

*The State of the University*  
*in February 1969*

“State of the University”  
address by  
President John A. Hannah



Faculty Convocation, February 10, 1969

MICHIGAN STATE UNIVERSITY

# The State of the University in February 1969

*The Faculty Bylaws require an annual faculty convocation on Monday evening nearest February 12, at which time the President shall report on the State of the University.*

THE DEVELOPMENTS of recent days have changed the nature of my role in this evening's program.

It is probable that I am participating in my last faculty convocation as your President. What I had originally intended to say seemed inadequate and inappropriate. What I will say is quite different from what was originally intended.

I propose to review a few of the more significant things that have happened in recent months and some of the problems we face.

I shall try to highlight the great potential ahead for this University as it travels the last mile toward its goal of becoming one of the truly distinguished universities of the world.

I will urge you of the faculty to have the courage to make some of the tough decisions that must be made on this campus and on other American university campuses.

And then I shall make some references to the situation in which I find myself and tell you why I am making the decision that is being made, and how that affects my role here.

Tonight we continue our tradition of making an annual report on the state of Michigan State University on the Monday nearest our Founders Day and at the start of this University's 115th year.

For me, this is an appreciated assignment.

There are many achievements to report, many fine successes to record, much excellence to reflect.

There are few other university presidents anywhere who have the opportunity to be so proud as I am, and for that I am most grateful

to all of the members of the entire University family—our faculty, our staff, and our students.

**T**ONIGHT'S MEETING brings to mind another faculty convocation in this building ten years ago, when Michigan State University was going through one of its most trying times.

Sixty percent of our present faculty have been with us less than these ten years, so perhaps for them and as a reminder to the rest of us it would be useful to review just what was happening back in the late 1950's.

The economy of the state and the nation had been good in the early 50's. The State of Michigan was financially healthy, and so was the University.

Then came what nationally was called a recession, but what for Michigan was a brief but sharp depression.

The state's treasury emptied. For 1958-59, the state appropriation to the University was cut more than \$1 million — not from our request to the legislature, but from the level of the appropriation for the previous year.

In other parts of state government there were payless pay days. University personnel were always paid on time, but it was a depressing and discouraging period in our history.

It was in the middle of this setting that in March of 1959 we had a faculty convocation.

The message that night was that we at Michigan State still had many strengths and a bright future. Even in the midst of that unhappy time we were looking ahead and setting up the machinery for what became known as "The Committee on the Future of Michigan State University."

The report from that faculty committee—after months of searching debate and analysis—was one of the most significant and influential in the entire history of this University. It is a tribute to the authors that even now its principles and major points remain valid.

**W**E ARE a very different Michigan State today from what we were in those ten short years ago. Perhaps we should remind ourselves of how our ability to serve society has expanded.

We are different in size—double what we were then.

We are different in quality—we were good then; but using the same measuring stick, we are excellent today.

Our campus facilities are very different. In a decade we have

added 56 new buildings or major additions to buildings at a total investment cost of \$184,638,500.

Our faculty salaries have almost doubled.

We have become a major institution for graduate education.

We have seven new colleges that did not exist in 1959, and 13 new academic departments. We have established 19 new bachelor's degree programs, 13 new master's programs, 13 more at the doctoral level, and 5 in agricultural technology.

During this decade our faculty has doubled in size and grown in quality. Outstanding new faculty members have had great impact on their students, and their colleagues, and their departments, and their colleges. They, too, helped shape Michigan State University. We are fortunate to have them here to join in moving this University forward.

**E**QUALLY IMPORTANT, today's students are significantly different from those of ten years ago. They are of much higher ability. Many more of our students come from relatively low-income families. Our entering freshman classes are much more representative of the total population than they used to be. The popularity of Michigan State with prospective students is at an all-time high. Today's students think very differently from those of the 1950's. The studies by our own Drs. Irving Lehman and Walker Hill and the continuing nationwide study, including this University, by the American Council on Education indicate many changes.

Today's MSU freshman is a better reader, better thinker, and has more ambitious educational plans than did his counterpart in 1958. But today's freshman does not place so much value on hard work, or traditional morality, or respect for authority as did his predecessor.

Today's student questions just about everything. He does not see life in a neat, sharp framework. He is more likely to respond to peer group and social pressure. Most of today's freshmen feel mature enough to judge for themselves when a rule is inappropriate.

Nearly all think students should help design the curriculum.

Two-thirds think faculty pay should be based at least in part on student evaluations.

Three-fourths still do not think that marijuana should be legalized.

Half think colleges in general are too lax on student protests.

Only one in three had a serious discussion about the future with his parents while still in high school, but 60 percent had a serious argument with a high school teacher.

Five out of eight read poetry not required for a class, and three out of four visited an art gallery within the past year.

Many of these items just confirm what we suspected as we all have watched students change over the years.

