[This is a draft of subsequently revised and edited text published in John Lofland, *Davis* (Arcadia, 2004).]

8. PROGRESSIVE DAVIS, 1972-89

In the postwar period, Davis was merely another exploding California suburb. Hundreds of Bill Streng and Stanley Davis tract homes were creeping from its borders, just like they were from other borders. Despite the bicycle, Davis as truly distinctive locale was not yet born.

But born it was. In the span of less than two decades over the 1970s and 1980s, Davis developed the distinctive image of being:

> a community that's enlightened, progressive, environmentally aware. It embraced growth control as gospel, saw the sun as an energy source and began singing the praises of recycling long before most communities. It's a nuke-free, pro-choice city that declared itself a sanctuary for political refugees from Central America and adopted an anti-smoking law that at the time was perhaps the toughest in the country (Fitch, Inrou ton).

This was, of course, only the **boosteristic** (or "progressive") version of Davis' new distinctiveness. Responding to the same changes, there was also a **detractor** or evil twin distinctiveness in which Davis was "eccentric" and "self-absorbed." What kind of a place "cites a women for snoring too loudly" and builds a toad-migration tunnel under a freeway overpass (Fitz, intdo)? To detractors, Davis was negatively distinctive in having "an overabundance of middle-class high-achievers out to save the world. Failing that, they at least want to save Davis from urban sprawl, suburban shopping malls, the world's love affair with

automobiles and other affliction of the modern world" (Fitz, intro). To such skeptics, the new Davis was "driven by a fear of conformity, worried that someday it will wake up and discover its just another Anytown USA" (Fitx, introduction). Favorite detractor catch-phrases born of this period (and that continue) included, "Only in Davis," "Carmel By the Causeway," and "the People's Republic of Davis." Professional anti-progressive Bob Duning's appellation was perhaps the most famous: "The City of All Things Right and Relevant."

This chapter tells the story of how Davis went from dumpy nothingness with a little bike emblem in 1971 to progressive glamour, celebrity lovers, and hostile detractors by the late 1980s.

I. THE "REVOLUTION" OF 1972. I cautiously fix the birth of "progressive Davis" as the evening of Tuesday, April 11, 1972. That night, the votes then counted in the City Council election made it clear that the order of things in Davis was changing in dramatic ways. None of the three strong-running winners was from the old downtown or UC aggie circles, the traditional sources of council members. Nor were they clearly in the mainstream of the newcomer "modernist" elements described in the last chapter as a new reformist tendency. Indeed, the only incumbent standing for re-election—classic "old boy" Henry Miller—received only 33% of the vote, running far behind the third place finisher (Bob Black) with 59%.

A. Poulas, Holdstock, Black. The three elected were , instead, from new kinds of constituencies representing new ideas. Finishing first with 74 percent of the votes (a strength not seen since 1954 and never again even approached) was Joan Poulas. She was a 35 year-old attorney and mother of two who had not

lived in Davis long and who had come to town with her spouse, a professor of law in the new School of Law. In second place with 68% was British-born Richard Holdstock, liberal Democratic activist and director of environmental health at UC Davis. Last but certainly not least was Bob Black with 59%. A recent President of the UC Davis student body, he was at this time running an organic/health food store in Davis (one of the first in the U. S.).

All three represented the "newcomer cosmopolitans" described in the last chapter. Within this broad tendency, however, there were differences on the questions of (1) how rapidly Davis ought to grow and in what fashion, (2) degree of acceptance of traditional white male leadership, and (3) support or not of the Vietnam War and the broader cultural challenges of the time.

The cosmopolitans newly dominant in the late 1950s and 1960s envisioned rapid growth and reconstructing Davis' downtown as a series of Le Corbusier-style high-rises and parking lots (Fitch 1998; Lofland 1999, 48-49). But, by the early 1970s, consequences of this rapid growth were becoming visible and stirred misgivings. Growth had then became a key issue in the 1972 election. Of the nine candidates, Poulos, Holdstock and Black seemed most clearly to catch hold of the problems of growth and of other concerns.

