day in May must wait, to cap the 1950's psychologically even as it seared its halves chronologically. The story of the U.S.C.A., only peripherally involved in the Panty Raid, found its next pinnacle at its silver anniversary mark in 1958. Not only did the most important and long-lasting student-owned organization reach its 25th birthday, it also sought to cap that event with a true solvency: further advancement towards hypothetical financial stability.

It was planned that the 25th anniversary of the U.S.C.A. be given a celebration. Hal Norton shrewdly saw it as an opportunity to better relations with the University. Those relations had never been particularly cozy until the 1950's when Clark Kerr, whose graduate project in state cooperatives had helped instigate the opening of Stebbins Hall, became Chancellor of the Berkeley campus.

"He was much more friendly than previous administrators," Norton said. "His door was always open to us... he invited our board to meet with him and some of his administrators." Kerr's friendliness was a major boon to the U.S.C.A. in 1958. "Kerr was responsible," according to Norton, "for our being able to have a commemoration of our 25th anniversary." Harmon Gymnasium, on the south side of the campus, was then the largest indoor meeting place available at the University. Kerr made it available to the co-op.

The speaker for the occasion was chosen especially for the purpose of enhancing the U.S.C.A.'s image in the Berkeley campus community. Eleonor Roosevelt was an audience and publicity magnet almost without par for liberal students. Norton reached Mrs. Roosevelt "through rather direct contact." The great lady assented and a full day of activities were planned for her at the co-op and the university.

A reception for co-op members at Ridge House was followed by a reception handled by Clark Kerr at U.C.'s Alumni House. At the Harmon Gym celebration, Kerr joined Mrs. Roosevelt, Norton, U.S.C.A. president T.Z. Chu and the entire U.S.C.A. Board on the speaker's platform. Seven thousand people sat before them in the Gymnasium, a packed-house crowd. Such a demonstration was bound to cause dubious minds on certain pertinent strata of the U.C. administration to take notice. You

> point I got a phone call from Hoyt. People had broken into the house and stealing things and giving the girls a hard time. So Dick Bloomfield, Bill Madison and I went down and *physically* threw people, mostly from Ridge House, out the door. We went up onto the roof and secured the door that people had broken to get into the house. I think we chased people away from Stebbins too, the basic argument being that you were an asshole to break anything here because it would raise your room and board rent next semester.

In the meantime the crowd of male students, frat, co-op, and rooming house, had roared down the wrath of Adam onto Stern Hall. A group had come up to join the mob there, and soon two thousand people were assaulting the dormitory.

> They broke into Stern hall forcibly. They ran around in the hall stealing things from the girls, mostly panties. . . lots of pushing, shoving, lot of damage done at Stern.
>
> Then the crowd left Stern and simply went down sorority row, like a *tidal wave*. The girls in some houses enticed them, because they were also bored. There were some houses that didn't want them in; they tried to keep them out. They broke the doors down, they broke the windows, thousands and thousands of dollars worth of damage was done.

The flabbergasted Berkeley Police Department closed Piedmont Avenue, site of the most frenetic action, but took no ardent action. Violence resulted against some of the intruders. One exhilarated young man kicked in a door at one sorority and was greeted with an iron the face. At another house a girl in a strategic spot atop a flight of stairs "whanged" each passing male with an umbrella held like a cricket bat. "One guy after another would come by and she'd just *whang* with this umbrella. *Whang! Whang!* Lot of very sore guys came out of that house."

Piedmont. Warring. Even Prospect. These are the Berkeley streets where Panhellenic women's groups dominated, and

that the College Housing Program of the Housing and Home Finance Agency, because of the direct loan provisions and the low interest rate, was more desirable, provided [the U.S.C.A.] could qualify." Drawing on his legal background, Norton then drafted the amendment. Basically his amendment stated that the university was not responsible for the co-op's debt.

Conferences with the Washington representative of the Cooperative League and a former Federal Trade Commissioner began Norton's drive. They decided to ask Senator William Fulbright to introduce the amendment. Fulbright was then Chairman of the Senate Banking and Currency Committee under which the Subcommittee on Housing functioned. If Fulbright didn't go along with the idea, the sub-committee's chairman, John Sparkman of Alabama, would be approached. Nothing ever came of these two pathways, but the bill amending the act was eventually introduced by Senator Paul Douglas of Illinois, who had been both a Federal Trade Commissioner and the Cooperative League's Washington representative at different times before retiring.

The reaction from Congress at first was favorable, but soon a problem appeared in the form of the director of the Housing and Home Finance Agency. His opposition to the amendment was based on his belief that student co-ops were "questionable financial risks" and the contention that federal funds should go only to the universities in such situations. His objections were echoed by the advisory committee to the College Housing Director.

Norton tried to counter these objections with an argument appealing to basic fairness:

> We expected the imposition of a financial standard prior to loaning to the eligible co-operative group, but we questioned the conclusion that student groups be excluded by legislation before they had any opportunity to meet the standard. Also, if the purpose of the College Housing Program was to meet a definite need, restriction of loans to colleges only was too restrictive particularly if it might result in excluding groups which catered to the low income student.

until about January 3rd. We went back to school, went for another three weeks, had finals. We had no spring recess. Three days after finals we came back and we registered. We registered for a week, and then we had classes. There was no Easter recess as I remember, for some reason.

By the time mid-May came around everybody was *tired*. May '56 was one of the hottest Mays we've ever had. It was really hot. People developed an interest in water-fighting.[2] People would bring firehoses, waterballoons, buckets and all the frats would have water-fights. We'd have then on northside. They went on-and-off for a period of about two weeks, with the Betas, the Phi Psi's... I remember at one point somebody throwing a huge waterballoon off the roof of the apartment house which then existed at the corner of Le Conte and Ridge, hitting a car's windshield, breaking it... the guy ran into a parked car, had an accident.

The University got very concerned about these water fights and sort of told people to calm it. Berkeley police started to tell people to cool it a little bit. But everyone was beginning to get a little freaky. People were developing hysteria. So every evening you'd have water-fights, wake up the next morning and wait for the water-fights.

We were damn near to the finals period, near the end of May, and there was a real BIG set of water-fights, which had several hundred people involved, all over. Everybody got very uptight. A lot of damage was being done; people used firehoses.

It was all building—a compression of the frustrations and psychic energy laid over from almost five months of next-to-solid schoolwork. The dam was bound to break in one great explosion if the trivial leaks represented by the water-fights didn't alleviate the pressure. And they did not.

And I remember how this happened.

[2]The incident of the weightlifter's window described earlier dates from this newfound frolic.

Berkeley would lend aid to the amendment. George Miller of the 8th district agreed to co-sponsor the Hagen bill and the 6th district's John Baldwin, a Republican to match the Democrat Miller, would speak in its favor. Norton sent Kingman's resumes of the organization's fiscal status and history to be used in support of the Washington efforts, as well as a letter documenting the co-op's value to a poor man's education from Dudley Dillard, head of the Economics Department at the University of Maryland.

Miller, Hagan and Baldwin were effusive in their praise of the U.S.C.A. and met questions from the members of the House Sub-Committee on Housing like old co-op honchos. Miller explained:

> These loans would finance low-cost dormitory facilities to be owned and managed by cooperative organizations of students on various college campuses throughout the country. The bill technically will make student cooperatives eligible for direct federal loans on the same basis that funds are now available for loans to colleges for dormitories to be operated on a rental basis.
>
> Student cooperatives, however, provide ownership of the facilities by students themselves... student labor for the maintenance and operation of these housing facilities provides training in the assumption of the responsibility of management. These factors strengthen the democratic processes of college education.

The committee members listened sympathetically to their fellow congressmen, and indicated support for the measure. However, just as the H.H.F.A. Director had opposed the bill, believing that the U.S.C.A. possessed inadequate financial security, so the committee held that a "financially secure" co-signer was necessary to safeguard the government's money. They were also worried that the government would have no legal entity to deal with if the "financially secure" parent institution, the University, in the U.S.C.A. 's case, did not co-sign the loan.

Obviously they did not understand the legal structure of the Berkeley cooperative. Norton, who had relied on the three

> co-op because we were interested in the same kinds of things.

Eisenstein, Eisenstat and Fitz came to the idea of sharing all the managerial duties of the co-op for a summer—work-shifts, kitchen, house. The summer of 1959 came to be known as the "Eisenfitz Summer" in the co-ops, and thus the yellow-columned temporary co-op between Clodhaven and Ridge Annex came to be called Eisenfitz.

The name is not without its ironies. Even though the U.S.C.A. "ownership" of these halls lasted only one year, they required University Regental approval of their names. The names did go through and Eisenstein considered it interesting and ironic; probably with a bit of triumph. He saw that he'd had a house named for him "before Davis and Norton got a house named after them."

Summer sessions in those days were open, on the U.C. level, to anyone over 21 or anyone over 18 with a high school diploma. As a result, an eclectic supply of people would attend Cal at those times. In the late '50's a huge influx of students from New York City came to these sessions.

Everything was different during the summer. In 1959, Eisenstein broke into the longstanding summer session income fund, which had steadily built up over several years, and took 150 people from Cloyne and Stebbins to a San Francisco concert, absolutely *gratis*. Two buses were chartered, tickets were purchased. "It was fantastic," Eisenstein explained, "we had a tremendous feeling of fellowship and joy."

