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INTERVIEW 1: MARCH 7, 2003
[Minidisc 1]

1-00:01:03
Rubens: I noticed that you were born in 1916, the second year of World War I—it wasn’t called that at the time. I’m wondering if you can tell me something about where you were raised—where you were born, and where you were raised.

1-00:01:21
Foley: Well, I was born in a college town, the village of Hamilton. It’s in central New York—it’s about forty miles southeast of Syracuse and about sixty miles north of Binghamton. When I was a kid, the town had about two thousand people in it, and Colgate [University]—which is the school there—at that point, had about a thousand men students.

1-00:01:55
Rubens: All men. I didn’t know that.

1-00:01:56
Foley: Yes.

1-00:02:02
Rubens: How had your parents come there?

1-00:02:06
Foley: Well, my father taught at Colgate. He joined the faculty, I think, in 1914.

1-00:02:14
Rubens: What did he teach?

1-00:02:16
Foley: Well, he taught sociology, but he was a wonderfully kind of non-academic guy.

1-00:02:25
Rubens: What do you mean by that?

1-00:02:33
Foley: He didn’t do much writing; he kind of pooh-poohed some of the standard academic traditions; he was as friendly, sort of, with the janitors as he was with his colleagues—very popular. He taught until, oh, I think ’46, 1946.

1-00:03:04
Rubens: Where had he been trained?

1-00:03:06
Foley: He graduated from Oberlin College in 1903, met my mother there. She was in the conservatory; she was a pianist. He then went on to divinity school at Oberlin, and very briefly was a minister, but then he went to the University of Chicago as a graduate student in sociology—primarily in criminology—and his professor, Charles Henderson, died before he completed his Ph.D. dissertation, so he never got his Ph.D.
Rubens: Couldn’t he have transferred to somebody else?

Foley: Well, I think it was his nature not to be too concerned. This was a small liberal arts college.

Rubens: Meaning he was able to get the job without the completed part of the—?

Foley: Yes, they weren’t that fussy.

Rubens: And, your mom?

Foley: She, I think, would have wished my father had continued as a minister. She was a very sweet soul, and she stayed quite active with the church, and was a good accompanist, and played the piano at Wednesday evening church and so on.

Rubens: What was the denomination?

Foley: I think nominally he was probably a Congregationalist.

Rubens: Was that the Congregational Church that she—?

Foley: I guess they both were that. Things are a little fuzzy. The Congregational Church actually folded, and she went over to a Baptist Church. They weren’t very doctrinaire.

Rubens: So, tell me just a little bit about growing up in a college town. Were there other siblings in the family?

Foley: I had a sister who was eight years older, and she was really out of my life by the time I was in high school. Incidentally, my mother died while I was in high school—died of cancer. But the village was wonderful.

Rubens: Did they literally call it a village also? Was it Hamilton Village?

Foley: Technically, there was a township of Hamilton, which was larger, but within—you either had villages or cities. I grew up early enough so that there weren’t many cars. We watched them come in, but we had the full run of the village. Just one school. It became a central school partway through the twenties, so about half the kids were farm kids and about half were village kids. My folks really, somehow in their own way, were very supportive, and it was, I thought, a happy childhood.
Rubens: Just a couple more questions, just about the town in general. By backing up, how many generations had your family been Americans? Were they—?

Foley: American?

Rubens: Yes, had they been—were they first or second generation, or could they trace themselves?

Foley: Well, it varied. My father had mixed background. On the strictly Irish, his ancestors came in the 1830s, just before the famine.

Rubens: Potato famine, yes.

Foley: On his mother’s side, they go back to the 1630s.

Rubens: Wow.

Foley: My mother’s back—they were mostly Scotch-Irish—part of the family to the early 1700s, part of the family back into the 1600s.

Rubens: Was there any extended family in the region at all? Your father came because of the job.

Foley: No, but after my folks moved to Hamilton, my mother’s parents also moved to Hamilton, so I had access to them. My grandfather died when I was about six, and my grandmother didn’t die until during World War II.

Rubens: Oh, that must have been tough, having her daughter die.

Foley: Well, yes.

Rubens: Did she play a big role in your life, your grandmother?

Foley: I don’t know. She was very short, she read a great deal, she’d never been to Scotland. We’d go up as kids, and she’d tell us all about Edinburgh as though she’d lived there, and she had an early crank Victrola—you know, it was kind of fun.

Rubens: All right, just a couple more things about your background. Your mother went to the Oberlin Conservatory. Did she have some aspirations to perform or to become famous?
Foley: No, she was very shy about this. But, her forte was accompanying. We didn’t have a great deal going on in Hamilton, but they would sometimes have musical evenings. You have to realize, I saw my first radio in about 1923—heard my first radio—and movies were silent, of course, but there was no television. So they were inclined to do more of their own, and we’d have musical evenings at home, and invite people in, and she’d sit at the piano. We always had sheet music on the piano.

Rubens: Were you taught piano?

Foley: No, I wasn’t very good at piano. I played the trumpet in high school, and played the euphonium in college in the band and concert band.

Rubens: You mentioned cars, seeing the cars come in. Did your family have an automobile?

Foley: We got a Willys Whippet in about 1926.

Rubens: I assume, then, your father walked to work. Did they have their own home, or was this faculty housing?

Foley: You could walk to work.

Rubens: And was it their own home, or faculty housing that was provided?

Foley: I was born in a rented house, but we moved about a block away, and that became our home.

Rubens: So it was your home, not provided by the college. You were coming of age in what is called an academic family, and a kind of quintessential—if not New England—upstate New York town. I think you mentioned religion wasn’t a significant part of your upbringing, even though your father had been trained as a—?

Foley: Well, not in any very overt sense.

Rubens: Okay. Were your parents politically active or aware?

Foley: No, not really.

Rubens: The town politics was not—
Foley: Well, not a great deal even there, I don’t think.

Rubens: I would imagine the town must have been pretty homogeneous. I mean, when you think about your neighbors and your classmates.

Foley: Amazingly, there was tremendous ethnic variety within the town.

Rubens: Just say something about that.

Foley: Norwegians, we had an Armenian family across the street, Poles. Indeed, these were the days when people cut loose with all kinds of jokes about ethnics. You know, it was a very different climate. But, despite the fact that kids would call each other by ethnic names that would now not be permitted, I think they really basically got along pretty well. It’s a little hard to describe.

Rubens: It is, I know. It’s a sensibility that young people today don’t really have.

Foley: I think very influential for me were four or five people, mostly teachers. There were some very dedicated teachers in this school. It was a terribly small school. My graduating class had about thirty-five, I think. I wanted to take solid geometry, and I think there were two of us in the class, and I used to take mechanical drawing, and I wanted to take advanced mechanical drawing, and I was the only person in the class—you know, this kind of almost like tutoring.

Rubens: Sure.

Foley: I was a Scout. You know, you can pooh-pooh the Scouts. It was, I think, kind of a good experience for me. The amazing thing was that the scoutmaster was a man named Larry Appley. He, at that time, was an instructor in rhetoric at Colgate, but he became the executive director of the American Management Association later on. Here was this guy who had all kinds of talent and everything, he’d go out camping with us over the weekends, and it was kind of nice.

Rubens: Were there any social issues that seemed to riven the town?

Foley: I don’t—of course, by the time I was in high school, these were Depression years. But the village, partly because of its being dependent on a private college, I think, was probably more immune to the Depression than many other communities. In that sense, we lived, perhaps, a protected life. My dad didn’t make a great deal of money, but somehow the salary mostly kept on.
Rubens: Just prior to being aware of the Depression—because you must have been about thirteen, fourteen in ’29 during the crash—I was wondering if the legacy of World War I resonated? So many of these towns have memorials.

Foley: Those were different days. The village had very ritualized events throughout the year, and Memorial Day was a day when there literally was a procession to one of the three cemeteries, and there’d be some recognition, not just of World War I, but of the Spanish-American War and the Civil War. We had some Spanish-American veterans. I’m not sure about the Civil War. We could have had one or two when I was very young. After the parade, the tradition was that the kids would all go up to Lake Moraine, which was about—a bunch of boys would go up about two miles away and go swimming. You always did that on Memorial Day.

Rubens: Was that like the opening of summer?

Foley: Then this was supposed to be about when you planted the corn, and the corn was supposed to be knee-high by the Fourth of July. It’s like an anthropologist would go in and see these, but this was part of our life.

Rubens: This is perhaps an odd reflection, and maybe not appropriate, but you become a professor of regional and city planning. You’re interested in architecture. Is there a way in which you think about the town as having some kind of visual or physical layout that was pleasing or particularly notable?

Foley: Well, I don’t know. I’ve often puzzled about that because here I was being protected from big city life. I can make more of a comment on the first time I’d ever really spent time in a city, but that’ll come a little later. I suppose I couldn’t help but associate the notion that a community somehow had some limits, and the notion that there was farmland around it, and that this was a marketing center. This is a convenient and somewhat romantic way to look at communities.

Rubens: Was there any other one major—the university accounted for, you’re saying, almost half the population—otherwise…?

Foley: They didn’t have much else by way of economic base. As a matter of fact, currently, the town is in considerable trouble, and the university, which is much larger now, is having to bail the town out for its own benefit.

Rubens: But then, small shops and markets—I mean, was the town itself able to withstand the Depression fairly well?
Foley: Curious. Take men’s clothing: there was a kind of a conflict between serving student needs, which would be one thing, and farmers coming in, and the story was that some farmers felt uncomfortable in a store like that. They’d go to some neighboring towns which only served farmers.

Rubens: You know, it was in the back of my mind when I asked you about any kind of faults or splits in the community. Often, in college towns, there’s the “townies” and the college people. I don’t want to make too much of it, but I was wondering if you…

Foley: Oh sure, there's a lot of backbiting. My father was vitriolic about a lot of people. [laughs] That was life.

Rubens: And the nature of it? Was it more the farming folk or the illiterate or the…?

Foley: Oh, I don’t know. You know, sometimes it’s just personalities.

Rubens: Strong opinions.

Foley: Yes.

Rubens: It was a university, though. Is that right?

Foley: It was called “university,” but it was essentially a liberal arts college. They had a miniscule master’s program in education, I think. But earlier, they’d had a divinity school. When I was a kid, that moved to Rochester and became Colgate Rochester Divinity School, which is in Rochester.

Rubens: You know, you’re giving a portrait of this almost quintessential village town—that your father was an academic. Summers—where were they spent?

Foley: I spent almost every summer in camp, and they didn’t travel a great deal.

Rubens: Did your sister, by the way—when she left home, where did she go?

Foley: My sister went to Oberlin, and then she went to Bryn Mawr [College], and completed a Ph.D. in social economy. She became a group worker.

Rubens: What do you mean by “group worker?”
Foley: She became—after some interning in Pittsburgh—director of a settlement house, first in New York and then in Denver.

Rubens: Oh really? Was there a pretty clear expectation in the family that you would be college-bound?

Foley: Oh, yes.

Rubens: You were naturally a good student?

Foley: Well, because of the Depression period, it seemed as if the only practical choice was for me to go to Colgate. I had no great objection to it, because I’d identified with the school. So, I did. I lived at home—I was a townie—but I joined a fraternity, and ate meals at the fraternity, and was kind of hybrid.

Rubens: So, you’re going to start Colgate in 1934.

Foley: Right.

Rubens: We’ll get to that in just one more minute. You mentioned that you were going to say something about the first time that you went to a city. Is that—shall we pick that up at another time?

Foley: I want to pick that up during the Colgate experience.

Rubens: Fine.

Foley: We had a—you see, for major shopping, we’d go to either Syracuse or Utica. There’s actually a train connection part of the time between Hamilton and Utica. But, I’m talking about big metropolitan areas.

Rubens: Sure. Was it a pretty big deal when the family did get a car, though?

Foley: Oh yes. But, you know, taking the car was always a precarious adventure. There were just two-lane roads, and if you went up a big hill—for example, if you went to Syracuse there was the hill going into Morrisville, and you’d always get stuck in queues. Tires were poor; you’d be very lucky not to have a trip to the city in which you didn’t have to change a tire. So, they worked but they’re nothing like cars today.

Rubens: Were you able to drive it? I mean, were you allowed to?
Foley: They were pretty relaxed. I can’t remember when I got my license—sixteen or seventeen. But there wasn’t much to it, and you could drive around the—I think there were kids underage that were driving some. The farm kids would drive, and they could drive around their own property. They’d begin driving when they were eleven or twelve.

Rubens: Had most of your neighbors gotten a car by the time you got one?

Foley: I just literally can’t remember. I don’t know.

Rubens: Did your mother drive, by the way?

Foley: No, I don’t think she ever did.

Rubens: I think that was often the case. Last question about growing up: you were raised during the period of Prohibition. It ends in ’33.

Foley: This is very real. What happened was that we slid out of full prohibition into a period when you could have near beer, and it affected me because I played in the village band. We practiced over at the fire station—this was when I was in high school. Sometimes, we would go out of town and there would be older men who would want beer, and we couldn’t have it, but there was always the puzzle of whether they were able to find it. Now, I can’t remember exactly when Prohibition was over, but—

Rubens: ’Thirty-three. It’s one of the first things Roosevelt does.

Foley: That was obviously a big change.

Rubens: Were you aware of kids in high school…?

Foley: I was pretty naïve, and I didn’t know about—the town didn’t have any speakeasies, but I guess that people desperate to get liquor, they probably could get some.

Rubens: Did your family have a strong position?

Foley: No, my father didn’t drink. Neither of them drank. I’d never had an alcoholic drink until I was about a sophomore in college.

Rubens: Were they ideologically teetotalers, or was that just how they lived?
Foley: No, I think it just happened. I don’t know.

Rubens: So, tell me about college. Was there ever any other choice but to go to Colgate?

Foley: We just decided it was the practical thing to do, and it worked out—

Rubens: Had you wanted to go to Oberlin? Your sister was there.

Foley: Three of my family had gone to Oberlin, but Oberlin didn’t excite me that much, and it would have been expensive. But, the scale was very different. The tuition at Colgate was three hundred dollars, and I’m not sure whether it was for a semester or a year, but I had a four-hundred-dollar scholarship.

Rubens: Was there a break for faculty children?

Foley: I don’t know what the circumstance was. I had a good high school record, and whether—I just don’t know.

Rubens: When you entered Colgate, did you have—you said there had been some teachers in high school that had been influential—any particular drive or focus?

Foley: Yes, I became a chemistry major. Colgate had you taking a whole series of required courses, breadth courses, but by the end of my sophomore year, I’d had about three chemistry courses, and I decided that I would rather change into social science. So I changed into sociology. I’d been reluctant to do it with my father there in the department. In effect, I did that and political science.

Then the most wonderful thing happened, and this is where I first really got introduced to a larger area, and the first time I got away from home, and the first time I got introduced to national politics. In the first semester of my junior year, I was a member of a Washington study group. Twelve students with a wonderful professor, Paul Jacobsen, went to Washington for the semester. This was the second year this program had been in effect. We stayed at a YMCA on G Street. The last time I was in Washington, some years ago, it no longer existed. Anyway, it wasn’t far from the State Department building. This was just a total immersion in federal, sort of, public administration. It was right in the heart of the New Deal. While we were there, Roosevelt was elected for a second term, and I remember they had a signal that, depending upon the color of the lights in the Washington Monument, you could tell who was winning the election.

Rubens: You were there that fall, then?
Foley: They had it coded. They had lights up at the top of the Washington Monument. Well, you didn’t have television in those days. Anyway, every morning, we had a seminar in the Brookings Institution, which was then at the end of Jackson Place, right across from the White House. Brookings is no longer there; it was demolished to make room for the first Executive Office building. We would go in and talk about our experience. The main thing we had to do was keep a diary of all we observed, and what was going on.

We were interns in three different agencies. The one that I remember the best was the Social Security Board. Social Security had just come into being, and here I was sitting there. What we were working on was what was going to happen to the unemployment insurance, because it was being delegated to the states. It was a little more complicated than some of the other features. In January, each of us was assigned to a congressman. I was assigned to Congressman Fred[erick Elliott] Biermann from Iowa. My job was to read the mail and the local papers from Iowa—I’d never been in Iowa, but that’s all right—and kind of sketch out a reply, a letter, that the congressman might send to these people.

We rode the little underground train that senators rode on. We saw or met various officials. I saw—was right close up to President Roosevelt a couple times. On Armistice Day—usually, he didn’t want to be photographed, but he’s a big man, and he had to walk some distance. I think Elliott was at his arm. Some of us stood on a roof of a wing of the Capitol looking down on Roosevelt’s second inaugural—in pouring rain. These were powerful experiences. Washington was by no means the city it is now. Washington came into its own, and the president’s office and its power came into its own, I think, during World War II, and we preceded that.

Rubens: By the way, was Biermann a Democrat? Did it even matter?

Foley: I think so, but I’m not sure. We weren’t assigned—

Rubens: It was nonpartisan, the program, ostensibly.

Foley: Yes, obviously he was one party or the other. I’m not sure.

Rubens: And, by the way, were your family supporters of the New Deal?

Foley: Well, sure.

Rubens: I have family that was proud that they never once voted for Roosevelt.

Foley: Oh yes. My family were Democrats. Yes.
Rubens: Boy, that must have been an exciting…

Foley: Well, it was, and—

Rubens: Did you also tour some of the major…?

Foley: We did all kinds of stuff. My roommate and I had a race running up to the top of the Washington Monument. You know, we had a little more vigor in those days.

Rubens: So, looking back, I mean, was this a turning point?

Foley: I think it very much triggered my interest in some kind of public service. I’m not necessarily a socialist in the full-blown—we don’t use the term any more—but I believed that it was government’s function, responsibility, to provide a number of functions. In Social Security, after all, this was an incredible thing. There could have been some people that objected to Social Security, but it is probably the most durable and vivid example of a major social policy commitment that we’ve made in this country. Much overdue—the comparable legislation in Britain was probably about 1910. It took us a while to catch up.

Rubens: Did you feel that your eyes had been opened also to a more complex kind of society?

Foley: Yes. But Washington didn’t have all the wonderful features of a city like New York. Let me go on to New York.

Rubens: Fine, please.

Foley: My father, despite the fact that he was always very happy in this little village, was a criminologist. He somehow understood that a very large number of Colgate students came from the New York metropolitan area. So, fairly early on, long before I went to Colgate myself, he instituted about a four-day special study tour in New York during spring recess for Colgate students. When I was, I suppose maybe about a sophomore, I took that trip along with the students.

Rubens: Before Washington or after?

Foley: I think probably before. It could have even been in late high school. I’m not sure.

Rubens: Okay.
Foley: Anyway, what happened was that we went to places that had to do with criminology. He introduced me to Warden [Lewis] Lawes, who was the head of Sing Sing Prison, for example, and to a man named [Alexander Oscar] Gettler, who was the toxicologist for New York City, the guy who figured out what poison might have killed somebody. A whole series of other things. Somehow, we went to the Federal Reserve Bank, and went down and saw all the gold in the basement. So, that was an unusual introduction to New York. Then, when I was in Colgate, I later went down with some fraternity brothers to hear big bands, and stayed with them because they lived in New York. So, I was just gradually being broken into the fact that there were big metropolitan areas, and there were other parts of the world than Hamilton.

Rubens: Yes. A couple other things just back about that. Your father, you said, had a particular interest in criminology, so were there particular cases that were discussed in your house that you can remember? Sacco and Vanzetti, for instance, I wonder if that was something that—

Foley: Oh, I guess there were, but I can’t remember.

Rubens: Nothing that strikes out?

Foley: No.

Rubens: And, I was wondering also if your father tried to steer you in any way in college?

Foley: No, I don’t think so.

Rubens: Clearly, you were not embarrassed by him.

Foley: No, and I’ve often thought about the fact that it’s quite amazing that I think somehow he managed to be as supportive as he was without being more intrusive. I’m not sure that I did as well as a father, but that’s something else.

Rubens: In ’36, if you’re going into D.C. during Roosevelt’s second inaugural, the issues are going to start mounting about stacking of the Supreme Court, and challenges to the NIRA [National Industrial Recovery Act]. I was just wondering if you had a particular awareness of corporate America?

Foley: One of the things I did was to sit in on—he’s a Wisconsin senator—hearings.

Rubens: The La Follette [Civil Liberties Committee]?
Foley: No, I don’t think so.

Rubens: Probably that was earlier. I may be wrong. Okay.

Foley: These were hearings on anti-labor activities by corporations hiring goons, strike-breakers and so on. Maybe the chairman was Senator La Follette, or it could have been Senator Wagner of New York. The Wagner Act [National Labor Relations Act] had just been passed in 1935.

Rubens: Yes.

Foley: So, I sat through these hearings listening to very vivid stories. I also remember somehow, during my stay there, I was in a downtown hotel and in an elevator, and in stepped a big, fat, jovial—head of the CIO [Congress of Industrial Organizations].

Rubens: Oh, I do this too. I know exactly who you mean. Uh, [John Llewellyn] Lewis.

Foley: Yes. No exchange, but it was happening at about the same time. What was happening was that the government was trying to rescue labor, and…

Rubens: Would you say amongst the twelve of you who were there, were most of them—“converts” might not be the word, but really sympathetic to what was going on, as opposed to oppositional?

Foley: Well, I can’t—I think so. I don’t know that we were avid partisans. Colgate is a liberal arts college. It always had the tradition of men choosing fields that they thought would be intellectually stimulating, quite apart from what they went on into. So, one of my colleagues, for example, in this program became a vice president of American Airlines. Others went on to various things. They didn’t necessarily all go into government.

Rubens: Sure. You know, I wanted to ask you about the intellectual stimulation, if you can remember. We have a couple more years of college to go through. Maybe I should ask this prior question: coming back from Washington, did Colgate seem like a small universe, and Hamilton a real village?

Foley: Well, of course, what was happening was that I had to begin to think of whether I wanted to do graduate work. I can’t, I think, reconstruct it all. Interestingly, I can remember—and I don’t know if there was connection with coursework or not—a book that was very influential was Catherine Bauer’s Modern Housing. Well, I never realized she and I would later be colleagues—and in my senior year—
Rubens: You actually read it, though? It was being read in college?

Foley: Well, I don’t know. It was in the library. I don’t know whether it was assigned or whether I bumbled into it. Lewis Mumford’s *The Culture of Cities* was published, I think, in my senior year. So, somehow, I was beginning to read and puzzle about some urban problems, but at that point hadn’t made any commitment. What happened then was a little confusing. I was toying between sociology and public administration, and I opted to go to Maxwell School in Syracuse University.

Rubens: I have not heard of Maxwell.

Foley: It’s a very high-quality, old-fashioned public administration school. They accepted only fifteen of us, we were all on scholarships, we all took identical courses, and it was a curious curriculum where the courses were offered sequentially. This meant that they could get some very good people from government or other places on leave, and the person would come in and give a six-day course, and somebody else would give a nine-day course, and another a two-day course, and so on. So, I went through this first year. It was dealing mostly in the first year with staff functions: personnel, budgeting, accounting, purchasing, these types of things. And, I decided before the year was out that it was too nuts-and-bolts. I guess I would have wanted something more general-policy. I did take an internship in the summer, which all of us were supposed to do. I worked in the New York State Department of Labor in Albany. It was a decent experience, but I decided to drop out of the program.

