

Title:

Todd Newberry: Professor of Biology

Author:

[Newberry, Andrew Todd](#)
[Jarrell, Randall](#)

Publication Date:

September 1, 2006

Series:

[Other Recent Work](#)

Permalink:

<http://escholarship.org/uc/item/79k9m51b>

Keywords:

Marine ecology, University of California, Santa Cruz history

Abstract:

This interview with [Andrew] Todd Newberry was conducted by Randall Jarrell, the former director of the Regional History Project, on July 18, 1994 in Newberry's office at UCSC. Todd Newberry arrived at UCSC as a founding faculty member in biology when the campus opened in 1965. He had earned a B.A. in biology from Princeton University and a Ph.D. in biology from Stanford University, where his doctoral research focused on ascidian tunicates ("sea squirts"). Other research interests included invertebrate development and reproduction and biosystematics. Professor Newberry speaks of teaching "as a form of persuasion, of launching, of getting people interested in things." Some of the other courses Newberry taught over the years included Invertebrate Zoology, The Organism in Its Environment (Biology 1A), Invertebrate Anatomy Laboratory, Morphogenesis, and California Marine Invertebrates.

In this narration Newberry provides his recollections of the early years at UCSC, particularly of Cowell College. He characterizes those years as "exhilarating," and as an "improbable adventure." He also discusses the development of the biology board [now department], and his colleagues such as William Doyle, Charles Daniel, and Peter Ray.

Supporting material:

Copyright Information:

All rights reserved unless otherwise indicated. Contact the author or original publisher for any necessary permissions. eScholarship is not the copyright owner for deposited works. Learn more at http://www.escholarship.org/help_copyright.html#reuse

Table of Contents

Introduction 1

Appointment at UC Santa Cruz 5

Cowell College 10

Biology Board 14

College/Board Conflicts 21

Reflections on UC Santa Cruz 33

Early Retirement 41

Index 47

Introduction

From 1991 through 1994, the University of California initiated three early retirement options for faculty and staff, known as VERIP (Voluntary Early Retirement Incentive Program), as a salary savings measure during a period of unprecedented budget cuts. The thinking was that many senior faculty with high salaries would retire and be replaced by young faculty at the lower end of the salary scale. At UC Santa Cruz, a number of pioneering senior faculty opted for early retirement. Since many of these faculty might leave the area, the Regional History Project initiated interviews with a group of them to document their recollections of early campus history and their participation in the development of various boards of studies (at that time UCSC's designation for departments) which over the years has led to national academic distinction in a number of disciplines.

This interview with [Andrew] Todd Newberry was conducted by Randall Jarrell, the former director of the Regional History Project, on July 18, 1994 in Newberry's office at UCSC. Todd Newberry arrived at UCSC as a founding faculty member in biology when the campus opened in 1965. He had earned a B.A. in biology from Princeton University and a Ph.D. in biology from Stanford University, where his doctoral research focused on ascidian tunicates ("sea squirts"). Other research interests included invertebrate development and reproduction and biosystematics.

One of my cherished memories of my undergraduate years at UCSC is of a field trip to explore the tidepools of the Año Nuevo State Reserve with the impassioned guidance of

Professor Todd Newberry. I recall him holding up a large tunicate and with great glee informing us students in the *Natural History of Año Nuevo* class that this improbable creature was one of our ancient, distant relations. This kind of inspiring teaching was characteristic of Professor Newberry, who in this oral history speaks of teaching “as a form of persuasion, of launching, of getting people interested in things.” Some of the other courses Newberry taught over the years included *Invertebrate Zoology*, *The Organism in Its Environment (Biology 1A)*, *Invertebrate Anatomy Laboratory*, *Morphogenesis*, and *California Marine Invertebrates*.

In this narration Newberry provides his recollections of the early years at UCSC, particularly of Cowell College. He characterizes those years as “exhilarating,” and as an “improbable adventure.” He also discusses the development of the biology board [now department], and his colleagues such as William Doyle, Charles Daniel, and Peter Ray. Reflecting on the strengths and weaknesses of this board at the time of his retirement in 1994, Newberry notes a problematic split between the molecular/cell biologists and the ecological biologists, a division which had left the board at cross-purposes in hiring and “unable to comprehend what another person’s intellectual problems or resource problems might be.”

Like many other founding faculty at UCSC, Newberry experienced tensions between his devotion to undergraduate teaching and the pressure to publish his research. He chose to devote himself to teaching rather than research, and won the Distinguished Teaching Award at UCSC in 1987. Newberry feels that he made this decision at some cost to his

career within the tenure system and discusses that in his oral history, as well as his disappointment with the directions UCSC took after the early years. “Those of us who came at the start have had not only a career-long commitment with the place, but really a love affair with the place; it’s our kid. We are bound to feel just profoundly, not disappointed . . . but disconcerted, dismayed, dis-something, discouraged sometimes.”

In his retirement Newberry has continued to be affiliated with UCSC as a teacher and researcher. In addition, he has a remarkable and inspiring record of publication. In 2005 he published *The Ardent Birder* (Ten Speed Press) in which he shares the wisdom of a lifelong birder, an accomplished scientist, and an extraordinary teacher. Written in the great tradition of literary natural history, the book offers tips on birding and information about birds, but also Newberry’s meditations on the experience of birdwatching itself. Newberry’s writing has also appeared in *Omnivore*, *The Antioch Review*, *The North American Review*, and *The Threepenny Review*. Finally, he leads birdwatching trips for the local bird club, the UCSC Arboretum, and other groups in Santa Cruz County. His wife, Louise, whom he mentions several times in the oral history, died suddenly on May 29, 2004. She was an active member of the Pajaro Valley Arts Council and worked for five years as director of the Eloise Smith Gallery at UCSC. She also helped to launch the Museum of Art and History in Santa Cruz.

We are happy to finally be able to publish this volume after many years of delay due to time and funding constraints. Newberry read the edited transcript of this interview and made extensive corrections. Copies of this volume are available in the Bancroft Library at

the University of California, Berkeley; and in Special Collections, McHenry Library, University of California, Santa Cruz. The Regional History Project is supported administratively by Christine Bunting, Head of Special Collections and Archives, and University Librarian Virginia Steel.

—Irene Reti, Director, Regional History Project

September 1, 2006

University of California, Santa Cruz

Appointment at UC Santa Cruz

Jarrell: To start, Todd, when did you come to UC Santa Cruz?

Newberry: 1965. I was at Hopkins Marine Station in Pacific Grove, and Lawrence Blinks and Cornelis van Niel said to check out UC Santa Cruz. In 1964, in June, I was on my way to Brussels for a post doc, and I stopped and met Dean [E. McHenry] and Barbara Sheriff. They were at Cabrillo [College] at the time.

Jarrell: Right, the campus offices, yes, before the campus was built.

Newberry: Yes. I spent about fifteen minutes with them, and then drove on to New York. The thing I remember of that meeting was Dean saying, "If we bat .500, that's a great average." That's the only thing that sticks in my mind, but I had three thousand miles to think about it. So I went off, and then got an offer around November 1964, which was clearly the work of Blinks and van Niel.

