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Campus Planning and Educational Context

The Cluster College Model

Gaining popularity in the 1960s, the cluster college concept was based on similar principles as the Garden City planning movement, which emerged in late nineteenth-century England. The ideal Garden City sought to solve the problems of the inner city by promoting green landscapes and areas for community repose. Applied to the university, the campus space would be organized according to smaller colleges, which were relatively self-sufficient units, but part of a greater whole. This way, as the campus grew, new clusters could be added without impacting the overall functioning of the campus. The surrounding environment and landscape were also heavily emphasized, as in the Garden City movement. This was also concurrent with an increased environmental awareness during this time period. Another fundamental aspect of the cluster college was the aspiration for students to develop independently and with freedom to develop their own curriculum. This utopian ideal was central to 1960s campus design, which was copied and broadened at other universities throughout the nation.¹

The 1960s trend in campus design strongly took hold in California where the state was growing and required many colleges to meet the population needs. The University of California system was also interested in experimenting with innovative forms of campus design. Rather

UCSD was envisioned to be a large university that gave students the more intimate experience of a smaller college by breaking it down into smaller residential colleges. This concept was popular in other large universities of the same era. At the time of planning, each college was to provide a special offering of courses, with spaces for living, learning, and socializing in proximity.
than construct giant, sprawling universities as built elsewhere, the Regents opted for the cluster model as the design strategy for several of its new colleges. These would achieve the size needed yet would retain the intimate scholastic atmosphere present at smaller colleges observed elsewhere. Clark Kerr, president of the University of California at that time, said in 1964:

*The big campus lacks the inestimable virtue which the small liberal arts college counts as its hallmark: the emphasis on the individual which small classes, a residential environment and a strong sense of relationship to others on the campus... give.*

With the growth of California in the post-war era, the University of California system planned for new universities to be placed in regions with the greatest growth. The state was viewed as promoting the most innovative, imaginative style of university design in the early 1960s. Plans for the campuses at San Diego, Santa Cruz, and Irvine were established in 1957, yet building did not commence until the mid-1960s and 70s. These three campuses each were conceived according to the cluster college model, yet each was differentiated by the inherent influences of its natural surroundings. The concept was to arrange universities into clusters of colleges, each consisting of its own buildings and internally focused in plan. The colleges would be internally alike in theme, including architecture and academic discipline. The smaller college units would be separated by open space, with housing, roadways, recreation fields, and parking on the exterior. Socially, the college was intended to be the nucleus of student life. The intent was to maintain the intimate nature of university life that was common in older campuses, yet use Modernist architecture and plan for growth and flexibility on a large scale.

**The Plan for Second College**

In San Diego, Roger Revelle was influential in promoting the cluster college model for the entire UCSD campus. The intent was not only to promote the intimacy and identity of the small college, but to retain land for future growth, build flexibility into the campus and buildings, minimize travel time between classes, and create memorable spaces. John Galbraith, the first chancellor of UCSD, alluded to the English college model of including classrooms and faculty offices within residential buildings. This, he offered, was a means of making the buildings part of an “organic whole” and creating an interaction of activity and spaces. These considerations would be carried out in the physical expression of the building plan as well. A flexible curriculum and freedom of choice were also major themes in Muir College’s development. Under the mentorship of faculty, students were to develop individual plans based on their own goals, at which they would arrive after thoughtful deliberation.

The founding provost for Muir College, John Stewart, arrived when much of the physical design...
of Second College had been put in place. He also believed in the small college ideal but saw the opportunity in Second College to go beyond the design of spaces and curriculum. He cared deeply about inculcating a sense of independence and self-education into the students. To accomplish that goal at Second College, he placed strong emphasis on participation in student life activities.

Participation in a palpable community, dedicated to a common cause which gives meaning and dignity to the students’ experience is part of that heart’s desire... They need freedom to try out a variety of identities, but they need, too, the assurance of membership in a stable and purposeful institution.

Ultimately, this goal was achieved in the early years of Muir. However, from the beginning there were not quite enough classrooms and the college continued to exchange resources with other colleges on campus. As the campus grew, the genuine cluster plan for the university was hard to achieve. Six colleges were developed, but the result did not achieve the level of academic self-sufficiency as had been imagined. Students, however, do retain a personal connection to their individual colleges. Students apply to and enroll in a single college within UCSD and identify greatly with that place throughout their undergraduate experience.

