



*Forty Ninth
Commencement
Addresses*

THE THIRD MAN
an address given at
University of Alaska, College
by
WILLIAM JOVANOVIČH
Essayist, Editor and Publisher

THE WAY IT IS
an address given at
University of Alaska, Anchorage
by
LAURENCE MCKINLEY GOULD
Scientist and Educator

**THE AMERICAN CAMPUS:
A CRISIS IN CONFIDENCE**
A charge to the Class of 1971
by
WILLIAM R. WOOD
President
University of Alaska

*Delivered at the Forty-Ninth
Commencement Exercises
University of Alaska
May, 1971*

ALASKA
LD
91
A4915
F3247
1971
c. 2

THE THIRD MAN
an address
by
WILLIAM JOVANOVICH

The world grinds through the day, and it wearies. Each morning it is painful to read the newspaper. Marshall McLuhan is right when he says that the only good news is the advertisements. As has long been usual, much of the news is a report of catastrophe, whether it be the result of bad luck or bad intention. What is peculiar to our time, however, is the repetition of arguments over public policy. One reads and hears the same theses, expressed again and again in the same wretched usage. It requires a certain valor to listen seriously, day after day, to people who say they must "relate," and who insist on "relevance" and "meaningfulness," but who never define, or even state, the terms of discourse. All of it would be tolerable, perhaps, if one could laugh a little without becoming suspect.

In this connection, take Newark, New Jersey. Indeed, the question is: Who will take Newark, New Jersey? There is, in fact, not much to laugh about in Newark, which may become the first city ever to be designated like an orphan, a public charge. It is bankrupt; its former mayor stole from the city and got caught, and its present mayor is at odds with both his allies and his enemies; its schools were closed for three months while parents, white and black, argued with black and white teachers over labor contracts. In the midst of this misery, something strange went on. Using \$36,796 of federal money, a Newark public school instructed black children in a program devised by the black poet and playwright LeRoi Jones, also called Baraka, and his wife. The teachers, called "mama," all dress alike; the children learn some words in Swahili; and, according to the *New York Times*, they exchange rote questions and collective responses: "To create a sense of discipline and pride, the students are supposed to make the folded arms gesture whenever they enter the classroom and to sit and stand according to special rules."

© 1971 by William Jovanovich
All rights reserved.

No part of this publication may be reproduced or transmitted in any form or by any means, electronic or mechanical, including photocopy, recording, or any information storage and retrieval system, without permission in writing from the author.

Printed in the United States of America

Now Mr. Jones misreads African history. Swahili is in origin a Bantu language, but its vocabulary is heavily Arabic, and more Africans speak English or French than they do Swahili. Africans are no more given to collectivist behavior than any other people. What is strange about Mr. Jones' program is not the similarity it bears to a fascist rally of the nineteen thirties, but rather, that it is financed by a citizenry which cannot think it worthwhile and on its own terms cannot afford it. How will these contradictions be examined? They cannot be discussed sensibly if one uses the banal rhetoric that is today repeated so tediously in the news media. We do surely need new terms of discourse.

Conservatives tend to speak for themselves, which is direct but also indulgent. Liberals presume to speak for "the people" — the uncounted and unnamed people — who, in politics, may be simply the followers needed to make a leader. The conservatives want orderliness to be assured. The liberals want orderliness too, but they want to be gratified by it. Right, left; right, left: march or run.

We need not only the terms of discourse, but also the instruments of measurement. Otherwise, there is no accounting for the conduct of individuals and for the composition of classes and peoples. All economic activity requires counting and comparing. All the things that inform or entertain us are comparable and are finally judged. All persons, singly or severally, manage in some way to rank themselves. Past societies used various measures: tribal, familial, feudal, religious. Today we depend mainly on political and economic instruments. And, today, both liberals and conservatives commonly presume that there is a whole difference between economic measures and political measures. I think there is not.

