

Lindenwood University

Digital Commons@Lindenwood University

---

John Brown

Lindenwood President Papers

---

3-16-1972

## **A New Tidal Wave. John Brown Speech to the Illinois Federation of Independent Colleges and Universities, March 16, 1972**

John Anthony Brown

Follow this and additional works at: [https://digitalcommons.lindenwood.edu/john\\_brown](https://digitalcommons.lindenwood.edu/john_brown)



Part of the [History Commons](#)

---

## A NEW TIDAL WAVE

Address given at the Annual Meeting Dinner of the Illinois Federation of Independent Colleges and Universities, Thursday, March 16, 1972, by John Anthony Brown, President, Independent Colleges and Universities of Missouri; President, The Lindenwood Colleges.

There is a tide running in higher education.

- It runs against the private, independent colleges and universities in our country.
- It runs against the liberal arts.
- It runs against long-established procedures of selectivity, grading and retention.
- It runs against the quest for excellence that marked the sixties.
- It sweeps over our efforts at being, or even becoming, a true community of earnest scholars.
- It even washes against the stated purposes and avowed aims of many colleges.

This new tidal wave carries some flotsam and jetsam, some consequences, some strange odds and ends:

### •LESS STUDENTS

It seems only yesterday that we were wringing our hands about the tidal wave of students that was going to inundate our institutions. That tidal wave of students came and receded very fast. Private institutions are not only losing in terms of the statistical percentage of the total number of college students which they enroll, but they are losing actual enrollment in many states. In the state of Missouri, the Commission on Higher Education has reported that the private sector has space for some 24,000 students--space in libraries, laboratories, classrooms, residence halls, all fully built and only partly utilized.

The United States Census Bureau reports within the past month that enrollment in private elementary and secondary schools has declined 23% in the six-year period ending in 1971--down some 7,000,000. I need not

recite the statistics to an audience comprised of private college presidents. We know that our doors are not being beaten down these days; we know that there is a transfer of students from the private to the public sector because of many factors, primarily cost; we know that the drop in student enrollment has created a budget crisis in many institutions in recent years, and has brought about cutbacks that are detrimental in some cases to the quality of the institution.

There are no studies of which I am aware, there are no projections about which I know, which indicate that there will be considerable growth in the private sector in the foreseeable future. And yet much of what we do has been built on the concept of growth. Much of what we planned was done on the assumption that we would continue to get larger. Although some of the private institutions in this country have frozen their enrollment at a size that is determined by their desire to remain small, almost every study of the plans of private institutions reveals that many of them are not able to attract the number of students that their long-range plans have called for in the past several years. Today's tidal wave is not bringing more students; it's bringing less, and there is not much chance that the tide in terms of numbers of students to the private sector will be drastically changed.

•MORE DEFICITS

In Father Paul Reinert's new book, TO TURN THE TIDE, we find a short summary of the situation about which we have all read a great deal:

"Without financial assistance on a large scale, several hundred private colleges and universities in the United States are expected to close in the next five years."<sup>1</sup> It certainly is not likely that all of these

---

<sup>1</sup>Reinert, Paul C. (S.J.), TO TURN THE TIDE, Englewood Cliffs, N. J., Prentice-Hall, Inc. 1972, p. 15.



closings will take place outside Illinois, or Missouri for that matter. As I listened to the new college presidents in the state of Illinois being introduced tonight--the eleventh president of College A and the seventeenth president of College B--I sat wondering whether one of the new presidents will turn out to be actually the last president of College A or B.

In this fiscal year, according to the Jellema study, which gets worse and worse as he updates it, we know that some two hundred institutions will use the last of their unrestricted endowment. They are literally burning up their futures. These institutions are losing both the funds they currently expend and future income.

Let me talk about my own institution, which is one of the wealthiest in our area of the country in terms of per student endowment. At Lindenwood we have accepted levels of deficit financing which, translated into future consequences, will deprive the institution over the next twenty-five years of \$1,875,000 in income. If we had not spent the million and a half that we have spent at Lindenwood from our reserves (of course, we have not spent any money held in trust) we would not only have the \$1,875,000 in income over the next twenty-five years, but at the end of that period we would still have the original million and a half we have spent.

As I reflect on this situation, I am reminded of the president who refused to serve on his own Board when he was invited to do so, saying, "I'd know so much about myself, I would have to fire myself!"