So, then I thought I would go into sociology, and I ended up with a fellowship to Harvard, but at the last minute Colgate offered me a chance to become a kind of an experimental tutor. There was a new program they were having, each tutor had about twenty or twenty-five freshmen, and the tutor was supposed to spend a certain amount of time with each of his tutees each week. I think I was also a teaching assistant. I’m not sure if it was good judgment, but I accepted that and turned down the Harvard fellowship.

Rubens: Was there a debate about that within your family?

Foley: No, no. In a sense, I now, as a teaching assistant, was working for my father’s department. But, I did it. I think the rationale was that I wanted to find out whether I liked teaching and academic life. But then, during that year, I quickly decided that I really wanted to get into urban sociology. I had not, I think, thought that Harvard was that strong in that. They might have been, I don’t know. So, I applied to the University of Chicago, and was accepted and offered a service scholarship. This was a great move that suddenly dumped me in Chicago. [laughs]

Rubens: Sure. Now, just one question about that, because that’s going to be a life turn here. Your father had gone to Chicago?
Foley: Yes, but there really was no direct connection. I knew he’d done it, but—

Rubens: Where had he been raised, by the way? Your father?

Foley: In Elyria, Ohio. Near Oberlin.

Rubens: You’re saying there really was no impact of him, no influence that he had been there. Well, he had had that strange experience of his professor dying. What was his—?

Foley: I don’t know. It was before I was born, so you know, I can’t—

Rubens: I’m not posing this question the way I want to, but clearly he must have been supportive of you going to Chicago—

Foley: Oh yes. I think probably he was proud of the fact that I was going on to graduate school, but—

Rubens: Did your sister, by the way, in any way—was she a counsel with you?

Foley: Well, my sister was much less academic.

Rubens: She indeed was more the public service administrator, somewhat more like Maxwell, yes.

Foley: She was concerned with nongovernmental social service.

Rubens: All right, so tell me, how do you get to Chicago, literally? How did you get there?

Foley: I guess I just came to understand that they had a fine program in urban sociology. I had a service scholarship the first year, which I think carried tuition, and the joker was that you had to do some work. My job was to abstract French journal articles for the *American Journal of Sociology*, which was published there. So, this bolstered my French, and I knew I was going to have to take language exams.

Rubens: Had you studied language in college?
Foley: I’d had a certain amount of French, and I had a French literature course. I couldn’t speak, but I could read pretty well, and technical French is not that bad. German is another story. I’ll come to that later.

Rubens: Fine. Just, by the way, knowing your interest in books later on, were you a reader in high school and college? Did you read novels and—I mean, this is the era of Gatsby and Fitzgerald, Andersen—

Foley: Oh, I guess I did a certain amount, but not an unusual amount, no.

Rubens: Okay, and so you come to Chicago. Did you come by yourself, by the way? Were there any classmates that came with you?

Foley: I’m trying to think… By this time, I’d met Katharine [Averill], whom I subsequently married. What happened was that three of us drove out to Chicago, Katharine, a friend of hers, and myself. We stopped in Elyria on the way, which was my father’s town, and so there were several aunts there. I walked in with these two gals, and I never told them which one I was interested in, so I thought they’d be impressed that I showed up with two women.

Rubens: [laughs]

Foley: Katharine became an instructor at the University of Illinois in Urbana in physical education.

Rubens: She had that job already?

Foley: She was about to start. It was her car. She had a car. She had a roadster, very sporty. I was pretty impressed.

Rubens: Where had you met her?

Foley: On a blind date. She went to Skidmore [College], which is in Saratoga Springs, and I was a senior, and it was her junior prom. When we were in Illinois we saw each other most weekends. One weekend I’d go to Urbana, and another weekend, she’d come to Chicago.

Rubens: Had you gotten married at that point?
Foley: Not then. I don’t know, I think attitudes were different in those days, and maybe I was being a little timid. But, I was taking a more monastic view of getting through my residence work before we got married. Well, I can come to what happened.

Rubens: Okay, all right. So, the three of you drive out, she goes on to Urbana—

Foley: I got a room in a rooming house near the campus, and—

Rubens: Was there someone that you were interested particularly in studying with, or were you assigned?

Foley: The person who was the best-known, probably, was Louis Wirth, and he was my main advisor. But, I also took a great deal of work from both William Ogburn and Samuel Stouffer. They were sort of quantitative sociologists.

Rubens: Had you read anything of Wirth before you had come?

Foley: Yes, I think I had. It was kind of curious because, in a way—I realize this is flashing way forward—about three or four weeks ago, I watched a television program on Chicago, and I realized all over again that what they were teaching us was really the urban sociology of Chicago. Of course, this became then—Chicago’s viewpoint became a target for some other schools. At Columbia, in particular, they were out to try to torpedo some of what was being taught at Chicago. And I think some of it was really becoming out of date. At the root of much of what they were presenting was that cities were variegated because of all the different ethnic groups that had come in, and that they were working toward an assimilation. That notion—that assimilation was the goal—was, I think, about a turn-of-the-century ideal, and became a pretty unrealistic view of what happened later. A certain amount of assimilation takes place, and a great deal of intermarriage—more than probably people recognize—but the notion that this was a kind of inevitable process, and this is where it was going to end up, I think was unrealistic.

Rubens: Was the term “Chicago School” being used?

Foley: Yes.

Rubens: When was [Robert] Park’s heyday?

Foley: You see, there was a textbook by Park and [Ernest] Burgess, and it must have first been put out very early, and then gone through successive editions, and that’s part of why this whole approach became dated. It also tied in with work in human ecology. What they
did to some extent was use a naturalistic model, and they treated cities as if they were like plant life. They borrowed a lot of the concepts for processes and spatial distribution that are used by plant biologists, or had been used by plant biologists: succession—oh, I can’t remember the various terms. It was to that, I think, that “The Chicago School” was particularly applied—the label.

Rubens: When was Park’s heyday?

Foley: Well, he was earlier. He probably was from around World War I some time up into the twenties. I don’t quite know when he died. He was no longer alive, but Burgess was. I had Burgess in a course on the family.

Rubens: Really?

Foley: He was a sweet guy. I don’t think he ever married. We all kind of laughed about the fact that he was teaching this course, but—

Rubens: Did people whisper that he might be a homosexual?

Foley: No, not that I know of. There wasn’t that much talk about that in those days. Anyway, I got through that toward the end of the year, and I must have let Wirth know that I needed money, so he said, “Well, I think I can work something for you.” Starting in June at the end of that first year, and running then for about a year, I became a research assistant at the Chicago Plan Commission. There were others there as well. Arnold Rose was there, who became a distinguished sociologist—he’s since died—and Gerald Breese, who then went on to become the director of the Bureau of Urban Research at Princeton. There were a couple of geographers who became well known: Robert Klove, who was to become a high administrative officer in the U.S. Census Bureau; and Harold Mayer, who became a geography professor, I think, at Northwestern.

Rubens: Were these people around the same—were they a cohort? Were they around the same age?

Foley: Yes, some of them were a little farther along in their Ph.D., and at least one of them may have had—Klove may have had his Ph.D., I’m not sure. But, we were all in this research division under a man named Homer Hoyt. Homer Hoyt was a real estate economist. He got his Ph.D. from Chicago in about 1933, and wrote a classic, very scholarly monograph entitled One Hundred Years of Land Values in Chicago. So I kind of slipped sideways into city planning.

Rubens: What were you literally doing there with the—where was the commission, by the way?
Foley: We were research assistants, and we were working on a number of research projects having to do with housing. I think we got into a problem on local taxes. We did various chores. Actually, my master’s thesis came out of this. My master’s thesis was entitled *An Index of the Physical Quality of Housing in Chicago*. I realized that this employed a style that, as with the work with Ogburn and Stouffer and so on, sought to develop reliable statistical summaries of certain phenomena that you felt were important—in this case, the quality of housing.

It’s interesting because it was well before any computerization. The calculating machines were crude, sometimes they were hand-crank. Sometimes you were working with a slide rule, so—by later standards—it was a very crude and kind of elementary applied statistics. But, this was what I was learning and was getting experience in.

Rubens: Did you literally go out into the field, and look at housing stock or neighborhoods?

Foley: In my case, what I did was select a small—for this thesis—let me go back. Let’s talk about the—no, I’ll stick with the thesis. I’d mostly relied on a WPA [Works Progress Administration] land use survey that had been made in Chicago and a few other very large cities in 1939. I also, in a sub-sample, went out and made my own semi-qualitative appraisals of some of these to see, get a feel, for what the statistics were showing, and whether they seemed valid.

Rubens: Could you explain to me what you meant by “qualitative,” because you said also part of it was the quality—

Foley: Well, if you’re concerned with the quality of housing, and I go out and look at some housing, in some cases I walked my way into the housing to see inside, and this was terribly important because you’re looking at the availability of plumbing and so on. But, in other cases, what you’re doing is just making your own judgment that this is a run-down building, or that it looks as if it weren’t structurally sound or what have you.

Rubens: So, by the way, were you particularly looking at working-class neighborhoods, or ethnic neighborhoods?

Foley: The Plan Commission is more concerned with the poor housing. In my thesis, I was interested in an index that would extend beyond it, and I think that was somewhat unrealistic. To go back to the research division for a minute, one of Hoyt’s good features was that he was very good at field visits. We would sometimes be working with statistics, and we’d go in and we wondered what these statistics meant. He said, “Well, let’s go out.” He’d call for a city car, and we’d go out. This was a great experience, because we were getting a lot of direct fieldwork. He was a knowledgeable guy; he knew real estate and housing. He had other characteristics that are more questionable, but—
Rubens: Would you call him a New Dealer type?

Foley: No.

Rubens: Okay.

Foley: It’s tricky. In the thirties, it became apparent that someone needed to invent a way by which people could more readily purchase homes, and this led to what is now the very widespread use of mortgage lending. The revolution was that people would pay the mortgage incrementally, the same as rent. Prior to that, you had to wait until the mortgage came due, and then suddenly, after twenty years, it had bloomed up and you’d have to pay an enormous amount. In this revolution, the federal government moved in to guarantee most of these mortgages. Hoyt was involved in designing the risk-rating system that the federal government used. Essentially, there were, as I recall three main areas—let’s call them A, B, and C. If it was A, you were clear to insure the mortgage. If it was B, you should question it pretty carefully before you insure the mortgage. If it was C, you shouldn’t insure the mortgage. This became what was known as redlining. So, Hoyt, to his discredit, is often known as the author of redlining.

Rubens: Literally, what is the word “redline?” Did they draw a line below B?

Foley: Redlining would be as though you had a city plat map and you put a red line around an area, and the federal government would not insure mortgages. On that basis, most mortgage lenders would not want to lend.

Rubens: We might as well, for the record, say these were often African American neighborhoods.

Foley: Well, that’s right. And, of course, judging the quality of risk is one of the challenges. I wasn’t director. It wasn’t as bad as I think some opponents—if you’re responsible for federal guarantees, you’d want to have some system. But, it just turned out to have some unforeseen and rather vicious consequences.

Rubens: Part of this drive to get risk rating—my understanding is that the loans were also over a longer period of time, so the potential for the risk was greater.

Foley: That’s right, but if this was the beginning of a long period, and you held the mortgage, why you still could get stuck.

Rubens: You bet. Are you saying that Chicago was a laboratory in a sense, that Hoyt really was—?
Foley: No. He had different hats. He was with the Chicago Plan Commission for a certain period. He went from that to become a private consultant. He’s since died.

Rubens: I see, but he wasn’t with the FHA [Federal Housing Administration]?

Foley: Yes, at some point he was, probably before he came to Chicago. I’m not sure of the timing on that. Anyway, my sense is that our experience there was great in the sense that we were having a kind of hands-on work in trying to document certain conditions and changes in Chicago. But, we were not very much connected with any long-range planning, or advanced planning. This was partly because of the internal structure—that we were in this one research unit—but it’s also because of the fact that that view of planning was not yet very prevalent. There was no planning school anywhere near the Chicago area, and I don’t think there were very—Harvard and MIT were in existence. There must have been two or three other programs around the country, but I don’t know. Here, I was in a plan commission before, somehow, a lot of what we think of as contemporary planning practice was in vogue.

Rubens: Let me be clear, was this a city planning commission? Not a county?

Foley: No, city.

Rubens: Where was it, literally?

Foley: Right in the heart of the Loop.

Rubens: Who is mayor at that time?

Foley: I don’t know. I don’t remember. Somehow, either I wasn’t very inquisitive, or we were kind of insulated, because we sort of did our research assistant thing, but not much more.

Rubens: In 1940, I believe also the Democratic Convention was in Chicago.

Foley: You got me.

Rubens: Because this will become such an issue by the sixties and the seventies, when you went to Chicago was this the first time that you had really seen African American large populations and neighborhoods? It was called “Negro” at the time.
Foley: Well, we were seeing them some in Washington. Yes, in a way. Also, it was a curious period, because it was a period of kind of black-and-tan. There was a lot of good black jazz.

Rubens: Tell me a little bit about that.

Foley: I don’t remember a lot about it, but we’d go out on a weekend to some of these joints. They were between—obviously, on the South Side—between us and downtown.

Rubens: Or further south too? Towards Sixty-third, further south?

Foley: Yes, I can’t—

Rubens: So, this was not a major feature of your life.

Foley: It was just before World War II and the Great Migration to Chicago really picked up in World War II—and the migration to the West Coast. So, we were in a more—there were troubles, but a more placid period. They were beginning to build some high-rise public housing, which was going to become, later, very troublesome. And the university itself was going to be in a much more difficult position in having to build its neighborhood relations, and fostering urban renewal and so on around. But when we were there, things—either we weren’t more aware of it, or things hadn’t become quite that difficult.

Rubens: Let me ask you just a few more questions about what you literally saw when you went into the neighborhoods. I recently saw an exhibit on Chicago housing in the black communities in the thirties up to ’41, and they showed two aspects of it. They showed middle-class housing and then they showed a series of photographs that were done by Richard Wright. He didn’t take them, but he was writing a book. They were of these—they called them kitchenettes—and gosh, they were saying that already there were these tenement-like structures where apartment flats were broken up, and there would be one bathroom that thirty-five people would be using. I mean, really kind of shocking. You know, I just didn’t realize that things were that bad, and I believe this is before the Great Migration.

Foley: It could very well be. But, unless you really got into the housing units, a lot of it was sort of masked.

Rubens: Yes, I think this is the whole point. Because he was African American, he could get in and see it. I guess the Chicago Defender was on a campaign also. It was a pretty important newspaper.
Foley: I’m not sure that we did as much fieldwork of the sort that would be required to get that intensive a look.

Rubens: Chicago’s ethnic working communities were pretty divided too, right? There were very specifically Irish and Polish and Italian. Were you aware of a kind of spatial and ethnic—?

Foley: Oh, sure. Yes, we knew it.

Rubens: Tell me about Wirth. What was it like to work with him? What was he like? Louis Wirth.

Foley: Oh, well, he was almost like an old-time European gentleman. He wasn’t awfully tall. He was fairly stout. Besides his interest in cities and what he’d done in that, he also taught a theory course. In this, he seemed to have a very sound historical grasp of European literature.

Rubens: Was he European?

Foley: Well, yes. He must have been Eastern European Jewish, and I don’t know the precise. I suspect that Wirth is a name that may have been taken along the way, I’m not sure.

Rubens: Did he have an accent?

Foley: Some, yes. He was very jovial, but he had a prodigious memory. He also was somehow very personally helpful to students.

Rubens: And a good teacher? A good lecturer?

Foley: Oh yes. Most of them were involved in various types of advising, and many of them were caught up in various New Deal advising.

Rubens: By the way, was Chicago co-ed?

Foley: Oh yes, oh yes. But, at that point, there weren’t very many women faculty members, which, I guess, was par for the course.

Rubens: And how about students?
Rubens: I think what I was trying to get at is if you had some kind of investment or sense of—worth isn’t the word I’m looking for—standing by being part of this Chicago School, and also having this experience in the planning department, in the Plan Commission.

Foley: I don’t quite understand.

Rubens: I’m not posing it well. Let’s do it in terms of chronology. You worked for the planning commission for one year?

Foley: Yes. June ’41 until June ’42.

Rubens: So, during that period, two things happened. Do you know that you’re going to be able to use the material to write your master’s thesis?

Foley: I think I must have worked it out by the end of the summer, and worked on the thesis somehow during the year. I don’t remember the details.

Rubens: Do you remember that Wirth was pleased with this?

Foley: Well, I hope so. By the time it was completed, I was about to go in the navy, and they may have not pushed me quite as much, and I may not have had my heart in it as much.

Rubens: But, I’m asking, so it’s not memorable that there was debate over it, or criticism?

Foley: Curiously—I have a copy at home, and I looked at it the other day—there’s no committee names on it, so I can’t remember precisely who was on the committee.

Rubens: Do you know if Hoyt read it? Would you have given it to Hoyt?

Foley: I think so. He shows up in acknowledgements, but whether that was a courtesy thing or not, I don’t know.

Rubens: Well, the second thing that happens that year, of course, is the bombing of Pearl Harbor.

Foley: Well, yes. Let me pick this up. In September, 1941, I proposed to Katharine, and she agreed, and so we in fact were engaged to be married the next June. The idea was that she would finish out one more academic year there, and I would get my master’s thesis out of the way, and my residence for the Ph.D. The master’s, under ordinary
circumstances, would have only been a way product, and I’m not sure whether everybody did them. So, we were to be married in June.

Pearl Harbor came, and she had—it was a weekend, it was a Sunday—she had driven up with a friend that weekend, and they had already left for Urbana. I walked around the corner to a Walgreens drugstore for lunch, and there was the headline, Pearl Harbor bombed. So, Katharine and I got in touch by phone, and decided that we should be married at Christmas. Well, it was already early December. She lived in Poughkeepsie, and we were married on December 27 in Poughkeepsie.

2-00:04:35
Rubens: You pushed up the marriage. Did you have some impending sense that you would be called off to war, or you would join?

2-00:04:41
Foley: Yes, yes. Four of her siblings were also married the same year. It was a pretty universal sense that we were in this for good, and all of us were in it. Okay, so I guess in about March or April—March—I went to the navy recruiting, and we talked, and I knew that the Supply Corps was a possibility, but I was wondering what else was available. So, they asked me what my specialty was, and I said, “cities,” and they said, “Well, we don’t think we’re going to have much of that in the navy.” In fact, Gerry Breese, whom I mentioned earlier, went into naval intelligence, and they were working on charts of Chinese ports that they thought they might have to use if they were going to have to invade Japan.

Anyway, they liked the fact that I’d had the year of public administration, so I was offered a chance to be an ensign in the Supply Corps. I finished the program in Chicago. We headed east, now married, and I went to Navy Supply Corps School, which was really Harvard Business School. It was a very intensive, two-month-plus program. We had mostly Harvard Business School professors who had been reserve officers, and they just put uniforms on. It was an intensive course in accounting, purchasing, so on; it flowed from the Maxwell. Curiously, I’d had accounting in college as an undergraduate, and I’d had accounting—so, we finished in August, I guess, given about three weeks leave.

I was to report to CBX. Well, “CB” is a construction battalion. The navy was using construction battalions. They were taking men experienced in construction—contractors and so on—and they were going out and building airfields and various installations, particularly in the Pacific. So it looked as if some of my colleagues were being sent to construction battalions. Jesus, that didn’t quite set with me, because I thought if I were going in the navy, I’d be going on a ship. It turned out that CBX was actually the naval operating base in Norfolk, and this was a CB training center. My first assignment, for about five months, was assistant disbursing officer at this big base.

I hooked a flight to Washington and went to the Bureau of Supplies and Accounts, and said that I hoped that, instead of construction battalion duty, that I could get a ship. They granted the wish. Katharine wasn’t very happy, but I think I had a better chance of getting back, and it turned out to be the case. I was probably in better touch this way.
Rubens: What had drawn you to the navy in the first place?

Foley: I don’t know. I liked ships. All during college, I’d been a waterfront director at big camps, and I taught sailing and canoeing.

Rubens: Those were your summer jobs?

Foley: Yes, yes. So, in March, 1942, Katharine and I set out for the West Coast, she pregnant—her doctor was saying yes she could go to the West Coast, but she couldn’t come back—to join a destroyer that was just being completed at Bethlehem Steel in San Francisco. We got to San Francisco, and no housing. Boy, things were tough. The hotels were full of officers, and serving as BOQ, Bachelor Officers’ Quarters. The Red Cross finally took us in hand, and we got a place down in Menlo Park, really very pleasant. A big estate was converted into a number of apartments. The nice thing was that two other wives in our destroyer squad were in there, so that if any of us got back, the news would spread to all the wives. Well, our first son was born May 18. The destroyer was commissioned May 28. In the meantime, my job as supply officer was to be sure that it was fully equipped with spare parts and all the stuff you needed to go to sea. So, we went out on shakedown cruise and so on.

Finally, they told us we were going to the Aleutians. This was tough duty, and we had all our winter gear and everything. We got to Hawaii—this was in the summer of ’43—and they said no, they needed us in the South Pacific, so we turned in all our heavy weather gear. I spent the next year or so mostly in the South Pacific. It was interesting duty.

Rubens: What was the name of the ship?

Foley: The *Trathen*, USS *Trathen* (DD-530).

Rubens: What does that mean?

Foley: Well, DD means destroyers, and 530 is the number of the destroyer.

Rubens: Oh, I see.

Foley: It shows on the bow. We supported landings in the Marshall Islands and along the New Guinea coast. We did a lot, but we were intact, fortunately at that point. Later on, the ship had more trouble after I left. Then, I was finally relieved—

Rubens: What did you literally do on the ship? What were you doing?
Every time we came in port, as supply officer, I was responsible for getting all the supplies that were needed for the ship, particularly food, spare parts, what have you, everything but fuel, oil, and ammunition, which were other officers’ responsibilities. I was also the paymaster. We had 325 officers and men—it was a good-sized ship. I ran a ship store, and I was also a decoding officer.

Decoding?

Yes. We had—well, we had cipher machines.

Had you been trained, when you were at Harvard, in that?

No, no, but you could pick that up.

By the way, I’m sorry to be naïve, was ensign entry-level?

Yes, ensign’s entry-level. Then I went up during the war, lieutenant junior grade, and I ended up lieutenant senior grade. It’s the equivalent of being a captain in the army. I was relieved of sea duty in late August of ’42—no, we went to sea in ’43. So, it was late August ’44.

So, you’re two years at sea, is that right?

I was at sea for over a year, and in the navy three and a half years.

But, I think you’re saying you shipped out in ’42.

I think I was a year off. We shipped out in the early summer of ’43.