* * *

I take it as unfortunate that the term "political economy" is no longer used in the academy or the business enterprise or the legislature. Stated simply, political economy has to do with the means, the rules, and the effects of social organization — the means can be defined as mainly economic, the rules as governmental, and the effects as cultural. Political economy as a single subject became common only about two centuries ago. It was discussed in letters between the English

philosophers David Hume and Adam Smith, and Smith was in fact the original professional economist. The practitioners of political science are, of course, far older. Politics was invented the first time on earth that three creatures came together and two of them agreed upon something without telling the third.

Political economy reached its fullest expression in the works of two great men in the mid-nineteenth century: John Stuart Mill and Karl Marx. The first edition of Mill's magnificent work *Principles of Political Economy* was published in the same year, 1848, that Marx and Engels published their *Communist Manifesto*. There is less disagreement between Mill and Marx than is generally supposed. Both of them concentrated their attention upon the workings of capitalism. Both of them foretold the rise of socialist systems, and neither of them was able to predict just how socialism could function. Moreover, both of them wrote in a distinctive style. Marx was pedantic, thorough, but also dramatic, whereas Mill's work has clarity and concinnity, and, like Marx's, it is warmed by belief. Yet the difference in the conclusions reached by these two philosophers is tremendous.

Mill and Marx lived at a time when there burst upon Europe the invention of machines and media and the effects of heavy industry and of mass distribution. What burst upon Europe, and afterward upon the rest of the world, was the Industrial Revolution. Only then could the study of political economy become a matter of high seriousness. This does not mean that before the nineteenth century no one described and analyzed the social orders of the Western world. Yet, until the time of the political economists, no one conceived of mankind in terms of Economic Man or Political Man.

Actually, mankind could probably have identified itself by these terms better in ancient times than later. In ancient Greece and Rome there were conditions not unlike those in nineteenth-century Great Britain or the United States. There was a citizenry that elected representatives to a republican form of government, and there was some form of market economy. The Emperor Diocletian put an end to laissez faire economy in an edict in A.D. 301 when he set wage and price controls — and in effect he put an end to it for over fifteen hundred years. During those centuries, up to the nineteenth, religion dominated the thought of Western man. He conceived of himself as Religious Man, and his measure

of society was a comparison between what was real and what was promised, between the city on earth and the city of God.

Using the definition of social organization I purpose here — as concerns the means, the rules, and the effects — we can presume that Religious Man is a figure of the past and will not be revived. After the Industrial Revolution, and after the revolutions in the United States and France and later throughout Europe, there were left but two terms of identity: Economic Man and Political Man.

Karl Marx did not himself invent, or even subscribe to, the idea of Economic Man, although some of his interpreters and devotees advance the idea. What he did create was a whole system that seeks to explain through economic theory all the causes and effects that occur in society — literally all of them. According to him, no part of the story of social organization can be explained finally except by reference to the class struggle, surplus value, and other theories of his. While he did not assume that man acts only out of economic motives or drives, he argued that society can be explained only by economic analysis.

It is grotesque to accuse the Soviet Communists as the so-called believers in Economic Man of denying those humane qualities that derive from religion, art, and family life. Some muddleheaded Americans have got wrong the Marxist and Leninist use of "materialism." They seem to think it has to do with the love of goods, when actually it is a term indicating the study of physical phenomena. The truth of the matter is that the Russians *are* materialistic, but this is because they are Europeans, not because they are communists. Europeans — including Catholics and Protestants, capitalists and socialists — are the most materialistic people on earth. They accuse Americans of this vice, which is not ours, but theirs. Americans are, as Mary McCarthy wrote, quite uneasy about the things they so expertly create. "We live among these objects," she says, "rather than by them." However that may be, the Marxist continues to believe that the measure of human circumstance must be economic. He continues to presume that political systems are not chosen by people but, rather, conveyed to them by the working of the absolute laws of economic function. Sooner or later, communists assume, everybody on earth will get his, whether he wants it or not.

John Stuart Mill was not so certain of his grounds, or of man's fate. He perceived that politics is not necessarily regulated by economic theory. He presumed that economic laws deal only with production, and not with how goods are distributed. The citizenry in fact decides what to do with its labor, which is to say that they exercise political choice apart from economic forces. "The distribution of wealth depends on the laws and customs of society." In his scheme of things there are laws, but also chances and choices. He was a man — to use a famous line of verse by his contemporary Matthew Arnold — "who saw life steadily and saw it whole."