It was the end of a decade, and of an era. 1960 came and with it the last full year of Eisenhower's presidency and American complacency. No one knew what was on the way, but change was felt imminent. The U.S.C.A. had 1000 members. Norton and the Board kept seeking a way to develop the Ridge property. Harry Lowell a man whose contribution to the U.S.C.A. as its assistant manager was immense during his time in the office, resigned in '59. In 1960, a small house one street north of Ridge Road, was purchased by the U.S.C.A. Although it could hold only 18 men, the hall was a good buy. In Ratcliff and Ratcliff's high-rise study, U.S.C.A. spokesmen had questioned the policy of utilizing older structures:

obvious that the Hearst strip owned by the University was destined to hold a multi-storied parking garage. The extensive property next to the Ridge House land owned by the U.S.C.A. remained in the possession of the Wilson family, and was therefore available, possibly, for co-op expansion. The U.S.C.A.'s architects, Ratcliff and Ratcliff, made up a 14-page questionnaire distributed throughout the organization which aimed at determining student opinion on what sort of building would be best suited for future needs. Based partially on this study and partly on Hal Norton's recommendations, Ratcliff and Ratcliff prepared an architectural study and plan for the Ridge-Scenic properties, which was presented to the University on June 10, 1959.

Illustrated with photographs of architects' models and film-over maps, the report called for a grand enterprise which would eventually house 1050 students. A three-winged high-rise men's residence unit spoked around a living-center hull would tower twelve stories above Ridge and Scenic. An eight-floor hall for women would squat in the present location of Ridge House. Between these two massive structures a central kitchen, office, and dining room edifice would sit. The rooms would all be doubles with standardized interiors. In the wheel-less hub-and-spoke arrangement planned for the men's hall, rooms at the hub would serve as living and recreation compartments, one for each two floors.

High-rises dorm units were much in vogue in the closing years of the 1950's. Included in the Ratcliff and Ratcliff booklet was a U.C. published map entitled "Long Range Development Plan for the Berkeley Campus" as it was seen in May, 1958. A plastic overlay by the architects indicated positions and residence figures of the seven current co-op houses, and the site of the New Project. The map itself indicates at seven sundry points around the campus high-rise dormitory projects of its own: two at the College Avenue sites which were indeed constructed, another pair half a block west bordering on Bowditch, two facing Dana (one of which U.C. eventually completed) below Telegraph, and a smaller, three-dorm unit on Ridge Road and La Loma, where once Newman Hall had stood and 2714 Ridge, the original Barrington which later became Kingman.

Dan Eisenstein was on the co-op Board in 1959 and de-

Palmer was obviously the best choice available in terms of involvement with the co-op. Where he was questionable was the part of the U.S.C.A. that Hal Norton had devoted so much effort to developing, the business end. The committee had another interview with Palmer and decided to hire him. Apparently the announcement had formalities. "I think someone just came up and told me that I'd gotten the job," Dick recalls. "Wasn't anything very formal about it." The co-op Board approved the committee's recommendation.

Dick was general-manager-elect two months before the departure of Norton and the opening of Ridge Project, but a number of activities involved with the building kept them from conferring on the job. Palmer had received his degree in January of 1966 in architecture and worked from that time until the house opened on its lounge furniture which he had designed as his senior thesis. The U.S.C.A. had voted to use Dick's design in the new unit, and had hired him to oversee its construction—necessary owing to the uniqueness of the design. "The job," said Palmer, "turned out to be fairly complicated because we had the various parts manufactured by a number of different companies, who brought them all to the site. All the final finishing and assembly was done by a student crew. I wound up dealing with fourteen or fifteen different suppliers for the angle brackets and the screws and the fasteners and the panels and all of that kind of stuff." The furniture work was made more difficult due to a botched job by U.S. Plywood, who were six weeks late delivering the necessary panels. "So we put together a crew of students who were essentially unskilled and assembled and finished all that furniture in six weeks."

At this time Dick was also linking the U.S.C.A. with Ratcliff, Slama and Cadwalader, a then-called architectural firm. The summer of '66 was all work and turmoil, even without the sudden, unexpected, transition of of the U.S.C.A. management. In the beginning of October, at the opening of the Ridge Project, Hal Norton retired and took off for an extended vacation in Europe. The 30-year-old Palmer moved into the manager's position.

Dick's first months on the job did not flow gently to success. "I had tremendous problems with the job. I didn't know what the hell I was doing at the time. Between August and October,

Chapter 5

1964–1971

When one thinks of the collegiate 1960s, it refuses to be labelled. The decade began with the final fadeout of the Silent Generation's football "whoopee" and ended with the takeover of Berkeley facilities by students and faculty, all dedicated to social action of a more untraditional sort. A lot changed in a student's life, and most every other type of human endeavor, during the 1960's.

However, it took a long, active, schizoid year to change things. 1964 was a jungle of events—both traditional and radical. At Barrington Hall in the fall of '64, activity in the Free Speech Movement shared concern with complex tactical strikes against Cal's eternal football rival, Stanford. Barrington was a fusebox of action along every line, and riding these fuses was Barrington's freshman athletic manager Phil Cawthorne. In that fall term of 1964, Cawthorne was not only active in the F.S.M. but also, as his account shall show later, took part in "RFs" against Stanford of an expense and complexity that military professionals might envy.

Highest among these was one expedition to Palo Alto made by eight Barringtonians with the objective of stealing a bell from one of Stanford's bell towers. The tower in question was located next to a police station, so a watch had to be posted. The bell weighed so much that pulleys and ropes had to be used. Worst of all, once the bell had been safely spirited away, nobody on the Stanford campus noticed its absence so a second attack had to

> other dorms, uniformity, regimentation of activities and general impersonality of buildings, have been avoided. The Ridge Project actively promotes diversity, freedom and variety of activities, and a small-scale residential environment.

The whole thing was coated in stucco and dedicated in October of 1965. Everyone who had contributed to the construction of the building, soon to be officially dubbed Ridge Project, was invited to the new site. All in all about 300 people came to stand in Ridge Road which had been blocked off by the city for the dedication and short ceremony. Roger Heyns, the new Berkeley chancellor, and Hal Norton gave short speeches. A bottle of champagne was bashed against the stucco and the company retired to a buffet luncheon. It was a moment of both relief and tension for the U.S.C.A. There was relief because, at last, a decent kitchen facility had been built and the dietician, Mrs. Alice Ramos, and chef, Andres Castro, could move from the Oxford anachronism into what was called one of the best kitchens around.

"Where for years the co-op kitchen had been the bane of the city health department," said Bill Davis, "as soon as the new project was built and the new kitchen finished, the co-op became Exhibit A. The city would bring people from all over to see this fine example of a first class kitchen. . . one of the finest kitchens in the Bay Area." It was four times as large as the old Oxford kitchen, infinitely cleaner and had much more convenience for the cooks and kitchen help. It could feed, if need be, 2,000 people. The warehouse was large and again, much more convenient for its student manager and workers. The central office contained two individual offices for the General Manager and Book-keeper, unparalleled luxury after the old carriage house. Hal Norton moved into his office to see Ridge Project occupied. On October 1st, he moved out. He had resigned from the managership the previous summer.

Norton had been in the organization for thirty years and had managed it for 25. He had built its business aspect to respectability, it had never defaulted on a debt, and thereby enabled the U.S.C.A. to gain the support of the Berkeley business community in the performance of its work. Even after hostility grew between the businessmen and the students in the city,

> mission for Ridge Project. The fact that I was in architecture made it of interest to me. I was in on one of the very first meetings of the planning for the present building . . . there had been other plans for this property in previous years, but they had been scrapped and this was a new start at the time I came into it.

Those "other plans" included the multi-hundred student high-rise project for which the U.S.C.A. Board, with the exception of Dan Eisenstein and some others, had been so hot. Fortunately, the Wilson property had held out and federal funds remained withheld, so the U.S.C.A. had not sunk its resources into the monstrosity. Without all that room to work with, the planning committee had to use the present U.S.C.A. property as fully as possible. The architects, who of course worked closely with the committee, therefore drew plans that took maximum advantage of the "building envelope"—the space available.

With the available lot, the needed kitchen, warehouse and office facilities had to be built. In addition to that, the housing was to accomodate as high a number of students as possible without disaster to human comfort and privacy. It would require originality and skill. In addition, there were University rules to consider; the U.S.C.A. wanted the U.C. to approve the new unit. The task wasn't made any easier by the decision to make the new building co-educational. Palmer recalled the difficulty of the trying to satisfy the University requirements:

> With the guidelines the university had at that point regarding the separation of sexes, the lock-out provision and that kind of thing, they simply were never able to reconcile those clauses with what we wanted to do. . . They wanted two or three locked doors between the women's wing and the dining room and all kinds of supervisory policies which we simply weren't able to fulfill.

The negotiations with the university, primarily through Mrs. Ruth Donelly, head of the U.C. Housing Service, went on for some time before the actual construction. Even as the plans were being haggled over, other events centered on that undeveloped property on Ridge Road.

diagrams of its buildings and eventually published his report in a dittographed pamphlet called *Smyth-Fernwald: Some Proposals for U.S.C.A. Development*. A thorough, careful and imaginative survey, *Proposals* delineated the co-op philosophy of allowing creative use of rooms and student self-government and examined each dorm building and the external space. Ideas for the improvement as well as plans for better office and kitchen service was included. The report enthusiastically documented the possibilities to the neglected set of bureaucrat bungled buildings.

In September, just as F.S.M. was getting underway, the Smyth-Fernwald idea fell in upon itself. A story in the *Co-op Highlights*, successor to the *U.S.C.A. News*, found its way to the offices of *The Daily Californian*. A front page story that appeared on September 24th, "Co-op Plans for Smyth-Fernwald?" generously quoted Palmer's report on the complex. Students in the complex revolted against the idea almost immedietely. *The Word*, a *Highlights*-like newsletter published at Smyth-Fernwald, editorialized against the change. In addition to a valid complaint that the University had not informed the dorm members of its offer to the U.S.C.A., its editor, Jerry Osborne, also griped about the "extremely dumpy appearance and poor food service" in the co-ops themselves. The *Daily Cal* story of October 12th quoted various negative reactions and generalized them as "Smyth-Fernwald residents did not like the idea of having to work, or felt that the complex would deteriorate under the co-op system." A petition circulated by Osborne at the unit gained 71.5% opposition to the co-op takeover out of 95% of the residents signing it. Or so it was claimed, since Osborne would not allow the *Daily Cal* to see the petition.