Okay, okay.

Then, I was relieved in late August or early September of ’44. I got duty at the Brooklyn Navy Yard issuing supplies to ships that were going across the Atlantic.

Why wouldn’t they have just kept you there on board? Is this a request of yours?

Well, the Supply Corps had a tradition of rotating officers, because there are a lot of land base supply operations as well.
Rubens: I’m trying to think about why they would have a tradition—it would seem like you would know the ropes in that area. Or was this an accounting system? Was this to keep you honest? [chuckles]

Foley: No, I think among other things, they figured it was fairer for officers to be able to see their families, and not have to be at sea all the time. It would be unfair for some people always to be at sea, and other people just always at land.

Rubens: Okay. Did Katharine move back?

Foley: We’d had another child by then. So, we ended the war in Brooklyn. Can I just add one more thing?

Rubens: Please.

Foley: The question then was what I was going to do when I got out of the navy. By chance, Colgate had set up an employment consulting office in New York for alumni, and I went in and talked with them about what might be possible. I’d been thinking increasingly about city planning. In fact, I’d also been communicating with Walter Blucher, the executive director of ASPO, American Society of Planning Officials. Their office was in Chicago, and way back, when I’d been in Chicago, I talked with them. I also explored a couple of other possibilities, perhaps going into business, but did not seriously, at that point, decide to go back and complete my Ph.D. It could have been a mistake. There were demobilization grants being offered by the Social Science Research Council, and some of my colleagues went back to Chicago. But, for some reason, while I’d been in the navy, some of the interest in academe got knocked out.

So I decided I’d like to go to work for a city planner, and after consulting with Walter Blucher, and talking this over some with the employment office in New York, I opted to go to work for Harland Bartholomew, who was in St. Louis. He had his own consulting firm, but he was also city planning engineer for St. Louis. So, I became planning analyst in St. Louis.

Rubens: How did you get that job? Did someone know him?

Foley: Well, partly through Blucher. What happened was that everybody was being sympathetic to those of us who were coming out of the service. There was a big mission to help us get back in to whatever we wanted to get in to. So, Blucher was helpful. At first, Bartholomew was extremely helpful. When I got to St. Louis, he loaned me his car, and helped us find housing and everything. But, then it turned out that he really was running the city planning operation with his little finger, and I became disillusioned after a few months, and I realized this wasn’t turning out to be the kind of experience that I’d wanted.
Within the first year, I somehow ran into Stuart [A.] Queen, who was a wonderful head of the sociology-anthropology department at Washington University there in St. Louis. It turned out that they had a faculty of about eight, and I think five or six of them, maybe five of them, had all come from the University of Chicago. He understood my plight, and he said, “Look, come out and we’ll give you full credit for what you did, all the work you had in Chicago. We’ll give you credit for what you had at Maxwell School, we’ll call it political science as a minor, and if you’ll just do the minimum requirements”—and I think maybe I took six courses, some of which were kind of tutorials—that I could get a Ph.D. there. So I switched over and, fortunately, Bartholomew was helpful in some ways in letting me have time off at certain times, and we’d work out odd times for me to have tutorial work.

So, I ended up there, and I worked out a Ph.D. dissertation which really was very ambitious. I decided to make a study of a big residential district in northwest St. Louis, and test the notion of neighborhood units, which is a concept used considerably in sociology, and to actually try to find out—I called it *A Study of Local Facility Use*—in other words, where residents in this big residential district shopped, where their kids went to school, where they went to the movies, where they went to church or synagogue—there was quite a big Jewish community there—where sort of functionally they lived, and to what extent they still had these kind of local, functional ties in a world in which, presumably, according to the urban theory, everything was becoming much depersonalized, and people were traveling farther to work and so on. So, I did this, and it involved four hundred interviews. I did over three hundred and fifty of them, and about fifty of them I had some students help. Mostly, it was during a long, hot summer—quite an experience. You couldn’t do it today. But, in those days, I went to the door, would talk myself in, and find out where people did these things. Somehow, it worked out.

Another thing that happened—I said much earlier I would come to the German. I passed the French, that was no problem, but I faced a second language. In those days, you had to have two languages. I’d had a German course in college, but I didn’t do very well, and I was dreading it. I walked down the hall of the big building in Washington University and Stuart Queen buttonholed me, and he said, “You know, I’ve been thinking. You probably want to take your language in German, but I think the coming language here in our country is Spanish.” He said, “Would you consider it?” And I said, “Why, sure.” He got me a tutor. I tutored for six weeks and passed the Spanish exam. You know, I didn’t end up being fluent, but I salvaged the… The last five months before I got my Ph.D., we had our third child, a daughter. I was a teaching assistant. I finished the dissertation and I passed my orals, and then we were ready to get out of St. Louis.

Rubens: This is ’48?

Foley: ’48, right. And you may have questions, but it was all kind of a flow—
Rubens: Of a piece, yes. Well, yes, let me ask you a few questions, then I think this is a good place to stop. What were you literally doing for Harland Bartholomew? I didn’t quite get the distinction if you were running the commission business or—

Foley: Well, it’s interesting because it does have a bearing on [interruption]—

Rubens: The work with Bartholomew.

Foley: I was to do sort of population forecasts. I worked on trends in manufacturing location within St. Louis. Indeed, they put out a report in the name of the Plan Commission, and my name never showed up at all. The only thing it had was Bartholomew’s name. In some ways, it kind of tied in with what I’d done at Chicago, but what it meant was that—if you’re familiar with the notion of line and staff, and it’s very strong in the military, I seemed to have ended up in many instances as being on the staff side. In the navy, for example, a line officer is a deck officer or an engineering officer. The staff officers were the supply officer and the medical officer. The staff is a person who isn’t in direct line of command in direct administration, but is serving, and so this was kind of—I got started in city planning in that kind of staff capacity.

Rubens: Both in Chicago and then here again?

Foley: In both, yes. I wasn’t realizing it at the time, but as I look back on it, I realize.

Rubens: So, later on, the draw of being a professor, being your own person—

Foley: No. The most striking contrast would be in contrast to somebody who came from, say, architecture, and who is used to designing, and who wanted to have an image of what things ought to become. I was probably much more geared to trying to understand what the trends had been. Actually, forecasting, I don’t think has generally worked out very well. I think that, in current planning terms, they’re backing much more away from this, and recognizing the fact that there could be various scenarios, and the notion of a single forecast, a population forecast or job forecast, is pretty unrealistic.

Rubens: Was St. Louis experiencing a postwar growth?

Foley: One of the problems was that St. Louis really was probably on its way downhill, and I think we were expected to act a little more optimistically in our forecasts. I had one occasion once to look back at some of the population forecasts that I’d made, and they were much too high. Central St. Louis, after we left, became dismal. In central St. Louis, there ended up being block after block after block that had been cleared for urban renewal. This was after my time. Without rebuilding, Roger [Montgomery] knew this, because Roger came to us from Washington University.
Rubens: That’s right, and it is ten years later.

Foley: But he remained in St. Louis much longer than I did. I never knew him earlier.

Rubens: So this period, though, in ’47-’48 is not a growth period in St. Louis particularly?

Foley: No, I think there was hope, but I think St. Louis has not thrived.

Rubens: Out of this dissertation that you did, studying the local facility use, did it lead to a conclusion? Did it argue a thesis?

Foley: Well, I think it is in a way someway characteristic of social science, that you’re out to test a theory, and you’re out to describe as accurately as you can, and you’re not necessarily being an applied social scientist. See, the theory is that you would plan cities, and designate physical boundaries around certain districts that you were calling “neighborhoods.” It turns out that, in most instances, city planners have used major thoroughfares as boundaries of these neighborhood districts. It also turns out that these thoroughfares usually have a lot of commercial facilities. So, from a functional point of view, the functional neighborhood extends on both sides of that district boundary, and the city-designated boundaries dissect what is the functional neighborhood. So, I was able to demonstrate that the functional neighborhood was very different from those that had been nominally designated on the map by the planners. Well, you know, it doesn’t lead immediately in a very positive direction. What it does do is say, look, you ought to think twice before you think that just because the planner makes these nice designations of local districts, they mean very much.

Rubens: Hmm, yes. There are a few threads to pick up, but I’m thinking maybe we should save them for next time.

Foley: This is fine.

Rubens: There are a few things I wanted to ask you just about your awareness of professional organizations when you were in Chicago, because you mention Blucher. But, let me just sit on some of this, and then we’ll pick up these few things and then move ahead.

Foley: That’s fine. And then, the next step, of course, is that I teach at the University of Rochester for three and a half years.

Rubens: Right. You know, what I do think we should do is, let’s just say the name of your daughter who was born, your third child.
Foley: Well, she’s known as Margot, M-A-R-G-O-T.

Rubens: Okay. And, then the second child is—

Foley: Bill. Bill, incidentally, later on became an urban planner. He was a head of a—well, managed a consulting firm that was quite successful, but tragically died of cancer at age thirty-nine.

Rubens: Oh dear. How old was your mother when she died?

Foley: My mother was, I think, in her low fifties.

Rubens: And then, that first child—the first child that’s born right before you go to war.

Foley: Tom. He’s turning sixty this year.

Rubens: This is just fascinating, just fascinating. Anything else that you want to just say right now?

Foley: No, that’s fine.

Rubens: All right, good. So, I’m going to turn it off, and I thank you so much for bearing with me.

[End of session]
INTERVIEW 2: MARCH 14, 2003
[Minidisc 3]

3-00:00:07
Rubens: Today is Friday. We met a week ago and I really learned a lot, and I enjoyed talking. I know that I pushed you a little more on your early life in Hamilton village than you may have wanted to, but I think it was interesting. I have just a few questions by way of backpedaling and moving up, but you had something you said you wanted to correct. You want to tell me now?

3-00:00:54
Foley: Well, this could duplicate a little bit, but let me pick up. I didn’t pick up very much on Katharine Averill—A-V-E-R-I-double L—the woman that I married in December, ’41. Katharine and I met on a blind date at Skidmore in Saratoga Springs. It was her junior prom. She was a junior and I was a senior. I was quite impressed because we played tennis and she beat me.

3-00:01:35
Rubens: Oh, you didn’t say that part.

3-00:01:40
Foley: I graduated that June, and went on to Maxwell School, which I talked about. She had another year, and while I was in Syracuse we could commute, and we could get together. Then, I think this was before—she got a position teaching at Westbrook Junior College. She taught in physical education. This was in Portland, Maine. By coincidence, I was going to be at Harvard, and so there were going to be weekend possibilities. She, in fact, taught there for two years. She taught there from September 1939 until June of 1941. Then, as I indicated before, I didn’t go to Harvard. I was a tutor for a year at Colgate. I went to Chicago. She came out to Urbana, Illinois, in August or September of 1941, and just taught for one year as an instructor in physical education at the University of Illinois, but she ended up with a university teaching position before I did. Then, three months later Pearl Harbor, and we were quickly married, although we had been engaged to be married later. So, that picks up on Katharine.

3-00:03:17
Rubens: Good, good. You had mentioned that you drove out together when you came to—

3-00:03:23
Foley: Well, it was that September 1941. I drove out with a Katharine and a Catherine, and I guess I told this story. We stopped and saw a group of aunts, and I didn’t tell them which I was in love with. [laughs]

3-00:03:40
Rubens: Of the women you knew, or your classmates, was this exceptional that she was able to get a position right away in Maine, and then come to a university? It does not seem common to me.

3-00:04:07
Foley: Well, I don’t know. I think she’s an above average woman. Let’s just put it that way.
Rubens: Had she intentions of a career?

Foley: I don’t think she was a great career woman, but there was a different culture in those days, and in fact, she accepted—presumably without any great struggle—the fact that she was overwhelmingly a mother and wife and—

Rubens: Support.

Foley: Support, yes.

Rubens: You were married after Pearl Harbor, but that was fortuitous. What was she intending to do after the year at Illinois?

Foley: I don’t know. I think she could have continued. I proposed to her soon after she came out in September.

Rubens: Yes, you had said that. Where did she stay when she came to visit you in Chicago?

Foley: I think there was a kind of a transient hotel nearby. We were pretty pure in those days, and I wasn’t living with her.

Rubens: Well, that seems very typical of the times. This is a strange leftover. I was trying to probe you a bit about your father’s interest in criminology. He taught criminology, and I asked you if he had a comment on Sacco-Vanzetti, which you didn’t remember. When you went to Chicago, was the Leopold and Loeb case still effervescent? I don’t know if he commented on it.

Foley: Well, it wasn’t much on my mind. Let’s put it that way. I didn’t follow my father’s interest in that.

Rubens: Did he come to visit you while you were in Chicago?

Foley: Pardon?

Rubens: Did he come to visit you? This was his alma mater, after all.

Foley: No. He didn’t.
Rubens: He left you your domain. You said that it was in Chicago that you joined the planning association. The Illinois Institute of Technology—did that have a reputation at that time?

Foley: Well, I think it did. One or two of my colleagues later, in architecture in Berkeley, came from there. But, I didn’t have contact with them, and my route was pretty academic. The American Society of Planning Officials, which probably was the one—is not a fully professional organization. It deals more with planning as a governmental activity, and it includes lay people and public officials and so on.

Rubens: Okay. I just didn’t want to leave any stone unturned. I figured you may have something to say about Chicago institute later. Two quick things: when you went to the Maxwell School—I suppose, looking back on it from having discussed what you did in St. Louis and your experience at the planning commission in Chicago—would you say that you had gained administrative skills? You know, might that have led you to the managerial, administrative roles that you would play later?

Foley: It’s hard to trace, and I wasn’t in an administrative role, really, in St. Louis. Both Maxwell School and Chicago were good partly because there were really very high-grade fellow students. And, I’m a believer that you get as much from the rub-off of your fellow students in some ways. I can remember in both cases, particularly in Chicago, looking up to students that were farther along than I was, and wondering, “My God. Will I ever be at that point?” You know, with great admiration for where they seemed to be. A number of my colleagues at Maxwell School went on to very responsible government administrative positions.

Rubens: I’m asking you that question because it’s my understanding that the American Society of Planning Officials was made up of governmental—to a large extent—and that the focus of planning, to the degree it was talked about as a profession, was about governmental administration.

Foley: You see, this was the tail end of the New Deal, and I think there was a different ethos in the world, and planning wasn’t a dirty word in those days. So, you kind of realize that planning was a version of policy making. It wasn’t just literally urban planning, but it was a willingness to try to look ahead and see what the possible alternatives were, and try to, somehow, choose an alternative to which you were going to align your efforts.

Rubens: Right. I just can’t remember. There was a time when you said that you had been introduced to Mumford—when you first read Mumford.

Foley: Oh, I read Mumford as an undergraduate. Curiously, Mumford was to then later come back in and be at Berkeley, and we were involved in seminars.
Rubens: I know that we will be getting to that. I wondered if, in this period, you are keeping attention—are you paying attention to Mumford? Is he a kind of polestar?

Foley: I wasn’t a great idealist, and I don’t think I was so much a convert as that I was interested in what he spelled out, and his interpretation of the development of cities.

Rubens: Did you go to the ’39 World’s Fair in New York?

Foley: Yes.

Rubens: Did you?

Foley: Oh yes.

Rubens: Tell me just a little about that.

Foley: Well, the most impressive thing was the—what was it—I guess it was the Geddes General Motors exhibit on—they weren’t called freeways, but it was an incredible three-dimensional model of the possibility of organizing a future urban area with these sweeping highways [Highways and Horizons Exhibit]. It was a direct precursor and model for the freeways that were to come. There were other—you know, it was an international fair, but I was very impressed.

Rubens: Do you remember being—?

Foley: Oh yes. I was very, very struck with that.

Rubens: Now, was that Futurama where you rode in a, almost like a gondola, over this three-dimensional model?

Foley: Maybe. I’m not sure—I don’t remember that part of it. The word “Futurama” rings a bell. I should remember. I don’t.

Rubens: No, no. I was just leading you there because Norman Bel Geddes designed it. I know he was very imbued with Mumford’s ideas about planned cities and grass beltways and so, I didn’t want to let—I remembered how important it was when you said you read Mumford. This is almost out of order too. It’s in the same, maybe more idealist, vein. It’s in ’39 and ’40 that [Francis] Violich and [Vernon] DeMars are starting to get involved with Telesis out here. That was a local—
Foley: That was a different world. I had no sense that that was going on.

Rubens: Fine. That’s exactly what I wanted to ask.

Foley: I heard a great deal about it when I got out here, but that was something else. Fran was never bashful in talking about what happened.

Rubens: Is that right? I have no idea what happened. I’ve read his summation. This was my last question; I wrote this down. At one point you said you had—after the war, you had given consideration to going into business, and I didn’t ask you what that was, and is that important?

Foley: Oh, some crazy thing. I thought maybe I’d like to run a hardware store. For the life of me, I can’t imagine what it was that triggered that. It quickly was dispelled, I think. The common theme was that for some reason, and I can’t understand it, I wasn’t, at that point, as I was getting out of the navy, keen on becoming an academe. So I was exploring what some other possibilities were. What I did do was to latch on to the fact that I’d like to really just get my hands dirty, and work for a good city planner. I guess I wasn’t really thinking very carefully about whether this involved future graduate study or what. [pause] I’m talking now about right at the end of the war.

Rubens: Yes. When you say, “Oh, who knows. Maybe I was just thinking about running a hardware store,” in part, might that have been a reaction to the war?

Foley: I don’t know. I guess I wasn’t very eager to go back and play student.

Rubens: Right.

Foley: It’s interesting, because if you talk with people here at Berkeley or at any of these places—this was a group of older students coming back with the G.I. Bill and so on, and many of them proved very serious, and they, in a sense, changed the climate of what was happening in these schools at the time. For some reason, it just didn’t click with me.

Rubens: You had two children, yes?

Foley: We had two children. I felt a modest responsibility for taking care of the family financially. I don’t know what the—a lot of others managed to get along on the G.I. Bill, and maybe I could have. I’m not sure that I even explored it very carefully.
Rubens: Sure.

Foley: In retrospect, it doesn’t seem very rational, but there it was.

Rubens: Good. I’m glad that I opened that up a bit. So, tell me about Rochester. How did that come about?

Foley: Okay. I have a Ph.D. from Washington University in June, ’48. I would be thirty-two that summer.

Rubens: Your third child is in ’48 as well.

Foley: Yes, that’s right. So I went fishing for jobs, and I’m not sure that—I can’t remember alternatives, and I didn’t, I don’t think, go to other interviews. But, Rochester appealed to us because it was back in our home state. It seemed to be a good school. So, I took it.

Rubens: What was it entitled? It was going to be a job in—?

Foley: Well, I think it was a department of sociology/anthropology. But, it was a small department, and the briefest way of speaking about it was just as a department of sociology.

Rubens: Okay. How would you have rated that as a position?

Foley: I was hopeful, and I was an assistant professor in what looked like a good school, and I had an interview with the chairman. The chairman will loom large in a couple of things I have to say. His name was Earl Koos. His last name was K-double O-S. At the beginning, he was extremely helpful and hospitable.

Rubens: Was he an older—had he been there?

Foley: Oh, he was probably fifty-five or so. Fairly jovial guy. Somehow, we found it possible financially to buy a house, which we did out in Pittsford, which is a village-like suburb, and really it was quite an idyllic place, particularly for the kids. It was a wonderful setting. You could walk to downtown Pittsford. The department, however, ended up by being on the remnant of an older University of Rochester campus called the Women’s Campus. In the meantime, a new campus, financed by Eastman money, had been built some distance away. This proved to be more of a setback than I had anticipated because, being on the so-called Women’s Campus, we attracted mostly women, and we failed to
attract the number of men students that would have been good, and a much better balance.

I was to be there three and a half years and by soon after I left, I think the Women’s Campus folded entirely, and everything moved to the new combined campus. I was teaching pretty straight sociology, a couple of sections of introductory. I can’t remember too much. I’m not sure that I had much chance to specialize in urban—it was a small enough department so that we didn’t necessarily get too much by way of specialties. I did teach a course in kind of research methods. Since I had done the field study in St. Louis, at one point I did a field study of a neighborhood in Rochester, and used students as interviewers. It was the Chili-Thurston district in Rochester. As a result of this, the department published a small monograph for me. [Neighbors or Urbanites? Rochester: University of Rochester, 1952] An interesting thing was that years later, maybe in ’72, the study was literally replicated by a professor at Rochester named Albert Hunter. [“The Loss of Community: An Empirical Test through Replication.”] The replication was published in American Sociological Review [Vol. 40, No. 5, October 1975]. So, but other than that, the study, I think, didn’t have great merit.

Koos, at this point, was being very helpful. But, then I began to get an uneasy feeling about Koos. He was into sort of medical sociology, and he had some funding—I can’t remember the name of the foundation, but it was tied in partly with the medical school at the University of Rochester, a very good medical school. Koos was concerned with evaluating some of the outreach medical programs that the medical school was offering, using trailers and vans and so on. I came to the conclusion, reluctantly, that Koos was probably a pathological liar. I became concerned about what my future was going to be, tied in so closely. He was a very dominant figure in a small department. So, the long and short of it was that, by the beginning of the fourth year, I decided I should leave. So I resigned my position and left in December of 1952, and wrote a very strong letter of protest to the administration about Koos. It was, in a sense, a very foolhardy thing to do, even if I was leaving. I didn’t think that Rochester ought to retain him, and, believe it or not, the university got rid of him the next year.

3-00:25:48 Rubens: Were you alone in this, oh, exposé, or protest?

3-00:25:50 Foley: Pretty much, yes. I don’t know quite all what happened after I left. The university fired him—a tenured department chairman—ostensibly on grounds of fiscal irregularities, but I think there was more. Later—in fact, only about ten or twelve years ago—I had a long letter from a researcher at the medical school saying that they wanted to replicate some of Koos’ earlier work, and they heard that there might be problems, and what was my reaction about it. I had to say, of course, that this was some time ago, and I didn’t know precisely, but I did say that I would feel that they ought to be suspicious of whether he’d somehow concocted part of his data.

3-00:26:51 Rubens: Now, to resign in the middle of the school year, that seems also brave.
Foley: I was just feeling I wanted to get out. I had a family and three kids, and we owned a house—

Rubens: Had you come to think of yourself as a researcher and professor? I mean, was this now settling into your identity?

Foley: I was, by this time, willing to continue an academic life, but I chose a kind of an odd timing. So, I was suddenly scurrying for a job, and I found no full-time regular teaching position. But, I learned of, and applied for, and was accepted as a research associate at the Bureau of Applied Social Research at Columbia. The director of my project was Kingsley Davis, who was a professor of sociology at that point at Columbia. He had an air force contract. This was a very curious period in the early fifties, when a number of the military, particularly the air force, were apparently trying to woo social scientists with the idea that there might be social science research that was relevant to certain aspects of morale or what have you in the service. What Kingsley had was a contract to provide detailed demographic information about the countries around the Mediterranean. So, I went to work for him.