Students have changed, and it is well for us to know about their attitudes and values, their goals and their commitments as they come to us.

**A** REPORTER on the state of this University at this stage in its history is faced with a multitude of accomplishments to reflect.

Ours is a vital and viable University.

It has had great momentum. It continues to have great momentum.

Students learn, researchers explore the unknown, books are written, advice is given, and through it all Michigan State serves the State of Michigan, and the nation, and the world, and the students and parents and citizens of all origins and all walks of life.

Amidst all this how does one choose which items to comment upon? For that matter, how can this University even be written down on paper, or encased within covers, or in any fashion be recorded in its entirety?

It cannot.

About all we can hope to do is put a few brush strokes on a canvas, a touch here and there, and hope that they are honestly typical, and with a further hope that those whose pictures do not get painted will understand the difference between impressionism and Norman Rockwell.

**I**F WE ARE TO IDENTIFY this evening a few specific, noteworthy changes, or acquisitions, or programs, the new computer must be one of the items mentioned because it figures in and supports the work of so many departments and colleges.

It hardly seems possible that it was only five years ago when we were so delighted to acquire the Controlled Data 3600 computer, then the fastest and most capable on any campus in America.

But in today's world, the state of the computer art does not stand still. For some time now, the CDC 3600 has been operated 24 hours a day, 7 days a week. It has given good service, but it is no longer the most sophisticated. And now we have installed a CDC 6500, almost as much faster than the 3600 as the 3600 was faster than its predecessor.

More than 6,000 students in seven MSU colleges now receive formal instruction in how to use the computer in relation to their major subject matter. Nearly 500 different faculty and student investigators from eleven MSU colleges use the computer to help speed research results.

The computer has become an all-campus facility. And while our new 6500 can handle a million instructions per second and its capabilities now exceed our scholars' requirements, this will not be true for long. The time will come when we will be looking back and saying: "Good old 6500—fine while it lasted, but now we need something really fast and really sophisticated."

Another item of major interest at this point in the history of this University is our College of Human Medicine.

The concept of our human medicine program is very different from that of the usual college of human medicine. Unlike most others, our College is not a separate entity, standing apart from the total university.

There are few if any other departments or colleges that have so many formal and informal relationships with so many diverse parts of our academic enterprise. Human Medicine here is becoming an almost all-University college at Michigan State. It has joint budgets, or joint faculty appointments, or some other kinds of relationships with the faculty of 27 different colleges and departments.

You know that we are seeking formal legislative approval and authorized funds to extend our human medicine program from its present pre-clinical two years to a full-fledged four-year, degree-granting institution. This move to full clinical instruction and to the graduation of some of the many more doctors that this state so desperately needs, has the backing and approval of the State Medical Society, the State Board of Education, the State Hospital Association, and other professional groups, and now has received the recommendation of Governor Milliken.

What remains is formal and financial approval from the state legislature, and we hope for both in this session of the legislature.

Assuming we do get these approvals, the students who started the first year of Human Medicine last fall on this campus could receive their M.D. degrees from MSU in 1972.

**I**F ALL YOU KNEW about college students was what you read under the newspaper headlines or saw on the television news programs, with student demands and ultimatums and protests, the sit-downs, and sit-ins, love-ins and "do-our-things", you would certainly not know that all of this visibility, and the resulting public concern, results from the attitudes and activities of a very small percentage of this generation of university students.

You certainly would not know that during the first week of this present winter term 3,000 students, one of every ten undergraduate students on our campus, went to the office of the Student Volunteer

Programs, and said to Jim Tanck and his small staff: "What can I do to help?"

They were offering to give up some of their own time, four hours for every week of the term, to take part without pay in one of the two dozen or more volunteer service programs that are manned by MSU students.

Young men and women such as these do not make headlines. Being a friendly big brother to a youngster who has no parents does not often make the front page. Little camera film is allotted to a student who tutors a high school boy so he understands mathematics—but more important, helps him see why he should stay in school instead of taking the easy way in dropping out. Giving up your own free time to help someone else is not that controversial, or spectacular, or to most news editors, that exciting. But it is exciting to the students who volunteer. For them this is relevance, and commitment, and significance, all rolled into one.

This is one important side of our University, one of the strokes of the brush that says what we are.

**T**HIS PAST WEEK we had this year's first hearings before the Appropriations Committee of the Senate, and as usual the legislators are much interested in enrollments, present and future predictions, not only on this campus but on all campuses.

Our future enrollment at Michigan State is a matter that affects all of us in a very major way.

More students want to attend college today than ever before.

To accommodate many of them, we are fortunate in Michigan to have a large and growing network of public community colleges. There are 28 today with a combined enrollment of more than 90,000, and the late Professor Max Smith of our Continuing Education staff had a hand in developing at least half of them.

