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Dear Friends:

This small volume represents a realized dream. Twenty years ago when the concept of Third College was introduced by then Chancellor McGill, the goal was to found a college that would bring awareness and recognition to the social problems we were facing in the decade of the seventies. Third College was based on the best ideals of academic excellence and social responsibility. This history outlines the beginnings, the struggles and the culmination of a dream realized.

As Chancellor and as a member of the Third College faculty, I am pleased to be part of the twentieth anniversary celebration and urge you to participate fully in the events we have planned to observe this important landmark.

Sincerely,

Richard C. Atkinson
Chancellor
Third College Philosophy

Third College was founded in 1970 and celebrates its twentieth anniversary during academic year 1990-91. It is a liberal arts and sciences college where students pursue majors in the humanities, fine arts, natural sciences, mathematics, engineering, and the social sciences. Third College has a rich tradition of sponsoring academic programs in Ethnic Studies, Urban Studies and Planning, Science and Technology, Teacher Education, Communication, and Third World Studies. The distinctive general-education requirements of the college are drawn from these programs and departments and are guided by the belief that, regardless of a student’s major, a liberal arts education must include an examination of the human condition in a multicultural society.

Third College is also dedicated to the development of students as responsible citizens as well as critical scholars and actively promotes student leadership programs in service to the community and campus.
Greetings! I am pleased to welcome you to read this book, which celebrates the Twentieth Anniversary of Third College at the University of California, San Diego. The interviews and essays that make up the text were compiled during a two-quarter workshop conducted by Professor Bob Dorn of the Department of Literature, and represent thousands of hours of research by current students at Third College. Professor Dorn and his class sought to compile a story told by the participants of the origination of the philosophy and mission of Third College from the very beginning up to today.

The conception of this book was one of the first products of the Third College 20th Anniversary Committee, whose members are listed on this page. I wish to thank this special committee for planning the anniversary events taking place in academic year, 1990-91 (please see the Twentieth Anniversary Calendar, p. 118). Also, I wish to convey heartfelt appreciation to the Publication Subcommittee of the 20th Anniversary group for overseeing the scope and appearance of this book.

As we begin our third decade of service in education, the past twenty years can be seen in terms of five generations of young people who have successively taken their turn in experiencing the unique environment called Third College at UCSD, an environment that is deeply rooted in the best ideals and aspirations of America in the 1960s. Each speaker, whether student, faculty or staff, shares in the mission and philosophy of Third College. The stories told on these pages show a community groping to, at once, understand itself—its traditions, its obligations, its past, its future, and its responsibilities to the broader community. Therein lies the creative tension that has always been a part of the Third College tradition. Regardless of his or her perspective, each participant felt that his or her own cause and methodology were the ones to be pursued. However, out of the common appeal to “do the right thing” came Third College.

I especially welcome you to read this book as a statement of where we have been as a college, and how we intend to carry out the educational and social mission that brought Third College into existence two decades ago.

Cecil Lytle
Provost, Third College

University of California, San Diego
Office of the Provost, Third College, D-009, La Jolla, CA 92037
Telephone: (619) 534-4002
A generation is now a lot of historical time; it had become so even twenty-five years ago when an ambitious, impressive new campus of the University of California, San Diego began to consider what intellectual form the third of its colleges was to take. The pace in the 1960s had quickened, certainly. It was possible for a president to be killed, his brother also, as he was nearing the final run for that office, and for the lives of the two most powerful African-Americans to be snuffed out as well; the country experienced urban riots, a moon landing, the election and disgrace of another president, the secret rise and quite famous collapse of a war that divided the country, the transformation of a broad movement of political reform and social revolution into hundreds of smaller phenomena ranging from cults to investment clubs—all this change could be contained (sometimes it seemed barely) in but two decades.

This is the historical moment at which Third College emerged. Probably, the maelstrom made change inevitable. Poetically, the first casualty was a plan for the college that would have emphasized the study of history. The goals of students who overthrew that first plan were in turn subjected to a faculty-dominated overhaul almost immediately, and only four years later significant parts of that founding plan were, in their turn, completely replaced in a mid-1970s course correction that many say has continued to shape Third for the last sixteen years. Others can convincingly argue that Third has been undergoing change without much of a break for the entire twenty years, that it is continually forming, and precisely because of its seemingly inherent discontent, it is bound to a future that will always reflect its past. The more she tries to change, the more frequently she encounters her past.

The book you are holding in your hands is a very real, if modest, part of that history. It results from a one-time only twenty-week workshop sponsored by Third College and the UCSD Department of Literature that enrolled twenty students who started looking into the twenty-year story. There is a certain symmetry to those numbers which arose quite by accident, that tempts us to think we had a bargain basement metaphysical connection to the past. But if we seemed by the second of the two quarters to have begun making real progress toward understanding the history of Third College, we can’t pretend we discovered the secrets that would explain the continuing story. It defies easy analysis.

Third College deserves a closer, lengthier inspection than we were able to give it. If we can be proud of the book, it will probably be because it makes more possible that future work. And even here we cannot claim to have done the first book on Third. About ten years ago Marsha Harris and Michael Estrada, then students of Carlos Blanco (writer, Spanish literature professor, and one of Third’s founding fathers), combined their own research in a document titled, “The History of Third College.” That small book served as a map and guide through much of the landscape we traveled, and if we got lost neither Harris nor Estrada can be blamed. They were explorers; we were probably more like visitors.

A host of people deserve thanks and it is one of the more daunting tasks to do them justice in a small space.

On behalf of all the workshoppers I would simply salute the people who made history at Third College. Today they may feel their very personal struggles have been lost to subsequent decades, but I think much has lived on. We live in an age when those who express the most hard-line resistance to the
liberation of souls and the freeing of peoples most often make the earliest and loudest claims for credit when it happens. I think those of you who believed there could be a better world, and who worked so passionately to realize it, can walk more proudly because of this odd paradox. It is a demonstration of your success.

I want to let readers know that the one person who had the most to do with seeing that this history was written was Cecil Lytle, provost of Third College for some two years now. He had enough heart to set this project in motion and then to trust, with significant personal risk, I think, that an untried process could succeed under its own power. Cecil told me midway through that he thought the project was what education should be about, and I believe he was right. He also seemed to know precisely when to enter a word of encouragement, and sometimes a nudge, as needed.

Though the anniversary book project was conceived at Third, its workshop was offered through the Department of Literature's writing section. I'm grateful to Susan Kirkpatrick, who has chaired the department for several years, and to Michael Davidson, who has administered the writing program of which I'm a minor part, for agreeing to sponsor this unorthodox project.

Throughout the year, students and I came to rely on certain supporting people who may themselves make little of the help they gave. Only a person who has worked with them can appreciate people like Nancy Heseketh and Jennifer Williams of the UCSD Department of Literature. They're friends and allies of this project. Pat Hansen, in the Provost's Office at Third, in material ways, and with her very brilliant smile, saw we get what we needed; Rosa Felice and Ofelia Wynn did too. Thanks also to "J.C.," or Joyce Chastain, in the Dean's Office.

UCSD, like any large university, has many specialists who are frequently more competent in the work of research than are those to whom it is entrusted. I'm referring to librarians, of course, and in particular to Geoff Wexler, Steve Coy, and Phil Smith, as well as the others in the eighth floor Central Library of UCSD who cared for this project, and showed it. And thank you, UCSD, for that invaluable repository, the archives.

Marilyn Houser, of UCSD's administrative records office, and Lynn Harris, keeper of the Academic Senate's records, fielded last-minute requests from the workshopers with good cheer.

A man who was there, Vince de Baca, rose well above the role of source to become a major part of this work through his memory's extraordinary grasp of the events, in so many of which he took part. Salud, Vince.

And thanks to the Publication Subcommittee of Nick Aguilar, Manuela Brown, Evette Gee, Irene Villanueva Smith, Jacquelyn Sorensen, and Dana Wright, chaired by Rebecca Lytle, which oversaw and approved the production of this book. Rebecca also, almost without help, saw to it that this book was not just words, but included pictures as well. Her key contacts were Jane Booth, photo archivist at the San Diego Historical Society; Reverend John Huber, an eyewitness and photographer of many of the early events as they occurred; Steve Coy of the UCSD Archives; Julie Dunn and John Lane, UCSD Publications Office; and Paul West, with University Relations, Office of the President.

I want to thank Jacquelyn Sorensen, in the Provost's Office. She, with Rebecca Lytle, read and prepared the manuscript, and both came to know the principal writer's quirks, linguistic and typographical. Jacquelyn, by virtue of being the staffer designated as the main provider for this project, had also to put up with my own demands, and did it with grace.

In mid-April, two-thirds of the manuscript written by that date was unaccountably lost in the untracked reaches of my IBM clone, unleashing momentary fears that the project might be halted. The backup copy was lost as well. I want to thank Eileen Conway, Stashik Czaja, Mike McNew, Joe Finley, and Dave Saunders, who all separately had a hand in reaching those remote corners to restore the text over a five-day period I spent with them. They made my life more livable.

As the narrative portions of this project extend only through 1972, many later alumni of Third whom we interviewed will find they are missing from the volume, and so is an integrated picture of the years they attended. Part Two of the book is their story, in telescoped, essay form. Time
grew short, and I have to offer our apologies for what may seem to some a truncation of the story. Again, we can hope others will pick up its thread.

When and if they do, they will start with Joe Watson, a tireless and powerful figure from the early years of Lumumba-Zapata and Third College. No other person comes close to making as much of its history in so many ways as this man, who sat still for hour after hour of wide-ranging interviews and was candid beyond our expectations, considering he remains a high campus official with responsibilities to the university that most of us know little about. We are in his debt, also, for opening his very extensive files to this project. From the earliest days of Joe Watson’s tenure in office, the files reveal a man who devoted himself to his work, which often directly served others.

As well, Carlos Blanco made his full personal papers available to us without hesitation. Examining them brings the spirit of the times into focus. It is also humbling to note the deep creativity of the man and the evidence of his commitment to students, as both qualities leap from the many and diverse pages of his files.

Thanks also to Charles Thomas, whose papers were very helpful, and to Nolan Penn for his advice and insight. Both are people of real distinction and courage and originality, virtues in short supply always but these days perhaps more than ever.

William Frazer, the first provost, deserves to know that many who once aimed their arguments at him consider him one of the fullest of human beings in this story, and freely said so to student investigators. The copious use of excerpts from Scott Lanterman’s interview with him should convey a sense of Frazer’s remarkable lack of pretension and genuine belief in a worthy experiment.

And finally, with concern I’ve waited too long, I want to hold up to the light a handful of students who became my friends. Readers who care about education will be glad to know that the magic still happens and that students do still light up as they find a truth and make it their own. There were times when they had more confidence in the project than did their instructor and putative leader. I’m in their debt to no less degree than I am to those already mentioned.

Some of you who read this were interviewed by one of the students in the workshop. There was an enormous amount of foundation work done by each student to prepare for those interviews. Newspaper microfilms were read and summarized, month by month and year by year, in the basement of UCSD’s Central Library. The workshop as a group were forced early to learn considerable amounts of recent local history even before they could set out to generate new history. Space will not allow me to account for all contributions of every student, but fairness requires that I try to salute the major ones.

Lisa Collins found meeting minutes and alumni addresses. She, Scott Lanterman, and Alex Wong ranged over areas of time and grew well enough acquainted with the broader picture to serve as occasional and general commentators on the history during the workshops. Lisa also came to understand the history of Urban and Rural Studies. Norm Cooley, our retired MD and humorist, twice drove to Los Angeles to interview Marsha Harris and Mike Estrada, and he interviewed former chancellor William McElroy. Randy Dotinga, in just one quarter, produced an important interview with Vince de Baca and an analysis of the power of the Board of Directors. James Field is responsible for key portions of the story behind the attack of national columnists in 1972.

Crucial passages of this book belong to Joe Finley. He quickly mastered the puzzle of how the administration determines what colleges will receive in the way of faculty support and other resources, and he produced a sketch of the development of ethnic studies at UCSD. As mentioned earlier, he fought his way through the magnetic jungle of my computer to bring portions of the story back to accessible memory. Joe’s byline appears twice. Barbara Galvan produced an early and critical account of the governmental crisis in 1972. Barbara also discovered far-flung contemporary materials and was one of the first students to appreciate the wealth of the archives.

Debbie Kelso was an eyewitness from the early 1970s we were lucky to have with us in the fall quarter for guidance. Paul Lanning, also with us for but one quarter because of a demanding schedule, analyzed early admissions policies and knew where some overlooked documents might be found. He produced several power charts that helped us learn who the actors were.
Scott Lanterman was the interviewer (of Frazer, Newton Harrison, and Joyce Justus) whose independent and critical mind encouraged his subjects to open up the depths of their experiences to the record. Late in the workshop Scott fell upon significant loads of central records and digested them in time for us to profit from the new information. Sharon Lutz found files off campus and was an early force in the organization of our working files.

Leslie Maloney joined the second quarter of the workshop and almost immediately became as well versed as any student in the history. She worked intensely on the post-1972 period, producing no fewer than seven fascinating interviews. She also interviewed Angela Davis and shared in the writing of a Part Two essay with Joe Finley.

Gina Mendola’s work is almost entirely hidden in this book, which is ironic in that she had two critically important interviews with Carlos Blanco and also interviewed Azzan Davis and Silvio Varon, all of whom have been liberally quoted. Along with Barbara Galvan, she twice interviewed the entertaining and spirited Martha (Salinas) Chaves. Almost the entire section recounting early recruitment of high school students into Third is Gina’s. Mike Rutherford had the courage to take on responsibilities as an administrative assistant even though he joined the workshop in mid-year. He located Keith Lowe and spent day and night absorbing five-inch stacks of reports and letters for distribution to students working in the various areas. He shared with Anne Scott the role of archivist.

Anne Scott rose to take on a greater load than any single other member of the group; she compared early plans of the college and had seven interviews. She was responsible for organizing and maintaining the files and for educating other members to their contents. Anne could find copying machines in locations I never asked to know about. She is the expert on who was and was not granted tenure at Third, always an issue in a school that took special interest in the matter. Suzanne Shaw came late to the workshop but produced interesting material on the curriculum, particularly interviews with faculty on the subject.

Jason Snell, with little guidance, managed to find and tell the story of pre-Lumumba-Zapata College III in startlingly sensible and professional prose. And, finally, thanks to Alex Wong, a spark plug. He was Joe Watson’s partner in three interviews that are worth reading in their entirety and without editing. Alex found Milan Lalic Molina early in the workshop, and the interview was exciting enough to inspire other students to reach that level of detail and emotion.

Only a few of the workshopers wrote material that appears with bylines. That is the result of their having specialized in events that proved possible to confine to separate discussion and events that occurred after 1972, when the main narrative ends. The absence of some student names over the essays within this book does not mean these less visible workshopers did not write, nor that they wrote less well than those who were were credited. It is, instead, confirmation that the major part of this book is a collective work, no less so than the Lumumba-Zapata demands were. I’m glad I was a part of that collective work.

Ultimately, I have to credit my partner and wife with the nearly infinite quantities of humor required of one who had to live with this project, and with me while I was engaged with it. Thank you, Deborah.

Bob Dorn
June 1990
This book is dedicated to all Third people, everywhere.
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Part One:
When the Revolution Was a Requirement

By Bob Dorn

with Lisa Collins
Norman Cooley
Randy Dotinga
James Field
Joe Finley
Barbara Galvan
Debbie Kelso
Paul Lanning
Scott Lanterman
Sharon Lutz
Kelly McPhillips
Leslie Maloney
Gina Mendola
Mike Rutherford
Anne Scott
Suzanne Shaw
Jason Snell
Alex Wong
Rebekah Young
Aerial view of the UCSD campus in 1966.
When UCSD started enrolling undergraduates in 1964, it was designed to be a university in the form of the Oxbridge schools of Britain, a large campus divided into small, individual colleges. The University of California’s plan was to split UCSD into three “clusters” of four colleges each. First College and Second College soon became Revelle and Muir. The two remaining holes in the first cluster would be a medical school and a third college yet to be given a name when planning to fill out the cluster began in 1965.

In November of that year, the College III Preliminary Planning Committee released the first substantial report on the contemplated unit. The committee, consisting of faculty members George Backus, Henry Booker, Gabriel Jackson, and C.D. Keeling and chaired by the literature department’s Andrew Wright, suggested that College III focus on the study of history and its theory. That suggested a name, Clio, the Greek muse of history. History was attractive because, while it was solidly within the humanities, as a discipline it delved into the sciences and the arts and toyed with social science methodologies in its work. College III would be common ground for the university.

The early planners knew that no college could be based only in historical studies, so archaeology, biophysics, philology, theoretical physics, and astrophysics were included in the curriculum. The theoretical aspects of the natural sciences would also be taught. The general idea was that students would take classes on the classics in a broad range of subjects and would graduate prepared for professional schools or careers. The committee wanted to broaden. This was one school that would not offer Geography 1000: The Hilly Sections of Southeastern Ohio, or so it suggested.

With equal cheek, the planners suggested that the full load at College III would be three courses per
quarter, not four. The four-course load made “students ride off in all directions.” This was a group that believed in the college system: each unit should determine its curriculum, have its own departments, and so on. Booker suggested that American education was “ruthlessly geared to a process of having students acquire little bits of knowledge for short periods of time.” He thought the new college ought to delay exams in some cases and in others use them to influence the student’s study, but not just use them for the purpose of assigning grades.

To implement Booker’s ideas, Backus developed seven pages of math in the back of the report that, he said, proved it was possible for students to spend half their time in small tutorials and half in large lectures that would eliminate the spreading reliance on raw teaching assistants.

By March 1966 the Academic Senate’s Committee on Educational Policy and Courses (CEP), which screens all new intellectual forms before they become curriculum, had found that Wright’s committee was mistaken on the basic notion of what UCSD college should be. The departments should be campuswide and should have allegiances broader than those of the colleges, but the CEP found some of the internal ideas interesting.

In August 1966 Chancellor John Galbraith created a second College III Planning Committee. By early 1967 Armin Rappaport, a UC Berkeley history professor and friend of the muse, Clio, was appointed provost. The second committee was reconstituted with provisional faculty, who decided College III should be known simply as “Third College.”

Their report, lengthier and more detailed, embraced the same definition of a full load. They reduced the language requirement of the Wright committee and fiddled the math and science sequence down to fewer courses, adding more remedial writing classes. For a while they had thought of making history optional but realized “Clio would in effect be ousted” from the college if they did.

On April 4, the assassination of Martin Luther King, Jr. in Memphis changed the face of the plan. On the strength of a hurriedly written proposal from biologist Dan Lindsley, the provisional faculty of the third college voted five committees into existence that would attempt to map out a college in honor of King’s values. One would recruit disadvantaged students, making use of the variance that allowed the university to admit up to 4 percent of its assigned enrollment from students who nearly qualified under standard formulas. There would be a community action committee to bring seminars to the city, and tutoring to children who sought it. A human relations committee would promote the full integration of majority and minority students.

The Lindsley report bore Lindsley’s own impassioned preamble that asserted, “The assassination of Martin Luther King in Memphis on April 4 is one of the bitter rewards that we reap from our apathetic acceptance of social injustice and racism in our society.” It resolved “that Third College be named Martin Luther King College” as a step toward reuniting Americans of every description and belief.

Provost Rappaport accepted all but the name. He thought that decision was better put off “until such time as our program does his name justice and honor.”

Provost Rappaport went to chemist Joseph Watson and writer and literature professor Carlos Blanco, the advisers respectively of the Black Student Caucus and the Mexican American Youth Association (later MEChA) to ask their ideas about an ethnic studies program. The two groups began thinking about what they might want. Their ideas grew.

In September the Rappaport plan, now well removed from the Wright Committee’s, was sent on to the CEP for its consideration. In March of 1969 the CEP responded. But it was all academic. Something called Lumumba-Zapata College had emerged. The CEP pointed out to anyone who hadn’t been watching that Rappaport’s Plan was “based upon discussion . . . which took place prior to the Lumumba-Zapata proposal” and “that there may be some alteration in Third College plans.” Time, for the moment, had outrun the muse of history.

—Jason Snell
Chapter 1

Lumumba Meets Zapata

Most often it is Angela Davis’ name that is attached to the writing of the Lumumba-Zapata demands; hers with Carlos Blanco’s (whose penmanship is on drafts circulated to coalition members) and Keith Lowe’s (a Jamaican professor of literature whose visa, according to various accounts, was lifted by the Nixon State Department while he was out of the country early in 1969, preventing his return), and those of Azzan Davis (no relation to Angela), Milan Molina, and Angela’s sister, Fania. People who came to Third early but just after its birth, like anthropologist Joyce Justus, say they were told the coalition’s manifesto was the work of a group led by Angela Davis, probably working with Herbert Marcuse.

For years detractors of the movement have refused to believe the document was substantially

Patrice Lumumba

Former prime minister of the Congo (Zaire) in the 1960s.

Patrice Lumumba, one of the most important African nationalist leaders of modern times, was born in the Congo (Zaire) on July 2, 1925. After attending mission schools, he worked in the Stanleyville post office and in a brewery. He also wrote essays and poems for several journals.

In 1955 he became president for a province of APIC, a Congo trade union of government employees. In 1958 he formed the Congolese National Movement, the first political party in the Congo, which was in the process of breaking away from its colonial parent, Belgium. Lumumba wished to form a single, nationwide party. He also attended the All-African People Conference, where he was influenced by nationalist African ideas.

Lumumba and chief rival Joseph Kasavubu formed the independent government of the Congo in 1960. Lumumba was prime minister, while Kasavubu was president. However, Kasavubu believed in a sectionalized and loose federal structure in the Congo, while Lumumba wanted a strong, centralized and unified state. He also opposed Pan-Africanism (African states working together) and the liberation of colonial territories.

War occurred soon after the new government was inaugurated. An area of the Congo called Katanga seceded, led by Moïse Tshombe. Lumumba at first appealed to the U.N. for help, but their reaction was not sufficient for him. He then appealed to the Soviet Union for help.

Appealing to the Soviets seems to have spelled the end of Lumumba. Although Lumumba favored “positive neutrality,” a return to African values, and a rejection of foreign ideology, the West was not happy with his overtures to the Soviet Union, and gave more help to his opponents.

Soon, an alliance of the army and Kasavubu overthrew Lumumba. He was later arrested and was killed while in Tshombe’s custody in 1961. The government announced that he was killed as he tried to escape. He was hailed as “the hero of Africa” at the time of his death.
student-written and have preferred to make it the work of Marcuse. His most famous student, Angela Davis, says it was

... collectively drawn up by the BSC and MAYA. We had seriously reflected on them and they truly were the product of long hours of discussion... Marcuse definitely supported the group, but he was not as involved with it.

Many people, including Angela Davis, remember Lowe’s early effort to define on paper Patrice Lumumba College. Lowe, who today teaches in Toronto, speaks of “an essay entitled ‘Towards a Black University,’” based on my experiences teaching at Howard University,” but the mystery of authorship is not dispelled by Lowe. “I don’t know that I played any role in the writing of the demands,” he says. Still, his ideas about curriculum, and Blanco’s, were probably crucial to the plan. Blanco knows there are copies of drafts in

... my longhand. So you can be sure I drafted one or two or three or who knows how many drafts of it. But so did Angela, so did Joe (Watson), so did our Jamaican professor in literature, Keith Lowe. And, so did the students. So it really is a collective piece of work... truly a collective effort. If anybody has kept papers, like I have, I’m sure you could find drafts in Joe’s longhand, in Keith Lowe’s.

In the Beginning

Beyond the question of authorship lies the immediate impulse for the document, and there lies real irony. Without Armin Rappaport, diplomatic historian and provisional provost under the original design for Third, there would have been no Lumumba-Zapata plan. In the late fall of 1968, Rappaport went to representatives of the Black Student Council and to the Mexican American Youth Association to ask what they might need from the new college.

Rappaport’s role, from his arrival on campus to the stormy days of the founding, is an alluring confusion. The traditionalist, he nevertheless presided over the reduction of the original, history-oriented plan for Third, substituting instead the more socially conscious programs suggested after the death of Martin Luther King, Jr. And yet when biologist Dan Lindsley, who had worked up the newer proposals, suggested that the school be named after the fallen civil rights leader, Rappaport could only offer a letter that rejected the name because the school was not yet worthy of it. He would soon accuse the BSC and MAYA of betraying his good faith; yet, still later, when the demands reached the Senate, it would be Rappaport who offered a key motion empowering the breakaway coalition.
When he went to the BSC and MAYA in 1968 Rappaport was asking people who already had a good idea what they wanted—at least in the case of the BSC. There had been Keith Lowe’s work. And, with Watson as faculty sponsor, the BSC had in the spring asked the school to initiate an African-American Studies program. A subcommittee of the Senate had been formed, the idea was okayed in its broad outlines, even a faculty search committee had been formed, though Watson later would tell San Diego Magazine that the pace seemed slow and the commitment only light and tentative.

Skeptical of Rappaport’s intentions, the BSC went to MAYA with a proposal that they throw in their lots and go for more than an ethnic element within a conventional college. MAYA, hitherto a more social group than political, had been electrified by statewide developments within the Chicano movement and was soon to change its name to the more militant, Movimiento Estudiantil de Aztlán, or MEChA.

Emiliano Zapata, an important figure in the Mexican Revolution and a leading proponent of land reform, was born on August 8, 1883. An uneducated peasant of Indian background, he joined Francisco Madero in trying to liberate Mexico in 1910 from the presidency of Porfirio Díaz. Zapata was the rebel leader in Morelos, in southern Mexico.

Díaz was overthrown, and Madero became president of Mexico. However, Zapata did not think that Madero went far enough in terms of land reform policy, so he renewed the Revolution, this time against Madero, and formed the Plan of Ayala, which featured land reform.

He also joined fellow revolutionary Pancho Villa for a time as they fought against a new revolutionary government led by Venustiano Carranza. In 1914, Zapata and Villa occupied Mexico City and forced Carranza to flee. Zapata then withdrew to Tlaltzapan and continued to fight. At the height of his power, he had control of Morelos and parts of adjoining states. In the areas he controlled, he gave land to his followers and tried to establish schools and social services. His slogan was “Land, liberty, and death to the hacendados (land owners).”

Zapata has been called variously “the apostle of agrarian reform” and “the Attila of the south.”

On April 10, 1919, he was killed by Colonel Jesus Guajardo, who pretended to be part of Zapata’s peasant army. Guajardo was on orders from a general allied with Carranza.
"The two student organizations got together and said, 'Yeah... let's write up some classes.' A group of about five of us (MAYA) started writing. We had our meager class outlines and BSC had a more elaborate program."

We demand that the Third College be devoted to relevant education for minority youth and to the study of the contemporary social problems of all people. To do this authentically, this college must radically depart from the usual role as the ideological backbone of the social system, and must instead subject every part of the system to ruthless criticism. To reflect these aims of the college, it will be called Lumumba-Zapata College. To enhance the beauty of the name, we demand that the architecture be of Mexican and African style; and that its landscape be of the same nature. Since there has been and continues to be an excluding tradition of exclusion of minority workers from the work force involved in institutions, except...

"I'm sure you know that Third College came about because they (BSC) came to us asking if we wanted a Mexican-American Studies Department, and all of a sudden we said, 'Well, there's a college opening; it's the Third World, so we want the whole college, okay?""  

Milan Lalic Molina
Catalyzed by the writing of the demands, the new coalition of friends (MAYA’s Izzie Chaves and the BSC’s Ed Spriggs were roommates) could not be contained within Rappaport’s plan. They broke off meetings with him and went straight to Chancellor William McGill with their own plans for the new third college.

A Suggestion of Violence

Now, long after the country has passed from Revolution into the Me Decade, Discomania, and on to Double Income Paradise, it’s easy to forget that often just behind the students stood gun-toting campus visitors who seemed ready to back up their brothers and sisters, if they needed backing up. Most often, though, the students seemed to do quite well on their own.

Chemistry professor Russell Doolittle remembers:

... before all this happened these were apparently perfectly mild people. I remember one young man in particular named Robert, who lived in the Ocean Beach area; I gave him a ride home one night. He lived over the store his parents ran; he was an only child, I think, and his parents were, I believe, Cuban, lower middle class you might say. He was a perfectly ordinary eighteen-year-old who could have been taken off any campus in the country but he spoke the language and found himself thrust into this role of leadership. It was amazing to me... to hear him issuing these demands, cowing the faculty. There was a revolution going on here. People who in ordinary circumstances would be intimidated by everyday life were suddenly out there pounding on the tables, making demands.

Almost certainly, a goodly amount of terror was felt by both administrators and faculty. Hardly a chapter in Chancellor McGill’s own account, The Year of the Monkey, is without a reference to fear. Again and again he explains how “anxiety must be overcome” by administrators and how “I would be forced either to run away or to fight publicly against determined and unthinking demonstrators led by clever people who meant us genuine harm.” Calling an aide before one confrontation, he writes, “my hand seemed to tremble as I dialed the phone. What if I should pass out in the middle of this, of all days?”

In his own account of the days of unrest that visited not just Third but the entire campus, McGill manages to face his fears manfully; others do not. “Marcuse was usually ready to urge students to strike, but seldom visible in the resulting crowd scenes,” he writes. Faculty coalition members played “the ‘radicalization game,’” McGill says in his account.

“They were sympathetic with the aims of the protesters but... moved out of the line of fire.” The Academic Senate and Rappaport vote in support of the coalition was, to McGill, a surrender. “Rappaport had capitulated. The Senate had capitulated...”

In fact, people, some people, did carry guns. William Frazer, now systemwide UC Vice President for Academic Affairs, remembers,

... there were things that happened that never should have happened. Somebody (brought) a gun to an Academic Senate meeting, somebody in the back, just a guest. It was a submachine. The back door had been left open. Needless to say, I had no patience with this sort of thing. This was not a symbol that I liked, but it was done only as a symbolic gesture. It never threatened anyone’s life.

Interestingly, the arrests seem to have come later in Third’s history, not at the beginning, and few faculty remember being intimidated into supporting the students. “It was a lot more than just a bunch of people throwing rocks and misbehaving,” says Ed Fussel, a literature professor who helped design several courses during a year at Third. “They wanted a bit of a revolution, but they wanted it intellectually.”
What made the Lumumba-Zapata coalition so effective, and therefore all the more radical, was its unity on the notion that student participation in the university's governance, or at least the college's, was close at hand. After all, empowerment was implied in all the reforms of the decade about to end. Fussell says:

This was incredibly radical. It had nothing to do particularly with the question of minority status except that the students from MAYA and the BSC, they wanted this not because they were so hot as students but because they didn't trust the faculty or the administration. You know, they'd been swindled too many times.

McGill, however, saw the coalition in terms of a large mass of enthusiastic and intelligent young people easily led by comparatively few ideologues; their interest in radical causes such as Eldridge Cleaver’s sociology lectures was “only a preoccupation of affluent middle-class youth.” Elsewhere in his *Year of the Monkey*, radicals appear simply to be “incurably romantic counterculture students” urged on by the SDS as well as the faculty.

Viewing the student coalition another way, McGill thought he also saw a basic difference between whites and students of color. Most white activists, he thought, were more or less Marxists, doctrinaire about a revolution against capital they could seek to make with blacks and other ethnic groups. The ethnic groups, on the other hand, he perceived to be inherently moderate and interested not in revolution but in opening both the university’s enrollment and its academic programs to cultures more representative of the country at large. He and his chief strategist at the time hatched a plan to drive a wedge into that perceived fissure.

“Murphy (Dean George) believed he saw a way in which the coalition could be fractured,” McGill writes. “To do it we would have to respond positively to the people whose main concerns were a minority-oriented program rather than the furtherance of Third World revolution.” That students as a general population might be able to oppose war, yearn for self-governance, and believe in ethnic studies apparently did not occur to McGill and others.

Marrying the goal of government by students to that of opening the school to large numbers of minority students must have seemed as natural to the great majority of blacks and Chicanos on campus as it was threatening to McGill. Many activists of the time remember that the years of 1968, 1969, and 1970 were a moment when all the issues seemed to have come together, not through an artificial fusion of ordinarily uncomplementary interests but through genuine communication.

Martha (Salinas) Chaves, in 1967 one of MAYA’s founding members, says MAYA began more as a social club,

...but by ‘68, the fall of ‘68, it started to get very political... The anti-war movement was really developing and so was the civil rights movement, and it kind of gave impetus to the anti-war movement and that got to the campus, I mean all the different campuses. So it was kinda the same people that were active in the anti-war movement that were active in the Chicano Moratorium (and) that were participating in government at Third when it developed.

**McGill vs. the Coalition**

Having judged Rappaport to be out of the fray because he supported the students, McGill personally took over negotiations with the L-Z coalition. The students had demanded he reply within twelve days to their March 14 plan. Facing what amounted to an ultimatum, he bought time on that date with a statement that in conciliatory tones raised procedural and policy obstacles to the demands. With the distribution of those preliminary objections to student members,
the following meeting between McGill and the coalition on April 2 was less cordial. They demanded he return in five days with definitive yea or nay to each of the points.

In the briefer, point-by-point answer of April 7, McGill started by rejecting the name of Lumumba-Zapata College, the first of many UCSD officials who were to do so off and on during the ensuing twenty years. “The hyphenation does not appeal to me,” he wrote. “It would also be more appropriate to suggest a single American minority figure.”

Though certainly not strident, McGill’s statement yielded on no major point. Third College’s budget would not be funded before Revelle’s and/or Muir’s (funding struggles of the coming few years in fact would work against Third), no Board of Directors would be approved, students organizing the college and doing its administrative work would not be granted course credit. He flatly refused to allow students and faculty to hire teachers independently of the existing campus departments. No college governing body, with or without student members, could hire and fire the provost; that would remain the chancellor’s prerogative. He was not going to allow the school to establish a racially based enrollment ratio and he was opposed to “student control of admissions to any college.” (Please see page 16.)

