

Excerpted from

CLARK KERR

THE
GOLD
AND THE
BLUE

A PERSONAL MEMOIR OF THE
UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA,
1949-1967



VOLUME TWO

Political Turmoil

©2003 by the Regents of the University of California. All rights reserved. May not be copied or reused without express written permission of the publisher.

[click here to](#)
BUY THIS BOOK

Politicizing the Ivory Tower

Colleges and universities over the centuries have been looked upon as ivory towers—remote from the turmoil of the surrounding world, a place for study and contemplation, a refuge for young persons to learn and mature before entering the real world of conflicts and temptations, a sanctuary for thought, a shelter against greed and other worldly concerns, an asylum from control by establishment authorities and thus a vantage point from which to criticize those authorities.

This vision was not always an accurate one. Universities did not escape the conflicts between royalists and parliamentarians in seventeenth-century England, or the religious battles during the Thirty Years' War in Germany, or the Napoleonic revolution in France. Historically, however, a veil of ignorance did mostly conceal universities from public scrutiny. Only in the twentieth century has this veil ripped apart, have universities been so consistently on the frontlines of social change and controversy, and so subject to public scrutiny, perhaps particularly in the state of California and especially at the University of California.

I try to set forth below some of the context, as I saw it, within which the University of California and other American research universities had to operate in the middle of the twentieth century. This context was, I thought, especially coercive. I sketch out this context, I fully realize, with a very broad brush.

For a historical view of the middle of the twentieth century as a context for universities as compared with earlier periods, see my essay "Shock Wave II: An Introduction to the Twenty-First Century."¹ I there suggest that the midcentury period that constituted "Shock Wave I" subjected American universities to unusual pressures to change their behavior. I go on to predict that the period following the advent of a new millennium may include another one.

■

Shock Wave I

Five external events fundamentally affected the University of California during the mid-twentieth-century period of Shock Wave I. They also affected all other American research universities, usually to a lesser extent. They were

- the Communist political and military challenges to capitalism and democracy, involving American universities in political controversies over alleged subversive activities
- the related advent of high-technology militarization, calling on universities for new research emphases
- the intensified speed of industrialization around the world, changing the nature of much of the labor force and creating a demand for occupationally focused university training
- a demographic engulfment of higher education, tripling enrollments from 1960 to 1975. (This resulted from a very high birthrate after World War II and the simultaneous advent of universal access to higher education. California was particularly affected because of the westward drift of the American population.)
- a tidal wave of human liberation for oppressed populations, drawing university students and faculty into its wake

Universities became integrated into the web of societal struggles as seldom before.

In the nineteenth century, American higher education was challenged by the advent of the German model, which introduced research into what had been almost solely teaching institutions. It was further challenged by the introduction of the land-grant model, which introduced university service to production elements of society. But these had come one at a time with long periods of adaptation. Suddenly there were five such challenges within a short period of time, roughly 1945 to 1970. Thus Shock Wave I. Five maelstroms to steer through all at once. The strains on the institutions were enormous: greater public fear of Communist subversion on campus, more secret research, the larger size of student bodies and the formation of critical masses for political disruption, the greater ascendancy of science, and related resentment of faculty in the humanities, and so on. Too many challenges, all at the same time and they exacerbated one another. Trouble was endemic and became epidemic.

THE COMMUNIST THREAT

The Communist challenge to democracy began with the rise of the U.S.S.R. at the end of World War I. An early Communist scare in the United States followed immediately. It was revived in the 1930s with the growth of the trade union movement, small segments of which were partially and temporarily under Communist leadership, and with Communist infiltration into the popular media, particularly the motion picture industry.

California and New York City were particularly affected. The International Longshoremen's and Warehousemen's Union (ILWU) came under Communist influence and one result was the San Francisco General Strike of 1934. Hollywood was also said to be infiltrated by Communists, both as writers and as participants in motion picture films. Ronald Reagan first came to public attention as an anti-Communist trade union leader in the motion picture industry.

Students and professors at Berkeley and UCLA were implicated in 1930s radicalism by a state legislative committee (the Tenney committee) that accused them of supporting Communist activities in the trade union movement and in Hollywood.