About one in every two freshmen starting college anywhere in Michigan in 1969 will start at a community college. Such institutions are important to their communities, but they are important to the senior colleges and universities, too. Last September more than 900 of their students transferred to Michigan State to complete their degree studies, and more come every term. We are pleased to have these advanced undergraduates. We must seek to continue our friendly and cooperative partnerships with our community colleges.

But back to our own campus enrollment.

For the three-year period 1964, 1965, and 1966, our student body grew by 10,510 students from 27,597 to 38,107. In the 1966-67 year, we

were approaching the 40,000-student level that our own planning had indicated was about the point at which we should level off. As a result of planned reductions in the size of the freshman classes and planned reductions in the number of new out-of-state students accepted, for the two-year period 1967 and 1968 our enrollment increased only 1,842 students from 38,107 to 39,949. We went up 38 percent in three years, and only 4.8 percent in the next two.

Despite the temporary interruption caused by Selective Service, which may be more pronounced next year than this, our major future growth should be at the graduate level. We should be putting increased emphasis on planning to bring our graduate resources and enrollments in line with each other. We should determine those academic areas that should be encouraged to grow in graduate enrollment, those that should hold about where they are, and ascertain if there are some that should actually be reduced in enrollment.

All the people of Michigan have a fundamental stake in maintaining the excellence of Michigan State University at whatever level of enrollment.

There are more than 90 colleges and universities, public and private, junior and senior, in this state.

They enroll each year one-third of a million students.

Michigan State enrolls one out of every eight of all of those students.

Michigan State enrolls one out of every five graduate students in the state.

And Michigan State teaches more Michigan residents than any other college or university anywhere.

The budget recommendations from Governor Milliken to the state legislature reflect this. For the first time in many years, they acknowledge the fact that Michigan State has considerable catching up to do.

Now we must convince the members of the legislature of the validity and merit of our needs.

Oakland University continues to grow in enrollment, in facilities, in quality, and in usefulness. It is destined in the years ahead to become an ever more important part of the totality that is MSU.

**W**E TEACH and do research and perform public service in East Lansing, in our centers around the State of Michigan, and also around the world.

Members of our faculty were involved this past year in international projects in Pakistan, Peru, Thailand, Turkey, Brazil, Bolivia, Argentina,



Colombia, Mexico, Central America, Nigeria, Tanzania, India, and many other places.

We have continued an expanded exchange program so that our students and faculty may study in Western Europe, in Asia, in Africa, and in Central and South America.

The international dimension of Michigan State University remains one of our most important.

Each succeeding year makes it increasingly clear that this and other American university campuses must be increasingly concerned with the incorporation into the on-campus educational programs of an adequate awareness of the kind of a world that today's young people are going to live their lives in.

Even though they may be unusual and spend their entire lives within 100 miles of where they were born, they must know why what happens in Korea, or in Vietnam, or in Biafra, or in some other far-off place, may have a profound impact on the lives of all of the people in the community where they live.

An understanding of the peoples of all the world, of all colors, of all races, of all religions, of all political philosophies is of increasing importance to all of us.

One of the most notable accomplishments of the past year was the complete approval and endorsement by this faculty and by our Trustees of the objectives of the report prepared by the Committee of Sixteen.

The members of that faculty committee—six Black and ten White—developed a set of objectives outlining what this University should be doing to promote equal educational opportunity at all levels on this campus.

This report called for an increase in the number of Black students and Black faculty, Black staff, and other Black employees, and for the establishment of a Center for Study and Research into the kinds of problems that face the urban disadvantaged.

Our University was fortunate to attract to the position of Assistant Provost and Director of the Center for Urban Affairs and Director of the Equal Opportunity Program Professor Ronald Lee, who has packed into his relatively few years three careers—first in the Army, then service as a White House fellow, and then as a high-ranking official of the United States Post Office Department.

Professor Lee in the few months that he has been here has made an impressive start in a very difficult assignment. He deserves all the help and support each of us can give him.

But it would be a mistake to think that Professor Lee or any other individual can accomplish what needs to be done without a high level of support and help from all of us. Providing equal educational oppor-

tunity to youngsters who have been shortchanged educationally for too long is not something that can be done by one person, or through one office, or over night.

Merely recruiting disadvantaged students to enroll at Michigan State is not enough.

Black students, as all other students, deserve a sympathetic but scrupulously honest response from the University.

A student who really has no chance to succeed should not be admitted merely to increase the numbers of the formerly disadvantaged on this campus.

A student who does have a chance to succeed must be offered more than merely a certificate of admission.

We owe to every student we admit a fighting chance to succeed.

This does not mean gift grades in class. It does not mean a lowering of standards or a lessening of expectations.

It may mean a remedial course, or postponing Natural Science, or it may mean graduation will take more than four years; but all of those measures are required for some proportion of all our students anyway.

We owe whatever academic tutoring is needed.

