INSTITUTIONS OF THE HIGHER LEARNING WILL HAVE TO--AND
IN SOME CASES HAVE ALREADY--FACED UP TO THE MAJOR ISSUES OF THE
1970's. TO A GREAT EXTENT WE HAVE AT UC CAUGHT UP--IF BARELY--
WITH THE THREE MAJOR ISSUES FACING UNIVERSITIES AT THIS TIME
DEALING WITH ALL THREE INTELLIGENTLY (AT THE SAME TIME) IS AN
TASK, RESEMBLING, AT TIMES, A ONE ARMED PAPER
HANGER, TRYING TO SWAT A MOSQUITO.

THE THREE TASKS FOR THE 70's & 80's

1. OUR FIRST JOB WAS TO REBUILD AND REORDER OUR HOUSE
AFTER THE MOVEMENTS, DISRUPTIONS, INNOVATIONS, AND THE GENERAL
SHAKING UP OF THE MIDDLE TO LATE 1960's. THERE HAS PROBABLY
NEVER BEEN A TIME WHEN HIGHER EDUCATION WAS MORE CENTRAL TO THE
NATIONAL CONSCIOUSNESS AS THEN, WHEN MORE GOOD AS WELL AS MORE
DAMAGE WAS DONE TO IT, AND WHEN IT MANIFESTED ITSELF AS MORE
CONFUSED AND CONFUSING. WE HAVEN'T FULLY ANALYZED THAT PERIOD,
WHAT IT HAS MEANT TO US. WE STILL NEED MORE TIME TO CATCH OUR
BREATH AND REBUILD.

2. THE SECOND TASK IS TO MANAGE DECLINE INTELLIGENTLY. WE
HAVE HAD TO FACE A SITUATION OF "NO GROWTH," "STEADY STATE"
CALL IT WHAT YOU WILL. IN ANY CASE, IT IS NOW AND WILL BE FOR AT
LEAST TWO MORE DECADES A PERIOD WHERE THE PRACTICES AND RHYTHMS
OF AN INCREASINGLY EXPANDING EDUCATIONAL HORIZON ARE NO LONGER
VALID.

FRANKLY, WITH ALL THE DIFFICULTIES AND ALL THE
COMPLAINTS--THE SHRILLNESS OF SOME, INCIDENTALLY, REFLECTING
EITHER A NAIVETE OR ADVOCACY BUDGETING, I VIEW THE 77-79 BUDGET
BIENNIA A "GRACE" PERIOD, A TWO YEAR PERIOD THAT WILL PERMIT THIS UNIVERSITY TO PREPARE FOR MORE AND MORE DIFFICULT PROBLEMS OF VASTLY REDUCED INCOME.

I SAY IT IS A "GRACE" PERIOD BECAUSE THE MAJOR PROBLEM FACING US IN MAKING UP THE 1977-79 BUDGET IS NOT A DECREASE IN INCOME BUT A PROBLEM OF RESOURCE ALLOCATION. WE WILL BE LUCKY TO GAIN AN INFLATIONARY INCREMENT FOR THE NEXT BIENNIAL. FOR THE 1981 BIENNIA, I FORESEE THE PROSPECT OF, AT BEST, NO INCREASE IN THE ACTUAL DOLLAR AMOUNT ALLOCATED TO UNIVERSITIES AND, AT WORST, A DECREASE IN THE ABSOLUTE NUMBER OF DOLLARS ALL STATE UNIVERSITIES WILL RECEIVE. THE DECREASES WILL CONTINUE AT AN INCREASING RATE FOR THE NEXT 4 TO 6 BIENNIA.

THE MANAGEMENT OF DECLINE WILL NOT ONLY REQUIRE NEW SKILLS AND NEW SACRIFICES, BUT EQUALLY, A NEW STATESMANSHEIP AND UNDERSTANDING. IT WILL ALSO REQUIRE A CHANGE IN THE TOTAL CULTURE OF MANAGEMENT OF UNIVERSITIES. THIS CHANGE WILL BE ANALOGOUS TO "FUTURE SHOCK," AND WILL BE ESPECIALLY DIFFICULT FOR THOSE OF US BROUGHT UP IN THE UNIVERSITY CULTURE OF THE 50's AND 60's HOW WE ADAPT TO AND COPE WITH THIS SHIFT FROM THE CULTURE OF GROWTH AND EXPANSION TO THAT OF PRESERVATION AND DECLINE WILL DETERMINE THE RISE OR FALL OF OUR UNIVERSITIES.