Few of the coalition members had thought they would win every point. Vince de Baca, who today is a Ph.D candidate in UCSD’s history department, says the entire plan was intended as “a general guideline,” even though the coalition used the language of the day and told McGill the plan was “non-negotiable.” Having gone that far, de Baca says, “we were not willing to march off passively and do what we were told.”

A stiffening of the BSC-MAYA negotiators brought a much more conciliatory response from McGill on April 14 in the form of a still briefer set of proposals worded by Dean George Murphy, among them a promise to compensate with money or academic credits students who might help administer the school once it opened. Murphy’s proposal also introduced the wedge he and McGill had agreed might be driven into the fissure they thought existed between students. UCSD would “make every effort” to hire minority contractors and “to enroll able minority students.” The school’s architecture would indeed be of Mexican and/or African style and the administration would even attempt to borrow money from banks with minority directors. All of these conditions, McGill later would write, were aimed to “undercut the leadership of Angela Davis and the other radicals.” But it was far too little, far too late. BSC and MAYA leaders refused to meet with the faculty committee McGill had appointed to implement the Murphy offer.

**The Demands Reach the Senate**

Apparently out of options, McGill then took a step he later came to regret; he moved the conflict into the Academic Senate.

What precisely he was asking of the Senate isn’t clear in his address to that body on April 23, when he asked for the Senate’s “help, particularly as the issues become more difficult and the options more limited.” In his book he concedes, “Our strategy was in considerable disarray. I was also thrashing around, putting out multiple feelers, giving subordinates contradictory assignments, and hoping against hope that something would head off the impending collision.” The Senate
was similarly divided, not the least because students had been meeting with some of its leaders while other students had been confronting Murphy and McGill. On April 15, MAYA and the BSC issued a statement saying they “wish to invite interested faculty to a meeting in 2622 Undergraduate Sciences Building on Friday, April 18” for a discussion of the Lumumba-Zapata proposal.

But much earlier than that, the coalition had been making its appeal directly to the faculty. On March 19 V.H. Rumsey, chairman of the Senate’s executive and university welfare committee, reported a recommendation of that body that UCSD establish “an experimental college with a high proportion of Black and Mexican Americans, in order to provide the opportunity for a flowering of the present strivings of the minority community.” The committee also favored “a larger measure of student participation in running the college than commonly prevails . . .” And while Rumsey said “the BSC and MAYA groups were extremely guarded . . . there were indications that beneath the extremely tense situation there was a desire to open up sympathetic discussions at some later stage.” Several of the coalition members had also met with the Committee on Educational Policy the previous fall as well, with the result that the committee recommended that Revelle College, where Paul Saltman was provost, include a black studies course in its Humanities sequence and, more importantly, that the Senate begin exploring the establishment of an “institute” in Afro-American studies.

And perhaps more important to the radical coalition, Frazer and his friend Frank Halpern, another young physicist, had been bringing students and faculty together. Frazer says,

I think our big contribution at the beginning was (that) they used my house in San Diego. And Frank and I and a few other faculty had the entire Academic Senate, about ninety-five of them eventually, come over on a Saturday and a Sunday with a couple of Third College students and a couple of the faculty who were trying to work with the students—Joe Watson and Carlos Blanco. And we’d go at it for at least three hours and at the end of that the folks that had been over to my house were all convinced that something good could be done with this. And that was the core of support that we had in the Academic Senate.

The Coalition Gains the Senate Floor

Having had that much contact, it was easy for the Senate to decide to admit students to its more formal debates. A set number of delegates from the Lumumba-Zapata coalition (twenty-eight), without voting privileges, would be admitted to the hall.

The debate by then had escaped the campus, taken into the community by both McGill and the coalition. Robert Carillo and Israel Chavez on March 26 told the Torrey Pines Kiwanis Club that the university was stalling reforms, and the longer it did so the greater

Robert Carillo and Israel Chavez were student leaders of the Lumumba-Zapata coalition.

would be the confrontation. A sympathetic graduate student said that new ideas were needed if the crisis were to be resolved. McGill in the same period was telling the Men’s Democratic Club of San Diego County and the local chapter of the professional journalism society that moderation was needed on campus, and that the public was not aware of the real causes of the
unrest. In his inaugural address he proposed that the campus organize a “junior college” expressly for minority students and designed to make them eligible to take regular campus courses, an idea that quickly was rejected by the coalition as demeaning.

Clearly, what had begun as an apparently overambitious attempt by fewer than 100 students and sympathetic faculty to grab real control of their affairs had broken new ground in a few short weeks. The new chancellor had been lured into handling the university’s negotiations himself, and every time he addressed a move by the coalition he was legitimizing it. On the other hand, could he afford not to recognize the group? After all, the Senate had become involved as well, and in this forum the students had already made some valuable allies.

Rappaport Supports Students

One development that seems to have struck the Senate with undeniable impact was the conversion of Armin Rappaport from his classics-oriented, history-based plan to the students’ very different vision. Unquestionably a man with impeccable establishment credentials as a diplomatic historian, Rappaport was also a gentleman of a kinder age who had felt betrayed when students abandoned his original plan for Third. McGill had removed him from the negotiations with the Lumumba-Zapata group, only a few weeks later sending him back to negotiate with the coalition using Murphy’s April 14 proposal as the administration’s talking point.

That placed Rappaport in the position of bargaining with people who had rejected him on behalf of a chancellor who had earlier removed him from the table for a plan that was obviously not his first choice. In his book, McGill says “...the discussions between Provost Rappaport and the Lumumba-Zapata protesters were not going well... He was on the brink of conceding that Third College should be restructured as a minority-oriented college with a greatly enlarged and perhaps even dominant student role in governance.”

In fact, McGill and Murphy had approached that same brink in the April 14 rewrite of the Lumumba-Zapata demands. Murphy’s document proposed an executive committee made up “of faculty members and students in equal numbers, each with one vote” to concur with the chancellor on a selection of a provost and, later, to advise the provost “on all matters of general college policy,” including the hiring and firing of faculty and administrators. The college would “be so named as to reflect its specific concerns with the minority community and the growing urban crisis” and every effort would be made “to enroll able students.”

UC Berkeley Heats Up, Again

As formal and informal meetings of the Senate began to deepen faculty involvement and take it campuswide, events beyond UCSD began to make a violent student uprising appear plausible.

For months at UC Berkeley, students calling themselves the Third World Liberation Front had been noisily demanding improvements in the ethnic studies offerings there. By April, students were also organizing their occupation of the university-owned site of a planned housing project for married students. By mid-April they’d moved in, planting trees, pouring sidewalks, and installing swings for children in what they now called People’s Park. The innocence of its appearance failed to comfort UC’s administration and its Board of Regents, who rightly or not considered it a revolutionary taking of property. In that context, the swelling voices of students, and some non-students, outside the Senate’s chamber at UCSD began to sound all the louder in McGill’s ears. Few faculty will admit they were swayed, however.
on the most mental level. It is our demand that the architects, general contractors, sub-contractors, and all supervisory personnel must be from the minority community.

The bonds for financing the construction of Lumumba-Zapata College must be held by minority financial Institutions, and must be offered in such denominations that members of the minority community may participate in the funding of the college.

In order to guarantee adequate funding of Lumumba-Zapata College:
1. The provost and/or his representative shall have review power over the budget of all the college and institutes.
2. The yearly budget for Lumumba-Zapata College will be finalized before that of all other colleges.

The governing body of Lumumba-Zapata College shall be the Board of Directors and shall consist of two students, one faculty member and the provost.

Board of Directors

1. The Board of Directors shall make the final ruling on all general college policy. It shall dispense and fill all F.T.E.'s and approve all administrative appointments. It shall have the authority to initiate any action or delegation of responsibility to any group it deems appropriate.
2. Each member of the Board of Directors shall have one vote.

Student Representation

1. The students who serve on the Board of Directors shall be chosen in a general election of the student body of Lumumba-Zapata College, to serve for a twelve month term.
2. The student representative can be recalled at any time by a majority vote of the student body of the college.

3. The student representatives shall be compensated at the rate of 125% of the average yearly income requirement of a college student at U.C.S.D.
4. The student representatives shall be given credit for one normal course per quarter for each quarter of service, which shall be applied towards graduation.

Faculty Representation

1. The faculty representative shall be elected by the faculty of Lumumba-Zapata College. He may be recalled at any time by a majority vote of the faculty of the college.
2. The faculty representative's service on the Board of Directors shall be equivalent to taking the place of his normal teaching and committee responsibilities.

Provost

1. The provost will be the administrative head of Lumumba-Zapata College.
2. The two students and one faculty representative shall make the final decision concerning the selection of the provost and shall have the power of recall over him.

In order to compensate for past and present injustices and to serve those most affected by white racism and economic exploitation, Lumumba-Zapata College must have an enrollment of 35% Blacks and 35% Mexican-Americans. Students must be selected on the basis of their potential by an admissions committee controlled by minority students. The University of California admission requirements must not be used as an instrument for excluding minority students from or limiting their numbers in Lumumba-Zapata College.

minority students at least in proportion to their representation in the community which supports and surrounds the University.”

Given that direction from McGill, it could not have come as a surprise when Rapaport reported April 25 that his own executive committee (he was still nominally provost) had decided that representatives of MAYA and the BSC would be invited to all its meetings and that “BSC/MAYA will have fifty percent voting power in all decisions.” The coalition had succeeded in making itself necessary to any college-based proposals to the administration. A Rapaport memo on April 25 read that “no decisions will be made regarding Third College on this campus without the approval of this joint body.” The executive committee, with its new student members, finally reported that student participation would continue only if “The Executive Committee and the administration of UCSD commit themselves to this general principle: that the Third College be devoted to relevant education for minority youth and to the study of the contemporary social problems of all people.”
It had turned out that Rappaport (who, according to his widow, left behind no personal papers from the period) had come to see more light in the students’ proposals than in McGill’s. His May 6 resolution in the Senate, accepting the Lumumba-Zapata coalition’s plan for a college board of directors with voting student members, must have struck the Senate members as simply one more step in the logical progression even McGill seemed to have been following in the Murphy document.

**Azzan and Izzie Push the Senators**

Several faculty members and students from the joint body Rappaport had been leading addressed the five formal parts of the resolution. Azzan Davis argued that the only way to ensure that the coalition’s strictly academic aims were met would be to concede the major political one, i.e., to recognize the Board of Directors and give it power to select faculty and assign them to departments. That would mean assigning the FTEs (full-time equivalents, or the way a university measures its academic labor force) to the college directly, instead of by way of the departments. This threatened departmental prerogatives. Israel Chaves argued that the board should be composed of three students, two faculty, and a provost and that this makeup would ensure that the college would be different from the other schools. All of the provisions required rules changes.

For one thing, only faculty could select new faculty under Senate rules. The provost was selected by the chancellor after consultation with the Senate. The bylaws generally, but clearly, extended authority to faculty and administrators, but not to students. It seemed no one had thought of the procedural obstacles facing the Senate before the scheduled meeting on the student plan, and that plan now seemed to call for the Senate to ignore its own charter.

Traditionalists would consider rewriting the bylaws prior to implementing any legislation as, at minimum, only prudent. Seen from the students’ point of view, however, talks from the fall of 1968 had been encouraging and yet they had won to that date not a single clear concession. The debate over procedures might have seemed to them an evasion, or a maneuver to block them under procedural guise.

Substitute motions to Rappaport’s began to flow as conservatives attempted to preserve the Senate’s procedural integrity and as others seemed to want to confuse. William Frazer offered a three-part substitute to Rappaport’s motion that was more general and closer to Murphy’s on the subject of student participation. McGill asked for a recess.

**Rappaport, Blanco Win Fight over Student Power**

When the meeting resumed the BSC’s Azzan Davis took the mike and urged passage of Rappaport’s motion so that the students could be given an indication there was still a reason to meet with the university. He said he did not expect the Senate to break its own rules. Frazer withdrew his substitution. That left the Senate once again facing the choice of destroying its procedures and approving the Board of Directors plan, or preserving its rules and asking for trouble from the faculty and students supporting the Lumumba-Zapata vision. At this point Carlos Blanco, having conferred with the BSC and MAYA representatives in the chamber, offered a sixth paragraph as an appendage to Rappaport’s five. All the five points of the resolution were approved on condition that the Senate change its resolutions as necessary to conform to the radical governance changes. The measure finally passed, eighty-seven to
Carlos Blanco
Professor of Spanish literature and faculty adviser to MAYA (MECHA).

THE BLANCO AMENDMENT:
The Senate approves the above five points of the Rappaport Resolution, with the clear understanding that whatever are legal technicalities will be resolved either by following present university regulations or trying to change those regulations whenever possible.

May 6 Victory Doesn’t Stop “Spontaneous” Walkout

Even after the May 6 victory, and with McGill out of town, distrust continued on the part of the students. The efforts of friendly faculty to circumvent roadblocks posed by Senate bylaws would be perceived as delaying tactics. Both May 6 and the following day Azzan Davis interrupted Senate procedures to warn that students were going to walk out if Senate members did not pass the Lumumba-Zapata outline and abandon their efforts to square the procedural circle.

Overnight, between the two meetings, Lumumba-Zapata student leaders had met with key members of the Senate. On May 7 the meeting opened with a resolution from one of the sympathetic senators that called for a sixteen-person planning committee constituted equally of students and faculty. Third’s provisional faculty would help choose the eight faculty members, along with the Senate, and the BSC and MAYA and the ASUCSD (Associated Students) would choose the eight student planners. The committee was to recommend to the Senate any legislative measures needed in order for the master plan to be implemented legally. The Senate was bound by the Blanco amendment of the day before to pass the necessary legislation.

Perhaps overreaching, Azzan Davis persuaded a friendly senator to offer a substitute that actually seemed weaker than the one that opened the day. It was defeated, and several students lost patience and began attacking the renewed parliamentary complications, for which Davis seemed at least partly responsible. Having castigated the academics, MAYA and the BSC showily left the meeting. “They were having these la-de-da, maybe, maybe not, big discussions, so a group of us said, ‘Fuck it, let’s go do it,’” Milan Molina says. What followed was, he says, “sort of spontaneous.” And sort of not. According to de Baca: “Two or three days before the Registrar’s Office was taken over we met in Del Mar, at Christina Rodriguez’ house. There were fifty or sixty MAYA and BSC. Most didn’t want to be too militant; there’d never been any kind of militant takeover.”

As the gathering wore on and theoretical discussion began to dominate, one of the women there, according to de Baca, taunted the men about being “revolutionaries on paper,” which was enough to push the meeting into a more radical phase. Accord-
ing to de Baca, committees were put together that would contact press and television in the event of an action, and collect food if a building were seized and a siege were to be withstood. No site had been agreed upon, nor was a date.

Izzie Chaves remembers that when the students walked out of the Senate meeting and into Revelle Plaza on May 7, 1969, they were still not resolved to take another step. When the suggestion of an occupation was made, Chaves says, “I was rather reluctant to do it; when it came down to that act ... Azzan tried to put a little trip on me; you know, ‘Where are you really at?’” Chaves went with the action group.

---

**Azzan Davis**

*Student leader of the Lumumba-Zapata coalition.*

Q. *The Registrar’s Office takeover, was it pre-planned?*

A. No. It was because of the discussion coming out of the Academic Senate meeting. There was some sort of sense of loss because (we) hadn’t actually heard that a vote had been taken ... We were standing out in the quad of Revelle Plaza with the discussion about, you know, ‘you still can’t really be sure whether they are going to finalize this.’

Q. *You thought they were just, sort of, jerking you guys around?*

A. Yes, well, I was listening (in the Senate) but much of the conversation of much of the faculty seemed much more sophisticated than I was capable of understanding at the time ... They might have been ready to do all of these things. But, like I said, the person who was there to make sure that they did all these things was Angela ... and whenever there was some philosophically sophisticated argument going (between coalition members) that we might get lost in, then there she was. And it was at that point in time principally her discussion with the group of us in Revelle Plaza. We were going to have to make some sort of commitment.

Q. *So, she was making the call for action?*

A. Yes, to come back and split up and rejoin over on the Matthews campus across from the Registrar’s Office. How we actually got into the Registrar’s Office, I don’t know.”

*Interview by Gina Mendola*
Milan Kicks the Registrar's Office Door Down; Senator Varon Offers a Motion

De Baca remembers that after the students left the meeting in the late afternoon, they were joined by perhaps as many as 400 more. They made their way to the Registrar's Office. According to de Baca, “The first guy, Milan Molina, kicked the glass door in, Angela Davis went in, and I went in right behind Angela.”

And Molina remembers:

Yeah, well, I kicked the door down. It was euphoria; of course, it was scary. We didn’t know if the police were going to come and shoot us or what the hell was going to happen because we were going to hold it until they decided to pass it (the Lumumba-Zapata plan) or they killed us. But it wasn’t fear, it was more like, ‘Okay, let’s have it,’ do you see?

Back in the Senate, where Chairman Walter Munk had convinced those present to continue the debate without considering the walkout of the students, both motions were discussed without resolution until someone moved to get them both off the floor, and that motion carried. Biologist Silvio Varon then offered another resolution that ever since has carried his name. Varon says his sponsorship of the resolution came about when

...I opened my mouth because I was upset by the faculty’s bickering over terms, and I just happened to be involved in the freaky resolution. ... There were lots of motions (and) people screaming from left to right over the question of changing three words. What you had was a motion from so-and-so and then three hours of whether or not we should use the word “college” or “colleges” ...
As people began moving paragraphs into and back out of the Varon resolution, word reached the floor that some fifty students were inside the Registrar’s Office, with more outside. Even so, the tuning of Varon’s proposal continued. When it came to a vote, it passed ninety-four to five with seven abstentions, as overwhelming a majority as could be imagined from a group that had seemed so fractured only moments before.

Varon thinks there was more opposition at the time than the vote would indicate:

There were lots of differences of opinion... There was opposition within the Senate to the plan. Some people would not allow this ragged band of “swearers and badmouths” to run things, no racism involved. It wasn’t a matter of racism. It had to be done with dignity.

But he thinks the outcome would have been no different if the students hadn’t taken action. “The fact that they walked out meant that we were, again, two opposing elements. The crucial thing was that we as faculty had failed to find a formula for compromise.”

Frazer is most clearly persuaded that the occupation had little effect on the vote:

I believe that the Senate was on that course and it was just going to happen. But... you certainly won’t get anything objective on it. There are those of us who would like to believe that what was quietly going on behind the scenes (was most important)... There are those who want some dramatic demonstration to cause it... Everybody has something they want to see.

---

**A Ninety-Minute Occupation Ends**

Molina says students in the Registrar’s Office were surprised when George Murphy returned to the scene so quickly to tell them that the Varon measure had passed, and to hand a copy of the hybrid to them through the broken glass door. Nearly everyone agrees that it was George Murphy who was dealing with the occupiers at the door, assuring them that the college was now a reality, that there would be a Board of Directors, that it would be a college oriented around minorities. They all seem to remember that Murphy offered amnesty to all but the person who kicked in the door. McGill credits Murphy with getting the crowd out of the office. But depending on political alliances and tendencies, the accounts of who was most influential in removing the coalition vary according to the speaker. Some say Blanco handed out copies of the Varon resolution, or read it, and others say...
VARON RESOLUTION

1. The Senate recommends that the Provost of Third College add to and modify the Provisional Faculty of the Third College to ensure that its members be committed to the educational needs of minority students.

2. In order that planning for Third College can continue without delay, the Senate recommends that a new Executive Committee for the Third College be immediately established and given Academic Senate status. Its eight members shall be selected by the Provost from the new Third College Provisional Faculty for their commitment to the principles underlying the BSC/MAYA proposal and in consultation with BSC/MAYA. They shall be approved by the Third College Provisional Faculty.

3. The Senate further recommends the immediate establishment of a Third College Planning Committee of the following composition:
   A. Eight students and eight faculty members.
   B. The student members shall be appointed three by BSC, three by MAYA and two by ASUCSD members committed to the Lumumba-Zapata College concepts.
   C. The eight faculty members will be the new Executive Committee for the Third College.
   D. Four faculty members shall be designated by the Planning Committee, one each representing the Senate Committees on Educational Policy, Budget, Admissions, and Rules and Jurisdiction, as advisors to the Planning Committee.

4. The Planning Committee is charged with developing a detailed master plan for Third College, in accordance with the resolution passed by the Academic Senate on May 6, 1969. This plan shall be in compliance with University regulations. When, in the course of planning, legislative changes are required, actions aimed at such changes should be initiated. If legal obstacles remain which prevent the full enactment of desired objectives, an accompanying report should describe these objectives and recommend necessary further legislation.

5. During the course of its work the committee shall regularly consult with the Third College Faculty and the four Senate committees represented on it.

6. If a situation should arise in which it is necessary for the Planning Committee to consult the entire Senate directly it can do so. Prior to such consultation the Committee shall, through the Chairman of the Division, obtain the advice of the appropriate Senate committees. These committees shall report their comments to the Senate.

7. The master plan shall be submitted to the Third College faculty and the Committee on Educational Policy before presentation to the Division for approval.

8. Given the nearness of quarter end, a substantial outline of such master plan shall be presented for Senate endorsement within two weeks.
Marcuse did, and still others say it was Joe Watson who told the crowd they’d won, that there was now a Board of Directors as the Lumumba-Zapata coalition had envisioned it.

Azzan Davis, so hot and exhortative in the Plaza that night, says he had a mood change once inside the building:

We didn’t have any reason to be in the Registrar’s Office, not unless we were going to be changing our grades or something. And my own youth was showing at that point in time. I said, ‘All right, let’s leave. Why wait until somebody calls the police?’ The speech I made was a moderate speech. It was not a radical speech.

The vote came quickly but the exit from the building took a little more time while the occupiers, some fifty-four of them, arranged a strategy to avoid identification. According to de Baca:

We had to get everybody outside the building to move up to the front of the building . . . we just yelled to them to do that from the windows . . . so that we could run out into the crowd and get lost in it, so that the police couldn’t identify us. The campus cops at that time were old men, really, not like the force a few years later. And Berkeley didn’t yet have its flying SWAT team. We still had to do it quickly because I think the San Diego Police had just started to arrive.

---

**McGill Throws His Support to Third**

As McGill had come to understand on May 6 the direction the Senate was moving, he retreated, leaving behind a wish as he did so that a new planning committee entirely sympathetic to the students be formed. Despite the tough-as-nails tone that sometimes colors the book’s narrative, more than a few professors today credit McGill for opening up to the new reality. It isn’t clear that he asked that the planning committee for Third be chaired by Frazer, but that physicist, who today is UC vice president for Academic Affairs, says,

McGill is one person who really saw the possibility of something good coming out of the Lumumba-Zapata demands and really encouraged the faculty members who were willing to work on it. It wasn’t just speeches we were making. And McGill was very supportive.

In fact, some nine months later when Third began functioning pretty much as the college envisioned by the Lumumba-Zapata coalition, radicals like Azzan Davis and Lenny Bourin, among the first members of the quasi-legal Board of Directors, signed a statement thanking McGill for providing the college support in the form of faculty positions.

---

*The crowd outside the Registrar’s Office moved up to obscure the student protestors from the campus police.*
The Frazer Committee Does the Improbable

The newly formed Planning Committee, with Bill Frazer at its head, had the daunting task of coming up with a coherent plan within just two weeks. It was a group caught in the warming embrace of its own ideals.

Newton Harrison, a young multimedia artist newly arrived from the University of New Mexico, and before that Yale University, and before that the streets of New York where he worked with settlement houses in Spanish Harlem, remembers:

We tried to make a new kind of society that was modeled on a socialist base. It was communitarian. More Quaker-like than a hierarchical Marxist system . . . I saw it as a town meeting, okay? Very exciting.

The plan was discussed along two major subject lines: administration and curriculum. Varon says the curriculum proposals were new, and . . . they were so innovative that they were viewed as radical, couched in violent terms. They used to talk about a Third World curriculum . . . That there ought to be a curriculum for urban and rural studies made a lot of sense. Communication, whether and how one uses the art of language and television, it made sense to view this as a program. The problem was converting the ideas that the students had brought into an acceptable curriculum.

If the students seemed radical, the most radical of them, Angela Davis, was now absent from the planning sessions. She busied herself with the dissertation Marcuse was supervising. They were nevertheless radical enough. German writer and professor, Reinhard Lettau, who comes in for periodic assaults in McGill’s book, was part of the Third World Studies subcommittee planning the curriculum, and so was Vince de Baca, who considers himself among the most radical of all the early activists. They were helping Blanco put together a reading list. Molina, whose identity as the kicker into the glass door of the Registrar’s Office has been preserved from general knowledge until now, helped put together the Science and Technology sequence. Ed Spriggs and Martha Salinas (later Chaves) and Azzan Davis also worked on curriculum that summer.

Russell Doolittle says that he was among the more conservative members (though today he feels he is more liberal than other veterans) and that he clashed with Frazer at one point over “where he was going, because I thought he was being unrealistic. And he shouted at me, ‘ Haven’t you ever been in a classroom?’ . . . There were a lot of compromises.” Doolittle himself wanted a Science and Technology program that was aimed at people with little exposure to the sciences in order “to get them to understand science, not to get them a better job but because it was such an important part of understanding who we are. And for the understanding of what the world was all about — why the grass was green.”
In Two Weeks of May 1969, a Plan Arrives in Three Parts

Time became a commodity of great value. Blanco says he was forced to rise at 5:30 every morning in order to provide himself a few hours at the beginning of the day “when the phone would not ring and I could get some work done.” (All faculty were teaching at Muir and Revelle while they did the work of planning.) Frazer, as chairman, spent time with all the subcommittees to produce the proposal. A young and very active, some said brilliant, physicist when he became fascinated by the nascent college, Frazer put his own work aside. “I had a couple of publications in 1969, one in ’68. Then in ’70 I had only one . . . 1969-73 was an interruption in my research, but I got back into it.”

The final draft to the Senate was written in three parts, reflecting the work of three major subcommittees: one on admissions, another on curriculum, and, finally, one on governance.

Admissions

The admissions section predictably called for minority groups to make up the preponderant portion of the college’s population and said enrollments would be halted whenever the minority population dropped below 70 percent of the whole. First- and second-year students would be the recruiters of high school candidates. It made no attempt to define scholastic eligibility, but said the existing admissions criteria were “unfair and culturally biased” and would have to change “first for Lumumba-Zapata College and then for the University as a whole.”

Curriculum

The section on curriculum called for the college to depart from “a dehumanizing academic and formal isolation of the ‘humanities’ from the sciences and the ‘social sciences.’” It was to be at all times strongly interdisciplinary and inclusive because the needs and aspirations of American ethnic minorities “cannot in some sense be seen outside of their relationship to those of Western civilization.” White students would be educated to minority views. The prevailing method would be inductive and practical; the experiences of the students would be related to their communities, and then to the world. The rich, new soil to be turned would require new scholastic tools, such as departments of Commu-

“We thought we could have this intimate level of student-faculty administrative governance of the college. We also thought there were some special (requirements) for minority education, particularly relevant curriculum. And we were also naive in thinking that kids who had a bad education up to that point could somehow miraculously be turned on and their whole potential would come through, despite many years of neglect. All that was just naive idealism.”

William Frazer
ication, Third World Studies, and Urban Studies. It would be possible for students to combine those new tools with the more tested disciplines as they fashioned their own majors. In the education subcommittee report, the planners said,

The curriculum for Lumumba-Zapata College must have the built-in possibilities for change. It is conceivable, for instance, that it should be reviewed and revised where needed on a yearly basis.

And a Future Government

The governance section had the fire of the original plan, too. But it included a disclaimer at its beginning that would prove troublesome later; it conceded that “the rules by which the University, its campuses, and their subdivisions are governed are complex” and it left to the permanent faculty of the college guided, of course, by Division (Senate) regulations and precedents the precise organization and structure of the college.

After that unmistakable blink of the revolutionary eye, the proposal then went on to define the college’s sovereignty in more radical terms. The government would rest on a full assembly to which all staff, students, and faculty automatically belonged. The executive arm would consist of two faculty members, three students, and a provost who could not chair the meetings. They could be recalled by the assembly at any time. They would tell departments who should be hired and would even have the power to deal out available openings to the departments they chose. It was their duty to review classroom performance of instructors. Always, in all sections, the planning committee made clear to the Senate that what had been put together in less than two weeks might well not last. “The educational program is so very difficult that it is unlikely that any program we devise at this time will pass the test of even one year without desirable modifications becoming apparent,” read one clause.

Almost apologetically, the committee entered caveats that the document “is tentative,” that “much consultation is still required,” that future members of the college would have to approve details not then fixed for Senate study. It had begun to seem daunting, this planning of a college.

The Senate Balks: “A College Should Have a Chief”

The report was handed to the Senate’s Committee on Educational Policy (CEP) on May 22, 1969, two weeks and a day after the Registrar’s Office incident and the Senate’s request for an outline. The CEP replied gently but unmistakably in the negative two weeks later. Could the planners justify in educational terms the banking of special admissions and scholarships in its effort to concentrate on ethnic minorities? Was it legal? Was it discrimination? Would its intention to grow slowly, so that attractive student-faculty ratios could be maintained, cause a strain on other colleges that would have to swell in order to accept the “other” qualified high school grads? Without offering a reason, the committee implied its opposition to giving the college power to, in effect, construct the departments.

On the all-important question of governance, which the Senate as a whole had seemed to approve, the CEP said simply,

University regulations require that a college have a chief administrative officer. It is not clear from the governance report whether, and if so, how, the provost intended to play that rôle. The academic plan should identify the chief administrative officer and clarify his relationship with the executive board.

Senate, Divided, Asks for Full Plan in Fall

Even though the CEP’s reception of the preliminary plan was tepid, the Senate as a body earlier, on
May 28, had voted to direct Frazer and its other members who were working on the plan to continue building the college plan through the summer, urging McGill to fund the effort. McGill himself spoke in favor of a measure that loaned faculty from other colleges for the year of planning and a following year of teaching until Third’s own administration, whatever form it might take, could hire. The resolution of the Senate as a whole had been mildly complimentary of the efforts of this strange partnership “for (its) extensive efforts of the past two weeks.” The Senate asked the planners to return with “a completed and duly processed Academic Plan . . . early in the Fall quarter.”

But the CEP’s response and analysis a few days later made clear that there was strong resistance on the committee, particularly where the curriculum departed from tradition. In the fall, the all-important CEP could have a lot to say about the plan that could throw the coming summer’s effort to the breeze. “Just because the program is innovative,” the CEP advised, “it would be desirable to provide somewhat greater detail than has been included in earlier (Revelle’s and Muir’s) academic plans.” (Emphasis added.) It warned that only the curriculum could “provide the justification for any special arrangements which place unusual requirements on the rest of the (campus) and on our Senate administrative procedures.” A sentence later it used the word “problem” to describe Third’s proposed courses.

That they managed to come up with a plan the Academic Senate could review (much less praise faintly) in the two weeks they’d spent together might have several explanations. The Senate’s attention was being drawn at the end of May to the alarming spectacle of street warfare in Berkeley, where Governor Reagan (who was, after all, chairman of the Board of Regents) had allowed the National Guard, state police, and Berkeley police to tear gas and round up students as he attempted to quell the People’s Park uprising. One person had been shot and killed, and the San Diego Senate had sent delegations to the scene in an attempt to determine to what extent the entire university was threatened by the action. At the end of May the Senate met four times on the matter, as well as to consider a new policy on guest lecturers inspired by the appearance on campus of hot new cultural and political figures. There was much to worry about, and it might have been easier to put off a confrontation with the Lumumba-Zapata coalition.

On the other hand, the preliminary plan was persuasive. It could draw on the manifesto that figures as diverse as Blanco, Lowe, Angela Davis, students, and, perhaps, Marcuse had already collaborated on. It could not be said to have been the work of only two weeks.

Finally, Senate members were looking across the aisles at student, non-voting delegates (twenty-eight non-Senate members were still being allowed into the meetings) whom in some cases they’d met in Frazer’s house. Some of those students were the same students who had pressed for a black studies program at Revelle a year earlier. It might have been difficult to defer their dream.