The next day, the A.S.U.C. Senate met to hear a motion against the sale of Smyth-Fernwald. It was brought up by Mike Adams and Sherri Cummings, representatives of the men's and women's residence halls, and claimed to present "strong arguments for not affecting the sale of ... Smyth-Fernwald" to the U.S.C.A. Dick Palmer attended the meeting and demolished the dorm representative claims and indicated several inaccuracies in the motion, notably the term "sale" and the statement that the U.S.C.A. "has indicated their plan to build a new co-operative, should they not be able to purchase [sic] Smythe-Fernwald," a

large enthralled by the challenge of funding such a project, just as many of them had been caught up by the challenge of controlling their own living group thirty years before.

> We organized what started out to be an Alumni Committee. Bill Davis was intimately involved in it. We began to organize committees. We had, in our hands at that point, an analysis done by the university which said that if we could raise something in the vicinity of $100,000 for a new building, we'd be doing very well. We began to organize Alumni Committees in communities where there were concentrations of alumni—Oakland, San Mateo County, Santa Clara County, Sacramento, Los Angeles.

Johnston had not shot rats in the Barrington kitchen and fretted over fires in the building's east alley for nothing. He discovered not only that he cared enough about the U.S.C.A. to contribute his own time to its campaign, but also that he enjoyed campaign work. "I decided that I would devote a year or two to full-time effort at this thing."

Richard Mollard was the chairman of the campaign at its outset. He was previously the sufferage bishop to the Diocese of Bishop James Pike in San Francisco, and later the Bishop of San Diego. He had two prongs in his attack: one which would concentrate on private citizens, the alumni, faculty, present U.S.C.A. members and members of the community; the other, which was expected to bring the mass of the funds, would approach philanthropic organizations for grants.

Dick Palmer was by no means an "old-timer" of the U.S.C.A. in '64. Yet, he was deeply involved in the project construction plans and was therefore very interested in the campaign. He explained the process:

> It's a pyramiding operation when you raise money. First thing you do is get in touch with people, in this case alumni and friends, whom you already know and who would invest some time and money in helping to raise funds. We organized the alumni and a lot of the alumni were able to give us leads to people

F.S.M. was absorbed by the U.S.C.A. without scarcely a hesitated stride. But, as Phil Cawthorne said years later, it and the atmosphere of mistrust, panic and hostility took its toll on a newly awakened student body. Ted Johnston's list-matching demanded by a conservative foundation may have discovered how many co-op members saw the inside of Santa Rita after the '64 sit-ins, but it could never gauge the disillusionment and politicalization of their ideas, their consciousnesses as students and as people. There were new ways of thinking of themselves, or at least questions fatal to the old ways.

> When we came in we knew we were bright. We were engineers, physicists... we had no political ideas. We were serious about being the new Edward Tellers, the new Albert Einsteins... but it was not to be.

At the time of F.S.M., the preliminary architectural drawings for the U.S.C.A.'s new unit had been in existence for a full year. In his June 1964 report, Norton compared the square footage of the five sites, buildings on Le Conte, Le Roy, and Ridge Road, with the available space next to Ridge House. The report listed reasons for and against the proposal. There were a number of immediate factors in favor of accepting it, namely the elimination of the need for a large organizational debt. However, there were still a number of potential problems, most notably the lack of central kitchen facilities in the G.T.U. sites. But other events intervened in the meantime.

Almost simultaneous with the G.T.U. proposal was a more palatable offer from the University itself, for it not only offered increased dormitory facilities but a large kitchen and dining room from which the whole U.S.C.A. system could be fed. The University proposal dealt with the Smyth-Fernwald dormitory colony which operated on a nine-acre plot at the highest, eastern-most extremity of Dwight Way, above Piedmont, above Waring, steep on the slopes of the Berkeley Hills. The complex contained several buildings built as post-war housing in the '40s. It held almost 475 students and had become a liability to the University. Its distance from campus and the uphill slog required to reach it were petty inconveniences compared to the maintenance problems which had been allowed to develop in the twenty years of its existence. Through the office

> these guys and find out how warmly they felt about the student co-op, how much they felt it helped them get through a really difficult time in their lives.

Amounts of contributions varied from five dollars to one incredible gift of $3,000 from one ex-member. Alumni, of course, were not the only ones approached.

> A number of ex-co-opers are in academia, probably thirty or forty guys on the Berkeley campus are ex-student co-opers. That's another aspect of the fundraising thing. A student committee got together and decided that they would do two things: solicit each other for funds and solicit the faculty at Berkeley. This was done on the basis of volunteer members of the student co-op who went in teams of two to visit faculty members... telling them what the student co-op was about and asking them if they would consider helping. Again, they shot for a $300 level of contribution. It was a very heartwarming thing. Ed Strong, then the chancellor of the Berkeley campus, gave. He contributed very heavily.

Better than $30,000 was raised from the UC faculty, and UC students contributed about the same. More than 60 philanthropic foundations were approached and 15 eventually gave the U.S.C.A. grants. Hal Norton's two decades of "wooing" the Berkeley business community through responsible practices justified itself. It could have been that other foundations would have come through, had not the history of the students' place in University life swung abruptly into public mind, a place it would remain for the rest of the 1960s.

It all had to do with solicitation of student, on the U.C. campus for off-campus activities. That was the official, administration perspective of things. From the viewpoint of a large and influential slug of the student population, however, the issue was one of the freedom of speech on campus. The movement that exploded onto Berkeley's Sproul Plaza in late September of 1964 eventually took that issue as its name, the Free Speech Movement, or the F.S.M.

The arrest of a non-student by campus cops on a charge of soliciting for a political cause was the catalyst. The police

> about the co-op ideology and what it can do for them, and of course we hope they will get turned on to it. Obviously not everybody will.
>
> They aren't going to get turned onto it unless they understand it, and have a chance to use it. That's where we've failed. We really don't tell them what it is they're involved in; we don't show them how it works. We leave it up to the older members to teach them if anybody does. With the increasing mobility of the campus we have fewer old members than we used to have... Our race memory is declining.
>
> I think there's a great deal to be done if the Board will simply recognize that it needs to be done. You can never make a 200-member 40-year-old organization act like a 14-member brand-new organization. That time is gone, and it will never be revived until this whole structure is gone and replaced by something new. I'm not sure that is neccessary. It depends on how you define your goals.
>
> If your goal is to involve everybody in the origins of a creative organization, starting everything from scratch, we clearly can't provide it. If you're talking about providing low-cost housing and an introduction to a different life style from the competitive, capitalist form, then I think we have a hell of a lot to offer even though we're large, and old.

Palmer sees a professionalization of member education—along the lines of CCB's large-budgetted educational activities—as a possible avenue towards a solution of that problem. The U.S.C.A. has done a lot. Its new members should know that.

"I think the co-ops have been a very profound influence on this community," Bill Davis, forty years a Berkeleyan, says. "This organization has affected the whole climate of this campus with respect to intergroup relations, but it also had an effect on the co-op movement in the city of Berkeley... it has affected the climate of this whole community. The student co-ops are still playing a part in creating that climate. It has gotten pretty subtle... Never has been a very direct effect. But it's there."

Hal and I were so damn busy getting the building done and the furniture done, we really had little time to talk to each other about the overall job of management. When I sat down in this chair on October 1st, I really didn't know what was going on." Fortunately, some veteran staff members stayed on long enough after Norton left to give Palmer invaluable aid. Most helpful was office secretary Diana Woo who had been with U.S.C.A. central operations for several years and who knew the office work intimately.

Even with the success of the new project, the U.S.C.A. soon found itself facing expansion decisions. Real estate markets in college towns, especially changeable environments like Berkeley, fluctuate. As the 1960's entered its latter half, a number of "distressed group living properties" went up for sale. Most of these properties belonged to bankupt sorority and fraternity chapters. The first house to become available to the Palmer-led U.S.C.A. was familiar to the organization. It belonged not to a fraternity but rather to an ethnic group on campus. Twenty years after losing the name of Lexington Hall, the Japanese Students Club again came to the attention of the U.S.C.A.

Responsible for the reacquisition of the J.S.C. were two old co-opers, George Yasakoshi and Ted Johnston. Johnston recalls the circumstances of the second leasing:

> Somewhere along the way in our effort to solicit funds for the Ridge Project, George and I began to talk about the J.S.C. At the time there was very little interest on the part of Japanese students in living separately and by themselves. The house was in bad repair, and George and I decided that it might be well if the student co-op could again assume the use of the house. We discussed without any serious negotiation the idea that in some way the title to the house might pass to the student co-op for some kind of reduced consideration, which would be scholarships for Japanese students or some such kind of thing.
>
> But then I think, with the emergence of strong ethnic identity movements, the Japanese Alumni Association finally decided that they could not afford to give the house away. So they put a price on

whose daughter Millie had rented an apartment there... Warren Widener, the new Mayor of Berkeley whose election had signalled a new sort of student activism in the community, attended and spoke. He had special reason to attend the event. For two years in the late '50s he had lived in Barrington Hall. The contributors to Ridge Project were invited, and many attended. Also there was Albert Bowker, the new U.C. Chancellor. It was Bowker's first encounter with an organized student group, and President Dave Grossberg was the first elected student leader he met.

The co-op's climatic project opened. And the Board turned to a house on Le Conte, just up for sale, which many believed suitable for married students' housing... It was something that hadn't been done before, but some felt that it might be worth doing...