* * *

Watching the scene in the United States today — in Washington, in Newark, in California, in Alaska — one observes our uncertainties. We are not sure how to determine what is happening; and we cannot agree, once we know what is happening, upon the terms of discourse. The result is a grinding repetition of argument, an inexact and vulgar use of language. The cause is, I think, the politicizing of the American people during the Vietnam war.

Americans have always projected themselves as a political-minded people. Indeed, that Washington, Jefferson, Hamilton, Adams, Franklin, and Madison — all of them cogent thinkers and superb writers of politics — should have legislated together during the founding of a nation seems incredible. The settling of the West was a century-long occurrence in which politics was dominant. Because of the West, the issue of slavery was brought to battle; because of the West, the alliance between big business and government was first formed, and later contested. Once the westering slowed and the immigrants flooded in, cities became the center of "regular" party politics. In short, politics has been thought to be a game that Americans play well, out of long practice.

But the fact is that the United States has been one of the few nations where a man can act in the public interest without standing on a political position. Most American businessmen and academicians — and practically all physicians, accountants, and engineers — have been little involved in party politics and little acquainted with political theory. The labor movement in

the United States has been largely unpolitical, much to the despair of the socialists. The American farmer cannot be trusted to be regularly partisan in politics.

All this has now changed. The war in Southeast Asia has changed it. This war is, in political effect, equal to the two other cataclysmic events in our history: the Civil War and the Great Depression. After each of these terrible events, Americans have undergone a period of intense and general politicizing. After the Civil War, the Confederate survivors organized against the blacks, and in the Northern cities the pattern of boss-and-buy politics was established. After the Civil War, the Republican and Democratic became the established parties, but they were made uneasy by the Populists, who accused them of rote government. The Great Depression brought on the New Deal, which was the first mass political movement in the history of the United States. I do not isolate and compare these three events — the Civil War, the Great Depression, and the Vietnam war — merely for the sake of stating a thesis. Ask, if you will, anyone over the age of fifty, or again, anyone over the age of seventy, if he considers the First or the Second World War to have been as threatening to the continuance of the American nation as was the Depression. You need hardly ask about Vietnam. It is unique, and it is uniquely fearsome. It is the first war in which Americans (other than the Confederate Southerners) will have been humiliated in a prolonged military action. It is the first war that has not brought prosperity, however temporary, to the economy. We witness right now a rise in prices and a fall in jobs — something never dreamt of in the philosophy of Adam Smith or Karl Marx or Lord Keynes.

In politicizing the Americans suddenly, the Vietnam war has caused a widespread adoption of theory and dogma, leading some of us to accept the Economic Man and others the Political Man. Who are we who differ so broadly from one another? We cannot be counted, but I think we can be named. The Old and the New Left, the Maoists, Leninists, Marxists, and the old tired fellow-travelers believe that the existing economic system must end in the fall of capitalism and the restriction of an open government. The blacks, Indians, the Americans of Mexican origin, and the Puerto Ricans, on the other hand, seem not to wish to subvert the power of the American economy; rather, they distrust its long-time egalitarian promises. They fear they will

not share in the bounty of American enterprise, and so in recourse they become political men. They want to legislate their progress. Then there is the middle class of America. It is so huge — about sixty per cent of the population — that it can hardly be characterized. The members of this mass-class are relatively affluent. They own some property. They have either reached up to their class or dropped out of it, but in either event they are mobile.