We owe the kind of personal interest that makes a difference, the kind, for instance, for which Dr. Gwen Norrell in the Counseling Center is so well known. I have been much impressed by letters and statements from more than enough of our Black undergraduates to know that they are convinced that "Doc", as they call her, has made a real difference to them. This campus could use more Gwendolyn Norrells. We are fortunate that we and our students have her here. I want her to know we appreciate her work. I hope there will be more with the same attitude of helpfulness who will want to join her.

But again I remind you that no one individual can do this important job alone.

Efforts by administrative officers can identify, recruit, admit, and find financial aid for disadvantaged students—but it will be in the departments, in the colleges, in the classrooms, and in the offices of individual faculty members where these students really can be helped to succeed academically.

All of us have an obligation to do our share and then some more. We need the help and the interest and cooperation from concerned and committed faculty members all across the campus.

It is my fondest hope that after I have left this campus all of you will want to play a constructive part in making this University a true leader among universities by doing all that it is appropriate to do to assist Black people and all of the others in our society who have been disadvantaged, or passed by, or forgotten.

That attitude will be in conformance with the basic philosophy that this University was designed for 115 years ago. The objective then was to make educational opportunity at the highest level and of the highest quality available to the disadvantaged of that day. In that day the disadvantaged were the children of the little people on farms, and of those who used the strength of their legs, and arms, and backs to earn their livelihood and an opportunity for their children. The goal was to make it possible for the children of the least advantaged through education to compete on an even basis with the children of all others.

In this day the objective remains the same. While some of the disadvantaged of today may live on farms, most of them live in cities and are Black. Their parents and grandparents and great grandparents were denied the opportunity for adequate education to lift themselves so that they, too, might compete evenly with all others.

I hope you will in the months and years ahead keep front and center the commitment this faculty and our Trustees have made to use our abilities, our energies, and our leadership to make this University an example to others in the area of equal opportunity for all.

The need is great, and I believe the result of that effort here as in international education will be rewarding and worthwhile, and that this University can lead all others in these important areas.

**A**MONG the many other items that could be mentioned this evening, I shall touch upon only a few.

Dr. Rust, the Ombudsman, reports he has more business than last year. To me it is heartening that he reports an average of only about four students a day seek his help. He reports that most of his business is complaints. We could hope that there would be none at all, but four complaints a day from almost 40,000 students does not seem overly numerous.

The first place award of our University mathematics team, for the third time in seven years in winning the Putnam National Mathematics Competition, was certainly noteworthy.

More than 400 of our students were invited this past year to join our new Phi Beta Kappa chapter.

The membership and contributions of the Honors College are at an all-time high.

Our Agricultural Experiment Station continues major breakthroughs to make more food possible for the world's hungry.

The Center of Excellence grant from the National Science Foundation of more than \$4 million for the departments of Mathematics and Physics and Chemistry and related sciences will help very much.

Our membership in the Universities Research Association, which is responsible for building the 200-Bev cyclotron, the world's most powerful, is significant.

The student advisement centers in the University College and elsewhere have helped lower the rate of student failure to what seems to me to be an almost irreducible 1.4 percent last fall among freshmen and sophomores.

There are many more that could be enumerated, but let us leave the past and the present and look briefly to the future, and beyond the immediate demands of this day.

Now, we begin to see that there is a real likelihood that the Michigan State University of tomorrow is going to be called upon to provide an education for people who will journey to the moon.

What kind of an education will these people require and want? What kind of a faculty will this University require to furnish it? What will be our programs and our courses?

What will be so new that it has not yet even been thought of?

Will our society, in fact, abandon some or many of the values and ideals that we who are no longer young think to be so important?

It would take a much clearer crystal ball than I possess to predict specifics that far ahead in time and that far out in space.

In the long-range future, Michigan State will be a better university. Our students will be better, and our faculty will know our students better. Hopefully, all teachers of that day will regard students as sensitive human beings, and fewer will regard them as printed lines on a class list.

The Michigan State of tomorrow will have much more information about its students and will have a built-in system to furnish that information as it is gathered to the faculty on a regular basis.

Michigan State will be a better university if there is built into it an assured continuing recognition that its product — learning and students who learn — is not something that rolls off an assembly line but is something generated within individuals, encouraged within individuals, caused to grow within individuals, and accomplished only by somehow lighting in the consciousness of the student a spark of interest, of curiosity, of inspiration, of desire to make the maximum of oneself.

Today, tomorrow, and in the long-range future when people may journey regularly to the moon, teaching still will be important. Teaching in whatever way each of us does it best. Teaching of individuals who then will teach themselves more. Setting an example of scholarship, and personal concern, and personal integrity will continue to be important.

**I**N THE FUTURE, as in the past, universities will reflect their students.

Some of us can look back to the 1940's. It was all business as the veterans came back and wanted to finish their educations right then.