> this and decided that Euclid was indeed a good unit for us and we would make an offer for it. Fortunately, our offer was slightly better than G.T.U.'s. Plus, in spite of what was happening with the building, the Japanese-American Alumni Association was sympathetic to the U.S.C.A. as an organization.... George Yasakoshi, who was on their board, was very persuasive in convincing them that they should sell the property to us under terms that we could handle.

Buying Euclid saved face and housing space for the U.S.C.A., but Palmer felt that the situation there was intolerable. Along with George Proper, a recent U.C. graduate and ex-Barrington manager working part-time for C.O., he decided that evicting Howie and all the other Euclidians from the house and beginning anew would be the best solution. Rather than let Howie tell his version of the story without argument, Palmer and Proper asked that a house meeting be called at which the problems could be hashed out and the members' ideas heard.

Proper was scared as he and the general manager walked the block between Ridge Project and the beleaguered co-op house. George had truly come up from the ranks, in the classic co-op manner. He had been athletics manager, kitchen manager and a two-semester house manager in Barrington, the first ever. He had overseen the 1967 change from all-male to co-ed (a "special study" had called for the change) and, since the University had abandoned its Approved Housing program, the U.S.C.A. had done so. He had also ran the U.S.C.A. one summer. Palmer, impressed with George's performance in all his jobs, elevated Proper steadily up the managerial stoop. George had had no direct contact with the rebellious Euclid membership and was understandably nervous. It didn't help the situation when, as the two C.O. representatives walked down the sidewalk towards the Euclid front door, a house member appeared at an upstairs window smashing the glass from the panels with a broomstick. Inside, newly-painted signs on the walls screamed "OFF PALMER and KILL PROPER" and a gory confrontation was promised.

And gory it was—full of loud voices. But there was a revelation for both the general membership and Dick Palmer, who

Board members. Dellums and the U.S.C.A. President, Carleton Mac Donald, gave short speeches. At the close of the ceremony the Congressman offered Carleton, renowned throughout the co-op system as something of a square, a soul slap, a minor but ingratiating symbol of revolutionary solidarity. MacDonald took Dellums' hand and calmly, solemnly, shook it with a brief, firm motion. It was the fall of 1970. The '60s had ended. The fall of '70 and the winter and spring quarters of 1971 would clip the ends of overt activism by Berkeley students. The attitudes of students again began to change.

In the winter, a Barrington member who brought street people and some connected problems of rip-offs and heroin peddling into the house was thrown out of the co-op by Mark Gary, who succeeded MacDonald as co-op President. Barringtonians, with many street friends, were of many minds about the ouster. Heroin, of course, was detested, as of course were the thefts and accostments of female members. They were much in favor of stopping the practice of putting up anybody who wandered into the house, but throwing out the member who invited them struck them badly. Nevertheless, it happened, and the practice of excluding specific people from the house, and a general closure of the hall to outside people, resulted from this move. Students began to draw into themselves as the '70-'71 school year ended... and the co-op found itself faced with alienation and a loss in confidence in the organization by its members.

The size of the co-op, over 1000 members, had much to do with this situation. And so in 1970, a decentralization program was implemented to deal with it. Basically, the program was designed to return a major share of the responsibility for running house activities to the individual houses—a return to "old style co-operativism." Expenses in the fields of food supplies, crockery, repairs, laundry, linen and managers' salaries were removed from central level responsibility and given back to the houses themselves to determine and control. Effects of the experiment, implemented in the Fall of '70, could not be determined for several years.

1971 was a busy year for the organization, even as it was a year of change for its members. The winter quarter saw the purchase of the Zeta Tau Alpha house on Warring Street. An old sorority, Z.T.A. had been on sale at steadily decreasing prices

of the man who had given aid at the birth of the co-op and throughout its history. Bill Davis had resigned from the co-op Board in 1968, though he would continue at Stiles Hall for three more years. When he heard of the honor, he said, "I was very pleased, of course. I felt a little embarassed in a way because of the other guys, other people who had a big hand in the organization and deserved that kind of recognition more than I, especially a fella like Hal Norton."

A dedication for Davis House was held, attended by a number of co-op pioneers like Larry Collins and Doug Cruikshank, as well as Chancellor Heyns. Davis, of course, was also there, awed by the honor:

> I'll always remember that when I was supposed to be downstairs getting ready to make my little acceptance speech I was out wandering around inspecting the house. I had my two daughters with me, and it was kind of a nice thing for me to have my two kids there to see this honor that was being bestowed upon me. We were walking through the house when everybody was gathering in the hallway there for the ceremonies. Finally I got traced down by somebody and brought down just in time to make my speech. My daughters and I missed all the nice things that people said about me.

Davis House was, by almost any standard, the finest house of the co-ops. Assignments to live there became the reward for the longest residencies. It prepared its own meals, had a fine view of San Francisco Bay and featured fine wood paneling. It was, like Ridge Project, a departure in tone from the "grubby" co-op image. Like Project, it drew the "elite" of the co-op system, those members who had lived in the organization for the most time. This exodus from the other houses caused a temporary power and experience vacuum to develop, which itself caused a redistribution of responsibility to other, newer co-op members.

Already, under Dick Palmer's co-op leadership, the organization had gained three units. More would soon follow. A pair of apartment houses near Kidd Hall on Le Conte Avenue had been purchased earlier, and U.S.C.A. members of long-standing had taken these. They were the first bona fide apartments to oper-

Palmer made his move, and the property lease came before the U.C. Finance Committee, which met in San Francisco. Dick requested that he be allowed to speak at that time, and waited outside the meeting room an entire afternoon before he was told that the committee hadn't time to hear him.

The meeting had gone the co-op's way even without Dick's presence, however. Despite the long-followed practice of following the suggestion of the U.C. treasurer, the Finance Committee had overuled his position and decided to accept a compromise proposal. This proposal had been advanced by Palmer in one of the three letters he had sent the Regents on the lease controversy. U.C. would buy Cloyne Court for its market value of $460,000, lease it back to the co-op for ten years, defer the purchase by taking over Cloyne's current mortgage of $140,000 and settle the deal with $320,000 when the U.S.C.A. surrendered the property. The U.S.C.A. sacrificed the difference between $320,000 at the time of purchase and the purchasing worth of the same amount ten years later, a form of lease payment. That lease was to run 40 years.

"It was," says Palmer, "what we thought was a very reasonable deal. It relieved the University of having to come up with a lot of cash; it guaranteed them ownership of the property eventually without having to condemn it; it gave us the fair market value for it; it gave us the apartments site. I guess they thought it was reasonable too, because they accepted it over the dead body of their treasurer."

The second half of the loan application was then prepared and went through with surprising alacrity. The co-op had contacted the Free Clinic and offered its aid in finding it a new home. The Clinic had sublet McKinley High School's old shop building from the Berkeley school district, which had a three-year lease on the property... as the school district's lease ran out, so did the Clinic's time in their current headquarters. Another location was eventually found, but while they were still in the old shop building, and just before the U.S.C.A. began to collect bids from contractors on the construction of the apartment complex, President Richard Nixon ordered American troops into Cambodia. It was the beginning of May, 1970.

Student demonstrations had boiled over Berkeley throughout the '68–'69 school year, but '69–'70 had, until April, been

years before, though not in time for the Ridge Project. The U.S.C.A.'s bookkeepers moved swiftly to determine the amount of the loan required from the Department of Housing and Urban Development, thus setting a limit for the size of any U.S.C.A. apartment house project on that site.

Students in the U.S.C.A. played the major role in determining the type of housing. Jay Goldsmith of Cloyne Court chaired a committee created from all the co-op houses and gathered their ideas. Consultations with architects proceeded simultaneously with Goldsmith's efforts.

> When we had a program prepared, we went to talk to the campus architect, Louis deMonte, who gave us his blessing. The program we'd worked up derived partly from the University's own ideas about housing and partly from our own ideas, and so it was not incompatible with what he'd envisioned doing with that site.
>
> When we had his blessing we did a rough schematic proposal and went to the Chancellor's Committee on Campus Development and presented the scheme to them. Most of them were receptive to the idea. . . there were a few who were not, mostly in the business part of the administration. The Chancellor himself, though, was firmly in favor of it. . . I'm glad to say he supported us all through that. He was of course critical in getting this project together.

The basic program presented by the U.S.C.A., aided by Ratcliff, Slama and Cadwalader, involved five, three-story apartment buildings surrounding a central courtyard, cafeteria and dining room. (Each apartment would have a fully-equipped kitchen, of course.) In addition, there would be basement parking and laundry facilities. Some studio apartments would be available. Each student would have a single room, even if they lived in a four, three or two-man apartment.

After obtaining Heyns' support, the U.S.C.A. sent a letter to the U.C. Regents outlining the proposal and asking along with the Berkeley administration that the co-op be allowed to lease the property. These efforts culminated in a letter sent by the Regents to the Department of Housing and Urban Development,

radical ideas and students.[4] In the 70s, Barrington further rejected mainstream culture. On one occasion, to make their stand against the rest of society, some Barringtonians started a campus student club, the Onngh Yanngh Consciousness Society for the Enlightened. The members claimed the club as an apolitical group who refused funding on the principle that they wanted to remain autonomous.[5] The Barringtonians used this stunt to mock other clubs that took orders from the University, so they could receive funding. Tradition at Barrington of "going against the grain" had become well established.

The counter culture that had been built at Barrington took its most extreme form in the 1980s. By then, most of Berkeley's counter cultural scene had waned. The once radical Berkeley was calming down as the Reagan era set in.[6] As places in Berkeley where counter culture could thrive went down, Barrington's role in the counter culture increased. During the early 80s and to varying degrees throughout the decade, the dominant sentiment at Barrington was anti-authority. Most residents took the attitude that they did not want to be told what to do i by anyone but themselves. Freedom was interpreted by them as doing what you want, when you want.[7] Those who wished to exercise this freedom found a safe haven at Barrington. The freedoms were expressed in forms such as spontaneous graffiti plastered throughout the house, the projecting of objects from the roof, weekend parties attended by five or six hundred people, ands especially, the free use of drugs.