These three did more than question the dominant, growth-oriented cosmopolitans politically. Their physical appearances questioned it in other ways. With the single exception of Kathleen C. Green, elected in 1958, council members were always male. Moreover, these males were clean-shaven, short-haired, and coat-and-tie wearing. The more recent ones were rather more cosmopolitan and liberal than the old downtown and aggie-faculty circles, but all were nonetheless "old-fashioned." Poulos, Holdstock and Black were otherwise:

a woman, two males with beards (one of whom wore hippie-like garb, long hair, and no coat or tie, as seen in Fig 7.x).

In 1972, changing City Council membership a public ritual of literal replacement. At the transition meeting, a departing member began seated in her or his old chair, but then left it. The new member then occupied that chair. Here is one observer's sense of that moment:

> They began the meeting with a table full of business-looking men, all clean-shaven, wearing suits and ties . . . . [The men who replaced them] were bearded, one had long hair and both wore short-sleeve shirts, and there was a woman. For me it was a visual representation of the change . . . and it was very potent and very charging (Mickey Barlow, quoted in Lofland, 200x: x).

B. A Precarious Progressive Majority. When we look at the election results of the progressive period, we see further erosion of the “old time” consensus politics. Progressive candidates were elected with frequency enough to form working majorities on the City Council, but (with the exception of 1972) they did not run away with elections.

This precariousness can be thought in **two parts**. The **first** part involved the continuing decline in lowest-winning percentages and the highest percent of votes received. There were the figures.

Election Year	**Lowest Winning Percent**	**Highest Percent**
1972	59	74
1974	**37***	**40**
1976	**33**	50

1978	**48**	**49**
1980	**45**	62
1982	**45**	**46**
1984	**42**	**46**
1986	51	53
1988	**42**	51

(* Winning office with less than 50% of the vote shown in boldface type.)

Of the 26 people elected in the previous—the exploding—period, five were voted for by less than a majority, which is **19%.** The progressive figures given just above present a very different picture. Among the 18 elected, eleven had less than a majority, which is **61**%.

Expressed differently, in the exploding period, the average lowest-winning percent was 57%. In the progressive period, this declined to 45%. In the exploding period, the average highest vote getting was 63%. In the progressive period, it declined to 52%.

The **second** part of understanding the progressive's precarious hold on power is to inspect the ideological leanings of the thirteen people elected to the Council in this period in relation to their strength in elections.

In time-sequence, these people won office with **the lowest-winning percents**: Bob Black, Tom Tomasi, Sandy Motley, Tom Tomasi, Bill Kopper, Tom Tomasi, Gerald Adler, Ann Evens and David Rosenberg.

Also in time-sequence, these people received the **highest percentage** of votes: Joan Poulas, Jim Stevens, Bob Black, Jim Stevens, Sandy Motley, Ann Evans, Debbie Taggart, Mike Corbett, and Mayard Skinner.

In most standard assessments of these matters, Black, Tomasi, and Kopper were considered the most left of Davis elected officials. They also ran among the weakest in the elections they won. In contrast, arch-conservative Jim Stevens was the highest vote-getter **twice** in the heydays of the progressive period (although he was denied any serious service as Mayor by progressive majorities). Poulas, Motley, Evans, Taggart, Corbett and Skinner were ambiguously mild left or centrist and all often did quite well.

I conclude that while the political leadership of this famous progressive period could achieve majorities sufficient to make innovative policies, it dominance was precarious.