The mass-class in America became politicized not because of politicians and political theorists, but in spite of them. It fears the Vietnam war not because of Senator Fulbright, who, after all, was the author of the Tonkin Gulf Resolution that gave President Johnson his free hand in running the war. It fears the war not because crude men are in power — after all, it was President Kennedy who sent the first large forces into Vietnam and who knew well what he caused all of us to risk. Rather, it fears that the men in power have mistaken their constituency. A succession of American leaders has failed to recognize that the majority wants an end to the war precisely because the majority has lost so much. I think that the mistake has been made by politicians and intellectuals alike because Americans no longer identify themselves plainly and simply by income and occupation. The middle class now affects a variety of styles. Amongst them there has been a loosening of attitudes, brought on mainly by the enormous effects of television. People now see themselves reflected in new images — they join national, not just local, communities of interest. Thus they become “the youth” and “women” and “environmentalists” and “the silent majority” and “concerned citizens.” Even so, they remain members of a whole and unique class, the only such class in history. Politicized though they are by mistrust of the war, worried though they are by the rising cost of both government and business enterprise, they still do not choose the singular and dogmatic ideas of either Political Man or Economic Man. Indeed, they need not choose. They are themselves — they always have been and they are today — the Third Man.

* * *

The Third Man is an American figure. He is a libertarian, the revolutionary who bases his claims on constitutional guarantees that are almost two centuries

old. The Third Man fulfills the prophecy of John Stuart Mill, who foresaw that it is possible to live in a free-market economy and at the same time protect against economic predators by enacting and respecting laws — the predators on the poor, the predators on natural life, the predators on civil rights, including the right of a man to use his labor and his ingenuity to create and accumulate goods. What Mill foresaw was a social balance between a free economy and a regulatory government. This is what the American has achieved. The Third Man stands ahead of the Economic and Political Men, and he is, to use the dialectic of Karl Marx, the synthesis of the two.

Soon there will appear in English a book by Jean-Francois Revel in which this French intellectual says: "The revolution of the twentieth century will take place in the United States. It can take place only there. It has already begun to develop there. It will occur in the rest of the world only if it succeeds first in North America." Perhaps, like so many French ideologues, Revel is hoping that America will "finish" the French Revolution of 1789 — it is a stock idea that the eighteenth-century bourgeoisie began the revolution and the "people" never were able to finish it, not even in Russia or China, where the dictatorship of the people remains a dictatorship. But if America is in fact the crucible where the world's future is forming, it will not settle the old arguments of European theorists. The American republic, as Jefferson conceived it, cannot complete a revolution, not even its own. It can go on and on in its pragmatic way, defining the public interest and settling some plain issues.

The United States is the only nation in the world that is trying to deal with the issue of race on a massive scale. It is the only nation that is seriously contemplating the question of whether living space and food and shelter and health care can each be made a civil right without its use being dictated. It is the only nation that is debating publicly whether it can use its power justly, or even whether, indeed, it should use its power at all. It is the only nation in which the government will give money to create radical change, and which will finance practices in contravention to its traditional and stated policy. And this, I think, explains some of the contradictions in the story of LeRoi Jones in Newark. Teaching Swahili makes little sense but can do small harm. Thinking that blacks out of some urge of racial

memory need to march collectively makes no sense at all — to blacks or whites. Yet, it is still worth \$37,000 to allow LeRoi Jones and the mamas to play out their simplistic dogma. It is worthwhile to encourage, not merely tolerate, radical proposals in the education of the young who are resilient and not readily frightened. Spending this money does not confuse the people of Newark, who know that they need more than an absurdist theater in the classroom. They know they need private jobs as well as public forums; they know that they need material resources as well as civil rights. The plain issue is that cities need money. If they cannot raise it, they must be given it. The point is that we can do what we will, and will do what we must. Domesticity is plain virtue. If the world's destiny lies here, let us then begin our work at home.

The Third Man asks not for the news, for he knows it is bound to be bad. He lives in the present because that is the only time there is, and so he is neither a reactionary nor a conspirator. He refuses to wallow in sentiments and he knows that patriotism should always be a proposition, not a refuge. He can, as a civil skeptic, refuse to give credit to political obsessions, left or right, and he will not be rallied to run or march. He can keep the promise of the American republic, which is that orderliness and eventfulness are not opposite, but coefficient. Who is the Third Man? He is the American who is emerging from Vietnam, claiming nothing, neither chastened nor proven by fire. He depends not on the past, not on the future. He gets through the day, which is his day. The whole world is watching him, and he is me and he is you.

