UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA SAN DIEGO 25th ANNIVERSARY ORAL HISTORY PROJECT

Interview with Dr. Clark Kerr
October 31, 1984 — Conference Room, Department of Psychology, UCSD
Interviewer, Dr. Kathryn Ringrose

- 1 **RINGROSE:** When we talked earlier, we decided that we would talk a bit about your
- 2 conception for a larger university structure, what you found at UCSD when you became
- 3 president of the university in 1958 and how you saw UCSD as fitting into this larger structure.
- 4 **KERR:** Well, I had been appointed president by the regents at a meeting in October of 1957 at
- 5 Davis and I began thinking about what we were going to do as of that time. I didn't wait until
- 6 1958. At the same meeting at which I was appointed to the presidency, the regents decided to
- 7 have three new campuses which is quite a story in itself—how they came to that conclusion.
- 8 One was to be in the San Diego area somewhere, one in the Los Angeles area and one some-
- 9 where in the South Bay area. So, I had to begin thinking right away about what ought to happen
- 10 at each of these separate places.
- To begin with, I felt that each of the three new campuses ought to be different from each other.
- 12 Each should have a distinctive personality. I had seen the terrible competition between Berkeley
- and UCLA and between UCLA and Berkeley which was really not good either way. The faculties
- 14 hated each other, were suspicious of each other and, if Berkeley got something, then UCLA
- wanted it two weeks later and two percent less and if UCLA got something, then Berkeley
- wanted it instantly and ten percent better. I thought this kind of competition was bad for relations
- 17 within the university.
- Also, I thought it was bad for the state of California to have two identical campuses even if they
- were located in different places. Identical campuses didn't offer to the people and the students
- of the state the same choices. I also felt that each campus would be better internally in the long
- 21 run if it had its own personality, its own character. So, that led to thinking how UCSD might be
- 22 different from UCLA in particular, since that was the nearest big campus, and also from
- 23 Berkeley.
- Now, there had been plans for doing something at San Diego that went back for several years
- 25 prior to my time. They had to do with establishing some kind of institute for the graduate study of
- science and engineering.
- 27 **RINGROSE:** The Science and Technology Institute.
- 28 **KERR:** I had sat as chancellor on the sidelines listening to those discussions back and forth and
- 29 I wasn't really convinced this was what the San Diego community needed or the University of
- 30 California either. It seemed to me that with the growth of the population of the state and the
- 31 growth of the San Diego community, there was going to be a need for a university that was very
- 32 broadly based.

- Now, I think the idea of that institute, or whatever it was called, came about in two or three
- ways. First of all, it was a way of saying to UCLA, "We are not going to compete with you across
- the board." Second, it built on what the Scripps Institution already had and third, it appealed to
- some local interests that wanted to attract industry in the high technology area. So, I can
- understand why the institute was suggested, but it seemed to me, looking at the growth of the
- 38 state and the growth of the San Diego area, that more was needed than this very restrictive
- 39 idea. Likewise, I had always been quite convinced that better work was done in broadly oriented
- 40 institutions where there could be some conversation across disciplinary lines and there was a
- 41 well-rounded academic atmosphere than in narrowly oriented ones.
- 42 So, when I came in, I never really considered for even a moment going ahead with the existing
- 43 plans. From the beginning of my involvement in October 1957, I began thinking in terms of a
- 44 general campus. Beyond that, I began thinking privately that this would be the third big research
- campus of the university to go along with Berkeley and UCLA. This later caused some trouble
- with Santa Cruz and Irvine and there were feelings there that I was giving advantages to San
- 47 Diego that they were not getting. That is true. Their feeling about it was correct. I was giving
- 48 special advantages to San Diego because I thought that, just geographically, if there was going
- 49 to be a third great research campus in the foreseeable future, it was going to be in the San
- Diego area. So those are two kinds of very basic and private decisions I made, one to have the
- 51 broad general campus and the second to give it a chance to compete with UCLA and Berkeley
- 52 almost from its inception.
- 53 Now, I don't think I ever, on the second point at least, went to the Board of Regents and said
- that, but it was always understood in the discussions I had with the Board, and the Board went
- along with both those ideas, the broad general campus and the third of the great research
- 56 universities. Now, this didn't mean that the others, Santa Cruz, and Irvine, couldn't, in a longer
- 57 period of time, be given the same opportunity, but rather that they would not initially be given the
- same opportunity as San Diego.
- 59 **RINGROSE**: Was the hope then that Santa Cruz and Irvine would serve as undergraduate
- 60 training—
- 61 **KERR:** Well, no, not entirely. For Santa Cruz, we did want to put a good deal of emphasis at the
- 62 undergraduate level. The Lick Observatory on Mount Hamilton had always considered itself a
- campus and I had a lot of problems attaching it to Santa Cruz. This was a way of saying to
- Santa Cruz, "You are involved also in research, and at the very highest level."
- 65 The thing at Santa Cruz was more of being an alternative campus to the standard big land grant
- 66 campus. I had been chancellor at Berkeley for six years and I had open office hours where
- students could come in without any appointment for two hours or whatever it took, one
- afternoon once or twice a month, whatever happened to fit in. I would listen to a lot of their
- 69 comments and criticisms and Santa Cruz was intended, really, to take care of those who were
- 70 not entirely happy in a big monstrous campus, monstrous in the sense of size, not in any other
- 71 way. They complained about having no sense of community, no contact with faculty members.

- 72 They complained about the tremendous specialization of the curriculum in which they learned a
- 73 lot of bits and pieces and nothing larger or broad.
- These ideas began in 1958 and as time went on there was more of this theme I had already
- been thinking about—and more students who wanted alternatives to the big impersonal places.
- 76 I really began thinking about that and doing something about it before the middle '6Os when it
- became a great cause celebre. There were people at Berkeley who said I tried to recreate
- 78 Swarthmore which is my undergraduate college within the University of California or a series of
- 79 Swarthmores. I did look at it that way, in terms of having a Swarthmore, an Antioch, a St. Johns,
- 80 etc., a lot of variety and a lot of diversity. When Santa Cruz started out it was intended to take
- an overflow from Berkeley. Actually, in the early years, there were more students who were
- being turned away from Santa Cruz to go to Berkeley than from Berkeley to Santa Cruz. Santa
- 83 Cruz happened to fit that particular time, but times changed, and students became more
- vocationally oriented, and that campus has lost a fair amount in terms of the original plans and
- 85 dreams for it.
- 86 Irvine was intended to be a land-grant university for the twenty-first century. The theme there
- 87 was to emphasize public service to an industrial society. The theme at San Diego was to
- 88 emphasize basic research. So, in a way, Santa Cruz was more oriented toward the student, and
- 89 sense of community and interdisciplinary instruction and research, Irvine more toward service in
- 90 the land-grant tradition, and San Diego basic research.
- 91 **RINGROSE:** How did Riverside fit in?
- 92 **KERR:** Riverside didn't fit in. It still doesn't fit in entirely. Riverside came along before my time.
- 93 There had already been the citrus experiment station there which was of worldwide fame in its
- 94 area. There was established next door to it a small liberal arts campus. The two never mixed
- 95 very well together. There was always in my mind a question as to whether Riverside was as well
- located as it might be because it was very, very hot there in the late spring and early fall. If I had
- 97 really thought that Riverside had the potential to become a big campus and help take care of
- 98 what was then called the "tidal wave" of students, we would not have started Irvine.
- 99 RINGROSE: I see.
- 100 **KERR:** Now, if Riverside had been located as had once been talked about, on a piece of land
- later taken over by Cal Poly, then it might have been located to take the tremendous increase in
- the number of people in Orange County and eastern Los Angeles County. But it was located too
- far away to serve that purpose.
- 104 **RINGROSE:** You often hear speculation about why we ended up with Riverside, Irvine, and
- San Diego relatively close together and yet they don't particularly support one another.
- 106 **KERR:** Well, Irvine and San Diego are really quite a long way apart, and we wanted to have a
- campus that would help take the pressure off of UCLA. That was Irvine. We wanted one that
- would take the pressure off of Berkeley. That was Santa Cruz. Then, we wanted one to serve
- what was becoming obviously the third great population center in the state. That was San