Most of us remember the 1950's. Apathetic was the word that was often used to describe our students, and while that was not always correct, there was an element of truth to it.

All of us have lived through the 60's. This is the decade of activism and activists. They challenged you, they challenged me, they challenged everyone and everything around them. You sometimes wondered why some of them bothered to stay in a place they criticized so much.

Now come the 70's.

We will continue to seek the solutions, but no one can promise it will be easy. No one can know the solutions, or even yet the targets in advance.

Our experience will not be like that of the man who was passing through a small town one day and saw indications of amazing marksmanship all about on trees, and barns, and fences. There were many, many bullseyes, each with a bullet hole in the exact center. He asked to meet the expert shot who turned out to be the village simpleton.

"This is sensational," the visitor said, "how in the world do you do it?"

"Easy as pie," came the answer. "I shoot first and draw the circles afterwards."

Many of education's critics are marksmen of that pattern.

But no university has the luxury of being able to shoot first and draw in the target afterward. Rather, we have the responsibility to know where we are aiming, and then to draw as straight a bead as possible.

We shall not always hit the bullseye. Sometimes we shall aim at impossible targets.

Sometimes we may misfire.

But always we must try, and if we continue the Michigan State University traditions of doing everything we undertake just as well as we possibly can, we will at least be able to feel that we have done our best.

**O**NE OF THE HALLMARKS of American universities is the fact that they have a great concern with the problems of living people.

This ingredient came into higher education as a result of the revolution that began on this campus with the opening of this institution dedicated to the concept that knowledge should be utilized for the improvement of the lives of living people. At a time when 85 percent of all people lived on farms, leaders with vision were urging a new emphasis in higher education. This was not to de-emphasize scholarship but to emphasize its utilization.

With the creation of the land-grant college system, the problems of farmers and housewives, and shopkeepers, and those involved in commerce and industry, the problems of government and public service, and all others, became legitimate subjects for campus research and inquiry.

I will not retell the story with which you are familiar.

The work of the agricultural experiment stations so increased the productivity of agriculture that instead of requiring the energies of 85 percent of all people to produce food and fiber, we now require only 5 percent, and that percentage will continue to decrease. One of today's problems is not a shortage of food and fiber, but how to dispose of the surpluses and maintain a stable income for those looking to agriculture for their livelihood.

As a result of this agricultural efficiency, the energies of four-fifths of all of our people have been released from farming and made available to provide the basic components for our affluent society. This energy has been free to invent and manufacture and operate all of the elements of production and distribution and of service that have made this the most affluent of all societies. Widely available educational opportunities have permitted almost all to get as much education as they want and will work for. Education has encouraged the development of inherent potential to the maximum and made it possible for those with developed ability to compete with all others.

Inculcating into our society the factor of starting out the members of each generation almost even provided the mobility that makes it possible for a child born into a least advantaged home to rise in his lifetime to a key position of importance in government, in industry, in commerce, in education, in society.

In every community the oldtimers can point to examples of youngsters born into homes of their friends who have moved through education to positions of respect and influence.

As a result of this contribution on the part of the total educational system, and particularly on the part of universities, there has developed an almost universal public confidence in education, and until recently, an almost universal public confidence in universities.

Pronouncements by political figures are sometimes questioned because it is recognized that there is at least the possibility that desire for votes may influence their objectivity.

Views and statements voiced by those working for business interests are often discounted because of the suspected allegiance to stockholders and their desires for profits and dividends.

Universities have been almost universally respected as being honest and forthright, and generally regarded as working for and pressing for

the public interest. All of society has been looking to universities to help solve its problems. The professor is now seldom pictured as an egghead. He is recognized as a competent, well-trained person with many resources available to him.

Almost every American family has wanted a university education for its children.

It is of first importance that universities retain and maintain their integrity and their dedication to serve the best interests of our total society. There is no other institution in our society so well qualified to fill that role of critic and defender, dedicated only to making society better.

Many thoughtful and responsible Americans are now raising serious questions as to whether universities have kept first things first.

They respect the importance for fully defending academic freedom for professors on the campus so that all knowledge, all opinions, all hypotheses can be examined and discussed regardless of their popularity. But in granting and assuring this freedom to the professor on the campus, the overwhelming majority believe in return that they have a right to expect that the campus appraisals will be objective, and that all sides of all issues will be examined and weighed and winnowed in the everlasting search for truth. Little people with their blind confidence in education and in educators have taken it for granted that academics always seek the truth, teach the truth, and contribute to the preservation of the truth.

They have expected that the professor, the dean, the administrator, the Trustee would remember always that the educational system itself was created to serve the needs of all of society. They expect that in the search for truth educators will keep in the totality of education an adequate appreciation for the fundamental values that alone can assure the preservation of the strengths of our society.