I HAVE EVERY HOPE THAT THIS UNIVERSITY, WHICH HAS, IN PAST DECADES, SUSTAINED AND OVERCOME SEVERE BUDGETARY AND OTHER SHOCKS, WILL NOT ONLY SURVIVE BUT IMPROVE. IT'S A TOUGH CHALLENGE BUT NOT, I TRUST, AN IMPOSSIBLE DREAM.

3. THE THIRD MAJOR JOB IS FAR MORE COMPLICATED THAN EVEN
THE FIRST TWO—if that seems possible. American colleges and universities are facing a national mood of disaffection. I do not have time to go into all of the factors that have shaped this mood, but I should mention a few of the most important ones:

A. The End of Continuity. There was a time when teaching was a "calling," almost like the ministry. Which meant, simply, that teaching enjoyed the contradictory status of being highly praised and woefully underpaid. The relationship between a professor and a university was virtually permanent.

B. The Decline of Consensus. Not only has continuity stopped, but more importantly, the idea of what an education was all about, what an educated person was required to know no longer exists. Thirty years ago there was such a thing as a "Harvard man" or a "Yalee"—or a UC student. Admissions officers had very little trouble identifying the "right" student for their institution. There were really only two models then: the Harvard, classical, elite, northeastern, effete and the practical populist midwestern. Period. What they both shared, however, should not be forgotten: that our undergraduate years were a staging area for civic leadership, a forum where the citizen's mind—critical, caring, and alert—were shaped for life.

C. And then the deluge: Universal education, the psychological and administrative and educational passage from mass to universal higher education.

And what this taught us was that we outgrew the capacity of our secondary schools to prepare all the student who came
THROUGH OUR DOORS. THIS IS NO SNIDE REMARK LEVELLED AT OUR SECONDARY SCHOOLS, GOD KNOWS; AND I WOULDN'T WANT TO THROW BRICKS EVEN IF THEY WERE DESERVED FOR THE BRICKS ALMOST ALWAYS TURN OUT TO BE BOOMERANGS BECAUSE WE HAVE TO ACKNOWLEDGE THAT WE OURSELVES HAVE TRAINED THE TEACHERS, THE STAFF, AND THE LEADERS (INCLUDING THE UNION LEADERS) WHO SERVE IN THEM. AS SO OFTEN HAPPENS, WHEN WE CONJURE UP DEVILS, THEY LOOK REMARKABLY LIKE US.

D. WE ALSO OUTGROW CURRICULUMS. PART OF THAT, OR COURSE, HAD TO DO WITH THE EXPLOSION OF KNOWLEDGE. AS ROBERT OPPENHEIMER ONCE SAID: "IF THE PHYSICAL REVIEW (ONE OF THE LEADING PHYSICS JOURNALS) CONTINUES TO GROW AT ITS PRESENT RATE, IT WILL WEIGH MORE THAN THE EARTH BY THE YEAR TWO THOUSAND."

MORE IMPORTANT IN MY VIEW WAS THAT THE ACADEMIC DISCIPLINES BECAME MORE COMPLEX AND INCREASINGLY DISTANT FROM THE OTHER DISCIPLINES--PRIMARILY BECAUSE IT WAS DIFFICULT ENOUGH TO MASTER ONE DISCIPLINE, LET ALONE BE SUFFICIENTLY BROAD EVEN TO RAISE QUESTIONS ABOUT OTHER DISCIPLINES. BECOMING INTRA-DISCIPLINARY WAS HARD ENOUGH TO ACHIEVE WITHOUT BECOMING INTER-DISCIPLINARY! IT BECAME EVEN FASHIONABLE TO SAY THAT COMMON CONCERNS WERE UNSCHOLARLY--OR WORSE: NOT "RESPECTABLE."

E. STILL A FURTHER HURT WAS THAT WE SUFFERED A LOSS OF CONFIDENCE IN OURSELVES, AS ACADEMICIANS, AS FACULTY MEMBERS AND AS ADMINISTRATORS--ATTACK DID THAT TO US. WE SERVED AS THE SCAPEGOAT FOR ALL THE SINS OF THE REPUBLIC. WE SEEMED TO SHED OUR SENSE OF "CALLING," OUR SENSE OF SHARED VALUES, WONDERED IF
our Shakespeare's Sonnets or archaeological reminiscences and were supposed to be "relevant" instead of elegant. We wondered if writing about something was an exercise in historic futility. We even wondered whether knowledge could be dangerous because of its potential for destruction or because of its political capacity for coercion and manipulating our lives.