It was, though, a precariousness of an odd sort because the electorate was also rather liberal on national and state issues. McGovern rather than Nixon easily carried Davis in 1972; Proposition 13 was decisively rejected in 1978; Reagan failed to carry Davis in 1980 and 1984; Republican Governor George Deukmejian lost in Davis in 1982; voters retained Chief Supreme Court Justice Rose Bird in 1986 despite her defeat state-wide. Such a pattern suggests that the center of the Davis electorate was liberal, but in a centrist manner. Thus, center-moderates such as Polulas, Motley and Taggart could do well. The precariousness involved people farther left, such as Kopper, Tomasi, and Black.

C. Sources of the "Revolution." A change of this kind of course invites speculation on its causes. In his *Growing Pains*, Mike Fitch suggests a number of "forces at work." Among them, there was, **first,** the entire country was in a crisis of the legitimacy of authority as well as subject to other profound changes. In such a context, more people are ready to look at new alternatives. **Second**, Davis was growing at a rate that was making even conservative nervous. It had added

2,000 people in 1971 alone. **Third**, the existing Council was in disarray. Two of the three incumbents were not running and a third had announced that he was resigning and leaving town after the election. **Fourth**, this was the first election in which students could vote. They were an estimated 3,400 new voters in a community were people were previously elected to office with some 2,300 votes. Because the three winners ran strong in **all** precincts (not just "student" ones) election pundits have disagreed on how important these new voters actually were. Nonetheless, students did vote in very significant numbers. 4,980 people voted in 1968 and 4,400 in 1970. 1972 was double these numbers: 10,957 (which would prove to be the largest number up to the 1980 election). **Fifth,** using the initiative process, a UC Davis student had organized a successful campaign to place a peace proposition on the ballot. It called for an immediate withdrawal from Vietnam and placing domestic goals above military involvement in other countries. This alone was thought to have brought voters out, especially student voters. The initiative carried with 76%, as did three bond measures also on the ballot.

III. GROWTH CONTROL. In 1972, a citizens' task force began revision of the City's general plan. The new plan adopted in the following year limited and controlled the city's future growth. Some characterized it as a "radical step" because, at that time, Petaluma was the only other California town that had "tried to impose growth limits." The plan required that growth be limited to that needed to meet "internally generated" housing needs (fitx, ch.2). "The main tool" for doing this was a system of yearly "housing allocation" (Fitx,ch. 2). Starting with allocations in the 300 range, in December, 1975, the Council cut it to a

maximum of 150 single-family houses in the next year. This was done "because Davis is growing too fast" (Diemcer, xxxx:35).

The housing allocation number was geared to projected desirable population levels. The early-on target was no more than 50,000 people by 1990. In 1981, the Council voted to change it to 50,000 by 2000.

As the 1980s moved on, external pressures to grow mounted. In 1987, a new revision of the General Plan was begun. In December of that year, the plan was amended to state that Davis would grow at 1.78% a year. This would result in a population of between 72 and 76 thousand in 2010.

A "hot" housing market in Davis began to encourage speculators to buy houses for the purpose of using them as rentals. Some people thought that the sale and often resale involved in this process increased both rents and the sale prices of houses. Seeking to curb such supposed upward pressure, in July, 1977, the Council passed a law requiring that all buyers of single-family home "guarantee to live in the house for one year following its purchase" (Diemcer, xxxx:35). (The measure contained a 1981 "sunset" clause. It was not re-enacted and lapsed.)

In spite of growth control efforts, 1977 was the City's "heaviest building year in its history " (Diemer, xxxx:35). Construction was valued at almost $24 million, including some $19 million for 563 single-family homes. The previous record had been $11 million for 503 homes in 1973.

Popular sentiment supporting growth control measures seemed enduring. As late as, June, 1986, a majority of voters supported advisory "Measure L" stating that Davis should grow as slowly as legally possible, and that annexations should be discouraged.

IV. DEVELOPER CHALLENGES. As one might expect, progressive growth control was not popular with real estate developers (to use the mildest of characterizations). But, they seemed by enlarge to accommodate to the situation. But not all. Several unsuccessful court challenges were made.