After World War II and the advent of the Cold War, the Communist challenge was taken especially seriously. One result was the loyalty oath controversy between faculty and regents within the University of California; another was the investigations by the new California State Senate Committee on Un-American Activities (the Burns committee), which paid particular attention to the University of California. The university administration had tried to fend off political involvement by establishing in the 1930s what became the controversial Rule 17, which spelled out conditions and limits under which students could engage in political activities that used the university's name and facilities. Yet the contests over Rule 17 ended up increasing rather than reducing political involvement.

It turned out, despite the intense fears, that Communist infiltration into the United States and California was minuscule. Public and governmental reactions were quite out of proportion.

THE MILITARY-INDUSTRIAL-SCIENTIFIC COMPLEX

The movement of military endeavors into industrial activity began during World War I with the production of tanks and machine guns. World War II,

however, brought the great intrusion of military activity into the universities, particularly with the development of the atomic bomb. The University of California was not affected by World War I except for the military enlistment of male students. It was, however, greatly changed by World War II, along with other federally financed research universities, especially MIT and the University of Chicago. On the Berkeley campus, work on the atom led to the establishment of the Lawrence Radiation Laboratory on the hill above Berkeley and later to university laboratories at Livermore and Los Alamos, New Mexico. These facilities conducted classified military research, which had never before been so greatly introduced into university activities.

After World War II came the Cold War that divided the world on a bipolar basis. The Soviet success with Sputnik in 1957 was a shock to America. And university scientists, already involved in the Cold War, intensified their efforts.

Both the U.S. and the U.S.S.R. created massive military-industrial-scientific complexes. The American competitive scientific system was based on its many universities and proved to be superior to the Russian series of governmentally controlled monopolies. Soviet science was carried out in the Academy of Sciences, its specialized institutes, and other government agencies, not in autonomous competitive universities. American universities through their superiority helped to win the hot war with Germany and Japan, and then the Cold War with Russia.

The University of California led this effort with two great research campuses—Berkeley and UCLA, joined by the Scripps Institution of Oceanography in San Diego, and with the three federal laboratories—at Berkeley, Livermore, and Los Alamos. The University of California became the leading military contractor among American universities and thus a particularly active participant in the Cold War.² California corporations, at the same time, became the nation's leading military contractors, with twice the proportion of the state's labor force involved than the national average.

Science, especially physics and chemistry, became the center of regental attention within the University of California as elsewhere, thus lowering the comparative status of the humanities as well as that of the less quantitative pursuits in the social sciences. Together, the downgraded areas included a substantial proportion of faculty within the Academic Senate. Two cultures, separate and unequal, were born.

An ambience of suspicion developed on the Berkeley campus, first and particularly involving scientists participating in the Oppenheimer case.³ It spread

within the Board of Regents with the loyalty oath controversy and among the state's legislators, where the Senate Un-American Activities Committee became increasingly prominent. No political conflict among scientists in the United States was ever more bitter than the Oppenheimer case. No board of trustees was ever more embroiled in dissension with its faculties than the Board of Regents of the University of California in the loyalty oath controversy. No state un-American activities committee was ever more active and endured longer than the one in California.

The federal government, for only the second time in American history, became a dominant player in American university life. The first time was with the development of the land-grant movement in the 1860s. And, as I found out as I participated in public forums all over the state, the public began to view the university as changing the world and not always for the better, as with the atomic bomb and later with DNA potentially subject to manipulation. I began to get questions about where university scientists were taking this new world and whether they were now playing God or, perhaps, the devil. I was surprised at how rapidly science was being viewed not as the great savior as in World War II but as a potential gravedigger with its "mad scientists."

Federal support of science for military purposes quickly spread after World War II to other spheres of science, particularly health, but also much else. The teaching university became predominantly the research university.

ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT

The increasing drive for economic development had a big impact on universities everywhere. I know of no good study of the consequences of economic development on higher education, but there is a close connection. The first universities in the Western world arose in Italy at the time of the rise of the city-states based on commerce and finance with their requirements for lawyers and accountants. As populations within the larger towns and cities grew more affluent, a new demand arose for teachers and medical doctors. These demands intensified with the movement from commercial to industrial economies. New occupations were created, such as engineering and management, that demanded ever higher levels of skills and thus more advanced training. Universities became increasingly active participants in economic growth.