Since the contract said the job began in July, and I was planning on being in Brittany in July, I was naive enough to wonder whether I was supposed to be here then. And so I started to ask in the spring of 1965: "When do I have to get there? What courses do you want me to teach?" And what I would get back was word that the picnic table had been moved under another oak tree. So I finally showed up in August 1965. We'd been through Santa Cruz from time to time, because I was in Pacific Grove and from there you go through here on the way to San Francisco. But I'd never been up to where the campus

would be, never been up High Street. When I got here I paused at the [First] Congregational Church because it was the largest building around, so that might be the university. But I figured it wasn't, with a cross atop its steeple. But then I kept driving by the campus entrance because, even though it had a gate, that was a cattle gate. I remember this sense of "where am I?" when I got on the ranch, because it was very much still a ranch. I figured I'd walk up and see what the buildings looked like, since we were down at the entrance, at the Cook House. Well, I walked and walked, and walked. Grasslands, cows . . . It was a very unnerving experience. So . . . August 1965. I rented Mary Takayanagi's house, the house she'd been renting, on Western Drive. Louise and the kids came after me, in late August.

Jarrell: Where had you been living?

Newberry: In Brussels and in Brittany. Louise stayed in New Jersey with the kids and my parents while I scouted out a place to stay here. I was thirty. She was about twenty-five, which is unnerving now, because now my daughters are older than Louise was then. So many years! I found the 1965-66 catalog and even the grade sheet for my first class here when I was moving my lab this spring, in some crazy ghost story way. I was moving from Applied Sciences into the new Earth and Marine Sciences building. The old lab was empty and I was picking stuff off the floor, just the last pieces of paper; and God knows how, but the grade sheet for my first course was lying there on the floor: *Invertebrate Zoology* in the Fall of 1965. As I recall, that was the first course I taught, and it was the very first class on campus. [Kenneth V.] Thimann was written up in the *Santa*

Cruz Sentinel as having taught the first class, but as I recall, he really didn't—I did. We used to joke about it. I insisted we met ten minutes early just to be sure. I found the grade sheet the other day. Spooky.

Jarrell: That's very serendipitous. So two of your professors at Hopkins had put in a good word for you.

Newberry: Yes. They weren't my professors, but they knew me well because Hopkins Marine Station was a tiny community of four faculty and about fifteen graduate students. Much smaller then than now.

Jarrell: So you met McHenry, and he knew that these two professors thought very well of you, and that was sort of the extent of the recruitment? (laughter).

Newberry: That was it. It was a different world. In the next thirty years I never gave a seminar and it got to be a perverse point of honor. They wanted a letter of recommendation from my postdoc supervisor in Brussels, Paul Brien, but he didn't speak English, so it came in French. I don't think anybody ever read it here. It must be in the files somewhere.

Jarrell: And you had graduated from Stanford?

Newberry: Yes, Princeton, and then Stanford. In biology. And at Stanford particularly working on tunicates, an enormous group of little-known animals.¹ I did my doctorate with Donald Abbott; he was my major professor.

Jarrell: Now, why were you interested in UC Santa Cruz, which hardly existed except in people's heads?

Newberry: It was across the bay and everyone looked toward it with salivating . . .

Jarrell: You mean when you were at Hopkins?

Newberry: Yes, it was the educational prize. We had some vague idea of what was planned. Everybody did. And I had this sense that—what I'm trying to remember is what I thought then, not what I think now—that if any public university could teach with the spirit of a private university, then the University of California had a shot at it. Most public universities probably didn't have the confidence or the will or the power to do that. If it was going to happen anywhere, it was going to be here in California: The idea of small classes. The idea that a great public university could concentrate on undergraduate education, even transform it. Things like that. The location. I knew the location well. The coast here. It had everything going for it. It's even on the sunny side of the bay—it's a level of heaven. So it had all of nature going for it, too.

1. Tunicates are part of the phylum *Urochordata*, closely related to the phylum *Chordata* that includes all vertebrates.

Jarrell: Where did you get your particular interest in undergraduate education? It's not something that's shared by all your colleagues.

Newberry: No, it isn't. I think I've always had it. Louise says that one difference between Harvard and Princeton is that at Harvard they think that you already are interested in what they are teaching, and at Princeton they've got to interest you in what they are trying to teach you. I found so many of my teachers at Princeton to be such *persuasive* teachers. And it seems to me that teaching is a form of persuasion, of getting people interested in things. Somehow they can find out about more on their own if you give them enough to be interested in, and some ways to find out on their own and the confidence to do that. I picked that approach up at Princeton, I'm sure. But I had great teachers, all the way from first grade on, not just there.

Jarrell: I think that's very interesting, because both [Clark] Kerr and McHenry . . . well, Kerr had gone to Swarthmore, and that was a singular experience that inspired him in the same way that you're talking about. But it wasn't everybody's reason, definitely, for coming here. Everybody had different reasons. But that was certainly one of the major emphases: a kind of intimate opportunity for both undergraduates and faculty, in light of the dissatisfaction at Berkeley, and the whole critique of the factory university.

Newberry: Yes, I think Clark Kerr's gotten a bad rap on his concept of the multiversity, because European universities, many of them very great, are like that—multiuniversities. But they sure aren't intimate! Here, there was a sense of a new

beginning. So American! So Californian! Everything is best at its beginning. When I accepted the offer, word came back: would I like to wait and come the following year? I shot back, "Not on your life." I wanted to be in on the start, and in Cowell [College].

Cowell College

Jarrell: Can you reflect back on what those first early years at Cowell College were like?

Page Smith was the founding provost. What kind of an experience was it for you?

Newberry: Oh, it was exhilarating. It was the most fun I think any of us ever had. I mean, there I was, only thirty. I'd never had a permanent academic job or any other permanent job, and here I was setting up a UC campus's academic policy. Harry Berger and Byron Stookey and a few of us would sit up there in Natural Sciences I, and we would decide academic policy for what was going to be an enormous university. It was heady stuff. And, here's a curious thing. Apparently it's famous in this town that the people who came at the start have become such bags of psychological problems and all, because, instead of rising through seniority and gaining power and having more and more responsibility as we grew up with our job, it's been just the reverse. We had all the power and responsibility at the very start, on Day One. And it's diminished and diffused and dispersed ever since, necessarily, as the place grew around us. But we started out like twenty-five little princes and princesses.

Jarrell: Wearing all these different hats. (laughter)

Newberry: Yes, yes. I mean, so many of us have fallen through the ranks, not risen through the ranks. Necessarily. Strange. Inverted. Most of the people at the top of UCSC now are very much latecomers. We pioneers are still on the farm.

Jarrell: (laughter) And tell me, in terms of Cowell College, were you participating in the core courses?