The Architectural Context

International Style and Modernism in Architecture

In the late nineteenth century, American architecture was focused on neoclassical and Renaissance forms. It was heavily influenced by the École des Beaux-Arts. Louis Sullivan was one of the first American architects to shift from the widespread dedication to the classical aesthetic and instead promote the concept of an architectural form reflecting a building’s essential functions. In the 1890s, Sullivan designed several buildings that articulated interior spatial organization through exterior ornamentation in his attempt to demonstrate a democratic view of architecture. Sullivan’s apprentices would elaborate on his form follows function concept, most notably his famed pupil, Frank Lloyd Wright.5 Irving Gill, who would become one of
San Diego's most notable architects, also worked briefly under Sullivan at the same time as Wright.

Like Sullivan’s before him, Wright’s career became a hallmark in the evolution of American Modernism. The first of his landmark buildings, particularly his residences in the Chicago area, designed in the early twentieth century, emphasized the natural landscape and open plans, with architectural elements of horizontality and asymmetry that echoed the buildings’ environmental setting. Although Wright tenaciously claimed his to be an individual style, his concepts and those of his predecessor Sullivan were emulated in what became the Chicago or Prairie School of architecture. Wright’s progressive style became a benchmark for the Modernist movement, particularly influencing European architects after his portfolio was published in Berlin in 1910.

Concurrently, the Arts and Crafts Movement developed in the United States, based on the concept of honesty of materials and form created by human hands rather than machinery. In California especially, architects of the Arts and Crafts Movement strived to break with the Old World architectural conventions and create something indigenous and appropriate for the landscape. Bernard Maybeck in Berkeley, Charles and Henry Greene in Pasadena, and Irving Gill in San Diego created distinctly Californian works that demonstrated the originality of the craftsman and native materials. The architecture that developed in California was always tailored for the region, influenced by attributes such as material and climate. As Modernism became widely practiced in later decades, this would remain a central tenet of California architecture. Gill played a role in the development of this uniquely California Modernism, working primarily in San Diego. In that sense, San Diego architecture was influential for a crucial bridge between Arts and Crafts and Modernism, with an unshakable adherence to local elements.
While American Modernism emphasized a natural approach to architecture, the European development of Modernism—the International Style—embraced the use of industrial materials and technology. Honesty and pure forms were equally, if not more heavily emphasized in Europe, however. The International Style developed in Europe after World War I with the concept of uniting craft traditions with innovative materials and technology. European Modernists, and their followers, made political statements through their designs, showing the democratic nature of simplistic forms, logical structural elements, the rejection of traditional forms and ornamentation, and the acceptance of mass production. Le Corbusier, de Stijl, and the Deutscher Werkbund and Bauhaus Schools were major influences in the development of the International Style.

The International Style was slow to catch on in 1920s America, where Art Deco still flourished. The first use of this type of International Style Modernism was Howe and Lescaze’s 1929 Philadelphia Savings Fund Society Building, while Richard Neutra and Rudolph Schindler contributed Modernist design to new California residential construction. Walter Gropius, Marcel Breuer, and Ludwig Mies van der Rohe were early proponents of the International Style in the United States in the 1940s. The 1950s brought a more widespread acceptance and use of the machine-inspired aesthetic and functionalist mode of architecture. As the style became more broadly distributed, the social message was no longer the premise of its design. By the late 1950s and 1960s, Modernist design had broken away from the rigidity of the International Style and began using organic shapes and heavy massing. These individualist designs were influenced by Alvar Aalto, Eero Saarinen, and the later works of Le Corbusier and Wright. Louis Kahn was a major contributor to this late Modern period. He described architecture as “creating of spaces that evoke a feeling of use,” which was a major departure from the minimalist approach of previous years. Kahn’s institutional designs, including the Salk Institute (1959-1965) in La Jolla, demonstrated a return to the articulation of space in a classical sense combined with an evocative expression of purpose. Through its various iterations, however, the basic principles of Modernism remained the honest expression of the buildings’ function and a minimalist approach to form.

**San Diego Modernism**

The history of San Diego has often been closely tied to economic booms and busts. With an economy based highly on military operations, San Diego experienced influxes in its economic activity during wartime, and a corresponding increase in money flowing into the City. With this great growth came more building and more architectural commissions. The development of a notable local architecture, created by local architects, therefore occurred between the wars—commencing in the 1920s and 30s, and following World War II, through the 1940s to the 60s. It was over the course of these decades that an architecture
movement emerged through the contribution of several key architects resulting in a specialized San Diego Modernism.