As the present tidal wave recedes, many colleges, for which we hold respect and affection, will be washed away.

• LESS UNDERSTANDING

We once talked about our colleges and universities being houses of intellect, a learning community, carefully organized, clearly structured, possessed of traditions, and convinced that there were certain appropriate ways to do the things that had to be done in our community. Everyone of us in this room remembers the ways in which we moved toward a degree and then another, and for some a third or a fourth. The track was rather clearly laid out. We fretted about the narrow limit of choice that was permitted us. We plodded on toward that degree.

Degree? What does a degree mean, when, in the not too distant future, a large percentage of all those who graduate from high school will go on to at least an associate's degree and a majority on to the bachelor's degree.

What does a degree mean even now, today, in the job market. You know, and I do too. Everyone in this room has heard of men with Ph.D.'s who do not indicate that they hold that degree when applying for positions in industry, or in the profession of engineering.

What's the purpose of a college or university? Is it to teach people to think? Are we dedicated to the thing we call reason? But this is an age in which there is intense, burning interest on the part of the student group, particularly, in non-reasonable experience, the non-rational. The interest of students in meditation, in Indian philosophy and the ancient Chinese writers, in Zen Buddhism and Transcendental Meditation, is more than just a superficial or faddist thing. Some of them want to go beyond reason, or beneath reason, or around reason. Is a college community the place for this kind of experience?

What about values? Are colleges and universities entirely out of the business of dealing with value systems? Is it now true that a college



which proclaims a value system, boldly and explicitly, loses the respect of many members of the academic community?

What about religious concerns? Is it now true that some colleges, in their effort to be more like the universities, even the public universities, have turned their backs on the religious orientation which was once part of the very being of the place? Is it true that in a time when students--if I understand students at all--yearn for religious experience, eagerly turn to the religious questions of meaning and purpose, many colleges turn away from these concerns?

Of all things, we fought at the time of the previous tidal wave and before to establish colleges and universities as bastions of free speech. There is hardly a person in the room, among those of us who are educators, who does not bear scars of the fights we made to see that points of view could be expressed, speakers could be heard, debates could be sponsored with people involved whose ideas were unpopular and even repugnant to many of us.

Now I know colleges, perhaps my own, at which it would be difficult to bring the Vice President of the United States to speak, at which the point of view of the typical member of the American Legion is not often presented, at which recruiters from companies which are on student black lists cannot recruit.

We do not define, lest we offend someone; we do not clearly state our position, lest we lose the support of someone. I believe that a college must so carefully define itself that it can be understood, understood by those who would support it, who then will, and understood by those who will not support it, who then won't.

•MORE COMPLICATED LEADERSHIP

When the tidal wave recedes from the college or university which each of us heads, one of the interesting sights will be found at the tiller. I know an anecdote which Governor Olgivie will understand perhaps better than any of us. Many years ago, when I lived in Pennsylvania, a friend of mine was made Commissioner of Education. The post in preceding administrations had been quasi-political, and the Commissioner had been a member of the governor's cabinet. A new governor wished to divorce the post from politics and free the commissioner from any responsibility in the political arena. He, therefore, released him from the obligation of attending cabinet meetings, told him to run the Department of Education and do everything he could with the funds available to make Pennsylvania the best state in the nation in terms of education.

After some months, during which the Governor and his Commissioner rarely saw each other, they came together. "Charlie," asked the Governor, "how is it going in the Education Department?"

"Mr. Governor," responded Charlie, "you gave me authority to run the Department; you put my hand on the tiller, and you said, 'Go to it!' I threw that tiller way over, as far as it would go, and do you know what happened, Mr. Governor? That ship, that Education Department, kept right on going in the direction it has been going for the last ten years."

When the tidal wave recedes, at least enough to see who is holding on to the tiller, if each of us--fellow presidents--has been strong and vigilant and willing to brace ourselves against the storm, we may be there. But some of our student leaders will be there, and the AAUP will have a small committee there; the buildings and grounds staff will have a deputation there, and the faculty senate will have a standing committee on tiller pushing. The women on our faculty will have an observation team



counting the persons present to see what proportion of them represents the feminine gender.

That tiller is going to be like the tug of war between the freshmen and sophomores. It has become almost impossible to give leadership in many of our academic institutions. Presidents who wish to lead, and are willing to be held accountable, are told that this is the age of low-profile leadership.