Newberry: No. I am now, now that I've retired. But no, although we all participated in just about everything else. I lived right next to the campus, there on Western Drive, and now on High Street, virtually on the edge of campus, and I was up here all the time. And we learned how a real leader led. For instance, College Night was weekly. As I recall, and I don't think it's an apocryphal story, Bob Werlin was assigned to find out how often we wanted College Night. So he polled the faculty and all but one of us said once a month. One of us said, I think, once every two or three weeks. So Bob took his results to Page Smith, our leader. And after hearing him out, Page said, "Okay, we'll just do it weekly." Now that's leading!

Page was very savvy. He often gave the appearance of simply misunderstanding what the faculty wanted. And as a result he could go ahead and just lead. He'd go his own way, knowing we would follow. He'd sound out his faculty, and then he'd do what he'd probably planned to do anyway. We were all up in Natural Sciences I. He was down in the bunker-like old towel room in the gym, which some of us called the air raid shelter, because we were threatening to bomb him from what's now Science Hill. That was his

bunker down there. We were always, as I recall, not furious with him, not exasperated, but just beside ourselves with frustration because he didn't seem to understand what we wanted.

Jarrell: What did you want?

Newberry: Well, I still don't know. I guess we were like kindergartners when it comes to that. What really did we want? A good question. But if we wanted College Night to be every month, then he understood it to be every week. And when I look back . . . what a brilliant move on Page's part. The people who spoke at College Night: what a fabulous cast!

Jarrell: Describe College Night, what it was.

Newberry: It was in the gym, where the core course had its lectures. It's all in *Solomon's House*, and that's an accurate book.² There was a cafeteria counter in a trailer nearby, between the old locker rooms and where the tennis courts are now, and you'd go through there and get your food and take it to the gym. We all went. It was simply assumed that we'd be there. And if we weren't, we were going to miss whoever was speaking, who we realized later . . . every week, the most extraordinary people. And they were as fascinated as anyone else was with this whole improbable adventure here.

2. In winter 1969 twelve students in a history workshop class at Cowell College produced a narrative of the first four years of Cowell College's existence. The resulting publication was *Solomon's House: A Self-Conscious History of Cowell College* (Felton, CA: Big Trees Press, 1970).

They didn't play at College Night, but I remember the Amadeus Quartet coming on a foggy night. They had to wonder, as they passed Cloud Nine [restaurant] on the summit on Highway 17, where the hell they were going. But they came and played Schubert's *Death and the Maiden* and a couple of other quartets, and then they headed back out of town. It was just that kind of place. Or, after supper in the gym, there was Susan Sontag. It was extraordinary.

Jarrell: And who would recruit these wonderful folks to come?

Newberry: I think Eloise, mainly, and Page. And enough of us knew enough people. Everyone was going through. For example, James Reston's mother lived on High Street, and he'd come by—so you'd look around and see these people. I remember thinking at one point when you'd see so many people whose faces you recognized, you wished they sort of had to pay their way by talking, rather than go through anonymously. And sometimes they did—at College Night.

Jarrell: It sounds like the faculty and students were so close that there was a real community in those days.

Newberry: Yes. It's very different now. Now I rarely go to College Night. It's very local now. The thrill is gone.

Jarrell: Why's that?

Newberry: Well, besides the disappearance of such terrific speakers, I think because when I came here, I was hardly older than the students, and now I'm as old as their grandfathers. So one community has turned into two—young and old.

Jarrell: So the generational . . .

Newberry: The gap long since began to open up.

Jarrell: But in the beginning you were just slightly older than your students.

Newberry: Yes, thirty, versus eighteen, twenty-one. Sure. We were almost like siblings.

Biology Board

Jarrell: Tell me about the biology board.

Newberry: There were three of us kids: Bill Doyle, Charles Daniel, and me. There was Kenneth Thimann. There was Peter Ray, who was a botanist . . . Jean Langenheim. Then there were intermittent visitors. Van Niel would come up and give lectures in my course. [Lawrence] Blinks and I taught courses together.

And then amazing people would appear. For instance, in 1966, I think it was [Alfred H.] Sturtevant, who was in many ways the founder of modern cytogenetics, and one of Thimann's old friends at Harvard, came and taught genetics. It was like learning, maybe

not evolution from Darwin, but almost. There was a sense of people of that stature being here as a show of support for Santa Cruz and for Thimann himself. Or it was again, the kind of fabulous reputation of the place. Adolph Seilacher came from Germany and taught the invertebrate paleontology course that Leo Laporte³ teaches now; he came for a year, spent his sabbatical here. I audited the course. I think there were about nine of us in there, but there should have been nine hundred. So, besides us three youngsters—Bill, Charles, and I—there were Jean and Peter Ray, and then Thimann at the top, very much at the top. When Sturtevant came, Bill and Charles and I were walking down the hall, and Kenneth said, “Oh, I’d like you to meet some of our graduate students,” and introduced the three of us.

Jarrell: (laughter) You know, it seems to me that the original sort of vision for Santa Cruz was that it was going to be a center for humanities. And in fact, because Kenneth Thimann came here and started a sort of second part of his career, science took off here, particularly biology, and proliferated more than anybody could have predicted. I don’t think it was in the original plans.

Newberry: It may not have been, but I don’t think it ever occurred to Bill or Charles or me that it wasn’t. The three of us got to know each other well. We’d go down to a little cafe on Mission Street and have lunch at least once a week and share our thoughts. So we got to know each other better than I knew Jean, or certainly better than I knew Peter. He was kind of standoffish, Peter. I think he rather disapproved of all the goings-on. It never

3. See the oral history edited by Randall Jarrell, *Leo Laporte, Professor of Earth Sciences, Recollections of UCSC, 1971-1996* (Regional History Project, University Library, UC Santa Cruz. 1998).

occurred to us that we were on the humanities campus. We were in the complete university. When people asked how the colleges were structured, I would say that they were structured so that if California did slide into the sea, each of these colleges could float independently and keep right on going, each complete in itself.

Jarrell: Right, kind of a Noah's ark of . . .

Newberry: Yes, everybody in it together. And so there was a sense of contemplating what we were teaching or doing, of asking that brutal question—"so what?"—that makes you step back from your own work and . . .

Jarrell: Wait, I'm not quite following you. What about the brutal question?

Newberry: Asking, why am I doing this? So what? About your results. Or about the subject you're teaching. So what? Why are you doing it that way? In a way, the students are asking that. You finish a lecture, and the first question or the last question is, so what? Why learn it? Why know it? Why bother? Why be interested? To the extent that that's a profoundly humanistic question, then yes, it's a humanities campus. We soon lost our hold on that question, because we grew in a very different way than we started. What I mean is, we had to hire to fill our gaps. You need a this, you need a that. Whereas at first you are total shipmates, making the boat sail at all.

Jarrell: Right. Just in the first phase.

Newberry: Yes, just to sail the crazy craft at all. By then, coming here was a different sort of decision, too, because by then we had already put to sea. We were underway. Then you think about *particular* jobs that need to be done.

Jarrell: In those early days when the board was building itself, were you involved in recruiting? You had such a small group.

Newberry: Everyone was very much involved in recruiting.