With the non-conventional Barrington attitude came a group of people who were not willing to put forth the effort to maintain the house as a safe, clean environment. Barrington became a place where the homeless, drugs, trashed hallways, and loud people all made a distinguishing mark. With close to two hundred people living in the same building and an attitude, which encouraged them to do whatever they wanted, Barrington was not an environment for all students.

The residents who bought into the counter cultural ideas

[4] George Proper

[5] "Onngh Yanngh on Campus," *Toad Lane Review*, February 1980.

[6] Appeal for the Ninth Circuit Court of Appeals in the Case Ruth Oscar and Charles Spinosa vU̇niversity Students Cooperative Association, U.S.C.A. Library, Berkeley, CA.

[7] George Proper.

Hal Norton visits Europe often, on vacation, from the job he took after leaving the co-op, director of the Alameda County Bar Association. He sees many old co-op members in Europe. Many are now business associates. They are everywhere, and if the response to the Ridge Project is an indication, they feel they owe the co-op a lot. The attraction of the organization, of the idea, interests the man who ran the one and interpreted the other for a quarter of a century.

> I suppose there's always things like doing things for yourself, that's one thing. We weren't so hidebound, so rigid... at least in the early days we were a new force, a new look, a new viewpoint, a new idea... and then we managed to roll with all the punches, and I think to a large extent we managed to keep current. Didn't we? Without being absolutely self-defeating, like the anarchist, who wants to tear his own building down, we did manage to stay current, and we managed to keep the interest of the people.
>
> We were the first to recognize that there's no reason why the student shouldn't have a voice in government. I think it's fair to say that we were in the vanguard for that.

The Berkeley students' co-op? "It's VITAL," he says, meaning that it lives, is alive. "There's been an inflow of new ideas, new students... we always seem to get some darn good ones, that come through and helps pull the thing together..."

sanitation codes. A Food Manager ordered food for the house. The House President and Vice-President ran the house council meetings. Social Managers planned social events like parties for the house. A few managers with minor responsibilities like gardening and recycling also helped oversee house operations. All managers were student house members and were democratically elected by the other members of the house.[12]

The managers were paid to make sure the house tasks were completed, but it was ultimately the responsibility of all house residents to make sure the house was maintained and ran smoothly. When members did their workshifts, closed doors and windows, followed established rules and held others accountable for following rules, the house to stayed safe and clean. It was also the responsibility of the members to participate in the decision-making processes of the house, i.e. house elections and councils. The system was dependent upon the effort put forth by the membership. The running of the house could break down if most members did not take responsibility for these duties. External agencies like the Central Office, in theory, only interfered with the way a house was run when the entire U.S.C.A. was affected, or when problems were of a drastic nature. All U.S.C.A. houses operated under this system of member control and autonomy, including Barrington Hall.

[12] Ibid.

Part II

Counterculture's Last Stand

participate in their micro and macro communities. The sixth Rochdale principle was cooperation among cooperatives. Just as co-op members joined together to mutually aid each other, cooperative organizations were encouraged to support one another, financially, politically, and otherwise. The final Rochdale principle, concern for community, delineated the common goal of community building. Like all cooperatives, the houses of the U.S.C.A. concerned themselves with building a supportive, functional community within the co-op as well as a respectful relationship with other community members and organizations.[7]

The seven Rochdale principles influenced the culture of all U.S.C.A. houses to varying degrees. U.S.C.A. members were at least aware of these principles, even if they were not always directly quoted as a reason for making decisions. They were often transmitted via co-op practices like voting in elections or voting at house council, rather than directly spread as a formal philosophy; though many houses did display a poster of the principles, and they were included in the U.S.C.A.'s Owner's Manual.[8] Barrington Hall's constitution and bylaws, which were distributed to but not necessarily read by every member, included a list and explanation of these principles.[9] Barrington, like other U.S.C.A. houses, shared in the spirit of the Rochdale principles.

The philosophy of the U.S.C.A. was expressed in the way it was run. A Board of Directors who supervised a staff of several employees, the Central Level staff, ran the U.S.C.A., as a whole entity. The Board of Directors (Board for short) made decisions that affected the entire U.S.C.A. membership. Board dealt with rent increases, U.S.C.A. policy changes, and problems that affected the entire organization. The Board, itself as controlled by all U.S.C.A. members through elected Board Representatives. Each house sent one Board Rep (short for Board Representative) per fifty house members to represent the house in the U.S.C.A. decision-making process. The Board Reps had the responsibility of ensuring the continuity and viability of the

[7] "Rochdale Principles," *U.S.C.A. Owner's Manual*, 1983, U.S.C.A. Library, Berkeley, CA.

[8] "Co-op Members and University Defunct," *Toad Lane Review*, April 8, 1983.

[9] Barrington Hall Constitution and By-laws, Barrington Hall miscellany, 308W.U592.bar, The Bancroft Library, University of California, Berkeley.

Prologue

As a member of the U.S.C.A., I have long heard snippets of stories about the infamous Barrington Hall. As a former member and aficionado of a large U.S.C.A. house, Casa Zimbabwe, which was also at one time considered the scourge of the U.S.C.A., I felt a sympathy for and identified with the stories I heard about Barrington. Learning of some of the exhilarating and often crazy antics of the house, I was struck with the desire to know exactly what happened at Barrington Hall. To me stories of the house seemed a little out of control, but also seemed familiar and close to one part of the college experience that I, myself, enjoyed. Why would the U.S.C.A. go to the extreme measure of shutting Barrington Hall down? The following, with information collected from a variety of sources including old U.S.C.A. newspapers, old Barringtonians, and more, is what I discovered as the story of Barrington Hall.

Krista Gasper
Summer 2002

[Editor: This text was originally written as a Summer 2002 Thesis, entitled *Counterculture's Last Stand: The Fall of Barrington Hall*. Thesis guidance was provided by Reginald Zelnik.]

ulation totaled around 1400 members living in 18 houses or apartment complexes.[2]

The organization expanded in ways other than size. Members saw the U.S.C.A. as being on "the leading edge of progressive culture. Most likely because it was run by students who were learning new ideas, the U.S.C.A. served as a catalyst for innovative ideas in Berkeley. It was the first housing organization to allow minorities to fully participate, and the first organization to allow co-ed housing of students.[3] In both the Free Speech Movement and protests against the war in Vietnam of the 60s, many U.S.C.A. members participated actively. Mario Savio, for example, one of the most well known leaders of the Free Speech Movement, was once a member of the U.S.C.A. house Oxford Hall.[4] Many U.S.C.A. members prided themselves on involvement with radical movements. In fact, most U.S.C.A. houses had a “Bail Funds” account to bail protestors out of jail. To express its progressive sentiment, the organization adopted the following as its mission statement.

> The purpose of the University Students' Cooperative Association (U.S.C.A.) is to offer low cost, cooperative housing to university students, thereby promoting the general welfare of the community and providing an educational opportunity for students who might not otherwise be able to afford a university education. The organization is committed to educating and influencing the community in order to eliminate prejudice and discrimination in housings.[5]

This statement verbalized the philosophy that underlay many U.S.C.A. traditions, that is, the organization was actively open to all breeds of people and their ideas.

In addition to adopting its own mission statement, the U.S.C.A. was shaped by the mission statement of the cooperative move-

[2]Ibid.

[3]Interview by author of George Proper, on March 26, 2002 (notes in author's possession).

[4]“History of the U.S.C.A.,” *Toad Lane Review*, April 8, 1983, U.S.C.A. Library, Berkeley, CA.

[5]‘Mission of the USCA,” *USCA Owner's Manual*: 1983, U.S.C.A. Library, Berkeley, CA.

Chapter 6

Introduction

At the location of 2315 Dwight Way sits Evans Manor, a building that stretches the entire block between Dana Street and Dwight Way. It is a quiet, private residence hall where students can be seen walking through pristine hallways where white walls are interrupted only by red doors. It is an average college-town building; behind the doors live students who rent the rooms. If one were to ask the students what they thought of the residence hall, most would say, “It is a nice place to stay while in college.” Few, if any, would know the history of the hall that had previously been the scourge of the neighborhood. Few would know that only a decade earlier, Evans Manor was covered with graffiti on the inside and outside and had the reputation among the community as a den of drug activity. The Evans Manor residents might be shocked to discover that their building was once a hotbed of counter cultural activity, and the people who lived there fought tooth and nail to keep their counterculture alive. Some neighbors most likely remember when the building claimed the name and spirit of Barrington Hall. Few who knew it actually can forget it, especially those who experienced everyday life within its walls. Even coopers now know of the infamous Barrington. When the name is mentioned, a gleam of excitement enters their eyes and the words they so long to say about Barrington Hall bubble to the surface; everyone has heard something about the place.

hostility toward any alternative lifestyle. Others thought the house should be dissolved. They claimed it was an unpleasant place for new co-op members, yet the only place for a new co-oper to secure housing. Barrington Hall, some members complained, was draining U.S.C.A. funds. Barrington managers argued that with enough energy the house could improve its reputation among community members, but still saw no reason for the house to sacrifice its acceptance of alternative lifestyles.[38]

In April 1986, Barrington members circulated a petition among U.S.C.A. members calling for a member referendum, a vote of all U.S.C.A. members, to keep Barrington Hall open. A plan for probation was included in the referendum. Under the probation plan, all major managerial positions were placed under the direct supervision of the Central Level, the right was given to the Central Level to require residents to sign an additional conditional contract, Central Level office hours were to be held at the house, the residential capacity for the house was reduced, and the police were given keys to house common areas, so they could make rounds regularly.[39] No previous co-op house had been placed under so much Central Level or police control and scrutiny. But this level of supervision was the only way Barringtonians saw they could keep their house alive. In their opinions, any Barrington was better than no Barrington. All 139 Barringtonians who voted in the referendum chose to keep the house open. Some did not want to be kicked out of their residence. Others felt strongly that countercultural and artistic ideas needed a place like Barrington to thrive. By a vote of 565-419, U.S.C.A. members voiced their desire to keep Barrington open under the conditions of the probation. Even if Barrington had not voted, a slight majority of the other voting USCG members wanted to keep the house open by a vote of 426-419.[40]

But, as can be seen, U.S.C.A. opinion about Barrington was split equally. Some co-op members, especially those who lived in small houses, saw Barrington as a blemish to the U.S.C.A.