Signs in the gym show UCSD student support for the UC Berkeley students during the People’s Park uprising.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Academic Requirements</th>
<th>Rappaport Plan</th>
<th>Lumumba-Zapata Demands</th>
<th>Third College Academic Plan</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>To Graduate</td>
<td>180 or 36 five-unit courses</td>
<td>Not Specified</td>
<td>180</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Departments</td>
<td>Anthropology; APIS; biology; chemistry; economics; history; history of the arts; literature; math; philosophy; physics; political science; social issues; sociology.</td>
<td>Theory and practice of revolutions; economic systems; science and technology; health sciences and public health; urban and rural development; communications arts; foreign languages; cultural heritage; white studies.</td>
<td>Interdepartmental departments: Third World Studies, urban &amp; rural development, health science, communication arts, APIS; Interdepartmental planned: literature sciences, pre-law, environmental design and engineering</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Breadth Requirements</td>
<td>History, 10 units; philosophy, 5 units; reading and writing, 10 units; social science, 10 units; math and natural science, 20 units.</td>
<td>Not specified.</td>
<td>Third World Studies, 12 units; urban and rural development, 12 units; communication arts, 12 units; science and technology, 16 units.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College Size</td>
<td>About 2000; 300 during the first year.</td>
<td>Not specified.</td>
<td>No change from Reveille and Muir; 150 during first year.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Admissions</td>
<td>Recruitment of disadvantaged; prior training (during high school) at UCSD.</td>
<td>35% Black and 35% Brown; control of admissions by committee of minority students; UC requirements not binding.</td>
<td>General Admissions Average of 3.0 or higher; includes high school GPA or SAT score; BPA (Background Motivation, and Persistence Average), gathered from interviews; letters of reference; seven-year experiment for this formula for admissions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Governance</td>
<td>Students and townspeople to join faculty as advisers to provost; Provost's Council with La Jollans and San Diegans; Board of Senior Fellows; faculty members in residence halls as four year advisers to students.</td>
<td>Board of Directors; role on hiring of staff (FT's); two students elected by student body annually; one faculty representative elected by college faculty; Board has final decision for choice of provost; provost can be recalled by Board; provost acts as administrative head; budget for college finalized ahead of other colleges, whose budgets can be reviewed by Board.</td>
<td>Board of Directors with three students and three faculty advisory to provost; organization temporary until college opening; bylaws to be approved by members of college.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Architecture</td>
<td>Mostly wood; low structures; faculty offices spread throughout academic buildings; dorms: 60 residents and room for 30 commuters; singles; doubles; apartments; kitchen units; separate dining units; squash courts and outdoor pool; auditorium; concert-lecture-drama production hall.</td>
<td>Mexican-African style; landscape appropriate; planning and construction from minority community; bonds held by minority financial institution.</td>
<td>Design not officially indicated; minority contractors and contractors and construction preferred; undergrads, grads, married students, faculty planned for inclusion in dorms.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Participation</td>
<td>Provost's Council, endowments by philanthropists sought; student &quot;lab work&quot; in major in community, if appropriate; tutoring in area high schools; lectures for members of community; representation of community on committees.</td>
<td>Recruitment of students in community by students and other members of college.</td>
<td>Community university centers in San Diego; counseling, tutoring; University Extension courses available on spot; teacher-education program; recruitment by students and faculty of minority students.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

creation of the new departments of Third World Studies, Communication, and Urban and Rural Studies. Frazer convinced the CEP that the plan could be considered without an explicit endorsement of department status for those programs. It was the first sign of what would become concerted resistance to the core programs.

Soon after the CEP expressed its reluctance to approve new departments, evidence of much deeper resistance arose in the form of a lengthy letter from the Department of Anthropology, then being lead by Professor Marc Swartz, to the CEP. It challenged the combined activist-intellectual and socialist-influenced plan of the committee on many fronts, raising point after point that later critics of Third College would also raise.

The inclusive broadness of the Third World definition, the anthropologists said, “seems largely to coincide with race, white and non-white . . . and, through separatism, to perpetuate rather than help extinguish a racial view of the world.”

The anthropologists were worried about politics creeping into classrooms where none had existed before. It was one thing to talk about the ruination visited upon Third World countries by the colonial powers. “The term (Third World) has some political justification in the common experience of colonized peoples,” the anthropologists wrote,

But the political may easily become the politicized and in this respect as well as the racial one mentioned above, the incoming Third College student may find himself segregated onto a narrow ideological island to which he is precommitted by the very charter of the Third College as it is now proposed . . . we urge that the Third College Program should be depoliticized in tone and intent.

The still formless Urban and Rural Studies program came in for far less criticism, but was “so all encompassing as to make the intention unclear.” They felt friendly toward the venture, but pointed out that anthropology already offered courses in the area of study, as did sociology.
**Patrick Ledden**  
Provost, Muir College.

**Q: There is a (program or course) at Muir College called Contemporary Issues/Cultural Traditions. How does this program or course relate to Third World Studies?**

**A:** Contemporary Issues/Cultural Traditions preceded Third World Studies. Muir College preceded Third College. In the early days of Muir College, we had a rather different general-education scheme than we presently have. It was in fact more an echo of Revelle than the present Muir scheme is. One of the early requirements was a variation on the humanities sequence. The idea was that students from Muir would complete a one-year course in some culture. The theory was that the course would be tied to a language requirement, so you would study the language and the culture.

Unfortunately, some of the earlier cultures covered were those from India and China and places where the language was not quite so obvious, like France or Spain, so you couldn’t count on the students coming into class with it. The language part of cultural traditions broke off very quickly. In that sense I suppose it’s possible to say that in the Cultural Traditions course some non-Western cultures were being studied, but there was at least... in some sense, there might have been some tie to the third world. Although the emphasis was more on culture.

Third World Studies often carries with it the notion of political and economic history rather than cultural history; it doesn’t have to, but it communicates that it does. I think the emphasis in the early Cultural Traditions sequences was on the culture of Africa, or on parts of Africa. In that sense, there may have been some precursor of Third World Studies, but I think not.

Then we decided to change the Muir curriculum to make it a less requirement-driven curriculum, and we developed this thing which at one time was called the Chinese menu. We had two sides to the world, the science side and the non-science side. And on the science side, there was social science, natural science, and mathematics, and on the other side was the foreign language, humanities and fine arts, and then, what to do with the cultural traditions? Well, it played kind of a swing role.

But over time, these interdisciplinary courses turned out to be very difficult to support... faculty interest is for the most part disciplinary rather than interdisciplinary... so that department prerogatives were gradually asserted... gradually the numbers of these cultural tradition sequences declined and I think about the only two that we regularly offer now are Cultural Traditions—Judaic, which has a long, almost separate history, and the women’s study cultural traditions course, which is drawing a pretty substantial number of students and by its nature has to be interdisciplinary. But those are really just vestiges; the title now, “Cultural Traditions,” is almost a vestigial title, but it is a convenient way for me to offer year-long sequences of an interdisciplinary kind. But their relation in a current state of affairs to Third World Studies or Urban and Rural Studies is quite marginal...

“Contemporary Issues” had some sort of requirement role in the early days. I don’t even know what was in those early courses. What it is now is a kind of blanket title for courses of an interdisciplinary or nondepartmental kind, so we teach... a course in use of the library, and for many years Provost Stewart taught a course called CI 20, Lola Ross teaches CI 22, Human Sexuality; there will be a course, CI 2, taught next quarter, which will be a sort of man and environment class. Next year, I hope in the spring quarter to have a course on AIDS, so that is what Contemporary Issues is for, courses that don’t have a natural departmental home; they are often interdisciplinary or cross-disciplinary. It used to be that each college had such a title.

**Q: What sort of influence did the Urban and Rural Studies program have on the other colleges, if it had any?**

**A:** One of the things we did in Warren College, sort of a preprofessional thing, was interning, and the model already existed in Urban Studies. Urban Studies in those days had a required internship. And that was the model we used and that’s really what is now the whole Warren Internship Program, the one they run for the whole campus, that really grew up, no question, grew out of the one that existed in Urban Studies. The model was the Urban Studies program.

*Interview by Lisa Collins*
The Major Counter-Arguments Emerge

In matters of governance, particularly faculty hiring, the anthropologists were plainly offended by the suggestion students could “carefully evaluate the work of each candidate as only people with full professional competence and experience in a field can do.” Here again, politics would be the result of student hiring as “surface impressions and particularly political style and ideological stance might become the criteria for selection and veto.”

Virtually all the issues of the struggle that would ensue had been set down by Swartz’s department. Third’s proposed use of the social sciences and humanities in combination (so as “to combat dehumanizing academic and formal isolation,” read the plan) was quickly seen as too unfocused by the traditional disciplines and awakened an uneasiness that might have had something to do with academic turf and the distribution of jobs. When the anthropologists criticized “nearly exclusive concentration on Black and Brown cultures, art and perspectives” because it would lead to “separatism” and segregation, they seemed to be speaking of reverse racism. They believed the hiring of faculty by competent academics “must be especially stressed in the case of the so-called Third World Studies lest they become—and come to be viewed—as inferior in quality to Western Studies,” a final caveat that carried the implication that Western Studies could survive academically quite well on its own, if Third World Studies might not. That debate still rages today, all over American campuses.

The CEP Wavers

As the year drew to a close, more people weighed in with suggestions to the CEP, not all of them unfriendly. Influential physicist Sheldon Schultz worried that the Frazer plan failed to address compensatory education for students whose high school instruction left them unready for the university disciplines, “particularly math and science” (though Doolittle and biology professor Willie Brown had been designing courses with that problem in mind, and Thiess had made provisions for fundamental instruction as well). Schultz also suggested that economics be emphasized by the school, a “practical, applied economics . . . which could be invaluable to breaking the cycle of minority community poverty.”

By December of 1969 the CEP had held twelve meetings, three of them public hearings to solicit opinions, and had failed to develop real confidence in the plan. On the matter of a special policy to admit greater numbers of minority students, it could come to no agreement whatsoever. This was more than a little disturbing, inasmuch as the college plan would still have to win the hearts and minds of the full Senate and, after that, those of the regents, in time for students to be admitted, the school to be funded, and faculty to be put in place with course outlines by the fall of 1970.

The CEP seemed to be throwing up its hands in frustration over the curriculum plan as well. On the morning of December 1, it failed to approve the curriculum element on a tie vote. A motion to send out to the full Academic Senate only those elements it could agree on failed also. With that, the chairman of the Senate decided to call a meeting of the full Senate on December 8 so that floor debate could start, with or without a CEP report. The next day, the CEP managed to pass a report out to the full Senate.

It was very qualified.

CEP Tells Senate It’s Worried

It suggested that the question of a policy that would vary from the university’s admissions standards so that minority attendance could be increased be put off altogether.

But the CEP was saying that in its meetings with Frazer and others no clear consensus of agreement on the plan had emerged, and an uneasy tone slipped into the report following those hearty first words. It judged that the Third College planners believed they could overcome whatever academic deficiencies its targeted students brought with them simply by motivating those students. “There is no basis upon which one could be assured of the success of such an approach.” Kroll’s introduction urged, no doubt to the relief of most of the planners, that Third not be pressed to grow as rapidly as the rest of the campus was growing, and that Muir and Revelle prepare themselves to accept consequently greater loads of qualified students.
Curriculum Concerns

The CEP recommended that the Academic Senate approve the plan (minus the admissions formula) but with a strong suggestion that in the not too distant future Third change its curriculum. The CEP was accepting the required core of Third World Studies, Communication, Urban and Rural Studies, and Science and Technology programs "as a satisfactory center for the Third College program." But in its recommendation it stated, "It is perhaps not the only possible center consistent with Third College and the development of alternate ways of satisfying the general education requirement would be desirable."

Admissions Concerns

On the morning of December 8 the CEP met again, hoping to come to an agreement on the admissions portions of the plan and also to hear the reactions of Provost Paul Saltman of Revelle and Provost John Stewart of Muir to the portions of the plan that would directly affect their colleges—the teaching loads and class sizes at Third. Stewart seemed satisfied his college could afford possibly larger classes and even suggested that the fury of creating a college might tax Third College faculty to the point that they could not participate in general campus affairs.

Saltman, on the other hand, "felt that intensive teaching by faculty is unrealistic over an extended period of time," according to the minutes of the meeting, and "was concerned with CEP's suggestion that the other colleges accept the added burden if Third College has problems." He suggested that Fourth College might have to be opened earlier.

As to the question of admissions, the committee continued to differ. Chairman Francis Halpern adjourned the CEP, sending the plan he had shepherded for months, ever since his meetings with the coalition on those late winter days in his friend's house, to the full Senate for its debate.

January 1970: Senate Gets Third College's Plan Again

What reached the Senate floor was a plan that began with a quote from a revolutionary of another time, George Washington, on the subject of education and freedom:

Knowledge is in every country the surest basis of public happiness, for the people themselves must learn to know and value their own rights; to discern and provide against invasion of them; to distinguish between oppression and the necessary exercise of lawful authority.

George Washington,
Message to Congress
January 8, 1790

Its tone was not as militant, nor its contents Marxist. Where the Lumumba-Zapata document warned that "contradictions which sustained America in the past are now threatening to annihilate the entire social edifice," the Frazer committee plan stated, "Today, our society is in the process of a moral, social, and technological evolution." Still, the planning committee's manifesto mentioned rats and reaches in the city slums, malnutrition, racism, and inadequate schools; it pointed to oppressive cycles of poverty and disenfranchisement among the rural poor of the labor camps, as it justified a program that would bring knowledge to those who wanted to change the conditions.

Plan Contained No Details on Governance

The plan had sections on general education, core programs, degree requirements, and graduate and undergraduate services.

But one of the most glaring omissions, in retrospect, was that of a detailed accounting of college governance. The Frazer committee simply presented four paragraphs that offered polite arguments in support of the notion that "Students and faculty will need to cooperate closely in all aspects of the college, with a fundamental educational role assigned to students... it is essential that students have a clear voice in the decision-making bodies of the college." There was no mention of a Board of Directors, nor of...
its makeup and the powers of its members, nor even of a provost or chief officer and the powers of that office. Instead, bowing to the original request/demand of the summer’s Third College Planning Committee led by Frazer, the CEP passed on to the full Senate a decision that “The details of this organization are to be specified in the college by-laws, which are to be formulated by the members of the college.”

Years later, a common misconception would grow that the outline of a Board of Directors with student membership, as the Lumumba-Zapata coalition had called for, was included in the Senate’s approved plan but only in an appendix on which the Senate did not vote. However, no section that fixed the methods by which important college decisions would be reached was included anywhere, front, middle, or back; nor did the members of the Senate so much as discuss or note the absence of such a detailed plan, according to minutes of the day’s meeting. In fact, not even the title of provost appears in the document, much less the powers of the office.

The Senate Approves All but Governance, Admissions

The appendices addressed the requisite new departments, the formula for admissions that was still not approved by the CEP, and separate models for recruitment and motivation of students offered by the BSC and MEChA-MAYA. These the Senate was careful to say it was not voting on.

Halpern was given the job of presenting the plan to the full body. Discussion moved quickly to a point where members felt it necessary to point out that if the curriculum was being offered tentatively, then any revisions would have to pass the CEP in subsequent months, or years. Several members launched an attempt to convert the CEP’s recommendations about grading standards and anticipated curriculum revisions, as well as its call for review of “student involvement in college programs,” into more mandatory language. Frazer, then Halpern, fought off those amendments. By secret ballot, the Senate passed the plan 114 to 14.

The Senate next turned to the problem of admissions, which had vexed the CEP and, as well, the student-faculty group that Frazer had led during the summer. One of the problems was that the Lumumba-Zapata coalition had never come to grips with the need to establish at the least a set of criteria on which to build a special admissions formula. They’d written that the college would be 35 percent black and 35 percent Mexican-American to be selected by an admissions committee controlled by minority students—all of which never came to pass. But even if the Senate had agreed to let students run the admissions program, the lack of any objective standard would have meant admissions were open to any and all comers.
The university was using mainly high school grade points and the Scholastic Aptitude Test. Those were the criteria that the Lumumba-Zapata coalition had said “must not be used as an instrument for excluding minority students.” It also had the special admit category, which allowed 4 percent of the new class to fall below the minimum admission standards set by the regular formula. But 4 percent did not provide the numbers needed to populate Third. And at any rate Third’s new leadership found the category offensive. The problem wasn’t with the minorities, they were saying, it was with the university admissions policy.

**The BMPA Admissions Formula Clears the Senate**

Frazer, other faculty, and a handful of students thought they could see a way to modify the standard admissions formula. It was to add a new factor to the equation, something they called, with socially scientific style, the BMPA. The acronym stood for Background, Motivation, and Persistence Average. The BMPA may have looked unfamiliar amidst the other acronyms of admissions algebra, but it did fit neatly into the existing formula. Using the terms of administrative art, which were the GAA (general admissions average), the GPA (grade point average), the SAT (Scholastic Aptitude Test), and the RA (letter of recommendation), this is what Third’s committee came up with:

![GPA formula](image)

The BMPA would be a numerical value standing for the subjective qualities that could predict a student’s success. It would be computed from the responses of applicants to questions asked by recruiters. Nothing was mentioned about race or social status or political advantage whatsoever. The plan included an outline of questions aimed at revealing an applicant’s judgment, commitment, ability to endure, and interest in education. It was called an experiment and was to last seven years.

Whatever else the Senate’s own admissions committee may have thought of the student-faculty creation, it had balked at the weights given the more subjective factors, the BMPA and the RA, or letters of recommendation. It proposed that the BMPA and the GPA weights be adjusted to equivalence, and the RA be reduced in relation to them. The committee’s suggested formula looked like this:

![Adjusted GPA formula](image)

In retrospect, however, the insertion into the formula of a wholly new and untried factor equal to the august and almost unassailable SAT and GPA was a victory. When the BMPA formula was passed into the full Senate for a vote, a special session was called. The Senate was unconvincing.

After much debate, a joint committee of the Senate and the Third planners was formed and told to submit a compromise before January 7. The plan that returned to the Senate January 6 differed little from the original, and the revolutionary BMPA remained. But the Senate accepted it. In the final voice vote, not a single nay could be heard.

**BMPA Fails to Win Over Berkeley in February**

Immediately after the Senate approval bad news came down from Berkeley. The university’s statewide admissions office told a UCSD representative that a plan that might exclude qualified high school graduates could never be accepted.

Berkeley hadn’t exactly said no. Staff members sent down some suggestions that momentarily gave the planners some hope. But by February 1970, when both the BMPA admissions plan and the master academic plan, which had been kept separate, were about to go before the Board of Regents, UCSD withdrew its strange admissions plan from consideration.
Student Recruiters on the Road

Since 1969 recruiting had been conducted on an informal footing, with MAYA/MEChA and BSC members fanning out to San Diego high schools looking for likely classmates. On occasion, even Carlos Blanco and no less a figure than disarmament authority and two-time Acting Chancellor Herbert York visited the schools and their counselors to pitch the still-unopened college.

One of Third’s earliest student recruiters, Chato Benitez, is still at it today as director of programs for the Early Outreach Office. Benitez entered UCSD in the fall of 1968 after graduating from Lincoln High School and remembers that in 1969 he was meeting Registrar Harold Temmer, who couldn’t be blamed for what Benitez describes as an edgy encounter; Temmer’s office had only the previous spring been occupied by people like Benitez. Despite the tension, Benitez and Temmer agreed to cooperate on channeling special admit students to Third. Benitez also succeeded in getting vice chancellor of Undergraduate Affairs, George Murphy, another veteran of the Lumumba-Zapata confrontation when he was McGill’s right hand, to provide money to the BSC and to MAYA for their forays into inner cities and agricultural towns.

Benitez remembers cramming with six others into a university car in October 1969 on their first trip to the Imperial Valley’s El Centro High School, where they stepped into 110 degrees as they entered the gym to recruit. “A lot of the kids just wanted to know where the place (UCSD) was. Some had seen it from their parents’ cars driving up Old Highway 101, up there on the hill, through the trees, and thought it was a private college.”

Most often, counselors would talk to recruiters about likely students before the meetings. Sometimes students were given passes into the interviewing areas. At one meeting a few students burst into the room to demand to speak to Benitez and his cohort. The counselors had judged them ill prepared, although they had decent averages and were interested.

“From then on we demanded to see all Mexicans and blacks with at least a 3.0 GPA,” Benitez says. Vince de Baca, who entered UCSD in 1968 from Kearny High, also recruited and says he distrusted counselors as well, and often went to teachers instead for advice on students.

Benitez says that Patrick Ledden, now provost at Muir, along with Blanco and, later, Joe Watson, were among the most involved faculty. Ledden worked hard while he was chair of the Special Action Committee, reviewing applicants who might enter under the special 4 percent rule. “He was always there when we needed him,” Benitez says.

Vince de Baca was one of the more political and militant of the recruiters and sometimes threw the Chicano gospel into his school presentations. He says he can remember visiting Mar Vista High School in San Ysidro, at the border, wearing a “Viva La Revolucion” pin on his fatigue and nearly shouting his speech to seniors there. A week later the high schoolers had staged a walkout to pressure the school to provide more community-based programs against drugs and other local problems. Vince de Baca insists that the recruiters didn’t look for the most radical students, but that the people they chose “fit the university requirements and were radical.”

Vince de Baca says he and six other Third students were “fired” from their recruiting positions by Joe Watson two years later when they defied the new, universitywide recruiting office and sent acceptance letters to students who had not been approved for admission by the central recruiters.

One of the people recruited by de Baca (he also remembers talking to Israel Chaves and Milan Lalic Molina) was Francisco Estrada, today an aide to San Diego City Council member Bob Filner. He entered in the first freshman class of fall 1970 after graduating from Lincoln High School and went to work almost immediately for the EOP office, which was the campuswide recruiting unit. Either through EOP or through TRAC, Third College’s own recruiting unit,
the ethic of turning students into recruiters, even if they had just enrolled, was an idea that not only had the support of faculty and early administrators like Frazer and Watson, but was also what they had in mind from the beginning. Estrada says,

On the whole, we weren’t just looking at the kid’s GPA. We recruited some who were more activist, who showed some social consciousness. One thing we looked for was an interest in world affairs, an interest in trying to improve the community. We looked at those students who displayed leadership skills. We felt those (traits) demonstrated potential.

Estrada later went to work for TRAC as well, which was more involved with locating special admit students. Thus it was often students who found other students. To a real extent, Third was being passed from hand to hand. With or without the BMPA, students were having an effect on the nature of other students who attended Third.

The Press and TV Waken

Had the regents known that students were taking a significant part in generating the incoming class at Third, the college might never have won their approval. Having lived with a very popular and very conservative governor who, as one administrator puts it, “had campaigned against the university,” the regents were sensitive to accusations that they were yielding too much authority. By the middle of 1969 administrators on campus and in Berkeley were getting letters from private citizens accusing them of “giving in to a minority” and “losing control” of the campuses.

The newspapers, too, seemed overly sensitive to attack for ignoring what was happening “on our nation’s campuses.” The two local papers, long the flagships of a conservative private chain, were printing almost daily letters to the editor attacking Marcuse and demanding that McGill not be confirmed as chancellor. When the La Mesa Republican Women’s Club demanded the removal of both men, the Tribune duly reported the fact. The campaign against McGill heated up further when conservative Republican legislators demanded the same late in March.

The papers could no more ignore the drumbeat of reaction than they could publish without ink. The demands of the Lumumba-Zapata coalition the previous spring had seemed to slip past the notice of editors and reporters, perhaps because they were preoccupied by the issues being raised by the right: Marcuse’s reappointment and the blockade in February of a Marine sent to recruit on campus. Five days after the initial meeting with McGill, the Union had reported the Lumumba-Zapata demands on the twelfth page of its local section. A week later came the Union’s second story on the new demands, a speech given to a La Jolla Kiwanis Club by several students. Neither of the local papers nor the Los Angeles Times seemed able, immediately, to grasp the extremes of what was being suggested by the coalition, even though the campus newspaper, The Triton Times, was struggling, with good effect, to keep up with the March and April negotiations among McGill, the Senate, and the student-faculty coalition.

The Registrar’s Office occupation was a bell in the night for the Copley papers, finally moving Third into its place in the devil’s bestiary of local politics. The initial call that went out from the Union and Tribune city desks sending photographers to the scene said that “Black students” had taken over the office. The stories the next day were long. The Tribune corrected the initially biased reaction and observed that there were white occupiers of the office as well as black. The subsequent coverage included attacks by Republican legislators and editorials condemning “anarchy.” The editorial writers and, to a much greater extent, the letter writers seemed to have been angered most by the granting of amnesty to all occupiers save the one who broke the glass. One irate citizen suggested that the district attorney should have filed charges of breaking and entering against the fifty-two students and should have named administrators accomplices for having condoned the act.
The Shooting and Arrest of Sam Jordan

One night in mid-November 1969, Sam Jordan was shot by a sheriff’s deputy as he and his wife, Fania, turned back an attempt to arrest them in their Del Mar home. For a year and a half afterward, while the two students fought attempted murder and other felony charges, Fania and Sam Jordan’s story was simply one more of a multitude that emanated from Third College, albeit one of the most dramatic and symbolic.

Though they were charged once and then brought into appellate court by a then-new and zealous district attorney, the Jordans never spent a day in jail. Their exoneration and vindication seemed to have escaped the notice of a press that otherwise had shown interest in the district attorney’s pursuit of the Jordans.

According to friends, the two had been angered with each other when Fania left the house the evening of November 17. She was hitchhiking very close to the house she and Sam were renting when two sheriff’s deputies, Bert Moorhead and James Palmer, stopped to question her.

According to court records, Sam saw the three and joined the scene, trying to get Fania to walk away. The record shows that Sam was himself then frisked for weapons. He was made to show identification. Sam told the two deputies he and Fania were having a family dispute and that the deputies would not have detained the couple if they had been white, after which, the court said, the two deputies told Sam he was under arrest.

According to the records, as Moorhead started to handcuff Sam, Fania attacked Moorhead, showing him enough to allow Sam to twist out of the deputy’s grasp. With the deputies in pursuit, both ran back to the house, where Sam managed to get his hands on a canceled check proving Fania and he were married, or at least had the same name. The court record shows that Sam ordered the deputies to “get out of my house. You don’t have a search warrant.” Moorhead said it was too late for that and insisted Sam was under arrest.

Another struggle broke out in which Sam, according to the court, managed to wrestle Moorhead to a couch. Palmer joined the fight, jumping on top of Sam. Fania began striking Moorhead in the face, which allowed Sam to escape into the bedroom, from which he emerged bearing a shotgun the court later said was unloaded. This prompted Moorhead to draw his weapon while Fania continued to pummel him. Four of five shots were deflected as Fania struck at Moorhead’s hand. One bullet pierced Sam’s shoulder.

Wounded, Sam retreated into the bedroom once more, causing the deputies to fear another retaliation. The court papers show that the deputies left the house and took up positions behind a vehicle in the street. Two shots were fired from the house; debris from one stung a deputy in the face. The police left.

When Sam showed up in the emergency room of Scripps Memorial Hospital for treatment of the shoulder wound, he was arrested.

Fania had sought help from fellow student and BSC member Sidney Glass, and was arrested when sheriff’s deputies traced her the next day to a house in Cardiff. Glass was also arrested on the second day for harboring a fugitive.

The Jordans were each charged with two counts of attempted murder of the deputies, and two counts each of assault with a deadly weapon.

By January 1970 the two leading teachers at Third, Joe Watson and Carlos Blanco, had started a defense fund for the Jordans, also adding to its beneficiaries Izzie Chaves, in trouble with San Diego police for his role in violence down in the barrio of central San Diego over dislocations there. Charges against Glass had been dropped.

Fundraisers were held, including at least one at the home of Jonas Salk and his wife, Francoise Gilot. The Jordans were being represented by Louis Katz, a talented defense attorney who in later years would head the San Diego County office for the defense of indigents.

After the arraignments of the Jordans, Superior Court Judge Robert Staniforth dismissed the case, ruling that the deputies had insufficient reason to detain either of the Jordans. District Attorney Ed Miller, new then, and still in the office today, appealed the case. On August 19, 1971, unnoted by the local press, Justice Gerald Brown and the court of appeals upheld Staniforth and found that there was no probable cause to arrest or frisk Sam Jordan and that “the police acted outside the scope of their authority and were aggressors . . . up to the time they reached the house.” The Court of Appeals dismissed the charges. The Jordans were free to resume their lives.

At about the time of the second dismissal, Sidney Glass was spending a year in graduate school at Yale (later to return to UCSD for several years to serve as resident dean) and was detained briefly by a New Haven policeman. “He wanted to know, of course, what a black man was doing in the neighborhood,” Glass says, adding that he told the policeman he was wanted for no crime. The officer told Glass to stay where he was while he checked the national crime computer. According to Glass, he came back, saying, “I know who you are, Sidney, you got into some trouble for trying to kill a California officer, huh?” Glass had to spend some time downtown before being released.

by Joe Finley
Third Becomes a News Staple

The event had awakened a kind of media madness in which it was evident that good information was either not valued or was being ignored. People saw in the event what they wanted to see. While the Union and Tribune the first day were convinced the occupation was an act of black action groups (perhaps envisioning a sort of Watts riot in academe), a writer to the La Jolla Light said the raiders were, but for one, all white and likened them to Nazi youth who planned “a series of confrontations aimed at establishing a totalitarian power.” As fearful readers and editors began to understand that the Academic Senate had all but declared Lumumba-Zapata College a reality, the letter writers began attacking that body. By now inaugurated, McGill remained a target: his “lack of spine . . . makes one wonder how he remains upright,” wrote a Vista resident to the Union. Another termed the actions of McGill and the Senate “limp-wristed treatment of campus anarchists,” and another nearly a month after the occupation called it “a destructive tantrum by student goons.”

The new chancellor seemed to have gained strength from the on-campus resolution of the conflict, and by June he was in the community making speeches that attempted to place the demonstrations in a context of permissible political action. He told the Union that campus disruption was rooted in social problems “for which youngsters are not responsible” and that the students were idealists who were aiming not at the university but at those social deficiencies. Curiously, the fury of the letters seemed to subside with the coming of summer.

But the intensity and virulence of public reaction to the May occupation and the Senate’s simultaneous approval of the plan had established Third as a staple item of coverage and the papers began covering Third more closely, sometimes with suspicion.

Regents Visit January 1970

In early January 1970, as the regents were about to visit the campus as part of their review of Third’s Academic Plan, a critical press was very much on McGill’s mind. “I am most anxious,” he wrote each regent, “to put this plan before the regents in circumstances that assure the consideration of the actual events and conditions here, rather than representations (of them) in the press.”

From the left, former UC President Charles Hitch, Regent DeWitt Higgs, and Governor Ronald Reagan at a regents’ meeting in San Diego.
Chapter 2

Summer to Summer 1969-70: Struggling toward Operations

Frazer’s Twenty Plan a College

That summer, the coalition members and their faculty coworkers went back to work. “They hired me, paid me,” remembers Bennie Chaves, a MAYA member who is today a psychiatrist in Northern California. He worked on the communication subcommittee with Varon, and with Joe Watson, the young chemist, who was also interested in the subject. According to Chavez:

Communications theory was really in vogue then . . . (the feeling was) if you could understand media you could educate people on how to get the word out to their communities. We were in a communications revolution even then, but I think only now people are beginning to understand that in large numbers.

When Armin Rappaport resigned in 1969, Chancellor McGill named William Frazer as acting provost. Supported by $64,000 McGill released from his discretionary fund, ten students and ten faculty members broke down into subgroups on curriculum and governance, with Frazer in the lead. Third World Studies was planned by Blanco, with writer and German literature professor Reinhard Lettau, sociologist Joseph Gusfield, BSU activist Sidney Glass, and de Baca. For the African and black readings they were guided by the list of Keith Lowe, the banished literature professor; it included Frantz Fanon’s Black Skin, White Masks, Kwame Nkrumah’s autobiography, Richard Wright’s Black Power, and Facing Mount Kenya, the reminiscences of Jomo Kenyatta, who had led Kenya to independence from Great Britain.
Basic Science and Mud Huts

In much the same way Doolittle was designing broad and inclusive basic science courses, Professor Frank Thiess designed mathematics courses that aimed to educate a student “to a point where he (was) ready to go into higher mathematics,” Frazer said in a contemporary account.

Visual artist Newton Harrison worked with student Joe Martinez on the design the campus might follow. Like the original manifesto of the coalition, the design group entertained some radical notions; in place of the Mexican-African architecture of the coalition’s famous demands, or perhaps recognizing that demand, the design group toyed with the notion of mudhuts for campus buildings. “The university was very young,” Martinez says. “A lot of the faculty members were very young.”

Eventually, the school contracted with a minority-owned firm of Los Angeles architects, who were not eager to work in the mud medium. According to Harrison:

People started out wanting to make mud huts and then the architects came in and asked what we really wanted and...um...it turned out Third College started to look like every other college except with more land around it because we made a big fight for a lot of land.”

When it was done, Varon paid tribute to the original Lumumba-Zapata plan and the coalition, telling a reporter for the La Jolla Light, “almost all the concepts in the present academic plan come from the students.”

The opening statement of Third College’s academic plan rang with the same passion as the earlier document presented McGill:

The college planned in detail here attempts to revitalize a humanitarian idea of higher education; it seeks to revitalize the view that a university must take as its first responsibility the education of citizens for public benefit...

Our cities and towns...are disfigured, wracked by violence which is directly linked to a cycle of poverty and disenfranchisement which oppresses millions and traps them in the dehumanized environment of the inner city...

And beyond the city, the same oppressive cycle of poverty and disenfranchisement infests workers’ camps, tenant farms, desert hogans, and Appalachian villages...

We must, we believe, accept the responsibility to alleviate these problems through our roles as educators.

Third’s Plan Gets a Friendly CEP Hearing

The delicate work of shepherding this first post-Lumumba-Zapata plan, the first plan to be built by faculty other than Carlos Blanco and Keith Lowe, fell to Acting Provost Bill Frazer. The task was probably made less difficult in the fall of 1969, thanks to the fact that the all-important Senate Committee on Educational Policy was no longer chaired by Norman Kroll, the man who the previous spring had written a warning against student participation in faculty appointments, mentioning the need for a true provost who would run the college, and referring to the preliminary core courses as “the curriculum problem” that would require greater clarity and development than did those of Revelle and Muir during their planning stages. Sitting in place of Kroll in the fall of 1969 was Francis Halpern, Frazer’s good friend, who was new to the committee. Also newly seated on the CEP was Carlos Blanco himself.

By mid-September, as the new school year began, the first draft by Frazer’s committee was in the hands of the CEP, which then scheduled two public hearings on the plan for mid-October and early November on the Matthews campus, where the new college would be located.

Anthropologists Attack TWS, URS

During the two months all aspects of the plan—curriculum, governance, admissions—were analyzed. Budget cuts looming over the Reagan administration’s horizon caused some to question the
Then Acting Provost Bill Frazer remembers:

None of us were sure how the regents were going to take the visit. For one thing, they were looking for good, creative, sound ways to do something positive—Urban Studies and so forth. On the other hand, the idea that there was some radical communist cell growing up at the college would have been . . .