A similar process was taking place all around the world. By the end of World War II, most nations were becoming industrialized and thus more competi-

tive with one another—the start of globalization. I was coauthor of a book (1960) that began by saying,

The world is entering a new age—the age of total industrialization. Some countries are far along the road; many more are just beginning the journey. But everywhere, at a faster or slower pace, the peoples of the world are on the march toward industrialism. They are launched on a long course that is certain to change their communities into new and vastly different societies whose forms cannot yet be clearly foreseen. The twentieth century is a century of enormous and profound and worldwide transformation.⁴

Successful industrialization brought progress to national economic systems; and, for the U.S. and the U.S.S.R., industrialization became basic to their comparative military and political supremacy. Industrialization also brought increasing family affluence, and higher education became a consumption good as well as a production necessity.

The United States, as a leader in industrialization, became the world's dominant economic power in the twentieth century, requiring a great upsurge in college graduates to supply engineers, managers, laboratory technicians, and other skilled personnel. Long past was the time when higher education was essential only to the practice of the ancient professions of teaching, law, theology, and medicine.

California, once highly agricultural, became a leading industrial state, and it ushered in the electronic revolution. It became the most populous state, at one point growing at the rate of half a million people each year. As a consequence, California's higher education system expanded vastly, leading, in turn, to the 1960 Master Plan for Higher Education and to growth in programs that met the need for an enlarged industrial labor force—for more “human capital.”

DEMOGRAPHIC CHANGES—UNIVERSAL ACCESS TO HIGHER EDUCATION

California's industrialization and its resultant population growth brought about a great increase in the number of university students. In addition, the number of children born in the United States each year almost doubled from the mid 1930s to the late 1950s, with the number of children per family rising from 2.3 in 1933 to 3.7 in 1957. This was also the period when access to higher education became increasingly universal. The period of elite access ended with

the Civil War. The land-grant movement and then the development of junior colleges ushered in a period of mass access. The GI Bill of Rights after World War II introduced a period of universal access. One half of the GIs enrolled as students came from families where no one ever before had gone to college.

Between 1958 and 1966, the University of California doubled in student numbers. It grew in that eight-year period as much as in the prior one hundred years. It built three new campuses and refocused the missions of four existing campuses, producing increased intercampus competition. Berkeley, although still the leader, suddenly went from being the only UC campus of any distinction to being one among nine—each with its own sense of rising importance. Expansion also led to decentralizing the University of California administration, and to consequent battles over the degrees and forms of decentralization.

THE HUMAN LIBERATION MOVEMENT

What I identify as the greatest ever worldwide movement of human liberation for formerly oppressed populations and individuals also had its repercussions within the University of California. I realize that I now engage in speculation that there was one interrelated wave of liberation after World War II instead of a whole series of unrelated incidents. But I see them as tied together, at least through inspiration and imitation, and commonly encouraged by rising world levels of education and mass communications. There was not, however, a single across-the-board liberation movement. It was, rather, a series of more or less simultaneous emancipations from old restrictions on individual freedoms. It was variously anticolonial, anticapitalist, antisexist, antiracist, anti-Western, and anti-adult authority. It was followed, at least in the United States, by a right-wing liberation movement against taxes, governmental controls, and social legislation. It was mostly, however, a leftist-oriented liberation movement of dramatic power that was followed by a somewhat similar rightist movement of lesser dimensions. It was inevitable that university students would at some point join in this vast reformation, and they did. Liberty, at least temporarily, was triumphant over equality and fraternity—great revolutionary themes of earlier times.

As I see it, this modern wave of liberation began after World War II with an explosion of national independence movements across the globe aimed at throwing off colonial control first in India, Pakistan, Malaysia, Ghana, and

the Philippines, followed by French Indochina, Tunisia and Algeria, and China. In addition to the original fifty-one (1945), sixty-six new nations became members of the United Nations in the subsequent twenty years. Some of the transfers of power were peaceful and some violent, and as these transfers went on, many were increasingly supported by the U.S.S.R., or supported by the U.S. Many of these independence movements, as in Cuba, were powered by student groups.