[38] "Co-opers speak their minds on Barrington," *USCA News*, Spring 1986.
[39] "Barrington Policy," U.C. Archives, The Bancroft Library. Barrington miscellany.
[40] "Barrington saved by members, put on probation."

of the hall found it uniquely beautiful. In a letter to the editor of the Toad Lane Review, the U.S.C.G. newspaper, one Barringtonian expressed his sentiment about the spirit of Barrington. He described the house as "a place of chaos with a sense of order;" "a place for the non-conventional;" and "a counter cultural haven." From his point of view, Barrington was a place for all types of iconoclasts to live and feel welcome; "hippies, punks, neo-radicals and weirdoes" were all a part of the Barrington culture.[8] Murals depicting all sorts of creative philosophies splattered the hallway walls. Many residents enjoyed the lifestyle, seeing Barrington as one of the only locations in Berkeley where a wide array of creative, alternatively minded people could freely live and express themselves.[9] The group that bought into the free loving, let-loose spirit of Barrington i easily perpetuated it. New members, who moved in; were met with the idea that this place is what it is and should be maintained as such.

New Barringtonians fell into several categories. Some residents had previously heard about Barrington and chose to live there to partake in the alternative culture. A majority of residents were new to the U.S.C.A. and moved to Barrington because it was the only house with an open room.[10] A few new residents moved in to discover that they liked the Barrington lifestyle and remained a part of the community. Many new residents put up with Barrington for a semester, and then moved on. They did not like it, but enjoyed the novelty of it.[11] Others in this group disdained living at Barrington and, at the first chance, moved to a different house. These people found little freedom in Barrington. They locked themselves in their rooms or stayed in other locations to escape the alternative culture. Often they were not yet familiar enough with the democratic process in the co-ops or did not have the time and energy to try to change the house's ideals. Therefore, the people who loved the house as a counter cultural haven were left with it.

The counterculture was perpetuated by a core group of about

[8] "Letter about Barrington," *Toad Lane Review*, May 10, 1984.
[9] "Opinion of other houses and what people do and do not like about the co-ops," *Toad Lane Review*, May 10, 1984.
[10] Found at web site http://www.barringtonhall.org/.
[11] "Barrington may be ridding itself of rat trap image," *Toad Lane Review*, October 1984.

pany now cancelled the insurance for the entire co-op, putting the organization in at risk. In response to the article, the Berkeley City Council asked the district attorney to look into the drug situation at Barrington. A City Council subcommittee was formed, and the U.S.C.A. formed its own investigative committee. The U.S.C.A. now had two committees investigating Barrington. The results of the U.S.C.A. investigation yielded that there was indeed a heroin problem at Barrington. Drug use was found to be more rampant than originally thought. The organization held a poorly attended press conference to convey their discovery and assure concerned community members that something would be done to curb the problem.[32] Community members responded with accusations that the U.S.C.A. was unfit to handle its problems.

Early spring 1986 saw a frantic situation at Barrington. Both the U.S.C.A. and the City of Berkeley were looking into what was happening at the house. The attention placed stress on the members who were making strong efforts to keep the house clean, cooperate with neighbors, improve security, and deal with excessive noise and drugs. A core group of Barringtonians devoted themselves to improving the image of the house. They added new locks to the doors, painted murals over graffiti, and had one street person who was staying in the house arrested to deter non-residents from living in Barrington for an extended period of time. But their efforts were mocked by other house members. New graffiti appeared soon after the old had been painted over.[33] The anarchistic, countercultural lifestyle was still heralded by many members. The destructive influence of a few was enough to strain the efforts made by concerned members. Even those concerned with improving Barrington continued to endorse the old lifestyle. The attitude of change only penetrated skin deep. At heart the Barringtonians were the same.

After some investigation, the U.S.C.A. determined that dozens of habitual heroin users and dealers lived in Barrington, and many students there said that they had tried heroin at least

[32] "Expulsion of Barrington heroin users, dealers threatened," *U.S.C.A. News*, February 27, 1986.
[33] "Barrington cleans up act", *USCA News*, Spring 1986.

ideas. Many residents saw themselves as carrying on the tradition of the Berkeley counter culture that grew out of the 50s and 60s. They viewed their mission as maintaining the counter culture, despite efforts from the outside world to put it to rest. As it had been in the sixties, they saw Barrington as a place to ignite social action. This desire is seen in practice when, in 1984, residents voted to make Barrington a sanctuary for refugees from El Salvador.[15]

Drugs were a definitive part of the Barrington counter culture. During the late 60s and 70s, more and more college students, including Barringtonians, began experimenting with drugs, especially psychedelics like mushrooms and LSD.[16] These substances fit well with the antimainstream culture that persisted at Barrington. Students found the co-op to be a welcoming and safe environment to try new things. When in the late 70s and early 80s, hard drugs like heroin and cocaine became fashionable, they also found an open door at Barrington. Drug experimentation became a key component of the Barrington lifestyle. One resident remembers it fondly, "Everyone at Barrington did drugs, or at least tolerated it, or stayed at school and never came to the place. We trippers had won it to ourselves for a few blissful years."[17] The hall was touted by many residents as a place where drug use was "legal." They brought their friends and others from the surrounding Berkeley community into the house to buy and use drugs.

Barrington held the reputation among community members as the place to get drugs. Documented as appearing on the wall of a bathroom stall on the U.C. campus was the question "Where does one find hard drugs in this city?" The answer written in large black ink was "Barrington Hall" with accompanying room numbers.[18] Barrington, every semester, threw several wine dinners and various huge bashes where hundreds of people flooded the dining rooms, hallways and suites, drank alcohol, partook in illegal drugs like LSD and cocaine, listened to very loud punk or rock music and generally partied very

[15] "Co-op Sanctuary Movement," *Toad Lane Review*, Spring 1985.
[16] George Proper.
[17] Found at web site http://involution.org/dossier.html.
[18] "Co-opers and Campus," *Toad Lane Review*, April 18, 1984.

drug era of the eighties, this newspaper article, widely read by community members, created shock waves for the U.S.C.A. The Berkeley City Council expressed grave concern for Barrington, as did the U.S.C.A.'s insurance company. The waves brought by the article were calmed by the central U.S.C.A. management. The organization's response, "kids will be kids," implied that the average college student in the mid-1980s, be they in dorms, fraternities, sororities or apartments' experimented with some drugs. Barrington, they claimed, was no different. The U.S.C.A. gave the impression that the situation was under control. That impression did not last for long.[25]

As the problems at Barrington were further illuminated, the U.S.C.A. Board felt the need to take action. The situation was discussed at the September 19th Board meeting. The U.S.C.A. General Manager recommended that Barrington be closed and cleaned thoroughly during the summer of 1986. He also recommended that the current house membership be moved to different houses, no house having a membership of more than 10 percent of ex-Barringtonians.[26] This proposed action had occurred in the early seventies at the 28 person Euclid Hall when a few anarchistically minded managers took control of the house and behaved uncooperatively, painting all the walls black, and generally making life hell for the rest of the residents."[27] The arguments cited for such a drastic action at Barrington were the same arguments used two years earlier when problems at Barrington were first discussed. Previous actions seemed to have changed nothing. Member injuries and lawsuits, insurance hassles, costly renovations with disappointing results, poor neighbor relations, City Health Department violations, difficulty filling the hall to capacity, AdCom cancellations, and most importantly, Barrington's failure to reverse itself in the areas of noise, sanitation, drugs and allowing minors to crash there were all concerns that contributed to the Boards discussion.[28]

A group known as PACT, "Parents and Children Together," a pro-family community group, also appeared at the Board meeting to voice their grievances with Barrington. They pre-

[25] Ibid.
[26] "Board of Directors threatens closure."
[27] *A History of Euclid Hall*, U.S.C.A. Library, Berkeley, CA.
[28] "Board of Directors threatens closure."

Chapter 9

What Were the Problems?

Unfortunately, for Barrington, it did not exist in a bubble. Despite all the freedoms they tried to create for themselves, the residents were still connected to the outside world that they were trying to reject. As the 1980s unfolded, hostile forces voiced compelling objections to the Barringtonian lifestyle. They allied with each other to pressure the U.S.C.A. to intervene at Barrington. Insurance companies, neighbors, the Berkeley Health Department, community organizations, the Berkeley City Council, the University, the media and other U.S.C.A. members all pointed accusatory fingers at Barrington. The Barringtonians had taken,principle of autonomy to an extreme, which leaked out into a world that was not willing to put up with it. Tension between Barrington and the outside world eventually resulted in a breakdown.