McGill invited the regents down in small groups, three or four at a time (Reagan came in a group that included Ed Carter, chairman of The Broadway stores, Catherine Hearst, whose daughter would later tumble into the twilight fringe of the age’s movements, Edwin Pauley, chairman of Standard Oil of California and Reagan’s closest ally on the board, ultra-rightist Max Rafferty, and several moderates), and they would come meet with the Board of Directors. I was put in a small office and I still remember this round table. Six people could barely fit around it. There’d be three regents and a student or two and a faculty member or two.

You should have seen the dynamics of these regents spending several hours elbow to elbow with us. Remember, you couldn’t help but be moved by the sincerity of these (students). When you have them interspersed and in a small room . . . you don’t necessarily bring everybody around to your point of view, but at least you bring everybody around to understanding the kind of people who were working on the plan and the degree to which they were dedicated.

On February 19, 1970, when the regents met to review Third’s plan, McGill and Frazer were asked how Third would accomplish its mission if it could not have the admissions variance—an odd question considering the regent who asked it had been one of those opposed to the variance plan. McGill explained that the pool of qualified applicants would just have to be supplemented with others admitted under the 4 percent special category. He paid tribute to the BSC and MEChA’s humble recruiting program, explaining that the student recruiters were working with future applicants as young as high school sophomores, hoping to get them into course work that could lead them to regular admission.

Frazer was less sanguine, and warned that if it proved impossible to enroll significant numbers of minorities, and Third began simply enrolling already qualified minorities, it would not be meeting its goals.

**Regents Approve Academic Plan, February 20, 1970**

Third made headway that day. A few regents seemed moved. Several argued that Third was doing what the other campuses should have attempted to do, and that a more flexible admissions standard might one day be forced on the entire university. If they had rejected Third’s odd admissions formula because the entire system had to operate under one standard, then they ought to recognize that Third’s program featured changes that might benefit the entire system, Fred Dutton argued.

Almost quietly, the next day the full board approved the plan. Its presentation had to be made during a two-day session in which regents were preoccupied with a Reagan-inspired tuition hike and a review of the disastrous days of People’s Park. Frazer, who was there throughout the two days, says the plan passed without a dissenting vote.

**A Name, and a Board of Directors, Not Approved**

Since the previous summer, during which the plan was being generated, Frazer had been acting provost. Following the regents’ approval of Third College (there was still no official name; Frazer and McGill had simply refused to ask the regents to approve of Lumumba-Zapata), Frazer continued in that position, attending the newly formed Board of Directors meetings, writing letters, and otherwise acting as much the administrator as was possible. Now, because the regents simply had neither approved nor rejected the unique Board of Directors scheme of governance, the board functioned sheerly as an expression of campus will. As long as no official governing body chose to object, it might live on indefinitely without a struggle.

During the period from shortly after the takeover of the Registrar’s Office and into mid-1970, about a year and a half, the business of Third College,
its governance, went forward according to that most radical of concepts—student governance. For a brief moment in the history of the University of California, people like Robert Carrillo, Azzan Davis, Vince de Baca, Tony Valenzuela, David Ichelson, Paul DeVan, and Paula Bacchus, among others, were to Third what the Directory was to France after the revolution there, an elected committee that did the business of the larger assembly, and reported to it. During the first year after the spring of 1969, ten faculty members were hired by these students and their faculty colleagues, Bill Frazer, Newton Harrison, Joe Watson, Silvio Varon, and Carlos Blanco. They decided to expand the academic advising office and determined who among the faculty of Third were to sit on which Senate committees.

“No way, of course, was the name Lumumba-Zapata ever going to be approved by the Academic Senate, much less the Regents. And so, because the minority students were very much tied to that name, we (would) just not name the college and (would) call it whatever we wanted to. When I left the college, I was given a pen and pencil set for going away, and it said, ‘Bill Frazer, Provost Lumumba-Zapata College.’ So, my idea was not to name it at all, and then it would be called Third College by tradition. Now there’s a move to rename it and I’m sorry that anyone’s bringing it up.”

William Frazer

The Delicate Role of the Provost

This Directory owed its existence to the Lumumba-Zapata Coalition and to the Senate enabling acts of May 6 and 7, and not to the UC Regents. In the eyes of the founding coalition certainly—and those of the Academic Senate at least technically—Frazer, whom McGill had named, was at most first among equals. He had accepted the job with the condition imposed by students that he would enjoy no veto power. Often when he executed documents, he was careful to sign his name over the modest proviso, “for the Board of Directors.” At times, the title, “provost,” or “acting provost,” did not appear below that signature.

From the administration’s point of view, there was, however, a provost, and he was supposed to do what the larger university wanted done. It all came down to what Frazer could manage to accomplish through force of sheer personal suasion. Frazer says,

See, I was Bill McGill’s appointed provost and he expected certain things of me and he would not allow formal delegation of power to the Board of Directors. So, we worked informally and I agreed to work that way and we made decisions that way (by consensus).

Of course, Frazer had an advantage over the other members of the board; he alone was a full-time administrator of the college. The five others had to go to class, either to learn or to teach. The student members were given support in the form of payment of $2.25 per hour for any meetings that were held, and
class credit for public administration courses, but they had to maintain a 2.5 grade-point average and attend to whatever other obligations they may have had as activists and true believers, which often took them off campus and into other radical arenas.

The regents, of course, never did formally vote on the sections of the Frazer committee plan that had dealt with governance, so the board had no formal status. This was a Directory dependent upon a student-faculty body, the General Assembly, for its authority. Like the board, the General Assembly had never been approved by the regents.

An Unofficial but Not Unnoticed Board

De Baca, an early member of the board, says there was a clear agreement that the Board of Directors was the unofficial but effective governing body of the college. “We understood that for reasons of politics outside the coalition there was a need to represent that student governance had not formally been approved. But they (the administration) allowed us to operate in a way that recognized we’d won the right. At the very least, we figured we’d managed to insert our foot in the door, they knew it, and it was up to us to prove we could make it work,” de Baca remembers.

Though the regents may have seemed an absentee landlord well removed from the scene in La Jolla, the new form of governance at Third College did not go unnoticed. There were several visits to the campus by individual regents and in committee, both before and after the February approval of the college, and they were not simple rituals.

Board member John Canady told influential newsman Harold Keen, in November 1969, that he was at that point impressed by the founding students he’d spoken to and by the few faculty on hand at Third (who were, at any rate, on loan from Muir and Revelle to help plan curriculum) but made clear he knew well where to put the pressure. In answer to Keen’s question, “Do you think there is any prospect here of their emphasizing revolutionary movements in their curricula?” Canady said, “I guess I have sufficient confidence in those in charge of academic planning for the university as a whole and the San Diego campus in particular that that would not be the case.”

The Board Works on Building a Faculty

Watson and Blanco were co-chairmen of the college’s committee to recruit faculty, and both were also deeply involved in the curriculum as well, trying to match prospective teachers to preferred courses and to distribute the FTEs accordingly. When it could identify a match, the committee would send the candidate to the Board of Directors for an interview. That meant—in the early days, when manpower was
short—Watson and Blanco were making recommendations to themselves, essentially, since they sat on the selection committee and on the Board of Directors.

At the same time Canady was telling Keen and Third College planners that the regents did not expect to approve a plan to teach revolution, the Board of Directors, minus the signatures of Watson and student member Lenny Bourin, sent McGill a note explaining the school’s instructional needs. They were ambitious.

In that November letter, they thanked McGill for honoring the college’s (and the Senate’s) request that Third be granted equal power with the departments in the issuing of FTEs, but asked (the Senate as well had recommended) that Third be treated as an entirely new campus of the university. The reasoning, theirs and the Senate’s, was that a new and untried program would have much higher start-up costs in the way a new university does. They asked for no fewer than twenty-eight full-time faculty, or their equivalents, and a loan of twelve from Revelle and Muir. Third World Studies would get eight; a nascent political science department, three; economics, three; and Science and Technology, eighteen, with other disciplines receiving the remaining eight positions. There was talk of the entire university receiving just twenty new FTEs. In a pinch, then, the Board of Directors would settle for seventeen dedicated FTEs. McGill had proposed ten faculty members so that Third’s expected 1970 student-to-faculty ratio would be 15 to 1. Blanco, Frazer, Davis, and Robert Carrillo were arguing that an expected 50 junior college transfers would swell the enrollment to 200 students, and a minimum of seventeen FTEs would be necessary to accommodate their needs and to plan the curriculum.

It must have been heavy for people barely out of their teens to exercise real power. Newton Harrison remembers that in the early days of its rule the board established “a great sense of community. We were all friends, we respected each other. There was also a lot of play.” He remembers a complementary balance. Silvio Varon “was the best negotiator we had.” Blanco was “the theoretician.” Azzan Davis “was amazing—he was amused, and could not be intimidated.”

In the spring Davis had been alternately tough and conciliatory during the final rush of the coalition into Senate negotiations. Once on the board in the fall, he began to feel, by his own account, a bit cocky. He was even to play a significant, though disputed, role in the selection of a permanent provost.

Who Will Be Provost, Watson or Blanco?

As part of the agreement to serve as acting provost, Frazer understood that he would not be asked to serve permanently. On campus, for a variety of reasons, there were really only two men who might have been named permanent provost: Blanco and Watson. Both had been active and popular with students, a consideration even the strongest conservatives on the Board of Regents looked upon as a necessity. Watson had been faculty adviser to the Black Student Council, Blanco the adviser to MAYA/
Joseph Watson, faculty adviser to BSU, and Carlos Blanco, faculty adviser to MEChA, were both potential candidates for the position of provost of Third College.

MEChA, and both had served tirelessly through the spring and summer of 1969 on the planning committee. Along with Frazer, they had been the lobbyists who helped sway members of the Senate toward approval of the experiment.

Blanco, in addition, attended statewide meetings of Chicano organizations, wrote letters to prospective faculty, and even visited high schools to recruit students. Old records in longhand or typescript outlines of courses in Third World Studies and world literature, with tentative weights given areas of study, are evidence of a very serious struggle he was waging to give traditional shape to bodies of work outside the experience of many of his colleagues, and perhaps his own.

Watson had worked hard contacting and recruiting prospective faculty and plotting possible allocations of FTEs for the departments Third envisioned.

The two men made for an interesting contrast. Watson, tall, and almost rawly youthful in appearance (he was only thirty), nevertheless was possessed of a certain dignity and authority, seemed just beyond reach and quite conservative in style, if not politics. “I don’t think...

...we needed someone to be provost and we had interviewed all of these different people, and there was just nobody we thought fit the bill. For some reason, we thought it had to be a Black. Blanco didn’t want to do it; he was in the middle of something or other. So, okay, Joe’s going to do it, and Joe didn’t want to do it. We had something like a (search) board that was made up of two or three professors, some students, one Black, one Chicano, one American Indian, one White, and some graduate students... we were sort of there, too. We were constantly surrounded by people, I was constantly talking to MAYA people, members of the BSU, we were all good friends, and everyone was, like, ‘ooh, ooh, what should we do?’ And Joe basically had to give up his chemistry career. He said, ‘Okay, I’ll do it for two or three years.’ But, you know, when you’re in chemistry and you’re doing research, you get one year behind and it’s like losing five. And after he’d done it a few years, I think he basically gave up and started to be an administrator. Last night when I saw him on television... I thought, God, I guess he never did get back to chemistry.”

Martha (Salinas) Chaves
"I had all that support, the support of the media, the so-called Left at the time, too, so I could have been the provost. I guess I’ve never said this, and I don’t know how you’re going to handle it; I’m a Mexican, okay? I’m a Mexican citizen and I’ve been raised in Mexico, my Mexican reality. And I’m Spanish-born. And, in fact, maybe I’m Spanish. So always I felt that my behavior, my role was one of (unintelligible) things, those things I support; but that in a way I have no right to take the real leadership position, especially the administrative one. Leadership among the organizations and all that, that was okay because we dealt on a very different level. But to become a provost . . . I didn’t feel it my right. Somebody who knew the roots, the deep roots of the problems of the United States should be the provost. And Joe was it; he could be a fighter, you know."

Carlos Blanco

McGill’s Choice

The person who mattered most in the selection process, the chancellor, was unequivocal about Watson. McGill wrote that, “the minority students, making full use of their new powers of governance, were determined to select their own provost. I was equally determined not to allow it.” According to McGill, he wanted Watson in the seat of power and waited a full year, from late spring of 1969 to the following year “until they (minority students) began to see things that way too.”

Despite the offer to the D.C. professor, McGill did in fact favor Watson over a period of time, as did the search committee. As early as February 1970 the committee was attempting to gain unanimity on Watson, but the MEChA delegate was holding out. Even after Watson was made the committee’s choice on February 18, MEChA offered the names of five candidates, none of them Blanco’s. The committee decided to review the candidates of MEChA only “if full scale search activities resume.”

But following the confusion in October and November over the Washington professor, Watson
“We went through a whole year of trying to find a provost; we interviewed a number of candidates . . . and Joe didn’t want it. Joe did not want to be provost. I mean Joe was doing exactly what everybody was doing, trying to find a person who could be president. I lived four houses down the street on Pearl Street from Joe. I was at home and I got this telephone call, and it was Azzan, and would I come down to Joe’s house? So I walked down to Joe’s. The kids were all sitting in Joe’s living room and Joe was saying, ‘Yeah, I guess I could be a candidate for provost; it’s late and we haven’t got one.’ And one student asked him, ‘Well, what kind of provost are you going to be, Joe?’ Azzan said, ‘We don’t have time for that; I’m going to talk to the Chicanos right now to tell them that Joe wants to be provost,’ and he got up and left.”

Joyce Justus

was the obvious choice in McGill’s and the rest of the committee’s eyes. By March 26, Watson was writing McGill, in confidence, on Provost’s Office stationery.

Watson Formally Appointed, July 1970

The president of MAYA/MEChA at the time, Nick Aguilar, says that organization was not consulted on the subject of Watson’s nomination to the office (which was, in any case, a mere matter of form; McGill was not giving up his right to name a provost). Aguilar says he and Davis got into a hot argument over the relaying of MEChA’s ‘approval.’ He says there was never a MEChA vote for or against Watson.

By June the campus knew of the search committee’s decision and the Board of Regents appointed Watson in July 1970.
Chapter 3

1970-71: Self-Rule in the First Year

There was little time to lose in celebration, as Watson and the board were forced to continue developing curriculum. Starting in April 1970, designs for mostly introductory courses were pushed onto the desks of CEP members for the approvals necessary before planning could begin for the first enrollments in the fall. Science and Technology's biology introduction, a math course in probability and computer logic, and another in geometry were approved. Three terms of introductory communications to be taught by Herb Schiller were also approved (though he was at that point still on the University of Illinois campus), as were Blanco's Third World Studies' three initial courses, to be taught by Schiller, Roger Barritteau, Arturo Madrid, Richard Harris, Benjamin T'Sou, Carlos Blanco, and Joyce Justus.

The requirements for the bachelor's degree from Third would also include three courses in Urban and Rural Studies, which were yet to be designed, and other courses in the core groups of Third World Studies, Communication, and Science and Technology. The maximum enrollment was expected to be
around 200, roughly made up of 150 entering freshmen and perhaps 50 to 75 transfers from Muir, Revelle, and junior colleges.

Watson’s stewardship began formally on two high notes. He was able to tell the Board of Directors that Third had received, thanks to McGill, the lion’s share of UCSD’s additional teaching positions for the upcoming school year—seventeen full-time positions, enough to maintain an almost Oxfordian student-to-faculty ratio.

And, almost concurrent with the regents’ approval of Watson, came news that a grant McGill, Watson, and Frazer had been quietly seeking from the Ford Foundation had come through. The foundation was releasing $149,000 to Third to be spent over the coming two years for a variety of programs. It was part of the foundation’s efforts to encourage nontraditional answers to the problems standing in the way of higher education’s enrollment of minorities and development of ethnic studies courses. Over the two years the money would help with the start-up costs of designing the curriculum and recruiting students. It would even fund research projects of Third students.

New Leaks that Columbia Wants McGill . . .

McGill had been since late spring 1969 an ally of nearly incalculable value to Third College, an enthusiastic supporter and believer in Watson and Frazer, who had seen to it that money and manpower flowed to the still-unopened college. He was, however, a lame duck even before Watson was known to be the incoming provost. Word had leaked out in January that Columbia University, where McGill had once taught, was probably going to offer the presidency to him. A month later it was official. McGill had accepted and would be finishing his last months at UCSD.

. . . Just as Departments Dispute Faculty Choices

McGill stayed very close to Third in the remainder of his part of the 1970 school year, particularly with regard to the selection of faculty. It was an area of operations that was giving the founders of the school trouble, and not because Blanco and Watson and the rest of the selection committee had differences. The academic departments were proving formidable in their defense of prerogatives they thought were threatened by the upstart college.

A turf war seemed under way. After all, if Third could require the hiring of an anthropologist with a certain specialty needed in its Third World Studies program, that might not match the needs of the anthropologists themselves, who were building a department along their own lines of the discipline. The trouble was certainly not coming from anthropology alone, though Third’s most effective on-campus critics to that point seemed to have been in that department. Early in February Watson told the board that a sociologist friendly to Third had confided that the department was edgy; “their projections and interests do not entirely agree with those of Third College,” read the summary of Watson’s remarks in the minutes of the February 5 meeting. The board suggested that Watson get together with representatives of all the social sciences, which were the disciplines most often likely to view Third’s curriculum as ally or rival.

Watson some time in March had picked up rumors that McGill, his ally, was getting nervous about the slowness with which Third was assembling its faculty. Writing McGill in confidence, Watson told him “there are people and departments on this campus who are trying to make Third College a failure” and that delays in the naming of faculty were the result of department refusals to ratify Third’s choices. “It is easy, very easy, to make prophecies fulfill themselves this way,” Watson wrote the outgoing McGill. He named four men in particular, and three departments—sociology, history, and math—but seemed most upset by the math department’s refusal to ratify a University of New Mexico faculty member, who had been voted teacher of the year there in the previous year, 1969.

Watson said he considered the candidate “one of the best men I have met in my life.” Watson said he was a good fit with Third’s interdisciplinary drift in that the candidate had ideas about applying probability theory to urban affairs, sociology, and economics, and he was a good enough mathematician to have
caused some Department of Mathematics members to force, over the objections of the chairman of the department, a meeting on whether or not the candidate ought to be appointed at the associate professor level, rather than the lower and more usual assistant level. “Before such a meeting took place and without official consultation with our Board of Directors,” Watson wrote, “he (the chairman) phoned (the candidate) and offered him the possibility of an appointment as Assistant Professor, Step III.” The mathematician broke off negotiations. Today he is still teaching at the University of New Mexico.

Some Conservative Academics
Find Politics

Watson had begun to suspect that scholarly objections were not the basic, or at least sole, motivation of the critics. In an August 1970 letter to members of the Academic Senate, Watson angrily complained that “several UCSD faculty members,” whom he did not name, were making calls to Berkeley officials and Sacramento legislators, “spreading the unfounded rumor that minority students have compromized the academic standards of UCSD.” Watson speculated that “because the rumors come from quarters not known for their positive interest in minorities,” shadowy critics of the still unopened college were trying “to create a ‘white backlash’” and perhaps discourage whomever would replace McGill from continuing support for Third.

Shortly after that letter, Regent John Canady informed UC President Charles Hitch that he had been informed that an assistant professor at the Santa Barbara campus “who was deeply involved in the riots there” had been hired by Third. Canady was upset and wanted to know how it came about that a man who might be found to have had criminal involvement with Santa Barbara’s Isla Vista riots of that year could be employed by San Diego. In fact, the assistant professor had not been hired but was scheduled for an October visit to be interviewed for a position. He was never hired.

Third was being subjected to a more intense kind of scrutiny just as Watson was sitting down at the provost’s chair and while the board was still undergoing its shakedown cruise. There had been deeply felt reservations among some of the faculty from the beginning, to which were added the wilder accusations of San Diego newspaper readers. A more political note of anger could be heard. Suspicions were being encouraged. Politicians were being sent tips as to “what was going on at UC San Diego.”

One of the sources inside UCSD was John Geddes, a forty-three-year-old former Navy flier who arrived at UCSD in 1967 as a psychological and career student counselor and assistant dean of Student Affairs. Geddes made no secret of his disgust and enmity in reaction to the student movement and wrote a three-part series of attacks on administrative laxity for the San Diego Union in 1968. Later, when a Marine Corps recruiter was blockaded on the Matthews campus by angry anti-war students, Geddes began to write stronger letters and articles that McGill found
"Some of the early faculty of the campus could not be brought in because he or she was Jewish. The point is, people are conservative and reluctant to change their ways in San Diego. A group of Third College faculty went on television as a panel during the planning stage (of Third) or just after the college opened. We were not prepared for the attack (we) found there. We were asked, 'Is it true that you are raising radicals to destroy the country?' It was amazing."

Silvio Varon

inflammatory. The man Geddes reported to, George Murphy, decided that Geddes' tracts targeted UCSD in general and not just the protesters and he ordered Geddes to stop attacking his own employer. Geddes would not, and later resigned.

Geddes was acting as education adviser to former Naval Intelligence officer and California assemblyman, John Stull. And Stull was not the kind of man who could have watched an antiwar rally for very long without feeling the pulse rise in his neck. He had campaigned for Barry Goldwater in 1964, been elected to the Assembly from the very conservative inland north of San Diego County in 1966, was a member of the American Legion (which had called for McGill's resignation), and had written a book entitled, Guns Are Not Gone Yet.

In September Stull called McGill, who by then was about to depart for Columbia, "perhaps the greatest revolutionary of them all" at UCSD. He was speaking to the San Diego County Federation of Women, whom he also told that Third's program was a "wild and wooly experiment in racism."

A few students were at work as well. Karl Keating and James Sills, Jr., contributors to campus publications, wrote a collection of loose analyses of Third World Studies and student governance, alleging that professors were intimidated by the threats of radicals, that a "well-timed 'putsch' that was premeditated had installed radicals in power," and that professors were being hired and students were being elected according to skin color. They sent copies of their report to a UC Berkeley administrator and to the incoming chancellor, William McElroy, among others.
Jack Douglas' "Third World College"

By far the best-known and probably most effective opponent on campus was sociologist Jack Douglas (not to be confused with Jack Douglass, a supporter of Third). He had a long list of publications—articles and books—and a very combative and hyperbolic debate style. Though Watson in his March letter to McGill had not named or described Douglas in his complaint of hidden departmental sabotage of Third faculty choices, Douglas responded in September with a letter asking Acting Chancellor Herbert York (York was ‘Acting’ from September 1970 to February 1972) why he and McGill had not upbraided Watson for “attacking me and others in slightly veiled terms as ‘racists.’” The shoe appeared to have fit.

The immediate cause Douglas seized appears to have been the understandings worked out in April by Watson and School of Medicine Dean Clifford Grobstein on an affirmative action program at the school. Douglas said the setting aside of four faculty positions, five internships, and three residencies for minorities amounted to a 30 percent quota system and that the School of Medicine had targeted seventeen of a total of fifty-six entering students as minorities as well. But he did not limit his attacks to affirmative action. He defined the seventeen as “sub-standard students,” though there was no evidence all seventeen were admitted under special circumstances. When Harold Keen interviewed Douglas together with Paul Saltman, then provost at Revelle, Douglas called the school “Third World College” and said that its ability to choose its own faculty (never true) “essentially makes the Third World College at UCSD an autonomous Third World College.”

Douglas made himself chairman of something he called the Coordinating Council of the Committee to Save the University and later said he was resigning from the position in order to save it from “official attacks on me.” It was not clear if there ever was another member to take his place. Whether alone or in concert with others, he was able to cause trouble for the fledgling school, where it most counted, at the regental level.

Douglas was in touch with Canady by mid-summer. As a result, Canady asked UC President Charles Hitch to schedule a discussion of Douglas’ complaints in the September meeting. Perhaps in preparation for the meeting, Douglas composed a bitter letter addressed ostensibly to McGill (who had stayed on to help York in the transition) but mailed carbons to Regent De Witt Higgs and to Hitch on August 21, 1970.

"Rumor and Innuendo"

First McGill, then York, wrote Douglas telling him his letter writing was “rumor and innuendo,” starting with the School of Medicine complaints of spring and continuing into the late summer. York told him, “I consider your behavior in this matter to be entirely inappropriate” and advised he go to the Senate with his complaints instead of “to higher outside authorities.”

Douglas’ reply to York was a rambling eight pages in which he told York, “I plead with you to attack the radicals who endanger our very lives.” He complained that Third was “controlling almost all new FTEs in sociology,” that “a famous Berkeley sociologist” had wanted to leave that school for UCSD but decided against it, and that no one to that point had proven any of his allegations about racial quotas and other matters false. This letter he sent to all the regents and to President Hitch.
Opening Ceremonies,
September 1970

Thus, even before Third had opened in September 1970 at least some of the regents had been encouraged to look upon Third in the light cast by People's Park, antiwar demonstrations, and other campus upheavals. Still, coverage of the experiment in the papers was by no means as suspicious as it had been. In fact, Third's opening was noted across the country (The Washington Post and The New York Times) and in California, both in Los Angeles and Bay Area papers, and in San Diego's homegrown papers, as an experiment of some hope. Words like "new frontier" and "optimistic" appeared in the headlines. The college was taking "first steps" toward becoming "a sort of domestic Peace Corps," a friendlier Union story said.

Watson gave the welcoming speech to a charter class of 169, whom Higgs and York also addressed. There were mariachis and a performance of Teatro Urbano and food. The racial balance of 1/3 black, 1/3 Chicano, and 1/3 other students had more or less been met.

September 23, 1970

TO: UCSD FACULTY

The Third College opening ceremony will be held Saturday, September 26, 1970, at 1:00 p.m. in the plaza in front of the Matthews Cafeteria.

On behalf of the College, I want to thank you for the vital role the UCSD faculty has played in making the opening of Third College possible. You are cordially invited to attend the opening ceremony.

Joseph W. Watson
Third College Provost
Divisions over an Admissions Policy

About two-thirds of the incoming student body could be said to be minority, which was achieved through a combination of aggressive recruiting at the high schools and junior colleges and the use of the admissions rule that allowed each campus to enroll 4 percent of its total from students of promise who nevertheless did not meet regular admissions standards.

The latter method was one Watson was never very enthusiastic about using. Confusion still surrounds the question of whether Third College was using more than its one-third share of the 4 percent special admits, taking advantage of a Muir and Revelle offer to give up some of their own 4 percent slots.

In February 1970, when the regents approved the academic plan, McGill assured sympathetic members of that board that Third would serve minorities by taking on more than its share of the 4 percent, at least initially. Yet the Third College General Assembly passed a resolution on May 12, 1970, that it would accept only one-third of the campus' allotment of specially admitted students. A letter dated the same day from Vice Chancellor and Dean of Student Affairs George Murphy and addressed to the college's Admissions Committee, assured the committee that a May 5 agreement between his office and the committee was in force and that he was awaiting a previously discussed authorization from the Board of Directors to make available as many as fifty special admit vacancies above those Third College qualified for. The board and assembly appeared to be arrayed against the Admissions Committee on the matter. One of the committee's chairmen, Sam Jordan, wrote McGill on May 22 asking him directly to admit forty-seven special admit freshmen in excess of Third's allotted number. That August, just before the college opened, Watson lashed out at McGill in a letter that said, “we will never permit your administration or any future administration at UCSD to place more than one-third of the 4 percent special action slots in Third College.”
Disagreement over the role of the university in adjusting imbalances could be found at all levels. The chairman of the Assembly Subcommittee on Higher Education, John Vasconcellos, was strongly advocating an overhaul of UC's admissions policy to combat what he saw as a growing tendency for the university to serve ever more affluent families. The chairman of UCSD's Academic Senate, Gabriel Jackson, who was to meet with Vasconcellos, wrote the legislator a letter in 1971 conceding that the colleges were failing to provide equal education to the economically disadvantaged, but said he feared any solutions that might lower the admissions standards of the university as a whole. "I don't know what one can do," Jackson wrote, "I just hope you won't throw out the baby with the bath simply because the University has an undesirable class component in the nature of its student body."

Watson himself advocated greater pressure be put on the lower levels of public education to provide equal quality at inner city and suburban schools, so that graduates of either could attend the university. To the Triton Times in fall 1970 he said La Jolla High would send about 80 percent of its student body to college, while Lincoln would send but 20 percent. "The students are not encouraged along the same lines as the Anglo is. The trend has to stop somewhere," Watson said.

Faculty members who considered themselves liberal could also insist that academic standards remain unchanged and, in fact, often did just that. When it came to admissions, nontraditional courses, and even compensatory reforms in the curriculum, academic arguments escaped conventional definitions of what was liberal or conservative.

Regents Order York, Watson to Explain Third College Board

Despite their melodramatic tenor and often hair-raising charges, the letters and carbons Douglas was sending had their intended effect. York was forced to prepare a report on Third's educational plan, its faculty, and its students for the October meeting of the regents. He told Watson, whom he had asked to help prepare the report, that the request was coming from Canady and that Canady's questions seemed to have been based, at least in part, on the copy he had received of Douglas' August 21 letter to McGill.

York and Watson faced the regents that October after the start of the 1970 school year. Conservative Dean Watkins, one of two regents closest to then-governor Reagan, began with questions about the role of the Third College Board of Directors in the hiring of faculty. York and Watson both described the Third College board as a consultant in the process, with the right to argue for individuals and review the names put forward by departments, but without the right to initiate hiring. Final hiring was left to the departments, they said. The regents took no action and broke into an executive session, reportedly to discuss specific individuals certified by the departments and Third for its initial faculty.
The fiction of board control of faculty nominations would never entirely die so long as the Third College Board of Directors existed. The spring following the regental check-up in October, York received a note from Watkins just before Watkins and other regents were scheduled to visit the campus. “I think some of the others (regents) would like to spend an hour with Professor Jack Douglas,” Watkins wrote, “to get his views on Third College problems.” Watkins also asked York to provide full vitae on all Third College faculty and “hard figures on applicants, admissions and qualifications of students for Third College.” A few weeks earlier in a phone conversation with Watson, Regent Ellie Heller, who then chaired the regents’ Committee on Educational Policy, told Watson she was about to propose establishment of a special regents subcommittee for regular visits to Third. Watson told York in a memo that “the main areas of interest (for the first visit) would be, one, Professor Herbert Schiller (the man who was almost single-handedly to battle for the establishment of the Department of Communication), and two, student veto power of prospective faculty candidates via the Board of Directors.” Watson proposed that Ms. Heller get her answers by way of scheduled meetings with department chairmen.

Extensive coverage of the October regents’ meeting in the Triton Times, then the campus newspaper, kept the board aware of the fact that it was being watched closely.

By late 1970 the board consisted of students Carlos Monge, Percy Myers, and Tony Valenzuela. The faculty members were Blanco, Frazer, and Watson, though many others who stayed active, like Varon and Harrison, and the new dean, Pasqual Martinez, sat in on the meetings.

There was full discussion of administrative concerns. Watson had to explain that the Ford Foundation grant uses had to satisfy the foundation’s educational goals; the money could not be used simply to support needy students. Watson was to determine the grades to be given student board members for their service. When he could not in good conscience assign an A to their transcripts, he was to take the issue to the full board for their decision. There was some disposable cash too, and the board decided whether MEChA and the BSU could expect to have programs funded.

Often, board business had to do with turf fights. Could the “free speech” area on Matthews be used by the Marines for recruiting, particularly if Third had not been previously consulted? The concept of a free speech area had to be established. It was, after the Third College Rules and Regulations Committee established its physical location and effective times. This defeated a libertarian minority on the board, who pointed out that to define where and when free speech would be permitted was to “limit” speech, not allow it.

The issue of police patrols came up more than once, particularly those of San Diego police who, by late 1970 under Chief Ray Hoobler, were seen as a hard-handed set of street cops with a very big intelligence department. The Third College board voted them off the free speech area and decided that campus police would not patrol the dorms of Third.

Paranoia was building, perhaps with good reason. Inquiries the board made of the registrar about leakage from student files in that office brought confirmation that file information had been made available to outside agencies, even when those files bore the registrar’s own flag forbidding outside use. In his book, McGill writes that he was asked early in 1969...
by an agent of the San Diego office of the FBI for files on Angela Davis and other students considered militant. McGill wrote that he refused the request, even though he was convinced that the bureau was acting "under instruction from the very top of the Nixon Administration." National security was the argument the agent presented, McGill wrote. According to Hugh French, a former detective with the San Diego Police Department, and former UCSD police chief (1973-83), "San Diego Police had an undercover cop in the middle of Students for a Democratic Society, making signs and taunting the cops right out there on the front line. But I never heard of any operation like that while I was there."

Jack Douglas, too, apparently was up to some intelligence work. The board received a report that Douglas had " unofficially obtained" the outlines of the remaining Third World Studies curriculum from the Senate's Committee on Educational Policy. That committee had made a decision to follow the development of Third World Studies closely. Douglas was challenging the course work even before the committee had ruled. The board's minutes show a consensus that, "the best reaction at this time is to postpone any defense of..."
courses until after the Winter Quarter has begun. Any kind of debate that may arise should be kept a procedural one within the proper (Senate) committees."

In addition, there were hints of another problem no one enjoyed talking about... race. Harrison and other board members may remember today a board full of intellectual and social compatriots, but the establishment of the initial 1/3, 1/3, and 1/3 ethnic ratio perhaps contained within it the seeds of exclusion and discrimination, even among people so given to the opposite values.