- Diego. Riverside was left off a bit on the side. There are other reasons for that, aside from what
- 111 I have mentioned. There was very bad blood between the people in the citrus experiment
- station and those in this little liberal arts college that was established under Gordon Watkins.
- The people in the liberal arts college looked down upon the individuals in agriculture and would
- actually call them "those clodhoppers". Now, as a matter of fact, those "clodhoppers" had
- international reputations of which they were very proud and the people in the little liberal arts
- 116 college did not in their fields, have the reputations which the people in the citrus experiment
- station had. So, it was a very divided campus in an area with a bad climate in the late spring
- and early fall and too far away from the growing population of Orange County to really fit. So,
- we never really tried to build that campus up. It had its own aspirations, but we never tried to
- build it up as the overflow for UCLA. We would never have done that.
- 121 **RINGROSE**: At one point was there an experiment in which Riverside was supposed to be an
- 122 elite undergraduate campus?
- 123 **KERR:** The idea was to have an undergraduate Oberlin or Pomona within the University of
- 124 California with a small number of students. We faced this tidal wave of students coming into the
- system. In the course of the 1960's the number of students in higher education tripled. Gordon
- Watkins—and I might say that Gordon Watkins was a wonderful person, and a very good friend
- of mine—his idea of this little Oberlin was not going to take the pressure and the faculty that had
- been recruited there thought themselves very precious. They had been promised that they
- would have a little liberal arts college. What we needed was to take care of not just a few
- hundred students but a good many thousands. And so that is another reason why Riverside
- didn't fit into the plans for expansion. The college there was not prepared psychologically to
- 132 accept expansion.
- 133 **RINGROSE:** I see. Now, how did San Diego fit into the larger higher education plan at this end
- of the state? I am thinking of the University of San Diego and San Diego State University.
- KERR: Well, that goes into quite a bit of history. The University of San Diego was not especially
- eager to have the University of California develop a campus here and there was resistance from
- that quarter, which had some impact in city politics and even, to some extent, on state politics.
- Nothing was done that was really out of order, but it is quite natural for people not to want to run
- up against tougher competition. San Diego State was another matter. Before the master plan of
- 140 1960, in which I was heavily involved, and really was the central person in developing it, the
- state colleges had aspirations, all of them, to become universities. As a matter of fact, when Pat
- Brown was running for governor, he promised them that when he became governor, they would
- 143 get university status.
- 144 **RINGROSE:** I didn't know that.
- 145 **KERR:** They didn't get university status, but he promised it to them publicly during the
- campaign. In working on the master plan, we had to put together the state college, the
- 147 community college, the private sector and the university sector into something that was also
- good for the state. I worked harder on that than anything I ever did in my life. The state colleges

- had this aspiration to become university campuses. I privately once offered four of them a
- chance to come into the University of California system and we would then not establish new
- campuses. One of the four was San Diego State, which was also perhaps the best or one of the
- two best state colleges at the time.
- 153 **RINGROSE:** They refused?
- 154 KERR: The four that were involved were San Francisco State, San Jose State, Fresno State and San Diego State. Now, I might say in the plans that the regents made or adopted in October 155 of 1957 they had said that after they got through establishing three new campuses, they would 156 consider one in the Fresno area. So, it was a potential campus too. I offered to them to come 157 158 into the university system and then we would not go ahead with our three and possibly four new 159 campuses. They refused this. Partly they didn't want to abandon the other state colleges. They 160 had all promised that they would hang together as a unit and try to get university status that way rather than through the University of California. But also, I was told that if they became part 161 162 of the University of California they would have to be under the academic senate of the university. Some of the presidents didn't like that because they didn't have any faculty groups at 163 all. They ran the place, and they didn't want to be put under all those restrictions. Now, I 164 personally think that one of the greatest strengths of the University of California is its academic 165 senate. It is a very strong senate, and they didn't like the idea of being put under senate 166
- 167 controls. Also, as one of them, when I was meeting with them all. I pointed out that there were
- departments in the University of California that didn't give the Ph.D. They used as an illustration
- one department that had run for a hundred years and had never been approved for the Ph.D. If
- they got their own university status, they would be able to give Ph.D. 's across the board
- according to their own standards immediately. They rejected my offer.
- Now once, however, the master plan was adopted which said that they were not to become
- universities, Malcolme Love, who was then the president of San Diego State, and was a very
- good friend of the university, accepted the master plan. He accepted the fact that there should
- be a research university. If it was not going to be his, then he was glad to see it developed in
- 176 connection with the Scripps Institution and gave us, as far as I could see, good support in the
- 177 San Diego community when one might have expected opposition. Now, I might say I always had
- in mind that we didn't want to locate right next door to San Diego State. In the case of Santa
- 179 Cruz, I was very conscious of not being right next to Stanford, for example, or not being right
- next door to San Jose State either. In the case of Irvine, we also didn't want to be right next to
- an existing institution. There were many sites we looked at here in the San Diego area. Once
- upon a time there must have been a list of about twelve. One of my concerns was that we not
- be right next door to somebody else and make the competition more intense and the
- 184 comparisons more unfair.
- 185 **RINGROSE:** Now, it has always seemed to me that perhaps there was a certain parceling out
- of academic turf that went on in San Diego. Initially engineering seemed to be at San Diego
- State, and certainly teacher training is centered at San Diego State. Is that official, or did it just
- 188 happen?

- 189 **KERR:** There was an understanding, I think never written, that we would not begin competing
- 190 with them in what were their strongest areas, engineering being one, and that we would go in a
- somewhat different direction. In other words, they were being good friends to us, and whether
- they were or not, we really were interested in what was good for the area and for the state.
- There wasn't any point in running all-out competition with existing programs which were as good
- or better than we could start out with.
- 195 **RINGROSE:** Let's talk about some of the political figures that were involved in the
- 196 establishment of the campus, the people that were off campus, starting with the governor and
- some of the regents who seemed to have very strong opinions.
- 198 **KERR:** Well, with the governor, Pat Brown, we located the three new campuses in the three
- strongest Republican areas in the state, San Diego County, Orange County, and Santa Cruz.
- 200 **RINGROSE:** I hadn't thought about that, but you are right.
- 201 **KERR:** He, on occasion, would comment to me, as did his lieutenant governor, Glen Anderson,
- 202 "Why do you have to choose the strongest Republican areas in the state when there is a
- 203 Democratic governor, lieutenant governor, a Democratic legislature? "They would always do it
- very nicely. I might say that I cannot say that I was ever subjected to any pressure. I was
- subject to some questioning, and, you might say, some implication that it would be a little
- 206 friendlier if we chose locations more favorable to them. I would explain each time that we were
- trying to serve the long-run interests of the state. We were trying to stay away from geographical
- 208 competition with existing institutions.
- We were thinking of where it would be easiest to recruit faculty members. That was very high in
- 210 my mind. I always thought that Santa Cruz, with the hills and the seashore, that you could
- recruit a much better faculty there than you could for downtown San Jose. With Irvine close to
- the coast and the hills there and nice housing areas, and of course La Jolla and San Diego.
- 213 The general policy that we had, or I had, was that the University of California wanted to rank
- among the best universities, public or private. Previously the idea had been well, we want
- Berkeley to be competitive with Michigan among the state universities. My view was that we
- were competing with Harvard or Chicago, and that was true also when we got San Diego and
- the other new campuses. It wasn't just the competition with the other public universities, it was
- competition to be good within the totality of universities. And this meant that you had to have
- 219 areas where you could recruit good faculty and, if there was any one thing uppermost in my
- 220 mind, aside from where population was increasing, it was whether an area would attract faculty
- members of the quality that we wanted.
- 222 **RINGROSE:** So, the governor in general was supportive of the endeavor.
- 223 **KERR:** Yes, he was supportive. He was. I might say, he started out— Fred Dutton, who was one
- of his two chief assistants, started out along the line that the University of California was the
- wave of the past, and the state colleges were the wave of the future.

- 226 **RINGROSE:** What did he mean by that?
- 227 **KERR:** Well, that the university was an elitist place, and we were going into a more egalitarian
- age. He also said, "The University of California is a Republican's institution, the regents are
- 229 Republicans and the students who go there either are Republicans or become Republicans and
- 230 the state colleges draw their support from the Democratic side of society." Now, Fred later
- became a member of the Board of Regents. At first, he had a big impact on the governor and
- the first budget that Pat Brown gave us was a quite unfavorable budget. I was up in Sacramento
- 233 protesting to Pat and to Fred Dutton and to Bill Coblentz, who was his other major aid—oh,
- Warren Christopher was in there too. There were really the three of them. I protested about the
- budget and the Governor was open-minded enough. He dropped his commitment to make the
- state colleges into universities and he dropped his unfavorable budget. As a matter of fact, his
- budgets got more and more favorable and Pat Brown's period of governorship was one of the
- great periods in the history of the university, partly because of his support.
- Now, we made every effort we could to get him to each campus to see what we were doing, to
- 240 get him to come to regents' meetings. I would always postpone my president's report about
- 241 what was going on in the university until he would arrive. He. often arrived late. It was really
- impressive to him to listen to all the things that were happening in this great university. He also
- 243 went around the nation and other governors were asking him, "How do you have such a great
- university?" and he began to develop a very great pride in it. He realized what an asset it was to
- the state. So, Pat started out committed to the state colleges and ended up as one of the
- 246 greatest friends and supporters the University of California had in the history of the state of
- California. But with this hesitancy, this question, raised with a smile, "Why do you have to put
- the three new campuses in Republican territory?"
- 249 **RINGROSE:** Of course, you could always answer that you were going to bring new ideas to
- those areas.
- 251 **KERR:** Well, I couldn't really do that because I knew enough of the statistics to know that young
- 252 people who got an elite education tended to make a fair amount of money and tended to
- become Republicans. Now they tended to become liberal Republicans, but they tended to
- become Republicans. I was not able to say that we were trying to turn them into Democrats, and
- even if I had been able to say that I certainly wouldn't have. Now, the legislature, of course, that
- 256 was a different matter. Higher education was in the process of booming all over the United
- 257 States during that period. There were legislative suggestions for campuses all over the state.
- 258 Just before we began working on the master plan a man by the name of Donnely, who was the
- 259 head of the Assembly Committee on Education, got a state college located in the town of
- 260 Turlock.
- 261 **RINGROSE:** That is in the far Thules.
- 262 **KERR:** Turlock is famous as being the turkey capital of the world but not the academic capital of
- the world. I just give that as an illustration. Every crossroads had planned for a college. The
- legislators wanted us in any area we wanted to go into, but they wanted us in their area, not