We faced the problem. We sold the house, and we got rid of our stuff. We were going back East, and we decided that, since Katharine’s mother had a big house up in Poughkeepsie, seventy-five miles north of New York, that she and the kids would settle there, and that I would get a small one-room flat by Columbia. That’s what we did. Well, I can remember in Pittsford puzzling about what we were going to send and everything. But anyway, we got East, and managed to sell the house. So, here I was at the bureau.

Rubens: Also in New York, and a major university.

Foley: What happened is that I commuted to Poughkeepsie twice a week. The railroad, the New York Central Railroad, had a water-level route. Trains were good and fast, and I could read or study or what have you. The older kids went to public school. Margot was perhaps too young for school, and Katharine’s mother was very accommodating. I realized that I had to fish for a permanent position, and the first big—I’ll come back to say a little bit more about what I did at Columbia, but the first good offering I had was to fill in for Amos Hawley, an urban sociologist at the University of Michigan. He wanted to be away for a year for sabbatical. So I went to Ann Arbor and had the interview. It was very tempting. Ann Arbor seemed very attractive. But, I knew, God darn it, it was only one year. Finally, I decided that I wouldn’t do it, so I turned that down. I think maybe I turned down one other offer for the short-term, but I was kind of nervous about what was going to happen.

Then the question came up as to whether I’d be at Columbia for another year, and what we’d do about housing. I began to find out what other people did. A lot of the faculty—who could afford more than I could—lived in New Jersey, particularly Leonia, New Jersey. We wanted to have the family together, so that summer we rented a house in—
oh gosh, I can’t think of it—in New Jersey, not far from Leonia. It didn’t work out very well. God, I had a hot, stinking commuting trip to New Jersey in summer.

3-00:32:01
Rubens: Where is Leonia?

3-00:32:06
Foley: It’s not too far from the west end of the George Washington Bridge. Maybe a little northwest. My geography’s a little hazy. But let me go back. The work at the bureau was very intriguing and extremely good training. It was like a postdoctoral. It turns out that the two—no, there were three really fine libraries in New York for the census-type information that we needed on these cities around the Mediterranean. The first one was the New York Public Library. You just can’t absolutely underestimate it. It has a research component that the ordinary public library wouldn’t, you know, just couldn’t possibly touch. The other was the UN library, which was gradually coming into being. The third was the American Geographical Society. This is not the National Geographic, this is the professional, which is beautifully organized. So, we would work in these various libraries, and—

3-00:33:21
Rubens: Were you a bit more advanced than the other people who worked there?

3-00:33:28
Foley: No, I don’t—

3-00:33:29
Rubens: Accomplished?

3-00:33:30
Foley: It varied. I had an assistant [pause]—Judith Blake was her professional name—who at that point was married to a psychiatrist. Kingsley Davis was married, but Kingsley and Judith decided to be married. When Katharine and I were coming out to Berkeley, Judith was in Reno, I think, getting a divorce. Kingsley came to Berkeley in sociology and Judith came and later headed the demography department here.

Another colleague was Fred Iklé. He had a Ph.D. from the University of Chicago. For his dissertation he had studied the effect of Allied bombing on German industrial cities, and concluded that we didn’t do as much damage as we’d claimed. Fred Iklé later became deputy undersecretary in the Department of Defense. Another colleague was Natalie Rogoff, R-O-G-O-F-F, and very, very able. She ended up marrying a Norwegian sociologist. We saw her years later in Oslo, Norway.

So, it was a good experience, but it was a kind of rough time for the family, and mostly, I was just damn anxious as to how I was going to pull out for the next year. So, what should happen but in mid or late July, right out of the blue, I get this letter from a T.J. Kent, Jr. here in Berkeley, wondering whether I would possibly consider employment at Berkeley. Well, you know, I wasn’t going to say, “My God, don’t say any more. I’m on my way.” [laughs] So, we had an exchange, and—

3-00:36:24
Rubens: How had he learned of you?
Foley: I think that they learned of me through the University of Michigan. I think I was recommended by somebody at the University of Michigan, because I’d had, you see, they’d wanted me to come there. I think Catherine Bauer, or Catherine Bauer Wurster—I’ll speak of her mostly as Catherine Bauer—was involved in the connection with Michigan. Anyway, Kent said it was too late to try to get tenure for me, and it would perhaps have been iffy at that point. I didn’t probably have quite enough background in publication and so on. So, they said they would appoint me as a lecturer for two years and put me up for tenure at the end of the two years. They also said that they realized they were approaching me at—by the time we finally concluded it, it was the tenth or twelfth or something like that of August, it was well into August. They said, because you’re having to come on such short notice, we will get a house—we will have a house for you to rent when you get to Berkeley.

Rubens: You didn’t come out and take a look or interview?

Foley: No, no.

Rubens: Was there a long-distance call?

Foley: Well, you see, the other thing is that I’d been in the Bay Area early in the navy days. Our two boys were both born on the Stanford campus; they were born at Stanford Hospital. I hadn’t been in Berkeley, and I hadn’t come to the campus, but it just, to me, at that point, looked like pretty big league stuff. Whether I could handle it, I’d have to wait and see. So, we packed up all our things, and shipped a lot of books and stuff, and we drove out. I can remember the last—we drove from Salt Lake City to Berkeley in one day, stopping at Lake Tahoe for a swim. We got into Berkeley in the evening, and were dead tired and hungry. We ate at some downtown restaurant, and then went up to find our house. It was about ten o’clock at night, and it was on Tamalpais Road. It was a house that was owned, we subsequently learned, by Dan Stanislawski, who was a geographer, and who was, at the time, teaching at the University of Arizona, I think, but had maintained his Berkeley house. We subsequently got to know him much better when he came back to Berkeley. We walked in the door, we had a key, and the beds were made, and God, what a kind of a wonderful, not conclusion, but a wonderful—

Rubens: Well, welcome. Beginning.

Foley: Welcome. After all the struggle of wondering what we’re going to do. So, here we are. I can remember Katharine was timid enough so she didn’t want to drive the car down from the hill for about three days, but I somehow got to the campus, and paid my respects. At that time, the department was in the little brown shingled building just above the architecture building on Hearst [Avenue]. The building is currently mostly called the Naval Architecture Building.
Rubens: Naval architecture?

Foley: Yes.

Rubens: You were appointed as a lecturer in—?

Foley: Well, Kent, it turned out, had to find some extra budget money, so he got some extra money from sociology, and the first year I had a part-time fractional appointment in sociology. I taught a course in sociology. I don’t know whether they had thought of holding me or not, but in any respect, I don’t think I was up to what they wanted, so Kent worked out an arrangement the second year, where part of my salary was paid from the real estate research program. This was a program under Paul Wendt, mostly associated with business administration.

Rubens: But in the planning school?

Foley: No. But, Kent had good ties to various related faculty and departments, and this was one of them.

Rubens: Now, did he tell you what he wanted you to do in city planning? I see you taught the planning problems, but what I’m really trying to ask is how did he instruct you or prepare you?

Foley: I was really hired, in a sense, as a social scientist. I think different people in the department may have had different images of what they thought I would do. I think one of the instrumental people was Catherine Bauer, and Catherine was fundamentally kind of a reformer, and thought that there could be effective applied social research, such that the research would come to bear and help bring about the reform. I think that Jack [Kent] somehow accepted the fact that this would seem to bring a certain kind of balance into the department. I replaced a faculty member named Sydney Williams. Syd Williams was an architect by background, and apparently very architecturally, visually oriented. He had students doing sketches as if they were architecture students and so on. Mel Webber talked about him because Mel Webber finished the Master of City Planning [MCP] program in June of 1952. I came in September of ’53. I didn’t meet Mel immediately, but I learned a little bit more about—the department before I came was pretty heavily design-oriented.

Anyway, Jack understood, and others understood, roughly what I’d been doing—that I’d been a planning analyst—so part of what I did was to try to offer coursework to students in what I was calling planning analysis. This involved kind of applied statistics; it involved the use of census data, for both population and economic information; the possibilities of forecasting. I also was, I think, right from the start, very
concerned with how you got feedback from residents as to how things actually worked out, and how you could anticipate how the things were going to affect residents.

Architects, I came to realize as I was at Berkeley longer, have the notion that if they can design the right environment, whether it’s micro—at a house level—or at a neighborhood level—residential level—somehow they can influence how people relate to each other. To a certain extent, this may be possible. But, in part, it’s a kind of a physical-environmental determinism, which a social scientist would be inclined to be skeptical about. So, I think I came to be a kind of a question raiser.

Rubens: Let me ask you, if you don’t mind just here, go back and pick up—when you did that neighborhood study in Rochester, did that have some feedback? Would you have said that?

Foley: No, I don’t think it—it didn’t have direct policy implications. It had indirect policy implications.

Rubens: Okay.

Foley: Let me just go on with a couple other things.

Rubens: Fine.

Foley: I thought that as an urban sociologist, I could help students become a little bit more sensitive to some of the salient characteristics of cities, how cities worked, how cities had been changing. In a sense, it was analogous to teaching anatomy to a medical student, because an urban planner might feel that his mission was to bring about a certain amount of change but, in fact, he’s dealing with a very complex phenomenon that has its own sort of momentum. So, if you’re gonna have some impact on this, you’ve got to understand what your possibilities are, what levers you can possibly pull, and so on. So, one of the courses that I taught, and I taught it for most of the time, was called The Metropolitan Region, and that probably was the closest to being kind of an urban sociology, urban government course.

Rubens: You taught that for a long time. 1953-78.

Foley: Yes. And then there were adaptations along the way. Let me say, I found the department faculty very congenial. I found the students very good and very, in their own way, dedicated—I was terribly impressed with the students. When I arrived, the average size of the MCP class was about fifteen, heavily male, usually about 14:1. The one thing that I remember was, I think that some women, at least, may have been almost discouraged, as if to say to them, “Look, this is kind of a tough game. We’re training planning directors, and you’re going into a kind of a smoke-filled, city hall atmosphere, and do
you really want to do this?” Well, you know, it was very absurd, but it took a long time to change that climate.

Rubens: Sure. Were these older students too? Some of them older?

Foley: Yes. In general, for a number of years, the average age of the MCP student as he got his degree was about twenty-eight.

Rubens: Some of these were war vets?

Foley: Yes, although this was—they really weren’t quite. They were probably past the G.I. Bill era.

Rubens: In fact, Korea is going to break out.

Foley: Yes. Another thing that fit into this was the fact that our family and our kids lived on Tamalpais Road for two years. Fran Violich lived diagonally across the road with his kids, Jack Kent lived two houses beyond Fran, and so, in a very unusual way, no matter how different our intellectual or professional outlook and attitudes might have been, we were very clubby. They were nice enough to accept us into the club. It reminded me a little bit of—when I came here, Jack, in a way, was being very fatherly. Earl Koos back at Rochester had been very fatherly.

Rubens: How much older was Kent than you?

Foley: Oh, Kent was about a year younger. I think. You see, Jack was a planning director in San Francisco at age twenty-nine. I was thirty-seven when I came to Berkeley, I think. But Jack was wonderful. Jack took me, within the first day or two, took me over to the Faculty Club, and he says, “I’m going to take you to lunch, and you ought to join.” Boom! Then, he says, “Have you set up your bank account yet?” And I said, “No.” He says, “Don’t bank at the Bank of America. Giannini is a bad regent [of the University of California].” [laughs] Jack just laid things out, you see. Hell, I was quite willing to go along.

Jack was really remarkable. He developed a pattern that every Monday morning, the department would have a faculty meeting. I can’t remember the earliest years, but within a few years after I was there, maybe even earlier, we latched on to the O’Neill Room, which is a big, very pleasant room in the Faculty Club, the northwest corner of the Faculty Club. We would have faculty meetings, I suppose, an hour and a half or two hours—small group. Then, the tradition was that every noon at lunch, an outsider would be invited. It would either be somebody in the profession, sometimes alumni, or it might be a faculty member in another department, or it might be a government official. The lunch would be informal, and a chance to let this person say a little bit about what was
on his mind, and we’d have a general discussion. It was a very congenial departmental community affair.

3-00:54:37
Rubens: Let me, if you don’t mind, stop you here for a minute and open that up a bit. Just the way you’re describing Jack—“direct,” “laid things out,”—I’m trying to get at if there was a sense that the department was on the move, that Jack had a vision of what this department was going to be, and you were going to play a role in that.

3-00:54:48
Foley: At first, I was mostly going with the flow and trying to find out what—but even when I was there—I came in ’53. The first graduates would have finished in about ’51.

3-00:54:48
Rubens: It was a two-year program?

3-00:54:48
Foley: Yes, ’50 or ’51. So, the program was very new. But, even then, we were the only urban planning program in California, and already the graduates were moving into influential positions in medium-sized cities, or getting experience in larger cities. One of the things that also struck me was that, in those early years, we had extremely close ties with the Bay Area chapter of the American Institute of Planners. This chapter would meet in, oh, various restaurants, often San Francisco, and most of our faculty would be there. A number of our students would be there. I think most of the students in those days had internships in planning agencies during the summer.

Now, the MCP program itself was kind of straitjacketed. All the students took essentially the same courses. It was heavily studio-oriented. This came out of the architecture tradition. But the studios could vary in their focus, and they weren’t always a kind of precise design, the way you might have in architecture. They might tackle a broader government policy problem.

Jack, to his credit, was not only an architect by background and an urban planning master’s degree holder from MIT, he was a real political animal. His kind of bible of the general plan—which was the theme of what was being taught—is, in its own way, rather remarkable because he explains, as I recall, that this is to be the legislative policy for a community so that it can guide its own growth. So, this pushes him into the whole business of the nature of legislation. So, while the urban general plan has a kind of a design component, it also is very policy-oriented.

The studios varied. I can’t remember very many of them, but some of them were very serious. You may have heard this story, but it’s fascinating. There was a studio that focused on four or five townships in southern Alameda County, and felt that these were destined to grow, that there was confusion now as to what was happening, and wouldn’t it be a good idea—the conclusion of the student group in the studio was that these four or five townships should be integrated, and there should be a new form of government, and there should be a major center, and minor centers. This was the birth of Fremont, quite literally. Now, that’s pretty amazing.
Even I have a career story—this is much later. I can’t remember the date of it. This wasn’t a studio course, but in one of my analysis courses, I wanted to give students some experience in household interviewing. So, we set a study for a big area that was potential for development in El Cerrito, and asked the question of whether people would want a commercial development, and posed some alternatives to them. We invited people to come in and review the results. It was as if it were—it was kind of in a studio style. The city manager from El Cerrito came. I remember it was a rainy day, and we didn’t have very many copies of the report that we’d prepared, but in those days we had ditto masters. The manager came up to me and said, “We’re having a community meeting. I’d like to have a few copies of this report.” So, instead of our controlling the situation and running off copies of the report, I loaned him the ditto masters. The next thing I knew, these had been distributed to, oh, a couple of hundred people at a community meeting, and this was the birth of El Cerrito Plaza. The plaza would have happened anyway. But, my point is that there was a tendency for us to work on real problems.

Rubens: Or real developments. You were in on the ground floor of this. You call this, I knew you had a word—“single track” I think is what you called that. The single track curriculum.

Foley: But, by the late fifties, there was a little loosening of the single track. There wasn’t much expansion of faculty, however. Mel came in a little after I did, and—

Rubens: I do want to interrupt you here now. I want to pick up before we get too far away from it—your meeting Catherine Bauer. Why did you say you think she knew of you from Michigan?

Foley: She had quite a network of people around the country, and I—at this point, I can’t remember who it might have been, but there were a couple of good research institutes at Michigan.

Rubens: Sure, of course. I actually worked for that later—Survey Research Institute, I think it was called.

Foley: Did you?

Rubens: Yes, I did.

Foley: In Ann Arbor?

Rubens: Yes. That’s exactly it.
Foley: There was also an Institute of Social Research, and I don’t know if that was a parent to the survey, or I don’t quite know what the structure was.

Rubens: By the way, should I have known who Amos Hawley was? Was he well known at the time?

Foley: Well, Amos Hawley was a well-known urban sociologist. He also was the chairman of the sociology department at Michigan at that time.

Rubens: So, he was well known?

Foley: Yes.

Rubens: Okay. And Kingsley Davis, too? Had he already made his—?

Foley: Oh yes. He was a brilliant scholar. He has a wonderful, big folio-sized demographic report on India. He was a very, very able guy.

Rubens: At the time you went to work there, he was well known?

Foley: Yes.

Rubens: Did you have access to him? Were you impressed by him?

Foley: Oh yes. He was operating this, and he was also wheeling-dealing in a number of other things.

Rubens: Okay. Well, you see, you’ve made a transition for me. How would you have characterized Jack in addition to being direct and clubby and looking out for you? He was a wheeler-dealer too, wasn’t he? I don’t mean for personal gain, I mean—

Foley: Well, yes. But, Jack had a sense of where he wanted to go, and he had a sense of needing allies. He was a very effective operator on campus and in the local Bay Area, but he would be constantly setting up kind of advisory committees, and he could figure out ways of pulling faculty from other departments. This was giving him political clout when he needed it later.

Rubens: Could you give me an example of pulling people from other departments?
Foley: He had—oh, I’m sorry—I’ll think of his name—a wonderful senior philosophy professor on a kind of permanent advisory committee. It was Stephen Pepper, who later became a confidant of Chancellor Strong. Jack also became very closely tied to Wurster. There was a real network of Jack and Bill Wurster and Catherine, just the three of them were an amazing trio the way they operated. You could write a book on their intricate relations. Bill Wurster was savvy, very able. He was an architect who had access to all kinds of people in the best society in the Bay Area, did these people’s houses.

I had great respect for Jack. The puzzle was to come later on, as it became clear that the department needed to expand, as to just, you know—and you could see inevitable tensions kind of developing. Partly—it would happen in any professional—just the tension between how, sort of strictly professional the department is going to be, and how academic the department’s going to be. This is a perennial—I think almost any professional program in a university faces it.

Rubens: And then the other slice—there may be others in addition, but is the social science orientation matched with the—?

Foley: That’s right. And, later on, as you know well, the difference between the so-called sort of physical urban planning, and the notion of social planning—

Rubens: But I didn’t let you answer about Catherine Bauer. That was—

Foley: Well, all right. Catherine—

Rubens: Even when you first met her, you knew who she was. Did you feel a little awestruck maybe?

Foley: Well, she’s a charming woman.

Rubens: Was she a big person? I don’t have a sense of her, physically.

Foley: It took me and a number of others to catch up with all of Catherine’s amazing life, including her love life.

Rubens: Just in terms of just actually meeting her, was she—?

Foley: Oh, she was direct, very articulate, very savvy, and never one to let the fact that she was a woman interfere. She could stand up to any man.
Rubens: She was pretty eminent by then, right?

Foley: Yes, yes. She had a good network, a tremendous series of articles and short monographs. If you go back and look at her book *Modern Housing*, which was written in ’35 or something like that, it’s a very thorough piece of work.

Rubens: So, I’m just trying to ask one more time if—was she quick-speaking and opinionated, or did you feel you could—

Foley: Oh yes, she’d speak up. But, the other thing was that she was responsive. You’d be in a meeting and go look in your mailbox two hours later, and there’d be a note from her, often very complimentary. She had a typewriter with little type. I don’t know if it was an Olivetti or what. She typed everything. Here would be a little note saying, “I thought your point at the meeting was great. Have you considered this?” She’d go on—just a very active mind. I looked at my copy of the Rochester study we did, for the first time in years a while back, and to my surprise and delight, tucked in the front of the report was a full page of her typed letter to me. This was written the first fall, maybe it was about November of ’53. I think what happened, as a new faculty, I was asked to circulate what few things I’d written, and this was her response to my study—just very nice. She thought that it was well done, and she thought of some of the implications, and she was interested in the neighborhood unit concept problem. You know, if she did that—and she did this to students and so on—you couldn’t help but practically fall in love with her for being so responsive and supportive.

Rubens: Did she bend your ear in the sense of, “I want you to—I think the department should cover certain issues?”

Foley: What happened was that she had access to funds. She knew the Ford Foundation people, who were big donors, and other sources. She would design projects, get the money, and then—well, she may have lined up people in advance—the foundations may have insisted on that. But she was a broker. She’d kind of farm out. So, she was able to raise, in a couple of cases, funds for things that ostensibly we were sort of doing together, but in which she would let me take the lead while she was scurrying around doing other things.

Rubens: Can you give me an example of that? Or, how soon did that start when you came?

Foley: We did a couple of things for the state. There was a state planning board, and I think I must have been a disappointment to her in the sense that much of what I did was pretty empirical, and didn’t necessarily feed as effectively into some of her reform concerns as we’d like.

Rubens: But, are you making this judgment now, looking back, or—?
Foley: She was, I think—remained very generous. She never seemed picky, or never acted very disappointed.

[Minidisc 4 not recorded]

[End of session]
INTERVIEW 3: MARCH 25, 2003
[Minidisc 5]

5-00:01:09
Rubens: You were talking about the Gregory House, and it was called the Gregory House? Did you folks refer to it as Wurster’s House or the Gregory House?

5-00:01:21
Foley: Well, it was called Wurster’s House, but it had this history of being kind of a classic, lovely old home.

5-00:01:28
Rubens: And the Gregories had been patrons of his, yes?

5-00:01:32
Foley: I think so, yes.

5-00:01:34
Rubens: I think they were a Palo Alto family.

5-00:01:37
Foley: I don’t know the background for them.

5-00:01:41
Rubens: I do think there’s a Diego Rivera painted on their wall, at Gregory House. I’m not sure.

5-00:01:47
Foley: I don’t recall.

5-00:01:51
Rubens: Well, you’re so kind. You’re so kind. We’ve started twenty minutes late or more. We were filling in just a few things, and I had a couple of things I wanted to ask you. I think we’re about ready to make the leap into the 1960s when the department really begins to change.

5-00:02:09
Foley: Already?

5-00:02:11
Rubens: But let me just ask you this—I’m taking this information from Webber’s oral history. He says there was a period, maybe in the fifties or sixties, when “Harvey Perloff and”—the transcriber thinks it says—“Julie Margolis…”

5-00:02:59
Foley: Oh, Julius Margolis. Yes.

5-00:03:01
Rubens: “…came to town, and our faculty met with them in the Wursters’ parlor. I remember vividly with Catherine… Catherine standing in the middle holding these two antagonized, antagonistic teams apart,… and Jack and Fran and so on were saying, ‘Nonsense, all that stuff about economics.’ And of all them saying, ‘Nonsense to all this
physical design.’ This became...” and he wrote a little essay about this in 1957. Were you there? Were you there when Perloff and Margolis were at the Wursters’ house?

5-00:03:43
Foley: I’m not sure. I don’t remember that incident, but I knew them all, and I realize it’s very plausible that it happened, but I can’t recount it. But, it is an example of the way Catherine, using the house, was able to convene meetings, and encourage people in the department to meet outsiders and so on.

5-00:04:17
Rubens: I guess what I’m pointing to is what seems to be some divisions that are bubbling up now, that are pedagogical ones and also practical ones.