**Under Fire, Factions Emerge**

Early in 1971, in January, the board was being reminded by a student, Phyliss Chiu, that it had no representative of Asian American students. Already, the board had spoken of expanding to include four students so that blacks, whites, Mexican Americans, and Native Americans could be represented. She won support from David Ichelson, the Native American board member, who considered even a four-student board exclusionary, and she asked that while the board was considering a formal change in its constitu-
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**Percy Myers**

*Student board member.*

**Q. What was the atmosphere on the board?**

**A.** A great deal of camaraderie, a great deal of love and support, because we all knew that we were in it together. And if the school was to survive and prosper it was up to us. We had differences. But among intelligent people, you always... work them out. Sometimes rather heatedly, and at other times rather cooperatively, but we were able to pull together as a student body.

*Interview by Lisa Collins*

That brought on the following exchange (quoted from board meeting minutes) between faculty members of the board and Vince de Baca, an interplay critics like Jack Douglas, Karl Keating, and James Sills might have tried to make much of:

**Frazer:** Why did you make the informal 4-member student Board proposal, which excludes whites?

**de Baca:** In terms of working together, bringing students together, this is the best position for the college.

**Frazer:** Does this mean excluding whites from the student body as well?

**de Baca:** No, from the Board.

**Varon:** If there is this direction that the college wants to take, how and why should white faculty be included in the college? Some faculty have already expressed this (question)?

**Watson:** Third College is not isolated. In terms of practical considerations we can look forward to seeing the demise of the college. Without going to other arguments, all Board members must work to have that proposal changed. It cannot be exclusionary. And it cannot represent all groups, it would cease to be effective, nor can it represent, continue to represent, specific groups.

Watson's warning about “the demise of the college” was not an exaggeration, and would become a public topic of conversation from the chancellor’s level on down the hierarchy of the university. Third College was actually being targeted by very powerful and national forces.
Campus Critics Win Some National Press

The first of the national attacks came in the October 6, 1971, issue of William Buckley's National Review and were filled with inexactitudes, exaggerations, and out-and-out nontruths:

Lumumba-Zapata University was what students called their school, located at the third campus to rise, called the Matthews Campus, which excluded whites and was part of a university that previously consisted of a liberal arts and a science college. . . . Most faculty members are in a state of acute nervous expectation of Third's opening because a committee of students will completely control both faculty appointments and the admission of future students. . . . There is a well-organized and determined Committee to Save the University . . . ; applicants for admissions have really been selected on the grounds of militancy rather than academic promise.

Most of the 2,000-word article was written by Jeffrey Hart, a Dartmouth professor, and seemed to have been based on information from Jack Douglas. Hart, however, says, "I got all my information from a colleague there (at UCSD) in the Literature Department whose name is Ronald Berman." Berman says he sent Hart, whom he knew from Navy days, only local news clippings. Though Berman says he knew little about Jack Douglas, Douglas, or more correctly his Committee to Save the University, had nominated Berman to replace McGill as chancellor. Berman instead was on his way to Washington to take over the direction of the National Endowment for the Humanities, named to that position by then-president Richard Nixon.

At about the same time, the more widely read syndicated columnist Robert Novak wrote under a Berkeley dateline a column that attacked what he called the "reconstitution" of the entire university by its radical students and professors. UCSD, and specifically Third, became the focus of the column, in which he said "McGill not only subverted academic standards but beckoned radical students nationwide to what until recently had been a quiet campus." Unnamed "responsible professors" at UCSD, Novak wrote, were putting up "equally militant defense" against the by-then locally familiar charge that McGill and radical professors were "giving black and brown students veto power over faculty appointments and promotions in their new Third College."

Novak Attacks Again

Novak's fit of race- and red-baiting was more than could be judged fair play by Acting Chancellor Herbert York, who wrote the Washington-based columnist a long letter pointing out that Third College could hardly be said to have brought down the standards of the University of California even before it

Joyce Justus
Senior vice president of Academic Affairs, Office of the President of the University of California.

Q. (Do you remember) Hart and Novak giving Third bad press?
A. I remember Hart and Novak; I drove Novak back to the airport after his visit.

Q. How was that? That's an interesting detail.
A. He went through this whole thing, he was asking questions the whole way back to the airport. More importantly, he was very careless . . . He knew what it was he saw, he came to find it and he found it . . .

Interview by Scott Lanterman
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had opened. He asked Novak for several corrections and offered him a VIP tour of the campus and the college. Novak accepted the invitation.

The result was a February 1971 column that did far more damage than the first, repeating the litany of reaction in language of intense shading. “Radicalism is creeping . . . threat . . . worried professors . . . danger . . . hyperagitated . . . black militant agitation . . . Frankenstein monster that may devour this seven-year-old university”—whatever else Novak wrote couldn’t have mattered to the outside onlooker. But some of the statements of “fact” inflicted mean wounds on the UCSD campus. An embarrassed economics professor had to write Herb Schiller, always a red flag to right wingers, that he had nothing to do with Novak’s smear ing statement that Schiller came in the back door as a communications professor when the Department of Economics refused to hire him. Schiller had always been a communications authority and had never represented himself as an economist, which the economics professor said he told Novak, “and the topic, as I recall, was very quickly changed by Novak,” the economist wrote Schiller by way of explanation. The Department of Biology felt compelled to write that Novak’s criticism of Third’s biology program had to be coming from outside the Department of Biology and called the claims “total fabrication.”

Hart Also Attacks Third College

It did not end there. In June Jeffrey Hart wrote yet another attack on Third, this time in his more noticeable national column. The outlandish and frenzied climax of the commentators came in July. The Chicago Tribune’s Washington columnist Willard Edwards told a curious story of a San Diego stockbroker named Steve Balkam who, when told that the Republicans were planning to hold their presidential nominating convention in San Diego in 1972, raced the halls of Washington, D.C., Revere-like, warning that the government must do something about “the third college” at UCSD. Edwards put one and one together and said the GOP was thus threatened by the 200-some students, faculty, and staff at Third College. According to Balkam, whose credentials as a political analyst went unquestioned by the stern and prudent Edwards, “The campus will form a base for soliciting revolutionaries from all over California to attack the Republican convention.”

As a result of the work of Edwards and Balkam, Watson and Revelle Provost Paul Saltman had to meet with Leon Farma, a key planner of the convention and Republican of national stature, to give reassurances that revolution was not brewing at UCSD. Watson had to reassure Regent DeWitt Higgs that no one at Third was calling for an assault on the super secret Naval Electronics Lab on Point Loma, as Edwards had alleged. Kim Fletcher, another leading Republican, was also going to speak to Nixon assistant Robert Finch to reassure the administration that San Diego was safe for the GOP, even with Third College on the scene.

The Tribune Poll, Spring 1971

Despite the thunder of the right columnists, local reporters struggled to do what they could to correct misinformation and cool the almost feverish suspicions of the largely conservative power brokers of San Diego. Tribune reporter Alan Merridew sent all 467 members of the Academic Senate an eleven-question survey designed to measure prevailing attitudes toward Third College. Its results indicated the columnists and the few on-campus enemies of Third would have an uphill battle in turning the UCSD campus against the newcomer.
### Tribune/Merridew Survey

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Yes (%)</th>
<th>No (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>UCSD in general</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minority students</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All UCSD students</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The community</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minority communities</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In general, do you approve of what you believe has been the trend of events at Third College?</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you think that what happens to Third College is of critical significance to the university?</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you believe Third College represents a potential threat to the university's standing outside the academic community?</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you believe Third College represents a departure from accepted standards of scholarship, research, and teaching?</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If yes, do you believe there are justifiable reasons for that departure?</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you believe political tests have been used in recruiting faculty?</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The survey results stopped just short of entirely discrediting the Douglas claim, so often repeated in the Hart and Novak columns and elsewhere, that faculty would prove to be against the school if they weren’t intimidated. The faculty was evenly split on the question, "Would you be reluctant to speak out against Third College?" and 19 percent of the respondents who said they were reluctant indicated that their reason was fear of physical violence aimed at them. Otherwise, the survey revealed significantly deep support for Third among the UCSD faculty. The survey was anonymous, but Merridew offered the faculty a chance to write general comments and sign their names. Sixty-one did so and of those, 47 percent were favorable and 21 percent were not. The survey would have been even more lopsidedly in favor of Third had the Third College faculty and Watson participated. They said they objected to the framing of the questions and to their negativity. Of Third’s faculty, only communications professor Herb Schiller participated.

### Some Bad, Some Good Publicity

With a press increasingly given to covering events on campus and elsewhere as symbolic struggles, and with conservatives, at least some of them, seeing The Apocalypse in expanded admissions policies, it was possible for Third College to become one of the icons of the decade of the 1960s (much of which actually happened in the 1970s). Watson was besieged by requests for interviews, so much so that he made no secret of the fact that all the attention he and students and faculty had to give the press and an inquiring public was getting in the way of the major service of the college: education. An understandable tenderness arose on the subject of negative publicity, along with a corollary interest in public relations.

The February 1971 arrest in Los Angeles of student Lenny Bourin was one of those incidents that acquired symbolic status. He and another Third College student, John Hoaglund, whose haunting pictures of the Vietnam War would later win him posthumous notice, had checked out a van and camera equipment from the Communication program for a trip to film Chicano moratorium activities in a park in that city. Bourin was charged with slashing the tires of a radio news car while there. Bourin was a former board member and was being considered for a full-time job as an instructor in the Communication program. All of that may have had something to do with the interest Regents Heller and Watkins were to show in the Board of Directors and in Herbert Schiller, whose program had authorized use of the university van for the Bourin/Hoaglund misadventure. "Undoubtedly, the negative publicity generated from the implied crimes will more severely impair
“Oh, Bourin. Well, we used to get these blue UCSD vans. We used to go everywhere, you name it. Into San Diego, to demonstrations off-campus, lots of non-University functions. Lenny’s supposed to be working for network news, now.”

Sidney Glass

Morgan State visited for a look at Third’s program in 1971. According to sociologist Joe Gusfield, Third College

was noticed every place I went. At one time I was active in the summers in a kind of seminar or workshop the Danforth Foundation sponsored for faculty from other colleges (in Colorado Springs) ... and they had a lot of questions about it. ... A number of people (in the seminars) were in one way or another involved in minority programs and minority colleges.

UC Delays Drawings of Buildings; Academic Classrooms Hard to Find

As all new UCSD colleges were to do after it, Third began life at the almost euphemistic Matthews campus, in the tin Quonsets of World War II. Its proper buildings were to have been available for occupancy beginning with the 1974-75 school year. That timetable began to appear doubtful even as early as November 1970, when UC President Charles Hitch wrote UCSD’s Acting Chancellor Herb York that Third should not expect to see funding of the drawings for the buildings in the 1971-72 appropriations.

The Reagan administration was talking about cutbacks in UC’s funding, and Third was already pinched; the campus was growing rapidly, and Watson was forced in his first year as provost to wheel and deal with some departments for classroom and lab space.

Faculty Split on Third’s Science Offerings

Throughout 1971 to varying degrees there was a sense of siege at Third College, and not just because the work of the wilder off-campus critics seemed to be making the regents nervous and more suspicious. Important elements of the faculty were not happy with
The Quonset huts on Matthews campus were the first Third College buildings.

the emerging shape of Third's academic design, no matter how supportive had been the results of the Tribune/Merridew survey of the Academic Senate.

To some extent, the faculty were divided on the important question facing the scientists. Should Third begin its students with a more remedial, compensatory approach, or should the sciences be taught with rigorous adventure and emphasis on advanced knowledge? Before 1969's planning efforts, there was pressure to do both.

Scientists outside Third, but with a very real interest in its social program, like Sheldon Schultz, had urged a more preparatory and interdisciplinary approach. Acting Chancellor Herb York in September 1970 wrote a letter to the Academic Senate, the science and controls, the export of technology to developing countries, and so on.

But York's authority over campus planning was limited to his native powers of persuasion, inasmuch as he would not be the one chosen to be chancellor. In the interregnum the faculty began to assert itself on educational policy. Thus there grew up a push and pull on Third, the newest of the colleges, as faculty with differing ideas on the university's mission played the battle out to some extent on the field of Third's curriculum.

For the moment, Third College decided its Science and Technology Program would be designed.

William McElroy
UCSD chancellor, 1972-80.

Q. Did Third College have an influence on any other university?
A. I answered a lot of phone calls about how we were doing, how we solved one problem or another at Third College, what courses we offered. Somewhere there's a lot of letters from other colleges wanting to know what we were doing.

Interview by Norman Cooley
to place the sciences in a worldly context in hopes of inspiring people who might not have had good preparation to go on later to more advanced work. Chemistry was Watson’s own department and a discipline that many said Watson never intended to leave for administration. The chemists were among the skeptical. The very influential, now professor emeritus, Martin Kamen, was one of those who pressed Watson in 1971 to change direction and toughen the science courses at Third. According to Watson’s recollection of the meeting with Kamen, the elder chemist said, “some people believe that the Third College health sciences major is designed to prepare students for the paramedical professions and not for medical school.” Watson insisted that the contemplated health sciences major was rigorous enough to serve well as a pre-med program and had that as one of its goals. Oddly, while Kamen was pushing Watson to orient his science programs around more basic research, he was also telling Watson that one of the department's four new FTEs in chemistry would go to “a natural products chemist.”

Those who argued for “puruer,” more advanced science found an ally in 1971's chairman of the Senate Committee on Educational Policy, biology professor Herbert Stern. For Third’s proposed major in health sciences, the committee under Stern recommended courses in genetics, cell anatomy and function, organic chemistry, and deep investigations into cellular chemistry and physiology. The five-course starter series would also be part of the human biology major contemplated by the Department of Biology, thus the enthusiasm for the microscopic approach.

School of Medicine Dean Clifford Grobstein objected, writing Stern, in August 1971, “For a number of health professions, the details of cell function, important though they are, are no more important than a general knowledge of the structure and function of the human body and its several organs.” Grobstein wanted courses in the general area of human behavior included in the health sciences. He wrote Stern in that same letter,

“It seems to me the health sciences major, if it is to succeed in achieving an identity distinct from biology or human biology, should be broader and more interdisciplinary in character.
Urs Is Born under Fire

Grobstein had put his pen on the precise word that seemed to pop up in all “non-ideological” criticisms of Third College—interdisciplinary, meaning too broad, too undisciplined, as the anthropologists had used it when arguing late in 1969 against Third World Studies before the CEP had approved the academic plan. Whereas it had been Third World Studies that had come in for the heaviest attacks on these grounds, the CEP came to essentially the same conclusion about Communication in July 1971, also calling that new field too broad. In mid-1971 the outline of still another Third College program was emerging, and it would soon draw the same fire.

“\text{Urban and Rural Studies} \text{ had always been a part of the intellectual scenery of the upstart college, ever since the Lumumba-Zapata coalition had talked about "urban and rural development" as one of nine "areas to be studied at Lumumba-Zapata College." In the broadest sense it was implicit even in Rappaport’s plan for field work in the social sciences. With an obvious emphasis on the practical questions of housing, poverty, the connection of country agrarian migrants to the industrializing cities, health care, transportation and crime, and the theories of how all related to all, Urban and Rural Studies wasn’t so much a potential department as it was a potential college, and an activist one at that. For “pure scholars” it must have seemed incomprehensibly broad and inevitably political. Its original coordinator and founder, psychologist Nolan Penn, says the history of Urban and Rural Studies was a long story of a set of ideas that probably ran against the general intellectual layout of UCSD.}

Penn had arrived in 1970 attached to the psychiatric division of the School of Medicine but with a joint appointment to Third. His vitae seemed to define multi- or interdisciplinary studies. He’d studied psychology at the University of Denver, been

\text{Nolan Penn, professor of psychiatry, UCSD School of Medicine.}
in the Army, trained at Harvard Medical, established one of the nation’s first African American studies programs while at the University of Wisconsin, and directed the School of Medicine’s group therapy and community psychiatry studies. It was understood he’d be the point man for the drive to qualify URS for full funding and university support. The great utility man, William Frazer, had started in the fall of 1970 as chairman of the college committee to develop the curriculum of URS and in April of 1971 obligingly gave up that role when the board asked him to yield to Penn. He, too, understood there would be heavy resistance to the URS program and warned the board that the committee “should stay together because they’ll fight for the department.”

By the end of May, $5,000 was appropriated from the Ford Foundation money to pay for summer planning of courses. The next month the psychologist Charles Thomas was hired, along with another man, the two forming with Penn the nucleus of the program. During the summer meetings of the Board of Directors (the members were now Paula Bacchus, Leo Howard, Jose Lopez, Joyce Justus, Varon, and Watson; Frazer had moved on to become chairman of the Academic Senate) department status for Communication and URS was discussed. URS was being placed on the fast track for that status.

**Activism Seems to Threaten Some**

Watson was particularly interested in seeing to it that URS would have a strong law sequence. For the 1970-71 year, before Penn’s arrival, Watson had arranged for Superior Court Judge Roger Ruffin to be paid for a two-course sequence on American Criminal Justice. Ruffin was a maverick on a San Diego bench that had precious few of those. He bore the sobriquet “Ruffin the Red” for having been on hand at radical get-togethers. The publisher of the classic San Diego underground newspaper, *The Street Journal*, once threw a fund-raising party and was arrested by undercover police for serving liquor without a license right under the gaze of Ruffin, who was attending the same party.

Watson wanted Ruffin and Milton Silverman, a brilliant local attorney who nearly two decades later would successfully defend Sagon Penn (no relation to Nolan) against murder charges in the killing of a San Diego police officer, to teach the criminal justice sequence for 1971-72. Acting Chancellor York approved.

Almost certainly, it was this kind of attachment to the community that worried many faculty. With independent, off-campus practitioners taking part in the curriculum, there would be less control of the program by on-campus anthropologists and sociologists. Urban and Rural Studies, because its charter called for it to wrestle with emerging social problems, had always included field work; this too might mean that existing disciplines oriented traditionally around more scholarly lines would have less control. Considering the San Diego environment, always politically conservative and already suspicious of Third, a program that proposed to send delegations of energized, activated, and perhaps politicized students into the various communities of the city probably struck a considerable number of faculty as foolhardy.

As the Senate continued to debate matters of curriculum and the departments continued to assert themselves in the absence of a permanent chancellor, it grew ever more imperative for Third College to develop a sturdy rationale for its curriculum. Former board member Newton Harrison made it a point to attend the board’s March 25 meeting to warn that Third would have to make a major effort to place members of its faculty on the Senate’s most important committee. The CEP, he said, “is fast becoming a mini-Senate and (is) talking about abandoning the college system.” Varon agreed and warned, “we should devote much more time to long-range strategic thinking.”
Watson Calls for a Review of Goals

Watson almost immediately pressed for a General Assembly that would be devoted exclusively to evolving a student-faculty consensus on the nature of the learning environment and what it should be at Third. He wanted to encourage as much negative criticism as possible, wanted to allow for as much candor as possible. To that end he urged, successfully, that no press be allowed into the convocation “due to the inhibitory factor to open criticism and discussion,” according to the board minutes. The point was to air grievances so that programs could be changed and improved. Rapid evolution, of course, had been urged by the CEP as a loose condition of its approval of Third’s academic plan late in 1969.

After the General Assembly in May and during the summer of 1971 the Board of Directors established a Curriculum Committee and charged it to review Third’s “academic philosophy and goals.” An explicit statement of the college’s educational goals was expected to emerge from the committee, which was to make a recommendation on writing competence and a program to measure it. Most of Watson’s letter to the committee explaining its task, however, was taken up by a lengthy series of questions and assertions that seemed to challenge a couple of Third College educational fundamentals.

Watson seemed opposed, on educational grounds, to continuing student participation in college governance at the same level. He wrote:

Student participation has been encouraged within Third College. However it is clear that such participation has had, in many cases, a detrimental effect on the academic performances of students as measured by mastery of course material. . . . It is, therefore, important to establish the relative priorities of participation and mastery of course work and the mechanisms for giving participation recognition, particularly in relation to traditional modes of recognition such as grades.

The minimum permitted grade-point average for student board members had been a C, or 2.0. It was raised to 2.5. A check in late March of the grade averages of students admitted under the 4 percent special admissions category had shown they were doing better than Muir’s own special admits. But there was some cause for worry as time wore on. In May

Watson asked the faculty to begin tutoring failing students. Of the 169 charter students, 160 were still on hand and 32 of those were either on probation or subject to dismissal for poor academic performance.

In his August letter to the new committee, Watson also seemed to be questioning the wisdom and practicality of testing education by taking it outside the immediate campus. Watson continued,

“Although there is considerable talk within Third College of educating students to return to participate in the development of their communities, this verbal commitment has not been translated into criteria for faculty appointments nor for course objectives. In fact, most of the programs and activities of the College have been directed toward traditional academic criteria and objectives; for example, preparing students for medical or graduate school. If Third College is to prepare students to be ‘Change Agents’ in depressed communities, should we explicitly have that goal reflected in all of the programs of the College, in the core curriculum, or just in certain select areas such as Urban Studies? Moreover, should we have such a goal at all?”

Third’s Review Committee

Lukewarm on URS

Early in November the Curriculum Committee, which was chaired by biologist Richard Dutton, came up with a short statement suitable for a catalog or brochure that lacked rhetorical fire but was entirely consistent with Third College intellectual beliefs about linkage of American ethnicities with the Third World, the need to strengthen social consciousness in the students, and the aim of education to provide solutions to the problems of the students’ communities.

Significantly, the Curriculum Committee washed its hands of the two questions Watson had posed on student governance and the bridging of classroom work to the community. About the latter question, which the committee defined as “community programs involving research, training and servicing in agencies or community centers,” the Curriculum Committee simply said another committee ought to be formed.
Penn pressed ahead with the development of the Urban and Rural Studies program, not always in harmony with either Watson or the Curriculum Committee. In November 1971, Watson vetoed a list of junior college courses Penn had certified as eligible for transfer credit. In December the Curriculum Committee gave the plan a tepid endorsement “as a draft document which provides a good basis for further development.” The committee wanted the design to place greater emphasis on the “Black, Brown, Native- and Asian-American experience” and how those histories “differ from the experience of other minority groups.” There wasn’t enough concentration on rural studies, and the committee thought the program was expressing its task in terms of problems and “should adopt a more positive approach.” One of the things that the Curriculum Committee recommended Penn was naturally inclined to do: that was to work closely with the health sciences major that was evolving, particularly in the area of field work. At the same time the Curriculum Committee was reporting its reservations, the Senate was approving the program as a field for a major. Next would be the matter of department status.
Chapter 4

The Unraveling

Though he may well have preferred to oversee the evolution of curriculum, Watson was embroiled throughout 1971 in the headaches of management everywhere. For reasons not entirely clear, the regents were considering an early start for Fourth College, as early as 1974. At a time when the Reagan governor’s mansion was preaching small government and budget cutbacks, the start of another college could mean a severe setback to Third’s development in material and in more scholarly, or FTE, support. UCSD was competing for appropriations with Irvine and other newer campuses in rapid growth areas. Or, contrarily, the regents would argue that UC Riverside was underenrolled and in a time when resources were growing scarcer why not redirect students to campuses where there was room?

Any cutback in Third’s funding would mean a blow to the low student-to-faculty ratios so vital to any program attempting to retain students cheated of adequate preparation. Watson had to defend Third’s program to Regent Catherine Hearst in an April meeting of that body, objecting, he said, to claims that Third was “a new thing” instead of an educational institution. It did little good, apparently; in the May meeting she was joined by immediate past chairman DeWitt Higgs, who said that if Revelle and Muir were full “students shouldn’t have to be captive to Third College.”

UCSD was serving a San Diego whose growth was quickening. If Fourth College would be opening sooner than expected, what might this mean to the funding of buildings for Third? York and Watson had already received word that the drawings would be delayed. Watson began to have meetings with campus planners.

It wasn’t all work. The first Cinco de Mayo was celebrated that May, with dancing and feasting. Two days later the BSC put on a free jazz concert featuring the Harold Land-Bobby Hutcherson group.
Factional Splits Weaken the Student Coalition

Rule by consensus always takes up time and demands pleading; compromise among idealists is at best tedious and nerve-wracking. And throughout 1971 it seemed there were more and more issues to dispose of and committees to dispose of them. Inevitably, deadlines began to slip. In July the board learned that the Course Review Committee had failed to turn in its report because faculty were finding it difficult to attend. Its report was postponed. A student committee to review the cases of shaky young scholars failed to bring out its report. The new resident dean, Sidney Glass, reported in a faculty-staff meeting that students were beginning to move out of the dorms, partly because they were finding it impossible to pay the bills. Dorm rooms were now going unoccupied.

Faculty-Staff Group Gains a Role

The faculty-staff meeting was itself new in October 1971, another attempt to put people on task and make more orderly the flow of activities. Its temporary chairman, biologist Willie Brown, asked the group to introduce itself, one by one. There were now thirty permanent and temporary faculty, thirty percent of them black and twenty-eight percent Hispanic. There was some tension in the air, too. Blanco urged that issues having to do with governance be taken to the General Assembly for resolution. He said faculty and staff were getting "wrapped up in day-to-day hassles."
Watson now wanted her in a 50 percent administrative position while she taught in Third World Studies. He wanted her to oversee admissions and counseling and had on his own refused to hire two candidates for the position. In the faculty-staff meeting of November could be found unmistakable signs of a battle over power between at least some faculty and Watson, as the faculty unit began criticizing the provost for having taken a hiring action independently of the board.

According to the minutes of the November meeting:

The question was raised as to how Provost Watson could dismiss the two candidates without any input from the rest of the Board of Directors or Third College. The Provost replied that he did not consider the candidates acceptable. The question was put to Provost Watson, hypothetically, that if the majority of the Board decided on one of these two candidates, what would happen? Provost Watson replied that there would probably be an impasse and no appointment would be made.

Watson had made an independent decision, as any ordinary executive would have. Faculty had called him to task on it. Power seemed now to be in motion, flowing from the board to Watson to the faculty, but not always with all three in the same meeting. For now Watson would not be able to carry his preference on academic counseling. He was told that the board would have to meet on the matter and that he would do its bidding. The meeting ended with Watson reminding the faculty that the board did its business by consensus.

Students on the board knew early in the second full school year 1971-72 that the original design of an absolutely egalitarian executive body accountable to the entire student body was slipping away. It may have had partly to do with the formation of the faculty-staff group. After all, if the faculty and staff were getting together in regular meetings and discussing matters formerly within the responsibility of the board, why have a board? But earlier than the regularization of faculty and staff meetings—late in the previous school year—several stalemates in the board meetings led finally to a nasty confrontation over a staffing matter that diminished the board’s power and added to Watson’s.
Watson, Board in May Stand-Off
Over a Job

The board had continued to review faculty it wanted hired, living as best it could with the difficulties of winning departmental consent. But, more and more, Joe Watson seemed to be a voice against some of the nominees, and it was getting to be difficult within the meetings. The critical fight came in May 1971, when the job of a lower-level administrator came up for review.

It was a significant job, again involving admissions and recruitment, and the administrator’s backers were mostly Hispanic. His detractors were fewer in number, but they included Joe Watson. Even his supporters conceded the man’s decisions and manners had chafed some people in key UCSD offices, and the administrator himself admitted that his working relationship with black student recruiters was not as good as with the MEChA people. But the board argued he should be given a chance to prove himself: Watson argued he should be dismissed. Though they tried to avoid a vote, it became inevitable. It went 4 to 1. Watson would not relent. The board suggested the man be phased into a new job. Watson refused. When the meeting adjourned at 8:00 p.m., it was with a last request, or advice, that Watson “accept the recommendation of the Board.” The man was fired, eventually, at a later date.

In a real sense, a line had been drawn in the sand, and it was going to be very difficult for either Watson on one side or the board on the other to step over it. In executive session at its next meeting, May 18, a student member opened the meeting with a request for a precise explanation of what power the board officially and informally had in relation to the provost. If the board’s power were to be judged advisory only, the student argued, and the provost could execute without board concurrence, then the General Assembly would have to be advised before the next election of board representatives.

Watson said the provost had the power to act independently and that the board could take the matter to the General Assembly, asking for a vote of no confidence which, if obtained, would be followed by the board’s request for the provost’s resignation. The time that endgame would be played out, however, was not during the next General Assembly.

General Assembly Can’t Resolve Fight over Watson’s Veto

The disputes within the board over faculty and staff hiring decisions had not by the fall become general knowledge. It was true that the signs were there to be read or investigated. It appeared that neither Watson nor the remaining board was eager to sharpen the conflict to a point so uncomfortable that the assembly would have no choice but to address the question of veto power or rule by majority. Instead, it was decided that a November 8, 1971, meeting of the assembly would discuss the trouble in the admissions process, and in governance, in general terms. A few days before the assembly meeting the board distributed a document that read, in part,

The risk: A fragmented hierarchical college where some members may have no representation, where students could lose their ability to determine what the college is going to be, because power and authority could become more centralized under the Administration instead of the General Assembly.

It was too much for the larger body to divine. There were factions that could be discerned, but what precisely was the assembly being asked to do? The

Joseph Watson
Third College provost, 1970-81.

Q. What generally were the points of conflict with the board?
A. It rested on philosophy, of what type of people we would appoint and whether specific people were appropriate. I don’t think the philosophy was so much the issue, it was sort of the background under which differences of opinion may have arisen, but it actually played itself out on the basis of individual faculty appointments and whether or not I endorsed them, or would we go forward.

Interview by Alex Wong
board met the following night and agreed the budding crisis had not been resolved. Another assembly would have to be held. Still later in the month, on November 22, a General Assembly failed to pass a constitutional change in the board that would have expanded its student membership and added a seat for teaching assistants. This in any case would simply have arrayed a larger majority against the dissenting voice and avoided the question of a veto altogether.

There were deepening fissures in the college. Newton Harrison said he saw four governing bodies: the programs, the General Assembly, the Board of Directors, and the provost. But Harrison was not saying what was becoming more and more obvious, that there was beginning to be a coalescing of two major groups, brown and black.

Watson, in the meantime, felt the sting of criticism that some black faculty were only reluctantly supporting him because of a color line. He sent the twelve black Third College faculty members a double-edged letter on November 22 that seemed to make two cuts at once. Watson wrote that he had heard,

... expressed the view that on ‘controversial issues’ the only support I have as Provost comes from the Black faculty and that this support is not based on the validity of my position, but is based solely on ethnic loyalty. ... If the latter is the case because my ideas and policies have been so bereft of value that their only foundation for support is ‘rally around the Black provost,’ then I will submit my resignation immediately. ... I have no desire to remain as provost under those conditions.

Factional Split Grows Beyond Healing

Paula Bacchus told the board on November 23, the night after the second failed assembly meeting, that all those who considered themselves “Others,” neither black nor brown, would be meeting to try to develop a governance proposal. She was joined by Milan Lalic Molina in those meetings and in a canvassing of people living in the dorms, but no formal or informal proposal was to come from those efforts to restore stability to college politics and halt the erosion of trust.

The chancellor’s office, awaiting its new occupant, was broken into by several Third College students, also in mid-November. They were protesting what they said was on- and off-campus harassment by police of minority students, and they said they had evidence. Hitchhikers to and from campus were being questioned. In fact, under San Diego Police Chief Ray Hoobler, field interrogations were being increased all over the city. The rise of aggressive policing may have had something to do with the regular meetings at police headquarters of a countywide and federal task force on security for the still-planned GOP convention. Later newspaper accounts would reveal that local
police had a contingency plan that called for the kidnapping of selected individuals, who would be transported across the border and held there before the convention took place. (The Republicans eventually moved their site to Miami.) Whatever they may have known, however they may have known it, the students who occupied the Chancellor’s Complex were claiming that campus police were working with the FBI and even the CIA to generate student dossiers. There was to have been a meeting between central administrators and the students, but the students did not show.

The rising suspicions were turning ugly, and many students at the time believed the police weren’t just watching what was happening and making life difficult for hitchhikers but had mounted a sophisticated intelligence plan. One of its aims, thought some students, was to split what remained of the Lumumba-Zapata coalition.

"MEChA had a dominant left and a big neutral center, both of them nationalistic. The BSC . . . at first its left was dominant, with Angela Davis, her sister Fania, Sam Jordan, Sidney (Glass), and Eddie (Spriggs). But then they all left, one way or the other; Azzan Davis left (for UC Riverside) and the leadership was sort of up to whoever remained. So, the BSC was split with a weaker left and a lot of people who were more nationalistic. And so I think the intrusion of the political police was easier. . . . It made it easier for the police agents, and that ideology. You know, ‘The Chicanos are getting everything. Blacks have got to keep together.’"

Israel Chaves

Some Suspect Police Provoke the Split

By January 1972 Pasqual Martinez reported back to the faculty-staff meeting that a UCSD-wide committee had found that files were being kept by campus police and the UCSD committee had not been allowed to inspect them. Contrary to McGill’s policy, the files were now being made available to unspecified “outside authorities.”

The campuswide committee and Third faculty and staff tried to give some protection to the students. If they were subjects of investigation, students could inspect their own dossiers. The committee found a group of San Diego lawyers who would volunteer their help. All faculty and staff were told never to give out student phone numbers and addresses to anyone under any condition. Pasqual Martinez, who was compiling a record of suspicious incidents, asked that anyone who witnessed abuse by police should get the badge and car number and give it to him.

The campus had now existed nearly a year under Acting Chancellor York (acting chancellor from September 1970 to February of 1972) in an era of unrest. The struggle over academic policy between Third and some members of the Senate, the emergence of distinct camps within Third that were fighting over who would govern, the attention the regents were giving to press and other critics, the police and whatever tactics they may have been using—all of it could not have been inspired by flaws within Third College. It almost seemed that just as this experiment in self-rule began, Third was confronted with a host of competing forces,
some of them eager to see in Third the object of their own frustrations. Clearly, a strong administration that could have stretched unbroken through the time of Third’s founding might have managed to shelter the college from the storm that now threatened to rip it from its roots, and might have allowed Third time enough to grow into the role it had defined for itself. Instead, the two-year-old college was now beginning to blame itself. By late 1971, it was clear that the internal struggles between the faculty and Watson and between Watson and the Board of Directors, together with external pressures being brought to bear, might be enough to kill Third. The solution to the problem was not going to come from inside the college. The solution, or resolution, was about to arrive in the form of a new campus order.

