Dr. Rhoads, members of the Haverford College community, and friends:

There is a very easy and a very natural way to begin these remarks: thank you.

It has not been a well-kept secret that, if Jonathan Rhoads went through with his announced intention to induct me this morning, I would accept this time. I start with the assumption that Haverford, building on a proud and distinctive past, expects a prouder, more distinctive future. If it is within me to help to that end, I shall. The support which Board, faculty, students, staff, and alumni have given me in the first two months makes me bold enough to hope that the college's distinguished line of presidents did not necessarily end with Hugh Borton's retirement in June.

It is now just eighty years since Isaac Sharpless began one of the most distinguished presidencies of this college. He said at his inauguration, "All successful education must be personal; and it is to maintain and expand this type in the individual that we must work." Those words are as pertinent in 1967 as they were in 1887. I do not intend to permit our current expansion program to destroy, or even to weaken, our emphasis upon the individual. I believe that we are ingenious enough and
caring enough at Haverford to keep an informal, highly personal, and vibrant atmosphere while we pursue modest, planned growth. For, if we don't achieve that goal here, we will have done more than to weaken the legacy given to us. We will have written ominous words about a future world where population pressures make it abundantly clear that smallness and privacy will be harder and harder to maintain. I am confident that some sober thought, some imagination, and even some old-fashioned kindness can ensure that those ominous words are not going to be written on this campus.

I assume then that with no more than 700 students, we will still be small and individualistic. And I assume further that we will still be privately supported, even though more and more of our students may come to be publicly supported.

In view of these assumptions, it is expected of me, today and in the years ahead, that I will champion the interests of the small, private college. I do so, gladly. But our case is not self-evident; we need more than just repeated assumptions that to be small and to be private are good in themselves. Those assumptions are too easy to refute: the large institutions can do so many things that we dare not try lest our efforts go for no higher goal than imitation, and the public institutions have access to support that would produce envy here if we didn't know that the support brought its own problems with it. We have to prove again and again that smallness and private status can be used creatively to do what no one else can do so well. Our
size must be used to move boldly, to try out new ideas in education, in administration, and in student-staff-faculty relations, and then to share the tested results of our efforts with others. Our freedom from political pressures gives us the chief responsibility to defend what is new and promising and what is old and worthy, whatever public opinion of the moment may say. If we play up to those advantages, we will deserve and get support; if we don't, we deserve the fate that some already predict for us.

I suggest then that this college cannot justify its search for future support simply on grounds of what we will do for the no more than 700 men that we expect to have on this campus by 1972. They will be our primary reason for existence, of course, and we owe it to them to see that education can be as student-centered, stimulating, personal, humane, and joyful outside the catalogue as it is inside. But that is not enough. We have to show too that Haverford, for all its smallness, matters in the world of education. We have to demonstrate our willingness to work with other educational institutions to share what we have learned and to learn from them.

At this time, our ties are closest with Swarthmore, with Lincoln, and, above all, with Bryn Mawr. It is to our advantage that we cooperate still further with them, in the knowledge that effective partnerships are not built on one partner giving and the other getting, but on a basis of each partner giving and getting together. I will go as far along the road to mutually beneficial cooperation as any of those colleges is willing
to go with us. I also ask my colleagues at Haverford to join with me in the search for ways by which we can work more closely with all other institutions that share our aims. And I specifically include in that the secondary schools of this region, public and private, center city and suburban. We have too much that is good here not to want to share it; we have too much that must be learned from others to permit us any smugness or aloofness.

There are some time-honored traditions that each of the more than two hundred college and university presidents being inducted this year will observe. One of them is to address some of the opening words to the alumni, to the faculty, and to the students. I respect that tradition, and will now obey it before I say some words that I think are distinctively applicable to Haverford.

The alumni will understand I think if I begin with some words of envy for the privilege that they have had. I respect my alma mater, Victoria College in the University of Toronto very highly, and yet I still wish I had a Haverford education, too. But I expect that this college must command the loyalty of its graduates on the basis of what we do from here on, and not on the basis of what this college once was. I hope that I can avoid creating disaffected alumni. But, even more, I want to avoid creating disinterested alumni. We need their active, informed help in defining and achieving Haverford's goals. I reject the idea that only the insiders know what is best for an educational institution. To avoid complacency and
drift, we must hear the thoughtful comments of all those, inside
or outside, who have reason to care about our progress. The
alumni voices that will be most welcome are those of men who take
the time, first, to separate what was important from what was
frill in their own years at the college, and, second, to hear
today's students and today's faculty. That task of listening
requires direct contact with the college as it now is; no daily
newspaper will suffice, for I have yet to see a front-page story
that adequately reflects the seriousness of purpose and the sense
of balance found on this campus. Those who will look at us
closely are unlikely to find any clear break with what was best
in this college's past. In our finest hours, which will not
necessarily be our least newsworthy ones, we will give witness
once again in our own way to the honesty, the vigor and the
idealism that marked most of 134 years of this college's history.