And a new kind of challenge was mounted in 1986. Ramco Enterprises of West Sacramento approached the Yolo County Supervisors with a plan to develop 440 acres of residential, commercial and industrial property outside the city on Davis' eastern border. After protracted struggle, the City Council agreed to annex the acreage and to allow 105 new residences each year. Seeking to block this annexation and the project itself, a citizen-petition initiative was put on the 1989 ballot. Called P and Q, both measures lost and the project proceeded (Dimer, xxx, Fich, ch. 6) (The official annexation in1989—number 67—was actually 600 acres. In one stroke Davis increased from 7.5 to 8.5 square miles.)

Some observers chalked this conflict up as a victory Frank Ramos (the apparent principal partner in Ramco Enterprises) specifically and developers more generally. Ramos had gone to the mat and got pretty much what he wanted. Although the Council won some battles in the form of land extractions and other features, they had, in some views, lost the war.

In this conflict, Ramos had successfully played the County Supervisors against the Davis Council, forcing Davis to annex under the threat of County development. The Davis Council subsequently sought to forestall future such threats by what was called the "pass-through agreement." In this, the City purchased the County's promise not to develop on Davis borders with on-going payments to the County from the City's redevelopment agency.

V. ENERGY CONSERVATION. In a sudden burst of both fear and enthusiasm, U.S. environmental consciousness and action mushroomed in 1970 and remained high in subsequent years. This new consciousness was especially strong in Davis in part because of changes at UC Davis. In the 1960s, its School of Agriculture (and agricultural studies more generally) started to decline. This led to rethinking their rationales and aims. Fitting with broader changes, missions were broadened to include all manner of environmental topics. The new, 1967, name of the Ag College signaled this: The College of Agricultural and Environmental Sciences. The idea of "ecology" began to take hold as "the catchword for a more holistic approach" to agriculture (Shcueirng, p. 117).

This shift drew a new generation of environmentally concerned students to Davis, an influx that fit well with the progressive, environmentally conscious City Council. (Kopper, Tomasi, Black, and Evans, among other Davis activists, were UCD graduates imbued with this consciousness.)

In addition, there was a real energy crisis in the United States in 1973. That crisis in tandem with UC Davis and other social changes set the stage for the creation and adoption of innovative energy policies in Davis. These included the Energy Conservation Building Ordinance of 1975, which required the north-south orientation of all new construction and encouraged solar heating devices. This measure alone prompted some people to call Davis "Solar City" (Diemeber, 2000:34). A city booklet describing the plan declared it "the first energy conservation building code in the country" (quoted in Fi, ch. 2). Along other lines, in October, 1979, the Council approved an ordinance requiring that up to $500 be spent on retrofitted energy conservation measures as a condition of selling an existing home. When it went into effect on January 1, 1980, it made

Davis the first city in the nation to implement mandatory home energy conservation.

At the more general level of philosophy and approach, the 1973 General Plan itself was hailed as "a sophisticated, comprehensive energy conservation framework that called for a better integrated transportation system, innovative building regulations and public education" (Fitx,ch. 2). In October, 1975, the Davis Director of Planning declared that the plan had "changed the shape of the city from sprawling suburbia to a well-managed, compact community" (quoted in F, ch 2

V. VILLAGE HOMES. In this 2003 book, *Village Homes*, landscape architect Mark Francis writes that Davis had by that year become "a kind of environmental Mecca for foreign architects and planners who learn about it from television documentaries and books on ecological communities." As himself an internationally renowned expert on these topics, Professor Francis was frequently asked to give tours of Davis to visiting groups of these professionals.

He reports that "it is always interesting to see their reaction when they arrive in Davis. A typical reaction is to look a bit confused by the more standard layout of the community." Cynics would say that these visitors are properly bewildered because there is in fact little in Davis that is not common elsewhere. But Professor Francis opines that the problem is that the "innovation is hidden."