5-00:04:28
Foley: I guess my sense is that this is perhaps a little over-dramatized, but since I can’t remember the incident, I shouldn’t say more. The other tension that was coming into play was the tension between being a scholarly department and being a professional department.

5-00:05:03
Rubens: Yes, and that’s what I’m asking you, I think. I’m trying to use that as a springboard. Maybe these tensions that we outlined last time, and I was saying, “Let’s hold off so that we fill in.” But, I think we’re just about ready to talk about them.

5-00:05:21
Foley: I think I would rather do just a little bit by way of kind of chronology and what was happening, and then perhaps we can talk more about the tension thing.

5-00:05:36
Rubens: That’s fine. What I’m really asking you then is if you were at that meeting. And then, he speaks very kindly of you. He says that when you came it made a genuine difference. You introduced different courses. We did talk about your courses. He says, “And he introduced me into a lot of the literature that I’d never heard of... And we did this series of studies, which were mostly reading and talking to each other... And we did that little book on the explorations of metropolitan spatial structure.” So, I want to make sure that we get that in the chronology. Did you—?

5-00:06:19
Foley: It’s very clear that Mel and I were very simpatico. It was also clear that I, perhaps, maintained somewhat more cordial relations with, say, Fran, in particular, perhaps Jack. Although, you know, Mel is a very gracious person, and in personal contacts, there was nothing biting or antagonistic. It’s just that he had strong convictions, and some of these convictions threatened, I think, Fran and Jack. This kind of worked itself out.

5-00:07:24
Rubens: But, did the two of you—he said, “We did this series of studies.” Did you read together?

5-00:07:29
Foley: Oh yes. Well, what happened is that—yes. This was a book of essays that Mel edited. It was published, I think, by the University of Pennsylvania Press. I think Catherine may have been involved in getting financing for—published in the sixties.
Rubens: Would that show up on your vitae?

Foley: Yes, because my essay would have shown up.

Rubens: Would have been in it, yes. So, this is before British—you want to take a look at this right here?


Foley: Sometime I can make a comment on my essay and on the book. Maybe I can do it now.

Rubens: I think so.

Foley: Mel wrote a tremendously influential essay in this book. It was one of two essays—I can’t remember whether the other one was before or after. The other one was an article. In these two essays, Mel was arguing that the organization of urban areas was increasingly dependent on non-spatial connections, and we were beginning to see the impact, particularly of telephones in the earlier period, but the nascent impact of computers. Now, PCs hadn’t really come in at that point, and that was what made his essays rather prescient. He came to have a good deal of influence intellectually and professionally. The thrust of his argument was that if urban areas are being organized on other than just spatial terms, then the notion of sort of spatial and physical planning is less relevant.

My essay, I think, was not a successful effort. It was an honest push to try to uncover researchable and somewhat theoretical links between the character of the physical environment, and the social and economic organization, and people’s attitudes. As Roger Montgomery once said [laughs]—he says, “It sounds like Talcott Parsons.” Roger was humorously very critical of what I—Talcott Parsons was the Harvard sociology professor who was known for these complex diagrams of trying to show the relation among segments of society.

Rubens: Of course, this was something that you had been doing, even back in St. Louis.

Foley: Well, the point is this. I still believed, at that point, and I think I believe it today, that there is an important role for professional physical planning. It seems to me that for all the tremendously revolutionary changes in the way we organize, it is still important to have a physical infrastructure, and it’s still important to lay out streets in new subdivisions, and some of these may seem rather mundane. What I was concerned—as a social scientist—was whether these had the kinds of impacts that the architectural-
minded physical planners thought they had. And, turning it around the other way, what we could learn about changing economic and social structure and what were the implications of these changes for physical planning. So, I was attempting to bridge between physical planning and a recognition of the non-physical aspects of urban organization. I’m quite sure that the article was not very influential. I think it may have been reprinted once or twice. And so, in that sense, I was disappointed. If there was any sense of a friendly duel—intellectual duel—between Mel’s article and mine, it’s clear that his won out.

Rubens: Well, he’s not talking about a duel. What I want to get away from is your evaluation of its success, but rather to focus on that “We did this series of studies,” so that had they been—

Foley: Yes, but I’m trying to get into the content of this particular study that several of us were involved in. Catherine Wurster had an essay—I think she wrote the introduction to the book. Bill [William Lindus Cody] Wheaton had an essay.

Rubens: So, the “we” here is not just you and he?

Foley: No, no. The book contained probably six or seven essays.

Rubens: He’s lauding you, and he’s saying, in part, that the kind of social science research you brought in is causing him to rethink.

Foley: I think we had mutual influences. It also turned out that, in our own way, we continued to have some consistent differences. He tended to be a pro-auto person. I, in some of my later research, was trying to indicate the large segment of people who don’t have access to cars, and arguing how are we going to take care of this. Then—well, let me stop there.

Rubens: All right. By the way, this is a good segue, though. He’s saying off of you, in this social science turn, Webber’s saying, “I had to rethink what we’d been doing on the BART project. And that business with the hierarchy of centers. This was wrong. It was a mistake.”

Foley: I won’t go back into that.

Rubens: All right, fine. Okay. I’m wondering also—I was thinking that that book came a little earlier. You have a real spate of publications coming out between—just consistently. It sounds to me that there are a lot of these ideas that come into that essay “An Approach to Metropolitan Spatial Structure.” That was your essay. “How Many Berkeley Residents Know about Their City’s Master Plan?” “Factors in the Location of Administrative Offices,” “The Suburbanization of Administrative Offices,”
“Architectural Research and Sociology Perspective.” I mean, this is just ’56, ’57, ’59. Then there’s “British Town Planning.” That looks like that’s a—I don’t know where that comes from—quite a bit on London. Do you want to say something about that?

Foley: I took all four sabbaticals in London.

Rubens: Aha! Why? What drew you?

Foley: Well, one, I was interested in getting out of the country and getting a break. Two, I’d always been intrigued with Britain. In this case, I decided I’d like to look in at their planning efforts.

Rubens: Did you have a base when you were there? Did you affiliate with—?

Foley: The first year I was at the London School of Economics [LSE]. They gave me office space. On both of the first two sabbaticals, I had ties to a group within LSE, headed by William Robson, who was a professor of public administration, that were rethinking how London should be governed. In a fascinating sense, Catherine—I felt close to Catherine Bauer—Catherine had gone much earlier, and gotten to know a lot of people in Britain and in Europe. I discovered this somewhere in my files—I’m not sure whether I still have it—but she wrote out in her inimitable way with her typewriter, tiny type, single-spaced, about four or five pages of people to contact there. So, it was a great experience.

Rubens: It looks like it was a very productive experience too. A lot came out of it.

Foley: It led to the only two major books that I wrote. The first one was on the planning of Greater London, and the second one was on the government of Greater London.

Rubens: Are you suggesting that Catherine had an influence on you going to London as well?

Foley: No. But once she heard I was going, she encouraged me. She was very much in with the New Town crowd. I admired what they did, but I was being an observer, rather than a missionary. In fact, much of what I did involved empirical research. In talking with Mel—Mel had powerful networks and, I think, many more personal contacts than I did, but he didn’t do a great deal of direct empirical research. I was an empirical researcher. Part of our going back and forth was this complementarity, but somewhat different in slant. It also means that I think that, since a good bit of what I wrote was reporting the results of surveys or of direct observation, that it, in itself, didn’t lead to changes in planning philosophy. I think, in this sense, Catherine may have been disappointed.

Catherine wanted research to be applied. Catherine wanted research to lead to modifications or improvements in programs and policy. I think one reason that what I
wrote was probably not more influential in the profession was the fact that I don’t think I really led through to focusing on modifications in planning policy. I remained an observer, an analyst, not only of the city, but trying to look in at the urban planning process. I’m not just trying to be defensive, because I think there was a place for that role, and a place for that role in a larger faculty in which a number of people were doing other things. I’m just trying to look back and reflect.

Rubens: Were you able to set any of your students onto “British Town Planning”? Was there anything they could do? Did this come into your curriculum?

Foley: No. I wasn’t influential, I think, in that respect. But I hope that I gave students, at a minimum, a little better feel for some tools that they could use.

Rubens: I was going to say it must have enriched these kinds of courses that you’re teaching: Population and Employment, Analysis.

Foley: I hope they were effective, and I think probably selectively—they meant more to some students than others.

Rubens: Okay. I just keep hearing an interior dialogue that you, in reflecting, have with Catherine Bauer. She must have affected you in some way that—several times now you speak about, “She must have been disappointed in me.” Did she ever literally—?

Foley: No. No, in a way we were allies. I think the interesting—she was an idea person also, and I think that she probably respected the fact that I had the interest in and the know-how to carry out—some of what we did involved rather large data banks. Curiously, in a day before we had the present ready access to computers, you know, so a lot of it was laboriously hand-cranked. [laughs]

Rubens: Could you just mention that? It’s exactly what I was going to ask you. How was the research that you did conducted? Did you have access to any of the mainframe computers?

Foley: Yes. There was a mainframe computer on campus. It must have come in, oh, I suppose around—it must have evolved, of course. When I first came in ’53, they were still building a huge vacuum-tube computer up in engineering, and it wasn’t until sometime—I suppose in the sixties—that more efficient computers came in. I would use research assistants. You had to know programming language, and I didn’t learn a programming language, but I had bright research assistants who did. They’d go over—sometimes they’d have to go over at two a.m. to get onto the computer. Everything would be on IBM punch cards, and you’d feel that you were partly successful if you just got decent results.
Rubens: The other thing I’m noticing is in these years also, ’58, ’59—I’m just taking this up to about ’64—that you’re giving papers.

Foley: Well, those are kind of, I think, common for faculty people who were at all active.

Rubens: But so, the point is that you were active. You were active in professional associations and—

Foley: It was a very stimulating time because a number of universities were picking up on urban planning. A number were beginning to reevaluate what they doing.

Rubens: And you had had some exposure to Michigan. You had almost been there. Certainly New York. So, it seems to me that a lot of these centers were things were coming out of, you were—

Foley: Well, partly I think that some of us did this as representatives of a department that was, hopefully, on the goal.

Rubens: I see. Particularly this one: Participant Working Seminar of Metropolitan Spatial Structure, which was at MIT and Harvard.

Foley: Well, that was kind of a specialty of mine. So, yes, I came up from time to time.

Rubens: Does that mean you would go back there? Were these summer institutes?

Foley: Well, most of these were fairly short-run. Curiously, Daniel Patrick Moynihan was the director of Harvard-MIT at that point.

Rubens: At that time?

Foley: Yes.

Rubens: What did you think of him? Did he have influence on you?

Foley: Oh, he was a very sharp, genial sort of guy.

Foley: I can’t tell you.

Rubens: All right, so where I feel we’ve gone is just hovering right about at the year 1964, and I don’t know where you want to pick up about—let me just look at my [Department of City and Regional Planning] chronology here.

Foley: Well, I think we could pick up at the late fifties and make the jump into the sixties. I’d just like to make few comments.

Rubens: Okay. I guess the reason I’ve been going to ’64 because that’s when the three new emphases are introduced, where the curriculum is really revised.

Foley: Well, there were a lot of pieces that were coming together.

Rubens: Yes.

Foley: First of all, I would like to comment on the atmosphere within the university. This was a period of very vigorous growth. Kerr was first chancellor of the campus, and then he slid over into being president of the university. We were, as a system, in the process of creating new campuses. There was a tremendous boom in student enrollment. From a budget point of view, amazingly, everything was gold. We were seldom hampered by budget difficulties. In that kind of a climate, it’s a happy climate [chuckles] because, within the university, there isn’t infighting. There’s enough to go around.

Rubens: Right.

Foley: One example is I continued to serve as a sort of an advisor to the emerging Environmental Design Library. By the early sixties, we were figuring out what our policy was going to be. I have nothing in writing on this, but it’s my distinct impression that we decided we were going to be the finest research library of its kind, certainly in the western U.S. and, if possible, in the U.S, and that we would just buy everything, any language, anything related to urban planning. This was the kind the mood that we were in.

Rubens: Are you talking about the DCRP library?

Foley: No, by this time, DCRP had become part of the Environmental Design Library. Effective 1959, the department became part of a new College of Environmental Design. We were still in our previous physical quarters, and we didn’t move into Wurster Hall until the late summer of 1964, but we were building library and so on. Okay.
Let me talk about faculty. What I don’t have any records on—from a point of view of
departmental administration, what is important in the faculty is what are called FTE,
full-time equivalent. We were to receive, as we went into the sixties, a tremendous
increase in FTE. My sense of the jump is that late fifties, we may have had something
like five FTE—I don’t know, four or five FTE.

5-00:33:22
Rubens: It says seven faculty.

5-00:33:24
Foley: If you had some part-time people, their FTE was picked up by another department. By
1970 we were probably up to something like fifteen FTE. I think roughly by sometime
in the seventies, we probably had as many as fourteen or fifteen tenured faculty
members. It was a tremendous increase that was to come.

5-00:33:55
Rubens: It looks like ’63 was a really big year when that’s happening.

5-00:33:58
Foley: Yes, what happened was that we were kind of marking time in terms of actual action,
but there was a great deal of discussion. The thrusts were in two or three directions.
First of all, it was a sense that we ought to move toward a Ph.D. program. I don’t think
that there was great resistance on the part of the physical planners. I think that what we
were trying to say was that we could become big enough so that the department could
accommodate both. I think the presumption was that there were some aspects of a Ph.D.
program that could be relevant to physical planning as well as other versions of
planning. The second thrust was to develop our own research institute structure. The
third thrust was just—kind of flowed from this—was that, inevitably, we would find
ourselves pulled into a series of topical areas that connected us to the wonderfully
strong collection of departments on the Berkeley campus. The strength of a graduate
program at the Berkeley campus has always been not just its own departmental
resources, but the resources it had in, oh, eighty-five other Ph.D. programs. So, this
really came to fulfillment in about 1963. We appointed Mike Teitz, Bill Wheaton, and
Jack Dyckman.

5-00:36:02
Rubens: Tom Cooke too.

5-00:36:08
Foley: Well, I mentioned these first three because they all have Ph.D.s and they are all
scholarly guys. Tom Cooke was one of our own graduates, was a planning consultant,
and was an excellent choice, but was much more in the master’s program dealing with
physical planning. Wheaton became the director of the Institute of Urban and Regional
Development. Dyckman became the director of an unaligned center for planning and
development research, and Mike Teitz did not immediately take any institute
leadership, but had come with a Ph.D. in regional science, and brought a very strong
scholarly ability in public economics, in model building. He was a very versatile guy—
became, I think, a remarkably fine faculty member.

This happened in the last—Jack Kent was chairman until June ’64, and I think he was
influenced particularly—well, there was a full faculty discussion of most of this. But, I
also think that Catherine and, probably indirectly, Bill Wurster were also involved. Catherine had wonderful connections, including direct connections to Clark Kerr, and I think that Catherine put the bee in Clark Kerr’s bonnet that we needed strong, independent research capabilities. I think Jack kind of went along on this, and I don’t know whether Jack had a sense where this was going to lead. It’s not fair to try to climb into his mind.

5-00:38:47
Rubens: This was also one of your pushes, too.

5-00:38:49
Foley: Well, the other thing that was happening was that in the spring of 1964, we’d had this pattern of meeting in the O’Neill room every Monday. This was one of Jack’s wonderful leadership devices. We had a committee—in fact, I was chairman—to try to re-look at the MCP program. My sense was that we ought to still have the physical planning option, but that we needed to expand, and so we did. We, at that point, agreed to two additional options, one in housing and urban redevelopment, and the third one was kind of iffy from my point of view, but it had to do with, really, model development, as it might affect—I can’t remember exactly how it was phrased. This reflected Mike Teitz’ and Jack Dyckman’s interests.

5-00:40:05
Rubens: Was this the planning and programming for urban systems?

5-00:40:08
Foley: Yes, planning and programming for urban systems. The urban systems is the—

5-00:40:11
Rubens: Urban systems is the key word.

5-00:40:13
Foley: It was more the modeling. It began to say—it raised the question of what the urban systems were. They could be educational systems; they could be what have you. Then, sometime after that, I think we followed with regional planning. No, no, that was—I don’t know. So, this was approved. I’m not sure how happy Jack and Fran were, but we voted it in. So, it was an eventful year. I became chairman that June, and we moved into Wurster Hall in August, and we, for the entering students, started right off with this new curriculum.

5-00:41:16
Rubens: Was this an expanded student enrollment too?

5-00:41:20
Foley: Well, it was going up, but not dramatically. I suppose we must have been up to twenty or twenty-five students coming in. That’s a matter of record.

5-00:41:38
Rubens: For you to be chair, did that mean you were teaching less?

5-00:41:43
Foley: Well, yes. It was curious. Jack had been the main chairman up to this point. Fran, I think, had been chairman from ’57 to ’60, partly because Jack went on sabbatical at the
beginning of that period. I guess they both wanted relief. Jack, I think, by this time, may have been a city council member, and I think I became chairman because—I may have mentioned—I think I was less threatening to the various camps. So, my challenge was to try to hold the pieces together, and build.

Rubens: Not chair because you had envisioned some of this change?

Foley: No. Well, in one sense, I think it was considerably my vision to alter the MCP program. I think I tended to be a pluralist and feel that in a world in which there was so much to be done, that students ought to have considerable leeway to have choice, and not just be channeled into a fairly single program.

Rubens: Now, you may want to do a big arc, but this is a very fateful fall, this fall of 1964 when you become chair, when you start the new program, when you’re in the new building. It’s the fall in which that controversy between the administration and what becomes the Free Speech Movement is starting.

Foley: In fact, one other incident, and I would like to bring this up—in November of that year, Catherine Bauer died. I’d just like to make a few comments because I was involved. It was a Saturday—I don’t know, maybe roughly the second Saturday in November—that she was reported missing, having gone on a hike or a long walk by herself up the very mountainous backdrop to their seafront home at Stinson Beach. By Monday, she still hadn’t been found. So we took a search party of, oh, I suppose fifty or sixty students and some faculty up. She was found that morning in a ravine, I think by Paul Sedway, who was an MCP student. The question was whether she had died a natural death or whether she had taken her own life. The coroner’s report, I think, suggests a natural death, but it’s been kind of open.

But I just want to say, Jack and I, the following weekend, decided we would like to retrace her steps. Partly, I guess, it was just a memorial gesture, but we were trying to puzzle out the whole business. Interestingly, we both wore glasses, and as we got up to the higher level where she had reached and her body was found, it was foggy, and both of our glasses—both Jack’s and my glasses—were fogged. She wore glasses, and so, one possibility is that it was wet, and she slipped and died of exposure. I think that’s what the coroner’s report was.

Rubens: As chair, you must have had to have a memorial service.

Foley: Well, I tell you, Martin Meyerson had become dean, and he was magnificent. He picked up on it. She was, at this point, associate dean, and close to him. I, in a sense, felt relieved because I think Martin made it a college affair, and handled it very, very well.

Rubens: This is maybe not an appropriate question, but I was thinking I’d rue that I didn’t ask you. It must have been hard to be married to Catherine Bauer, and it was a later
marriage. Was she a formidable person in comparison to Wurster, or was he also a strong personality?

Foley: They were both delightful people, and both very strong. They had a daughter, who’s still living. I have a block on the name. But then—

So let’s go onto the FSM [Free Speech Movement] period. It obviously affected us very directly. The most practical thing that ended up for the department was the fact that I think we responded, perhaps before many of the other departments, by deciding that we should have student representation on some of the faculty committees: admission committee and other committees, and that there was a—I don’t know the precise pattern, but there were student representatives to faculty meetings. So, this was a constructive response, I think. Wurster Hall was kind of a hotbed of activity. They turned out more of the silkscreen posters probably than any place else on campus. You know, these are quite remarkable and are now collector’s items.

There were meetings and meetings and meetings—and I don’t mean to be cynical on this—but the students were certainly correct in picking up the free speech issue and, you know, the faculty tried to finally respond, and [Chancellor Edward] Strong was quite clearly wrong. I noticed in Kerr’s recent memoirs he comments on the fact—how wrong the Strong decision was and that there were two or three serious mistakes by the administration. The students switched to wanting really to democratize the operation of the school, of the college. So, they were calling meetings and they wanted this really to be democratic. They wanted to have councils that would include students and staff and janitors. So, I remember sitting through kind of countless meetings, and you wanted to hear it out, and you wanted to sort out what might seem to be workable, but it went on for a long time.

Rubens: Do you have any students that come to mind when you think about who were some of the more radical or articulate?

Foley: No, no.

Rubens: I realize we haven’t looked at that.

Foley: Well, you would have had views of that from perhaps other interviews.

Rubens: I haven’t. I haven’t gotten—I should pursue it.

Foley: Yes.
Rubens: The other question: being chair, were you held accountable in any certain way? Did Strong or any of the administration say to you, “Tone down your kids,” or do you recall any of those higher level meetings where you were?

Foley: No, I—well, the dramatic meetings were a couple of Academic Senate meetings. That was rather different. No, by this time, we were in the college, so our ties were partly through the dean. Meyerson was there, and Meyerson had to mediate a lot of things. I think, in general, he probably was fairly adept at this.

Rubens: Why do you think Meyerson was asked to come in and replace Strong? He’d only been there a year.

Foley: Well, that’s right, but it was a tribute to the fact that he seemed to have this ability to, well, in fact, lead and to get people together. So, I guess it was probably by early January that he was picked up as the acting chancellor. Wurster, I think, came back.

Rubens: Was there any consideration of you moving up into a dean’s position?

Foley: No, no.

Rubens: You were the chair.

Foley: I didn’t aspire to it, and I wouldn’t have been considered.

Rubens: Okay.

Foley: The other thing—let me go on a little bit. The other thing that we faced—we had the institutes; we didn’t have a Ph.D. program. So, I and others were fully involved in this. One of the concerns was that, because we were a professional department, we didn’t want to be pushed into a professional doctor’s degree. Social Welfare had had this problem earlier. I think Social Welfare may have ended up with both degrees. The professional degree was Doctor of Social Welfare, and the other degree was a Ph.D.

So, we had to head this off. The dean of the Graduate Division was Sanford Elberg, Sandy Elberg. He proved to be very, very helpful. He was ostensibly trying to be judicious, because it was ultimately his responsibility to decide, through whatever advisory committees he set up on it, whether we’d get it. But, he also was a friend in court, and so we got it steered through, and I think it was approved probably by ’65. So, by ’65 or ’66, we’d made this tremendous jump from where we’d been in the late fifties.

Rubens: And you’re chair in these years. You’re chair in ’65, ’66, into ’67.
Foley: The interesting thing is that in many ways it was a departmental affair. It was just that we had a certain amount of continuing housekeeping and hand-holding from time to time, and I found it a challenge. I don’t think I was as relaxed and adept as some people who can handle these things with their little finger and still be—

Rubens: Well, these are pretty heady years. Now, after FSM it’s going to be this constant anti-war environment where there’s strikes and—

Foley: Of course, the other thing that was beginning to heat up was the changes in the national administration because of Vietnam. We were moving toward ’68 and the Laos and—of course, this was to affect the character of the Ph.D. program.