The tiller is really the fulcrum of governance. If we so confuse the structure of governance that no one can be held accountable, what happens when we go on the rocks? What happens when we avoid the rocks and skillfully find the deep channel? What happens when the ship veers away from its basic goals and objectives, or when it runs madly in circular motion?

I believe the time has come for radical transformation of our structures of governance in the colleges and universities. It would be the height of folly, given the social situation through which children move as they approach high school and college, to deny them a voice when they become young men and women in the determination of policy at the college level.

What I am warning against, as this tidal wave washes over us, is the probability that the system of governance which will emerge when the wave recedes will not be workable.

Colleges and universities are extremely complex institutions. While students are perhaps the most important constituency, they are not the only constituency. There is the possibility of a kind of divided community with squabbling and in-fighting of a kind we have not yet seen--and we see a lot of it in the academic community, as students insist that nobody can represent them but students, and faculty insists that nobody can speak



for them but faculty, and clerical employees take the same position. It's possible to come up with a system of governance so cumbersome, so complicated, so committee ridden and so divisive that it will not work.

•LESS AUTHORITY AND COUNTERAUTHORITY

Homer D. Babbidge, Jr. has given me two quotes which will help me illustrate this particular piece of flotsam or jetsam that the tidal wave has brought with it: "What I find vastly more difficult to comprehend is the activist notion that institutions can be operated without a system of governance." The second quote: "Young people seem unaware of the elaborate systems required to undergird their things, and the doing thereof."

Most students and faculty seem to be moving in the direction of broadening the agenda for our colleges and universities, widening the goals and deepening the concerns of our institutions for problems within the society.

Students, very rightly, expect us to provide more and more equipment for their work, more and more opportunity for them to get broader and deeper kinds of experience than they used to get, through our computers, our off-campus programs, our internships, our elaborate independent and individualized study programs, our interim terms, and our costly laboratory, library, and other learning equipment.

With the complicated steering mechanism that I have described in the previous section of this paper it becomes increasingly difficult for the institution to be effective and efficient in these new areas.

As the top administrators try to consult, try to get readings from the various parts of the collegiate or university constituency, they have some practical problems.

Who are our student leaders these days? Is the answer not that one must know what the issue is before one can identify the leaders? On the

Vietnam War there is one set of leaders; on racial issues there is another; on intervisitation in the residence halls you will find a third.

Who are the faculty leaders? Less than students, but more than faculty in the past, one finds faculty moving toward very elaborate and cumbersome forms of organization. Just as students deny the privilege to anyone of speaking for them, faculty seem to shy away from forms of faculty organization which might make it possible for a handful of chosen faculty leaders to cooperate, or it could happen the other way around, to obstruct, in the name of the full faculty. "Nobody speaks for us." "Nobody acts for us."

In a way, when the agenda for action on our campuses is broadened to permit the doing of everyone's "own thing" a superstructure to service that agenda becomes overwhelming.

There is an anti-authoritarianism running which creates problems for us in the college community. These problems are not confined to the president's office. Those who distrust authority distrust the professor, who is, after all, an authority. They distrust the dean--another kind of authority. They distrust the health center and the personnel thereof. We must somehow cut into this distrust. A system of governance in a community of distrust is difficult to design and, once designed, not liable to work.

•MORE TENURE; MORE CONTRACTUAL OBLIGATIONS; MORE NOTICE FOR NON-RENEWAL:  
MORE GADGETRY AND EQUIPMENT (TV, FM, COMPUTERS)

I want to talk about tenure. Presidents do not do that very often and almost always when they do they are far away from their own campus. With a certain amount of courage, I have raised the issue that the present tidal wave has brought with it with my own faculty colleagues. There are several Missouri colleges which will have between eighty and ninety



percent of their faculty tenured by 1975 if the trend of the past five years is projected into the next five. At my own institution, it looks as if we may have over ninety percent of our faculty tenured by 1974. What will that mean? Is it a good idea, in a smaller college, where there are only two or three members of some departments to have all tenured? Is it a good idea to tenure people into a department when almost all of them are in the same age group? Is it a good idea to transform tenure, as we seem to have gently done, into an almost automatic process? Are we aware that over the past ten years the average age at which tenure is being granted is falling across the country to the point where there are many cases of tenure going to people in their low thirties and a few cases of tenure going to faculty in the upper twenties. As we now interpret tenure, and as we now deal with issues involving tenure, this means that we are entering into a thirty-five to forty-year contract with some people. The only way the contract can be voided is by proving incompetency or moral turpitude, or by resorting to the very desperate eventuality of declaring fiscal exigency, a euphemism for going broke.