Jarrell: In filling in the gaps and saying, we need somebody for this, and we need somebody for that?

Newberry: Yes, although you still had this sense that you were after the best person, not just the right field. For a long time, I think right up until about Sinsheimer's day, at least for me, this was so. You have to ask the others how they feel. But I was always thinking in terms of finding a companion and a colleague, not an "ist,": this "ist" or that "ist." For some years we could indulge these thoughts, these choices, since we were all teaching everything. Eventually the "ists" simply overwhelmed the original crowd, I guess unavoidably, need-met by need-met.

Jarrell: And this is before . . . I know that Thimann brought graduate students with him.

Newberry: We all had graduate students. I had some, too.

Jarrell: So there were graduate students right from the start.

Newberry: Oh, yes. Doctoral and Master's. I forget what the formal arrangements were, whether it was arranged with Berkeley or what, how they were getting their degrees, but very quickly they were here.

Jarrell: Who thought through and mounted the program for a Ph.D. in biology?

Newberry: Oh, we just scrambled around, cobbled it together, initiated our own graduate training, made our wish lists come alive, got on with it.

Jarrell: You just scrambled around. It sure isn't like that today, is it?

Newberry: Oh no. No, on paper it isn't, but it is when you actually do it. Probably ever since Athens. We still do it the same way. We call it teaching, but the day-to-day truth of the matter is that we have to scramble. It is too personal to be anything else. But then, it was by the seat of our pants.

Jarrell: In discussing undergraduate education in biology, not just in biology, but undergraduate education, the emphasis, the commitment that was initially here—what did that involve? What did that mean in practice, in experience? Because I assume it's different now, somewhat?

Newberry: I don't know how to answer the question. We taught as best we could. The titles were general. They still are. You have to have confidence in people teaching the whole thing that the course title describes. But yes, at the start we stretched our brains and our talents—we had to. Now it's more, well, delimited.

Jarrell: Maybe a good way to enter that is your experience as an undergraduate at Princeton, and the way you learned about biology, the people with whom you worked, and what that experience was like.

Newberry: Oh there was no comparison. Princeton might be an ideal, but it wouldn't be a model at all. Princeton was very "society," very sure of itself, very arrived; so conservative it could be liberal, long since a success, envied, mocked but not ridiculed. Princeton, Harvard, Yale . . . they are faraway peaks; UCSC was still a ranch. Those three are rich, too. They can afford our dreams—can afford to do them. That's what Princeton is for UCSC: not a model, but a dream.

Jarrell: Just to compare it. No, not as a model. But it sounds as if you had a very close working relationship with your teachers there. It wasn't like you were one in a thousand. Sounds like you had some very human-scale . . .

Newberry: You know, Princeton is not a big place. A university doesn't grow great by growing fat. At the time, in the 1950s, there were about 2800 students. I forget how many biology majors there were in my class; 120 keeps coming to mind. I know only two of us

were biologists, the rest were all pre-med; it was very much a pre-med major. But it did mean that the two of us, Dave Cameron and I, we were kind of the only square pegs in the square hole, as far as the faculty went. And so to that extent there was an intimacy to our education, just by the coincidence of our interests. But at the same time the East Coast schools then had standoffish faculty, even standoffish students. Socially it's a very different country. Out here, I'd say that there is probably an expectation of a kind of California pals-y relationship with students that I never had, and never wanted. And in fact, I was calling students here Mr. and Miss for ages.

Jarrell: Not this informal, first-name business.

Newberry: I've never felt comfortable with that, rarely had students over to the house. But we did have the entire graduating class in biology over to the house once for sit-down dinner, or something like that. Imagine! So it was intimate in the sense of being small. You got to know people. And people of new sorts. I remember the first day before class outside the classroom for my class that had, I think nine students; there was one tall person with his hair down to his shoulders, and I was thinking, God, he'll end up in my class. You know, I'd hardly seen anyone like that—not at Princeton for sure, and then not at Stanford in the fifties. And he did. He was wonderful, a magnificent student. But it was that kind of . . . the shock of the new and the shock of California both. I recall feeling again, as I had felt in 1957 when I first came West, after growing up in New Jersey—I'd been out West before, but first came West then to stay, at least for some time—I felt then

the sense that the only thing the West Coast had in common with the East Coast was the English language.

Jarrell: It was that stark?

Newberry: It struck me as that thorough a difference. It probably wasn't, but it felt that way. To this day I still feel like I'm just out a while from New Jersey, even though I've spent thirty-six years out here, more than half my life.

College/Board Conflicts

Jarrell: Over the years, many people have talked about the growing tension in terms of faculty demands, between one's board of study affiliation and the college one was affiliated with. Because, as you well recall, it was in the beginning a joint appointment system, where you were hired by your college and your board. Was that tense or difficult, or was there any conflict in that for you?

Newberry: There was from time to time, and I think that the sciences have had a peculiarly unhappy and uncomfortable relationship with the colleges, but I was lucky in some ways that, unhappy as the biology department is, at least it's a department that from the start has known what a biology department is. The work-rules change over the years, but not the sense of what we seem to be trying to understand about the world and how that shapes our little band. It's very different from some other areas that are forever trying to justify their existence as a department. Cowell College, from the start, knew

what a college is, or what it wanted to be as a college. All that stuff about Oxford and Cambridge spoke to that. So at least the two entities that I was in weren't groping around trying to find out what they were. For better or for worse, we knew that from the start. I've always kept my office in Cowell. So I've never had any sense of estrangement from Cowell. If anything, I have felt estranged from the board.

Jarrell: Really?

Newberry: In fact, one of the reasons that I have retired early was a sense of estrangement from the board—a long story that I hesitate to get into. But as to problems in hiring, I'd say no, with a couple of exceptions: my sense is that the colleges never really got in the way of who biology wanted to take on. And now, of course, for many scientists UCSC is a college-free campus—to their loss, I think: all farm, no garden.

Jarrell: Many of the very young faculty at the same time that they were coming here and building the early colleges, also had an obligation to produce their research. In some cases faculty experienced a great difficulty in conducting their research, while at the same time feeling a desire and an obligation both, to really give a lot of energy, to invest a lot of themselves, in building kind of an intellectual community in their college. Did you experience anything like that?

Newberry: Yes, and I chose the college and teaching above all. That was why I came here: to teach well. Now, whether I chose well or ill, I am still here to teach, even if I am

early-retired by VERIP. I'm a teacher. It may be too soon to have a perspective on it. But still, my research record, is, with one exception, it's seen as the worst in the department, because I found that I could either teach or I could do research. I couldn't seem to do both. Many people can do both. A few people, John Pearse, for example, do both magnificently. I just found that I couldn't do both well. And since I knew I taught well, whenever the choice came up I would teach. Only the department, not the world, clamored for my publications, after all. To share my ideas, I taught. And you could teach and be a full member of the college. Even if you were teaching in areas that the college couldn't make head or tail of, the college was a community of teachers, first and foremost.