- 265 someplace else. One of the reasons for the master plan was that increasingly the legislature 266 was taking over control of higher education as they had done in the case of Turlock. I thought 267 that higher education ought to be determined by other than strictly political principles, and one of the purposes of the master plan was to take it out of politics and have the decisions essentially 268 269 made by academic people. That is what did happen, incidentally, out of the master plan. So, the 270 legislators were just all over the place. They were generally favorable to new campuses, but 271 each wanted it in his particular territory. The same way with the citizens. You know we had bids 272 from all over the state of California for new campuses of the university, absolutely every place. 273 Now, I know that once the campuses got there, there tended, sometimes, to be problems in the community, but when they didn't have a campus of the University of California, they wanted 274 275 one.
- 276 **RINGROSE:** My sense is that there was a great deal of backing in San Diego.
- 277 **KERR:** In San Diego there was a lot of backing. Now, one thing we did when we decided to go 278 into each of the areas was organize the alumni of the university, set up committees of alumni in each area. For example, Jim Archer was the leader down here. He pulled together other alumni, 279 280 mostly from Berkeley. They really became our citizens' committee. The same thing was true at Irvine and Santa Cruz. I very early set up faculty advisory committees from the existing 281 282 campuses to give advice and to bring faculty interest and support— Also, these committees 283 became the initial academic senate. Now, San Diego already had faculty, so it was rather 284 different, but in the case of Santa Cruz and Irvine there were senate committees established to 285 get the senate idea going there from the very beginning. They established the traditions of the 286 university and the involvement of faculty in making decisions. So, we used existing faculty and 287 existing alumni as the basis for the campuses.
- 288 **RINGROSE:** Now, down here in San Diego, did these alumni groups, the people that were working with Archer, believe that they were working toward a full-service campus?
- KERR: I never raised that with them, because by the time I got them in that issue had already been decided. It was going to be full-service. They favored the full-service. They wanted a law school, a medical school. I never heard anything except support for the idea of the big campus from them. Now, there was opposition—
- 294 **RINGROSE**: Internally?
- KERR: Internally? No, no but externally, and in dealing with the city council—after all we were bargaining altogether for twelve hundred acres from the city, and you don't ask for twelve
- 297 hundred acres if you are going to set up an Institute for Science and Technology.
- 298 **RINGROSE:** I have noticed that you were always very careful not to ask for too much. You 299 never let the campus get greedy.
- KERR: No. Once this campus wanted to have a plan for forty thousand. You may know about that. I said no. I had battles with all the campuses that way. They all wanted to plan to have a hundred thousand students someday. That wasn't in the cards, and it wasn't wise. You see

- 303 there was also, you might say in the background, this is all very complicated, there was once a
- 304 plan to have all of this massive number of students go to Berkeley and UCLA, and I kept
- 305 arguing that it would be better to have more campuses around the state which were smaller
- than to have two monstrosities. Ed Pauley once asked, when I was talking about the new
- campuses and asking to have a reasonable size set on them, we had to have an eventual size
- when we talked about land, he said, "How many people can be held in the Memorial Stadium in
- Berkeley?" Eighty-three thousand. And so, he said, "I move that we plan the campus for 83,000
- 310 because I think that every student ought to be able to see the football games."
- 311 And I said "We're going to serve the state better by having more locations and having each
- campus have its own separate personality. Also, we'll be better situated for the people of the
- 313 State to know what we're doing for the State than if they concentrate on two big campuses."
- 314 **RINGROSE:** Now, this must also be the same time that the community college movement was
- 315 getting underway.
- 316 **KERR:** Yes.
- 317 **RINGROSE:** So, there must also have been people who suggested that the answer was two
- 318 years of local education and then....
- 319 **KERR:** Let me say that the university totally supported the community colleges. There had been
- 320 a liaison committee between the university and the state colleges. I sat on the sidelines and
- watched them operate. It was one versus one. Nothing could ever be decided. That wouldn't
- work. When I went into the master plan, I knew one on one wouldn't work because you couldn't
- 323 get a majority and so I first thought, let's bring in the community colleges, which makes a third.
- Then I thought, let's bring in the private institutions, which makes a fourth, and they have got an
- interest in it as well. We brought the private colleges in very heavily. We can say that the
- relationships between public and private institutions in California are better than anyplace else,
- partly because we did that. So, we had to break this stalemate of one versus one. We had to
- 328 bring in somebody else, and so we brought in two other partners and had the four segments
- 329 involved.
- Now, we were in the process of trying to protect the elite status of the University of California.
- 331 As a matter of fact, in the master plan we raised entrance standards far beyond what any public
- institution had ever done. At the same time, I was fully conscious that there were great
- egalitarian pressures developing in the United States and in California. We went absolutely all
- out to support the community colleges in spreading throughout the state. This state was the first
- 335 geographical government in the history of the world to guarantee that every single high school
- 336 student in the state could find a place at a community college. We had guarantee of universal
- access. Then we also put in that their transfers would have number one priority for getting into
- the University of California, so you couldn't say we were putting them in a dead-end place. They
- 339 could move on.

- We were concerned about another part of this problem. I had to break the stalemate of one on
- one. I also had to be involved in making it possible for a state university to operate at the
- 342 highest level in the competition with Harvard and Chicago and Columbia and not be pushed
- down by the egalitarian pressures. So, we wanted the community colleges to spread
- 344 everywhere and to give access and then, of course, we also made provision in the master plan
- 345 for the state colleges to become somewhat more selective. This opened up more opportunity for
- the community colleges. The state colleges took about the top fifty or sixty percent and they
- were bound to the top one third. But then students could go to a community college, transfer to
- a state college and then to the university. Opportunity was never to be closed off. It was
- supposed to be open for people to show what they could do at several stages of their lives. It
- was a very complex thing putting that all together, and I must say that when we got through with
- 351 it, it was adopted unanimously by the State Board of Education which then ran the state
- 352 colleges. It was adopted unanimously by the Board of Regents, and with only one dissenting
- vote out of 120 in the Assembly and the Senate of the State of California put together. I raised
- the question of a master plan at my second meeting as president in August 1958 and we had it
- ready in the spring of 1960. This is now 1984.
- 356 **RINGROSE:** So that is twenty-six years, and it is still valid.
- 357 **KERR:** Yes, it still holds.
- 358 **RINGROSE:** That is a wonderful track record for something like that.
- 359 **KERR:** Yes, well you see in the absence of a master plan we could not plan. If the state
- 360 college... For example, who was going to get the medical schools? Who was going to get the
- law schools? Nobody could plan. They couldn't and we couldn't and the whole thing was falling
- into the hands of the politicians who were fighting over who gets this and who gets that.
- 363 **RINGROSE**: What kind of professional schools did you originally envision for the San Diego
- 364 campus?
- 365 **KERR:** The full range.
- 366 **RINGROSE:** Did you feel that you had support for that internally, or did you feel that the
- 367 campus would have to work for that support?
- 368 **KERR:** The regents always agreed with that idea. The community always agreed. There was
- internal opposition, let me say, here, in San Diego, within the existing faculty. You see the
- existing faculty was accustomed to Scripps. That was the faculty we started with. Now, Scripps
- is really post-Ph.D., post doctorate. I remember coming down here to an early meeting and I
- was talking about making this a general research university and not a specialized one.
- 373 Somebody stood up and said, "Why are you forcing us to take undergraduates? Why are you
- forcing us to take M.A. candidates? Why are you forcing us to take Ph.D. 's? Let those run-of-
- the-mill Ph.D. candidates go to San Diego State and let us concentrate on the post-doctorates."
- 376 He said this to applause. So, there was opposition, not from Roger Revelle, though Roger was
- the one who proposed this Institute for Science and Technology, not from Roger but from a lot