Personnel problems, in all areas of a college or university's life, have become problems of legal character as a consequence of recent court decisions. I am sure most of us desire--and it is a commendable desire--to eliminate as much arbitrary, capricious and whimsical treatment of individuals as possible. I'm not complaining about the difficulties that are attendant to protection of rights of individuals. Freedom is not a quality of life that is easy to administer. I am saying that in the mood of distrust discussed above and the confusion about procedure, which is the consequence of our tendency to import into our college and university communities procedures used in the outside community, we have created a vast amount of work for everyone--faculty committees as well as

administrators. We have also given birth to a certain kind of tension and doubt. We are now threatened with the bureaucratic disease of inaction.

If every personnel case, whether it deals with students, faculty, clerical, or grounds employees, becomes a kind of Supreme Court case, consuming great amounts of time, energy, and good will, the tendency is not to bring any charges against anyone for anything.

On top of all this, or beside all this, or under all this, or surrounding all this, is the vast need on our campuses occasioned by the explosion of knowledge and the technological revolution for new kinds of equipment and gadgetry. I hear the frightening rumor that one of our universities in Missouri has seven major computers purring away, and that there is a kind of cold war among the computer centers that goes on day in and day out. We have only one, but I know what it costs, if not what it does. But even at my own very small college there is closed-circuit television, an FM radio station, a computer center, and a massive amount of audiovisual equipment, ranging from slide projectors to complicated machines which I ignore, lest anyone call me ignorant when I ask what their purpose may be.

We face all this with a kind of strange syndrome. If College X gets a computer, College Y feels it must. If College Y gets a circular auditorium and can multiproject, College Z must do so quickly thereafter. We really are playing the game that used to be called "Keeping Up With the Joneses." It's a very bad disease, and we had better begin to exercise some restraint or we will become warehouses filled with gadgets.

•LESS DISTINCTIVENESS

So far this speech has not brought much laughter into our little circle. As I looked at the tidal wave which I believe is swirling about



us and rocking us back and forth, the thing that perhaps disturbs me as much as anything else is an awareness I have--and I wish you could prove me wrong--that our private institutions are becoming more and more like the public institutions, and that each of us is becoming more like each other, so that it is becoming increasingly difficult to distinguish the private from the public and to distinguish colleges within either sector from each other.

For several years I have been quoting the Executive Director of the Association of College Admissions Counselors, who somewhere said something that made me very angry; and this was it: "I don't know of an admissions counselor in the country who can tell you what you get for twice as much money at the private college." After your initial anger, I suggest a reaction to such an audacious statement. Ask your own admissions director what he tells parents about your institution which would justify the expenditure of something in the order of \$5,000 to \$10,000 more to send a son or daughter to us than to send the same son or daughter to one of our state colleges.

Personal attention? There is some personal attention in some of the public institutions. Tradition? Tradition is running out of our college as water through a sieve. An opportunity to be known as a person rather than a number? Many of the bigger institutions, many of the public institutions have gone to great lengths to individualize their treatment of students, and it isn't really quite fair to say that the public institutions function with students as sheep, and we function with students as highly individualistic human beings, all of whom are known by full name to each other, the faculty, and the President's wife.

Our institutions are becoming on a daily basis less distinctive than they were. This is a major problem which must be given top priority lest

we all sink into a sea of similarity.

While our students may be doing their own thing, we are not doing our own thing as institutions. We rush toward each other as soon as one of us develops a new idea which attracts attention. When Florida Presbyterian came up with the 4-1-4, could anyone have dreamed that in only a few short years four or five hundred colleges would be proudly proclaiming the discovery of that form of calendar organization? When independent study became the mark of two or three of our eastern institutions, would anyone have dreamed that every one of us would be claiming to have discovered the virtues of independent study?

I would suggest that distinctiveness requires us to stand apart from each other. We are too alike.