**William McElroy Appointed Chancellor, June 1971**

Early in 1971, on a break from considerations of grading procedures, the ethnic composition of the Board of Directors, and the role of police on campus, there was some idle chat about who might be the next chancellor of UCSD. The scuttlebutt until recently had been that James Fletcher, then president of the University of Utah, had the inside rail. But news had reached campus that he was instead likely to become the head of NASA. Next in line, went the best information, was the president of the University of Washington.

Fletcher took the NASA job (he did so twice, in fact) and UW’s president did not come to UCSD. The man who became the third UCSD chancellor was William D. McElroy, an avuncular, cigarette-smoking biologist with a rich central Texas baritone that stayed with him long after he’d left the borderland for Stanford, Reed, Princeton, and Johns Hopkins (where he taught in and eventually chaired the Biology Department). He arrived at UCSD after two years as director of the National Science Foundation, and he knew next to nothing about Third College when he got there.

He wasn’t, evidently, the hard-handed conservative that Jack Douglas had been lobbying the regents to appoint; he’d known Eleanor Roosevelt well (and once suggested Third be named after her, during one of the many years the school’s administrators tried to rename it, “because of her contribution to minority programs,” he says). But neither was McElroy the slightly distracted, good-natured monk his personal style suggested. He was capable of being on John Fitzgerald Kennedy’s Science Advisory Committee and of being named by Richard Nixon to head the National Science Foundation because, unlike the man nominated before him but rejected by Nixon, McElroy was a scientist who did not denounce the Cold War. And yet at the NSF he steered new money to research in technology assessment and the development of ways to anticipate the impact of technical innovation on the environment and society. He also warned of a possible public backlash against science if more attention was not paid by scientists to the quality of average lives. He was, in short, complicated and politically adept.

**“The politics became turf wars. . . . It got to the point we made power plays. We started jamming up a black EOP director. We were all fighting over the same bone.”**

*Vince de Baca*

---

**William McElroy**

*UCSD chancellor, 1972-80.*

**Q.** When you took the job as chancellor, did you have an inkling that there was some ferment and instability at Third College?

**A.** Not as much as I ran into when I got here! I knew of the importance of the program and I just thought it was acceptable that we should be concerned with minority students . . .

**Q.** Did you get any kind of briefing from Dr. York or Dr. McGill about what was going on there before you took the job?

**A.** Not that I remember.

*Interview by Norman Cooley*
McElroy did not arrive at UCSD until January 1972. He brought two NSF staffers with him to take up significant positions: Bud Sisco, who would be vice chancellor for Business, and Dave Ryer, whose title was assistant to the chancellor. Perhaps more significantly, McElroy requested and won approval for the elevation of Revelle College Provost Paul Saltman, another biologist, to the office of vice chancellor for Academic Affairs. So as 1972 opened, a very new order was being erected.

Perhaps most important in terms of Third’s development, McElroy was a scientist with connections, and would prove equal to helping the scientists of UCSD attract grants and new faculty with grant-getting capability. During McElroy’s nearly ten-year administration, UCSD would rise to be among the top magnets of federal money in the sciences. That was not immediately encouraging to Third’s humanities and social science programs, like Communication, Third World Studies, and Urban and Rural Studies, but the scientists (Halpern, Frazer, Varon, Watson) had been on hand at Third’s creation, and by 1971 interest in putting together a strong science program was building at Third, particularly a program that would produce medical careers.

No aspect of Third College’s history more clearly demonstrates the impact of McElroy’s new administration than the experience of Urban and Rural Studies. Already well along the pathway toward department status, URS had received advice from Third College’s Curriculum Committee and from the Senate’s Committee on Educational Policy (CEP). The two did not always agree. For instance, whereas the Third College committee was unhappy that URS was not concentrating heavily on black and Hispanic cultural histories, the CEP warned against such an approach. But there were no fundamental differences over the reach of the program; it was recognized that either as a department or as a more limited program, it would certainly require communication across departmental lines and use of faculty from the humanities and the social sciences as well as from the School of Medicine. In fact, for every one faculty member assigned to teach in the program, there would be two from outside the program.

By June 1972 the CEP wrote McElroy that it approved of the program’s application and hoped McElroy would grant departmental status to URS and appoint a committee to search for the new department’s chairman “at the earliest possible date.” The CEP thought Third was being innovative in attempting to find the socio-behavioral connections between the urban and rural experiences. High student interest was likely in both undergraduate and graduate courses and there were job opportunities awaiting them, the CEP said.

McElroy’s response took more than a month and arrived as a confidential letter to the four people who were designated as Third’s full-time faculty assigned to URS (Nolan Penn, Faustina Solis, Charles Thomas, and Robert Heifritz). It also went to the chairmen of the Departments of Anthropology (Marc Swartz), Economics (Richard Attiyeh), and Sociology (Aaron Cicourel), who would provide the great majority of loaned faculty. Chancellor McElroy was saying that full departmental status would be decided upon in one year and that, in the meantime, the seven would form an Urban and Rural Studies
Committee, chaired by Penn, that would run the program in the interim.

Penn had worked a full year on the Urban and Rural Studies Program, which had already made progress before his stewardship and had already won the approval of the CEP. Major changes in it would be hard to stomach. In addition, he was working with, among others, Marc Swartz, the anthropologist who had so strongly opposed Third World Studies on many grounds that could be applied to URS. As well, there was a man on the committee from sociology, still a small department, one of whose members was Jack Douglas.

Penn tried to continue building the program as if he were its chairman, free of a committee to report to. It didn’t work from the beginning. By October he and Watson and the three others from Third College were infuriated by what they viewed as the interference of the departments. Sociology’s Aaron Cicourel, for example, was suggesting course designs, subject matters, and the hiring of people to Vice Chancellor Saltman. Saltman told Penn to stop arranging interviews with prospective faculty.

Watson, having been backed up by McElroy, decided to find out how far the chancellor’s support went. He wrote in October an attack on the department chairmen who sat on McElroy’s Urban and Rural Studies Committee, that read, in part:

The extreme reaction to Prof. Penn’s exercising of the elementary initiatives of a committee chairman has made a shambles of the committee, destroyed all threads of cooperation and good will, and given all the outside members of the committee (the department chairmen) the image of intruders hell-bent on retarding, if not totally destroying, Urban and Rural Studies.

Watson asked McElroy to dissolve the committee and simply recommend to the full Senate approval of departmenthood for Urban and Rural Studies.

"Today they’re putting together an Ethnic Studies program, there’s the Pacific Rim… now that area studies and ethnic studies are of use to them, they start taking credit for the idea. It fits their needs now, because they need to teach Mexican-Americans Japanese, so they can sell enchiladas in Tokyo, or teach the Japanese Spanish, so they can sell Toyotas in Mexico…"  

Vince de Baca

Michael Parrish
Professor, Department of History.

Q. Why wasn’t URS given departmental status?

A. I think there are two reasons, but the fundamental one that comes to my mind is the jealousy of existing social science departments on campus. They are always edgy because new departments are very expensive to start; it would mean taking away resources from the already existing departments. This is especially hard to do when you propose a nontraditional field. Scholars in the traditional fields are out to protect their own turf.

The second reason was the benign belief that you might get a better intellectual meal with faculty from a variety of departments teaching an interdisciplinary program. The chancellor had decided to put the departments and the new URS faculty into the same room and reopen the planning of the program. It was a move that would either establish or kill already strained relations between Third and the social science departments.

Interview by Anne Scott
McElroy immediately did precisely the opposite and, long before the targeted date, refused to send the CEP’s positive recommendation on to the Senate for a full floor vote. Penn underwent the embarrassment of sending out letters disinviting prospective faculty. He resigned the chairmanship of McElroy’s Urban and Rural Studies Committee in October 1972.

Anthropologist Joyce Justus was to take Penn’s place as Urban and Rural Studies coordinator, and urban studies programs nationwide were contacted for help in beefing up the proposed curriculum, but it was hopeless. Even with subsequent approvals from the CEP in later years, the program never could win the help of the important departments, sociology and anthropology. Today, it remains a program under the name of Urban Studies and Planning.

**Departments Emerge Stronger**

The departments had won a significant struggle, to the detriment of not just Third, but any college-based academic program. From the URS struggle forward, hiring would increasingly become the prerogative of the departments. The college affiliation of faculty would be mostly in name only.

There were to be other reforms by McElroy as to how the colleges related to the departments. They did not favor the colleges. Only a year after the Urban and Rural Studies loss, Watson said in a July 1973 meeting of the program coordinators that McElroy wanted to strengthen the departments over the colleges because the departments were more oriented toward graduate programs, which McElroy said had not been receiving enough attention from the faculty. He saw the colleges, which tended to care more about undergraduate programs, as too powerful, according to Watson. McElroy wanted to concentrate the departments in physical locations, a move that would cause the professors to begin to identify more closely with departmental affairs rather than with those of the colleges where they had offices and other affiliations. McElroy was offering Third College a Humanities Building if it agreed with the plan.

McElroy, on the other hand, had never had the benefit of viewing the crazier days of the Lumumba-Zapata demands and could feel no sense of relief that Watson and his troubled board and inquiring faculty were easier to deal with. At any rate, his January 1972 arrival provided time only for on-the-job training.

**Third’s Buildings Suffer New Delay**

Just at the beginning of 1972 a shock was felt in UCSD’s planning offices. Legislative analyst A. Alan Post, a man whose name was as familiar to UC educators as was the name of any regent, released a report that recommended delay or suspension altogether of the construction of Third College classrooms and offices. Post’s office was equivalent on the state level to the General Accounting Office on the federal; it provided a nonpartisan analysis of problems the legislature often found too sticky for its own staffs to reach agreement on.

Post’s analysts gave two reasons for the cutback judgment: three years hence UCSD would have excess space if the buildings the university wanted to build were built, and, more disturbing, Third College’s future was in doubt because they felt Third College’s academic plan was unsound.

McElroy’s newly named Vice Chancellor Paul Saltman wrote letters to both Post’s office and the business vice president of UC, Chester McCorkle, insisting Third’s plan was sound. He told Post’s office he regretted “that we failed to convey the soundness” in earlier sessions with that office. He told McCorkle’s office that Post’s analyst had never in earlier conferences with the university voiced reservations about Third. Oddly, the analyst’s report on appropriations had addressed the role of Third’s Board of Directors, specifically on faculty appointments.

Watson appeared not to have been informed immediately of the university’s response to these developments in the state capital. His letter of alarm landed on McElroy’s desk a week after Saltman had mailed out his own letters to Sacramento and Berkeley. Watson pointed out that no one on campus or off had indicated any weaknesses in the academic plan or
On the other hand, insiders knew well that the bylaws contained a hammer. At any time, by a two-thirds vote, the board could send a request to the entire student, staff, and faculty for a no-confidence vote by mail ballot. If two of the three groups returned with a two-thirds negative vote, the provost was fired. Watson had even agreed to that reading at an earlier board meeting.

Even so, because the regents had never approved the governance sections of the Academic Plan, it remained to be seen whether a vote against Provost Watson could be made to stick. Who would see that he stepped down?

**Watson Won’t Yield His Veto**

At the February 18 meeting, Watson coolly told the board again that the regents had hired him to be provost and that when the board disagreed with his decisions, he would nevertheless carry them out. New board member Brian O’Brien, a biologist, argued that Watson had been intransigent on too many issues and that the question of majority or consensus, advisory or effective rule, would not have come up otherwise. Watson repeated that he could not give up responsibilities the regents had told him were exclusively his.

On February 24, in a similar discussion, the faculty-staff meeting produced a majority vote advising that ultimate authority lay with the Board of Directors and that the board, in the staff’s and faculty’s eyes, should rule by majority vote. The board was being braced up for the inevitable confrontation.

In early March it sent the matter of majority rule to the General Assembly for that body’s directions. The assembly voted by a clear majority to tell the board that it should conduct its own business by majority vote as well. The problem remained, however, as to how to make the majority rule stick. The assembly did not pass a binding amendment to the bylaws, though the large majority had made itself clear on the matter.

William Frazer, whom everyone respected, made an equally eloquent plea attempting to head off the collapse. He wrote faculty and staff in mid-April of 1972,

If the Provost strongly believes the majority action (of the Board) to be wrong, and the Board is unable to convince him otherwise, we cannot realistically expect the Provost to execute that decision effectively. More devious Provosts might pretend to execute such decisions, but our Provost tells us frankly that he cannot. Those of us who helped set up the institutions of the College failed to deal with this problem, because the initial climate of good will concealed its importance. Now we must face the problem. What alternatives exist?

Frazer had none. But he was hoping to see the factions “begin now to develop workable institutions. . . .”

All action had now shifted from the board, which was simply disabled by the paradox created by

---

**Sidney Glass**

*BSU leader.*

**Q. So, did Watson ever think the board could run the school?**

**A.** He was always oriented around it being advisory. Blanco and lots of others said, ‘No, students should play a major role, and maybe Watson can’t go public with that, can’t portray that.’ A lot of people thought that in time he’d get radical, become Third World, but he never was that.

**Q. He was pretty much in the minority?**

**A.** He was pretty tough, and lots of people could see that when he played basketball. He was relentless.

*Interview by Bob Dorn*
absence of a bylaw on voting, to the faculty and staff and the various student factions. The faculty and staff raised the pressure on Watson with a one-vote majority vote to recall faculty members from the many standing committees and the board. No college business would be possible under those circumstances. MEChA removed its representatives from the committees and the board as well.

Watson blinked, but only the slightest bit. In an open letter dated April 24, 1972, and distributed to the entire college on April 25, he offered an interim government that would do its business only by unanimous vote. He would take no actions (under the powers the regents gave him) if the board disapproved. A student-faculty committee would work out a permanent solution to the constitutional problem “which would be consistent with strong student-faculty participation and the unique responsibilities of the Provost to Third College.” The words convinced no one of any change in his position.

**Students, Faculty Ask Watson to Resign**

MEChA voted to recall Watson. So did a coalition of “The Others,” Asian Americans, Native Americans, and the White Caucus. Eventually, they were to call themselves the Lumumba-Zapata Steering Committee.

Perhaps because the ballots were mailed, the resulting numbers have been vague and unmentioned over the years, but no one quarrels with contemporary accounts that put at two-thirds the vote to oust him, including Watson himself. In addition, seventeen of the thirty-two faculty members signed their names to a May 1 letter to Chancellor McElroy that said Watson was to blame for the divisions and asked for his resignation and the appointment of an acting provost.

**BSU Stands by Watson**

As a body, the Black Student Union stood with Watson, attacking the original coalition on the grounds it had been taken over by white students. This was a charge made only just plausible by the fact that virtually all the original black leadership of the coalition had departed the campus, but it ignored the presence of other minorities and reduced the very large Chicano faction to the status of puppets. The mid-May issue of Black Voices, an on-campus publica-
"There was a two-day period of rumor of guns on campus right around the time of the Watson resignation struggle. There were all kinds of stashes; knives, guns, one guy even had some plastique, there was a brisk trade with guys returning from Vietnam."

Sidney Glass

Dr. Watson knows that he is fighting against total White takeover of Third College. Once White administrators take over the decision-making, the Others' arguments for the right of self-determination and student participation will become null and void. For Chicano students to even imply a 'coalition' with the White caucus or White faculty is a farce."

When interviewed by the Union, the Black Student Union president described the vote against Watson in essentially the same way. "We see it as an attack not only against Dr. Watson but on us as Blacks." The Union reporter attributed to the BSU president the diagnosis that the revolt against Watson "appears to be a move by Mexican Americans but instead is being promoted by Whites." The BSU president was among those who was widely suspected by blacks as well as whites and Chicanos to be one of the police agents on campus.

One Last Concerted Effort Toward Unity

In February of 1972 anonymous poison pamphlets had struck the Third College campus with a sickening specificity that many thought could only have been disinformation and provocation planted by police. Blacks who supported the board and opposed Watson were singled out for attack as drug users who preferred sex with whites. White and Chicano faculty were said to be giving failing grades to black students. Names were named, libelous perver-
sions described, and violence was promised in enough detail to cause all thirty-two faculty members to side with Watson in warning students:

The document purports to protect certain faculty against attacks by other members of the College. . . . The base accusations contained in this document are obviously intended to provoke a reaction of anger and divisiveness within the College . . .

But that March 31, 1972, letter would be the last time the faculty and Watson would speak as one. And though no one believed the letter expressed the real views of anyone on campus, the rift between the factions grew deeper. One day shortly after the vote against Watson, Charles Thomas remembers that a

Joseph Watson
Third College provost, 1970-81.

Q. What's your feeling on whether or not members of the SDPD Red Squad, the FBI, or others were undercover at Third as students to disrupt the college?

A. I believed at the time, and I still believe, that we had a number of undercover law enforcement people involved and, in fact, maybe some of them were even a little encouraging of certain activities.

Q. As provost, did you know if these organizations contacted anyone within the administration to let them know that there were people coming in here?

A. I have no hard facts, and it has never been raised with me in any sense administratively. And, I actually don't believe it would have been raised with me.

Interview by Alex Wong
large group of black students took up positions on the campus and dared anyone to cross them. No one did. He says:

It would have been a disaster. They (blacks) were being pushed into it and would have been left alone. They were lined up from the Medical School to the Registrar’s Office, to the Chancellor’s complex and to the north. It was almost all of the black students and it was all black and it went on the better part of the afternoon. I remember one of the vice chancellors coming out and telling me most clearly I should go home, I shouldn’t have been out there with them.

On May 10 the Lumumba-Zapata Steering Committee, composed of all the political organizations other than the BSU, together with some faculty and the TAs, sent Chancellor McElroy a letter complaining about the threats and blaming the black students who had held a press conference for singling out Brian O’Brien and calling him a ringleader of the revolt against Watson. They said reporters were on campus asking if Will Wright and Silvio Varon were also “behind” the ouster attempt. And they said threats had been telephoned against O’Brien and his wife at home.

A week later the Lumumba-Zapata Steering Committee eased back on the resignation demand, saying it could live with Provost Watson if he would accept a ten-person board that ruled by majority. They also asked that Blanco be made vice provost. It was a far cry from Watson’s April 25 proposal and at any rate was made moot by Chancellor McElroy on May 25, 1972.

**Watson Resigns over McElroy Proposal**

The chancellor proposed an expanded board, but one which would be advisory only. He would create the position of vice provost. The enforcement and final decision would lie with the vice chancellor or chancellor, however, when the provost could not reconcile his position with the board’s.

Watson resigned the same day, saying he could not live with a proposal that established another administrator and turned stalemates between the advisory body and himself over to the central administration for resolution. But there were few quotes from him in the press explaining his reasons. Two months later, in a lengthy interview with a United States International University graduate student pursuing course work in conflict resolution, Watson made clear what conditions would have kept him from leaving or staying. He said he would have left the provost’s office if McElroy had made the board the final authority. He was willing to stay if McElroy had “maintained the Provost with authority,” or he would have gotten out of the way and let the chancellor’s office take over, if that had been McElroy’s decision. Watson told the USIU student,

The administration had that third option . . . ‘Your position was right, but your style was wrong . . . and at least they would maintain the principle . . . you maintain the principle but you get rid of the principal, who is essentially the center of the conflict. So you say (to the faculty and students), ‘Okay, you guys, you have your complaints against Watson. We get rid of Watson, but these are the ground rules and this is way we operate.’ Now, that’s the way the administration can, in a sense, maintain a principle, but in a sense keep things quiet and move on from there. And that’s the option I felt the Chancellor had as a possible solution at the time.

**McElroy Threatens to Close Third, Watson Returns**

McElroy, of course, did no such thing. He refused to accept Watson’s resignation and instead wrote UC President Charles Hitch a one-page letter bringing him up to date and telling him that:

If we are not able to reach a satisfactory solution within the general guidelines of my statement, then I see no alternative but to move the faculty, students, and programs into the other colleges and dissolve Third College.

He took the message to television and the press as well. If Watson were to stick to his decision, Third would cease to exist.
"He (Watson) had a discussion with Carlos (Blanco) before he turned in his resignation letter. Carlos thought he'd convinced Joe to keep going. Carlos wanted Joe to fight for his position. But, see, when Joe offered his neck to McElroy, what happened? McElroy wouldn't take the resignation and told Joe to get back in there and do his job. After that, Joe was really an administrator."

Vince de Baca

On May 30, Watson withdrew his resignation in a two-paragraph letter to McElroy that said he had reconsidered because

... the administration and departments made explicitly clear their support for Third College as an educational institution. In addition, the confidence and support that you have expressed for me in the face of considerable counter-pressure played a major part in my decision to withdraw my resignation request.

He was coming back as provost because of the support of the administration and the departments, although some of the latter units had been been opposed to Third's academic plan from the beginning. The letter mentioned nothing about the support or lack of it from students and faculty.

The 1971-72 school year was almost over. MEChA students mounted a hunger strike and continued to demand that Watson step down. On June 1, 1972, they briefly lowered the California flag at Matthews campus and raised one that represented the lost land of Aztlan, but it was now just guerilla theater. The final uprising of Lumumba-Zapata occurred with only one-half of the coalition that made it work in the first place.

In the fall, Watson offered the position of vice provost to Blanco, who turned it down because, as he explained to Watson, it offered no true power to the second in command. That fall, Watson also established an advisory Third College Council in the place of the self-dissolved Board of Directors. It was attended haphazardly. Later, in a housekeeping move, Watson had the General Assembly eliminated from the bylaws, inasmuch as it was the body that gave the Board of Directors its legitimacy and, after all, that body had gone out of existence.

And by late 1973, as enrollments began to drop, Watson initiated a new set of more relaxed general education requirements, in hopes of attracting greater numbers of students to Third College. The 1974 curriculum reform reduced from eight to three the number of courses in the core programs of Third World Studies, Urban and Rural Studies, and Communication required of all Third College students before they could graduate. It became possible for a student to graduate from Third without taking a single Third World Studies course. The revolution was no longer a requirement.

—Bob Dorn

William McElroy
UCSD chancellor, 1972-80.

Q. What occurred at the time Joe Watson resigned?
A. They got after him in a way that was not fair to him, and that's when I did have to step in. They wanted him to resign and I refused to accept it. I talked with Joe and told him he had my full support. And I hoped he would come back in.

Q. Was changing the governance plan a part of his changing his mind?
A. Yes. That was one of the really tough ones I had to make, the one in terms of governance. I thought Joe was a fine person who understood what it was the college was trying to do, but he had practically all the authority taken away. I finally told Joe, 'You have my backing and strong support to go ahead and try to do the things that need to be done to make a strong college.'

Interview by Norman Cooley
its documentations to him. Pointedly, he wrote McElroy:

There would appear to be only two most probable explanations for this very disturbing budget report: either the communication with the Office of the President (of UC) and Legislature of one or more campus departments is unacceptably poor, or certain campus spokesmen are stating one position to Third College and a diametrically opposing and detrimental position to those off campus. In either case, there exists a situation which must be corrected quickly and firmly—even if it means the dismissal of individuals.

McElroy enclosed Saltman’s two letters to Sacramento and the UC president’s office of a week earlier and assured Watson, “Paul and I are agreed that we must trace this action (emphasis added) to its source in order precisely to prevent its reoccurrence.”

**Watson Wins a Compromise**

Something was going on politically. Soon thereafter, in March, the San Diego County Federation of Republican Women’s Clubs passed a resolution asking the Legislature and regents not to fund any Third College buildings without first investigating the college. It was the first of a number of organizations and government agencies to find reasons not to build the college. A compromise of sorts was soon reached with the analyst’s office, a bargain in which UCSD agreed to grow at a slightly faster rate and to begin planning of Fourth College in exchange for Post’s recommendation that the coming budget include money for the first academic units of Third.

The construction scare, which in later years would continue to bedevil Third and delay its escape from the Quonsets of Matthews campus, eased in 1972, but Watson’s workload continued to be driven by crisis. The tensions on campus were contributing to drive academic performances downward. In January, 76 of Third’s 350 students, or 16.5 percent, were in academic difficulty and subject to dismissal; most of them were newly admitted. The dorms, with an expanded capacity of 212, held only 113 students. More EOP money was in the pipeline to help the poorer students afford on-campus housing, but it would not arrive until the fall.

---

**Joseph Watson**

Third College provost, 1970-81.

Q. Everyone else I have talked to has said that it was impossible to manage the system as it was originally planned, which tied the departments to specific colleges, and that departmental autonomy was essential to the functioning of the university.

A. I would agree with that, but it does not have to be absolute departmental autonomy without any relationship or supportive connection to a college. So, for example, you could have departmental autonomy but still insist that Economics be at Third College, physically... and that Economics teach labor economics, teach urban economics, have some faculty whose research interests relate to the matter of the disadvantaged community...

Q. How does a college’s ideology get reflected in a department?

A. Oh, by the kind of faculty you bring in. If you have labor economists, you then have the sorts of things Third College is interested in.

Q. So, are you saying the college should have some input in the scope of the department’s courses and in the actual selection process of the faculty?

A. Oh yes. I strongly believe that. Look, when you get departments of forty-five people a provost should have no say in all forty-five, but (over) those people who should be active participants in the college because of their areas of interest, the college should have some say. And I’ll give you one more example (that) relates to the colleges. The Department of Psychology has been heavily experimental. Every provost on this campus has wanted to have more clinical, more social psychology offered; it’s a better match to the interests of the students. I think the colleges should have that level of influence on things.

*Interview by Alex Wong*
THIRD COLLEGE
called, an assembly

"Gov. Reagan, Board of Regents, we believe in participatory education at Third— but, you know, the students are just plain not interested."

"Board member, we come to the meetings, meetings, meetings; we make recommendations, recommendations, recommendations, but discussion cannot progress beyond the first agenda item. Besides, no one knows what happens under the table."

"Students, come and support your local faculty member— you all may have a good teacher."

"But professor, righteous people are prisoners... kept away from society because they don't fit into the political game."

"Yeah, we're too busy doing revolutionary acts, like ripping off, being high, jamming, being Yippie, Red, Black, White, Brown, liberated... all we want to do is fill the quota set up by big business for our kind of folk. A mediocre education is ok, as long as we get out real soon: "RIGHT OH!" "RIGHT OH!"

and NOBODY CAME
but 50 people or less

Paralysis in Government

Though these were troubling developments, they could have been fixed in time, time which Watson and the board did not have. By the beginning of 1972, the governance dispute was paralyzing the means of decision making. Students and faculty of all the camps and ideologies were out of communication or were insulting each other, or worse. It wasn't clear if there was any agreement over where the power lay.

To an outsider, even a knowledgeable one, the question might have seemed disingenuous. The regents had never approved a governance scheme that included an autonomous Board of Directors. For public consumption, the board had even certified it was advisory in nature. The latest copy of the bylaws called the board the college's "executive arm," with the provost and each student and faculty member enjoying one vote apiece. It mentioned nothing about majority or consensus rule.
Part Two:
After the Revolution

By Bob Dora

with Joe Finley
Leslie Maloney
Anne Scott
Chapter 5
The Mission Revised

By Bob Dorn and Joe Finley

The year 1972 was Third College’s watershed, its continental divide. The events of that year, most of them by design, placed in motion a redefinition of the college, one that defined Third more by what it no longer was than by what it was to be.

Certainly it was not Lumumba-Zapata College. The regents and the UCSD Academic Senate had never formally been asked to call it such, and with most of the very radical black activists off campus, it stood no real chance of being revived as a cause.

There was no longer an autonomous Board of Directors, with power to review and suggest who would be hired. Composed of fairly radical members, the board voted to disband in spring 1972 rather than acknowledge and accept its advisory status. Indeed, by spring 1972 the governance question was no longer whether the board was to rule by consensus or majority, but whether it had any real power or was only an advisory body. The board’s self-dissolution left Provost Joe Watson and his staff as the only executive body for the college. It was true that Third College bylaws gave the General Assembly final powers over the executive, but the assembly’s power to rule had never really been tested and, for the time being at least, remained potential and not actual.

Watson established an advisory body, the Third College Council, in fall 1972. Later, in 1977, the General Assembly was dissolved by Watson “because of its intimate connection with the Board of Directors,” as he explained to the council. That same year he requested that council amend the Third College bylaws so there could be some provision to ask the entire college, students, faculty, and staff for an opinion on critical matters without having to refer to the General Assembly. Using that term would have raised the question under the old bylaws of whether the provost would have to execute the results of such a plebiscite. Another change in the bylaws wiped the General Assembly from the record in 1977.

In spring 1972, MEChA, the only remaining influence from Lumumba-Zapata days, had demanded that the office of vice provost be created, with substantive power over curriculum. Carlos Blanco was the obvious choice for the position. Blanco told Watson he would accept the position only if he were empowered to recruit faculty and the job were defined as something more than half-time. He also set general conditions, including a guarantee that recruitment of minority students continue at the same rate as in previous years and that the college-based programs be protected from the departments which wanted to name the faculty members.

Watson offered Blanco the title, Assistant Provost for Academic Affairs, but set the position at half-time and defined its powers with words like “coordinates” and “advises” and “maintain liaison.” Blanco declined the job. No one else was offered such a position in Blanco’s place.

There shortly followed a major upheaval in the academic and intellectual underpinnings of the college.

Before Third College received approval from the Academic Senate in 1970, its planned academic programs had taken an almost methodical battering from the Department of Anthropology and others in the social sciences. Senate approval came with a pointed condition that the curriculum be reviewed intensely and regularly in the early years of the college. That sort of reaction brought on a nagging sense of vulnerability among Third’s academicians. As psychologist and Urban and Rural Studies professor Charles Thomas put it, “Third has always had a case of inferiority, and a worry about ‘respectability.’” He went on:

The departments and the colleges have always inspired divided loyalties within faculty (what is good for one is not always good for the other, and teachers must choose and make decisions that serve one or the other’s...
interests). What was happening with Third, it was seen as soft, not hard core, not scientific, by the departments, even when the programs were scientific. And it's interesting that the programs at Third that didn't achieve departmental status are the programs that were there when the college began; they're still programs and they happen to have ethnic core contents—Urban and Rural Studies and Third World Studies.

By 1973, it was clear that curriculum changes were in the offering. In February Watson told the faculty-staff meeting that he felt he saw certain deficiencies in the Third World Studies (TWS) and Communication Programs. The meetings had been confrontational for some time, but in this one Watson openly criticized course work in both programs, saying, "the problem seems to be a lack of continuity between the lectures, sections, and readings." No other programs were singled out. Carlos Blanco and Herb Schiller, who was the most outstanding member of the Communication Program, were by this time extremely critical of the accretion of power in Watson's hands. The other core program, Urban and Rural Studies (URS), was now being administered not by Nolan Penn, but by Joyce Justus.

With the new program coordinators in place, Watson proposed his curriculum reform. In place of the eight-course mandatory core in which TWS and URS each supplied three and Communication two courses, which was fully 60 percent of a Third College student's general-education requirements, Watson's plan allowed students a three-course core in which political science and economics courses could be substituted for TWS, URS, and Communication courses. Several of the qualified economics and political science courses involved no social development or Third World material.

The new coordinators pointed out that under the new plan "students could graduate having taken no courses from three of the four Third College programs," according to the meeting minutes, but the curriculum change was approved later anyway.

The effect, of course, was to take weight and prestige from the programs and to at least modify the college's orientation toward Third World literature and practical political reforms. The changes went into effect the following year, 1974, and were familiarly known as Plan B.

The implementation of Plan B was accompanied by community meetings about Third's "image," but the modifications were real. There was, it seems, an effort to eliminate from Third's requirements the element that called for the cultivation and extension of minority studies. To effect this change, ethnic and Third World studies and innercity social analysis were now made optional. In fact, with criticism now coming from within Third College, the programs became not just optional, but questionable.

Most probably, the pressure to eliminate the core curriculum was coming from beyond Watson.

The reform was coupled with the demand from the administration of William McElroy and Paul Saltman that Third College no longer pursue a leisurely expansion, but instead grow at a much faster rate. In order for Third to attract students in greater numbers, the theory went, the exclusiveness of its curriculum would have to change.

Indeed it was. By 1976, the entering freshman class was 60 percent white.

There was a fairly open, commercial feeling to the campaign to remake the college and swell its numbers. Saltman told The Tribune, September 4, 1974, "I believe that we are paying on the head count. If Joe doesn't sell dresses, he doesn't get any more inventory. It's that simple."

Less than two years later, in May 1976, with the new curriculum in place, Watson explained to the same paper how it had come about that greater
numbers of students were now entering Third, and that its appeal had broadened. "I decided to push it (the college), the same way as selling soap."

The changes, however, did not make all Third College students happy, then or later. By 1980, resident assistants (RAs) in the dorms were reporting that students were dissatisfied that Third College had so heavily emphasized the sciences, and that the atmosphere had changed on the campus. In his last moments as provost, before being succeeded by Faustina Solis, Watson wrote a letter to the RAs, calling the complaint "an unjustified attitude among many of those interested in the non-sciences." He continued, "A lot of people seem to find it better to advance the view that there is nothing on the campus outside of the sciences and that it is impossible to generate non-science activities."

Watson argued that three of the four college programs were not oriented toward sciences (though they were no longer a central part of the required curriculum), and said that he would set aside additional funding for lecture programs in social and political issues. But it was difficult to argue that there was not a strong science bent at Third College. In fall of 1980, the provost's own report on the most popular majors among the college's 1,871 students showed the top three were biology, computer sciences, and engineering. Communication was the only program in the top ten; it was the sixth most popular major at the college, with 6 percent of Third College students. Fully 46 percent of Third College students majored in the sciences, while the rest were classified as either humanities, social sciences, arts, or other.