- of the existing faculty, opposition to the idea of having a broad university and then also
- 379 particularly to having professional schools. They were looked down upon as some-thing low. I
- 380 remember at another faculty meeting some faculty member got up and said, "You are trying to
- make us just another Harvard. We are never going to sink so low." That was in reference to
- undergraduate teaching and the professional schools.
- 383 **RINGROSE:** This must have been in the height of the period when really serious faculty just
- were not interested in being involved in teaching.
- 385 **KERR:** Well, they were riding extremely high, the ablest faculties across the country, right then.
- We had had sputnik and the tremendous emphasis on scientific research. We had this huge
- tidal wave of students. They knew they could get jobs anyplace. After all, Scripps was a little
- jewel. It was the greatest center in the world for oceanographic research and areas growing out
- of that. But I can see how the people–I was really always sympathetic to their point of view
- 390 given what they had. They had this beautiful little world of their own. They all knew each other.
- 391 And here, somebody was coming in from the outside and saying, "Your world is going to be
- 392 changed. It is going to become bigger. It is going to become more diverse than it has been." I
- 393 would argue that in the long run better research would be done if there was more cross-
- fertilization among fields than if there was more narrow specialization. I have always been
- 395 extremely critical of the Russian system of a National Academy of Science unconnected with
- teaching, little specialty by little specialty, and clearly, they have not been as productive as we
- have. The French have somewhat the same system, in fact the Russians got it from the French.
- 398 So, I would argue that it would be a better intellectual atmosphere for your work. But it did
- 399 change their community.
- 400 **RINGROSE**: And their style of operation because
- 401 **KERR:** Yes, it was very informal.
- 402 **RINGROSE:** Yes, and also you are free to go out on the boat and do your research.
- 403 **KERR:** And you didn't have any classes to meet.
- 404 **RINGROSE:** With undergraduates suddenly, you are tied to classes and schedules and
- 405 quarters and leaves—
- 406 **KERR:** You know, there was just a real feeling about it. As I think I said to you earlier, I have
- said several times jokingly to myself that I had better be there on the first day that an
- 408 undergraduate comes on the campus to see that he isn't shot. The feeling was really quite
- strong at that time. That is a gross exaggeration, but there was the feeling—. But I had to look at
- 410 it from the point of view of, the total university and the state as a whole, and that San Diego
- deserved, and some day was going to have a general research university. It was better that it be
- done then and at the highest level of quality that we could get.
- 413 **RINGROSE:** I think the long-term result of this has been that Scripps remains somewhat
- 414 isolated.

- 415 **KERR:** Yes, that's right.
- 416 **RINGROSE:** It really isn't the core of the campus. Perhaps that wasn't intended from the
- 417 beginning.
- 418 **KERR:** It was never intended. It was always intended that they would be able to live, to the
- extent they wanted to, their individual lives. But I am certain that some of them made friends up
- here on the mesa. Some of the people up here on the mesa have gone down there and seen
- 421 some of their work. It is a richer intellectual and also cultural environment than it would
- 422 otherwise have been for Scripps.
- 423 **RINGROSE:** Talk about the college structure as you envisioned it here on this campus.
- 424 **KERR:** Well, I favored an approach of decentralization particularly of those things which
- involved human contact. You realize that a lot of impersonal things like budgets and figures
- 426 have to be centralized, but otherwise it is important to decentralize as far as possible the human
- contact into smaller communities. I also felt that in a smaller community you would have more
- 428 contact with people across fields, a multidisciplinary impact. At Santa Cruz we went ahead with
- 429 colleges that were supposed to run about seven hundred and fifty. The plan here was for
- twenty-five hundred. I might say that Roger and I talked about this, but he really came up with
- the plan for San Diego which I accepted with enthusiasm because it was along the same lines
- that I had been thinking which was smaller units than a massive campus. I had lived through
- Berkeley. I had seen the anonymity of it. I had seen how faculty members didn't get to know
- each other. The first year that I gave the reception for retiring faculty members I assumed that
- they would all know each other, they had all been around for twenty or thirty years, and I found
- that somebody in geology had never met somebody in the next building in engineering. So, I
- was very much interested in having these smaller communities and one of my themes was to
- 438 make the University of California seem smaller to the individual student and faculty member
- even as it became bigger in total size. We did that at Santa Cruz where Dean McHenry and I
- jointly developed the plans. Roger really developed the plan here, which was entirely
- compatible. It was different from Santa Cruz but entirely compatible with what I had in mind. He
- 442 just told me, and I said fine. We never debated or disagreed about it. I adopted it with
- 443 enthusiasm.
- Then, of course, I had to go to the board because we were doing things differently. I quickly
- convinced the board that these new campuses, if they were just going to be overflows from
- Berkeley and UCLA, or, as once suggested, "satellites" that was a term that was used at
- 447 UCLA you couldn't get the faculty you wanted, you couldn't attract the students. We wanted
- each campus to have its own individual personality. Each one would be different. The regents
- picked that up very guickly. I had more difficulty with the Senate committees working on it and
- 450 not quite seeing, and I might say to a certain extent they were right, how these new approaches
- 451 would work as well as what was the tried and standard approach that they were accustomed to.
- 452 **RINGROSE:** Well, a structure based on strong departments is traditional.

- KERR: I know, and that is what has happened both at Santa Cruz and here in San Diego, that
- 454 the departments have increasingly taken over. I still think, however, it was better to start each
- 455 place off with its own—

[END OF PART ONE, BEGIN PART TWO]

- 456 **RINGROSE:** We were talking about the college system, and you said that you thought that
- new campuses were better off having their own personalities.
- 458 **KERR:** Yes. The new campuses were better off having their new personalities. When I was
- chancellor at Berkeley before the statewide administration was making any plans for the tidal
- 460 wave, we decided that we didn't want to go over 27,500 students. I had gone through endless
- discussions with the faculty on that. We knew something had to happen and we did a certain
- 462 amount of planning about a satellite campus in West Oakland or on the Gill tract which is near
- Berkeley. We all came to the conclusion that we didn't want to recruit faculty members for a
- 464 satellite campus, and we didn't want to accept students at a satellite campus feeling they were
- second class. So, that was burned into my soul. To give the new campuses a fair chance they
- had to have some sense of independence and individuality from the very beginning. San Diego
- 467 was San Diego, not overflow for UCLA, etc. As I have said, the regents accepted this really
- 468 without debate, this differentiation. I tried very hard to differentiate UCLA and Berkeley. That
- was more difficult but also somewhat successful. You don't have the same "watching each
- other." We worked out some different specialties for UCLA than Berkeley had and so on. So, it
- wasn't just for the new campuses. Santa Barbara had to get its own personality, and Davis its
- own personality. The regents accepted that. The faculty members were the ones who were
- doubtful whether it would work. They were about two-thirds right as it has turned out.
- 474 **RINGROSE:** Well, as you were saying earlier, the faculty in the University of California is
- extremely strong. It makes it a difficult unit to administer.
- 476 **KERR:** Well, not difficult to administer. The faculty is very, very strong. I came out of the
- 477 academic senate myself, and when I was chancellor at Berkeley one of the common phrases
- 478 was that it was almost impossible to find out where the Senate ended and the chancellor's office
- began, we worked so closely together. But the faculty does have a lot to say, and faculty
- 480 members tend to think about the standard pattern that they have been trained in and
- accustomed to and they think that is the one and only way.
- 482 **RINGROSE:** It is very difficult for them to change.
- 483 **KERR:** Yes, it is very difficult. And it may turn out to have been impossible, but it is still better to
- 484 have made the effort than not.
- 485 **RINGROSE:** Herb York made an interesting comment when I interviewed him. We were
- 486 talking about the role of the chancellor on the new campus, which really should have been very
- 487 exciting, and he rather wistfully said, "You know, the kinds of decisions the faculty let me make
- were how many parking spaces to have and how wide to paint the lines."