THE WAY IT IS

*an address given at the
University of Alaska, Anchorage
First Commencement
May 9, 1971
by
LAURENCE M. GOULD*

This is a unique moment in the history of the University of Alaska at Anchorage. This is your first commencement. It is the beginning of greatness which lies ahead of you. This is also a unique moment in the life of every one of you graduates. This has never happened before and it will not happen again, though this University lasts for a thousand, thousand years. Furthermore, it is the most important thing going on anywhere in these fifty states of ours. Not important because I am here, nor yet because you are here but because it symbolizes the most important aspect of our common national life.

Education is our secular religion and this is the one occasion when we share the sacraments of that religion. This "indigenous tribal rite," which we call "commencement," is uniquely American. No other country has anything like it. Education is the single most important unifying influence in our national life, and commencement is the one occasion when we express that unity. It is the only occasion which brings all segments of the University together; the one occasion when we can speak with one voice in expressing our hopes and aspirations for the graduating classes. And for us who have graduated long since it is an occasion to rededicate ourselves to the faith that holds this and all other good universities together; namely that education and research are man's greatest allies in his quest for fulfillment. Apathy and ignorance are his most dangerous enemies.

However great the problems that lie ahead of us, only a literate world may be able to solve them. An ignorant and apathetic one can lead only to disaster.

I could, of course, tell you there are no goals for you; that you really don't have any future; that you inhabit a world which hangs upon the edge of nuclear destruction; that your world may end tomorrow. I could

do that except that I don't believe things will happen that way. Civilizations are like individuals; a few die violent deaths but most die in bed. Our civilization will die when the spiritual forces that make us wish to be right and noble die in the hearts of man. Arnold Toynbee has pointed out that nineteen of twenty-one civilizations have died from decay within rather than by conquest from without. There were no bands playing and no flags waving when these civilizations died. It happened slowly in the quiet and the dark when no one was aware.

I know that it is a troublesome world which you inherit but I think it may be interesting trouble. Besides if you don't like turmoil it is just too bad. You were born in the wrong century.

The world into which many of us were born is gone and will never return. We cannot, if we would, follow Francis Bacon's advice, "it were well that man in his innovations follow the example of nature who proceeds by small steps slowly."

Ours is obviously a time between an age which is dying and one which is yet to be born. This is a fearful thing for those who confuse comfort with civilization or those who follow beaten tracks or grooves, and as somebody has said beaten paths are for beaten people and a groove is but a grave with the ends knocked out.

The new and compelling reality of your world is change. All the relations of life are changing — person to person and nation to nation. We have been seeing a mass migration from farm to city without precedent in its magnitude. All our traditional institutions are changing. Even the great world religions are beginning to talk to each other. I think we shall survive in this world of change only to the extent that we become familiar with it. I think the most important person in changing times is not the ready follower of change but the person of unchangeable values.

More than half of you graduating today will be working at jobs that didn't even exist when you were born and most of those jobs will disappear before you are ready to retire. In a world of such rapid change even the most advanced education this University has given you will not survive as a sufficient tool over your whole career. Education must become a lifelong task. This is not new, but is a new imperative. Any notion, therefore, of education that does not include continuity is illusive. We are educated only, as there is open to us, an orderly

process of growth from what we are to something better.

Ours is a period of disenchantment. The realization that prosperity and comfort do not assure health and happiness depresses all of us. We have learned that material progress often has consequences that spoil the quality of life. It has taken us a long time to realize the fallacy of a secure future based on a policy of infinite expansion in a finite world. The greatest task that lies ahead of us is the establishment of some kind of equilibrium between the finite limited resources of planet earth and its human population. There will be no ultimate solution to the problems that face you until this balance is achieved.

We all know that the applications of science and technology have done more than any other tools in the history of man to rid us of ignorance and fear and to provide us with food and shelter, but in using the products of science and technology we have been fooling ourselves with the illusion that we can have something for nothing. This is not so. There is a price tag on everything. Every good casts its shadow.

We further fool ourselves with the illusion that we have conquered nature or that we can conquer it. We have done so much to control it that it has led man to believe he is master of his destiny. This is not so, we cannot decide our own lives as we please. We are not free from the evolutionary processes which have created us. We have not yet learned that we cannot bully nature but must learn to negotiate with it. Today our pressure on nature is provoking nature's revenge and we are "sitting down to a banquet of consequences."