We acquired a political nervousness about any dealings with government. We forget that universities have best been able to change their societies when they strove as honestly as they could to serve them.

* * * * * * *

There is more I could say about the causes and consequences of this new national mood and how its affected us in the academy. Far more, but what I have said should be sufficient to provide at the very least a flavor of where we are.

As to where we go, I have two suggestions:

1. The first may sound terribly old fashioned or--alright, out of character. But I mean it profoundly, understanding the risks of how what I am about to say can be distorted and misinterpreted, even by those who might agree with me.

It is simply an affirmation that it takes a structured curriculum to deal with education in general and the liberal arts in particular. That is, there is still a baggage of knowledge and skills which educated people share and which they must carry. Details can be argued about, not substance.

Jean Kerr, the writer and wife of the NY Times Drama Critic, Walter Kerr claimed that authority in the Kerr House was
FOUNDED ON TWO PRINCIPLES: "IT'S OUR HOUSE AND WE'RE BIGGER THAN THEY ARE."

SEEMS TO ME THAT AUTHORITY IN A UNIVERSITY RESTS IN THE FACULTY FOR THE SAME REASON, OR ALMOST THE SAME REASON: THEY KNOW MORE THAN THE STUDENTS: FOR THIS REASON NOT ALL DECISIONS CAN BE EITHER DEMOCRATIC OR PARTICIPATORY. UNIVERSITIES ARE ESSENTIALLY HIERARCHICAL PLACES WHERE KNOWLEDGE MATTERS AND WHERE KNOWLEDGE MUST GOVERN.

2. THE SECOND IDEA IS A CALL FOR THE RETURN TO VALUES IN HIGHER EDUCATION. WE SEEM TO HAVE LOST SIGHT OF MY FAVORITY AND MOST QUOTABLE OF ALL MODERN PHILOSOPHERS, ALFRED NORTH WHITEHEAD'S VISION. HE BELIEVED THAT THE COLLEGE CLASSROOM WAS A PLACE WHERE THE REPUBLIC WAS REMADE, HAMMERED OUT ANEW BY THE ENERGY, THE INEXPERIENCE, AND IMAGINATION OF THE YOUNG ON THE ANVIL LIKE TOLERANCE, PATIENCE, AND UNDERSTANDING OF THEIR ELEDERS. THIS WAS
THE VISION OF WHICH AMERICAN HIGHER EDUCATION WAS BUILT--AND WE HAVE COME VERY CLOSE TO LOSING.

YES, WE DO HAVE MASSIVE PROBLEMS IN HIGHER EDUCATION, AS I SAID EARLIER, THE MANAGEMENT OF DECLINE, REBUILDING OUR CATHEDRAL OF LEARNING FOLLOWING THE CONVULSIONS OF THE 60's.

BUT MORE IMPORTANT THAN THOSE TWO INCREDIBLY DIFFICULT TASKS IS THE CHALLENGE I AM TRYING TO DRAMATIZE, TRYING TO GET US ALL TOO FACE UP TO; A RETURN TO VALUES. THAT WILL BE OUR MAJOR TASK OF THE NEXT 10 TO 15 YEARS.

I KNOW THERE WILL BE LOTS OF OTHER CHANGES, TOO, AND WE WILL BE CRYING INTO A VARIETY OF TOWELS ON DECLINING BUDGETS AND "STEADY STATE" BLUES.

ON THE OTHER HAND, IN A SENSE, WE'RE PAID TO DREAM.

AND I KEEP DREAMING OF HOW WONDERFUL IT WOULD BE IF THE MASSED GRADUATES OF U.C. NEXT JUNE STOOD UP, RAISED THEIR RIGHT HANDS, AND SOLEMNLY TOOK THE ATHENIAN OATH, NOT FOR OUR CITY, NOT FOR THIS REPUBLIC. WHAT WOULD IT BE LIKE TO HEAR 5,000 GRADUATES, 5000 YOUNG AND NOT SO YOUNG VOICES SAYING SIMPLY: "I SWEAR TO LEAVE THIS REPUBLIC STRONGER, RICHER AND MORE BEAUTIFUL THAN IT WAS WHEN I CAME TO IT."

I HOPE I HAVE LIVED UP TO THAT OATH.