On the faculty, my words can be brief. I have the good
fortune to serve a faculty of the highest quality. It is part of
my job to see that this quality remains at least as high no matter
how intense the competitive pressures for professors becomes in
American colleges and universities. It is another part of my task
to see that this quality is rewarded and used as fully as possible.
These men and women are teachers, above all, of wisdom and giving-
ness; researchers of imagination and concern; and, hopefully in
larger numbers in the future than at present, artists of creativity
and taste. Our faculty must have even more diversity of views,
disciplines, and backgrounds than we now know. It needs no such
diversity in academic excellence or dedication to the fullest growth of young men. In all their roles as members of a still small community, it is this faculty that finally sets the tone for Haverford. The President may talk, but it is the faculty who act. They will ultimately choose, from the way they greet an inquiry in class to the way they greet a student in their homes, how personal and creative Haverford education is going to be. I hope I know their choice.

And so the students. Today's college administrator must start with the assumption that, for all of the similarities between today's students and those who went before them, the new generation's men hear and step to different drummers. No student generation before this has been so sensitive, so concerned, so restless, and hence so fully alive. It is neither their lot, nor their intention, to make administrators' lives easy. Their message to us is a paraphrase of President Truman's advice: "If you can't stand the heat, get out of the President's office." And whether these students will have a bigger role in the total life of their colleges does not seem to be an open question any longer. The issue is not whether, but how.

Haverford has a record here and an opportunity. This college has shown in its student-administered honor system, governing both academic and social conduct, that young men can govern their affairs; they know that privilege and responsibility are partners. Those who, for whatever reason, sneered at or were shocked at the college's trial changes in the social code of the
Honor System last year must have overlooked the fact that those moves towards self-government demand much more from our students than the more explicit rules elsewhere. The Honor System demands of each man that he demonstrate in all his behavior that he is mindful of his obligations to his fellow students, his guests, and the total college community. The students put themselves on the line last year when they sought these changes. The new President will stand with them, as his predecessor did, so long as they demonstrate that they want freedom and will pay its price, which is a considered respect for the legitimate rights and sensitivities of others.

The record to date suggests that Haverford students should, for the sakes of all of us, become more deeply involved in the design and execution of all plans to keep this college strong, relevant, and free. I intend to achieve that deeper involvement. I did not deny that there are risks in this, and it would be just as irresponsible for a President to base his decisions on a head count of the students as it would be to base them on a publication count of the faculty, a letter count of the alumni, or an asset count of the trustees. Students, faculty, alumni, and Board — they are all legitimate parts of the decision-making process. I frankly have no intention of abdicating a leadership role; but I assume that my decisions will be better ones — wiser, more acceptable, longer lasting — when I take the time to seek out the advice of many of the men who share high hopes for Haverford. Two months is a very short time on which
to base any judgment. But let the record show that I have not yet seen an important decision made on this campus that would not have been a better decision had students been more deeply involved in it.

There is another consequence which flows from the assumption that this is the most fully alive generation of students that has sat in our classrooms. As teachers, we will be forced, even more than our predecessors were, to say that we do not have answers to many of their concerns. At best, we have a method; a method to bring to bear on those concerns. But that method is tried and proven: open inquiry accepting no restraints on what a man should ask about, tentative conclusions using whatever we know to date while admitting that new knowledge will upset today's conclusions, and an awareness of a set of values against which to test the significance of any one concern. Just so long as we believe in that method, we need never fear saying to our students, "I don't know, but I'll gladly join you in trying to find out."

I am aware that this review of our strengths in alumni, faculty, and students has not been a modest one. But I see these strengths, not as matters to boast about, but as explanations of why Haverford cannot settle for being just one more high quality liberal arts college. We need a distinctive purpose to which we can devote our principal energies. And if I must choose one test by which Haverford is to be judged, I know what my choice will be: let our impact be measured, above all else, by the uses to which our graduates put their knowledge and their humanity.
If we are to do well on that test, we have no alternative but to start in the undergraduate years to plant the idea and the practice of involvement in the world around us. It is too slim a hope to expect that men who are asked to live aloof through four of the most critical years of their lives, years of being as much as of becoming, will later on pick up a meaningful pattern of participation in man's affairs.

There may have been a time when it was safe to harbor the dream of a college as a place of withdrawal, and to think of college years as a time simply to develop oneself to the fullest, intellectually, morally, and physically, in isolation from the pressures of the day. I find much of that dream irrelevant for our mission. Too much is happening -- in war and peace, in the self-assertion of groups of men long exploited by their fellow men, in the pressures of more men living closer together, in the impact of new knowledge, in the forms but not the depth of moral concerns -- to permit withdrawal by those who can bring gifts of insight, balance and independence to the issues. Moreover, every cherished attribute of the scholarly community is forever under attack from some quarter in society. So long as freedom of inquiry is suspect anywhere, we must be there fighting to uphold it.

Yet the sad conclusion that I draw from recent history is that, in many of the most exciting arenas of action, the academic community has either been too hard to find or too emotional to be heard.