•MORE COMPETITION

If there is less distinctiveness, there is more competition, and perhaps the two are related. Competition is a bad word in the academic community. Last year there were something in the order of 110,000 vacancies in the freshman classes at our colleges and universities that were not filled. This fall the prediction is that there will be 125,000 vacancies. These vacancies are not just in our sector, not just in the private college sector. They are in the public sector as well.

We now see the spectacle of public institutions across the country suffering decreases in enrollment and setting out to recruit students actively. I need not tell you this, for your admissions people face this competition day in and day out. But we in the independent sector compete with each other. Indeed, the raids we have made on our own distinctiveness are partly the consequence of bad judgment as to how to compete. College and university planners all over the country have come to the conclusion that colleges must be as much like universities as they can be, and



universities must be as much like each other as they can be. Translated this means that all of them must try to do as much as they can, so that nobody can turn away and go to another institution.

It won't work; it's absurd as a basic approach, but it's there.

Dr. Fred Ness, of the Association of American Colleges, in his last annual report said that one of the trends in higher education that was most alarming to him was the increased tension developing between the private and the public sectors. I come from a state in which we are leaders in this whole movement, for tension between the private and public sectors in Missouri developed sooner and has grown more rapidly than in most other states.

Dr. Ness is right. It is preposterous to think that you could have a system of higher education--which your governor, your master plan, and your educational leaders, both public and private, call for in Illinois--and strengthen that system by weakening any of its parts.

The private institutions cannot gain from raiding the appropriations of the public institutions. The public institutions cannot gain from greedily trying to shove the private institutions out of the picture. We need to cooperate if we are to maintain a pluralistic system of higher education in this country. There must be understanding; there must be dialogue, and there must be enforced liaison between the public and the private sectors.

I would like to see a competent study made of the migration of academic administrators from institution to institution. I believe that there is less and less migration from the private to the public sector and vice versa than there used to be. I find in my own state that many of my educational colleagues in the public sector have no understanding whatever of the nature of the private sector or the problems of that

sector. I must also say, with equal candor, that many of my colleagues in the private sector haven't the least idea about the kinds of problems that the public sector now faces.

One of the great misunderstandings is found in the assumption many people make that private institutions are for the sons and daughters of the rich. Indeed, it could even be claimed by some private institutions that they are serving a greater social purpose in the education of underprivileged and disadvantaged students than their public colleagues. In Missouri, the private institutions last year gave nearly 20 million dollars of financial aid. It is interesting that the total deficits of the institutions in Missouri was not too far from this figure, so that a case can be made that the private institutions in the state of Missouri are granting financial aid to students who attend the private sector in an amount that is very close to the total deficits of the private colleges.

While the private colleges may be overextending themselves with financial aid, the public institutions, faced with declining enrollment, waive even the low tuition and dispense scholarships without regard for need, in ways that have never been thoroughly discussed and sometimes are not thoroughly revealed.

So, if we are honest about it, we will join in recognizing, as the President of the Association of American Colleges has recognized, that all across the country there is increased tension between the private and public sectors. This tension is related to the tidal wave, related to the decrease in student enrollment and the fiscal problems in many of the states.

Some of you, if not all, know what I am talking about when I say that there is intense competition among us in the private sector. If you do not think there is, contact a halfway decent student who has put



his or her name into the College Center at Evanston. A young woman walked into my office last year with a briefcase full of offers from colleges all over the central part of the United States because (1) she didn't need any financial aid, (2) she had a combined verbal and math score of 1,400, (3) she was breathing. This young woman, based on the forms she had filled out for the College Center, had received more than one hundred assurances from colleges that they were convinced that their admissions committee would admit her if she would only apply by return mail. Some of the most enterprising colleges told the young lady that they had taken her case to the admissions committee and had been given a tentative approval, subject to the filing of an application.

But, now if you feel badly, let me make you feel better. The competition in the private sector is as tiddlywinks compares to Russian roulette with the competition that is beginning to take place within the public sector.

It all sounds so very organized and reasonable: there are community colleges and junior colleges for certain students; then there are state colleges which used to be teachers colleges, but are now general institutions in most cases, for other students; and then there is the university system with several campuses in several of our states for even other students. The problem is that students are not baptized in the name of community colleges, state colleges, or universities, so you have to recruit them. The scramble is intense.