- 489 **KERR:** That is right.
- 490 **RINGROSE**: Obviously early on this was a very strong faculty and it made its own decisions.
- 491 **KERR:** That is right.
- 492 **RINGROSE**: And you were happy to have it that way?
- KERR: I was not only happy to have it that way, I really started every campus with a little senate
- 494 in the University of California model.
- 495 **RINGROSE**: The other thing that I think is characteristic of this campus, and probably not
- 496 unique is that the faculty was built from the top down.
- 497 **KERR:** Yes. Now that was a very wise idea, incidentally, and it was Roger Revelle's idea. Again,
- 498 I agreed with it completely from the beginning. It was possible to get started at the graduate
- 499 level. Remember there was this post-doctoral feeling in the minds of people already. You can
- start a campus at the Ph.D. level with a single department, just Chemistry. When you start
- serving undergraduates, you have to have pretty nearly a full range of faculty. So, he started
- recruiting people in individual departments at the full professor level. Now, I made available, and
- this caused me lots of trouble everywhere else in the university, except not with the Board of
- Regents, more overscale appointments here than any place else. There were very few new
- appointments at overscale anywhere else in the university. There were overscale professors
- 506 who had been promoted up the line at UCLA and Berkeley, but—
- 507 **RINGROSE:** You don't usually come in at overscale.
- 508 **KERR:** No, but here we did make arrangements to give Roger— Of course, every case had to
- 509 be judged on its merit. We gave him a substantial number of overscale full professor
- 510 appointments. That was at a time when Irvine and Santa Cruz were recruiting assistant
- 511 professors or associate professors. That caused me a lot of trouble at UCLA, Irvine, Santa Cruz,
- Berkeley, at all the campuses. Santa Barbara, Davis, Riverside. It was because we were
- 513 building this to be the third great research university inside the total University of California.
- Roger was terrific at recruitment. He got people that warranted this. Also, compared with the
- other two new campuses, there was the fact that Scripps was already here, and a certain
- 516 number of scientists were here, and the attraction of the San Diego area. San Diego was
- 517 certainly given a better opportunity to start off than many other new endeavors of the sixties
- across the country. I don't know, there may have been close to a thousand new institutions
- established. San Diego was given a better chance than any place else in the country, in some
- 520 ways almost a better chance than ever in American history. Now, Chicago was given, with the
- Rockefeller money, a very, very good opportunity, but they didn't have anything to go on, you
- see. Here there was Scripps to go on and the reputation of the University of California. Stanford
- started off with Stanford money, but nothing else. So, we had here a very attractive community,
- 524 San Diego. We had La Jolla at the highest level. We had the good reputation of the University of
- 525 California. We had a somewhat unique plan and then I made available all these overscale
- 526 appointments. That was a combination which couldn't fail.

- 527 **RINGROSE:** Would you say that this has been the most successful of the sixty's campuses?
- 528 **KERR:** Oh, clearly. I would say that of new campuses in American history, campuses that
- started from scratch, and then got into the first rank very quickly, there really are only three, and
- they are the ones we have been talking about. Chicago very quickly made it. Stanford very
- 531 quickly made it · and San Diego. You might add Johns Hopkins, although that took a little bit
- 532 longer to do. You know Berkeley took a long time and Harvard and Yale and Wisconsin took a
- long time. I guess I would add Johns Hopkins in as a fourth, but not so instantaneously. You
- see, the other campuses, their view was that I was showing favoritism to San Diego. My view
- was that I was showing special treatment, but because the situation was very special. That is
- 536 just a different way of saying the same thing. A different perspective. The way I say it, special
- treatment well-deserved, makes it sound good. Favoritism makes the same thing sound
- 538 somehow unfair.
- 539 **RINGROSE:** It seems to me that in some people's eyes the long-term plan was to have
- Berkeley and UCLA and then a group of other campuses.
- 541 **KERR:** With the others given a chance to rise over a period of time.
- 542 **RINGROSE:** But then there is also another possible scenario that is the north, middle, south
- scenario that would have Berkeley, UCLA, San Diego and then a lower tier group.
- KERR: Well, both ways are true—three great research campuses distributed around the state.
- 545 There was more sense in putting research here than at Irvine. Also, with UCLA, it would have
- been much more difficult to make Irvine the third with the opposition of UCLA, some regents,
- and the faculty. It would have been the same way with Santa Cruz.
- 548 **RINGROSE:** The second scenario makes special treatment for San Diego make sense, but it
- 549 also requires that Irvine and Santa Cruz—
- 550 **KERR:**—have to wait a while. Well, Santa Cruz had its own special plan. Once it was more
- attractive than Berkeley to students. It still has the highest verbal scores of any of the
- 552 campuses. We did add Lick observatory to it to give it something special. And Irvine was given
- this chance to be a rather ill-defined idea, the land grant model for the twentieth century. It never
- really did develop as I hoped it would—the kind of sense of service to a modern industrial
- society that the land grant model implied. We did things for Santa Barbara. We gave them study
- abroad, for example, and we gave them an engineering school that has developed quite well.
- Davis was just really asked to keep on being the best agricultural place, center for agricultural
- study, in the United States and perhaps in the world. San Francisco moved up tremendously.
- When I became president, it was about 25th or 30th, and now it is in anybody's top four or
- perhaps top three. Also, there were some dreams there that didn't come true. The idea there
- was to be not a medical center but a university that concentrated on the total care of human
- beings. Some of that did get done, bringing in those aspects of city and regional planning which
- affect health. And they did add some anthropologists to do comparative studies of what is a
- healthy environment to live in. They were all given some opportunity to look forward to, to

- distinguish themselves within the university and the nation. San Diego was given, by all odds,
- the best opportunity.
- 567 **RINGROSE**: This same model for San Diego as a third research university, I assume this is
- 568 what made John Galbraith so sensitive to the library issue, which I gather became—
- 569 **KERR:** About the library issue, there never really was that much of a difference in my mind as I
- think there was in John's mind. He took that extremely seriously.
- 571 **RINGROSE:** That was his baby.
- KERR: Yes, I know. We agreed from the beginning that the San Diego library would grow faster
- 573 than the other two and I had all kinds of antagonistic criticism from Irvine and Santa Cruz for
- 574 having it grow faster. It did grow a lot faster. John was very impatient. He wanted results very
- 575 quickly. There were limits to what I could do compared to Berkeley and UCLA, not just with the
- 576 faculty but with the regents, getting the money out of Sacramento. But I never disagreed with
- 577 him about this being the third big library. The grounds I used to justify it to the other campuses
- were that it was farther removed than, say, Irvine or Riverside, from Los Angeles or Santa Cruz
- or Davis or San Francisco from Berkeley. What we did there was set up daily bus services for
- 580 each of them.
- Then John got extremely upset at this suggested delay of one month on presenting plans for the
- new library building to the regents. I only asked for it because of his design which was an
- unusual one. When this came up, I was already involved in all the problems of the student
- movement, the FSM etc. on top of running a big university and under intense political attack all
- over the state and at the beginnings of the attacks within the Board of Regents. I wanted a great
- library here. There was no question of that. I had fought the battles for it. If anybody fought
- battles for it, I did. It was easy enough for John to say he wanted it, but I was the one who had
- to get the money and get the regents to approve and faculties elsewhere to not rebel. I did ask
- for a one-month postponement so that I could talk with him about the design for the library and
- its location. I had a guestion that I wanted to raise with him, not opposition. I wondered whether
- the design was best, this Corbusier thing where you kind of give away your first floor and the
- 592 winds tend to— I have been in Corbusier type buildings in many places around the world and
- they tend to become wind tunnels. I had a concern about that. I wondered also whether the
- library was located close enough to the center of the campus.
- Well, anyway I was concerned about location and about the first two floors of the Corbusier
- design. I just asked for one month's postponement. Then John, to my regret, became very
- angry about it and I think saw in it more than was ever there. I just really had at least what I
- thought were very legitimate concerns and I asked for one month so that I could get a chance to
- talk with him and I was not then situated to do so and so I asked Elmo Morgan (I should have
- called myself) but I asked Elmo to call John and say that wanted to talk with him and wanted to
- 601 put it on the next agenda, not this agenda. I never knew exactly what Elmo said, but I gather
- 602 Elmo did it in a way that made John even more unhappy.

- I might just say on that issue I was in no way holding up the San Diego campus. I was point
- 604 man for the San Diego campus out there fighting faculties on other campuses. There was some
- 605 hesitancy, especially on the part of Southern California regents identified with UCLA and in the
- legislature, there was favoritism, too. I was the point man for the Campus. I asked for one month
- to have a chance to talk with him personally and he got very unhappy and resigned temporarily.
- 608 He withdrew that.
- There was one other big problem with John. The original plan for the medical school called for a
- school costing twenty-five or thirty million dollars and John brought in plans that cost one
- 611 hundred and twenty million, something like that. I wanted some time to study those. The
- meeting on the library took place in San Francisco. The one on the medical school took place at
- 613 Irvine. I was having tremendous difficulty with the Board because the campus— I had gone to
- the Board and I had gone to the Governor and I had gone to the legislature with a medical
- school that was to cost twenty-five million and all of a sudden, I was asked to find a hundred
- and twenty-five million.
- 617 **RINGROSE:** You can't keep your credibility that way.
- 618 **KERR:** With a jump that big, I wanted to take another look at it. And John, I know, looked upon
- that as an unfriendly act. As a matter of fact, if I had moved immediately to accept that figure,
- there never would have been a medical school here because people would have felt that they
- had been just terribly misled.
- 622 **RINGROSE:** Wasn't there also some controversy over the type of medical school that was
- 623 planned here?
- 624 **KERR:** Yes, there was a controversy over whether it was to be a research-oriented medical
- school or was also to be of service to the community.
- 626 **RINGROSE**: And this all is involved with the issue of hospitals and clinical education.
- 627 **KERR:** That is correct. It is tied up with Scripps Hospital and... There were a lot of problems.
- And there again I wanted a little bit of time and John, I think quite understandably, wanted to
- move a little faster than I was able to move. But I can just tell you that if I had not asked for
- some time to study it and told the regents we were going to study it; they might very well have
- 631 just right out of hand— or when it hit the Governor or legislature with a figure five times as large
- as they were expecting, they might just as well have said that they had been terribly misled and
- that was the end of that.
- 634 **RINGROSE:** Since we were talking about the regents and we skipped ahead a little bit, could
- 635 we go back and talk about Regent Pauley and some of the individuals, some of the political
- interconnections which we will probably never really work out completely, between people like
- 637 Boyd and Pauley?
- 638 **KERR:** Pauley, for a reason, or reasons I never understood, was very antagonistic to the San
- 639 Diego effort. He was personally very antagonistic to Roger Revelle. He carried with him the