Successful struggles against colonialism inspired others who felt themselves oppressed, including women, ethnic and racial and religious minorities, and even students under adult authority. Of course, there had been earlier explosions of nationalism and of democratic sentiment, as beginning with the American and French revolutions. There were also other periods of human liberation, such as the rise of Christianity within the Roman Empire, peasant revolts in England in the fourteenth century, the Reformation, the events of 1848 in Europe, the antislavery movement and the attempt to secure the vote for women in the nineteenth-century United States, and the ascension of trade union movements. But nothing was so worldwide and so pervasive as the ferment after World War II. Its central theme was the empowerment of individuals and of suppressed groups against external domination by other individuals and groups, as well as against constraining customs and beliefs. It emerged as a cultural revolution against all forms of domination. The Old Left had an economic agenda—labor versus capital. Now the agenda of the New Left had broadened its base, going beyond varying forms of socialism and communism.

This worldwide movement of liberation had many university-related aftermaths:

the temporary rise of Cuba and, later, China, as models for the revolt of the “wretched of the earth,” and of Fidel Castro, Ché Guevara, and Mao Tse-tung as heroes for university youth

the rise of the civil rights movement in the United States, of the counter-culture, and of the student movement across America

American students’ demand to end in loco parentis attitudes and controls on campus, to adopt “participatory democracy” (from the Students for a Democratic Society [SDS]) and to reject a “sandbox” approach to the role of student governments—participating in the world’s events and not being confined to campus concerns

POSTMODERNITY

I am inclined to add, but hesitantly, a sixth impact: the rise of a series of intellectual concerns that have come to be identified under the heading of “post-modernity”:

an emphasis on the negative consequences of science and technology, including the new means of warfare

an attack on the overemphasis on the material aspects of life, as contrasted with the ethical and aesthetic

recognition of the Enlightenment’s neglect of the undersides of human nature

a loss of faith in eternal progress and a surge in the public sense of apprehension about the future

the increasing division of society into smaller and smaller identity groups

opposition to accelerating building of “iron cages” of rules—to the “programmed society”

a rejection of the convictions of the eighteenth-century Enlightenment

David Harvey has written,

Whether or not the Enlightenment project was doomed from the start to plunge us into a Kafkaesque world, whether or not it was bound to lead to Auschwitz and Hiroshima, and whether it has any power left to inform and inspire contemporary thought and action, are crucial questions. There are those, like Habermas, who continue to support the project, albeit with a strong dose of scepticism over aims, a lot of anguishing over the relation between means and ends, and a certain pessimism as to the possibility of realizing such a project under contemporary economic and political conditions. And then there are those—and this is, as we shall see, the core of postmodernist philosophical thought—who insist that we should, in the name of human emancipation, abandon the Enlightenment project entirely. Which position we take depends upon how we explain the “dark side” of our recent history and the degree to which we attribute it to the defects of Enlightenment reason rather than to a lack of its proper application.⁵

The student movements of the United States and Europe in the 1960s expressed some of these postmodern themes. Some of their leaders may be looked upon either as among the originators of this mentality or at least early con-

verts. The Port Huron statement of the Students for a Democratic Society in 1962 had some similar themes:⁶

looking uncomfortably at the world we inherit
 the Cold War and the bomb
 the decline of an era
 we may be the last generation in the experiment of living
 deeply felt animosities
 values . . . devalued and corrupted
 the horrors of the twentieth century
 man . . . a thing to be manipulated
 depersonalization [that] reduces human beings to the status of things
 loneliness, estrangement, isolation describe the vast distance between man
 and man
 the idolatrous worship of things

The Port Huron statement may be read as an early document in the post-modernity movement that has engaged increasing numbers of students and faculty members, particularly in the arts and humanities, sociology, philosophy, and anthropology. A new mentality may be challenging the Enlightenment orientation that has ruled for two centuries and more. Is it really happening? Were student leaders of the 1960s early prophets along with some of their teachers? Or is postmodernity just an inchoate fancy? If some students were prophets of postmodernity, they may also turn out to be gravediggers of the modern university if large segments of the university should agree with them, since universities have been the main instrument of the Enlightenment in spreading rationality and science, and in developing technology. Then these students might eventually reduce public support enough to really close down universities, as the Free Speech Movement said it wanted to do with the university at Berkeley in 1964.