When there were lots of students and all three divisions of the public sector were turning them down, it was not a very difficult problem to come up with some kind of formula, the most specific perhaps that in California, which opened the university to a limited number of students, and the state colleges to a broader spectrum of students and required the junior colleges

to take anyone who wished to come. Now the university has found that some students who are eligible to attend it are attending the junior colleges. That's terrible! Now the state colleges are finding that some students who used to start with the state colleges are starting with the junior colleges and transferring to the university and leaving them in the middle. And now the junior colleges have offered to take all freshmen admitted to the public sector. Enough. I simply wanted to make the point that the tidal wave which now engulfs us has floating in it a kind of competition which renders anything we have ever seen before child's play.

•LESS MOBILITY

If the tidal wave brings more competition, it also brings less mobility, less flexibility, in several new areas. Take the faculty. Only a few years back, we were moaning about the fact that many faculty held allegiance to their discipline and not the institution. Irritate them at all and they would flit off to another institution where they were almost sure to get promotion in rank and a good increase. Certainly not true today.

One of the reasons that many of our institutions face a new kind of problem in granting tenure is because the mobility of faculty has been seriously affected by the professional job market for those who teach and even those who administer.

One college president I know says that the only thing worse than high turnover is no turnover. The only thing worse than the faculty person who jumps to another institution on slightest provocation is the faculty person who can't jump to another institution, even when provoked. He feels trapped. He feels himself to be in a professional box. Sometimes he becomes bitter.



There is a psychology of insecurity and a hostility caused by immobility that we are going to face in great measure from faculty in the years immediately ahead. It will be very foolish of us not to find ways in which to help our faculty grow and ways to help them avoid the feeling that they are trapped within a particular institution.

Take students. Again, only a few years ago all studies showed tremendous student mobility. We feared that the day was coming when students would be hopping all over the United States, from institution to institution, passing judgment on us and notifying us ten days after arrival that they weren't going to put up with the restrictions on our campus which required them to wear shoes or bras or to attend classes or to take exams or to be graded or to sit up rather than lie down in the library.

Now there is a new situation. States like Illinois, in the avant-garde, as far as a Missourian is concerned, have developed scholarship programs and grants to institutions. Only a few years ago, Lindenwood College had twenty-two percent of its students from Illinois. Today the figure is much less than half of that. Tomorrow the figure will be even lower, for your scholarship program will head the student toward one of your institutions, and the grant, when the student comes to your institution, will make you eager to receive the student from Illinois. The student is not likely to get angry enough at you to transfer to Missouri or Iowa or California or New York and pay the out-of-state fees and lose the scholarship.

All of this has happened very suddenly. When this tidal wave recedes, one of the interesting residues will be a provincialism which we tried to throw off in the fifties and sixties. The revolution in transportation and communications made it easier for students to cross the country in search of the kind of educational institution they wished. Now our state

scholarship programs will tend to keep them at home.

It's too early to draw profound conclusions, but I see many signs in studying the statistics of my own state and of yours that our private institutions are going to become much more provincial than they were, and I believe we would like them to be.

Mr. Governor, it seems to me that one of the next steps is for the Governor of Illinois to sit down with the Governor of Michigan and the Governor of Wisconsin and the Governor of Iowa and the governor of any other state in the region--oh, if only the Governor of Missouri could get into the act--and begin to talk about a regional reciprocation of scholarships and grants.

•MORE HOSTILITY

I have already claimed that reduced mobility will bring about increased hostility on the part of some. Daniel Patrick Moynihan in his famous leaked memorandum to the President wrote, "What has been pulling us apart?" "One wishes one knew."

John Fischer is quoted by Logan Wilson in Mr. Wilson's most recent book as writing, ". . . one of our difficulties is the 'life style currently favored by many adolescents of the affluent middleclass.'" Wilson goes on to quote John Fischer as saying that the life style is not only ". . . 'hedonistic, hairy, impulsive, anti-rational, anti-organization, and contemptuous of the straight society,' but it is counter to the work ethic as we have noted in the past."<sup>2</sup>

It's obvious that our colleges and universities are the battleground for a kind of war between students and the rest of society. I am one of those who agree with the President of Harvard in his statement to the

---

<sup>2</sup>Wilson, Logan, SHAPING AMERICAN HIGHER EDUCATION, American Council on Education, Washington, D.C., 1972, p. 187.



freshman class last year that there is not really a generation gap as much as there is a gap between students and the rest of society, even members of their own age group who are not in school.