But that as it may, foreign visitors are not confused by the 60 acre, 244 residence area in far west Davis called "Village Homes." They may be disappointed with how most of Davis looks, but not by that neighborhood. It is often described as constituted of " lush and extensive open spaces." According to Francis, visitors commonly comment, "this would be a great place to live."

By all accounts, such sentiments are not confined to foreign visitors. Celebrity Americas such as Rosalynn Carter, Jane Fonda, and Pete Seeger have made their own treks to Village Homes. And the place seems equally or more popular with the people who actually live there.

Such acclaim and reverence was not always so. Indeed, the Village Homes story is the classic one we know and love and that we have already heard regarding bicycles: the triumph of vision, goodness and persistence over narrow-mindedness, risk-aversion, and bureaucratic rigidity.

The visionaries in this case were Judy and Mike Corbett, then in their twenties, and the year was 1972. As they reported their situation: “We had no financial assets and no track record in development. We were embarking on a large-scale project that incorporated numerous untried and innovative features . . . [But,] luck was on our side. It took a great deal of tenacity and perseverance, but in the end we were able to overcome multiple obstacles and build Village Homes” (quoted in Francis, Village Homes, p. 20).

The obstacles included the Davis director of planning simply laughing at Mike when he first presented the development map to her. She told him to come back when he met the building code. FHA officials, whose approval for insuring mortgages was critical, disliked a long list of the plan’s features, which included narrow, winding streets, and extensive solar installations in each home.

In finally wining through, the energy conservation ferment then percolating in Davis and embodied in the new Davis building codes described earlier began to soften the views of City officials. But, it was the Davis City Council that finally saved the project. The Corbetts appealed negative lower decisions to the Council and, in the words of Judy Corbett, “the City Council was

very liberal and supportive of what we were doing." "After almost three years of delays and negotiations, they were allowed to begin construction of the first houses in 1975" (Francis, p. 30). So began what would become a distinctive feature of Davis, a town otherwise (except for its downtown) looking much like an Orange County slurb.

VI. DOWNTOWN DEVELOPMENT. Although a clear commitment to Davis having a downtown was made in the exploding period and an auspicious beginning made, the going was not easy over the 1970s and 1980s. The lack of large parcels made it difficult to site a large store. Further, Davisites were ambivalent about large stores anyway, especially those that were units of national chains. Moreover, Davis' very success in slowing its growth made it of marginal interest to large-store builders because it's population was so small.

These attitudes and limitations were clearly displayed in the protracted problem of developing the block bounded by Third, B, Fourth, and C. It had become vacant in 1966 and, amazingly, would remain so until its dedication as an extension of Central Park in 1990—a period of 34 years! Early-on, the block was going have an Arden-Mayfair grocery store. The project never started but people began to call the land that anyway. In 1985, it was leased to Terranomics to build a two-level shopping center with some two dozen retail stores and 300 parking places, among other features.

One might think this was exactly the kind of thing one needed for a developed downtown. But, no, a citizen initiative put the project to a vote in January, 1986 and defeated it. Actually, the contest was framed positively rather than negatively. A yes vote made the block a park extension of Central Park, which meant no shopping center. "Yes" got 60% of the vote. With that, Fourth

Street between B and C was eliminated and Central Park more than doubled in size. Of some import, a covered plaza for the Farmers' Market was built along C just north of Third. Other amenities were added.

Importantly led by Mayor Bill Kopper, efforts at "adaptive reuse" of older buildings rather than demolition began in the early 1970s. Almost a dozen of such projects had been completed by the late 1980s, including Orange Court at 125-137 E, Park Place at 216-228 D, and Saunders Place at Fourth and D. These and other reconfigurations of older buildings greatly contributed to the sense that Davis still had a traditional downtown.