The University Reacts

Coping with these five or perhaps six great external impacts taken together has left imprints on the University of California, among them:

- the efforts of the university administration in the 1930s to forestall political involvement on campus
- the loyalty oath controversy in 1949–50, with divisions between and within the faculty and the regents
- the focus from 1941 until 1971 of a state legislature un-American activities committee on the University of California
- the introduction of military-related scientific research, with its security checks and suspicions of treason, within the University of California
- the rise of science to supreme status within the university's faculties, with a parallel decline of the humanities
- the enhancement of the overall role of the federal government in university affairs
- the rise of a radical left-wing student movement in American universities, including the events in fall 1964 at Berkeley
- the election of Ronald Reagan as governor in 1966

In the course of these major adjustments, the university became a quite changed institution. Changes included

the flight of faculty interest from undergraduate teaching to federally supported research and to graduate students

the growth of outside consulting activities by faculty members, and their resulting decreased attention to campus concerns

a more rapid advancement along the historical course of movement from elite to mass to universal access to higher education, as demonstrated in the California Master Plan

increased attention to admissions policies as tertiary education became more influential in determining the future life chances of individuals. Admission policy became a public issue for the Board of Regents, not just an academic agenda item for the Academic Senate

the explosion of enrollments in the University of California

a reorientation of student interests from liberal education and collegiate activities to vocational and professional interests with added attention particularly to engineering and business administration

the introduction of women's studies and ethnic studies into the curriculum

an increase in faculty members and students who have lost faith in modernity

Where once it had been viewed by many as a refuge from the worries and the evils of the world, these developments have placed the university in a position where critics, right and left, could charge it variously with supporting subversion or being a willing part of a huge war machine; with being a “factory” turning out “human capital” or supporting unfettered individual human aspirations and/or fundamental criticisms of modern society.

The university has responded by saying,

Subversion? The university engaged in no proved acts of treason but made many contributions to the vitality of the United States.

A war machine? Yes, but the result of the buildup was to help defeat both Hitler and Stalin.

An essential element of industrialization? Yes, but higher levels of human skills have led to higher levels of literacy and longevity, and perhaps of life satisfaction.

Human liberation? On balance, higher education has been a great force in the liberation of the human spirit.

Postmodernity? Possibly the university may engage more aggressively in constructive solutions to the negative aspects of modernity utilizing rational thought and science and technology.

These outside intrusions I have been discussing had obvious impacts on academic life: on disturbances in classrooms, on debates in the Academic Senate, on budgets from Sacramento, on the tenure of administrators. But the academic triumphs also had their own impacts on the political turmoil. As the university became more famous, it attracted attention to all of its activities and they became the subject of public comment. Activists of all kinds could gain more visibility if they could involve the university: radical students, ambitious politicians, and public commentators. As the university became more famous it also became more of a lure to able and aggressive students. In addition, a famous faculty gets involved in external controversies, as in building the atomic bomb. And as the University of California became the home of more famous faculty members, they withdrew from contact with undergraduates and turned more of their contacts over to junior faculty and to teaching assistants and thus reduced the sense of authority on campus. A teaching university tends to unite teachers and undergraduate students, a research university to disunite them. The transformation of the one type of university into

the other led to great successes but also to great failures. Political turmoil was inherent in the academic triumphs not only at Berkeley but also at Harvard, Chicago, and Columbia.

A PUZZLING QUESTION. Why have California and the University of California been comparatively so affected? California has been the fastest growing section of the nation and a state of increasingly diverse recent immigrants. It has been a society disproportionately composed of adventuresome, ambitious, mobile individuals, as well as of escapists. It has been at the center of the “western tilt” of American society. It has been a society in constant alteration. It has been disproportionately involved in national defense, industrialization, high technology, and in human liberation.

The state has had a volatile electorate that has moved from the progressive Republican Party of Hiram Johnson and Earl Warren to a conservative Republican Party of Richard Nixon and Ronald Reagan; that has shifted from a moderate Democratic governor (Edmund G. [“Pat”] Brown) to a conservative Republican (Ronald Reagan) to a countercultural Democrat (Edmund G. [“Jerry”] Brown) in the course of less than a decade. This volatility has been enhanced by a weak party system that has been a source of instability.