And now they see on university campuses so much emphasis on freedom of expression, freedom for dissent, freedom for demonstration that the universities are caught in situations where a very small number of people, dedicated and committed to a preconceived purpose, are permitted to advocate and practice the destruction of objectivity.

Universities are at a crucial point in their history. Their critics, many within their own ranks, mark them openly as the outer bulwarks of the structure which is their ultimate target, our political system itself. This small coterie has declared social revolution against America, and America's universities have been marked as the first fortresses that must fall.

We have been openly warned of the weapons to be used, of the tactics to be employed. Truth, and honor, and integrity, and fairness are to be sacrificed. Tradition has no worth. Deliberation, and discussion,

and decisions arrived at through reason must be discarded as obsolete. Henceforth decisions are to be reached through force and by ultimatum.

This assault on the university is marked by audacity of concept. These attacks outrage the values on which higher learning stands—truth, honesty, intellectual integrity, desire for the improvement of mankind in every aspect and at every level.

The very impracticability of many of the demands explains their true purpose—not the improvement of our society, but confusion, disruption, destruction, and chaos.

The issues at stake are the future of our society, the future of our social system, the future of our political system, the future status of the ideals and principles that have been the bulwark of our free society.

The real objective of this assault is disorder and the elimination or weakening of the discipline and order that all organized societies have found to be essential for survival. Destroy this order and discipline, and in the resulting chaos society loses its capacity to improve itself.

Those who have planned their coordinated attack have carefully identified the legitimate sources of dissatisfaction among students, and they are callously attempting to weld all of those unhappy for any reason into a revolutionary front.

Our task as faculty members must be to retain our sense of judgment and our ability to differentiate between those who have good reason to complain because of inequity and human imperfection, and those who seek disruption for the ulterior purpose they have openly already described to us.

We have already been openly warned that the faculty tenure system which leaves professional appraisal of faculty members to the professionals concerned must be radically altered and its control shared with others whose ability to judge is clearly less qualified.

There is nothing wrong with the demand of students that they should have an opportunity to participate in the appraisal of the effectiveness of their teachers. We know that this consultation process is far more extensive than students realize. Students should be more widely informed of the process and should be invited to share in it. This can be accomplished without destroying the basic elements of the tenure system which assures the professor the protected opportunity to seek the truth in his area of expertise.

The tenure system, like most other human inventions, is not perfect and could be improved.

The land-grant college system was founded and has always operated on the philosophical premise now flaunted as a new revolution premise. The basic ideal was and continues to be that higher education should be freely available to every American with but one fundamental quali-



fication—he must have the mental ability to do the work. Michigan State admits its students without questions as to their race, or color, or religion, or political persuasion, or economic status. It asks only, “Are you capable of doing the kind of intellectual work required?”

I maintain my faith in the quality of our students and their attitude and values. Taken as a group, they are a part of the ablest generation of young Americans this country has ever produced.

If the educational system and the universities and our public leaders will see to it that all of the facts are kept before them, they are fully capable of differentiating between facts and propaganda, between the true and the false, between the good and the bad.

On this campus the faculty committees, the academic council, the Board of Trustees, all encourage opportunities for the presentation of every point of view, every criticism, every dissent. But at the same time, they demand that the dissenters and the propagandists shall not interfere with the operation of the University.

I urge all of you to continue this firm position and to support and require that whenever the protagonists of disruption interrupt the orderly operation of the University that at that point the University request the civil authorities to take whatever steps required to permit the University to function in accordance with its objectives so that those who teach, and those who learn, and those who do research, and those who do public service will not be interfered with by those who want to destroy the establishment and who would substitute chaos for order, repression for opportunity, allegiance to their point of view for freedom.

I would remind every member of this faculty: the responsibility is yours. The President, the Trustees, the Deans will not make this decision.

The meaningful decision will be made by responsible members of the faculty. And the basic question is only whether you have the courage and the willingness to defend order, and freedom, and basic decency, and ethics, and integrity, and morality; or are you going to behave like an ostrich and dive your head into the library or laboratory and say, “Let someone else worry.” If you do, you run the risk of seeing chipped away the very attributes that make your profession attractive to you and useful to society.

The strength of this University is in its departments where the tenured faculty speak with equal voices. That is where the basic decisions that are important are made. That situation was not achieved easily. If you do not exercise your obligation responsibly, you could lose it. It is my guess that society will not stand idly by and watch American universities abandon what the public considers to be the rightful responsibility of

educators to be concerned with the maintenance of the well-being of our total society.

The line that has been established on this campus is simple and easily understood. It is that in granting full freedom to examine, to listen, to speak, to dissent, to picket, there shall be no interference with the rights of all others to carry on the work that seems to them to be important—to teach, to learn, to do research, to perform public service. I hope you will have the courage to hold that position.