And my sense was (without excusing my abysmal research record), that you can be a scholar and share your scholarship as a teacher. Printing up what you do, or dancing it, or filming it, or whatever your mode of production, is another way of teaching. But in a way, saying that may just mean that I came to those kinds of terms with my choice. Also, the first group of us, the first-year people, I've always had the sense that Page [Smith] really saw to it that his kids got through, got tenure. I don't know how he did it, but he did. I mean, I think we all feel that. Others may say no, what they threw themselves into here ruined their careers. I can think of people who feel that way and hold it against Page himself that one thing or another untoward happened. My sense is that I got tenure here for accomplishments that—real as they were—wouldn't have gotten me tenure elsewhere. Tension? Yes. Penalty for skimpy research? Yes. Reward for arduous teaching? Yes.

Jarrell: Not tenure on other campuses?

Newberry: Neither on other campuses nor at other public universities. And if I look around for why things turned out all right for so many of us here, I think that Page, and maybe Dean, were the people who just saw that it happened. Loyalty.

Jarrell: You raised something. You said that the reasons why you didn't do a lot of research were not because of an investment in, or attention to teaching in a college. But you felt that you couldn't teach and do research simultaneously.

Newberry: I still feel that way. It's a fault, sure enough, but it was a choice. A forced choice, given my faults, my flaws, as a researcher.

Jarrell: Right. But you don't seem comfortable with the decision that you made. You use adjectives that are quite . . .

Newberry: Oh, yeah. I don't feel comfortable. I do but I don't. My career has been as a teacher in what is turning out to be just another research university.

Jarrell: You're renowned.

Newberry: But my relationship with the department has been . . . uncomfortable.

Jarrell: Because of that?

Newberry: It's hard to know. Departmental family dynamics? Biology at Santa Cruz—that would take an oral history in itself. And not one with thrilling surprises, despite some splendid participants.

Jarrell: But I'm interested, because one of the questions . . .

Newberry: A scientist is expected to do a lot of research that appears frequently, and I clearly have not met that expectation.

Jarrell: What do you mean?

Newberry: Well, that I came up for promotion and was turned down, came up and was turned down. I finally said, at one point in a letter, "I feel like the Harold Stassen of merit increases." Here at UCSC I was uncommonly free to make my choice. But it's been an expensive one in many ways, and certainly expensive in the sense of the esteem of my colleagues. And yet . . . and yet . . . here I still am.

Jarrell: You know, another kind of perspective on this is that you seem to embody and to have experienced this conflict in the University of California. Although they say that teaching is one of the criteria, along with research, it seems that teaching is in fact given very short shrift.

Newberry: Well, if it's bad, it's more easily excused than a delinquent research record.

Jarrell: No value at all, I might almost say, in determining tenure.

Newberry: No, not that absolute. But more excusable if it is not really up to snuff. Yes, I squeaked through to tenure. In comparison, the promotion penalties were small stuff—just demoralizing. And, crazily, one of the reasons of for retiring now is that I want to finally get some of the neglected research done. That, and teaching in the sciences here has taken on an industrial quality, the classes have gotten so big. Research is the game here now—just what we set out, I thought, to avoid. So it's time to move on—so I can do my research, too, after all. Ironically.

Jarrell: How did this predicament happen?

Newberry: It just happened. I was Cowell's senior preceptor under Jasper Rose and that was during Cambodia and People's Park and all. Then I was academic advisor for the department as the department just exploded in numbers, and I'd spend my whole week advising students. It was only after a while that you begin to realize that your colleagues . . . if they think teaching is a minor craft, then advising is of even less consequence. Now it's a staff job.

Jarrell: So when you mentioned the estrangement, that you felt more at home and comfortable in your college, it really has to do with this whole research thing?

Newberry: Or with this teaching things. But yes: in the department I felt delinquent, something of an outcast, in, after all, the family I helped start. But as a scientist in Cowell, there, too, you feel a strange outsidership. I mean, anything that comes up, whether it's the weather, or the bird somebody just saw, and they turn to me, and I'm supposed to . . .

Jarrell: To know. (laughter)

Newberry: I'm supposed to know how it works. But there's a larger sense in the college, in Cowell anyway, of inclusion, if you're in the college. In the biology board, I had this sense, as Mary Holmes once said, that the worst thing isn't to have people disagree with you. The worst thing is for people just to be indifferent. The sense of being dead wood. A kind of non-communication. My sense, though, is that a lot of people in biology feel estranged. That it's a troubled department.

Jarrell: Yes, I wish you'd elaborate a little bit on that. I'm interested on your perspective on what has ailed it. Or if you like, its strengths and its weaknesses as a department.

Newberry: One outside committee described it as dumbbell-shaped. There's this big group of molecular/cell biologists and then there's a big group of marine behavioral and ecological biologists, and then there's little in between. We're at cross-purposes in hiring. We are constantly calculating our workload down to two decimal points. And here we're hiring like there's no tomorrow. We just hired six people.

Jarrell: You just hired six people in biology?

Newberry: Yes. And we want to hire four next year. But the field is so huge, so wide, that people simply don't comprehend what another person's intellectual interests or resource problems might be. It's already too big a department. It's time to break it up into two, maybe even three departments.

Jarrell: How would you divide it?

Newberry: Have the molecular people in one group and . . .

Jarrell: And have their own department of molecular biology?

Newberry: Yes. And the organismal and ecological, evolutionary people would have their group. And there's no reason why there shouldn't be as much communication as there is between say, American studies and literature, or American studies and history. But we can't even get ourselves together enough to decide that. So there's that. And some unfortunate personalities in the department, including me, of course—the Ghost of First Intentions. And I have the sense almost that when such largesse is showered on you, as has been showered on biology, there is a tendency to just demand more and more and more of the same, and not to stop and think with imagination how we can do better with what we've got, but rather constantly to be insisting on more. Like a runaway train. Where do we really want the biology train to go, anyway? And why?

Jarrell: Have you worked very closely with graduate students over these years?

Newberry: Yes. Right now I have three. I'd like to take more, but the department won't make it clear whether they'll permit it.

Jarrell: Why?

Newberry: VERIP seems to complicate matters, for one thing. For another, I have not had lots and lots of graduate students. Again, John Pearse would be at the other extreme; what a success, the tremendous graduate program that he's had. For another thing, in many ways I've done almost entirely team teaching since I've been here. With Blinks, with Pearse, with whomever . . . in many ways I've shared graduate students with John, particularly, so that it's one big group. The department can well wonder if I can manage on my own. And with my meager research record, they can well wonder twice.

Jarrell: In terms of the undergraduates, are most of the biology majors pre-med?

Newberry: No, they're all over the map. They reflect changing interests all the time.

Jarrell: What do you think of a young person who graduates with a bachelor's degree in biology from UC Santa Cruz? How well prepared is that young person?