- support of several of the southern regents. Others beyond that, Catherine Hearst on one
- occasion was quite violent, I never knew why, also about San Diego and about Roger. And
- Pauley, I can't say that he really— He caused an awful lot of controversy. He always kept
- raising the question about noise from the air base. He wanted us to look at other locations like
- Balboa Park, which was an impossibility. This went on, it seems like forever. My guess is that he
- was raising objections to this campus at every meeting over a period of two or three years. Now,
- I might exaggerate it because it seemed like it was just endless. I don't know whether, in the
- end, it delayed the campus or not. It certainly made it much more difficult getting it underway in
- 648 that atmosphere. I did not think that his objections were well taken. I did not agree with him on
- the merits of his objections at all, but he made us go through all kinds of studies of feasibility,
- etc. Why he did it, I don't know. I don't think it was the air base. I don't think it was Balboa.
- He also kept harping on the fact that Roger and some of his friends had bought some property
- in the area. I was always guite convinced that Roger had done it before the prices rose so that
- other faculty people who came in would not have to pay exorbitant prices for the land.
- 654 He found all kinds of things to object to and made it very personal against Roger and to some
- extent personal against me. I was already in battles with him. He had been chairman of the
- board and was the senior regent and he wanted to be the permanent regent as Dixon had been,
- his predecessor.
- 658 **RINGROSE:** I think I don't understand what you mean by the permanent regent.
- 659 **KERR:** The permanent chairman as Dixon had been. I got the regents to vote that we would turn
- over the chairmanship every two years. That is a big argument on both sides.
- 661 **RINGROSE**: I see. That wouldn't make you very popular with him.
- 662 **KERR:** No, and he is a man who is very oriented toward power. He also had a view that the
- senior regent, whether chairman or not, could veto various things. The tradition of the Board had
- been that nobody could do anything that the senior regent wanted to veto. There was a terrible
- battle over an honorary degree for a professor at Berkeley who was dying of cancer and had
- earned the degree but who had been the major opponent to the oath. The famous case was
- Tolman vs. the Board of Regents. I came in proposing an honorary degree for Tolman as a
- 668 psychologist. To Pauley that was a treasonable idea. He tried to exercise his veto as the senior
- regent on that. This had always been that no honorary degree could be given if the senior
- 670 regent opposed it. I got the Board to vote that honorary degrees would be given on the basis of
- a secret ballot with a two-third majority. He resented that terribly.
- 672 Likewise, I think he had expected me to be a more pliant president, less independent than I
- turned out to be. There were a lot of reasons why he expected that. He, of course, was a
- 674 powerful man. The Los Angeles Rams, you know, once belonged to him. He was important in
- the Democratic party.
- 676 **RINGROSE:** I wasn't aware he was a Democrat.

- 677 **KERR:** He felt much more that the president –he had terrible problems with my predecessor,
- Robert Gordon Sproul, whom he fought at every regents meeting he never treated me
- disrespectfully, he fought me. But he had treated Sproul disrespectfully over the six years I sat
- on the sidelines as a chancellor. So, I never knew... He didn't fight about Irvine. He didn't fight
- about Santa Cruz. Why did he fight about San Diego? I don't know.
- 682 **RINGROSE:** It also seems, when I look at it from the historical material that is left at this end,
- that he seems to have had excellent political pipelines into San Diego so that when he went
- after something, he got heavy coverage in the press. This is why I hadn't realized he was a
- Democrat. I had never really thought too much about his personal political affiliation. I always
- assumed he was a Republican because he got such good conservative backing down here.
- 687 **KERR:** No, no, he was a conservative Democrat.
- 688 RINGROSE: Of course, I think one of the problems for John Galbraith was that once he
- 689 resigned, he became the hero of a very conservative kind of constituency down here and that
- was not a very comfortable position for him at all.
- KERR: No, with Bob Biron and some other people who, in my judgment, were Birchers.
- 692 **RINGROSE:** He clearly was very eager to get out of that situation.
- 693 **KERR:** He moved out very fast. My impression is that some of the faculty members encouraged
- 694 him very strongly to change his position if he wanted to have their continued support. Some
- faculty members pretty much laid down the law to John.
- 696 **RINGROSE:** I can believe that the faculty here could do that.
- 697 **KERR:** Yes. If he wanted their support, he had to withdraw his resignation and support me and
- 698 not be part of this right-wing opposition to me that had developed with Pauley's leadership at all
- 699 times.
- 700 **RINGROSE:** It does seem to have centered on Pauley.
- 701 **KERR:** John Canaday was also heavily involved, and, to some extent, Phil Boyd.
- 702 **RINGROSE**: That is a very interesting phenomenon, and one that I really haven't gotten to the
- 703 roots of.
- 704 **KERR:** There are quite a few reasons why the right wing should be opposed to me, including
- reasons within the San Diego community. La Jolla was a place that restricted access to minority
- 706 groups including Jews. This was true, I might say, also of the Irvine Corporation. In both cases I
- 707 had to make it absolutely clear that the University of California would never move into a
- 708 community which had any restriction on religious or racial grounds. That was an underground
- thing which spread very widely in the conservative and landowning community.

- 710 **RINGROSE:** It was a serious problem here, but one that people are very reluctant to discuss.
- 711 **KERR:** Yes, but it was a much more serious problem in 1960.
- 712 **RINGROSE:** I meant in the past. It was a very serious problem here at that time. Now, today,
- 713 people are still reluctant to discuss it.
- 714 **KERR:** It was a factor. It was a big factor. There was a time when Dan Aldrich thought I had lost
- 715 him his campus at Irvine because I told the Irvine Land Company people that they had to
- remove, on all that acreage they owned, these exclusionary—there is a special name for them.
- 717 **RINGROSE:** It is a kind of covenanting, isn't it?
- 718 **KERR:** That's right. They had to remove all their covenants, or we would not move in, and they
- said they wouldn't do it, and Dan took me out and said, "You have just lost me my campus." And
- 720 I said, "Dan, I just won it for you. because they are going to cave in. You can never build a
- 721 campus under those circumstances."
- 722 **RINGROSE:** There is a community, a very old faculty community that is just north of the
- Scripps campus that is built on land that belonged to the Scripps family and was pretty much
- 724 used for Scripps faculty.
- 725 **KERR:** Yes, I am familiar with that.
- 726 **RINGROSE**: Is this connected with the problem we have been discussing? Was it started to
- serve Scripps faculty at a time when the area was restricted?
- 728 **KERR:** Yes, in that restricted area. That community was not at all exclusionary.
- 729 **RINGROSE:** I understand that. Did Roger Revelle establish that community in order to provide
- 730 available housing that would not exclude anyone?
- 731 **KERR:** I don't know. I assumed that was one of the reasons for it. I never asked. The problems
- we had were with La Jolla most specifically and San Diego more generally on these
- 733 exclusionary practices. It was something that never got into the press or was commented on,
- but it was a basic factor. It was wrong, what they wanted. Aside from that, you couldn't develop
- 735 a great university under those conditions.
- 736 **RINGROSE:** No, it is very difficult.
- 737 **KERR:** It is impossible. Of course, later Federal law and court decisions changed all that but,
- 738 you see, nobody could then say I was taking my position because of the law and therefore it
- personal. There are many other reasons why the right wing was upset with me.
- 740 **RINGROSE:** By this time there was difficulty with the students at Berkeley.