In spite of the brilliant accomplishments of science and technology we are still in bondage to living nature. We rely almost completely upon photosynthesis, the process by which plants alone can use energy direct from the sun. No animals can do this. Job was profoundly right when he said, "all flesh is grass."

Here in the United States we have assumed that a rising standard of living would dispel most of the economic and social ills of mankind. It has done neither and we know now that not even affluence and knowledge are sufficient to do it.

The 60's was a period of great economic progress but also one of great tragedy for much of the world. The 70's, which is your decade, may indeed be the beginning of the end or the beginning of a new civilization. If it is the latter as the late great Joseph Wood Krutch has said

"it will not be because we have walked on the moon and plumbed the depths of the sea but because we have come to realize that wealth and power and even knowledge are not necessarily good in themselves but may become instruments of good or evil."

I think I can understand, in part at least, the present rebellion of the world's young. It is not a passing fancy. They are in revolt against a society which they believe is controlled by technology rather than man. In his address as retiring President of the American Association for the Advancement of Science in 1968, Dr. Donald Price said, "the rebels are right in being pessimists. I do not think they are pessimistic enough. To me it seems possible that the new amount of technological power let loose in an overcrowded world may overload any system we may devise for its control. The possibility of a complete and apocalyptic end of civilization cannot be dismissed as a morbid fancy."

Of course, I do not dismiss it as a morbid fancy, but on the other hand I do not agree with Dr. Price. I believe the surest way to insure the collapse of civilization and to assure it quickly would be to turn our backs on science and technology. Those in revolt say that science and technology haven't made man happy. Of course, they have not because they were never meant to. They are neutral. I know of no discovery of science which does not have a dual aspect. Mark those words. Any instrument of science and technology may be a tool for good or evil. They may liberate us or enslave us. The surgeon's knife may save your life or cut your throat. It is patently foolish, therefore, to hold science and technology responsible for the current ills of mankind. Science and technology have not increased man's folly, they have only made it more dangerous.

I am not saying that science and technology can solve the problems of society but conversely they cannot be solved without science and technology. If the world is ever to have a cure for cancer it will be because of scientific research and technology. The worst disaster in human history occurred because of the great so-called tidal wave in East Pakistan in November 1970. More than half a million people were drowned, but within forty days the high birth rates of the people of East Pakistan has repaired the damage and the population was back to "normal." As a complement to this statement remember that the man who won the Nobel Prize for Peace in 1970 was Norman Borlaug, who had discovered

Is there still time? There is a real possibility that changes in our environment have already exceeded our capacity to adapt and the best minds seem to agree that we are on the edge of a nutritional and environmental catastrophe. The Nobel laureate who discovered Vitamin C recently said, "at present we are on the road to extermination. We are so deep in the groove that we cannot make a turn." Barry Commoner, one of the most astute students of our environmental problems believes that critical decisions must be made in the next ten years or the process of death is inevitable. Other estimates vary as high as one hundred years but all agree that we are in a crisis period.

The history of life throughout its two or three billions of years on planet earth has been largely a history of failures and of all of the millions of species which have been rendered extinct by evolution, man is the only one to know in advance what may destroy him. Herein it seems to me lies a great hope. To be aware of a problem is a necessary prelude to its solution.

We have all been taught during our school days that probably the most brilliant period in man's life was ancient Athens — the age of Pericles. Here was the greatest combination of art, letters, and science that man has ever known, but it rode to its excellence on the backs of slaves. Let your imagination run as wild as it can. Think of the kind of society that lies ahead of you based not upon the limited strength of human flesh but on the unlimited strength of the tools of science and technology.

Do not leave here thinking I have said that science and technology will save the world. I have not said that at all. I have only said that the world cannot be saved without them, but I do say now that to have the kind of world we need, we not only need the scientist, we need the theologian, the historian, and the philosopher as well.

I feel especially comfortable making statements like these here in Alaska. All of the forty-nine states have very special interests in you, more than you can possibly have in any or all of the rest.