Before the turn of the twentieth century, San Diego exhibited styles of architecture that would have been typical of any American boom town, with the exception of the Spanish-influenced mission architecture from the time of the City’s foundation. Around the turn of the century, Irving Gill made the first impact in the creation of a local architecture for San Diego. His early works reduced traditional ornamental forms to simple lines and masses, laying the foundations of early San Diego Modernism. The buildings, though innovative, were mostly isolated, individual commissions for prominent City figures. Practicing slightly after Gill, William Templeton Johnson, used a Beaux Arts vocabulary in the Spanish Revival Style. He was arguably the most influential San Diego architect of this period, but his buildings employed a great degree of ornamentation and historical allusion. They were mostly civic and larger commercial buildings which were early landmarks for San Diego, which still stand today. Gill and Johnson were the most prominent architects that shaped early San Diego. Though Gill laid the foundations of Modernism, a proliferation of his style was slow to take hold.

In the 1920s, southern California underwent exponential development and population growth in its cities, fueled by post-war economic expansion. In San Diego, this translated into needed investment in civic institutions to support rising populations. Architects were given significant commissions to design in a veritable “uncharted territory” of architectural style. Private residences were the most iconic projects to result from this first building boom of the 1920s and 30s. Architects working in Los Angeles and San Diego in the post-war years were beginning to forge a uniquely southern California style of architecture reflecting the climate, topography, and materials of the region, and incorporating current innovations in materials and engineering. In Los Angeles, significant architects of this period included Richard Neutra and Rudolph Schindler, who built residences that defied all precedents. Robert Alexander was a part of this group, as he was partnered with Neutra from 1949 to 1958. Additionally, the bulk of Frank Lloyd Wright’s work of the 1920s was his California Houses, many in Los Angeles, which had a significant impact on the regional residential styles that were soon to develop.

In San Diego, local architects were forging a unique style of Modernism that was distinctive to the City. Several of these architects, including Sim Bruce Richards, Loch Crane, and Frederick Liebhardt, had studied under Frank Lloyd Wright at the famed Taliesen Fellowship. Their designs typically reflected an intimate appreciation of wood and natural materials, resulting in structures that respected and utilized their natural surroundings and natural
Asian architecture was also influential in this style. Richards and Crane especially were famous for creating residences that eschewed precedent and were unique to their setting. Lloyd Ruocco was a fundamental founding member of the San Diego Modernism movement as well. Dissatisfied with the reliance on historical precedent, Ruocco worked toward an architecture that was original and place-specific. He alluded to Mediterranean influences, which engaged the outdoors into interior spaces, and often used organic materials in their unaltered forms and abundant windows. In his later projects, he adopted styles more typical of other Modernists, who used post-and-beam design and built homes that were usable, efficient, and suitable for everyday use. The early Modern houses were always meant to be as equally livable as they were beautiful.

A turning point in the emergence of a regional Modernism in southern California that reached the national spotlight was the Case Study House Program, begun in 1945. The program, sponsored by Art & Architecture Magazine, brought together many important Modernist architects in the region, encouraging the furtherance of a regional style that was contemporary in form yet designed and constructed on a budget. The homes were meant to uphold a Modernist ideal, yet be reproducible for the average American family. Three of these houses were built in La Jolla. Aside from the Case Study Houses, the late 1940s through the 1960s was an active period of building and growing prominence of Modernist architecture in San Diego and southern California. The most significant architects that contributed to this period in San Diego included Robert Mosher and Roy Drew (Mosher & Drew), Richard G. Wheeler, Frederick Liebhardt and Eugene Weston III, Frank Hope, Russell Forester, and Lloyd Ruocco.