Expanding the time-frame to include the next period, it is of note the City of Davis became a major historic preservation/rehabilitation presence in the downtown over the 1970-90s. Indeed, it became a major owner or controller of Davis historic buildings: (1) the Old Davis High School remodeled into a City Hall (late 1970s); (2) the Southern Pacific Rail station (1980s); (3) the old library remodeled into a meeting-room/museum (1980s-90s); (4) the Dresbach-Hunt-Boyer Mansion (1994); (5) the long-term lease on and remodel of the Varsity Theater (1990s); (6) The old City Hall, originally the only building the City owned; and, (7) the Boy Scout Cabin, on which the City had a lease with an option to buy the land from UC Davis, giving it operational if not "on paper" ownership (Demolishing, ch. X). (More than a decade into the contested period, stewardship of numbers 4, 5, and 6 on this list would prove to be problematic.)

VII. THE COUNCIL'S FOREIGN POLICIES. Continuing a long standing practice of adopting policies on matters outside its jurisdiction (e. g. banning Japanese nationals in California), the Council took stands on these among other matters: **1972,** supported the Equal Rights Amendment; **1982**, supported a

bilateral freeze on production of nuclear weapons (3-2 vote); **1986**, declared Davis a sanctuary city; **1989**, declared Davis a "Pro-Choice" city (3-0 with two abstentions);**1989**, signaling the near-end of a era, voted down a proposed nuclear-free ordinance. (Interest in the pro-choice question ran so high that the meeting on it was held before an overflow crowed in the largest room of Veterans Memorial.)

X. FAULTERING CITY AND UC DAVIS FINANCING. One of the roots of the expansiveness of the Davis government in the earlier 1970s was a strong economy and burgeoning property taxes. Things soon changed.

A. Proposition 13 Staggers Local Government. On June 6, 1978, the California electorate adopted the famous "Proposition 13," which strongly limited increases in property taxes. Yolo County was one of the few areas that voted against it and this was primarily due to the very heavy negative vote in Davis. Across the state, local governments were forced to lay off employees. Davis laid off 23 and the Davis-area school district laid off 28. At the Council meeting of June 21, 1978, two members voted (perhaps in jest) to "stop supplying pens and pencils to . . . City employees." The motion failed with two members against and one absent.

B. Rough Times But Growth at UC Davis. In this last chapter I described Louis Menand's analysis of 1945-75 as the golden era of the American college. Around 1975, the system began to stall and fall. "The student deferment was abolished and American involvement in the war ended; the college-age population stopped growing; the country went into recession; and the economic value of a college degree began to fall . . . A system that had quintupled . . . in the

span of a generation suddenly found itself with empty dormitory beds and a huge tenured faculty (*New York Review of Books*, 10-18-01).

UD Davis was equally hit. I was a professor of sociology there at this time and I remember serious discussions of how UC might not need a department of everything on every campus. Why not only two or three rather than the nine sociology department then existing? Redundancy lay-offs of tenured professors loomed, raising the question of whether one's tenure was in UC as a whole or only at Davis. No one was certain. Every expenditure was up for review, right down to removing almost all the telephones. In February of 1982, a major campus concern was that budget cuts would result in the loss of about 2,300 students and over a hundred faculty.

Somehow, UC Davis survived, and even did rather well. Despite all the agony and financial and staff soul searching, the campus had almost twice as many students in 1990 (22,000) as it had in 1970 (12,600).

IX. PUBLIC CRISIS AND DRAMA. In the sweep of Davis history, the progressive period likely stands above the other eight in the number and intensity of its dramatic political events. By "dramatic political events" I mean occasions on which (1) large numbers of emotionally aroused people assembled to demand that officials act or not act, (2) acts of nonviolent protest took place, and/or (3) an atmosphere of crisis prevailed. A number of these have been mentioned in connection with other matters already described in this chapter. Let me record just one more: the iconic, albeit brief, transportation stoppage of May 9, 1972. Responding to Nixon's resumption of North Vietnam bombing, "several hundred Davisites spread out on Interstate 80, briefly blocking the

freeway. Later the same day about 60 people sat on and blocked the railroad tracks near the SP station. Council member Bob Black was among those arrested.