It was a problem that the Western Association of Schools and Colleges had seen four years earlier. WASC is the agency that audits and accredits all schools in California and other western states. Its 1976 study said a lot about Third College and UCSD, and dealt with much more than the question of the sciences. One section in particular deserves to be quoted at length:

A rather intense, time-consuming student-faculty interaction is encouraged. . . . In this regard Third College may well represent the best values of the collegiate model. Yet, it also brings Third College into marked conflict with departmental units which strive for quality in research and in graduate education. . . . An institutional character cloned by Scripps (Institution of Oceanography, which predated UCSD) many years ago and fostered by a university faculty largely oriented to research and graduate programs is one which UCSD is understandably reluctant to relinquish. Public commitments to the principal objectives of Third College have not yet been fully institutionalized, and confusion and frustration exist within the college because of the distance between what was set forth in the original proposal for Third College and what seems to be significantly different programs which are evolving.

Certainly the report must have had an impact on Third College. In 1979, Third's Curriculum Committee backed off somewhat from the 1974 reform. In that year, selected Urban and Rural Studies and Third World Studies courses were combined in a required grouping called Societal Analysis, restoring a fraction of those programs to required status. Also, the political science and economics options that were strictly traditional and concerned with methodology were eliminated from the requirements.

But even the changes of 1974 could not erase the idea that Third College was dedicated to the study of ethnicity, the inner city, and the Third World. In the late 1980s, Mae Brown, presently director of Academic Advising at Third, said she got a call from a high school counselor in Albuquerque who wondered why Third was recruiting a talented student of his, interested in engineering. Ms. Brown stated:

He said the student was not a minority, wasn't interested in the humanities or social sciences and shouldn't be going to Third. I was curious to know where he got his notions about Third and he said he had checked the Fisk Guide (which describes colleges), the 1985 edition. I checked the guide and called them to say we were described, unfairly, as 'a child of the 1960's.' In the next edition the only change they made was to 'a child of the 1970's.'

No doubt by the mid-1970s, the imagery of Angela Davis, Lumumba-Zapata, and the Third World had something to do with chasing away some stu-
udents, many of whom were becoming less interested in liberation and more interested in jobs. But Third’s own reports in 1977 showed that lower enrollments were being caused “by a low retention rate (66 percent) and not by low numbers of new students.”

An ever-enlarging UCSD and Third College began extensive self-studies and management overhauls and analyses of student motivation. Those students with on-campus jobs tended to stay. Those who were attending Third College because they couldn’t get into the more crowded Revelle and Muir were most likely to leave. The Council of Provosts’ Retention Report in the late 1970s reported that UCSD students as a whole were part of “the Lonely Crowd,” a term for modern alienation coined by 1950s sociologist David Riesman.

Third College instituted leadership training conferences and followed up on students sent to the camp, asking those who didn’t take part in internal college government activities why they did not. In 1981, worried about low participation in student government and a reported reluctance of minority and ethnic students to enroll in Third, the administrative staff asked a student board to investigate. The board stated “They (students) feel that the people in Third College talk a lot about being interested in minority welfare but never do anything about it.”

In 1980, there were 626 new students entering Third: 6.5 percent were black, 8 percent were Mexican-American, 12.5 percent were Asian, and 64 percent were white. In 1987, the overall enrollment by ethnicity of Third’s 3,012 students was as follows: black, 5.2 percent; Native American, 0.3 percent; Mexican-American, 7.5 percent; Asians, including Filipino, 21.2 percent; and white, 57.1 percent. Third College was only scarcely more colorful than the rest of the campus. But a good case might be made for there really not being any basic problem at Third. Its enrollment overall was not very much lower than that at any of the other campuses. In fact, while Watson was worrying about a low retention rate, Third’s retention rate was actually higher than those at the other colleges. The endless, embarrassing question of declining minority enrollments seemed beyond solution. Third’s statistics were higher than those of the general UCSD campus, but still were not achieving hoped-for goals in terms of minority student enrollments. Nevertheless, the debate over direction, purpose, and cause of declining minority enrollments went on into the 1980s. Appropriately, the quarreling and dissent would often be expressed in terms of student rights.

In 1987, Third College Council developed a program called “Back to Basics.” Student talk turned, as it had before, to reestablishing the college’s traditions, and somehow making its history better known. The revitalization proposal, as it came to be known, was first given just three minutes on Third Council’s docket. A year later, some governance changes were made. One of the proposal’s two student originators, Erik Basil, said:

We were asking them to effect a revitalization of the college by addressing three areas. First, to create a historical profile of the college and distribute it to students, faculty, and staff, with a survey attached to it. Second, was to address recruitment and retention . . . We wanted to address the decline in minority enrollment, we wanted to start a recruitment program. And lastly, curriculum. We wanted to address the weakness and the lack of identification with the college that resulted from a really weak general-education program that was no longer unique.

As they approached the 1990s, students were looking back to Third College’s roots for a sense of direction.

In 1988, various members of Third College began considering the production of a commemorative book that would review its two-decade history of accomplishment. This and the other essays and historical overviews in Third College Twentieth Anniversary 1970-1990: Diversity, Justice, and Imagination are the result of a quest for reflection on the past in order to better understand Third College’s present and its future.

Also in anticipation of the Twentieth Anniversary Celebration, Third College has enhanced its general-education core curriculum. A new three-quarter core course entitled “Diversity, Justice, and Imagination” (DJI) will be instituted fall 1991, and will be taught by nine senior faculty members drawn from the Departments of Anthropology, Communication, Ethnic Studies, History, Literature, Music, Political Science, and Visual Arts. The course is a topical
approach to concepts as revealed through major
documents, case studies, and literature on the subjects
of diversity, justice, and imagination.
Students will study a wide range of materials
including the Federalist Papers, the United States
Constitution, the Bill of Rights, various constitutional
law case studies (such as Bakke, Serrano, and others),
and the representations of these complex issues in
literature by creative writers such as Chinua Achebe,
James Baldwin, Herman Melville, Pablo Neruda,
George Orwell, Henry Thoreau, Elie Wiesel, and
others. This new three-quarter core course will also
include a strong emphasis on student writing
assignments.

Third College’s other subject requirements
(natural sciences, mathematics, disciplinary electives,
arts, third world studies, ethnic studies) will remain
intact. In addition to these requirements and the new
DJI sequence, however, Third College will com-
mence a new Public Service Option for general-
education credit. Students electing this option will
serve as tutors to underrepresented minority chil-
dren in San Diego area public schools.

The newest development in interdisciplinary
studies, which has been strongly supported by Third
College, is the recent approval of the Department of
Ethnic Studies. According to a report issued by
the Academic Senate, the new Department of
Ethnic Studies will focus on the social processes
of immigration, slavery, and confinement, and
how these processes affected the develop-
ment of the United
States. Ethnic Studies
courses will examine
carefully the histories,
languages, and cultures
of America’s racial and
ethnic groups and the
relationship of these
groups to each other. The department will differ
from the Third World Studies Program, which
focuses on Third World cultures and nations outside
the United States.

The Department of Ethnic Studies will change
the focus of programs such as Chicano Studies and
African-American Studies. In the past, these programs
were largely autonomous and isolated from one
another. Ethnic Studies will focus on the comparative
analysis of many races and cultures. Furthermore,
Ethnic Studies will explore the experience of European
American immigrants. According to the Academic
Senate report, the department’s comparative focus will
make the program unique, as compared to similar
ethnic studies departments at UCLA, UCSB, and UC
Berkeley.

The foundation for the Department of Ethnic
Studies dates back to the creation of the Chicano
Studies Program in 1974, and the establishment of the
Black Studies Program in 1978. In the past, students
were allowed to major in one of these programs, like
Chicano Studies, for example, but were required to
take courses in Urban and Rural Studies and Third
World Studies to complete the major. Because all these
programs were fairly isolated, the responsibility of
integrating all of the various material belonged to the
student. Under the new Department of Ethnic Studies,
these programs will become incorporated into a single
entity.

The push for a Department of Ethnic Studies
began about two years ago. Delays in the proposal
have been largely the result of a debate as to whether
the various ethnic programs, such as Chicano Studies,
should be made into individual departments or simply
unified into a single department. According to the
Academic Senate, the Department of Ethnic Studies
should be operational by the 1990-91 academic year.
Initially, the department will begin with only two or
three permanent faculty; the rest of the teaching staff
will be borrowed from other departments, and will
increase by approximately two new permanent faculty
each year over the next four years. Ramon Gutierrez
has been appointed chairman of the new Department
of Ethnic Studies.

According to an article in the Los Angeles
Times, the Academic Senate approved the proposal for
the department on May 20, 1990. Chancellor Atkinson
approved the department and submitted the proposal
to the UC Regents for final approval, which was
granted in October.

Today, in 1990, the Third College educational
plan reflects the strengths of its earlier vision in its
diverse and interdisciplinary academic programs, including Urban Studies and Planning, Chicano Studies, the Teacher Education Program, Contem-

porary Black Arts Program, Third World Studies, and the San Diego Area Writing Project.

---

**Third College Profile, 1990**

**Provoest:** Cecil Lytle, Professor, Department of Music  
appointed July 1988

**Dean of Students:** Francine Martinez, Ph.D.  
appointed July 1990

**Resident Dean:** Yolanda Trevino  
appointed June 1975

**Director of Academic Advising:** Mae Brown  
appointed September 1979

**Business Manager:** Patricia Hansen  
appointed September 1984

**Population:**  
3,178 full-time students  
175 faculty  
40 staff

**Students Majors:**  
43%...social science  
33%...science/engineering  
20%...humanities/fine arts  
4%...double or special majors

**Student Demographic Breakdown:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Third College</th>
<th>UCSD Overall</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>African American</td>
<td>4.25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>17.08%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Indian</td>
<td>.67%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mexican American</td>
<td>8.57%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Hispanic</td>
<td>3.24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Filipino</td>
<td>4.86%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E. Indian/Pakistan</td>
<td>1.02%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Polynesian</td>
<td>.16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Caucasian</td>
<td>54.98%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Info Not Available</td>
<td>5.17%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Gender:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Third College</th>
<th>UCSD Overall</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Women</td>
<td>54%</td>
<td>47%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Men</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>53%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Student Majors:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Third College</th>
<th>UCSD Overall</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Arts</td>
<td>5.00%</td>
<td>3.90%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engineering</td>
<td>17.40%</td>
<td>19.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Humanities</td>
<td>7.10%</td>
<td>6.40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Science/Math</td>
<td>25.20%</td>
<td>24.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Science</td>
<td>34.50%</td>
<td>32.40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Double/Special</td>
<td>10.80%</td>
<td>14.30%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Enrollment by Home Location:**

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>San Diego</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Los Angeles/Orange Counties</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Francisco</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other California Counties</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Out of State</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foreign</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Freshmen Admitted, Fall 1990**

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>High School GPA (median)</td>
<td>3.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SAT Score Verbal (median)</td>
<td>550</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SAT Score Math (median)</td>
<td>640</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Chapter 6

The Revolution Updated

By Bob Dorn, Joe Finley
Leslie Maloney and Anne Scott

Spring 1972

The small revolt that MEChA led for several weeks in late spring of 1972 was to be the last uprising by Third College students in the 1970s. That certainly was not true of the UCSD campus in general, which was regularly struck by moratoriums, boycotts, marches against the war in Vietnam and against CIA recruiting on campus, and demonstrations conducted in anger over the administration’s dealings with the nonprofit student COOP, which through much of the decade was the only student government on campus. At Third, however, life was to settle down during that decade. The coalition led mainly by African-Americans and Chicanos was split for several years after the governance crisis. MEChA and the BSU, according to many students in the college at the time, managed only cool hellos and little more. There were no joint programs. The original bond between these two groups was later eroded as they became increasingly alienated from one another.

That split might have had something to do with the Chicanos’ revolt against Provost Joe Watson’s insistence that he not be subjected to majority rule of the Board of Directors. It was a bitter last stand that featured not the familiar activists, but newly radicalized and disappointed young Mexican-Americans, some from small towns in the Imperial Valley.
Valley who had never thought to oppose “the system” before. It was the time of Cesar Chavez, the United Farmworkers’ living legend, who had twice starved himself as a means of firing up his followers and drawing outside financial support. The MEChA Last Stand must have been modeled after Chavez’ movement.

Marline Tuyay remembers, “At least a half dozen of us, which grew to at least a dozen, decided to have a hunger strike. I think it went on for about a week. I was just taking liquids, I started to go through this hallucinatory stage.” The San Diego Union minimized the seriousness of the strike, writing that the students were in fact eating.

“We got so mad. All of us were really not eating, we were really starving ourselves,” Tuyay insists. Another student, however, names two males who did sneak away from the site of the strike to down some solid food. The strike ended with the end of the 1972 school year. While MEChA was having its last concerted revolt, BSU members began cleaning the walls of revolutionary slogans.

By the end of the decade, there was a renewal of the Lumumba-Zapata coalition. A Third World slate ran in 1980 for campuswide government offices, and Jules Bagneris was elected student body president and Alma (Key)
Hills, a vice president, the first two black students to win those offices. Bagneris is remembered as the student body president who walked out of the inaugu-ral ceremonies for the new chancellor, Richard Atkinson, late in 1981. Bagneris had been instructed to do it by the Student Council in protest over what the council considered a lack of consultation with students about the appointment.

The Tolbert Case, Spring 1981

But it was not Chancellor Atkinson’s nomination that accounted for Third’s most radical action since the occupation of the Registrar’s Office more than ten years before. The events of June 1981 that resulted in the arrest and jailing of thirty-four students were rooted in anger over the case of Emory Tolbert, an historian whom the university refused to hire permanently.

Tolbert was an assistant professor of African-American studies in the Department of History who had first been denied tenure at UCSD in 1979. Two years later, though, his case appeared stronger. He had published a book, The UNIA and Black Los Angeles, that had gained the attention of some reviewers, and students regarded him highly as a teacher.

His case came along at a time when all the major ethnic student groups, MEChA, the Native-American Students Association, the Asian-American Students Association, were coming alive, hoping to promote ethnic studies and the hiring of ethnic faculty and the recruitment and retention of students of color.

The BSU had started the 1981 school year with Tolbert’s hiring as an agenda item, and he became a symbol of the renewed ethnic consciousness. Posters were hung throughout campus and on the fences beside Interstate 5 along the east edge of the campus. A letter-writing campaign on Tolbert’s behalf was begun. The UCSD administration maintained the tenure process was fair and that at any rate nothing could be done to alter the faculty’s traditional prerogative to hire.

Students suspected that many sociologists and historians were put off by Tolbert’s enthusiasm for the 1920s black separatist and nationalist, Marcus Garvey, whom Tolbert had researched. Garvey’s own radicalism made it easy for students to see Tolbert as vulnerable to a political, not an academic, rejection.

On May 22, 1981, the Department of History formally denied tenure to Tolbert, and students quickly reacted.

“When they made the announcement, we got moving,” recalls Alma Key Hills, who at that time had been in office only a few weeks. She, BSU President Ken Overton, and other members of the BSU met in Hills’ apartment to plan a demonstration, one that would prove to the administration that the students were prepared to fight to keep Tolbert on campus. A small group of students was to sit in at the Chancellor’s Office with a list of demands that, in addition to tenure for Tolbert, included an expansion of ethnic studies programs and increased recruitment of minority students. While the smaller group occupied Chancellor Atkinson’s office, a larger one was to hold a rally on the gym steps to gather mass student support for the sit-in.

The student planners thought the rally would be the key to the protest’s success, in that it could heighten the drama of the occupation. Third’s organizers knew that drama led to press, and press coverage could affect university decisions. They also anticipated
Former Provost Joe Watson thinks of the tenure struggle as one of the historical events he’d most like the chance to change:

I think the college and the campus may have done harm to individuals because we put a great deal of demands on assistant professors. Those who responded with true commitment and extensive hard work in some respects may have sacrificed themselves. And I think that’s one aspect of the college’s history which, in retrospect, we very much should have done differently.

By 1977, Michael Real, a Communications professor hired without tenure in 1971, noted that tenure grants were down by as much as 36 percent. The stiffening of tenure competition under Saltman and McElroy particularly hurt Third College, in that most of its faculty had been hired during the previous four to five years and came up for tenure just as the drive for increased grants and more prestige was at a boil.

Joyce Justus became coordinator of the Urban and Rural Studies Program in 1972, following Nolan Penn’s resignation during the fight for department status. She was often quoted in the press, and the administration was liberal in praise of her efforts to develop the program. Watson had made her a half-time administrator at Third as well. With those responsibilities, she wasn’t able to push along three academic papers to publication and the Department of Anthropology, an early nemesis of Third, refused to propose that she be given tenure. Nor was the UCSD administration, addressed almost fiercely by Watson in a defense of Justus, inclined to come to her rescue.

Perhaps another roadblock to tenure was the professor’s field of expertise. Several Third College assistant professors felt hostility aimed at Third World Studies. Former sociology professor Anthony Ngubo says a majority of the faculty during his stay at UCSD wanted to preserve the European view. Psychologist Philip Rafael, who arrived in the early 1970s to act as Counseling Services’ main therapist for Third College students, says, “The game is white male... A Third World Studies professor is limited by the very fact that his field is not within the framework of American ideology.” Joe Watson says, “Those who were in the mainstream had a higher probability of being tenured than those who were not... Anybody who says that there wasn’t a disadvantage is blind to reality.”

Denied tenure in 1977, sociologist Gail Omvedt refused to go gently into the night. She attacked UCSD in a public letter that said, “publication abroad or in
One of the earliest and most famous of tenure cases was that of Arturo Madrid. Hired away from Dartmouth College as an assistant professor in Spanish and Latin American literature in 1972, Madrid became a mainstay in the Third World Studies Program. Almost immediately after arriving at UCSD, he was offered positions at the University of Minnesota and the University of Texas and asked the Department of Literature and Third College to initiate an accelerated tenure bid here. They did so, recommending he be approved. The Senate’s Budget Committee recommended the approval as well, so that only Vice Chancellor Saltman’s approval remained.

Vice Chancellor Paul Saltman told The Triton Times in 1973 that Madrid “had not produced any papers in the last five years since his Ph.D. degree or other research projects that could illustrate a possible approach to the UC tenure stipulations.” Saltman appointed a special committee to consider what else could be offered Madrid. It returned with a recommendation that Madrid be granted a lectureship with security of employment. Saltman turned back that recommendation, saying he thought it best to wait.

Madrid went on to direct departments and programs at Minnesota, the Ford Foundation, and the United States Department of Education. In 1985, he helped found and today is president of the Tomas Rivera Center, which is affiliated with the graduate program at the Claremont Colleges. The University of Minnesota made him a full professor in 1980, seven years after he left UCSD, untenured.

Madrid says the original faculty at Third “was made vulnerable by the fact we were Third College, with a leftist ideology. Because Third College had been forced on UCSD, they didn’t want to spend the funds or do anything to encourage its growth. It was a challenge to the (mainstream’s) hegemony.” Madrid says the ideological opposition to Third “hid behind the rhetoric of ‘quality of education.’” He and biologist Brian O’Brien, who was also denied tenure, say Watson did not support the Third World orientation of Third.

But Watson was in a difficult position as a provost faced with trying to sell the central administration on the soundness of Third’s curriculum and its reformist ideology. Some of the founding faculty of Third College were scattered and the college was forced to develop its curriculum without them after the late 1970s.
**Professor Madrid Denied Bid for Accelerated Tenure**

Dr. Arturo Madrid, Spanish literature professor at UCSD, has been denied tenure after 12 years of teaching at the university. Dr. Madrid's application for tenure was reviewed by the university's Academic Senate, which recommended denial. The university's Academic Senate and the UCSD administration have been under criticism for their handling of tenure decisions. Dr. Madrid's colleagues have expressed support for his application, and the case has sparked debate about the fairness of tenure evaluations.

**Third College Faculty Statistics, 1990**

- Total number of Third College faculty: 195
- Tenure track faculty: 45
  (Working toward tenure)
- Tenured faculty: 101
- Nontenured faculty: 48
  (Includes temporary lecturers, and lecturers with security of employment)

**Epilogue: Where Are Third College Faculty Today?**

1. Carlos Blanco-Aguinaga is professor, with tenure, Department of Literature, Third College, UCSD.
2. Willie Brown is associate professor, with tenure, Department of Biology, Third College, UCSD.
3. Joyce Justus is assistant vice president for Academic Affairs of the University of California.
4. Arturo Madrid is president, The Tomas Rivera Center, Claremont, California.
5. Brian O'Brien is professor of life sciences at Santa Rosa Junior College.
6. Nolan Penn is professor, with tenure, Department of Psychiatry, School of Medicine, UCSD.
7. Michael Real directs the Mass Communications Department of San Diego State University.
8. Herb Schiller is professor emeritus, with tenure, Department of Communication, Third College, UCSD.
9. Emory Tolbert is professor and chairman of Afro-American and Ethnic Studies at California State University, Fullerton.
10. Joseph Watson is professor, with tenure, Department of Chemistry, and vice chancellor of Undergraduate Affairs, UCSD.
The TCHB Sleep-In, November 1986

It was a small thing if seen from the outside, the sleep-in at TCHB (Third College Humanities Building, home, then, to the Department of Literature). It didn’t last long and it seemed to have more in common with the panty raids and pranks of earlier generations than it did with liberation and empowerment. But the overnight gathering at the Department of Literature quad had its origin in the tiny slights and harassing indignities of student life in a large university. Third College freshmen were mad and were not going to wait in line any longer.

The problem had to do with course scheduling, specifically a two-quarter writing sequence called Third College Writing Program 1A and 1B. Students thought it was front-loaded, so that enough sections existed for 1A, while 1B had about half the needed sections. That would have meant many students couldn’t get required writing courses out of the way in their freshman year. This, in turn, raised the real concern that later they would be unable to declare majors and enroll in more advanced courses in time to graduate in four years, which might mean giving up financial aid in their final fifth year.

Those who went to college in the 1960s and early 1970s may find all that attention to scheduling simply too managerial and perhaps emblematic of the spirit of the 1980s, when the word “revolution” came to be associated with the name “Reagan,” but the stress and the building of careers have loomed larger in students’ lives, as in everyone else’s. Three times a year students have to stand in line thinking about how to squeeze themselves into overloaded classes serving a campus of some 16,000 souls with whom they are in competition. Three times a year, they face choices that will determine how they’ll enter a new millennium.

What confronted professors and Third College staff reporting to work on Monday morning, November 17, 1986, was simply evidence of pressure relief. According to a letter written to Provost Faustina Solis by eyewitness Phyllis Campbell, program representative of the Third College Writing Program (TCWP):

... the quad area of TCHB was mobbed with students and littered with mattresses, sleeping bags, couch cushions (from the dorms), trash, and empty beer and liquor bottles. Literature and (Third College Writing Program) faculty and staff had to push through groups of students to enter the offices. Some had to step over or around bags of trash, sleeping bags, reclining students, and beer cans. A group of male students near my office smelled strongly of alcohol and appeared to be under the influence. Two or three radios were going full blast.

There were from 150 to 200 students in the quad who had stayed the whole night, some of them arriving at 3:30 the preceding (Sunday) afternoon, just to stand in line for a place in the scarce TCWP 1B sections.

As their numbers swelled, so did their rebelliousness. Beer and fast food began arriving as night fell. Mattresses were brought down from the dorms, along with stereo equipment. Some students raced along the top and ground floor catwalks of the building, taking all the nameplates from professors’ doors. A fire was built in the middle of the quad from student notebooks. A student entertained the crowd by igniting and blowing lighter fluid in a plume of flame from his mouth.

At 3:00 a.m., those who wanted a revel nearly came to blows with those who wanted to grab some sleep. One of the enterprising latter group found and threw off the circuit switches to the building to kill the noise from the stereo speakers. At 4:00 a.m., those sleeping on the grass were awakened as the automatic water sprinklers went on.

As soon as power was restored to the building, registration for winter classes began. Becky Kessab, TCWP secretary, recalls:

In less than two hours, all sections of 1B for the winter quarter were filled. The other students had to take 1B in spring quarter. They had been advised of this beforehand, as I sent a note to all 1A section instructors in the fall quarter, so students would be aware of the scheduling of IB. But I explained it again to the remaining students, who were told they would be able to take 1B in spring quarter, and they then dispersed.
ALL TCWP INSTRUCTORS:

Attached is a notice that should go to all of your students this week. You should emphasize that not all of the TCWP 1A students will be able to take TCWP IB in winter quarter. Most of them will take it in spring quarter.

However, if they want to take IB in winter quarter, they should come to my office first thing Monday morning, November 17 (not before), to enroll. My office opens at 8 a.m. Last year, the IB classes filled up within two hours after we began enrolling. Students should have their schedules all prepared and know which TCWP class they want.

Thanks for your help.

Phyllis Campbell, TCWP Program Representative for the past fifteen years, adds:

The students were confused about how TCWP 1A and IB are scheduled over the course of the academic year. In the fall, only 1A is offered; in the winter some sections of 1A and some of IB are offered; in the spring IB is offered, and sometimes 1A. Students are alerted that most will have to take IB in the spring quarter. There is always room for all the students who need IB to complete the sequence in their first year. Since the students didn’t understand that space was only limited in IB in the winter quarter, not in the spring, they panicked and spent the night, unnecessarily, in order to try to enroll in a winter IB section. The whole situation was caused by a misunderstanding. To avoid this situation happening again, we have taken pains since then to publicize the fact that some students must wait until spring to take IB.

Third College students are still required to take TCWP 1A and IB as part of their graduation requirements. IB is offered in the winter and the spring quarters, as it was in 1986.
being arrested and attempted to prepare for that. Only students with clean records were selected to occupy Atkinson’s office.

Sixteen students entered the Chancellor’s Office at noon on June 2, 1981, interrupting his luncheon meeting with community leaders in an adjoining room. The demonstrators locked the office doors and prevented Chancellor Atkinson’s staff from using the phones. At the same moment, about 200 students gathered at the gym steps to hear a speech made by Student Affirmative Action Committee chairman, Robert Tambuzi.

Tambuzi’s speech was interrupted strategically so that the crowd could learn that students from the BSU, MEChA, NASA, and AASA were sitting-in at the Chancellor’s Office. Now rallied behind the occupiers, the crowd began to march toward the Chancellor’s Complex chanting “TOLBERT! TENURE!” as it went.

Atkinson, meanwhile, was angrily demanding that the students leave his office. He said he would talk, but only outside the office. The students refused, and Atkinson warned them that he would have them arrested. The students continued to hold the office, stalling for the expected arrival of their supporters. Ken Overton remembers:

If they hadn’t come and if we hadn’t had the support of all these students . . . there’s no way the sit-in would have had the sort of success it had. Because we were sixteen students in the Chancellor’s Office. If there was not outside support he could have easily had the cops come in and had us out of there and nothing would have been said about it.

By the time the people from the rally reached the office, the police had also arrived, fitted with riot attire and armed with guns and billy clubs. They prevented some newly arrived students from entering the office, but eventually eighteen more forced their way inside. Now thirty-four students were crowded in the office. Meanwhile, the number of demonstrators outside had swelled to nearly 300, all of them chanting “TOLBERT, TENURE! TOLBERT TENURE!”

When Chancellor Atkinson renewed his offer to negotiate outside the office, in nearby conference room 111A, the students decided to send a delegation, with Tambuzi, Conrado Gerardo, and Taiji Miyagawa as negotiators. MEChA’s chairman, according to a reporter for The Guardian, was wary. “How are you going to guarantee that you will negotiate in good faith?” Conrado Gerardo asked Atkinson. “We did this 10 years ago and we’re back here doing the same thing. We want commitment if we’re going to go (out of here).”


Atkinson seemed unimpressed, and renewed his warning that if the students didn’t leave they’d be arrested upon his order, adding that once the arrests started they could not be stopped.

Atkinson agreed only to no recrimination for students involved and told Tambuzi he was committed to affirmative action. With that, the police moved in to clear Atkinson’s office. The thirty-four students joined hands in a circle and picked up the “TOLBERT, TENURE” chant of those outside. The arrests were made calmly and without violence, though former
UCSD Police Chief Hugh French remembers it was not without physical force:

I can remember having to throw Channel 10 reporter Adrienne Alpert out of the back of a police van. You know, they were built so that you could pass through from the front to the back with the prisoners’ cage in the middle, and she had climbed in there with Leonard Villareal working the camera and they had the microphone stuck in the faces of these students. I mean, physically, I had to throw them out.

The men were taken downtown, booked, and released, while the women were taken to Las Colinas Women’s Detention Facility in Santee, where they were also booked and released. At first, the university refused to allow ASUCSD President Jules Bagneris to take two university vans set aside for AS use to the jail to transport the thirty-four back to campus. The administration quickly relented and allowed their use.

Afterward, the Tolbert decision remained unchanged. Another historian of Afro-American history was hired, one who had what Tolbert says was “a good reputation.” Tolbert doesn’t feel the demonstration was a failure. “I never pass up an opportunity to say how grateful I am for the student support I received, and to say that it was the key factor in allowing me to continue elsewhere.”

In addition, Chancellor Atkinson stated in a letter to the protestors, “I agree, we have inadequate numbers of Third World faculty, and I have made the recruitment of such faculty my highest priority. . . .” The arrests, however, had the effect of deflecting the new uprising, according to Bagneris:

It siphoned the movement. I mean it just wiped us out, basically. . . . They spent so much time, the thirty-four students, talking about legal matters and how they could fight the case and how they could get out of being fined, and maybe doing community service, and coming up with some money for a legal fund . . . they couldn’t sustain the movement for tenure or for any activism. It was gone. So, in that respect, Chancellor Atkinson, if he wanted to end the movement and he wanted to do it swiftly, he did it by the arrests. It was probably, looking back on it, a very shrewd move.

Publish or Politics?

Students’ interest in the granting of tenure to professors provides a dramatic demonstration of the Third College belief that education can be democratic and that students and professors can share in the responsibilities of learning. Mike Estrada, a Third College student who today is a lawyer in Los Angeles, says, “Back then (1975 to 1979) the faculty who were having to leave were very popular with students, and at the time students knew a lot about tenure. The lesson we learned was that student support for faculty was pretty much the kiss of death for the faculty member.”

In 1972, Third College recruited several junior faculty to teach the Third World Studies, Communication, Literature and Society, and Urban and Rural Studies curricula. They came to Third fully aware that they were expected to extend themselves to students. When grade averages began falling early in 1972, teachers were exhorted by Provost Joe Watson to redouble their efforts, even to the point of visiting dorms to tutor the lagging students, in order to bring up the overall grade-point average of Third College students. Those teachers who were willing to put in long hours often were student favorites.

At UCSD, a relatively new place on the academic map even today, greater consideration is often given to accomplishments that can bring prestige to the college quickly. That sometimes skews tenure decisions in favor of those academics whose research promises breakthroughs published in traditional journals. It is relatively easy to assess the number and worth of publications, whereas judging teaching skills is more subjective. As Paul Saltman, once vice chancellor for Academic Affairs, says, “Part of the game here is to write it down.” UCSD once entertained the notion of developing a rating system for professors that would take into account and quantify a professor’s teaching abilities, but the Academic Senate refused to approve the system.
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Some Reminiscences on the Founding of Third College

by William R. Frazer
Third College Provost, 1969-70

My year as acting provost of Third College, and the year preceding, were the founding years of the college in its present form. The presentation of the Lumumba-Zapata demands to then-Provost Armin Rappaport electrified the campus with a radical vision of a college dedicated to the education of minority students (i.e., black and Mexican-American students, as represented in the proposed name of the college). The Lumumba-Zapata demands, in the form of a small pamphlet, were phrased in a mixture of Marxist rhetoric and 1960s "relevancy." Most faculty were puzzled, angered, or even frightened by the demands and accompanying demonstrations. But as some of us met the BSA and MEChA (black and Chicano student associations) members who were advocating the demands, we were struck by their earnestness and ability. Some of us began to hope that the Lumumba-Zapata demands could spark a really exciting educational development.

But there was a long way to go between Lumumba-Zapata demands and opening a college—generating support among faculty, winning Chancellor McGill’s confidence, gaining approval by the Academic Senate and then by the regents, recruiting faculty, planning courses, attracting students. . . . How did we ever have the temerity to begin?

On a personal note, how did I find myself drawn toward the center of this activity—a theoretical physicist, nonminority, not politically active, with no record of social consciousness, and certainly not a Marxist? Perhaps my centrist position, with no special interest to further, made me a credible consensus builder. Faculty were organizing into groups of like-minded colleagues, to seek strength in those times of turmoil. I believe I was the farthest-right member of the right-wing faculty caucus.

The most urgent task was to build support (or, at least, receptivity) among faculty. To this end Frank Halpern (a friend and colleague in physics) and I, joined by a few other faculty, began organizing meetings in our homes. We invited faculty in groups of ten, with a few BSA and MEChA representatives, along with Joe Watson and Carlos Blanco, their faculty advisers (what a heroic contribution of time and energy Watson and Blanco made during this period, maintaining the confidence of BSA and MEChA as well as the respect of their faculty colleagues!). We spent long hours in each of these meetings, with very spirited exchanges, and eventually reached more than a hundred faculty. Most of them were as impressed as I with the students and with the potential of building an exciting and academically sound college.

Academic Senate encouragement to pursue our efforts came in the spring of 1969, and resulted in my being selected to chair the Executive Committee of the third college planning faculty. In the early summer I was appointed acting provost by Chancellor McGill. His encouragement was visionary, and absolutely essential. Since these are personal reminiscences, the reader will not be surprised that I am
preoccupied with my own role, to the neglect of others, including Bill McGill. But I am sure Bill will understand—after all, he has had his day in print with his book, *Year of the Monkey*.