While residential, smaller-scale architecture was the realm in which the greatest amount of progress and experimentation in Modernism occurred, a large-scale, civic or commercial variety was slower to take form. Following World War II, San Diego again experienced an economic boom and corresponding population growth. As the City grew and gained prominence as a major city in the United States, larger civic and institutional commissions began to generate memorable buildings. The arrival of major league professional sports and downtown redevelopment were also indicative of this time. These municipal investments required iconic edifices, reflecting the style of the time, yet because of their massive program requirements, resulted in a translation of Modern architectural forms into large-scale buildings. San Diego Stadium, now Qualcomm Stadium, and the Downtown Civic Concourse, completed by a consortium of local architects, were a part of this era. The local architecture firms that had begun their practices with notable residential projects rose to the challenge of larger commissions as the need appeared. The firms that played a role in this later trend included, but were not limited to,
Mosher & Drew, Homer Delawie, Richard G. Wheeler & Associates, Liebhardt and Weston, CJ “Pat” Paderewski, Ward Deems and William Lewis (Deems-Lewis), Frank Hope, and Tucker, Sadler & Bennett. Many of these firms were responsible for creating the buildings that are now San Diego’s most recognizable landmarks like Balboa Park and Downtown. Balboa Park, including San Diego Zoo, includes works of Mosher & Drew, Hope, Delawie, and Ruocco. Downtown features works of that period by Deems-Lewis, Wheeler, Hester, Mosher & Drew, Delawie, Hope, Richards, and Ruocco. Singular gems like the Green Dragon Colony (Mosher), San Diego Stadium (Hope), and the Coronado Bridge (Mosher) also exemplify this founding period of architecture.

The arrival of a University of California campus was another step in San Diego’s rising prominence. The creation of this university was a focused effort by the Regents of the University to place universities in areas experiencing significant growth, of which San Diego was one. As the locus of a major building campaign, the University would exhibit the most up-to-date architecture of the time. The foundation of the University in 1960 corresponded to the growth of a larger commercial and institutional Modernism that was taking shape in the city. In the hopes of creating an iconic campus, the University hired leading local architects to design its first buildings. Revelle College and SIO featured the works of these firms, but none were done with the same amount of coordination and cohesion as Muir College. The design for Muir College, which was coordinated and masterplanned by Robert Mosher, included many of the key architects included in the San Diego Modern movement. These include Robert Mosher, Dale Naegle, Eugene Weston III, Frederick Liebhardt, Frank L. Hope & Associates, and Richard G. Wheeler & Associates. This small collection of buildings at Muir College is a compact, intact representation of this significant time of growth and innovation in the City. Much like Balboa Park and Downtown, Muir College resulted from the collocated collaboration of several key designers, itself forming an icon of this era.

Principles of Modernism at Muir College
While the spaces between buildings created a desired spatial experience, the design of the buildings themselves sought to further humanist and Modernist ideals. Modernism and Humanism were each distinct ways of approaching architectural design that were popular at the time, having gained momentum in the post-war years. The central tenets that Mosher employed in his architectural framework were the honesty of materials and form follows function. The buildings were to clearly express their interior purpose, so that residential architecture would look distinct from an academic building, and buildings dedicated to lab space would appear different from those housing humanities classes. Each decorative element or massing variation was to fulfill a purpose.
In devising an architectural scheme for Muir College, consulting architect Robert Mosher followed strict adherence to principles of Modernism. Mr. Mosher illustrated these concepts in the model that was prepared for the masterplan, pictured below.

**HISTORIC RESOURCES INVENTORY & PRESERVATION PLAN**

Mosher chose a modular design for the academic buildings to allow for the greatest amount of flexibility within the interiors, while creating a sense of order, harmony, and rhythm. These elements were expressed on the exterior by the repetition of waffle slabs, covered walkways, and arcades. This modular type of architecture was common for the period as a result of the nature of precast concrete units, which were cast prior to construction. Employing consistent, repetitive units often made financial sense for efficiency in addition to creating the desired unified design motif. The tower typology and use of concrete had been dictated in previous years and were maintained through the Mosher plan. Concrete was a popular, inexpensive, and flexible material in those days and allowed for different forms of expression, so it was a valid choice for Second College.

Through the leadership of the executive architect and the overarching design principles, buildings that related to each other from a material and massing standpoint were still able to achieve a level of distinction and visual interest. The buildings’ thoughtful orientation to the pedestrian level was also a strictly enforced design principle, which helped to further the humanist experience and sense of spatial enclosure. The humanistic experience of the Muir campus also owed greatly to the landscape design by Wimmer & Yamada, which greatly softened the starkness of the concrete and created a sense of enclosure at the human scale.