In 1982, Barrington began experiencing higher turnover rates, lower occupancy, more safety problems, a greater number of sanitation problems and more neighborhood complaints than in previous years. The U.S.C.A. Central Management noticed the new problems and asked the Board of Directors to address them. In the summer of 1982, the U.S.C.A. Board established a committee to look at and brainstorm solutions to these var-

conservative Hoyt Hall saw the restrictions as unfair. She did not think so much control over Barrington should be given to an outside group such as Ellsmere.[15] But others thought that Barrington needed to clean up its act and saw this neighbor complaint as an opportunity to lay down some ground rules for the house.[16]

Unfortunately in practice the Barringtonians saw no need for ground rules. The agreement was essentially ignored from the day it was signed.[17] House members soon forgot or ignored the agreement and continued to act in an unruly fashion. The neighbors continued to complain. The problems with its neighbors plagued Barrington to its end.

In February 1984, during the troubles with the Ellsmere apartments, and most likely because of them, the Barringtonians were hit with a surprise city health inspection which they failed miserably. The inspectors threatened to shut the kitchen down if a six-page list of violations was not corrected.[18] Again the U.S.C.A. intervened to help Barrington clean up. But the failed inspection made the already scrutinized Barringtonians more hostile toward the outside world. The House Manager felt the Barrington lifestyle had been disrespected by the Health Board. Other houses had kitchen sanitation problems, but Barringtonians thought they were singled out by the inspectors. The House Manager claimed that the health inspectors "said not enough people were using the serving utensils. When people came down the stairs to eat, they said it looked like they hadn't washed their hands."[19] Such charges were seen as direct insults to Barringtonians. Still Barrington was forced to comply with the city's demands so they could retain a food service license. The hours of workshift owed were raised to six per week, more than any other U.S.C.A. house. Barrington also organized a massive house-cleaning party to meet the demands. But the damage had already been done. Barrington was put on a one-year probation under the terms that with one failed

[15] "Barrington saved from shutdown."
[16] Ibid.
[17] George Proper
[18] Report from City of Berkeley Health and Human Services of March 21, 1984, Barrington Hall miscellany, 308W.U592.bar, The Bancroft Library, University of California, Berkeley.
[19] "Barrington saved from shutdown."

sirables" were seen as associated with drugs, violence, and theft at Barrington. According to the insurance company, residents could not feel personally safe or feel that their possessions were safe with such a large non-resident population in the house.[3]

Of course these problems were not unique to Barrington. Many co-op houses, especially the large ones, experienced similar problems.[4] But the cancellation of Barrington's insurance did wave a red flag in the face of the U.S.C.A. Board. The U.S.C.A. could not afford to operate Barrington without insurance, and the cancelled insurance of this house threatened the stability of the entire organization's insurance. Immediate efforts at the central and house levels were instigated to resolve the safety issues. A Central Level maintenance crew helped the Barringtonians fix the broken doors and stair railing, and the house focused more workshift power on cleaning. For the long-term future of Barrington, members of the Board saw three possibilities. First, they could close the building for the spring and summer quarters for repairs, an option that would result in the displacement of many spring residents and a few summer ones. Second, they could increase the rent at Barrington by charging the residents for the higher insurance rates, the likely result of buying insurance from a different company. The rent at Barrington was less than the rent at other U.S.C.A. houses to encourage more students to choose to live at Barrington. This second option reduced the rent differential decreasing the incentive to live in the house. Finally, the Board had the option of hiring an outside agency to help clean up Barrington and charging the costs to the residents, implying that perhaps the current residents were not apt to tackle the problems themselves.[5]

That spring, despite Barrington's passing a follow-up insurance inspection, the Board voted to close and renovate the hall for the summer. More committee meetings and several surveys of Barrington residents further illuminated what should be improved at Barrington. Security, general dirtiness, and maintenance issues again topped the list.[6]

[3] "Barrington insurance coverage cancelled," *Toad Lane Review*, February 11, 1983.
[4] "Another big house's problems," *Toad Lane Review*, May 10, 1984.
[5] "Barrington's insurance coverage cancelled."
[6] "Barrington passes inspection," *Toad Lane Review*, February 11, 1983.

us than you, so we can do what we want" caught up with them. Only this time the neighbors, the City of Berkeley, the University, the media, other community members, and other U.S.C.A. members joined to create a majority that was greater than Barrington.

Barrington was able to hide behind the veil of the slow paced, often lenient U.S.C.A. system for several years. In the process, the house tarnished the reputation of the organization and mocked many of its principles. How to deal with the house split U.S.C.A. members. But Barrington also forced the U.S.C.A. to look at itself and reshape its views. The organization took steps to prevent future major infractions. After Barrington, regulations restricting parties and alcoholic beverages were instituted. New safety codes were passed. When the U.S.C.A. later experienced similar but less extreme problems with its other two large houses, Cloyne Court and Casa Zimbabwe, the organization dealt with the situations in a more direct, timely fashion.

Despite all of the problems it caused, with the loss of Barrington, the U.S.C.A. and Berkeley have been deprived a valuable asset. As a judge in the Orfali-Potter lawsuit described, Barrington was "the last rampart" of sixties counterculture in Berkeley, California. This place to partake in an alternative experience was rejected in favor of conformity. Fortunately, Barrington continues to live as a legend. Many U.S.C.A. members today look at Barrington as mythical and are inspired to see a small hart of Barrington in their own houses. Shut down but not forgotten, Barrington lives in the hearts of many.

They thought the idea of keeping it open in its present state was ridiculous. Some had been former Barrington members who moved out to escape the problems and lifestyle. This group claimed to know, firsthand, the problems with the counterculture at Barrington.[41] Still others who had once lived at Barrington remained loyal to the house. Even though they no longer chose to live at Barrington, they thought Barrington should remain open as a place to be experienced.[42] Many U.S.C.A. members in favor of the referendum lived in the bigger U.S.C.A. houses and sympathized with Barrington's plight. Large houses like Cloyne also experienced problems like those at Barrington. Noise complaints, sanitation issues and drug problems were found to a lesser degree at these houses.[43] The members felt the Barrington culture was not extremely different from any other co-op living situation with a large number of people.

Barrington was closed for the summer of 1986, but opened again in the fall under the supervision of a full-time, professional, hired manager. Carlos Cabana, a man in his early 20s from Cloyne, took on the position of first professional manager of Barrington.[44] He managed there for one year and ran the house in conjunction with the "B Team," the Barrington team, a group of Central Level managers and staff, also known as the Central Level Management Team. The "B Team" regularly met with the Barrington managers to make sure the house was running smoothly. The "B team" was seen by some as controlling and oppressive, against the co-op principles of democratic *member* control and autonomy, so about six student Board members joined to form a Barrington response task force and wore pagers. If a problem was reported at Barrington, the Board task force responded to it.[45] Cabana, the "B Team," and the Board task force managed to keep a loose lid on Barrington for twelve months. They were not able to change the counter cultural persona of Barrington, but did keep it fairly subdued. During Cabana's management, the Barrington controversy did

[41] Ibid.
[42] George Proper.
[43] "Another big house's problems."
[44] George Proper.
[45] George Proper.

it was not surprising that he too was "one of them". As a former member, Dick understood and was sympathetic to the Barrington culture. He kept an even looser lid on the house than Cabana, showing more leniency in enforcing probation policies.[49] In September of 1987, Barrington threw a wine dinner at which a bowl of punch laced with LSD was served freely to party attendees. Several people were hospitalized after consuming the punch, one with spinal injuries after jumping off the three-story roof of a neighboring building.[50] Always looking for another scandal, the news media picked up on the story. Community members, including the City Council and University officials, were again alerted to a drug-related incident at Barrington. They pressured the U.S.C.A. to do more.

The City Council gave a variety of reactions. One City Councilwoman, Shirley Dean, now proclaimed that the U.S.C.A. could not handle Barrington and the University should take control of the management at Barrington and run it as a student dormitory. This solution would have stripped Barrington of its student-owned, student-run status. With her demand, she did not seem to realize how important democratic control of the co-op was to the students. She seemed to only see Barrington as a political symbol, an example to other groups that illegal behavior would not be tolerated. The University did not seriously consider her demand.[51] Another Councilman, Don Jelenik, announced plans to create a committee to investigate the charges. He thought the City Council should have more than just media reports before condemning the place.[52] Other council members saw Dean and Jelenik as overreacting. Councilwoman Nancy Skinner said, "Drug use is an endemic problem of student life regardless of whether you live in the dorms, the co-ops, or the Greek system. I don't condone the situation at Barrington Hall, but we have to realize that this is a student wide phenomenon and I don't see why the city should get involved in the affairs of the U.S.C.A. any more than it should in that of the frats or

---

[49] Ibid.

[50] "Seven hospitalized after 'acid punch' party, house chief quits," *The Daily Californian*, October 16, 1987.

[51] "Problems at Berkeley dorm," *San Francisco Examiner*, October 26, 1987.

[52] "City council members call for big change at Barrington Hall", *The Daily Californian*, October 22, 1987.

the fire. But the rioters picked up the bottles that had been left by neighboring residents for recycling as well as bricks from a chimney that had been damaged during the earthquake of the previous year and hurled them at the firefighters and police.[77] A fireman and a policeman were hit with bottles and bricks. and the situation was deemed to be out of control. The riot squad was called in to evacuate the building. By that time the police were very frustrated with the rioters, and as they cleared out the building, they bashed in computer screens and used hostile force.

Some evacuated residents later claimed that the police treated them brutally, beating females and minorities excessively. The rioters were not allowed back into the building until the next day.[78]

The riot brought out the intense emotions that had been building all semester. Residents thought of the incident as an example of the oppressive nature of the U.S.C.A. They equated the police brutality against residents with the "brutal" way they were stripped of their home.[79]

The riot left the "holdovers" charged with destructive energy, however, their moods soon changed when one of them died. The sealed door to the roof could not be opened by residents, so they had been climbing out a window, up a gutter pipe and reaching across a two- to three- foot overhang to pull themselves on to it. One day while trying to climb onto the Barrington roof, a "holdover" fell and died. His death brought a somber mood to the rest of the "holdovers." Other factors also worked igiinst them. Later that week, the group lost their final court appeal to stay in the house, and the eviction was set. On a Thursday night, it was leaked to the residents that the sheriff would appear to evict them the following Monday. But the U.S.C.A. with the sheriff showed up by surprise on the next morning, Friday, to carry out the evictions. The "holdovers" had not prepared for the eviction by calling in help to hold down the house and were already drained by the recent death.