Newberry: Oh, as well prepared as anyone else, I think, because, in a way, after the undergraduate years, you're twenty-one, and you've been introduced through some introductory courses anywhere. You're not yet prepared to do much. Surely most biology majors, by far, don't intend to become biologists. It's a major, is all, for most, I'm sure. If lightning strikes, if you do decide to try to become a biologist, that's what graduate schools are for. If you're really interested, you prepare to go on and really buckle down and learn now in a professional way. No, they're not more than ordinarily prepared, but they have certain advantages. For example, certainly up until recently, our students have not been scared of professors; they have gained some self-confidence. My sense of what people are learning as undergraduates, or for that matter as graduate students, is to be investigative reporters. They're learning to investigate, and then they're learning to report. They learn to report . . . as I said earlier, by dance, by film, by papers, by whatever, on what they've investigated, which could be anything from what clams do, to what they can themselves do. To that extent, I think, we can give a terrific education here. When we still had rigorous senior thesis and essay requirements, we did give our students a special stamp. That's mostly history now.

But I think, whether it's the budget, or for whatever reasons, I think we're pulling in. Losing our imagination, losing our willingness to push our best students hard. In some places you're forced to work very, very hard. Here I don't think you're forced to work very, very hard. You can be stimulated to work very hard. Even though hard-working undergraduates are working as hard and as well here as anywhere else. But you've got to ride herd on them as in anything else—even tennis, whatever. Aching joints and all.

Aching brains. And it takes time to help an undergraduate keep going, work through the discouragement—graduate students too, for that matter. The proportion that takes hold is always very low. If ten percent of your undergraduates are taking hold . . .

Jarrell: Just get completely, passionately involved . . . yes.

Newberry: Then that's a very high average. And ninety percent is the cost of doing business, the big physiological expenditure that fosters a little development. Overhead. All those heartless ways of absorbing that toll. On the other hand, we owe it to that ninety percent to really enrich their lives, too—not just patronize them as the cost. The undergraduate experience is all about that, too.

Education is in a way a very inefficient enterprise; that's why it's a non-profit institution, after all. And then, the budget shrinking. Then people try to streamline it. You can't streamline it. It's just still a very . . . it's like pregnancy; teaching takes time. We ruin it if we rush it.

Jarrell: You mentioned a moment ago: industrial teaching.

Newberry: Yes, I mean huge classes where you don't get to know anybody. The sea of faces. You're administering a class, not teaching students. Biology 1A, which was a celebrated course here, a huge course that had a staff of twenty-four, and field work and reports even though there were 500 students. I used to call it the opera season. I was just

an impresario. That's what I was doing. I wasn't really getting a chance to teach much. Or I was teaching in spite of running such a giant course. It was as big as colleges were supposed to be, just that one course.

Jarrell: When did that start getting so large? In the mid-1970s?

Newberry: I've had big courses since we began. I used to teach a marine biology course that we used to call "Fish and Games." Huge. At one point it was about twenty percent of the student body. Blinks and I were co-teaching it, and we decided things were out of hand. It was Biology 42, I think, and we decided to renumber it Biology 70. That seemed like a ponderous number. We changed the title from *Marine Biology* to *Aquatic Productivity*. That seemed like a pretty daunting title. We didn't change anything else. It cut the course enrollment by three quarters. We started over again with a fresh crowd. It was exactly the same lecture course, alive again. But Pearse and Newberry, *Invertebrate Zoology* . . . you just can't get a hundred people around a little tidepool. That's like playing a string quartet with a symphony orchestra. Enrollments matter. But what about the students we turned away?

Jarrell: Have you taught upper-division, very small, any small courses?

Newberry: Yes, and they are just as much work. But you actually teach actual people, one on one. And the way I arrange my year, over the years I learned to teach the big course in the fall. And in the winter what became a big course with a hundred students,

John and I would co-teach *Invertebrate Zoology*. That was just as much work, because it was field work and labs and all that. Then in the spring I always was able to teach a small class, either a graduate course or a follow-up to invertebrate zoology, or something like that. It made for a constantly refreshing year.

Reflections on UC Santa Cruz

Jarrell: I'd like to shift now to your view of this campus, not so much just your college or your board, but your overview of UC Santa Cruz as an entity as it's approaching thirty years old. What kind of a place do you think this is? What are the things that you like, that you don't like? Would you send one of your kids here?

Newberry: They've both been here. One daughter went to Brown and one went to Stanford, but they have both taken courses here, because there were such good teachers that they wanted to learn from: [Jonathan] Beecher, people like that. Our younger daughter, when she was recovering from brain surgery, was here ostensibly for a quarter. But in those days if you were in for a quarter they didn't notice if you were still here after a year. She went back to Brown after she recovered, but I think she was here for a year. I think all of us (I have) should take some of each other's classes here. That's the only sure way to know this place from the students' academic perspective—the rest of their perspective is out of our reach. Another answer to your question is that there was that book *Whatever Happened to the Class of 1964*? We could hardly have picked a worse time—scarcely—a better time, but hardly a worse time—to start a university than the middle 1960s—assassinations, Vietnam, riots, and marches, Cambodia, Nixon, Jerry Brown with

all his meager surprises, Reagan . . . on it goes. It was a hell of a time to try to start an oddball university. Of course, maybe it always is. But there it is, and so there are some damaged goods here.

Jarrell: What do you mean? Damaged goods?

Newberry: I mean we seem to have had failures of nerve, failures of imagination, failures of support, failures of purpose. A lot of us who came at the start have had not only a career-long commitment to UCSC, but really a love affair with the place. With its failures, its cavings-in to ordinariness, to what we hoped to try to do better, we are bound to feel profoundly disconcerted, dismayed, dis-something, discouraged sometimes. I don't think that [Chancellor Robert L.] Sinsheimer is right in talking about nostalgia for an era that never was. He wasn't here. I was here; it happened here. But we faltered.

Jarrell: That was in his memoir?

Newberry: Yes, and he said it in the *San Francisco Chronicle*, I think. He'd come out with stuff like that.

Jarrell: That kind of trivialized the history of this institution prior to his coming?

Newberry: I think . . . I think people let other people trivialize it. They trivialize what they don't know anything about. Two examples are [William] Everson, the poet, who used to give a course called *Birth of a Poet*. And I can see you are smiling. Everyone smiles when they think about *Birth of a Poet*. But I was there. And it produced some fine young poets. His evaluations of his students were kind of dopey. So what? What has that to do with the quality of the class, of the experience students had in it?

Jarrell: That wasn't why I was smiling. I was just thinking that he recently died. And I think that the whole history of fine printing in this community, and in California, was enormously enhanced by his being here, and by what he did.⁴

Newberry: Yes. And what [Gregory] Bateson did when he was here, people like that. These were exceptional anywhere, by any standard of excellence. The whole *Birth of a Poet* thing, which is always being held up and trashed, as you know, one of these loopy Santa Cruz things, and being held up that way by people who weren't here. It is deeply unjust. There was a *Newsweek* article some years ago that was such a bunch of cheap shots by people who weren't here. So vulgar! The other example worth recalling was the chicken course.

Jarrell: With Charles Daniel and Page Smith.