**HUMAN SCALE**

To create a humanistic environment, Mosher dictated that each building be designed toward a human scale. Since the buildings are tall, this was most applicable to their bases. Entrances are clearly articulated, are oriented to outdoor areas, and are linked by human-scaled arcades.

**HONESTY OF MATERIALS**

A primary consideration in Modernism was the honest expression of materials. This means that materials should be used based on their inherent properties. The choice of precast concrete dictated the bulk and massing that would characterize the buildings.

**ARCHITECTURAL VOCABULARY**

In addition to a unified approach and similar massing, the Muir College buildings are aesthetically cohesive due to their architectural detailing. The windows, which are different for academic and residential buildings, are the most prominent. A “waffle” motif is also repeated as part of expressed building features and as a decorative element.

**FORM FOLLOWS FUNCTION**

This main tenet of Modernism dictates that the shape of a building should reflect its intended function or purpose. At Muir College, the towers of the buildings also house the utilities that are channeled to each floor.

**DECEMBER 2008**
The Social Context

Campus Uprisings of the 1960s
At the time of UCSD’s founding, college campuses throughout the United States and abroad were experiencing unprecedented challenges with student volatility based on the Vietnam War, civil rights, and social changes. In campuses across the nation, the 1960s and early 1970s are remembered for hostility between students and administrators, and students’ confrontation of international issues through local demonstrations.

Student populations in the 1960s were far different than those of previous generations. Universities had grown immensely following World War II, both in student population and in the level of research conducted. Universities were centers of technological advancement during war years, which caused them to transition from isolated scholarly hubs into institutions of worldly impact. Following the war, students flooded the universities as a result of the GI Bill. Political awareness increased due to expanded media sources and coverage. Students were exposed to events happening throughout the country and world, with access to multiple points of view. This aspect became important as world events began to trigger disillusionment and aggression among young populations. By mid-century, universities were enclaves of determined young people armed with significant political minds and intellectual potential.

This increased awareness collided with key divisive issues that surfaced during the 1960s. The Civil Rights Movement and the Vietnam War were the two main factors of
discontent in this decade. The first student incident of the Civil Rights Movement was a 1960 sit-in in North Carolina. In 1963, the United States entered the Vietnam War, causing great opposition in student bodies. Protests about war and civil rights on campus raised questions about freedom of expression on university property, leading to disagreements with college administrators. Such demonstrations were rampant on campuses throughout the United States during this time. In 1964, the Free Speech Movement began at the University of California at Berkeley, targeting students’ right to protest on campus. Berkeley became the main stage for this movement, as it was a liberal campus with high involvement in activist organizations. The campus was also the site of the most infamous demonstration: People’s Park in 1969. This resulted in a student being shot by local law enforcement attempting to suppress a demonstration. Student populations disillusioned by these events were additionally upset by the assassinations of three prominent leaders, John F. Kennedy, Martin Luther King, Jr., and Robert F. Kennedy, between 1963 and 1968. This aggravated the atmosphere of frustration and distrust.

Amid this social climate, administrators and architects of universities then in planning stages had much to consider beyond the curriculum and building programs. They had to specifically address how they would deal with an uprising, should one occur, and how they might curb student conflict. The planners of UCSD especially felt this pressure, given the focus on its sister campus Berkeley as one of the prime centers of student disaffection.

Implications for John Muir College
For the planners of John Muir College, the masterplan had a direct correlation with this climate of social change. The architects charged with creating this new environment carefully weighed social indicators in their design decisions. Student experience and the fostering of individuality, not mimicry, were paramount in the design of student life and education, as well as the buildings. Not only was the fear of revolt in the minds of the planners of Muir College, but also the perceived changes in the overall behavior of students. The 1960s were also a time of increased freedom for women and minorities,
and long-standing norms of social hierarchy were being toppled. The concern of John Stewart and Robert Mosher to revise the plan for Muir College was given special urgency given that uprisings were occurring on nearby college campuses. Had the plans emerged at a less pivotal time, their concerns may have been seen as idealistic and given less weight. From the standpoint of the architects, it was the chance of a lifetime—to plan and design in the midst of radical social change.19

Despite the best intentions of the designers, however, UCSD was not free from student uprisings of its own. During its first years, demonstrations promoting free speech and opposing the Vietnam War were not uncommon. Significant uprisings occurred throughout the University of California campuses in reaction to People’s Park in 1969. In the same year, Chancellor William J. McGill was censured by the University of California Regents for allegedly harboring Herbert Marcuse, who was a UCSD faculty member and known leftist with a significant following. In 1970, Muir College was the site of a Vietnam-related sit-in, and in the same year, a student opposing war set himself afire in Revelle Plaza.20