Take the case of our urban crises. Our cities just might
still pull out of their deepening troubles and they might even reappear as splendid hubs of metropolitan areas. But, if they do so, the record to date suggests they will have to do it without much help from the colleges and the universities. For we have few historians of the city, few economists challenged by the problems right on their doorsteps, few political scientists interested in local government's challenges and opportunities, and few sociologists sensing the full thrust of the drive by the metropolitan poor to play a bigger part in rebuilding their homes and their lives. Academicians have, by and large, a fine record for noble thoughts on issues of race and prejudice. Their action, in programs or program-oriented research, is much more modest. True, they were there the morning after the riots to gather data; but, in the days before the riots, they were often either absent or insensitive to what was happening.

Or take the case of Vietnam. This war now tears at the nation's conscience and clarity of purpose. The academic community has brought courage and conscience into the debate, but has too often left out the standards of good taste, scholarship, and examination of alternatives that, even at this late date, might lift the debate to a higher level. Some day, this country will stand in deep debt to the professors and students who spoke out on Vietnam loud enough and strong enough to give us pause; that same day, we may also stop to wish that they had brought more of their academic disciplines to bear upon the issues.
Or, one more example, take the case of new knowledge in biology. It seems a safe enough prediction that new discoveries in genetics and in the whole area of prolonging human life will pose moral issues at least as awesome as those posed earlier by developments in nuclear physics. The biologists' values, I suppose, will count for no more than other men's in resolving issues; but a skillful combination of their knowledge and their values could highlight the choices ahead of us. Isn't this the time for a biologists' counterpart for the 1960's and the 1970's of the influential Bulletin of the Atomic Scientists? For it does matter to what uses man puts his new knowledge, and the creators of that knowledge have voices to be heard. We will need the biologist in the arena of public discussion almost as much as we need him in the laboratory.

Each of these examples is one where Haverford College can make a distinctive contribution. We cannot muster the resources that some other institutions might, but it doesn't take size to combine discipline and concern. We are academically strong in departments that bear directly upon many of those matters. We are still flexible enough, I hope, that we might even get several departments working together on projects without regard to jurisdictional lines. And our faculty and students have demonstrated again and again that they care about the world supporting them, most notably in the Serendipity Day Camp program and in their work for peace. This campus is the proud home of a new, student-inspired drive to work for national non-military
service, in Peace Corps, VISTA, or rebuilding Vietnam, as an alternative to the military draft. These and other examples tell me that this college can offer one key model for intelligent and sustained involvement of academic people in public affairs.

But the counterargument to involvement needs a hearing. Involvement has its price: reflection suffers when action dominates. The scholar, young or old, needs time to withdraw and to look back on what has been learned and ahead to what comes next. Involvement also can imperil free and objective criticism of institutions and ideas. This argument has merit; all involvement and no withdrawal would rob the academic community of most of its strength. But is it too much to expect a balanced pattern of involvement and withdrawal in our lives? Can't there be a time to think and a time to act? And can't we strive for the same standards of rationality at both times? We already ask of our students a rhythm which alternates studies in one field with mind-stretching beyond that field, with planned physical education, with productive work on part-time or summer jobs, and with just plain fun. I do not see much risk in getting more involvement in the world's affairs for the faculty into that mix -- and I do not doubt that the faculty could handle the mix well.

I speak of this matter of the application of knowledge to man's concerns for one special reason. Haverford proudly remains a Quaker college. Giving up compulsory Fifth Day Meeting last year and inaugurating a non-Quaker President this morning do not change the basic fact that we draw constant strength and
direction from our Quaker tradition and from the fifteen percent of our faculty and eight percent of our students who are part of the Society of Friends. Here are the roots of the honesty and openness, the combination of individualism and community life, the pressure of conscience, the simplicity (well-masked on ceremonial days like this), and perhaps even the enjoyment that pervades this campus.

It is fully in keeping with this heritage that we find so strong a campus interest in the pursuit of peace. Members of this college community will differ in the methods they would follow toward peace, but most would agree that Haverford should bear constant witness to the feasibility, even the necessity of non-violent resolution to man's conflicts. They would reject flatly the suggestion that the peace they seek is a product of cowardice or isolation. Just the opposite. It is a product of courage and involvement. I can add little that is new to their concern for peace. But perhaps I can add a determination that we now become a small but important center for research on all peaceful paths to conflict resolution. This would be just the right home for such urgent work.

It is equally in keeping with this heritage that we stick to a problem area after the first wave of activists has rushed to a new arena. The Negro problem -- or, equally accurately, the white problem -- is out of fashion this fall, I am told. But that only says to me that the problem is uncovered and the hard, non-glamorous work is about to begin. We have a painful road
ahead of us in the United States before prejudice, apathy and sheer inhumanity of man to man begin to disappear behind us. This is no time for our colleges and universities to shun that road. Men are going to go along it whether we are with them or not. Their journey can be made a little faster and a lot less violent if we put the sharpest of our minds where the strongest of our convictions already are. Haverford can show Philadelphia and the nation that we are in the civil rights struggle, neither casually nor shrilly, but steadily and thoughtfully.

For one and a third centuries, there have been men on this ground who wanted this one small college to represent something special. They have had different words to fit different times. But one theme has run throughout all the years and all the words: give witness to what you believe. I take up this presidency convinced that we have no higher mission than that. It will give us work enough and guidance enough to fill all the days ahead.
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