The biggest tilt in the political tectonic plates came in 1964 when the Republican Party in California shifted from the liberal Warren Republicans who had always supported the University of California to the conservative Reagan-Goldwater Republicans. The realization that an immense change was impending came to me and to many others the night of June 2, 1964, the date of the presidential Republican primary election in California between Barry Goldwater and Nelson Rockefeller. That evening, as the returns came in indicating that Goldwater (with Reagan’s support) was winning, I was attending a B’nai Brith dinner at a San Francisco hotel where I was to receive an award. There was shock and consternation all over that room, filled mostly with pro-Rockefeller supporters. “Impossible.” “Catastrophic.” “Los Angeles has taken over.” “What does it mean?” I knew instantly what it would mean for the University of California: progressive Republicans, who had been among our best supporters for a century, would no longer be in a position to assure support.

Nineteen sixty-four also began the loss of control of the legislature by pro-university agricultural forces. The recent “one-person one-vote” Supreme Court ruling meant that the rural counties and their long-term legislators,

strongly attached to the College of Agriculture and the University of California, would no longer control key committees.⁷ The university, for the first time in history, saw its bulletproof vest torn away.

California has become a politically divided state with a liberal tone in the San Francisco Bay Area and a more conservative ambience, although changing, in Orange and San Diego counties and the Central Valley. It is a state that has been variously symbolized by Jack London in Oakland and by John Wayne in Hollywood, by the ILWU and Harry Bridges in San Francisco, and by the union-busting Merchants and Manufacturers Association in Los Angeles.

In the midst of this discordant political history, California has had a very large, very visible, outstanding public university system with excellent students and faculty members—a university that developed a reputation for avant-garde political action at its two major campuses during the 1930s and the loyalty oath controversy after the end of World War II and then built on this reputation.

Most of all, as I have lived through some of the turmoil surrounding the University of California, I have observed that no other state except New York has experienced more examples of influence by the left than California: in Hollywood, in San Francisco on the waterfront and in the Haight-Ashbury district, and in Berkeley during the 1960s. Also, few states have seen more spectacular flourishes of influence by the right than California: the political successes of Richard Nixon and Ronald Reagan, the support given to the John Birch Society, and the attention given to the reports of the state Senate Committee on Un-American Activities. To understand modern California, however, it is more important to acknowledge the longer-run domination by the right than the shorter-run glimpses of the influence of the left in the second half of the twentieth century. And the University of California's Board of Regents has ruled supreme more often than the Academic Senate.

In sum, it has been a state with a dynamic and disjointed political community that was centered, to an unusual degree, around an autonomous, anarchic, audacious university, with the community and the university agitating each other.

FORMAL RESPONSES OF THE UNIVERSITY. The Board of Regents, the administration, and the Academic Senate of the University of California developed a variety of responses to these challenges. They were

opening up university facilities to political discussions and to political advocacy while not accepting Communists as faculty or staff members, and while fighting the Senate Committee on Un-American Activities

accepting federal research programs aggressively, while concentrating secret research “on the hill” at Berkeley, at Livermore, and at Los Alamos

helping to create the Master Plan for Higher Education to concentrate research on the campuses of the University of California, to turn the state colleges into polytechnic institutions, and to make places available to all high school graduates in community colleges

turning all of its campuses, old and new, into research universities, while trying to create a liberal arts and collegiate campus at Santa Cruz for those faculty members and students who might be attracted to it

setting a maximum size for the university’s campuses and decentralizing administration to offset the disadvantages of greatly increased total size

accepting multicultural and women’s studies and pushing outreach programs aggressively to acknowledge the importance of minorities and women

creating one of the world’s greatest library systems to support and encourage the otherwise comparatively neglected humanities and social sciences

THE LARGER PUZZLING QUESTION. Under such difficult circumstances, how did the University of California survive and prosper? All the above makes it sound as though the university in mid twentieth century lost substantial control over its own destiny, that it was being tossed around by external forces, no longer steering by its own compass alone. This is all true. It became more a plaything of the external environment. It was no longer an isolated ivory tower, if it ever had been. Now it was at the very center of society and of social turmoil.

Yet it did survive. How could this be? I offer these answers:

- The growing size and wealth of the state of California created resources to support a strong university.
- California, with its agreeable climate and its strong universities, was well situated to take advantage of the national shift to a knowledge (or, at least, an information) society.
- The autonomy of the Board of Regents partially protected the university from some of the state’s wilder political swings.