**N**OW AT LONG LAST, we come to the necessity that I discuss my own decision of recent days. I cannot do it without becoming personal. Unless I become personal, you may not understand why I am doing what I am about to do.

Thirty-five years ago last fall I was on leave from Michigan State University as Managing Director of one of the NRA Blue Eagle Codes under the direction of General Johnson. Our country was battling the great depression. Obviously I was younger then than I am now. I had been a member of the staff of this University for ten years in the College of Agriculture. President Shaw visited me in Kansas City, and offered me the opportunity to come back to this campus as Secretary of the Board of Agriculture, now known as the Board of Trustees, and as Secretary of this institution which was then known as Michigan State College.

At the same time I was considering an opportunity to accept an important executive position in an agriculturally oriented, large industrial enterprise.

The alternatives were to return here as Secretary at a salary of \$4,500 per year or go with the industrial corporation at more than four times that figure, which was an astronomical salary in those days.

I tried to look at the world and look at myself, and decided that the issue was whether I wanted to make money or do something satisfying and worthwhile.

My decision was then, and has been ever since, that one so fortunate as to have a responsible position with a complex state university has an opportunity to affect the lives of more people for good than anywhere else in our society.

The decision to rejoin this University was an irrevocable one, and over the years there have been many opportunities to do many different things. Regardless of the economic advantages elsewhere or other incentives, these opportunities were never seriously considered because I had always intended to spend all of my active life as a part of this University so long as the Board of Trustees wanted me to do so.

The Trustees and the University have been very generous to me. I know of no one who has had a more interesting career. There have been many forums, many opportunities to do many things in Michigan, at the national level, in the world. Had I my life to live over again I would be delighted to do it in the same way.

A few months ago our Faculty Steering Committee created the new committee giving consideration to the development of a system that would assure faculty participation in the selection of my successor, whenever that time should come. I assured the committee that I had no intention to retire soon but expected to stay for two years beyond the present one and to retire, hopefully voluntarily, at the end of June in 1971.

And now with little notice I am about to leave. If my nomination is approved by the Senate, I will become the Administrator of the Agency for International Development, and I would like to tell you why.

Twenty years ago President Truman proposed in his inauguration address that America should make available her "know how" to the underdeveloped countries of the world so that they might be helped to utilize all of their resources, human and material, for the improvement of the lives of their own people.

When Congress authorized the implementation of that concept it created the International Development Advisory Board, and Mr. Truman appointed me one of its members. The present Governor of New York, Mr. Nelson Rockefeller, was its chairman.

Years earlier in the middle of the great world war, this University had looked at the world of that day and decided that there was nothing much more important than that this University incorporate into itself an international dimension.

It was clear then as it is now that the United States must always in the future be interested in the total area of the Pacific, in Asia, in Latin America, in Africa, and in the rest of the world, too.

In 1943, Professor S. C. Lee, then at the University of Hawaii, was persuaded to come here to head up a new Institute of Foreign Studies.

Our University was one of the first universities involved with our government in an overseas project as a part of the Point 4 concept, and we have been extensively involved ever since. This was the first American university to dignify its international interests by elevating the director to the status of Dean of International Programs.

There has never been a moment's doubt in my mind but that the kind of international involvement that increased the international competence of our faculty was in the interest of this University. It has long been clear that even for our students who may never travel outside the State of Michigan, it is of first importance that they have the maximum in the way of understanding of all of the peoples of the world, and particularly

the non-white peoples, and that they know something of their histories, their cultures, their languages, their aspirations.

Anyone who is not blind or stupid cannot help but see that the basic instincts and basic aspirations of all peoples everywhere are much the same. The basic aspiration is always for the maximum in the way of opportunity to determine the course and pattern of one's own life, and the maximum in the way of freedom of choice. It is in essence the desire to attain the objectives of the old American dictum of "life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness."

From this concept, came the recognition that if "life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness" were a legitimate ambition for the black man in Africa, the yellow man in Asia, the brown man in Indonesia, or the native peoples in Latin America, then we could not ignore the same opportunities for those members of the large ethnic groups within our own country who had been denied the equal advantages of that creed.

The Point 4 concept became a logical forerunner for what we now think of as the Civil Rights programs for Afro-Americans, Spanish-speaking Americans, and American Indians and Eskimos.

Now, in February 1969, we find our country fighting an unpopular war on the other side of the world. 570,000 American men, many of them serving involuntarily, are at war in Vietnam. Large numbers of American military forces are maintained in Korea, more in Europe.

All of us recognize that what happens in Vietnam, or Korea, or Biafra can have a profound effect on our own lives.

Our country has problems overseas. We are strong and rich—and suspect and disliked.

We do not have unlimited resources, either economic or human. We cannot carry all the burdens of the world on our shoulders even if we were so foolish as to want to do so.