- 741 **KERR:** That's right. They blamed that on me, that my more moderate policies had been
- responsible. You see the rules of the university when I became president, were that no
- controversial person could speak on the campus. When I was chancellor, twice Adlai Stevenson
- spoke from Oxford Street. He was not allowed to set foot on the campus because he was a
- controversial speaker. He was controversial because he was running for public office. The
- 746 public office was the Presidency of the United States. When I became president, one of my first
- 747 actions was to change that and say that people of all persuasions could speak on campus, and
- somebody found a special rule that Communists couldn't. It took me several years to change
- that, but I got it changed. It became a state issue. When Nixon ran for Governor in 1962, in
- opposition to what I had done, he said that when he became Governor, he was going to issue
- an executive order to the university saying that it had to go back to the old rules.
- 752 **RINGROSE**: Reagan made a lot of hay on that issue too, didn't he?
- 753 **KERR:** Yes. I had to tell the press that if a Governor were to issue such an executive order, we
- would study it carefully, but then we would stand on our constitutional independence. We would
- do what was best for the university and that was to allow all points of view to be expressed. So,
- there were various reasons. I had made ROTC, which had always been compulsory, voluntary. I
- required that fraternities and sororities could not discriminate on the basis of race and sex if they
- 758 wanted to keep the name of the university. There were a lot of reasons why the right wing was
- unhappy. Pauley was the leader of that, with John Canaday and Phil Boyd and a few others
- within the Board of Regents.
- 761 **RINGROSE:** The people down here were also just scared to death that some of the kinds of
- problems that existed at Berkeley would emerge on this campus, and, indeed, eventually that
- 763 happened.
- 764 **KERR:** It was a nationwide, a worldwide phenomenon.
- 765 **RINGROSE:** Right, but of course it can't happen in La Jolla. Not our young people.
- 766 **KERR:** That's right. So, anyway, John fell in, temporarily, with that group, not meaning to at all. I
- think he was repulsed by it.
- 768 **RINGROSE:** Why don't you give me an idea of what the general atmosphere was like in the
- 769 early 60's nationally when the campus was started.
- 770 **KERR:** Well, the planning for the University of California expansion really began in 1957 when I
- was appointed as president, and then went on through the period to about the middle sixties. By
- that time, the plans were made. Of course, there was the very heavy birthrate. The net
- reproduction rate then was 3.5%. It has now dropped down to 1.7 or 1.8%, but 3.5% was a very
- high level and people were making their projections. California was in the process of taking in,
- aside from the high birth rate in the state, taking in people from outside the state, half a million
- people a year. So, it looked as if this was the westward tilt of the continent, to California. Aside
- from the growth of the nation and particularly of California, it was a period of optimism generally

- then. We had gone through Eisenhower, and a period of good feeling. We came to JFK and the
- 779 New Frontier. Anything was possible.
- We were then the great military power of the world. We were then the great economic power of
- the world. We also had become the intellectual center of the world. For so long we had been an
- offshoot of Europe and our scholarship was derivative and imitative and now, all of a sudden,
- we were the intellectual capital of the world. There was generally a feeling of hope and
- expectation that anything was possible. It was within that atmosphere, particularly in science,
- that new knowledge was going to lead us to this better world. You could do whatever you
- 786 wanted to, and you could do it better with knowledge and science. It was a kind of euphoric
- period for the American people and for higher education even more than the American people
- as a whole. Plans were made within that atmosphere. And so, some of the things at San Diego
- which went beyond the plans we approved, like having a campus of, say forty thousand rather
- than hold it down to twenty-seven five, and having a campus that was not held down to the
- standards of Harvard, etc., were sort of expressions of that period of fast advance, building a
- new world, and everybody wanted to be part of it and their institution was going to lead.
- 793 **RINGROSE**: Alexander's master plan (the master plan for the San Diego campus) certainly
- 794 reflects that.
- 795 **KERR:** Yes. It was beyond anything– If anybody was the author of planning for the University of
- California I certainly was, with the master plan, the campus physical plans, campus academic
- 797 plans that I had begun as chancellor and then had carried through the whole university. Plans
- ought to be made only as far as you can see ahead. That plan, and the idea of having forty
- thousand students, went beyond anything that was going to happen within the future that
- anyone could see. I thought it was excessive. We never did adopt it.
- 801 **RINGROSE**: So, those things were generated locally?
- 802 **KERR:** Yes, they were generated locally. Well, I'm not sure the Alexander plan was. The regents
- probably asked for it but the campus would have asked the regents to ask for it.
- 804 **RINGROSE:** But somebody must have told him to plan for a campus of forty thousand.
- 805 **KERR:** That I just don't know. I just say that there was his plan which was not feasible within any
- 806 advanced period that anybody could contemplate, and we didn't want to go that far. We had
- made that decision when we had decided not to let Berkeley become as big as Ohio State or
- 808 Michigan State or Michigan or Minnesota. We wanted to have institutions that, while they were
- big, didn't keep on growing forever and become monstrous. So, the Alexander Plan was not
- made effective, and the forty thousand figure was not accepted. But they were within the temper
- of the times.
- 812 **RINGROSE**: Why was the naming of the San Diego campus such a volatile issue? It seems so
- 813 insignificant.

- KERR: It was a volatile issue in the La Jolla community because it had always been the Scripps
- Institution, La Jolla. The campus was to be in La Jolla and La Jolla was very proud of its name
- and wanted to attach a university with a worldwide reputation.to it. However other people might
- have felt, I never felt that was a possibility. We were, after all, dealing with a city council of San
- Diego to give us 1200 of the choicest acres in the world and they were not going to give it to
- anything called La Jolla. Aside from that, we were building a campus for the southern part, not
- iust for San Diego and San Diego County, but for the southern part of the state. To name it after
- what was, literally, then a village, had, to me, no justification.
- 822 It was just a question of how to handle the local protests. That was mostly handled by Roger
- Revelle. There was some debate within the Board of Regents, let me say, about that, but I
- never had any sense that I would have any difficulty over the name University of California, San
- Diego within the board. In other words, it was a temporary obstacle to be gotten around and not
- 826 a barrier.
- 827 **RINGROSE:** Given everything that Roger Revelle did for the campus, obviously people on the
- 828 campus still puzzle that he never was named chancellor of the campus. Our first official
- 829 chancellor was Herb York. Were you involved in that selection?
- 830 KERR: Yes.
- 831 **RINGROSE:** Would you talk about that a bit?
- 832 **KERR:** First, on Herb York, he had been a professor at Berkeley, and he had also been the
- director of what became the Lawrence Livermore Laboratory. He had also been, by that time,
- assistant secretary of defense for research. The regents had a great deal of confidence in him.
- 835 We faced a huge investment of money and Herb looked like a person who had handled big
- 836 problems and big budgets and big construction projects. Herb was not happy in the job and
- asked to be relieved of it. One of the sad days was when he came to see me and told me that
- he just couldn't take it any longer and for me to get him out as fast as I could.
- On Roger, one of the difficult moments of my life was when I had to tell Roger that he would not
- be the chancellor. He dreamed about this campus. He put a lot into it. He used to come up here
- on the ridge on a moonlit evening and think what the campus would look like when it was built.
- He told me he had been promised by my predecessor, Robert Gordon Sproul, that he would be
- head of whatever this institute was. You see, the title chancellor only belonged to UCLA and
- Berkeley when I became president. I extended it to the other operations. But Sproul had
- promised him that he would be head of this new enterprise. I had to tell Roger what was going
- to happen. I might say that within the administration of the university there were only two of us,
- maybe I would want to qualify that if I thought about it, who had broad intellectual interests. I
- think I did, and I know Roger did have intellectual interests. So, we had more in common than
- two administrators normally would have.
- 850 The regents would not accept Roger. To go through a prolonged battle to make him chancellor
- would have been bad for the campus. Pauley was totally opposed to him. Pauley carried with

- him some other regents. He was a very dynamic, powerful person. In those days he carried with
- him Ed Carter, who later broke away from him. But I must say, Carter, in those days, was doing
- anything that Ed Pauley said for him to do. Catherine Hearst followed along with him, as did
- John Canaday. There was quite a group. To try to make Roger chancellor would have held up
- the development of the campus. It would have been a long battle. The regents would not have
- accepted him.
- 858 Partly it was Pauley's opposition, but there really was some concern among other regents about
- the wisdom of his having bought up property in the area. Among those who liked Roger and
- believed him, there were those who worried about the political wisdom of it, while not distrusting
- his motives, which I never did. I always thought that his motives were of the very highest. But it
- showed lack of political wisdom.
- 863 **RINGROSE:** He certainly wasn't alone in doing that.
- 864 **KERR:** No, he certainly wasn't alone in it.
- 865 **RINGROSE**: Many people connected with the campus were—
- 866 **KERR:** I know that perfectly well. Roger was a fantastic recruiter. He was less good at managing
- the campus, getting budgets in on time, having them carefully thought out, developing plans for
- the campus. Roger was a leader. There was a question in the minds of some of the regents who
- liked him and admired him about whether he would be the kind of a manager it took to make the
- budgets, run the large bureaucracy, build the buildings, build the bureaucracy. He was not a
- bureaucrat at all. He would come back from a trip at midnight, call his secretary and work until
- morning. It was not the type of business approach that the regents were accustomed to. Roger
- had no support, and, in fact, some opposition from the other chancellors. He was very arrogant
- about San Diego in relationship to UCLA and to Berkeley and to the other campuses. I had to
- carry the responsibility for making the decisions that favored San Diego, his comments—

[END OF PART TWO, BEGIN PART THREE]

- The other chancellors gave him no support, and I am sure, in talking with the regents, probably
- quite the contrary. Likewise, there was a question—he had had this terrible battle with Jonas
- 878 Salk.
- 879 **RINGROSE:** Right. I have wondered how much that hurt him.
- KERR: Roger, in the course of that battle, antagonized some people like Jim Archer and some
- of the other local people who wanted the Salk Institute. There is one chap, I forget his name
- now, who had given a lot of money in connection with the Salk- he was very much involved in
- the Salk interests in— Anyway, he was a prominent alumnus here and prominent in town—
- They very much wanted Salk here and Roger didn't want to give up the right to that piece of
- land. There were times when I was down here when Roger and Salk would almost fight each
- other physically. I remember one time in Jim Archer's house I had Roger in one bedroom and

Salk in another so they wouldn't get into a physical fight, yelling at each other, and I was going back and forth talking with them.