McGill wrote about this tense period in his memoirs, The Year of the Monkey: Revolt on Campus.21 During his chancellorship, McGill also dealt with the Lumumba-Zapata conflict, which concerned civil rights. Minority students rallied to have the Third College reserved for minorities and named Lumumba-Zapata College in honor of minority revolutionaries. The conflict was resolved, but it contributed to this tumultuous period. Although this early decade was trying for the young university, it did not derail its growth and progression. If anything, it made the communities stronger and underscored the important role of students’ perspective in the dynamic functioning of a proper campus.

The Environmental Context

Environmental Sensitivity in Design

The release of Silent Spring by Rachel Carson in the early 1960s marked the unofficial beginning of environmental awareness in the United States. The movement grew in the 1970s, but the connection between human behavior and environmental impact was revealed through scientific research. By the mid-1960s, conservation ecology and other fields that focused on these trends. Design professionals were also influenced by environmentalism. Design with Nature, the 1969 book by landscape architect and planner Ian McHarg, highlighted the importance of responsible development and incorporating natural systems into the built environment. Design theorists from then on increasingly considered nature and environmental sensitivity.

The establishment of the San Diego campus came during this time in which environmental preservation and sensitivity to nature were gaining prominence. The burgeoning modern landscape architecture movement of the late 1960s and early 1970s had this as a primary
focus. University of California campus planning during this time—especially Santa Cruz and San Diego—epitomized the landscape trends of the time with a special attention to the natural elements in the siting of the buildings. The principles behind these designs were sensitivity towards nature; minimal impact on the site and topography; using a palette of native plant species; and benefitting from the natural resources of the land, such as water, wind, and sun. In San Diego, the Torrey Pines, the site on the Pacific Rim, and the fresh coastal climate were all character-defining features of the site that were considered in the design of the university. Particularly, the Torrey Pines and the eucalyptus groves have become iconic parts of the campus. This is a common trend on college campuses, where the landscape is a symbol for the institution. The campus was designed to use the land in a most efficient manner to accommodate future growth. Additionally, minimal land usage was an early part of the UCSD plan. The 1963 Alexander plan called for only 20 percent of the land to be used for buildings and towers with smaller footprints. As Muir College was most consistent with early planning intentions, it is the most dense and compact of all the colleges. His plan also placed emphasis on the natural topography of the site and employing the greatest orientation to sun, wind, ocean, and mountains.

The landscape strategy employed at UCSD has achieved a level of excellence due to its aesthetic cohesion and the retention of preexisting elements. The landscape design was completed by Wimmer &
Yamada, a local San Diego firm, which had experience dealing with the indigenous plants of the region. Wimmer & Yamada were retained early in 1960 and worked on the campus until 1976, when campus planning in general fell out of favor and happened without coordinated oversight. From the beginning, retaining as many trees as possible was an essential part of the plan. The preservation of the natural environment and a soft, understated landscape design were a top priority of the administration and the designers. Although aesthetic and stylistic motivations were priorities, concerns for environmental protection were influenced by popular discourse around the same time. As the landscape has matured, it has further enhanced the sense of intimacy on the campus. Ivy planted at the base of some of the buildings has grown up the side, covering the concrete almost entirely in places. The deep green tones of the ivy creates a favorable contrast with the grey of the concrete. The landscape itself has become an unmistakable element of Muir College.

**John Muir's Legacy Fulfilled**

Central to the design goals of Muir College, in addition to the furtherance of educational practices, was the advancement of an appreciation for the natural environment. From the earliest planning stages of the University, the geographical location of the campus and the climate of San...
Diego were meant to come forward in the design of the college.

The choice of John Muir, the original American naturalist, as the namesake of the college was indicative of the college's proclivity towards nature. John Stewart, the founding provost of Muir College, himself strongly valued wilderness, humanism, and naturalism and thought a oneness with nature to be a step in self-realization and learning. Throughout his career at the college, he led expeditions and retreats into the “wild” for student discussions and reflections. Students’ oneness with the natural environment was always kept at the heart of Muir College.