4. William Everson founded the Limekiln Press at UC Santa Cruz, which was housed at the University Library and trained an entire generation of Santa Cruz book artists. Everson taught poetry at UC Santa Cruz between 1969 and 1978. He published over fifty volumes of poetry. His honors include a Guggenheim Fellowship, a Pulitzer nomination, a National Endowment for the Arts Grant and the PEN Center USA West, Body of Work Award. Everson died on June 3, 1994.

Newberry: It was a terrific class. They called it the chicken course. They could have called it *Gallinaceous Fowl in History* or something like that, but it's suddenly become an object of ignorant derision, too. We can always poke fun at what we do. But there are ways in which I think we've given ourselves a bad rap, or let others. I suppose that we never really could have kept things going for long, with the original ideas, whatever they were, because often they *weren't* very well thought out. We got rid of grades, but we never really thought through what to put in their place. You know, getting rid of grades was one step in a long march. We forgot to keep going.

Jarrell: What do you think of the narrative evaluation?

Newberry: Evaluations were all over the map before we settled on anything like what we have now. But even "good, improving" tells me more than "B." But evaluations are work. You bring in people who have no particular interest in the things we were trying to do. Why should they do that work? Why not just grade? So the untended garden reverts to what was there before. And maybe the lifetime of great educational experiment like Santa Cruz, or Black Mountain, maybe it is a decade or so, not much more. Then, the thrill quelled, they diminish to a kind of ordinariness. I think that is what the campus has become, kind of ordinary.

Jarrell: It's kind of like a lot of people. I mean. if you think of one's adolescence and twenties as kind of experimental and open-minded and maybe a little iconoclastic. And

that as people approach their thirties maybe some of them, most of them, become a little closer to the vest, a little less adventurous.

Newberry: Yes. But we weren't an adolescent, we were a newborn. But we had to raise ourself, and we blew it. We lost the spirit. Karl Lamb once captured our timidity in what some of us called Lamb's Dictum: that the more [UC] Santa Cruz tries to be like [UC] Berkeley the more it ends up like [UC] Santa Barbara. I think that exposes part of the problem. And I think we've been chronically unfortunate in our central administration, in our leaders after Dean and Page.

Jarrell: How so?

Newberry: I think our chancellors and vice chancellors have been, with rare exceptions since McHenry's first five years, let's say, inappropriate.

Jarrell: In what way inappropriate? Could you be a little more concrete?

Newberry: I think they have not connected spiritually, with their faculty, nor cared to. It's become distant and dysfunctional. My view admittedly dates back to the days when Dean McHenry, living in Pasatiempo, would come across me hitching a ride to work—and would pick me up. That did create a bond!

Jarrell: And now?

Newberry: The disconnect between two different worlds. It is almost like a military arrangement, with the central administration the commissioned officers. And if we non-com professors had any ambition, we'd rise to be lieutenants and captains and colonels like them. But we don't. We do other things. Well, true enough—choices again.

Jarrell: But there seems to be a status game, that if you're from the professoriat and you move up into administration, you have a little more cachet?

Newberry: Yes. But many of us, most of us, don't want it. Yet here at UCSC we do want—we once had—our voices heard and honored, one by one. Our voices of UCSC Experience—or at least our voices of passionate commitment.

Jarrell: What did you think of Chancellor [Robert L.] Sinsheimer's tenure here?

Newberry: I thought it was an internal disaster. I felt that we profoundly mistreated [Mark] Christensen, who may have been the Dan Quayle of chancellors, but I think we never gave him a chance. And now what he did has become par for the course.

Jarrell: What Sinsheimer did?

Newberry: No, what Christensen did. I mean the inefficiency, the non-responsiveness, the inability to cope, whatever the problems were. I don't know who did him in. I do know that very few of us stood up for him. I was away that year in Europe, and when I

came back I couldn't make head or tails of what all the fuss was, but I certainly have this sense that the people who followed him have been no better. Maybe more competent, but not better. I share a sense that Sinsheimer almost was brought in to put us in our place. In reading over that part of his memoirs that have to do with UCSC, I think he sees it that way too. He's a perfectly good man. That's not the issue. It's not a personal thing at all. But it was a totally inappropriate appointment. Pister, I think, was probably a terrific appointment, but it should have been made fifteen years ago.

Jarrell: Can you talk about Chancellor McHenry?

Newberry: I think McHenry stayed five years too long. He could have gone out, in a way, undefeated. At the end he was so isolated. He was chancellor during a period of destructive impoliteness—not his style at all. It was simply accepted that people would insult each other in public. He couldn't take it. So McHenry stayed too long. He's been a wonderful former chancellor.

Jarrell: Chancellor emeritus.

Newberry: Yes, he's been terrific. But I think he's been consulted entirely too little. And now it's too late.

Jarrell: But isn't it interesting, if you think of ex-presidents, former presidents, it's the same . . . the same thing prevails.

Newberry: Yes.

Jarrell: The bureaucracy doesn't operate that way.

Newberry: [Angus E.] Taylor, I think, was a great success. He's an old UC hand. And the same thing with [Karl S.] Pister. But through their years we grew and grew, and grew apart, as I've said—administration and faculty turning into management and labor. What did Bush call it? "The vision thing."

Jarrell: And I left out [Robert B.] Stevens.

Newberry: Stevens. I don't think he knew what he walked into. Some kind of academic bear trap.

One of [your] questions is, has this originally experimental campus either succeeded or failed? If I had to choose, if I had to choose one verb or the other, I would have to say it's failed. But I think that in a way failure is built into an educational experiment, and this was an educational experiment. I think that failure is the normal outcome of educational experiments. And that's why there will be another some day. One of the unique strengths of our campus, though, one that won't be repeated, it seems, is its beauty. It's still . . . to go home down by the east pasture at the end of the day is still one of the great exhilarations—after thirty years, to look out over that bay. What a redemption!

And here's redemption of another kind: One English summer Louise and I were visiting Ann Dizikes's parents, Helen and Christopher Morris, both of them celebrated teachers at Cambridge. As we were walking across the yard at King's College, Helen asked me how things were going at Santa Cruz, and I probably pulled a longish face. A keystone we were passing noted King's founding in 1441. Helen pointed to it, put a hand on my shoulder, turned to me and said, "Never judge a university during its first five hundred years." Amen.

Early Retirement

Jarrell: Tell me a little bit about VERIP, this really unprecedented move in systemwide to offer very attractive retirement packages to faculty and staff. You said you had some thoughts on that. It certainly has an impact on this campus. One in eight faculty is retiring at UCSC.

Newberry: Yes, in three years. It's what I call the gang of eighty-four.

Jarrell: The gang of eighty-four. (laughter)

Newberry: Yes, there's eighty-four of us, eighty-four faculty, let alone staff. Almost all the original faculty.

Jarrell: Actually, if you look at VERIP 1, 2 and 3, I think it's closer to about one-hundred-something.

Newberry: Yes . . . to some observers it cleans out the stables, but maybe it will turn out to be a good thing on this campus, a chance to start afresh. Each campus is facing its own consequences. Berkeley is truly alarmed.

Jarrell: Yes.