Rubens: Once the Ph.D. program starts, do you literally teach in that as well?

Foley: I didn’t play a very major role in that. I think I wanted to continue to be sure that the MCP program was functioning, and I felt that we had a number of new faculty that could pick up on the Ph.D. And the Ph.D. had the—by its nature—could be pretty individually tailored for individual students.

Rubens: And, by this time—just a leftover question—did you feel the library had neared its mission of being one of the finest—

Foley: Oh yes. The only problem was that I think that the library was severely shortchanged in Wurster Hall. Wurster Hall was designed by architects who still had an image of the program being primarily studio work, so Wurster Hall consisted of all these floors where the architects could be, and the library was really an abysmal space. It had no separate carrels or reading places. I think I did my share of complaining, but by the time I got around to fully understanding what was happening, things were a little bit in concrete. The irony is that in the south wing of Wurster Hall is a two-story shop. They redesigned the program for entering architecture students. This shop is a magnificent space. That’s the only two-story building in Wurster. The reading room in Wurster should have—have you been into the changed library?

Rubens: No, I haven’t.

Foley: Well, you should go in because what they’ve now done is punch a big rectangular hole in the floor above the main reading room. With glass walls, it gives you a much better sense of space. They still don’t have a lot of carrels. But, they had no image of the fact that we were moving toward Ph.D.s.

Rubens: That there would be research, that there would be study.
Foley: That’s right. So, the department had to struggle. It got permission to take one of the floors, the fourth floor I guess, and build offices in it, and adapt it for our use. So, this was a college that had not only had an architectural heritage, but we were in a new building designed by architects who thought they understood what the educational demands were going to be.

Rubens: Well, and it was supposed to be teaching where the wires were exposed, and the plumbing, and you could see all that. But, did any of you secretly or sub rosa say, “This is not an attractive building. This is not a workable building?” Was that pretty close to the surface?

Foley: Our own space was kind of curious because we were given studio rooms. But, you see, the plans for Wurster Hall had been developed before we changed our MCP program. So, whoever had been representing the department earlier on any kind of a building committee was approving the idea that we were still primarily physical planning. So, in this sense it was kind of awkward that we were frozen into a building at the very time that we were busting into all these new programs.

Rubens: Yes. That is an interesting irony. Was there ever any question raised about the building being so disconnected to the architecture of the law school behind it and the music school?

Foley: Oh yes. I knew David Boyden fairly well. He was the chairman of the music department. The music building is a lovely two-story building with tile roof. They added Hertz Hall, which is also a magnificent building with tile roof. At the south are the art studio, art department studio windows of the art and anthropology building. So, here’s David Boyden sitting here, envisioning this as an art enclave within the campus, and what shows up but the plans for Wurster Hall. He was apoplectic.

Rubens: It was concrete, brutal.

Foley: Oh God, he was mad.

Rubens: Oh, that’s interesting.

Foley: He just said, “What on earth is this ugly, huge, out-of-scale building doing here?” But, unfortunately—

Rubens: There’s no stopping it.

Foley: He didn’t stop it.
Rubens: [laughs] And, I wanted to ask, just since you were mentioning about a school being driven by architects precisely at a time when the college is busting out and taking on the research and Ph.D. dimensions, where are you, literally? Have you now—are you a full-time member of the—?

Foley: No, I stayed a fractional member of the architecture department until, I think, around ’70, mid—I think ’73 or ’74. Which was curious, because it involved me going to two sets of meetings, which is always the bane of anybody in two departments. But since I was being in part a sociologist looking in at what was going on, this was also a chance to kind of get more of a feel for how architects look at things, and how they look at architectural education. It was a nuisance in some ways to have to spend that amount of time, but I think it was probably part of my education.

Rubens: Were there people in the architecture department that you were particularly drawn to or felt some camaraderie with?

Foley: Oh, I enjoyed contacts with a number, and had brief teaching alliances with various people along the way. Then, with time, they began to bring in more people with varied interests, partly involved with ecology and environmental design, other specialties. Then, of course, they got their own Ph.D. program, which, I think, was heavily oriented toward the history of architecture.

Rubens: Yes. Is that when Alexander comes in?

Foley: Well, he came in earlier. He was a very strong person, but also a kind of a loner. He had his own private institute outside of the campus.

Rubens: Oh, I didn’t know that.

Foley: Oh yes. He was tremendously productive. He wrote four or five classic books published by Oxford University Press, really trying to break architecture down into the essential components that have to be dealt with if you’re designing, as if to suggest that you don’t have to be an architect to do some of this. It was to encourage people to either be more intelligent clients of architects, or do some of their own thing.

Rubens: But he had a—I never realized this. It was a private institute? He must have had funding—

Foley: Well, I think he must have done consulting, and I don’t quite know how—but, he came in and he taught, and he came to faculty meetings. But he never embedded himself in the structure of the department.
Rubens: I see. When you mentioned that the Ph.D. in architecture was history-oriented, is that when [Spiro] Kostof comes in?

Foley: I would think so, yes.

Rubens: I’m asking if you had any particular relation with either one of those, other than collegial?

Foley: Yes, I knew a number of them very well. I didn’t continue being as active in—they had enough people and had enough momentum—which I think I was able to help to catalyze in the very early years—so that I didn’t have to—. My essential teaching responsibility was just one seminar a year with a relatively small group of graduate students.

Rubens: But I notice—now maybe we’re jumping ahead—you did teach a course with [Allan] Jacobs. When does he come in?

Foley: Oh, that was just a—I was about to retire, and Jake had been giving this wonderful course where, in whatever semester, every Friday, students would meet at some point in San Francisco, and spend the afternoon on a walking tour and then end up having coffee some place. And, they’d look at—they’d try to diagnose the area and figure out—and Jake, from his experience, would talk about what the department may have done. Jake knew I was retiring, and he asked if I wouldn’t like to join him on that. It was a wonderful experience.

Rubens: Oh, I bet.

Foley: So, that was all. It was essentially his course.

Rubens: But, you were able to hold forth?

Foley: Yes.

Rubens: So, anything else that you think about your chairmanship? The department continues to expand, [Donald] Appleyard’s coming in, [Roger] Montgomery’s coming in.

Foley: No. One little comment: sometime before I became chairman, maybe around 1960, Sally Walker became the department secretary. She became a bit of an institution, and stayed on. I think she was there for over twenty years.
Rubens: 1959 she—you say until '77?

Foley: Okay.

Rubens: Eighteen years.

Foley: Jack and she had always gotten on very, very well. She had a close relation with students, and kind of a mothering role. I think, by the time we got to the end of her career, she may not have been quite on top of the emerging changes in technology and some of the changes that were required to handle a somewhat bigger, more complex department. But she deserves some mention because she was very much a part of this for many years.

Rubens: So, was that who you relied on during these chairmanship years?

Foley: Yes, yes.

Rubens: Is she the woman who Montgomery ends up being with? No.

Foley: No, no.

Rubens: No, that’s somebody else. All right, we have your chronology. There’s some—Corwin Mocine becomes the vice chair in the year of your going out. Mel Webber became the chair. Mel Webber replaced you.

Foley: No. Jack Dyckman followed me as DCRP chairman. Mel took over as director of the Institute of Urban and Regional Development, but was never chairman of DCRP.

Rubens: All right. So, then ’68 is a year of more expansion.

Foley: One of the other things that we were doing, and I can’t remember the chronology on this—we were gradually setting up a number of joint programs, mostly at the master’s level, but then, of course, the Ph.D. program, by definition, involved an outside field for everybody. So, there were a lot of alliances there.

Rubens: And did that govern some of the appointments—[Leonard] Duhl with public health, [Stephen S.] Cohen with economics?
Yes. What happened, of course, and this would have been covered in Webber’s oral history, I’m sure—Mel took the initiative at getting funding from the National Institute of Mental Health, NIMH, for a new field in the Ph.D. program, I think called Social Policies Planning, or whatever. It was sufficiently funded so they were able to bring in several people, mostly part-time. This involved Len Duhl, in particular.

I don’t know who Douglas Lee is. I should, but I don’t.

Oh, Douglas Lee was a kind of urban economist, and he was quite a bit into modeling. Although, interestingly, in his essay in the department’s fiftieth thing, he decries the over-reliance on models. He didn’t stay with us awfully long.

Let me make a couple of comments, and of course, you were very much aware of this yourself, but for the record, one of the curious things that happened is that, ostensibly, the Social Policies Planning program was a Ph.D. field. But the times were such that this somehow struck a very receptive chord among students, and the network got the word out, and students around the country heard that this program was happening. So it probably came to influence the MCP program more than it might have been originally expected to do.

Another feature was the fact that a number of the Ph.D. students were being encouraged to go through the MCP program, or go through a number of the main courses in the MCP program, so there came to be a kind of a merger between MCP and Ph.D. on this. It was also at a time when the more established options within MCP had sort of broken down. So, this became a very fluid period, and I think the thing that became a little worrisome was whether the Social Policies Planning was taking over a bit too much within the department, for all the credit you give for Mel’s lead on it, and the effectiveness with which it was moving ahead. So, you begin to get some backlash and some concern, I think probably legitimate concern on the part of people that still felt there was a place for physical planning. By the end of my period as an active faculty member, I think there was some effort to reconstitute the physical planning program in a little stronger role.

There also emerged a new inter-department effort to man an urban design program, and this involved all three departments. This, apparently, is still going on. I haven’t kept that active a hand in current developments.

[End of session]
Rubens: I think we should just pick up with the expansion of the program in 1968, is that right?

Foley: All right.

Rubens: Are you chair in '68?

Foley: No. Jack Dyckman—are we on?

Rubens: Yes, we are on now.

Foley: Jack Dyckman was chairman from '67 to '70.

Rubens: Yes.

Foley: And I think Mike Teitz from '70 to '74.

Rubens: And then you come back—

Foley: Right.

Rubens: —in '74 to '77. All right. So let me just ask you this. Were you content enough to not be chair and to turn it over to Dyckman?

Foley: Oh yes, I was glad to be out of it.

Rubens: I can imagine. I mean, what heady years for you to be heading that department.

Foley: Oh yes, but there was enormous satisfaction too.

Rubens: Yes. And you know, the thing that we didn’t get on your first round, I mean, you’re continuing to publish during this period. You’re giving papers, you’re getting grants. You got a grant from the American Philosophical Society for sabbatical research that first year.
Foley: That’s right.

Rubens: Could you say something about that? Maybe let’s speak about your own research interests, and then what—

Foley: I think I commented—that was on a sabbatical, and I think I’d made some mention.

Rubens: Yes.

Foley: For the record, let me just say that there’s been an interruption of about thirteen months since my last [session] so there could be some duplication.

Rubens: Excellent, yes.

Foley: What year was that grant?

Rubens: It says 1967, to ’68.

Foley: That was my third sabbatical—no, second sabbatical—and I was mostly working. I was doing a first draft of a book entitled Governing Greater London. It came out in ’72.

Rubens: Yes, yes. Yes, I know we talked about that on the last—but we don’t have it on tape. We don’t have it on tape.

Foley: Governing the London Region was the title.

Rubens: Okay.

Foley: So that was what I was working on.

Rubens: Okay. And then in ’73—oh, you’re reviewing. Here’s a review of London urban patterns. I’m sorry that I can’t find this. Governing the London Region:—

Foley: Right.

Rubens: —Reorganization and Planning in the 1960s.
Foley: Right.

Rubens: Yes, okay. All right. And did you continue your interest in London?

Foley: No, I eased off on that and, starting in the seventies, as I’ll indicate, I switched my main thrust of research.

Rubens: So do you want to pick that up in order, or do you want to talk about your research interests?

Foley: No, let me—that’s fine. I’ll pick up. With the imminent advent of BART [Bay Area Rapid Transit District], there turned out to be both research needs and some possibilities of funding. So I was involved in designing a pre-BART survey trying to assess the character of residents in the Bay Area and their current use of transportation. Particularly, what I was concerned with was trying to identify exactly how many and what types of persons did not have direct access to the use of a car. The standard simpler measure was how many households did not have cars, but I felt that this was a vast oversimplification. Because, for example, a household could have a car but there could be three adults and a couple of teenagers. And let’s assume that one of the workers took the car. That meant that the car was not available for the others. So I was interested in developing a much more sophisticated indicator that showed much more precisely which people were in households that had no car but also which people were in households where, even though they could potentially drive, the car was not available. And in some other instances there might have been a car available but this particular person didn’t have a license.

I then produced, during the seventies, five different research reports on this topic. This was my major thrust. Four of them were working papers with the Institute of Urban and Regional Development. One of them—well, initially in that form was a report to a committee of the National Academy of Sciences, and it was subsequently published in a book by Hawley and Rock [Metropolitan America]. It expanded to try to indicate for the country, or particularly for metropolitan areas in the country as a whole, the same picture that I had been providing in detail for the Bay Area. I took the opportunity a while back to reread some of these reports, and I’m impressed that they were very thoroughly done, but I realized it was a research style that was distinctively mine. It was completely empirical work. There was very little conjecture in it. It involved the design of survey mechanisms or the capacity to tap other sources such as census sources or some other people’s surveys, and I think it provided an excellent picture of the situation. In a nutshell what the story was, is that about three out of ten people in the Bay Area as of 1971—this pre-BART study—did lack access to a car, and this is a very large total population. Then the question came as to what extent BART could play to this. My general sense is that BART ended up by being more like a suburban railroad. It was fine for commuters that were near the BART lines to get into what then was a very strong central San Francisco.
Rubens: Right.

Foley: But unless the total public transportation system were intricately geared to tie with BART and provide fine networks of bus service, it was very difficult for a person who didn’t have access to a car to come anywhere near replicating what one could do if you had a car. Unfortunately, I don’t think that I managed to get this into publications that had—except for the Hawley/Rock book, I don’t think that the working papers had a very wide circulation, and I don’t think I was as effective networking and selling what I had found as I could have been. And I think there was a clear weakness in the sense that I didn’t move more cleanly and forcefully to policy implications. But it represented very sound empirical findings.

Rubens: Did you have student—

Foley: Oh yes.

Rubens: —or employees under you, doing—?

Foley: Yes, I had some research assistants who worked with me.

Rubens: Were they literally going to households and—

Foley: No. We relied on the Survey Research Center. I didn’t manage to promote any Ph.D. dissertations out of it. I’ll make a comment about that later.

Rubens: When we talk about the graduate program?

Foley: Yes.

Rubens: What about the Urban Institute? Was it necessarily your responsibility to have these distributed?

Foley: No, but it—they were rather specialized monographs.

Rubens: Who paid for them, by the way? How were they paid for?

Foley: Well, there were various sources. Partly some BART funds, partly some state funds.
Rubens: Okay. But it was not the responsibility of the Urban Institute to distribute them or to hold a public hearing?

Foley: Oh, they distributed it. I think there was a sizeable local—

Rubens: All right.

Foley: And they may have had impacts of which I was not aware. But in a sense, I was really pushing the notion that there were people who were transportation-disadvantaged in a world in which, in general, people were being promised that the automobile was the ideal solution.

Rubens: Sure.

Foley: It’s been a major challenge for transportation and for city planning all these years. The U.S., relatively speaking, is saturated with cars, and we’re now at a point where certainly households with middle or upper income have virtually a car per person, per adult. Let me just go one further.

Rubens: Good.

Foley: One of these reports was on the rising use of cars and the same problem of who didn’t get to use cars in Britain and France, and that was the subject of one of my sabbaticals. It must have been a sabbatical in ’73. It must have been the third sabbatical, and I was based at the Center for Urban Studies in London but I spent a week every month in France. I should have concentrated the time in France. One of my reports does the same measurement, to the extent that I was able, in Britain and in France that I had done here in the U.S. Therefore, I was almost able to produce kind of a triangular comparison, and it’s intriguing that France, if anything, during the period up to the early seventies, was accepting the car with much more of a love affair than the British, which is kind of characteristically French, I think. Once they grab onto something, well, boy, there’s nothing that’d stop them. In both cases they ended up in the early seventies at a little below the level that the U.S. had been in about 1950. So in one sense this is as if they hadn’t gotten very far, but the rate at which they had increased was tremendous.

France was fascinating because France had a much different progression. The French invented a motorized bicycle—the moped or “cyclomoteur.” And so the first step was to get one of these motorized bicycles, and these were tremendously prevalent in the 1960s. And then you only gradually move to maybe a very small car, [2CV] Deux Chevaux or something like that.

Rubens: Literally a motorized bicycle, not the moped?
Foley: Yes. We spent a lot of time touring in France and going to rural areas, and one of the intriguing things was what use the people made of cars. We would go to a rural stock fair. A stock fair was where, in an agricultural community center, farmers would be bringing in pigs and chickens and everything, and we watched—the Deux Chevaux were these cute little cars that had sort of rubber bands under the seats and so on. And they’d have three pigs in the back seat; they didn’t have pickup trucks, you see. Pickup trucks were very much an American kind of adaptation.

Rubens: Yes, yes.

Foley: Well, I’ll stop there, but this was, I guess, a period of probably six or seven fairly intensive years. I was wonderfully absorbed in it, but I became a bit frustrated and discouraged that I somehow didn’t think that I was finding a way to be more effective in going the next step as to what these results were leading to.

Rubens: Meaning affecting policy?

Foley: Yes, yes.

Rubens: Yes. Well, I don’t think you were alone. I mean, this was the period when there was such a sort of people’s critique of BART. This is the era of—earlier—Chester Hartman’s crusade against redevelopment. Part of that was also pointing out that BART was just to funnel white-collar workers into downtown San Francisco. You had the statistical and analytic material but there was a general cry, and there never was a change. I wanted to ask you, one of your titles that was in another Hawley and Rock book was about institutional and contextual factors affecting housing choices of minority residents. This was in ’73.

Foley: Yes, well, I don’t think you were alone. I mean, this was the period when there was such a sort of people’s critique of BART. This is the era of—earlier—Chester Hartman’s crusade against redevelopment. Part of that was also pointing out that BART was just to funnel white-collar workers into downtown San Francisco. You had the statistical and analytic material but there was a general cry, and there never was a change. I wanted to ask you, one of your titles that was in another Hawley and Rock book was about institutional and contextual factors affecting housing choices of minority residents. This was in ’73.

Foley: Yes, this was also somewhat of a side theme—the problem of disadvantaged getting a fair break in housing—but I didn’t think of myself as a houser and I didn’t teach in housing as such.

Rubens: Is that the phrase, “a houser”?

Foley: Well, it’s sometimes used, yes.

Rubens: That’s interesting! I just had never heard that. Do you want to come back now and talk about then what you’re teaching, and activities up until ’74 when you reassumed—?

Foley: Let me make one brief comment on teaching, and then I’d like to talk a little bit about the second chairmanship.
Rubens: Fine.

Foley: At that point I’ll talk more about the Ph.D. program. The other thing that I did in the seventies was to develop a fresh course called the Analysis of Urban Livability, and it picked up on the fact that I had taught earlier courses in General Analysis, sort of applied statistics and so on. And it tied into the notion of the use of survey research, and the substantive questions of what is it that matters to people—to urban residents—and how do you find out, how can you get feedback. One of the things that was happening that I found intriguing, and I could have mentioned this earlier, is that we were getting a much larger percentage of women in the program. And women had different sensitivities, fortunately, for what a mother would want with a child, and the notion of tot playgrounds, or the notion of decent play space; different concerns than men. And so this opened up this area to some extent. In cleaning out earlier, I have not kept any syllabi from the course, I regret, and I’m not going to say very much specifically about it.

Rubens: But again you’re using quantitative methods, empirical, to—

Foley: Well, and qualitative. I was a believer in the fact that there isn’t as sharp a line, and that in many instances quantitative indices are merely quickie ways of trying to grasp what is often qualitatively very complex.

Rubens: Hm-mmm. Sure.

Foley: And it also means that there could be a lot of abuse, but this is in the whole area of applied statistics.

Rubens: Sure, yes. It’s sort of a raging controversy in many fields during this period.

Foley: And I think all the way through, what I was trying to teach was that the proper use of statistical indices is an art, and that you have to first of all be very, very sure that you have a good grasp of how well the index is measuring what you want to measure. And second, a kind of sense of humor or sense of proportion as to what you ought not to expect that index to do. Essentially the final judgments, I think, have to be qualitative on more than just the—so I was a quantifier who wanted to always have students be very cautious in their use or overuse of statistics.

Rubens: Well, and using them to help probe and get out these issues of qualitative measures of livability.

Foley: Yes.
Rubens: Do we have a copy of that report? That seems like that would be a—

Foley: Which report?

Rubens: I mean, did anything come out of this class? Was there a report?

Foley: No, no. I don’t think that—no, I don’t. No, I don’t.

Rubens: Okay.

Foley: Unfortunately it’s a blank.

Rubens: Just two minor questions on this; maybe they’re not important. At some point you started using computers, is that right?

Foley: Well, we talked a little bit about that earlier—

Rubens: Yes.

Foley: —because when I came we were using main line and then we—PCs came in in the early 1980s. I got my first PC, a secondhand IBM PC, in 1985. And that was after I’d retired. So, what I was teaching—this goes back to some other comments I made about the crudity of the calculating machines when I was a graduate student at the University of Chicago. Even up through the seventies, the equipment that we had was pretty crude. They were beginning to miniaturize calculating machines in probably the mid-seventies, and I can remember buying a huge electrical calculating machine for my own use. I think in the early seventies it cost me over a thousand dollars, and within three or four years they were coming out with little hand calculators that would do everything that the big ones did and they were cheaper and smaller. So I was out of the main research game before the new computers and their wonderful potentials were in use.

Rubens: I’m assuming you were having—when students did the surveys for you, they must have used—

Foley: Yes, I used students a lot. Also, on some of our surveys, we had funds enough so that we used the Campus Survey Research Center.

Rubens: I was going to ask you that. Do you have any comments, is it appropriate—maybe we don’t need to discuss it about the Campus Survey Research Center. It never was what—
Foley: Well, I was on their advisory committee for some time, and I remember—particularly a director named William Nichols. I can’t give you the precise time.

Rubens: Okay.

Foley: And they tied very closely to the state, and the state relegated certain tasks to them. There was coordination on a lot of population research between the Survey Research Center and the State Population Office. I think that they were pretty well organized and in their own way effective. In a fascinating way—this is just further comment, that I don’t think you can do a lot of that survey research today. I haven’t kept up, but I think people are much more resistant to it. I know I personally am much more resistant. I’m not very inclined today to suddenly take fifteen minutes and respond to some telephone request.

Rubens: Well, I think because there’s been such a saturation of it in every domain.

Foley: There’s a lot of things; it’s just a different climate.

Rubens: Yes, a very different climate.

Foley: Yes.