[77] "Riots at 2315 Dwight Way," *Toad Lane Review*, Marc 23, 1990.
[78] Flyer passed out titles "The following is an account of events at Barrington on the weekend of 3/2-4 as witnessed by civilians that were them," Barrington Hall miscellany, 308W.U592.bar, The Bancroft Library, University of California, Berkeley.
[79] Ibid.

president.[56]

More questions were raised as to whether the acid punch was an isolated incident or whether little had changed since the Barrington probation. Gene Jun, the house manager in the fall 1985 semester, claimed the house had changed. Previously the members had been "oblivious," taking the attitude of "no one can touch us." But now the "open community is gone. Barrington no longer takes pride in a lack of guest policy, an attitude which left doors open to crashers, and eventually drew in street people and dealers." The current kitchen manager at Barrington claimed that the prevailing attitude was "it's not cool to do heroin anymore."[57] However subdued members claimed Barrington had become, some members still had the impression that "anything goes" and acted accordingly. These members and toleration of them by the rest of the house contributed to further distrust of Barrington. Under pressure from the City Council, University officials, the insurance company, and members of the press, the Board, at a November meeting, voted once again to shut the house down and reopen it the next fall with one hundred percent turnover. According to the Board, Barrington had picked the wrong time to publicly break the rules.

As previously, Barringtonians joined together to push for yet another co-op-wide referendum to replace the Board decision for closure and 100 percent turnover. They argued that the issue was of such importance that it should be considered by all members. The Barringtonian opinion was that "the status quo is a viable solution to all the house's problems," given enough time. Barringtonians pointed to the evidence that directly after the wine dinner, even before pressure had been applied by the press, actions like the council's banning of wine dinners for the rest of the semester, increasing in-house security, and working out a better management structure were taken. The Barrington ians had; since the Board meeting, invited Councilman Jelenik to meet with the house. According to house management, he expressed feelings that he had previously been misinformed by the media and others about the problems at Barrington. He too

[56] "Barrington acid punch stirs uproar," *Toad Lane Review*, November 3, 1987.
[57] Ibid.

iėboth fall and spring semesters. When the U.S.C.A. membership opted to shut Barrington down before the spring semester started, they cancelled the residents' contracts. But legally the residents could contest the cancellation and in the meantime, could stay in the building until they had been formally evicted. These seventeen members chose to exercise their squatters while they appealed eviction.[71]

For the first few weeks of the "holdovers" stay in the house, they "partied like there was no tomorrow." (There was no tomorrow.) The seventeen Barringtonians threw massive, loud 500-person parties every weekend. They methodically destroyed the house. Their vandalism was dramatic and well planned. On one instance, the Barringtonians climbed onto the roof, ran a fire hose down a light shaft that provided air circulation to a column of bathrooms, and turned it on with the intention of flooding and destroying the dining room and the rest of the house.[72] The large amount of damage from that incident was only a fraction of what they had done by the time they were evicted.

The "holdovers" seemed to be claiming the house as theirs; they did whatever they wanted to it to express this attitude. Their actions demonstrated anarchy at its most extreme. The "holdovers" actually thought that they would win the eviction appeal and Barrington would continue as their counter cultural haven.[73] A few non-"holdover" ex-Barringtonians were organizing to independently purchase the house from the U.S.C.A.[74] The Barrington members felt a strong commitment to their house, most assuredly multiplied by the drive to kick them out. They truly thought they had a right to live as they wanted in Barrington.

The U.S.C.A. hired security guards in an attempt to secure the building. At first entry level Brink's Security Guards were called in. But with larger scale vandalism of the house, Phoenix security guards who carried firearms appeared.[75] The situation of the house held hostage was intense for all involved.

[71] "15 live and legally contest issue," *Toad Lane Review*, February 28, 1990

[72] George Proper.

[73] "Why are you squatting?," *Toad Lane Review*, February 28, 1990.

[74] Ibid.

[75] George Proper.

Hoyt Hall to pay him.[62] The financial burden of the lawsuit was a source of contention among members as it carried on for several years in appeals courts. Worries about it played a major role in their later to shut Barrington down.

The 1988–1989 school year saw some improvement at Barrington and little in the way of new controversy, offering some relief to the U.S.C.A. and the house. But in September of 1989, two years following the first scandalous acid distribution incident at Barrington, reports were made to the Central Level Management Team of a second party at which acid was freely distributed, this time by major house managers. The report also alleged that house funds were used to purchase nitrous oxide. A few people claimed that acid distribution at Barrington was a common occurrence, a tradition, but was usually easily hidden by in-house Barrington managers. This allegation had no substantial proof, but from the stories people recall about Barrington today, it seems likely that the allegation had some validity. To discuss all allegations, the Barrington House Council convened in an emergency meeting. The report given to the Central Level by the House President indicated that the council found allegations of manager involvement to be false. The council concluded that the people suspected of "informing" the C.L.M.T. held hostile feelings toward the house because one of them had been kicked out. Another non-managerial Barrington member asserted that most house members had little, if any information about the incident. It seemed to her that the house managers were trying to keep a tight lid on the incident even among house members.[63] There seemed to by a discrepancy between what house managers and some members were saying.

The next week, the Board convened to discuss drugs at Barrington for a third time. To sort through all the contending stories, they established an investigative committee. Having learned from past mistakes, the Board also sent out a press release to curb any media controversy. It stated, "The U.S.C.A. does not condone and will not tolerate any illicit drug activities in our homes. [If the incident is true] drastic and permanent action for change at Barrington Hall [will be taken]." They re-

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

[63] "Acid at Barrington Hall again?," *Toad Line Review*, October 4, 1989.

Part III

Appendix

Appendix A

Memorable Graffiti from Barrington Hall

- *Courtesy of Cynthia Walker*

- You're persona non grata in my hippy van, bitch.
- Better living through chemistry.
- Time is a crutch, eat Mandarin oranges
- You can't fistfuck with nuclear arms.
- Only seven more shopping days 'til Armageddon.
- Everybody is alienated but me.
- Is the nightmare real or did someone paint the window black?
- Squat or rot.
- Fuck the Dead.
- Chaos Teaches, Order Instructs.
- Music would be Math if you couldn't hear it.
- Kraven Wimps For Capitalism!
- Less is More...More or Less

Appendix B

Reader Responses

Demitria Monde Thraam

I'm the one... who was known by the name of Psyche in the first year I spent at Barrington and later as Demitria Monde Thraam, the name I have retained to this day. I was one who sought out Barrington for its countercultural elements—indeed, in retrospect, I think it was access to such a living situation that was probably the whole reason I ever really bothered to get the high school grades up high enough to go to university.

What I feel it is important that I state is the following.

I spent three years as a junkie. They were not at Barrington, however, but only happened in the 1990's after its closure. Without a doubt, Barrington's closure was one of the factors that drove me to want to take such an unintelligence-enhancing drug as heroin.

I painted six or seven murals in the place that are gone forever—only one of them was even photographed.

My days at Barrington were the only time in my life I can ever say I was even halfway socially functional.

The neighbour complaints were mostly made by two individuals who I sensed were actually acting out of a sad sort of "Barringtonian envy." They (Beverly Potter and John "Red Green" Harmon) were both lonely and middle-aged, their youth behind them—a feeling I now understand all too well. In John Harmon's case especially this was manifest: there were days when it was reported that he had loitered around the dining

folks took one look at me and suggested that I drop by Barrington.

Barrington was a beautiful, horrible mess. As an acid head, I found much to admire, but much that made even me queasy. Because it wasn't clear who was in charge, I didn't make my presence too obvious and didn't do much in the way of finding an official room. Reading your piece, I realize now that I probably could have worked out an arrangement for a room. Instead, I wound up back on the road—camping out in Santa Cruz, and later falling into my first Dead tour.

My week or two in and around Barrington was eye-opening. There was still much magic there. I ran into the mythic Berkeley Bob once, who, as far as I could tell, was able to read people's thoughts and communicate with beings that no-one else could see. I slept on the roof and in stairwells. I had some of my belongings stolen by an ex-felon, and never felt entirely safe. I was offered a place to sleep in a room that was being used for mass distribution (and maybe manufacture) of what I think was meth. Bad place to try and sleep. I added my graffiti to the walls: "Confusion Reigns; Contentment Shynes."

The existence of that place in the midst of the larger society was bizarre, paradoxical, inexplicable. It seemed to be on the very edge of implosion. That it survived for another 5 years in any form amazes me!

More magic: while corresponding with my home co-op in Madison, I discovered that at the same time that I'd wandered off to Barrington, someone from Barrington had wandered to Nottingham. (None of us Hamsters had ever heard of Barrington previously.) I think he moved into my room. I wouldn't be surprised if the meth room I stayed in was his old room. 9 months later, I was at the Rainbow Gathering in Pennsylvania, where I parted with a sweater that I'd routinely worn for years. I placed it on a bush. Minutes later, I found a blanket on the branch of a tree and started wearing that. The next evening, I ran into a man my age who was wearing my old sweater. I let him know that. He got a strange look on his face and informed me that I was wearing his old blanket. We talked and found out that we'd recently switched co-ops with one another. My name is John Davidson. His was David Johnson. It was very, very weird. We never followed up on our contact with one another.