And so without belaboring the obvious, an opportunity has come for me to head up the Agency for International Development that is concerned with the extension of foreign assistance in all of its manifestations, economic aid, technical assistance, the development of human resources, the distribution of food to help those who are hungry.

Both President Nixon and Secretary Rogers have urged me to accept this responsibility and have assured me of their complete support.

And so after struggling with myself I am making the decision that I never expected to make, and that is to leave Michigan State University. It may be egocentric or something, but it is awfully difficult for me to think of myself, healthy and well, and not as a part of this University, or to think of this University without my being a part of it.

My decision is that at this particular moment in history Michigan

State University does not really need me. There is unlimited competence here.

The passage of time is inexorable. It really makes little difference whether I retire now or in June of 1970, or June of 1971. The separation had to come sooner or later, and even later was going to be pretty soon.

I am more fortunate than most in being given this opportunity to become associated with able and dedicated Americans who I am satisfied are ready and willing to re-examine what America stands for at home and abroad and to move in the direction of re-establishing peace in the world.

AID is in trouble. It has been in trouble. It has been in increasing trouble in recent years. Part of this trouble is associated with the Vietnamese war, part of it may be for other reasons.

Many of its former effective supporters in the Congress and elsewhere have been lost. Each succeeding year the criticism at appropriation time has seemed to increase, and the appropriations have been decreased.

I have been a critic of some of what I have seen of AID, and I suspect that I may learn that some of the things that I thought I knew are not true.

I had thought that my departure might be phased over a period of time, but the fact that Michigan State University has continuing contracts with AID makes that inadvisable. I do not want to disadvantage this University in its international programs. The importance of the new assignment dictates that I must get on with it soon and full time.

And so when the Senate gets around to confirming my nomination toward the end of this month, if the Board of Trustees grants my request I will shortly thereafter cease to be your President and will become the President Emeritus.

Instead of retiring into inactivity, I shall move into the most challenging and undoubtedly the most difficult role of my career. If I fail, it will not be because I have not tried.

If I can have some degree of success, I hope I can make another contribution to the welfare of the people of Michigan, and the people of America, and the people of the world. It is an opportunity, and an obligation, and a challenge that I cannot refuse.

Wherever I am and whatever I shall be doing, I will always be interested in everything that is good for this University.

You, my friends, have made 47 years of continuous contact with this University more rewarding, more interesting, more satisfying, in every way than any person ever has a right to expect.

I believe that our Trustees intend to rely heavily upon the advice and counsel of the faculty in the selection of my successor, and that they

intend also to consult with students, with alumni, and with others. I shall only urge them, and all of you, to get on with it.

In the interests of this University, the selection of my successor should be expedited. I have watched many universities change presidents, and I know that there is nothing much worse for a university than to have the process drag on month after month while the searchers seek for perfection they will never find. Undue delay could result in stuttering, inactivity, and loss of momentum. There is no reason why the job cannot be as well done in the next five months as it could be in the next five years, and I will hope that you and the Trustees set your sights at having it completed so that the new president can assume his new responsibility, hopefully in July, perhaps even sooner, certainly not much later.

## Now to a conclusion.

Recently each of you received in the mail a copy of the 1967-68 Michigan State University Report of Progress prepared under the direction of Jim Denison, who, as Assistant to the President in Charge of University Relations, has contributed so very much to this institution and to me for more than 20 years.

One section of this excellently written report asks:

“How does a university develop the momentum to carry it on in difficult times, the magnetism to attract all the desirable assets here listed?”

“To be sure, it takes time, or a legislature could vote to establish a great university tomorrow; it takes physical resources, else a great university could be established in a vacant lot; it must take human resources, for all great universities are rich in this respect.

“But it must take more; not all old universities are great universities; not all accumulations of brick and stone and glass pulse with the vitality that marks a great university; not all combinations of capable human beings become successful enterprises, as many a free spender has discovered to his surprise and regret.

“The secret is likely to be found in the combination of these and other elements, but the innermost secret must surely lie in the way a group of human beings acts on each other in a given physical, intellectual, and emotional climate.”

At Michigan State this interaction, laced with love for our University, surely produced more than the sum of its parts.

Each of us giving something extra, each of us gets something extra.

Whatever that something is, I know it has worked its way on so many of you who have devoted or will devote your lives to making this

University all that she is, all that she wants to be, all that she deserves to be.

She is our pride, she is our joy, she is our inspiration.

**W**E OPENED this gathering tonight by recalling 1959. Now let us close with the repetition of a statement made at that convocation ten years ago.

Then I was quoting a member of our faculty who had said:

“Greatness for a university is not a destination, but a continuous journey.”

Ladies and gentlemen, let us continue. Let us assure that this University will continue on the road it has been traveling and get over that last mile that will make this in fact one of the truly distinguished universities of the world.

We have come a long way.

There may still be rough spots ahead, but the goal we have been seeking is in sight.