Rubens: Politics—political campaigns—came to depend so much on that, on direct mail that had been dependent upon all of this very targeted kind of research.

Foley: That’s right. And of course the commercial surveys were killers because, as they became more prevalent, it made it more difficult for outfits like Survey Research Center or other what you’d call scholarly public opinion pollsters to do their job.

Rubens: I think that’s a fascinating topic. Good. That’s what I wanted to ask you. And where was the Survey Research Center? Do you know where it was literally?

Foley: Well, all the years I was working, it was in what had been Anna Head School.

Rubens: Down on Bancroft?

Foley: No, on Channing.

Rubens: Oh yes.
Foley: It’s a brown-shingled complex.

Rubens: Okay. I always confuse that. I thought it was the one on—okay. Good. Good. All right. And one last thing just until we get to your chair, you were also until ’74 part-time in the architecture department.

Foley: Yes. I continued to teach the one seminar, and I think I must have commented on it before. It had a generic title because it had different people teaching in it. I think it was something like the social—

Rubens: Social factors?

Foley: No, there’s a list of courses.


Foley: Right, right. And I kept doing it. It was kind of little. I enjoyed it, but I didn’t make a big thing of it.

Rubens: Okay. We’ll come to your Ph.D. students. So do you want to talk about becoming—?

Foley: Let me comment too on the Ph.D. program. The Ph.D. program was activated in ’66. The first three Ph.D.s were turned out in 1971. I saw a figure recently that, by 1976, we had turned out thirty-three Ph.D.s, and there were a number of probably fifty more at that point in the pipeline. I was on some Ph.D. committees, and I was chair—the only one that I specifically remember was just one student, Richard Willig. I’m not quite sure why I didn’t get more fully involved except that I think that in some ways I felt that we now had a number of senior Ph.D. faculty members and they were moving on into this. I guess I was still concerned with shepherding the MCP [Master of City Planning] program, and working through the differences between the sort of physical planners and other faculty members. I also continued to keep minding fairly strongly the whole admissions—the MC admissions.

Rubens: Do you say this with regret that it was a—?

Foley: Well, no. I think it would have been rewarding to have somehow paid more attention to this and lured a handful of able students into it.
Rubens: Sure, sure. Looking back twenty-five years, then you realize you have a, maybe a more tangible legacy than—

Foley: When I joined the faculty in ’53, we had about thirty students. By the time I retired in ’79 we had about 150 or 160. When I started, we perhaps had five regular faculty members. When I left I think we had something more like twenty-two, some of them split appointments. So it was a big growth.

Rubens: Real growth.

Foley: Let me, if I may, go onto the chairman. I was rather reluctant to accept the second department chairmanship. I felt that I had momentum on my research, and I think that if—looking back on it, and I know my wife has made this same comment, I don’t think I’m a terribly good multitasker. I think I liked to immerse myself in a single major thrust, and I think that I felt that taking the chairmanship and doing the job in my version of being conscientious was not going to permit me to continue to get funding and continue the research that I had been doing. And I think that’s what turned out to be the case. I realized somebody needed to do it and I did it, and I paid attention to what I think had to be done.

Rubens: How did it come about that you were asked to do it?

Foley: Well, I guess they needed somebody to do it, and I don’t know whether other people—I don’t know the background.

Rubens: Okay.

Foley: Or I don’t remember the background.

Rubens: Fine.

Foley: As I got toward the end of the chairmanship, I had to think of what I was going to pick up on, and I guess I was feeling a bit discouraged that I didn’t have some kind of a thrust that I was just really eager to take on.

Rubens: You mean vis-à-vis the department?

Foley: Yes, in either research or teaching.

Rubens: Okay.
Foley: I have great admiration for those people who continue to love what they’re doing, right even into retirement, but I just didn’t happen to end up by being that kind of a guy. So I had a final sabbatical in the spring and summer of ’78. This wasn’t quite as focused. By this time I’d become kind of intrigued with the rising use of telephones, and the implications. Well, it reminds me of Mel Webber’s concern with the extent to which telephones make aspatial contacts possible and what it means for the spatial organization of urban areas. Well, it turned out from my earlier experience in Britain that I realized that the telephone was, for a variety of reasons—partly cultural—not used in the way that we use it. For one thing, educated Britons felt that the proper thing to do was to write a note; it was not appropriate just to thank somebody by phone. The mail service was excellent. Indeed, if you can believe this, at the turn of the century (around 1900), London had about six mail deliveries a day, and if you mailed a letter by four in the afternoon, there was a good chance it would be delivered that evening to a nearby London destination. Second, somehow they had never developed the yellow page part. The first two sabbaticals we were there, if you wanted to use the equivalent of the Yellow Pages you had to go to your local post office. People just didn’t have them. So by the seventies, the telephone was suddenly beginning to pick up. I did some empirical work on the increasing use, and I was trying to get at what it meant. I wasn’t successful in doing what I hoped to and I didn’t finally publish from it.

Rubens: You did not.

Foley: Yes. Some other people—Claude Fischer on campus in Sociology picked up on this later, not necessarily on Britain. In a sense it was kind of the counterpart of the auto study because the telephone, like the car, was a way by which residents had access to services and to other people.

Rubens: Yes, yes.

Foley: So anyway—

Rubens: Although it sounds like you were pointing to that it was creating a new kind of social space.

Foley: Yes, but I—it didn’t quite gel.

Rubens: Okay.

Foley: It didn’t quite gel. So anyway, right or wrong, I decided to retire, and retired in June of ’79.
Rubens: Let’s review just a tiny bit what happens under your leadership for three years. Firstly, I noticed that Janice Perlman is appointed. Do you have anything to do with that appointment or—

Foley: Yes, I think I was involved in the appointment.

Rubens: This is the first woman that’s appointed to the department, isn’t it?

Foley: We had Catherine Wurster earlier. Janice was soon followed by Anne Markusen and Judith Innes.

Rubens: I was wanting to ask you that earlier when you mentioned that you noticed there was an increase in the number of women students and that they were bringing new kinds of concerns.

Foley: Well, we picked up several people. We picked up Allan Jacobs.

Rubens: Allan Jacobs comes in ’75 under you. Richard Dodson. And then in ’76 is David Dowall.

Foley: Yes, David turned out to be a marvelous appointment, I think.

Rubens: What was his—?

Foley: Well, his background was in economics. He came from the University of Colorado, but he ended up in recent years being very active, including being chairman of the campus Academic Senate.

Rubens: In ’76 Judith Innes is appointed.

Foley: Yes, Judith came in. Yes.


Foley: Yes. But it was a kind of a traumatic period of change because Jack Kent, Fran Violich, and Corwin Mocine all retired in the earlier mid-seventies, some of them a little before my chairmanship. So we were left without the old-time physical planning stalwarts. Allan Jacobs was in; got caught up in the urban design program as well as the straight MCP program.
This fed into part of the challenge that I felt I had of how we maintained the best of the more traditional program that we’d had while accommodating and being innovative—as innovative as we could—in bringing about change. There were understandable tensions. I could have talked about this earlier, but in any professional graduate program there are going to be tensions between professional activity and the scholarly side. I think there were two sets of tensions that we had. One was between the MCP program, presumably professional, and the Ph.D. The other was the tension between, in effect, the social policy’s planning program which cut loose almost completely from physical planning, and the notion that somehow city planning involves fundamentally concern about the spatial organization of urban areas. It’s intriguing that in the Berkeley Planning Journal in 1998, I think—it was on the occasion of the fiftieth anniversary of the department—Mel Webber had a piece particularly on the social policy’s planning Ph.D. program, but Manuel Castells also had an essay. Castells replaced me in the department. He was much stronger than I was in many, many ways, and maintained full ties with the sociology department. But in this essay Castells argues that a professional program ought to be sure that it still focuses heavily on practice. And he felt, I think as I do, that the city planning field as a profession still needed to focus primarily on the spatial organization and on the creation of the physical environment in the form of housing and other structures. And as Castells warned, if you let the Ph.D. program wander wherever it wants and let Ph.D. students just write on whatever you want, what you become is a kind of a second-class social science department.

Rubens: Oh, that’s interesting.

Foley: And so I think in my own way I was also trying somehow to wrestle with this, but we were in the early throes of the Ph.D., and I don’t think we put any limits on what the dissertations could be on.

Rubens: This was certainly an era, the seventies, where there was—well, how would I say it?—a lot of rebelliousness amongst students. I mean, this is the height of the antiwar movement, the repercussions from the Third World Strike, and the creation of Ethnic Studies. It seemed to me students were not as—didn’t take direction as easily as they had [laughs] taken it in the past.

Foley: I think that’s true. It’s sort of interesting, Castells made the same point in his recent—1998. I think you had to have the program loose enough so that students didn’t feel that they were being unnecessarily regimented, and yet at the same time you didn’t want to have it just wander all over the place.

Rubens: Sure, of course. Let me ask you a couple of pointed questions. Were you pretty active in, then, the searching for faculty appointees? For example, even Castells.

Foley: No, I was not involved there, but in most of the other ones I was.
Rubens: Probably you were for Dodson and Innes and Dowall. As chair, you would inevitably be part of the search.

Foley: Oh yes. Yes.

Rubens: Do you remember during that period—I know that it’s a long ways back now—tensions between your own department and what was going on in campus?

Foley: No, I don’t think so. My feeling was that the tensions of which I spoke didn’t lead to open fights. Faculty meetings and other negotiating sessions, I felt, went pretty well, and I think that if I had skills that were helpful they were probably in being able to be accepted by and be in good touch with all or most of the faculty no matter what their positions were.

Rubens: That’s what it sounds like. Yes.

Foley: Particularly when the old-timers were still in the department. I knew them well and we got along, and then being involved, in part, in recruiting other people. You know, there have been departments here on campus—

Rubens: Well, Sociology.

Foley: —Anthropology and Sociology and others where the chancellor’s office had to prohibit them even having faculty meetings.

Rubens: [laughs] Is that right? That I hadn’t heard.

Foley: Oh yes.

Rubens: I know there were terrible—

Foley: You know, academics—

Rubens: —divisions.

Foley: —if they want to be vitriolic and really cut loose.
Rubens: You know, you mentioned earlier, when you first came on, that there was a kind of social and intellectual climate in that department, in your department. That lots of, if not parties, gatherings at Wurster’s house there was the—I don’t know if it was Monday lunch. I forget what day it was. Were you able to maintain any of that kind of—

Foley: No, no. We lost that.

Rubens: Because it got so big and—

Foley: That’s right. And I think this was partly the fact that Katharine and I were not more vigorous in promoting social gatherings, for example, at the house. The Kents were very good at this. But that was the way it was.

Rubens: It also seems an era when this was not happening as much.

Foley: Yes. It would have been good if—but we were too big to ever quite achieve what had been the pattern, the earlier pattern.

Rubens: Is your memory that you had regular department meetings? It must have been a pretty big gathering if you did. I’m trying to think of ways that the new faculty was integrated.

Foley: Well, I guess there were a variety of ways.

Rubens: Yes.

Foley: In some ways, the department meetings were by their nature rather formal and would have been preceded by memos and clique talks.

Rubens: There was business to be accomplished.

Foley: Yes.

Rubens: Yes. So nothing stands out particularly in those years? And I was going to ask you, I can’t in my own mind think who the chancellor was, but the question is: did you have any particular dealings with the chancellor that are outstanding in your mind in those three years?

Foley: No. Our dealings tended to be much more with the dean of the graduate division and the vice chancellor for professional schools.
Rubens: Who was that?

Foley: Well, I think [George] Maslach was the vice chancellor in part of this.

Rubens: But it’s more important whether something stands out as being dramatic and important.

Foley: And then, of course, we did deal with our own dean.

Rubens: [William Lindus Cody] Wheaton was dean, wasn’t he for most of the time, your second chair? And did he die during—I had a question mark if he died in ’76.

Foley: He died in 1978, during his deanship or very soon after, and I can’t remember.

Rubens: We can look that up. Now, the part that we also put over was the course that you were teaching in this period. I think you said you wanted to save that for right about now.

Foley: No, I don’t want to—there’s no more to say on that.

Rubens: Oh okay, fine. All right.

Foley: I would like to at some point make a few comments about retirement.

Rubens: Yes, let’s do that. Let me just think where I had just put it.

Foley: Unless you—go ahead if you find anything else.

Rubens: Yes, I thought that—just one second. So there’s nothing about the seminar for Ph.D. students that you—?

Foley: Oh yes. Yes, I enjoyed that and I did that for a couple of—two or three years.

Rubens: Yes, that’s what it looks like.

Foley: And we mostly met in our living room.

Rubens: Oh!
It usually involved about six or seven students, and as I recall that over half of them were women. Cynthia Kroll, in particular, stands out. I’m having a little memory problems on others. That was fun because we were mostly talking about methods. I was an empiricist, and I somehow doggedly stuck with the fact that students ought to be decently—

Trained and knowledgeable?

Not necessarily just trained at this level but be properly selective of what methods they could employ.

That’s interesting. And then the other course was Field Observation and Diagnosis of—

Oh, that was just a single walking tour of San Francisco.

Oh really? With Jacobs.

It was Jacobs’ course, and he very nicely asked me if I’d like to join him the last year. He led all the ones in San Francisco, but I’d been intrigued with Alameda so I remember vividly that I led a field walk in the city of Alameda. We’d meet right after lunch every Friday, walk all afternoon, and then stop and have coffee at the end of the afternoon.

What intrigued you about Alameda?

Oh, it’s just a wonderful old city. It’d been served by street railroads, and it had big Victorian houses. And it’s been—some of it’s been sort of passed by by the big urban sweep.

Yes. Yes, it’s an enclave, it seems. Yes.

I can’t remember how I got intrigued. Anyway—

But you would just get over there and walk around it and point things out.

Yes, yes.

Okay. So I think then in terms of your chair and—did they have a party for you when you retired?
Foley: Yes, very nicely.

Rubens: This may be a segue for you. You were on the University Library Committee.

Foley: Yes. From 1973 to 1977. And I ended up as chairman the last year.

Rubens: You were on the statewide as well?

Foley: Well, yes, that’s just the way the Academic Senate is organized—

Rubens: I see.

Foley: —that there’s a statewide committee as a counterpart of each campus one.

Rubens: Let me see if I just understand how that works.

Foley: One person from each campus becomes a member of a statewide committee.

Rubens: I see.

Foley: And you meet around the different campuses.

Rubens: It sounds to me like you had a number of meetings.

Foley: Yes.

Rubens: Isn’t this a period when the quality and the quantity of the Cal library is diminishing? I mean, it had been really a—

Foley: Well, the three things that I—I don’t know whether I’d mentioned this in an earlier interview or not, but let’s assume not. My recollection is that we did three things—there were a lot of others, but on the campus. The main stacks were in the old glass-floored tower, and we felt that stack maintenance was deteriorating to the point where library staff and users were not keeping books in fine condition. So we insisted that somehow they do a better job on that. I think we were successful. Second, we moved an entire century of books from the main library to Bancroft.
Rubens: Oh!

Foley: I’m embarrassed I can’t remember which century, but this has been a pattern that the oldest books go to Bancroft where they get carefully shelved and maintained. Rare old books, sometimes delicate little books, were just loose in the stacks and were being battered by other big books. The other thing—the most important—is that we helped to ease out the librarian, Richard Dougherty, who in 1978 went to the University of Michigan.

Rubens: Oh, I see, I see. And in retrospect, might that be some accounting of how the library didn’t, in that era, have its—

Foley: Later on, I—the other thing that was bubbling up was the fact that they were talking about building a regional library facility, and when that came about—I think, during my early retirement—I was on an advisory committee for that. It’s the building up in the Richmond Field Station, which serves the northern campuses. It is known now as the Northern Regional Library Facility.

Rubens: And that hadn’t existed until this period?

Foley: That’s right. That’s right.

Rubens: Oh, I didn’t realize that.

Foley: No. It was a great invention because it relieved shelf space here and the way it works is, as you know, you can get any book from there on a day’s notice—

Rubens: Right.

Foley: —or they have a reading room and you can go out to their reading room and use it.

Rubens: Right. Yes, I’ve used it.

Foley: Yes.

Rubens: What drove your interest in being on the library committee? How did that come about?

Foley: I’ve always loved books. We’ll get to this again. I think I’ve probably mentioned that one of the wonderful things that I was able to be involved in—I felt very privileged—
was that for three years in the sixties I was on the editorial committee on the University of California Press. And we were making decisions as to what books should be published.

Rubens: That’s a lot of work being on that, isn’t it?

Foley: Well, it was like a wonderful seminar. We had some brilliant people. I felt like a rube in from the country compared with some of them on the committee, but it was a wonderful experience.

Rubens: How were you appointed to that? How does one get appointed to that?

Foley: I think it came out of my first book. It was within the sphere of the a social science editor of the Press, Grant Barnes. He later became the director of the Stanford University Press. He persuaded me to consider the committee and nominated me.

Rubens: I don’t think we’ve discussed this.

Foley: It was a stimulating experience. We met every month on a different campus, and so I got to know all the campuses.

Rubens: Are there some books that stand out in your mind? I understood if you’re on the board you’re responsible for presenting some kind of summary or making a case for—

Foley: To some extent, but typically the staff would do the initial legwork and would be nominating a book. Anyway, it feeds into my retirement.

Rubens: Please, yes.

Foley: During the first couple of years of retirement, Katharine and I did the kind of obvious—we went camping, we bought a new diesel car and drove across the country and camped, and we had some repairs on the house. And somehow I had a yen to take some courses on campus. I took a course in California history, which intrigued me. We were from the East.

Rubens: Was this with Walton Bean?

Foley: No, in fact this course was through University Extension and it was Charles Wollenberg.
Rubens: Oh, yes, yes. Yes.

Foley: The other people in the class weren’t very stimulating, but he was great.

Rubens: Yes.

Foley: His brother lived around the corner from us, so we got to know him pretty well. Then I took a course entitled “The Book,” and it was in the library school. It was taught by a man who subsequently became the director of the California Historical Society. But it was an eye-opener. I had always thought of books for their content, and this course had to do with all the elements that go into book production: paper and covers and typesetting and design. I suddenly realized this was a new world, and I realized that the designs of the typical social science books that I had been looking at were pretty goddamned dull. In most cases the publishers didn’t pay much attention to how it looked. I began suddenly to look carefully at each title page. I became aware of the fact that there were acknowledged wonderful printers. Then—I don’t know how on earth this happened, but University Extension ran a series of courses on book collecting, and I took them. I went to all of them, and this again was a wonderful eye-opener. One of the courses was on bookselling. It was a weekend sort of seminar, and three prominent local dealers—including Peter Howard of Serendipity, a wonderful bookstore here in Berkeley—gave their histories of starting their businesses. Well, this fed into the fact that when we’d been in London on sabbatical, we’d browse used bookstores with fascination, and that I’d become a bit of a collector there. I had been picking up some very nice early Baedeker travel guides, some special folding British maps, and I had begun to collect Penguin paperbacks. So this kind of went on.

I was also at that time, I think, serving on a couple of Academic Senate committees dealing with university retirement, and I became involved with a small group that thought we ought to start an emeriti association and possibly an emeriti center. Somebody had heard that UCLA had a center, and so I remember that I was dispatched to go down to UCLA and study how their center worked. I came back and reported, and partly as a result of that—I wasn’t the key leader but I was part—we established the faculty Emeriti Association. This has been a thriving organization ever since, and then as you probably know about ten or eleven years ago some members of that group founded the Retirement Center, which is now based in quarters in the law school. And Mel Webber has been extremely active in—the center has promoted a series of special courses for retirees. So I was partly caught up in that, but I had to make a decision as to whether I was going to try to pick up and continue research or possible consulting. I came to the conclusion that I—this again, I guess, is my one-track style—that I either wanted to do it fully, or not act as if I were an informed professional if I wasn’t keeping up. I decided to make the break. Again, I respect the people who stayed on—and there’s some wonderful emeriti faculty teaching and research—but I decided to make the break and I decided to take the plunge and become a bookseller. So in the spring of 1982, I set up my own business selling out-of-print University Press books.
Rubens: Oh, wow.

Foley: I felt that I understood this type of scholarly book, and within a couple of months I'd established a working relation with University Press Books, the bookstore on Bancroft, and I became their out-of-print counterpart. I ran my business for about twelve or thirteen years; sold it in January 1995 to University Press Books. By the time I sold it, I had about 6,000 books in stock and 2,000 were on consignment at University Press Books. So they just took those over and picked up the rest. I also had a direct working relation with the University of California Press, and the relation was that I’d be notified of books as they went out of print and I was given a chance to buy them. It also turned out that they were consolidating some internal reference libraries, and as they consolidated I was able to buy old books, sometimes fairly rare. Both UPB and University of California Press books also referred customers to me. So it was a very nice arrangement. I didn’t want to have a store. I worked out of home, and—

Rubens: Did you have space?

Foley: Yes, we built bookcases in a big basement and we took over one bedroom. Katharine wasn’t very happy with that. People could come to the house by invitation, and I sold by phone. In those days there was no Internet, and during part of the period, for about a five-year period, I was searching for books for people. I had some wonderful customers, some unusual customers.

Rubens: Was this word of mouth, or did you—?

Foley: Well, a lot of things. One of the things that happened was that right early on—I had just made the arrangement with University Press Books—UPB was asked to write up something about itself for the *AB Bookman’s Weekly*, Antiquarian Book *Bookman’s Weekly*. And Bill McClung, who was the key guy at UPB, asked if I wouldn’t like to write it. So with some gall I wrote about my business, and it brought some immediate replies. Within a week I had a call from Johns Hopkins University Library, and they had a lot of donated books that they didn’t want to sell there because it was embarrassing. The university professors would give them the books, so they—I just took any cartons they wanted to send and I sent them a check. And I had other sources. I had a lot of fun doing it. One of the nice things was that it became kind of a family business, and our oldest granddaughter worked two different summers, including the summer between her freshman and sophomore years when she was at Brown, and her sister worked for a summer. My daughter, who wanted to go to library school, came to work. I had computerized my business by that time—not the Internet, but—

Rubens: Your inventory.
Foley: And she came to learn how you use computers. I was coordinated with the computer system at UPB. Anyway, then when that was over, I picked up as a volunteer with the Friends of the Berkeley Public Library. And when the main public library was completely rebuilt and a new addition added, we had to get out and we got a bookstore underneath the parking—the city’s parking garage between Durant and Channing, just west of Telegraph. The city gave us space at a dollar a month, and we put in lights and carpeting and set up a store.

Rubens: In that big huge orange building?

Foley: Yes, yes. And it’s a very successful store. I was just one of the volunteers but I’d had more bookselling experience than most of the rest of them so I took quite a lead in establishing the categories, and I give pricing seminars to volunteers. So it’s been fun.

Rubens: Is it still there?

Foley: Yes, and we also have a small store. We make about eighty thousand dollars a year for special projects at the library and scholarships for young library staff.

Rubens: Very nice.

Foley: So books had a way of—let me just tell you one other thing if I can.

Rubens: Sure, please do.