Notes:
8 Handlin, p. 251.
16 Ibid. p. 91.
17 Ibid. pp. 94-97.
18 OCEANIDS, UCSD Campus Women’s Organization, p. 35.
19 Ibid.
23 OCEANIDS, UCSD Campus Women’s Organization, p. 30.
26 Interview with Joseph Yamada. 12 March 2008.
STATEMENT OF SIGNIFICANCE

Criteria of Significance

The criteria for evaluating buildings, landscapes, and sites of historical significance are formed by the National Register of Historic Places (NRHP) and the California Register of Historic Resources (CRHR). The criteria for the national and state registers are similar. Typically, resources listed on the National Register are automatically listed on the state’s register. In both cases, the properties listed include districts, sites, buildings, structures, and objects that are significant in American history, architecture, archaeology, engineering, and culture.

The four criteria of the National and California Registers are based on distinct types of significance that a resource can embody. The wording is slightly different for the two registers, but the intent is the same. The resource can be found to be significant if it:

A) is associated with events that have made a significant contribution to the broad patterns of our history;
B) is associated with the lives of persons significant in our past;
C) embodies the distinctive characteristics of a type, period, or method of construction, or that represent the work of a master, or that possess high artistic values, or that represent a significant and distinguishable entity whose components may lack individual distinction; or
D) yielded or may likely yield information important in prehistory or history.

On the National and California Registers, resources can be listed as individuals or as contributing to a district. ¹

Summary of Significance

Based on the relevant historic contexts, the individual buildings that comprise Muir College appear to meet Criterion A and C of historic significance. Criterion A is supported by the role that Muir College played in the formation of UCSD, which in turn had a substantial impact on the growth and definition of San Diego in the late twentieth century. Being the second college at UCSD, Muir now stands as testimony to this early time. Additionally, the academic framework of Muir College, which was formed during this same period, reflects broad patterns in shifting ideals of collegiate instruction, with more emphasis placed on freedom of choice and individuality. The trend was nationwide, but predominated in California due to its substantial population growth and the expansion of the University of California system during the mid-century. This academic paradigm was most successfully realized at Muir College, thanks to its integration of academic and physical planning, student life, and the leadership of John Stewart. The buildings were viewed as physical extensions of the academic and sociological ideals of the college, and were each tailored to meet these goals. In this way, the buildings are associated with patterns or events that have made a significant contribution to the history...
of California and the region in the 1960s.

The Muir College campus buildings are also significant under Criterion C, which addresses architectural merit. Significance under Criterion C signifies that the resource embodies the distinctive characteristics of a type, period, region, or method of construction; or represents the work of a master; or possesses high artistic values. Exceptional in their architectural consistency, the Muir buildings reflect the ideals of Modern architecture through their concrete construction, clean lines, absence of ornamentation, and structural expression. They are also remarkable for achieving distinction within a defined palette of architectural details. As each building was tailored to meet the needs of its occupants, the architects were able to provide ideal spaces for instruction and living, and also achieve greatness in architectural design. As such, the buildings represent a type and period emblematic of the era through distinctive design details associated with Modern architecture.

Also under Criterion C, the Muir College buildings are associated with prolific master architects Robert Mosher of the San Diego firm Mosher and Drew, consulting architects A. Quincy Jones, FAIA, and previously Robert E. Alexander, FAIA, of Los Angeles. The team of talented local architects who devised the individual buildings for Muir College including Fredrick Liebhardt, Eugene Weston, Richard G. Wheeler, Frank L. Hope, and Dale Naegle, also were major contributors to local architectural identity. The Muir College campus is further associated with the landscape architecture firm Wimmer, Yamada, and Associates, ASLA, of San Diego.

The buildings also feature the use of architectural concrete, which was an emerging and widely-used material in the 1960s and 70s. Architects throughout the country were advancing the sophistication of this material during this time. It was especially common in Southern California. Thus, the buildings quality under Criterion C for their distinct method of construction.

**Period of Significance**

The period of significance for a historic resource is the span of time in which a property attained the significance for which it meets the criteria. The major findings of significance for these resources include campus and academic planning, and architecture. These have been factored into the identified period of significance, which is defined as 1963 to 1971. These dates range from the publication of the first masterplan for the college (1963) to the time by which most academic and residential buildings at Muir College were opened and occupied (1971). It is this crucial period on which the findings of significance are based.