In you rests a large segment of our national security. Beyond that your economic and social problems concern us as do your environmental and political problems and some of the most important of all are the scientific problems crying for solution here in this brand new state. You are, indeed, the first state ever

to have the opportunity to plan out your role in a relatively untouched region. You should and can avoid many of the mistakes the other forty-nine have made. Here is where the action is going to be. Here you may be able to lead the way, if only the other forty-nine states leave you alone and don't try to tell you what to do.

But however we look at the future, it is clear that civilization, as we have shaped it and used it, is in the midst of a great shake-up. Of course we face times of great testing but they are at the same time pregnant with great and dynamic promise as well as with possible disaster. Do you realize that this is the first time in human history that it has been accepted, even in principal, that all human beings are entitled to freedom, social justice, and equal opportunity.

We have for the first time in human history the tools to do this or to destroy ourselves. I think we can build a better world. I believe we have a period of grace in which to restore our environment and I don't feel the least bit sorry for you who graduate tonight. I don't think it is because I am so many years older than any of you that I envy you. Looking back over the long history of man I can see no period, however noble, in which I had rather live than right now and if I were fifty years younger I would want to start that life in Alaska.

I congratulate you in having been born in a period of such great possibilities and I tell you, my young friends, that whatever the future holds, so long as there is romance in young love and joy in family loyalties, life can still be a glad and triumphant thing.

THE AMERICAN CAMPUS: A CRISIS IN CONFIDENCE

A charge to the Class of 1971

by WILLIAM R. WOOD

President

University of Alaska

Class of 1971, yours has not been a vintage year in American higher education. A vintage year requires an abundance of sunshine, an absence of extremes in climatic conditions, and the proper nutrients at just the right stages of growth.

Your time in college, unfortunately for you and the world, which you keep reminding me you did not create, has seen a heavy overcast of gloom-filled clouds and abnormally stormy weather. At times the storms have driven you to the edge of darkness, when the real purpose of your journey was to seek the light and a better way.

Some few of you, it distresses me to observe, have not joined seriously in the search for truth and light, but impatiently have resisted and rejected the efforts of those who sought to give you a helping hand along the way. Only a few to be sure have so acted, and they should take no credit for adding to the burden of the rest of your generation. No credit is merited, for it is one thing to sound the alarm when it appears the engine is moving too fast in the wrong direction. It is quite another deliberately to try to push the entire train off the track.

Throughout the Nation in recent years the selfish, misguided, unreasoned actions of a few have negated the hard work, the intelligent application of true ability to constructive tasks of the great majority of university students.

The wild and weird actions of a few have added much to inflationary costs in services, supplies, security, and insurance. Rightly, the general public is fed up to the gills with nonsense that pretends to be "higher education." The institution upon which a free and independent people have relied so heavily and in which they have placed their absolute trust has been made to appear unworthy. People have grown weary of disturbance, of unreasonable demands made by some students and by some faculty. They have turned from

generous to marginal support of higher education for obvious cause. The general public is at the very brink of abandoning what it has long termed its wisest, most promising, and most enduring investment, its moral and financial support of higher education.

This is bitter, bitter medicine, and unnecessary, for the hundreds of thousands of students and the thousands of professional persons in higher education who have not been a party to disruption. Nor have they subscribed or succumbed to the wish-book philosophy of the restless, the emotionally volatile, the non-thinkers, the non-competitors, whose only goal seems to be personal attention at any cost. If the profession of education is to avoid swallowing the bitter concoction being prescribed by the public, the Profession must set its house in order as a learned profession. Yet there are elements in the fraternity that would move in the opposite direction and destroy the great gains in freedom, in prestige, in service to human kind that have been accumulated through generations of sacrifice and strenuous effort.

The sorry fact surfaces that some who profess to being professors ought not to be associated with an institution of higher learning in any capacity. I say this on behalf of a besmirched and beleaguered profession, and in spite of the encouragement to discord and disruption provided by some members of the legal profession and by some members of the modern communications media industry. Raucous cries of academic freedom, of free speech, strident, arrogant, authoritarian calls for a new "life style," and pressure tactics from the underground "Demonstrators' Handbook" must not deter truly professional persons on whatever campus they may be from the unpleasant task of cleansing the nest. An independent, self-reliant profession of the learned cannot survive as a sanctuary for malcontents or a haven for misfits. It is well for everyone in the education profession to remember that the public holds the power of the purse, a most effective universal language.