Newberry: But maybe what Berkeley is losing is different from what we're losing. Maybe we are losing a lot of people who are simply worn out. It's hard to know. But the feeling many of us have felt, that our going really is a loss, has come mostly from our students. The administration seems almost gleeful—or indifferent.

Jarrell: Really?

Newberry: I can't speak for other departments, but there's been nothing so far in biology to mark the occasion at all. Not even an email. Maybe eventually, but not yet.

Jarrell: It's kind of business as usual?

Newberry: And no more kerfuffles. If anything it vindicates the decisions that many of us made to go, if this is what we're leaving.

Jarrell: That's why I said business as usual. It's like it's all business, and the idea that you're human beings who have invested thirty years of your life in creating this place. I mean, that's the way I'm looking at it. Is that what you're meaning?

Newberry: My own leaving . . . well, it creates a staffing problem, but it's a payroll savings and it opens up lab space. But—uh-oh. I want to keep my lab. Finally, I want to do that research. But now I cannot get clear on how I pay the rent. Because of course a lab is not a free room.

Jarrell: Right. You have to get research funding.

Newberry: Do I need research funding? Where from? How much? I can do my work for four thousand dollars a year, and I can bring that in by teaching for a teaching assistant's wages, which I'm glad to do . . . well, there's four thousand dollars. Does that pay the rent for the lab? But the guy next door needs \$400,000 a year to do his work. Do I need to get a one hundred times as much as I need to do my research? Same size room. He's doing one kind of biology, I'm doing another. How do we work that out? From the board, silence.

Jarrell: You mean you ask those questions and you get no response?

Newberry: None. It makes you feel that you made the right decision.

Jarrell: To leave?

Newberry: Yes. I had no intention of retiring. But then I came up for another merit increase and I thought, this is ridiculous. I don't want to go through this charade again, being Harold Stassen again. So over a year ago I decided to pretend I was veriping and see what it feels like. In fact, VERIP hadn't even been offered then. I decided I would just retire. It was a year ago. Louise and I were down in L.A. getting an art fix, going to the museums. Louise and I do this now and then, go somewhere and get our art fix. We were staying at UCLA. I'd never had that many days to see UCLA on a visit. It's very different from here. Redwoods are different from parkland. And it was just enough of a change of scene that I thought, I'll just pretend that I'm getting out. VERIP or no VERIP. If retirement equals death, I'll just try death and see what it feels like. Well, there are certain feelings in life that are almost indescribable. One of them is getting out of the dentist's chair. And this felt like getting out of the dentist's chair. It felt like that all last year. It's over. The drilling is done. The teeth-cleaning woman is done. I can go out and eat corn again. And it was a wonderful feeling. So by the time VERIP really did come around in January, I'd had six months to . . .

Jarrell: Try it on?

Newberry: To try it on. And it felt great. I also had the good luck, as it turned out, to have postponed a sabbatical twice because of Louise's parents' health.

Jarrell: To postpone?

Newberry: Yes. Because every time I got ready to take it they'd end up in the hospital. And so I took the spring on sabbatical in Paris for two months. In my case, it personally created a sense of closure, and of re-beginning, and I was able to learn methods and things that I want to apply, and to focus on what I want to do for, I figure, the next fifteen years.

Jarrell: When you were in Paris were you visiting labs, or . . .

Newberry: I was working with two colleagues, a husband and wife, about my age, that I've known since we were all graduate students. They are at the natural history museum, and are the best in the world in my field, and scarcely teach at all. They are at the other extreme from me. So it was . . . it made me glad to have done what I did. But it couldn't have been a better way to begin what I want to do.

Jarrell: That sounds wonderful. Now if you can just figure out what you need to do to get lab space here.

Newberry: If I can't keep the space in the Earth and Marine Sciences building, then I'd move to the Long [Marine] Lab. If I can't keep the space there, I'd try to get a room in the Wrigley factory, or something. I just need a little space. I need really fine optics and just

an open-enough window to ventilate the room. I don't need much to do the work that I want to do.

Jarrell: Yes. I wish you well. I hope you figure out where that space is.

A

Abbott, Donald 8

advising 26

Amadeus Quartet 13

Año Nuevo State Reserve 1

Applied Sciences building 6

B

Bateson, Gregory 35

Beecher, Jonathan 33

Berger, Harold 10

biology board 27

Birth of a Poet 35

Blinks, Lawrence 5, 14, 29, 32

boards of studies 21

Brown University 33

Brown, Jerry 33

Brussels, Belgium 6, 7

C

Cabrillo College 5

Cambodia 26, 33

Cameron, David 20

Christensen, Mark N. 38

College Night 11, 12, 13

college system, UCSC 13, 16, 21, 22

college/board conflicts 21

Cowell College 10, 11, 21, 26, 27

Cowell Ranch 6

D

Daniel, Charles W. 14, 15, 35

biology board 14, 17, 20, 21, 27, 28, 43

Dizikes, Ann 41

Doyle, William T. 14, 15

E

Earth and Marine Sciences building 45

East Coast 20, 21

Everson, William 35

F

founding faculty 10, 14

G

graduate students 29, 30

H

Harvard University 9, 14

Holmes, Mary 27

Hopkins Marine Station 5, 7, 8

humanities at UCSC 16

K

Kerr, Clark 9

L

Lamb, Karl 37

Langenheim, Jean H. 14, 15

Laporte, Leo F. 15

M

McHenry, Dean E. 5, 7, 9, 24, 37, 39

N

narrative evaluation system 36

Natural Sciences I building 10, 11

New Jersey 6, 20, 21

Newberry, Louise 6, 9, 44

Newsweek magazine 35

P

Pacific Grove, California 5

Pearse, John S. 23, 29, 32, 33

People's Park 26

Pister, Karl S. 39, 40

Princeton University 8, 9, 19

Q

Quayle, Dan 38

R

Ray, Peter M. 14, 15

Reagan, Ronald 34

Reston, James 13

Rose, Jasper 26

S

San Francisco Chronicle 34

Santa Cruz Sentinel 6

Science Hill. 11

Seilacher, Adolph 15

Sheriff, Barbara 5

Sinsheimer, Robert L. 17, 34, 38, 39

Smith, Eloise 13

Smith, Page 10, 11, 12, 13, 23, 24, 35, 37

Solomon's House 12

Sontag, Susan 13

Stanford University 7, 8, 20, 33

Stevens, Robert S. 40

Stookey, Byron 10

Sturtevant, Alfred H. 14

Swarthmore College 9

T

Takayanagi, Mary K. 6

Taylor, Angus E. 40

tenure system 22, 23, 25

Thimann, Kenneth V. 6, 14, 15, 17

U

UC Berkeley 9, 18, 37, 42

UC Los Angeles 44

UC Santa Barbara 37

undergraduate education 8, 9, 18, 31

V

van Niel, Cornelis 5, 14

Vietnam War 33

Voluntary Early Retirement Incentive Program (VERIP) 23, 41, 44

W

Werlin, Bob 11

West Coast 20