- The academic authority of the Academic Senate within the university greatly advanced the university's fundamental academic missions.
- The moderates in the regents and in the Academic Senate held control at some crucial times, as in December 1964.
- The university was unusually open to science and closed to anti-Semitism.
- The university as a whole benefited from having Berkeley as its nucleus, with its academic stature and its history of governance shared by the faculty.
- Aggressive leadership at many levels of the university served it well at crucial times in its history, as in 1900 with the rise of the American university, and as in the 1930s and 1940s with the rise of science.
- The California Master Plan for Higher Education concentrated resources for the advancement of knowledge on nine campuses of the University of California instead of scattering them among an eventually additional twenty-three campuses of the California State University system.
- The decentralization of the University of California gave chancellors executive authority and the responsibility for forward momentum on their campuses.
- The statewide administrative leadership gave "flagship status" to all University of California campuses.
- The policy of setting an enrollment cap on the size of any one University of California campus preserved more human-scale institutions.

EVALUATION. The University of California faced enormous assignments. When the adjustments to them were made,

The university had a much higher standing in the academic world than ever before. It was also of more service to the state of California and its productive activities.

Berkeley stood higher among universities nationally and worldwide but was now one of several distinguished campuses in the university and not the only one.

Faculty members had many more and better opportunities to develop their national and international reputations.

Graduate students were much better cared for and served.

Undergraduates were more neglected and some of them resented this, with good reason.

Administrators were more tormented by competing pressures.

Each of the campuses of the university has been affected by these developments. As I look back on how well or how badly the University of California has responded to the impacts of these developments, I award “highest honors” to

the support of science, initiated particularly under the presidency of Robert Gordon Sproul (1930–58), the subsequent rise of academic distinction across the academic spectrum, and the creation of one of the world’s best university library systems

successful handling of enrollment growth within the parameters of the Master Plan for Higher Education, involving the creation of three new UC campuses and the reorientation of missions on four existing campuses

“High honors” go to

the realization of decentralized governance, but sometimes too slowly

the liberalization of many policies, such as those making ROTC voluntary, providing the “open forum” for outside speakers eventually including Communists, starting an “equal opportunity” program for disadvantaged students, mandating nondiscrimination by fraternities and sororities, and introducing continuous tenure for the faculty

the promotion of the arts and of cultural programs on all campuses

the creation of a more rounded set of facilities for students that included residence halls, intramural sports fields, student centers, and undergraduate libraries

No honors go to

the lack of more expeditious and effective recognition of the need, within reasonable limits, to open up political “advocacy” opportunities on campus property to students in fall 1964

the absence of early understanding of the depth of Berkeley faculty reactions to the campus’s diminished role in the affairs of the university system

the late recognition of the intensity of the backlash against the student movement among conservative regents, alumni, faculty members, legislators, and elements of the public press

That the university survived and prospered, however, suggests that the successes more than offset the failures; more gold than black and blue.

The “Old” Berkeley and the “New”

The Berkeley of the 1930s and the Berkeley of the 1960s were two quite different places. The Berkeley of the 1930s was basically a teaching institution where faculty typically taught nine hours per week. Teachers regularly kept long office hours open to students. In my department, economics, office hours were held in a large open area in South Hall, the “bullpen.” Every faculty member had a desk there and was expected to be at this desk at least from 1:30 to 3:30 P.M. five days a week to meet students and to converse with other faculty members. Faculty members were quite conscious of their teaching reputations, on which promotions significantly depended. Teaching the large introductory course to undergraduates was the highest honor a department could confer.

Most, but not all faculty members, did some research but usually carried out this activity on weekends, vacations, and sabbaticals. Faculty social life was very active, with many teas and dinners to which graduate students were sometimes invited. Faculty members often attended student athletic events. It was a community of friends. Few faculty members traveled to the East Coast even once a year; the trip took four nights and three days by train. Robert Nisbet, in his *Teachers and Scholars*, has well described those years. I highly recommend this book. He strongly praised the “faculty for its commitment to teaching in the thirties.”⁸ And student life was mostly organized around the collegiate interests of the fraternities and sororities.