The profession does not stand alone. Perhaps parents throughout the Nation from every station in life might not be so bewildered and concerned today by the theme of a much publicized book, "The Greening of America," if yesterday they had been more attentive to the browning of America, the tanning of little hides when they needed it. In all of this I could be so very,

very wrong. The intuitions and inclinations of youth invariably triumph over the disillusion and the disinclinations of maturity. Fortunately for the continued primacy of the human race, the ripening process takes time, much time for the mellowing by learning and experience.

Class of 1971, as students of purpose you expect quite properly the best, or at least the good, even though neither your experience nor your intuitive insights are entirely to be relied upon as yet in judging quality performance at either level. The general public expects the best or at least the good for the money it spends on education, although it too in any given instance is seldom in a position to take an unbiased position based wholly on known facts.

A second inescapable conclusion for our time surfaces. Education on a life-long learning basis is an absolute necessity for each of us. It is not a paradox, however, to note that some, in fact a considerable number, who call themselves students today, ought not to be on any existing campus. They are where they are for no sound reason or for no reason at all. They need to learn, but let them find those opportunities in the special ways that suit their special cases — outside the campus environment which they profess to find intolerable.

Class of 1971, tell your sons and daughters that the college experience is a precious thing. It is as fragile as a bluebird's song, or a butterfly's gossamer wing, yet it is also more durable than gold or diamonds. How easy to handle it carelessly or to mistreat it, particularly when one is young, filled with dreams and oh, so lacking in experience.

The college experience is not designed for every teen-age high school graduate. It is not the essential ingredient for the good life for all. It is for some, even many, but not for all. There are other sound approaches to the good life, however, you may interpret it. Any institution that provides a college educational opportunity has a set of purposes. They change from time to time in detail, but seldom in broad outline. You help to change them but so does the total social-economic cultural milieu of the age. Those purposes continuously under review and modification are the justification for the existence of the institution and for its support.

A prospective student should not waste his time enrolling in a college or university if his career purposes or his intellectual curiosity purposes do not mesh with the purposes of that college or university. In other words, do not urge your children to go to college solely because their friends are enrolling, or because you want them to go, or because they seek to avoid a possible unpleasantness for themselves such as the draft, or home, or competition, or work. If one is born with ultimate wisdom, it would seem a waste of time and talent to associate with any university either as a student or faculty member.

The university is not a tool of the ALIBI AGE. It does not hold that somebody else ought to do something to improve conditions; it tries through its own special efforts to inform, to instruct and encourage self-reliant persons of good sense and good will to perform competently for their own and the common good.

Counsel your children to try college when and only when they feel they are ready, at first possibly on a part-time basis in evening school, or by correspondence. They might try learning on their own. Many a distinguished figure in world history has. There is the job, the good acquaintances, the radio, the television, the cassette player, the newspapers and periodicals, and best of all, the free public library. Civilization, whatever its faults assumed or real, certainly offers the individual man or woman a plethora of opportunities to learn on his own.

Class of 1971, I have been forthright with you today for I know you would have me tell it as it seems to me it is. You have been honest with me and I believe with yourselves. You have been concerned and so have I. Together we have shared few illusions nor any despair about the present or the future. You haven't given up the good cause of higher education. Neither have I. Ours is a precious heritage. By your good work this year, you have contributed much to Alaska and to its university that has been noteworthy, at times courageous, and even self-sacrificing. Much of it, unfortunately, has gone unheralded.

It appears that the great good you have accomplished has been drowned temporarily in a teapot tempest fermented by a few. Do not for a second doubt that your accomplishment will surface quickly to offset the crisis in confidence that briefly has beset our

campus, as well as virtually every other campus in America.

I commend you for what you are and for what you represent — the greatest asset of this magnificent State or of any other.

Best of luck wherever you may go, and please remember, my door, however small it may become, will always be open to you.