X. DAVIS BECAME A CELEBRITY. Like people, places can become celebrities. One way this happens is that people who are celebrates say, "this place is a celebrity." It is an anointing process in which existing celebrities make new ones. Further, once the process is kicked off, other celebrities jump on the wagon in order to bath in the new light. And then, the celebrity machine—the mass media—fuels and amplifies circles of celebration. A warm time is had by all.

Something of this sort appears to have happened to Davis in the later 1970s. The kick-off celebrity-making event seems to have been First Lady Rosalynn Carter's visit in March, 1979. She toured Village Homes, rode on a London double-decker bus, pedaled a bicycle on a greenbelt, and had dinner with selected members of the progressive elite at the home of Mayor Tom Tomasi. She also attended a special meeting of the City Council where she presented leaders with honors for energy conservation (Diemcer, xxx:36).

A news account of his visit described a moment on the bus tour when Mrs. Carter remarked to Bill Kopper and Tom Tomasi and solar designer Marshall Hunt: "Y'all are so young," . . . amid laughter" (DE, 3-21-79). And so they were. Mrs. Carter had recognized a significant feature of the Davis progressive era that is often overlooked. Environmental concern, growth control and other flourishing policies in Davis were very much "children's crusades." Major movers such as Bob Black and Bill Kopper were young baby boomers, people almost the same age as the Baby-Boomer-In-Chief, President Bill Clinton.

Four months after Mrs. Carter's visit, her husband, President Jimmy Carter, made a major address to the nation on energy in which he praised Davis for doing a "tremendous job" in reducing energy use. This was a very heavy celebrity anointing and it kicked the celebrity machine into gear. Magazines, newspapers and televisions stations around the world did features on Davis. Some of them even bothered to go there and poke around.

After the initial burst, celebrity simmered and trickled. U. S. Secretary of Energy, Charles Duncan visited in January, 1980. Actress Jane Fonda chose a Davis theater for the July, 1982 Northern California premier of her, "On Golden Pond." In March, 1984, French president Francois Mitterrand visited Davis in order to see Village Homes (landing there in a helicopter). (Apocryphal had it that Mitterand thought all of Davis looked like Village Homes and that the city resembled a typical French village.)

XII. "ALL THINGS RIGHT AND RELEVANT." In the early 2000s, cultural geographer Blake Gumphrecht was struck that no one had ever done a serious, book-length study of the major American phenomena of the college town. Seeking to remedy this neglect, he began research and developed a set of eight characteristic tendencies of such towns. These included their distinctive commercial districts, unusual sorts of residential areas, and cultures centered on sports. Of course, college towns differ in the degree they stress or have developed one or another of the eight The better to understand each, he selected eight towns, one each that displayed each dimension in exaggerated form.
For example, he thought Ithaca, New York was an especially exaggerated instance of specialized residential areas distinctive to college towns. Therefore, he did an in depth study of this aspect of Ithaca.

One of his eight dimension is captioned "All Things Right and Relevant. " This phrase refers to the tendency of college towns to be idealistic, moralistic, and bastions of liberal politics. You guessed it. He selected Davis as an especially exaggerated case of this college town tendency. Indeed, the very name of the tendency and it's meaning is taken, with acknowledgement, from its creator, Bob Dunning.

Professor Gumprecht's research helps make three points with which I conclude this chapter. **First**, by the later 1990s, Davis was famous enough for its progressive ethos that a social scientist with a comparative perspective could think it plausible to use it as an exemplar of that tendency. **Second**, Gumprecht did not write about all of Davis history. He recognized that the phenomenon he depicts started in the early 1970s. **Third**, this period was a distinctive moment in Davis history. Like all moments, it faded.

CONTESTED DAVIS, 1990-—

[Chapter 9 is not included in this draft.]