889 I really worked out for the Salk Institute. I hoped they would be closer with the campus and become closer than they did in fact. I thought it would be an advantage to have that talent that 890 close by. I was really the one who worked out making this land available to them rather than 891 892 claiming it belonged to us. The regents agreed with me that we should give up whatever claims we had to that beautiful piece of property in favor of having the Salk people come in. We wanted 893 to see a general environment of intellectual endeavor not just the campus by itself. We thought 894 we would add to it. So, that turned off— The regents got involved in it, some of them, and the 895 896 local community. Roger had some other disagreements with La Jolla and with the city council. 897 The regents developed doubts that he could handle— You see, he was so involved personally 898 in this campus. He felt so personally strongly about it, so attached to the ideals he had. The regents developed doubts as to whether or not he would be diplomatic in how he handled it. 899 900 They heard from the chancellors that he was not diplomatic in dealing with them. They heard it 901 from Salk, and Salk had some very high-powered supporters and from the local community. So, the regents would not have approved him. There would have been a bitter fight over it, which 902 903 would have held up the development of the campus.

So, I never took his name to the regents to be turned down and fought over. I told him that he was not to be the chancellor. Both of us were very sad. It was a very sad affair. Then we brought in Herb York with the experience he had and the confidence the regents had in him to move the campus along. Now, Roger made a tremendous investment central to the ideas of the campus. He got together a core of faculty that was really superb. The question I had to face is was it better for the campus to move to somebody else than Roger, though he had done what he had done, somebody else who would be more on the managerial side to carry it through with less controversy. What was better for the long-run future of San Diego? The cost was to Roger. It was, in a minor way, also to me in having to tell him that. I could easily have taken it to the Board and had a vote against him, which would have been public, and not taken the responsibility myself.

- 915 **RINGROSE:** It was probably much easier on him this way.
- 916 **KERR:** Easier on him?

904

905 906

907

908

909

910

911

912913

914

- 917 **RINGROSE:** Yes, and harder on you.
- KERR: Harder on me, but, hopefully, easier on him in the long run. Then I came in that the first college on the campus should be named after him. I developed a job, which never interested
- 920 him very much, being statewide dean of research and development. Then he went off to
- Harvard. Those are some of the tough decisions that you have to make.
- 922 I had to make a decision to drop Ray Allen who had been brought down from the University of
- 923 Washington with the promise he would be Sproul's successor as president. The regents, when it
- was all over, chose me unanimously. He hadn't a single vote. I was the new man. a young

- 925 faculty member brought in as chancellor with a man who had been the president of a big
- 926 university. Then, beyond that, I had to go to him and tell him, after he had been turned down as
- 927 president, that I thought UCLA would progress faster under some other leadership. It wasn't as
- though Roger was the only tough one, I had to deal with. And UCLA did progress better under
- 929 Frank Murphy than it would have under Ray Allen. The question is, if I had been interested in
- 930 surviving, and I didn't survive, I could have survived a lot easier if I had been interested in
- 931 managing what existed. I could have done that. But it was a very special time in the history of
- the United States and the history of the University of California and unusual things could be
- done. I decided to try to do the best I could by Berkeley, and Berkeley did get rated ahead of
- Harvard. There were some tough decisions there, removing department chairmen, and a lot of
- other things. And UCLA and San Diego and elsewhere took advantage of that particular time. I
- 936 was sophisticated enough to know that I would someday pay the consequences, and one day I
- 937 did. They were greater than I had expected and harsher than I expected, but I did pay the
- 938 consequences.
- 939 **RINGROSE:** One of the things that seems to me, looking at the materials in the archive, is that
- you positioned people on the campuses in order to be able to move them into managerial roles.
- Am I right that you essentially sent Galbraith and Tschirge down here? Nobody ever says that,
- but when I read the papers, it crawls right out.
- 943 **KERR:** I was always looking around all the time for talent. I would try people out on something.
- John, for example, had been chairman of a senate committee advising Irvine and had done an
- extremely good job. I have tremendous respect for him. I tried him out, not necessarily thinking
- of San Diego at the time, I was just thinking that here was a person that would be a good
- 947 campus head.
- 948 **RINGROSE**: You sent him down here to get some experience.
- 949 **KERR:** In the same way Ivan Hinderaker was vice chancellor at Irvine and became chancellor at
- 950 Riverside and there were other people
- 951 **RINGROSE:** So, this is more a matter of recognizing talent and then putting it in a place where
- 952 it can develop rather than trying to put people onto the campus that could act as your agents.
- 953 **KERR:** Yes. There was no case of anyone acting as my agent. Well, after all I had been the
- author of decentralization of the university. I had been chancellor under a centralized
- 955 administration. I cut the statewide administration from 1,000 to 250 people when I was
- 956 president. As the university was more than doubling in size and in its most active period, starting
- new campuses. So, I wasn't in the business of assigning anybody to be my agent on campus.
- 958 That wouldn't work anyway, with— It would be a crazy idea.
- 959 **RINGROSE:** When Reagan was elected in 1966, funds for the university system were
- 960 severely cut. What was the impact of this for this campus?
- 961 **KERR:** The first budget he came in with cut the state support for the university maybe thirty or
- 962 forty million. I have forgotten which it was. I think it was forty million. from two-hundred and thirty

963 million to a hundred and ninety. This was a sum of money which the university, in those days. 964 would notice. Actually, that money was restored. There was private understanding that he had with some of the regents that if they got him a president who would be more cooperative with 965 him-I had several battles with him, not just one, several with him. It was clear I was not going to 966 967 be subservient to the governor. I had never been subservient to anybody. We also, at that time, 968 did not know how much Reagan places an emphasis on being a team player, as has been shown. I presume he felt that way then and I was not on the governor's team. I was on the 969 970 university's team. He privately told the regents that if he could get a more cooperative president, 971 he would restore that money. So, the money was restored.

972 However, he later gave a series of unfriendly budgets. Charlie Hitch, who was my successor, and was one of my vice presidents, in his last year as president said that during that period of 973 time when he was president and Reagan was governor, the real resources per student at the 974 University of California had been cut by twenty percent. That went far beyond anything that 975 976 happened during the great Depression. The remarkable thing is how well the university survived 977 it. If somebody had told me, when I was fired, that the man who fired me was going to cut the 978 resources of the university by twenty percent in real terms per student, I would have thought, my 979 god, that is going to be just terrible. Actually, the university survived it. Now, Jerry Brown's worst 980 budget was as good as Reagan's best budget, but it didn't make up for what had been lost 981 under Reagan. So, Brown, sort of accepted what Reagan left to him, and did not improve on it. 982 This meant that there were sixteen years of budgets which were not what the university 983 deserved, given its distinction and the need to keep up with the competition. The miracle is that 984 the university came out of those sixteen years as strong as it did. One thing that helped it was that lots of other places around the country were having trouble too with their states and with 985 their governors and with private giving during the seventies, which was a bad decade with 986 OPEC and recessions and depressions. It indicates that the university was an extremely strong 987 organization. It had very great loyalty from its faculty members who stayed with it during that 988

RINGROSE: What is your larger vision for the University of California at this point? How do you think UCSD fits into this larger structure?

989

990

991

992

993 994

995

996

997

998

999

1000

1001

1002

1003

period of time.

KERR: Well, the University of California system is clearly the best university system in the nation. Berkeley still gets rated number one, which I might say is incredible to people in the Ivy League. UCLA is now in the top ten. San Diego is moving up fast. So is Davis and Santa Barbara. Irvine, of the new campuses established since World War II, is sort of tied with the prestige campus of the State University of New York at Stonybrook as the most successful. So, it is the best system. I think it is also the best governed system. Generally, systems are not well governed. There is much more trouble than within this particular system, decentralized as it is. California is not gaining in population as it once did, but it is still a pretty prosperous state and is gaining in population. Our education faces at least fifteen difficult years as the size of the age cohort goes down almost twenty-five percent by 1997.

There are bound to be some economic readjustments with the budget deficit and trade deficit and all the rest of that. There will be some tough years for the University of California, but I

- would expect that on a comparative basis, by the year 2000, it will be ranking even higher as a total university system, and San Diego in particular, than it does today.
- 1006 **RINGROSE:** I want to thank you very much. It has been an honor to talk to you, and I have certainly enjoyed it very much.

[END OF PART THREE, END OF INTERVIEW]