By the 1960s Berkeley, now a research university, was a different world. Teaching hours were being reduced by one half. There were many more teaching assistants to deal with introductory classes, freeing faculty time. There were 565 teaching assistants in 1953 and 1,430 in 1964—almost half of all teaching personnel by 1964 were teaching assistants.⁹ Teaching had become a “load.” Faculty members flew around the nation and the world to conferences and consultations. I began asking faculty colleagues two questions when meeting them after an interval, “Where are you just back from?” and “Where do you go next?”

Social life was much diminished, in part because spouses now had their own jobs and sets of friends. Fewer faculty members lived within walking distance of campus or of their colleagues. Living near the attractions of the campus had become more expensive. Departments were larger and more faculty members were devoted to their increasingly restricted specialties. The faculty had been partially polarized by the loyalty oath controversy of the early 1950s and by other political issues. Student leaders also were more organized around divisive political causes, although students more generally were more organized around their future careers. Many faculty members had outside sources of income, particularly from consultancies. The Board of Regents had become more an arena for political contests and less a guardian of campus autonomy.

Berkeley, both at the faculty and student levels, was no longer a single community but many. It had been a single-industry village—teaching. Now it was a city of great variety, more heavily devoted to research and service. *Mr. Chips* in his tweeds was now *The Man in the Grey Flannel Suit*. I tried to describe this shift in my 1963 Godkin lectures at Harvard. Unfortunately, many listeners or later readers thought I had invented—or was uncritically endorsing—the “multiversity” instead of merely describing the tremendous changes I had observed.¹⁰

The most obvious things that did not change—and still remain intact—are the central role of the budget (academic personnel) committee of the Academic Senate that has guarded faculty quality across the board, the conduct of the Cal Band that has epitomized campus spirit, and the intensity of the universal grievances about the lack of parking spaces.

The several external impacts that have been discussed in this chapter turned Alma Mater into Multiversity. And as such, it plays with politics and politics plays with it. The simple and cohesive and exclusive community of teachers and of collegiate-oriented students as it existed before the threat of Communist domination of world society, before the introduction of military-related research and of federally supported research more generally, or the industrialization of curriculum and faculty, of massive enrollment numbers, remains a memory cherished by some but no longer a practical alternative. I share the nostalgia of Robert Nisbet and members of his generation of which I was one and understand the romantic dreams of some modern students, including some of the FSM, for a campus community of close-knit friends engaged in collegiate activities or in surveying the world and its evils and wishing to set them

aright. But nostalgia is for the very old and dreams are for the very young, not for those navigating the swift-flowing currents of life.

Volume 1 of my memoirs of the University of California was about the creation and maintenance of academic triumphs. This second volume is about how the university protected these academic triumphs despite the actual impacts of great external challenges; of how it survived Shock Wave I; and of how it solved the mystery of how to make academic triumphs and political turmoil compatible with each other.

My Orientations toward Certain of These Developments

I shall in subsequent chapters discuss my reactions to some of the above challenges. Let me say here just the following:

COMMUNISM. I was totally opposed to communism—to its emphasis on total monopoly by one party over all political and economic life, and its reliance on force to assert its will. I voted to endorse the policy of the Board of Regents in 1949 against employment of Communists who were then undergoing the strict enforcement of the “party line” through the Cominform. I did not think that party members under these circumstances were free to be independent scholars. However, as chancellor and president, I refused to act against alleged Communists without full proof.

I did not think that communism was a threat to our internal democracy. I did think, however, that the Soviet Union was an external military threat and that the United States should be prepared to defend itself against this threat, and that the University of California should be prepared to help in that effort.

INDUSTRIALIZATION. I thought industrialization of economic life was inevitable and desirable, and that the university should be willing and even eager to train skilled personnel to advance it, and to engage in scientific research that supported it. However, I saw the sad impacts on undergraduate liberal education and on the humanities and tried to offset them.

UNIVERSAL ACCESS. I favored the movement toward universal access for all young people to higher education but wanted to assure that it would not overwhelm the highest level of training for the most able among them.

POLITICIZATION. I did not like the politicization of academic life that followed as one result of movement toward liberalization of social life although I basically favored its causes. Several of the related individual movements, however, used methods of politicization to advance their efforts. I felt that aggressive politicization disturbed both the desirable internal tranquillity of scholarly life and the public acceptance of academic institutions. I was repelled by my contact with such aggressive politicization in Latin America, Germany, and China and feared its replication in the United States.