Certainly unbridled and conspicuous contempt for the straight society will not make it easier for presidents to function, either as presiding officers or fund raisers or for governors to get educational budgets approved by legislators. If it's in the mood of the country for people to be mad at each other and for groups to be hostile, it is certainly clear that the degree of anger with which many people look upon the student group is very great.

The anger should not obscure the fact that we must make clear, those of us who are college presidents, that the life style of many of our students is not the life style of invaders from Mars. These students are our sons and daughters, yours, mine, the presidents of the banks, the superintendents of schools, the sons and daughters of the preachers, the businessmen, and the doctors, and the lawyers, all over the country.

They are, after all, sons and daughters of the straight people. And they are, most of them, what they are before we get them. They are a segment of our society, and they are angry in many cases, disappointed in many cases, frustrated in many cases, confused in many cases, misinformed in some cases, better informed than the rest of us in other cases--they are a group about which it is dangerous to generalize.

They are in our colleges and universities, and they make it hard for our institutions to function as they used to function. They make it hard for people to teach the way they used to teach, for people to advocate values as they used to advocate values, for presidents to raise money as they used to raise money, for dorm supervisors to supervise as they used to supervise--they make it tough.

But they are ours. We made them what they are. And one of the things they are is a group of young people who have something to say which we seem to be refusing to hear.

I do not find that they insist that we agree with them, always. But they do want to be heard.

They turn many of us off. And, of course, we turn many of them off. No place and nobody are as important to the student generation as our colleges and our academic leaders.

The hostility that many of our students have to the establishment cannot be met by organizing a hostile force in counteraction. Ways must be found for exchange, for communication, for some form of understanding, and for basic adjustment on both sides.

If there is some evidence that some of us in the establishment generation are freezing in our tracks and becoming less and less willing to hear what the students are trying to say, there is also some evidence that students are solidifying in their attitudes to the point where they are becoming hostile to the very kind of freedom which they basically believe to be fundamental.

So, here we are in a great tidal wave which sweeps around us. I have described some of the things in the tidal wave which are not pleasant. There must be some good things to be found among the residue when the wave recedes. I am anxious tonight to have you concentrate with me on those things which threaten to twist and turn us in ways which will make it impossible for us to perform the functions we still declare to be our main mission.

What can we do about the collapse of the system of governance which prevailed in the academic world for the last thirty years?

•Among the things we can do is stubbornly insist upon a new system of governance that will work, that will make it possible for an



institution to achieve its objectives, to go somewhere chosen, not to go somewhere at random.

What can we do about our tendency to become tweedledum and tweedledee institutions, each like the other, each claiming to do everything the other does just a little better?

•We can face the fact that this tide toward institutional quality and sameness will be disastrous if we wish to make claims of distinctiveness.

What can we do about deficits and the falling enrollments and the rising costs of operation?

•We can face the fact that while we cannot directly adopt the management procedures of business, or even of government, we can improve on our management and must stop doing that which we cannot afford. The cardinal sin in the educational community is to go ahead and do something that cannot be afforded on the assumption that it will attract additional support later on. That's a siren song.

It is not likely that this tidal wave is going to find us in a position to raise great additional sums of money from the traditional private sources, wealthy individuals, corporations, and alumni of our institutions. It is necessary for us to get our faculties to understand the nature of the tidal wave, the likely posture in which it will leave us, and the difficult task of staying alive as the effects of the tidal wave settle in upon us.

I believe the first tidal wave--the tidal wave of students who are going to inundate us--proved us to be very badly informed about consequences. We did not study the demographic facts and did not act as if we were aware that a tidal wave is not a lake, a tidal wave comes and goes. We have moved ahead in extending our higher education at public expense in state after state without full awareness of

the cost consequences. New York is an example. We have moved ahead in the transformation of our institutions as we have faced the problems of the new tidal wave with the same kind of failure to be hardheaded about the facts and the same kind of aversion for basic planning and research that marked us ten years ago.

If we think, and think deeply, about the period ahead, some of us may survive. Those that do will be the institutions that clarify their purpose and thus attract support; those that survive will be the institutions which adjust themselves to the new needs of education that are now so clearly part of the present scene. And those that do will be the colleges and universities which can change the ways they do things, but not do things colleges should not do.