Foley: Let me go back a bit.

Rubens: Yes, I hope you’re not getting too tired. This is wonderful.

Foley: No, no. Have we still got time?

Rubens: Yes, we do. Yes.

Foley: We had four children, two boys and two girls, and we have eight grandchildren. Our second son was named Bill, and after kind of a slow start he graduated from San Diego State, he went into the Peace Corps, he was in Sierra Leone. He came back and he got into city planning and, without going to graduate school, he passed the exams and became a qualified city planner.
Rubens: Where was this?

Foley: Well, he started in Newport Beach, California. He ended up as vice president of a consulting firm, and he ran an office in Newport Beach with about a dozen planners in it. This was kind of fun to have a son involved. He’d come up and talk with me and tell me how out of touch I was, which was true.

Rubens: [laughs]

Foley: Sadly, he died of cancer at the age of thirty-nine.

Rubens: Yes.

Foley: I’ll jump now—I continued to be in love with Penguin books and developed quite a fine collection and had it all on computer. In about 1997, I approached Anthony Bliss, rare books curator of the Bancroft Library. They were interested both for the collection and for the comprehensive computerized database. They were developing what they called “finding aids.” Each finding aid provides an index and description of all the contents of some archival collection. It could be photographs or what have you. I had all the data so that they could convert directly to it. So the Bancroft now has my 3,200-volume Penguin collection with two finding aids, essays on the history of Penguin collecting, and so on. Katharine and I made the donation in memory of our son, Bill. They also have a few of my Baedekers, but most of them I sold back to a London dealer. So that’s sort of—

Rubens: It’s a wonderful rounding.

Foley: They’ve been wonderful years. Oh, just one other small point. One of my nice continuing ties to campus is the fact that since the late 1950s I’ve been a member of the Little Thinkers luncheon group, and we meet every Friday noon in a room in the Faculty Club.

Rubens: Since the fifties?

Foley: Yes. We’ve had considerable turnover. Currently, the members are mostly retirees. The main tradition is that there is only one conversation. But never any agenda.

Rubens: How many is that, roughly?

Foley: We generally have from eight to twelve.
Rubens: Really?

Foley: Yes.

Rubens: And what is the significance of the name “Little Thinkers”?

Foley: Well, David Krech, the psychologist, was in the group—

Rubens: Yes, yes.

Foley: —and he came home one day and told Hilda, his wife, that this was a group of great thinkers or something like that. And she said, “Oh, that’s not true. This is just a group of little thinkers.” And it took.

Rubens: That’s funny. That is. Yes. Is this appropriate to ask you this? I mean, I’m wondering if there’s some other people in this group that should—whose oral history should be done. When you mentioned David Krech, you know our office hasn’t done anything with psychology or education.

Foley: Well, he’s long since died.

Rubens: Yes, yes, but I’m saying—

Foley: Henry Nash Smith, for example, was in it for a long time.

Rubens: Was he? We’ve done him.

Foley: You’ve picked up on all of these people.

Rubens: Oh yes, yes. No, I meant other—

Foley: And you have oral histories probably on at least four or five of the people in the group.

Rubens: Is that right?

Foley: Yes. I won’t go into names.
Rubens: Fine. That’s fine. That’s fine. You know, if you think of someone later on or see that someone’s interested, you can forward that to us.

Foley: Sure, sure.

Rubens: I just want to ask you about this store. I can’t see this store. In that parking structure there’s something called Revolutionary Books.

Foley: There’s an arcade that goes underneath.

Rubens: Yes, yes.

Foley: Unfortunately, most of them are vacant. The city hasn’t done a good—

Rubens: Yes.

Foley: There’s a little stub that goes to an elevator, and diagonally across from the elevator is our store.

Rubens: Gosh, I didn’t know that.

Foley: And it’s open—

Rubens: And across the way is a Revolutionary Books of some kind.

Foley: The Revolutionary Books is on the main concourse but if you take the T, we’re at the end of the side of the T.

Rubens: Okay, I’ll look for it. I’ll look for it. The remodel of the Berkeley Public Library, I think, is one of the finest things I’ve seen.

Foley: Well, the Berkeley Public Library currently has terrible budget problems.

Rubens: Has it?

Foley: Yes.
Rubens: Yes, yes.

Foley: We’d better—

Rubens: Good. Good. You know, I told you—let me just look, just one last thing.

Foley: Good.

Rubens: The only reason I asked you about the new music building was because you have a part you mention in your oral history at some point when the building went up.

Foley: When Wurster [Hall] went up—

Rubens: How [David] Boyden was just—

Foley: Well, if Boyden was apoplectic then, when he was chairman of the Music Department, he would be doubly so now.

Rubens: [laughs] Do you think so? I just wanted to ask you.

Foley: Well—

Rubens: It’s a strange building, isn’t it?

Foley: Yes. I don’t think buildings should be prima donnas—

Rubens: Yes, it’s strange.

Foley: —in a campus setting. On the other hand, it’s kind of intriguing because we’ve now been walking past it for several months and it’s now beginning to settle in a little bit, and it has some kind of intriguing features. Quite clearly you—with the unusual window pattern in the outside, you sort of wonder what is bringing that pattern inside. And so I’m eager to get in and see what it’s like. And particularly because it will house the Music Library—with its strong and distinctive holdings.

Rubens: Me too.
Foley: And my sense is that it probably will be a wonderfully functional building inside. But time will tell how it settles in.

Rubens: But I thought of that description. That’s why I said I just wanted to ask you if you had any reflections on it, because when you’re down—

Foley: That’s the main thing that surprises me, that there aren’t people that are sensitive to his earlier reaction. [laughs]

Rubens: Yes, yes. Yes. I just saw a picture also of the—is it called the Southeast Asian Library?

Foley: I haven’t seen that.

Rubens: But I don’t know where it’s supposed to be located. I can’t figure that out.

Foley: It’s at the upper end of the big glade outside the main library, and just below, just west of Evans Hall.

Rubens: Oh, I see. It’s going to be in front of that. That looked like it—where did I see it? Either in the Daily Cal or just—it’s a drawing, but it looks quite in keeping with Doe. It looks like a classic building, and I thought that’s what a library should look like. I’ve just never understood why there’s not more central planning here on this campus that makes these buildings more harmonious.

Foley: Well, that’s another story.

Rubens: Yes, it’s another story.

Foley: I won’t get into that.

Rubens: All right. I bet you have some opinions. Well, let me just ask you. Did you ever serve on any buildings committee, or want to?

Foley: No, but I was somewhat familiar with some of the architectural politics. [laughs]

Rubens: Yes, all right. You don’t want to say anything about that?

Foley: No, no.
Rubens: Okay.

Foley: We’ll pass.

Rubens: Okay. All right. I’m going to push “stop.”

[End of interview]
DCRP CHRONOLOGY, 1948 to 1980

1948
- Jack Kent & formation of DCRP; 5 students admitted (all male)
- Jack Kent chairman DCRP, 1948-57, 1960-64
- DCRP housed in temporary building, T-22 (until 1951)

1949
- Fran Violich app'ted (joint with Landsc. Arch.)
- Sydney Williams app'ted
- Mel Scott app'ted
- Single-track curriculum. Studios emphasized.

1950
- Catherine Bauer app'ted
- Wm. Wurster app'ted Dean, School of Architecture
- First MCP degree awarded to Amalswar Barua and an MA degree (?) to Elton Andrews
- Tradition established by this date or earlier that DCRP faculty would have a meeting and then lunch together every Monday, presumably in a small room in the Faculty Club. At some point the setting became the large O'Neill Room of the Faculty Club. At each lunch a city planning professional or a faculty member from another department was also invited for an open discussion. (Until we moved into Wurster Hall in Sept. 1964)

1951
- DCRP moved to its own brown shingle building on Hearst just east of the Architecture Building (until 1964). [Later, came to be known as the Naval Architecture Building.]
- A new departmental library established in a small room off the departmental office.

1952
- Mel Webber in MCP class graduating in June 1952

1953
- Syd Williams departed
- Don Foley app'ted Lecturer (joint app'tment in Sociology changing, in 1954, jt. app'tment with Real Estate Research progr.)
- School of Architecture became College of Architecture
1954

1955
- 11 students in ’55 MCP class (10 M, 1 F)
- Don Foley appted Assoc. Prof., with a small joint aptment in Architecture
  (Arch. aptment lasted until 1974)

1956
- Mel Webber appted
- Barclay Jones appted
- Bill Doebele – MCP ’56 – later became Harvard prof.
- Jack Kent on sabbatical in London 1956-57
- Fran Violich became chair DCRP (until 1960)?

1957
- DCRP discussion of whether to join proposed new college. Alternatives:
  Separate graduate school; join with a public policy type college; or join the
  proposed College of Environmental Design
- Jack Kent became Berkeley City Council member (for the next 8 years)
- In these early years there were close ties between DCRP and the local
  chapter of the American Institute of Planners (AIP).

1958
- By now DCRP had 30 MCP students, 7 faculty and 4 staff
- Holway Jones served as CRP librarian (until about 1966 or so?)
- MCP curriculum revised. Less emphasis on studio courses, wider range of
  courses required, new option: writing thesis or taking comprehensive exam
- Mel Scott (Lecturer with tenure) handling Univ. Extens. Progr. In CRP
  (don’t know range of dates) For a few years he also offered individual
  critiques of student papers.
- Mel Webber took on editorship of Journal of the American Institute of
  Planners (for 4 years). Ann Brower, key staffer. This also brought other
  DCRP faculty into this endeavor, as the Journal was beefed up and given a
  more scholarly tone.
1959
- Acad. Senate approved creation of College of Environmental Design. Includes Architecture (sep. College), Landscape Archit. (Coll. of Agriculture), and DCRP (sep. Dept. reporting directly to Chancellor)
- Sally Walker became Departmental Secretary (until 1977 – 18 years!)

1960
- 18 students in ’60 MCP class (17M, 1 F)
- Jack Kent reassumed DCRP chair from Fran Violich (until ’64)

1961
- Barclay Jones went to Cornell
- John Herbert appted
- Corwin Mocine appted. He also headed Univ. Extens. Program in CRP (until 1965)

1962

1963
- Michael Teitz appted
- Tom Cooke appted
- John Dyckman appted
- Bill Wheaton appted.
- Institute of Urban and Regional Development formed, as upper tier. At this pt., under CED Dean. Bill Wheaton 1st Director (until 1967).
- Center for Planning and Development Research formed, as lower tier under IURD. Jack Dyckman, Director (until 1967)
- Center for Real Estate and Urban Economics (the former Real Estate Research Program) became the 2nd lower-tier unit. Paul Wendt, Director. Closely related to Business Administration rather than DCRP.
- Wm. Wurster retired as Dean, College of Architecture
- Martin Meyerson appted new Dean (although Urban Planning background, took professorial apptment in Architecture Dept)
- Catherine Bauer appted Assoc Dean
- 60% of ’63 MCP graduates went to local physical planning agencies (cf ’73 graduates, where only 13% went to such agencies)

1964
- MCP curriculum revision. Three new emphases introduced:
a) Urban physical planning
b) Housing, renewal, and development
c) Planning and programming for urban systems
- Don Foley dept chair (until end of Dec. 1967 — 3 1/2 yrs)
- Sept: DCRP moved into Wurster Hall
- DCRP faculty meetings now held in Wurster Hall seminar room instead of
  in the O'Neill Room.
- Nov: Catherine Bauer died in hiking accident
- December on: Free Speech Movement and its disruptions
- Major grant from Mellon Charitable Trust, enabling DCRP to offer
  fellowships for the next 8 years
- Michael Heyman, Law School, became part-time DCRP faculty member.
  Joint MCP-Law program started (a bit later, but not sure of date)
- John Herbert left. To U Penn?
- Department of Decorative Art (previously in College of Letters and
  Science) joined CED as Department of Design

1965
- Jan: Meyerson became Acting Chancellor. Wurster returned as Acting
  Dean
- DCRP’s PhD program approved
- Andrei Rogers appted
- 17 students in ’65 MCP class (13M, 4F)
- Warren Jones picked up Univ. Extens. Program? How long?
- After FSM discussions, students gained representation on some DCRP
  committees and at faculty meetings

1966
- PhD program activated. Each student to take work in 3 fields:
  a) planning theory
  b) an optional field within DCRP
  c) an optional field outside DCRP
  Regional planning added as field
- First PhD students admitted
- William Alonso appted
- At about this time Charles Shain became City Planning Librarian under Art
  Waugh, the Environmental Design Librarian
1967

- About this date, Social Policies Planning field added to PhD program with strong funding from NIMH. Came to have strong influence in the Dept.
- Donald Appleyard appted (joint with Landscape Architecture?)
- Richard Meier appted (joint with both Architecture and Landscape Architecture)
- Roger Montgomery appted (joint with Architecture)
- Wm. Wheaton became Dean, CED. (Until 1976)
- Jack Dyckman, DCRP chair 1967-1970 ??
- Mel Webber became chairman, IURD, and moved it under Graduate Div. IURD now became single-level. (The Center for Planning and Development Research may have been dissolved into it. Or it may have moved under the control of the Architecture Dept., later renamed Center for Environmental Design.)
- Agreement that UCLA start new Urban Planning program. (UCLA reluctant, UCSantaBarbara wanted it!)
- Corwin Mocine became Vice-Chairman DCRP (until 1975)

1968

- Douglas Lee appted
- Stephen Cohen appted
- Leonard Duhl appted (joint with Public Health)
- PhD program in Architecture established

1969

- Mel Scott retired
- Major revision of MCP program: elimination of areas of emphasis; students develop personal study programs with faculty guidance. Faculty panel system introduced. For students, taking exam option, individualized comprehensive exams prepared.

1970

- Tom Cooke left, for full-time consulting
- Andre Rogers left, to ??
- 55 students in '70 MCP class, perhaps some PhDs? (43M, 12F); 36 received MCP degrees in June 1970
- Between Jan. 1966 and June 1970 44 students admitted to PhD program
- First 3 PhD degrees granted. One to Bernardo Ynzenga. The others??
- Mike Teitz became chair DCRP (until 1974) ??
1971
- Chet McGuire appted
- Thomas Dickert appted (joint with Landsc. Arch.)
- PhD program in Landscape Architecture established

1972
- Berkeley Environmental Simulation Laboratory created by Donald Appleyard with NSF funding.

1973
- Fred Collignon appted
- Only 12% of MCP grads went to local physical planning agencies. In 1963, by contrast, 60% of MCP grads went to such agencies

1974
- Jack Kent retired
- Don Foley started 2nd term as DCRP chairman (to 1977)
- Janice Perlman appted
- By Jan: 17 PhD degrees had been awarded. 33 additional candidates admitted.
- Doug Lee left
- Department of Design phased out; new Program in Visual Design within CED

1975
- Fran Violich retired
- Allan Jacobs appted
- Richard Dodson appted
- 56 students in '75 MCP class, with some PhDs? (41M, 15F)

1976
- Corwin Mocine retired
- David Dowall appted
- Judith Innes appted
- Bill Alonso left, went back to Harvard
- Wm. Wheaton left Deanship. Died ??
- Richard Bender, Dean CED (until 1988)
1977
- Alan Jacobs became DCRP Chair (until 1981?)
- Ann Markusen appted
- Edward Blakely appted (then or a bit later?)
- Sally Walker’s last year as Departmental Secretary.
- Jack Dyckman left, to Johns Hopkins

1978
- Martin Gellen appted
- Chet McGuire left
- DCRP returns its program toward professionalism with emphasis on environmental planning (per Webber essay) [See 1979, Kent comment]

1979
- Richard Dodson left
- June: DLF retired
- Manuel Castells appted (joint with Sociology)
- Reevaluation of curriculum “with limited number of fields of specialization in the MCP program starting fall 1979” (per Kent history)

1980
- Mike Heyman became Chancellor of UC Berkeley campus
- Robert Cervero appted
- Peter Hall appted
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CHRONOLOGY FOR DON FOLEY AT DCRP – 1953 TO 1980

Aug. 1953: Appointed Lecturer in CRP and Sociology

1953-78: Taught CP 226, The Metropolitan Region

July 1954: Lecturer in CRP, with joint appointment in Real Estate Research Program

July 1955: Appointed Associate Professor of City Planning and Architecture. Architecture appointment about one-sixth (?); lasted until 1974.

1957-65: Taught year-long sequence, CP 253-254, City Planning Analysis
1957-65: Taught Arch. 134, Introduction to Architectural Research (sometimes with Reichek or DeMars)


July 1963: Promoted to Professor

Spring 1964: Chair of curriculum revision committee. As result of thorough faculty discussion, in May 1964 we agreed to introduce three new emphases. [See DCRP Chronology, 1964]

July 1964: Became DCRP chair. Until end of Dec. 1967 (3 ½ years)

1965-66: President, Association of Collegiate Schools of Planning

1965-70: Taught CP 219, Population and Employment Analysis and Forecasting (with Mike Teitz who taught the Employment portion; DF taught the Population portion)

1966-74: Taught Arch. 249A, Social and Cultural Factors in Architectural Design
1967-68: Member of inter-campus University committee that convinced the UCLA administration to start an Urban Planning program

Jan.-Aug. 1968: 2nd sabbatical in London. No formal base, but had close association with an LSE working group on Greater London government under Professor William Robson. Resulted in partial draft for *Governing the London Region* (UC Press, 1972)

Summer 1970: Acting chair, DCRP

1970-72: Taught the basic upper division course, CP 110, Introduction to City Planning

1971-79: Taught CP210, The Analysis of Urban Livability


July 1974: Started 2nd term as DCRP chair. Until June 1977 (3 years)

1977-79: Taught CP 290, Seminar for PhD students


June 1979: Retired. Became professor emeritus. Replacement was Manuel Castells, who has held joint appointment in DCRP and Sociology

May 1980: Awarded The Berkeley Citation
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THE EVOLVING DCRP GRADUATE PROGRAM: OPTIONS AND TENSIONS

1948-58: 2-yr single-track MCP. Emphasis on studios. Geared to carrying out general physical plan for city or county. Thesis required?

In 1953, DF joined 4 other DCRP faculty: Kent, Violich, Bauer and Scott

As of 1958, 7 regular DCRP faculty with perhaps 1 or 2 part-time lecturers. Webber and Barclay Jones added/


Note that no undergraduate program offered. Students come in from considerable variety of undergraduate backgrounds.

Kent also urged MCP students to get at least 2 or 3 broadening courses in other departments (e.g., Tussman’s Political Philosophy course)

1964-69: MCP now offered optional emphases
- Urban physical planning
- Housing, renewal and development
- Planning & programming for urban systems

1966: PhD program went into effect with fields mirroring MCP program. Regional Planning added as a field (1966?) Social Policies Planning added as a field (1967). Activation of several joint programs (some a bit later): With Law, Transportation Engineering, Public Health, Urban Design, with Architecture and Landscape Architecture

Concurrently, in 1963, IURD started, with its Center for Planning and Development Research.


Tensions and competing philosophies were inevitable.
- Professional program vs. scholarly program (In practical terms,
Professional internships vs. research assistantships
- Urban physical planning vs. broader conceptions of planning
- Tie-ins with CED vs. tie-ins with larger campus.
- The particular pull of Social Policies Planning, nominally as a PhD field, but intruding into the MCP program as well
- Whether to push for an undergraduate major [Finally, in about 2002]

1969-1979: Adjustments in MCP program. In 1969, loosened up to give MCP students considerable leeway to design their own programs. In about 1979, tightening up the optional fields for study. Also increased emphasis on environmental planning.

- As of 1975. DCRP had about 26 faculty members: 13 full-time within DCRP, 9 full-time on campus but split with another dept., and some 4 part-time lecturers. (This is more than triple the 8 faculty in 1958.)

- DF retired in June 1979. Will not attempt to comment on the evolution within DCRP after that date, except to state the obvious fact that DCRP is still a functioning whole. (In contrast some other programs, like MIT’s have moved to an Urban Studies focus.)

*******

When I joined DCRP in Sept. 1953, there were 5 of us on the faculty: Kent, Violich, Bauer, Scott and myself. We had about 30 MCP students. We were housed in the brown shingle building on Hearst just up the hill from the Architecture Dept.

When I left DCRP in June 1979 after 26 years, there were about 22 faculty members. We had an estimated 150 graduate students: 110 MCP and 40 PhD.
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Lowney, Skip and John D. Landis (eds.), *50 Years of City and Regional Planning at UC Berkeley: A Celebratory Anthology of Faculty Essays* (NSQ Press, 1998) [See also separate entries below.]


Webber, Melvin M., and Frederick C. Collignon, “Fifty Years of DCRP Faculty,” in *50 Years of City and Regional Planning* . . . pp. 499-501.

Webber, Melvin M., and Frederick C. Collignon, “Ideas That Drove DCRP,” in *50 Years of City and Regional Planning* . . . pp. 491-497.

* * * * *

Adams, Gerald D., “T. J. Kent, 81, a man who helped create The City” [an obituary], *The San Francisco Sunday Examiner and Chronicle* (May 3, 1998)

*Berkeley Planning Journal* (Vol. 1, No. 1, 1984 – Vol. 15, 2001, and continuing) Each issue, near the back, had a section devoted to DCRP. These sections vary in content, but provided contemporary information or commentary. In earlier years, they included news about graduates. In more recent years, they included PhD dissertation abstracts and some titles of MCP theses or professional reports. [ED Library: HT166 A1 B4]


Foley, Donald L., Berkeley M.C.P. Students and Graduates: A Two-Decade Review (Department of City and Regional Planning, UC Berkeley, July 1970) [ED Library: LD752 F65 1970 ENVI Non-circulating]

Foley, Donald L. 4-page mimeographed letter to DCRP Alumni and Friends, February 3, 1965

Foley, Donald L., “Comments about Catherine Bauer Wurster” (Computer print-out, Sept. 1999) [At a campus gathering for launching the Oberlander-Newbrun biography]


Fraker, Harrison, 1-page letter to CED faculty on occasion of Jack Kent’s death (May 4, 1998)

Kent, T. J., “T. J. Kent, Jr., professor and political activist: a career in city and regional planning in the San Francisco Bay Area: an interview conducted by Malca Chall in 1981-1982” [ED Libr: NA9095 K45 1987] [Reprinted from Bancroft Library oral history on land use planning in California]


Untitled typed list of DCRP MCP students by class, 1948-50 to 1973-75. 6pp. (Xeroxed, no date)
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Fran Violich, Jack Kent, Don Foley, Mel Webber
DCRP Founders Day, September 6, 1997
In the courtyard of the old Architecture Building

Photo by Jane Scherr
LISA RUBENS

Lisa Rubens is an historian with the Regional Oral History Office who directs projects on university history and the history of social movements. She has a Masters in City Planning and a Ph.D. in History, both from the University of California, Berkeley. Before coming to ROHO in 1987, she taught United States, Women’s and California History in the Peralta Community College district for sixteen years. Her own research and writing is on women in California history and the Golden Gate International Exhibition.