In the summer we organized and carried out a crash planning effort, with planning faculty assisted by about fifteen students employed for the summer for that purpose. My chief task, in addition to organizing this diverse crew, was to serve as editor. I had to read the draft academic plan as a typical faculty member or regent would read it. I had to keep the Marxist rhetoric out, while still retaining the inspiration of the Lumumba-Zapata document. We finally finished the Academic Plan on a frantic weekend in September, with my wife Jane and I working night and day on the final writing and editing. Our training at Broad Ripple High School in Indianapolis, Indiana, where she edited the school paper and I edited the yearbook, served us well.

Rereading the Third College Academic Plan today elicits some pained embarrassment (how could we have been so naive as to think we were going to teach science inductively, starting from everyday experience?), but mostly great pride in what we accomplished. We developed a plan the students felt was theirs, the planning faculty were enthusiastic about, the Academic Senate and regents could accept.

We finessed some contentious issues: the name of the college, the governance, admissions, and the need for new departments. I thought that if we tried to do everything at once we risked losing everything; therefore, some of these issues were ignored in the plan, others were relegated to appendices which represented work in progress on which I did not seek Academic Senate approval in 1968.

Reluctantly, the students accepted my advice that asking the regents to name the college “Lumumba-Zapata College” would jeopardize approval of the plan (to understare the case). Instead, we agreed to propose no name: officially the working designation “third college” would remain in place, and within the college we could use whatever name we chose. When I left the provost’s position, I was given by Joe Watson, the incoming provost, a desk-pan set inscribed with my name and the title “Provost of Lumumba-Zapata College, 1969-1970.”

The governance issue was a similar problem. We adopted our own bylaws, and sought no external approval. The Lumumba-Zapata demands called for the college to be governed by a six-person Board of Directors composed of three students (one selected by BSA, one by MEChA, and one other), two faculty (initially Watson and Blanco), and the provost. Decisions were to be made by consensus.

Chancellor McGill, visionary as he may have been about the future of the college, was not about to delegate the authority of a provost (what little there is) to a Board of Directors. I solved this one by agreeing inside the college that I would work by consensus with the board, but with no formal delegation of authority. During my one year we were able to make the board work—but at great cost, especially to the students. A.W. Russ, our business manager, paid me a heartfelt compliment: “One thing about you, Bill, is that you hang in there!”

And hanging in there was about the only advantage I had. Sometimes the board meetings would start in the morning and go on until late at night. Students and faculty came and went to classes and labs, but I, with full time to try to make the college work, hung in there. Note that I was thirty-six at the time: I have neither the stamina nor the patience for such a life today.

Eventually we reached consensus by exhaustion, and it was always a consensus I could live with. It is not surprising that such participatory democracy eventually perished from exhaustion. There really is an important role for students, faculty, and administrators to play in governing a college or university, but their roles are different and they must respect the primary task of students to learn and of faculty to teach and do research.

Governance by board consensus was one of several quixotic tasks we undertook, but from the vantage point of twenty-one years later, I would not have missed a moment of it. Our lives were enriched remarkably and our perspectives broadened by the experience. A college was built, which has by now lost the most quixotic elements of Lumumba-Zapata College, but which has retained enough memory of its initial ideals to enable it to enrich the entire campus with its distinctive character.
Reflections
on the Founding of Third College

by Joseph W. Watson
Third College Provost, 1970-81

For a number of reasons, I find it difficult to write about the founding years of Third College. First, memory fades with time, and twenty-plus years is a long time to remember events accurately in all their nuances. In addition, over time, memory becomes selective and, perhaps, even slanted, particularly in matters of great personal importance. And for me, Third College remains a matter of personal significance. My first years as provost were virtually all-consuming. With the exception of my family, Third College was effectively the dominant factor in my life. As a result, I find that even today, nine years after leaving the provostship of Third College, I still react to comments about the early years of Third College as if they were statements being made about a close personal friend. I have therefore tried to excuse myself from discussions of the formative years of Third College as an easy means of avoiding old issues which are still strongly felt. I will avoid most of those issues in the following reflections and comments.

My recollections of the early years of Third College are always centered first and foremost on the core of students who, during the period 1968 to 1970, participated in the events that led to a reformulation of the plans for Third College. It is my recollection that the students were very much reluctant activists. Their concerns, interests, and wishes were not very different from those of other students: grades, social life, finances, and their future. If possible, they would have happily just been students. But no matter how hard they may have wished for such an average student’s existence, it was not possible because they were black and brown students, and neither the campus nor the times would allow them to forget that overarching fact. Nevertheless, their orientation was basically one of moderation. In seeking change at UCSD, they sought dialog and cooperation, not confrontation.

When first asked to direct their attention and concerns to Third College, they rejected the invitation on the grounds that minority students and their concerns and interests should be represented in the two established colleges, Revelle and Muir, and not be postponed and shunted to a still-to-be-opened Third College. They then redoubled their efforts to have those two colleges respond favorably to their requests. It was only when those approaches to the extant colleges were rejected by a senior administrator in a manner that was considered arrogant and reflecting the view that neither the students nor the communities they represented had a right to make curricula requests of the university, that their approach changed from requests and discussion to demands and confrontation. This one rejection was certainly not the sole cause of the change in attitude and approach, for there had been many other rejections. It just happened to be the one in the series that tipped the balance toward the view that there was little real interest at UCSD in the concerns and plight of minorities, and that progress in having UCSD respond affirmatively to minority needs and interests would be extremely slow without a major change in relationships and priorities. If such
changes could not be achieved, it was felt that the minority students should leave UCSD for UCLA and Berkeley, where there were minority communities actively struggling for positive changes.

My respect and admiration for the 1968-70 core of students is based principally on their being reluctant activists. They had no interest in entering a struggle, but they saw a problem, requested change through the available channels, and when those requests failed, petitioned by more vigorous and effective means to correct the injustices and wrongs they perceived. Although there may be considerable debate and criticism of their specific methods and actions, there certainly must be praise for their acting in concert with what we like to believe is an American dictum and tradition: Do not passively accept injustices and wrongs—act to correct them.

One of my great concerns during the formative years of Third College, and particularly during the 1969-71 period, was that the struggles for Third College would exact a high emotional and academic toll on the students. Fortunately, the students appear to have gained strength and resolve from the struggle. It is testimony to their strength of character and dedication that all ultimately obtained their bachelor's degrees, and virtually all earned advanced degrees and became successful professionals and influential citizens.

What were the goals of Third College? There were and are probably at least "n + 1" views of the goals of Third College, where "n" is the number of people being polled for their opinions. Thus, I will only claim that what follows is just my view of the primary goals of Third College. First and foremost, its goal was to enroll and educate a large number of students from groups that have been historically disadvantaged in American society and underrepresented in higher education (African Americans, Mexican Americans and Native Americans). The goal never meant that Third
College should only enroll students from these groups or that students from these groups should not be enrolled in the other UCSD colleges in substantial numbers. The goal simply meant that Third College should play a lead and major role in educating students from these groups.

The Third College education was to be broad and inclusive, covering all the disciplines, with a special emphasis on the natural sciences, mathematics, and engineering. There was always a strong interest in premedical studies, with the result that Third College sends a significant number of graduates on to medical, dental, and other health-related graduate schools each year.

The second priority goal for Third College was an integrated faculty, with all racial and ethnic groups, particularly those historically underrepresented on university faculties, having significant, not token, representation. The matter of faculty is central to any academic institution. The faculty determines the curriculum, its scope and emphasis. The faculty determines the intellectual tone and vigor of a college. By its composition and interests, the faculty declares who and what are important or irrelevant in the academy. No matter how it may be phrased and whatever ancillary issues may be discussed, the struggle for Third College was at its core an issue of faculty, curriculum, and academic research interests.

In its early years, Third College was successful in recruiting a faculty that was diverse and deeply committed to the educational goals of the college. The faculty was exceptionally dedicated to developing a curriculum that addressed students and topics long ignored by universities and colleges. The majority of the new faculty was non-tenured junior faculty who enthusiastically devoted themselves to teaching, the students, and Third College. When they were reviewed for tenure, their teaching, extraordinary service to the students and the college, and their distinctive research interests were not given sufficient recognition and weight by departmental and campuswide reviewers; and consequently they were denied tenure and let go. These junior faculty, more than any other group in the college, were the casualties of the struggle to develop Third College. It is to be hoped that they and their careers fully rebounded from the setback they suffered at UCSD. In at least some instances this has clearly been the case.

Although there have been vigorous criticisms of Third College, some were based on the most noble of motivations and considerations, and others were simply mean-spirited; there was also a great deal of empathetic and active support from all corners of the campus—particularly from the faculty—as well as from off-campus. Because they are often the targets of unjustified blame, I will only specifically mention the critical approval and support Third College received from the regents and the legislature. Without their supportive actions, the college simply could not have opened and developed. Third College is therefore indebted to those many regents and legislators who made the effort to reach fair decisions based on a critical evaluation and a determination of the facts, fictions, and the unknowns.

For those actively involved, the formative years of Third College were a period of great excitement and challenge, of high expectation and frequent frustration, and often of exhaustion. There was also a great sense of progress and achievement. Third College provided a sense of mission and noble goals, a sense of righting long-standing discrimination and wrongs. Because the enrollment and educational goals established for Third College were radical departures from contemporary American society, it is no surprise that they have not been fully achieved. But the true test of the success or failure of Third College should not be whether the goals advocated for it in 1969-70 have been fully achieved, but whether those goals remain the fundamental dream that propels the college and gives its faculty, students, and administration a distinct sense of mission. In honor of all those who struggled for Third College for over two decades, may that always be the case.
Musings on Third College

by Faustina Solis
Third College Provost, 1981-88

Twenty years have transpired since Third College was established as part of the configuration of colleges which was a special feature of the academic structure of UCSD. I came to the university in winter quarter, 1971, in the formative stages of the college when enthusiasm, exuberance, and commitment for the new college were holding fast.

Truly it is difficult to recapture the wide range of impressions, thoughts, and expectations from a period in my life that was laced with the intricacies of so many experiences. There were many delightful episodes, happy and momentous occasions, as well as those fraught with common frustrations and stresses. Third College has been an integral part of my life for the past twenty years and it will remain thus as long as I live. Why? I do not think I can really tell you because I myself do not fully understand it. But this I know, one having been a part of Third College, one can never remain neutral about it (actually few persons are neutral about Third College whether they know anything about it or not).

When I was appointed to the Department of Community and Family Medicine in 1971, it was understood that I would also have academic responsibility as a faculty member of Third College, particularly in the Urban and Rural Studies Program. At the college I was speedily introduced to the tough yet delicate process of generating and promoting ideas, principles, and policies for Third College which would meet the approval of many varied sectors of the campus population: students, faculty, and administration. Truthfully, most of the time I felt out of my element and totally unprepared to cope with the bureaucratic machinations of the academic world. Nonetheless, I was buoyed by the intriguing intensity of commitment so warmly demonstrated by the founding core of students and faculty, all working together. I observed heated debates in those early meetings, but eventually agreement was reached and we were able to settle upon the most appropriate policies for that period of time, policies which would launch Third College on a dynamic course of development.

The faculty were persistent, as they spent untold hours in framing the general-education requirements and special program curricula in keeping with the espoused mission of the college, which called for a broad range of studies—i.e., cultural, social, historical, and political perspectives of contemporary social issues. It was not always accepted that there should be a broad consideration, but the eventual structure of courses was contained within a framework of multiethnic considerations, as the focus could not be devoted specifically to the United States. In subsequent years I have not encountered the impressive attendance and excitement in student meetings that characterized the participation in those years. Those students were part of the turmoil which had resulted in a tenuous victory—I say tenuous because obviously there were many on campus who never approved of the concept of Third College and believed that eventually it would crumble.

Oh yes, we muddled through months when the
students felt strongly they were more equipped than we to dictate the "relevance" of courses and studies. As faculty members, we prevailed in maintaining standards of achievement, but not without a skirmish here and there.

I cannot proceed without giving special recognition to Dr. Joseph Watson, who served as provost of Third College for twelve years. He provided the leadership and vision to forge the permanent establishment of Third College. At times the roar of diverse opinions must have been deafening, but he took calculated risks and made necessary decisions in stride. He headed the recruitment of faculty and became a strong advocate for the fledgling Third College academic programs. For the most part, those programs have been strengthened through the years: Communication has become a department, Teacher Education Program now offers an advanced degree, Urban Studies and Planning has developed a strong major, and Third World Studies and Chicano Studies will undoubtedly play an important role in complementing the course of study for the new Department of Ethnic Studies.

When I became acting provost in 1981, the Third College permanent campus was established, and the academic curriculum also was in place. Though I was acquainted with the faculty, I was less knowledgeable concerning the activities of the staff, many of whom I came to regard with admiration. The implementation of policy on a day-to-day basis becomes the responsibility of staff, who we often tend to take for granted. It was they and/or students who devised innovative procedures and programs to enhance the physical and social well-being and academic progress of Third College students. For example: the inclusion in the graduation ceremony of parents accompanying the graduates during the conferring of degrees was a tradition established by the Charter Class. The partnership of students and staff established the Cultural Celebration as a tradition for Open House Sunday, developed a highly sophisticated, well-trained peer academic advising corps, and assisted in the design of the new dormitories. Then there were the special support programs administered by faculty and staff, such as the Minority Biomedical Research Program and the highly successful Honors Achievement Workshop. The program staff was able to depend on the provost's staff for technical support and hands-on assistance.

At Third College we have never been afraid to be the testing ground for innovative ideas, activities, or programs which would enhance the quality of education or services offered to students. I hope that Third College will always retain that flexibility, responsibly, as it has to date.

It is not unusual to hear alumni, and sometimes faculty and staff, decry the fact that Third College has not carried forth the purpose for which it was established. Third College, in my estimation, cannot ever be what it was at its birth. Students are no longer imbued with the sense of a cause to be fought. I often spoke to students who did not know about Third College's legacy, nor did they actually care to know, for their goals were quite individualistic. This is a fact of life. There are many students, however, who chose Third College because they believed in those early tenets, and there are students who, in the process of their education, understand and become advocates of the importance of the college's mission.

The critics of the apparent lack of conviction for Third College's mission are correct in the sense that the social issues of racism, poverty, and unequal opportunities for segments of our society are as prevalent today as they were twenty years ago. The trend in demographic changes and its impact on society, which Third College's philosophy attempted to address, have become a matter of urgency. However, even at Third College we have not been successful in becoming a helping educational partner in the greater community. Such a partnership is necessary to assure a balanced, diverse student population, and it will be difficult to catch up.

I do not believe that, in the future, Third College will be indistinguishable from the other colleges. It has its own history, and that cannot be erased. Changing the name of the college does not change attitudes or expectations, and if ever UCSD needed a Third College it is now, as history repeats itself. It is most fortunate that Provost Cecil Lytle is at the helm, for he brings a vigor and creativity so essential in the leadership of Third College.

I trust that the next twenty years will engender a breadth and scope of development at Third College that reflects greater sensitivity as well as substantive scholarly achievements not measured simply by enrollments and numbers of buildings.
Third College Today: A Contemporary View
by Cecil Lytle
Third College Provost, 1988-present

It is difficult for anyone at the University of California, San Diego to speak in terms of long traditions. Those few things that we revere for their longevity and excellence (like the Scripps Institution of Oceanography) were already well established when UCSD was founded in 1960. The meteoric rise of UCSD, therefore, is even more astounding given its overall youth. This campus is, indeed, a phenomenon that embodies characteristics uniquely Californian. Its youth is matched only by its pride, unabashed energy, and eclecticism.

The University of California, San Diego was barely four years old when First College (later renamed Revelle College) began. The opening of Second College (renamed John Muir College) coincided with the founding of the School of Medicine and the appointment of William J. McGill as the third UCSD chancellor, in 1968. Except for Fourth College (later renamed Warren College) and Fifth College, each of the first three undergraduate colleges was founded during the turbulence and optimism that engulfed America during the early 1960s.

Although the turbulence continued unabated, the optimism of the early 1960s had changed to bitterness and frustration by the latter part of the decade. Combining the public opposition to the Vietnam War with the abandonment of the quest for The Great Society, Americans inexorably turned inward in order to find power in themselves and insulation from a government they severely distrusted.

Nationally, the drive toward personal and group retrenchment gave rise to the Black Power Movement with its designs for self-reliance and conspicuous pride. The same year that Third College opened its doors, Ralph Nader organized a small band of young lawyers into Nader’s Raiders for the sole purpose of protecting consumers from corporate and governmental abuse. Also that year, John Gardner and Common Cause began a grassroots no-nonsense approach to understanding our democracy, and Earth Day advocates started a twenty-year revolution in the way we think about the planet. Locally, the creation of Chicano Park near Barrio Logan became the battle cry of self-determination for people of Mexican origin. The establishment of the Centro Cultural de La Raza in Balboa Park in 1970 was the artistic expression of the movement.

These local and national events coincided with UCSD’s need to create the third of its colleges. It is not surprising, therefore, that the moral and social imperatives expressed in Chicano Park, Watts, and Wounded Knee collided headlong with the innocent altruism of the relatively new university in La Jolla. Out of that collision came the need to make the spirit of UCSD’s newest institution more responsive to the interests of Chicanos, African Americans, and Native Americans. In part, the creation of Third College allowed this campus to constructively focus and reflect its involvement in the social change that was sweeping America. As Berkeley erupted in a near hopeless confrontation between groups of its citizens who each thought they...
were right, the San Diego campus was attempting to rethink the core goals and ambitions of higher education. The initial academic programs of the college were Third World Studies, Urban & Rural Studies, Communication, and Science & Technology. Soon, these programs were joined by Chicano Studies, Contemporary Black Arts, and the Teacher Education Program. The intent was to offer to all UCSD students a consideration of what Langston Hughes called the "other America," the America that colleges one and two neglected to include in their initial philosophic orbit.

Perhaps because we are so close in time to the founding of this college, beginnings are more prominent—and even more cherished—than endings. Like their counterparts in the academic departments, many of the founders of the colleges at UCSD are still active in the life of the campus. Because many of the participants in the evolution of Third College were students, it is remarkable to think that the college is today as old as they were when they helped to shape the philosophy of Third College two decades ago. Unlike an academic department, however, the conventions and institutional memory of a college at UCSD are subject to rapid alterations more akin to the time cycle of students.

Throughout my seventeen years at Third College and UCSD, "participation" has always been the benchmark of Third College. The first students, who in 1968 began to help develop the scope of the academic and social spirit of the third college, saw their mission extending beyond the protective boundaries of the campus. Because of the energy of the era, public service, to them, was a matter of personal survival. The recruitment, retention, and training of students of color was not just a matter of public service, but the unfolding of a struggle of epic moral proportions. The charter students at Third College captured the moral high ground, with a youthful enthusiasm which succeeded in inspiring an idyllic campus community that was quite unprepared for the sort of upheaval more commonly associated with Berkeley, Madison, and later Kent State.

The challenge facing Third College, however, goes beyond the simple reverence for the past. The coming years provide opportunities for more innovation and new beginnings. Citizens of Third College respond to two ideals: quality education and social responsibility. The new curriculum, scheduled to begin fall 1991, helps us address both of these principles. The three-quarter core course sequence, Diversity, Justice, and Imagination provides a common academic experience for all of our entering first-year students. The faculty, staff, and students of the college spent thousands of person-hours over the last two years developing this new sequence. Although we assiduously attempted to dodge the trivializing public debate conducted on the issue of core courses, it became clear to me that our mission in 1990 was to essentially update and refocus the core academic experience envisioned in 1970 for today's young people, who will enter an exciting and rapidly changing California and world in the twenty-first century.

Part of the update and renewal is also revealed in the Public Service Option portion of the new curriculum. It has always been a Third College belief that education is the proper tool to empower groups and individuals who have traditionally been denied opportunity in this country. Our students recognize that public service is still in their best interests as members of an ever-interdependent society. Through this new program, Third College students will receive general-education course credit for serving as one-on-one tutors to hundreds of underrepresented minority children in San Diego inner-city schools. This effort is a very old idea at Third College. Indeed, several of the charter students took it upon themselves to actively recruit and tutor students of color. However, the practice waned because it was too dependent upon individual student commitment, time, and energy.

The re-establishment of this option in 1990 as a part of the Third College core curriculum serves as a perpetual reminder to us all that the mission of a university goes beyond the campus boundaries. The chief purpose of the new Third College Public Service Option is to develop a cadre of future UC eligible students.

It should come as no small surprise that educational institutions typically lag behind trends. In a study conducted a few years ago, it was found that over two-thirds of the student population at UCSD already participate in some form of public service. However, they usually see this activity as lying outside of the expectations or demands of the most important institutions in their lives—the university. The institution requires what it deems important to the development of an educated person, i.e., mathematics, basic sciences, writing, humanities, arts, and social sciences. Erroneously, our institution does not expect that there is a role
for the university in encouraging citizenship, or a place where all of this new knowledge can be shared.

The Third College Public Service Option, therefore, offers dual benefits. First, our students will be allowed to use their power as participants in the grand social arena, and the college will recognize and reward this service as it rewards and recognizes other contributions and achievements, namely, with course credit. While participation in this program is voluntary, our first orientation meetings indicate that there is enthusiastic student support for this curricular option. Third College students recognize that, regardless of their own personal socioeconomic backgrounds, they are already the beneficiaries of the best educational opportunity in the United States. The young people selected for the first year of the Third College Public Service Option, therefore, already subscribe to the adage, “to whom much is given, much is required.”

Second, the university will be committing its most valuable resource—its bright and energetic young people—to the very practical realization of excellence in education and access to opportunity for all of the citizens of our community. Another positive aspect of this new program is that it brings one of our original academic programs, the Teacher Education Program, back into its central role in the lives of our students.

Other academic programs closely associated with the college have taken giant leaps forward in their own evolution. After a two-year effort, the UCSD Academic Senate voted in April 1990 to approve the establishment of the Department of Ethnic Studies. This past September, the Regents of the University of California officially approved the creation of this new department on the San Diego campus. This possibility has been discussed since before Third College existed and remains a project closely aligned with the interests of the college today. Now, in our twentieth year, the full aspirations of our programs in Chicano Studies, Asian American Studies, and Contemporary Black Arts have come to fruition. Over these past twenty-four months, a number of faculty closely associated with Third College have played key roles in this development, most notably, Carlos Blanco, Matthew Chen, Tim McDaniel, Paul Drake, Floyd Gaffney, Jim Lin, Ramon Ruiz, and the chair of the new department, Ramon Gutierrez. The establishment of the Department of Ethnic Studies means there will be greater stability in our general-education courses with the presence of faculty who teach and conduct research on issues central to the interests of the college.

There were many moments when the effort to create a Department of Ethnic Studies at UCSD was reminiscent of the effort to create a unique third college on the UCSD campus over twenty years ago. This time, however, there was less external controversy and internal dissension. Perhaps this is proof of our general maturity. More importantly, the Third College community, as well as the broader UCSD campus, is today more comfortable with its role as the intellectual presence on issues directly related to the concerns expressed by an ethnic studies department.

The future looks bright in terms of the special opportunities we can provide Third College students. Through the intelligent hard work of Mae Brown, director of Third College Academic Advising, we began formal student exchange programs with Morehouse College and Spelman College in Atlanta. This new program allows UCSD students to spend up to a year at one of these prestigious historically black colleges, while a similar number of Atlanta students study at UCSD. Like the Dartmouth student exchange program, students have the opportunity to study in a collegiate environment significantly different from a public research university in southern California. We hope to extend this opportunity to include faculty and staff in the very near future.

The occasion of the twentieth anniversary of Third College will be celebrated throughout the 1990-91 academic year with events which stem from the heart of the college’s philosophy. These events are outlined in this book and are planned to renew and heighten our goals of academic excellence, public service, and cultural diversity. (See 20th Anniversary Calendar, p. 118).

Given the original mandate, the twentieth anniversary celebration, and recent programmatic innovations, the quest to find a more meaningful name for the college is appropriate. I realize that this is a highly charged issue that interests current faculty, students, and staff, as well as previous members who are no longer at Third College. The name of a college should as accurately as possible be the symbol that represents its beliefs. The fact that Third College stands and strives is a tribute to the thousands of good people who have shared in its dream. Our campus is no longer a cozy intellectual community of
COMMENCEMENT CEREMONY

Processional—Faculty and Graduating Class of 1990

Call to Order
Dr. Ramon Pinon, Chairman, Third College Faculty

Invocation
The Reverend Edward Reynolds

Welcome
Dr. Richard Akinshon, Chancellor
University of California, San Diego
Professor Cecil Lytle, Provost
Third College, University of California, San Diego

Senior Address
Kimberly M. Dzierz

Commencement Address
Representative Tom Lantos, 11th Congressional District

Confering of Degrees
Chancellor Richard Atkinson
Provost Cecil Lytle

Presentation of Awards
Third College Medallion: Joan C. Willett
UCSD Oceanside Award: Grace A. Espinelli
UCSD Alumni Award: Paul I. Lanning
Third College Alumni Award: Sydney C. Young
Third College Outstanding Faculty Award: Edward Reynolds
Third College Dean's Award: Stephanie DeLaTorre
Third College Provost's Award: Michael P. Casey
Third College Outstanding Senior Award: Alexander Wong

Call to Close
Dr. Ramon Pinon, Chairman, Third College Faculty

*Over for awards explanation

COMMENCEMENT AWARDS
Class of 1990

Third College Outstanding Faculty Award
presented to
Dr. Edward Reynolds
Professor of History
by vote of the senior class for outstanding commitment and service to students

Third College Outstanding Senior Award
presented to
Alexander Wong
by vote of his peers for representing the ideals of Third College

Third College Dean's Award
presented to
Stephanie DeLaTorre
and
Erik Nielsen
by the Dean's Awards Committee for outstanding service, leadership, and scholarship

UCSD Alumni Award
presented to
Sydney C. Young
for outstanding commitment to Third College

UCSD Oceanside Award
presented to
Grace A. Espinelli
by Third College and the UCSD Oceanside for outstanding service to the college

Third College Medallion
presented to
Joan C. Willett
Outstanding High School Teacher
Woodbridge High School for outstanding commitment to education
two or three small colleges. Over the next decades, UCSD will burgeon to include up to as many as seven colleges serving a student population of nearly 30,000.

It was felt that along with the curriculum revision and public service commitment, the present name of the college needed to be addressed. After several Town Meetings, the publication of position papers, countless faculty, staff, and student meetings, a student referendum, and the advice of the Third College Renaming Committee, I was pleased to forward a list of recommendations to the UCSD Naming Committee. Foremost was the recommendation that effective fall 1991 the college be renamed King College in honor of Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr. Indeed, this recommendation to the regents brings us full circle. The event which moved the Third College at UCSD away from the pursuits of Clio and toward a more contemporary vision of the United States was the assassination of Reverend Martin Luther King, Jr. This fact alone recognizes the indelible mark made upon all of us by Dr. King. There is no question that Martin Luther King, Jr. liberated all Americans and offered a view of what we can become as a college and as a civilization. The recommendation also included honoring my predecessor by renaming Third College Lecture Hall, Solis Hall.

We were near the final step in the multi-layered procedure which involves the college, the UCSD Naming Committee, the chancellor and, ultimately, the UC regents. Following the chancellor’s approval, but before forwarding the matter to the regents, the university, as a courtesy, sought the endorsement of Mrs. Coretta Scott King. Mrs. King has declined to endorse the renaming because of her longtime dream to build a King College in Atlanta. Out of respect for Mrs. King’s wishes, UCSD will not forward the recommendation for King College to the regents. Third College will retain its present name. While we regret the outcome of this effort to rename the college, I believe that the exercise has been useful. The new and exciting programs mentioned above are the direct result of this open process. The discussions held during this two-year period have helped our community to deepen its commitment to the principles that brought Third College into existence twenty years ago.

It is my hope that every reader of this book will reflect broadly on the comments and opinions expressed herein. This text should not be read as the personal trials or opinions of individual participants in search of concurrence or opposition. Rather, it should be read as a not too distant drama that began when the University of California, San Diego, like every other community in the United States during the 1960s, sought to come to terms with and expand upon the powerful visionary ideals of the era.

Without a doubt, Third College is one of the successful experiments from the 1960s that continues to work! I invite you to join us as Third College enters its third decade of service to excellence in education and social responsibility.
Third College
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Faith Ringgold
Celebrating Cultural Diversity in the American Theatre
September 2 - November 10, 1990
Grove Gallery

King Concert Series I
Cecil Lytle, pianist and The La Jolla Symphony
Tom Nee, Conductor
October 18, 1990
5:00 p.m.
Price Center Plaza

Language, Literacy and Culture for Deaf Children
Open Forum:
October 20, 1990
9:00 a.m.
3201 Robinson Bldg. - IRPS

Contact: Dr. Carol Padden
534-4410

Third College Lecture Series on Cultural Literacy
Arturo Madrid, Presenter
October 24, 1990
7:00 p.m.
Oceanview Lounge

Why Americans Don't Vote: A Symposium
November 2, 1990
9:00 a.m. - 4:30 p.m.
Mandeville Recital Hall

An exhibition of artist Faith Ringgold's soft sculpture, including painted story quilts and doll on loan from New York's Bernice Steinbaum Gallery.

Third College Provost Cecil Lytle, a noted concert pianist, will appear as piano soloist with the La Jolla Symphony in a courtyard performance of American music.

In association with the Department of Communication, the Educational Cultural Complex of San Diego, the Greater Los Angeles Council on Deafness, and Gallaudet University, this conference will bring together researchers, educators, parents and other individuals who have an interest in literacy in young deaf children.

Dr. Arturo Madrid, a charter Third College faculty member in the early 1970s, is currently the director of the Tomas Rivera Center at the Claremont Graduate School. Presented in association with the Teacher Education Program, Dr. Madrid will lead off this lecture series highlighting recent participants on Bill Moyers' PBS program, World of Ideas.

One of the great challenges of the last two decades has been to halt the precipitous decline in voter turnout and civic participation at all levels of society. To what is this attributable, and how can we reinvigorate our democratic process? These and similar issues will be addressed at this symposium.

World Writing and Politics at the End of the 20th Century
November 2-4, 1990
IRPS Auditorium

Cultural Diversity in the American Theatre:
Moving Toward the 21st Century
November 8-11, 1990
Price Center

Contact: Dr. Floyd Gaffney
534-0670

King Concert Series II
Cecil Lytle, pianist
December 2, 1990
3:00 p.m.
Mandeville Auditorium

Martin Luther King, Jr. Commemorative Concert
UCSD Gospel Choir
Ken Anderson, Director
January 21, 1991
7:30 p.m.
Mandeville Auditorium

Third College Lecture Series on Cultural Literacy
Paolo Freire, Presenter
February 4-8, 1991
Price Center

Also celebrating the 25th Anniversary of the Department of Literature, this symposium examines the complex relationship between writing and politics that serves as a common denominator connecting different literatures and cultural discourses.

The keynote speakers at this conference focusing on the development of non-mainstream theatre will be Luis Valdez, playwright author of Zoot Suit, and No Stinkin' Badges, and Lloyd Richards, Director of the Yale University Theatre, and director of several August Wilson Plays.

The program will include two monumental works: Schubert's Piano Sonata in B Major, D. 960 and Beethoven's Piano Sonata # 32 in C Minor, opus 111.

Each year overflow audiences attend this free public event in remembrance of the aspirations and ideals of the slain civil rights leader. In recent years the evening has also featured an address by a leading public figure.

Brazil's Secretary of Education, Paulo Freire, is author of Pedagogy of the Oppressed, Pedagogy for Liberation, The Politics of Education and over 100 articles on overcoming adult illiteracy, education as an emancipatory force, and cultural literacy.
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King Concert Series III
In Celebration of Black History Month: Rags to Other Riches
February 10, 1991
3:00 p.m.
Mandeville Center

A discussion and performance by Cecil Lytle of music by Scott Joplin with commentary that traces the evolution of the musical properties of ragtime found throughout jazz and contemporary music in the twentieth century.

Third College Lecture Series on Cultural Literacy
Dr. Michael Rose, Presenter
February 20-21, 1991
Price Center

Dr. Rose, director of the UCLA Writing Program, authored Lives on the Boundaries, a critically acclaimed work about the struggles and achievements of America’s underclass and the cultural resources they deploy against the barriers erected by the dominant class.

In King’s Image
March 14 - April 27, 1991
Grove Gallery

This art exhibition will present various artistic representations of the Reverend Martin Luther King, Jr.

Artist’s Reception:
April 13, 1991
6:30 - 8:00 p.m.

Bill T. Jones/Arnie Zane Dance Company
March 19 - 20, 1991
Speckles Theatre

Premiere performances of a new work entitled The Last Supper at Uncle Tom’s Cabin. Presented in association with the San Diego Foundation for Performing Arts.

Third College Film Festival
April 1991
Contact: Dr. Robert Cancel
534-3276

This month-long series will present feature films from around the world, and will be preceded by talks by directors, actors, or artisans associated with each production.

Third College Cultural Celebration
April 14, 1991

An annual display of the dance, music, art and fashion of many of America’s cultures held during UCSD’s Open House.

Evening with Film-maker
Paul Espinosa
May 2, 1991
7:00 p.m.
Price Center Theatre

Dr. Paul Espinosa has written and produced numerous programs on Mexican immigrants and U.S./Mexico border issues. His documentaries include: In the Shadow of the Law, The Trail North, The Lemon Grove Incident, and Ballad of an Unsung Hero.

Third College Alumni Reunion
May 24-26, 1991

The first reunion in the history of the college will be a gathering of graduates from across the years held over Memorial Day weekend. Events will include a campus fun-run, concerts, lectures, a family-day picnic, and year-specific class reunions.

Alumni Nate East and Hollis Gentry join Provost Cecil Lytle in this command performance during the Alumni Reunion.
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