

Pusey's speech to the Associated Harvard Alumni

(Following is the text of remarks by President Nathan M. Pusey prepared for delivery at the annual meeting of the Associated Harvard Alumni in the Tercentenary Theater, Harvard Yard, yesterday.)

Most of us here have sung the first stanza of "Fair Harvard"—sung it or heard it sung many times. Yet, I must admit though Harvard has made part of my life for nearly forty-seven years, I have never, until recent weeks, felt so deeply as I do now the significance of that verse which speaks of "surrendering" our Alma Mater "from the age that is past to the age that is waiting before."

The age that is just past was an exciting one. For a quarter of a century the general public believed in universities — indeed, admired and looked to them, and was generous in its support of them. Students thronged the campuses in unprecedented numbers, and were at least reasonably helped — and reasonably satisfied — by what they found there. More often than not, they liked what they found in academe. At the same time the teaching profession revived from the depression years and the wartime low. Discovery was in the air. Knowledge advanced. The influence of American universities spread to the far corners of the earth. That better and happier world for which men have been yearning since the beginning of time — an ordered and healthy world — seemed possible of early achievement through the instrumentality of advancing learning, and the general affluence which was sure to follow in its wake.

At the outset of the age just ended we were motivated by considerations which then seemed to us newly important, and we ordered our priorities in their light. The experiences of the Second World War had made us vividly aware of the world as a whole. We were determined to know more about peoples and cultures which up to then had been disgracefully neglected.

For this reason, language institutes and area-study centers blossomed as never before. There was fresh appreciation—born in our understanding of the war — of the importance of free institutions and, along with it, a compelling hunger for world order. We believed that greater knowledge of the diverse peoples of the world and more contact with them (the increased ease of travel was to help this along) could and would lead to stable regional and world political organizations. Or so we hopefully and wishfully thought. In any event international studies of all kinds burgeoned in this and other universities and effected great changes in their curricula.

We believed, too, that the process of social and economic development could be analyzed and understood, and when understood, that it could quickly be fostered everywhere. We assumed that the strands of various local and national political, economic

and legal systems could be — indeed inevitably would be — woven together, with better understanding, to achieve and guarantee peace and plenty everywhere. Perhaps also even happiness. At any rate, backwardness, ignorance, hostility, poverty and disease — these things could and would be eliminated, or at least mightily reduced. The task was simply to gain the knowledge and train the people to put the knowledge to work. Science and technology were the given tools and in face of this expectation — and promise — nations and peoples everywhere came to honor and look to universities as never before. Old ones flourished and new ones sprang to life around the globe.

Such was the hope directed toward universities from the outside. Inside, of course, understanding of the potential of universities went deeper. Within reach were the fundamental properties of matter, an infinitely richer understanding of the whole universe — even the origin of life itself. The mysteries of the psyche could now be explored and the development and behavior of men understood. New tools and methods held promise of revealing new facts about the depths of the oceans, and the nearer and the more distant space. It was a great time for all university people to be alive, and especially so here, for Harvard was in the forefront of all this — drawing into the effort older and younger scholars from all over the world. Once a New England college, Harvard had finally been transformed into a national university in Mr. Conant's time. In the postwar years it grew steadily in international influence and esteem.

Nor were our thoughts during all these years focused exclusively on material interests. There was lively concern about questions of quality in life. We continued to direct attention — indeed sought especially to direct attention — to art, letters and music, not as refuges from society or the workaday world, not as escape from reality, but as sources of refreshment, and of deeper understanding of the objective world in human terms, of enhanced experience; and beyond this, for access to the realm of the spirit with its more profound joys.

So we dreamed and so we worked.

The effort has not come out exactly as we had hoped. At least not yet. But now a change has occurred, and as so frequently happens with the weather, the change was accompanied by storms.

Universities are no longer universally admired. Indeed some people have even come to look upon them less as saviors than as the source of evils from which society must be saved. The general public evidences less esteem for university faculties. Even the professors themselves have come to have doubts about what they are doing, or perhaps rather, about their chances of gaining wider public appreciation

and support of the significance of the work they care about so deeply.

A growing number of students are less readily impressed by what professors have to offer and less ready to devote sustained attention to their teaching. These sharply critical students are also less convinced of the integrity and validity of society's institutions, including its colleges and universities; and they are less ready to work in and for them, on established terms, than were the young who for the most part were happy to be attending and serving these same institutions just a few years ago. The aims and methods of universities have come into question — fundamentally. Again they stand in need of articulation and of redefinition. There can be no doubt that we are entering a new, very different, and, it appears, a very troubled period in higher education.

The goals which meant so much to us a generation ago have lost much of their appeal. The public's gaze is now shifting back from the big world to the domestic scene. Prejudice, poverty, urban blight, injustices at home, disturbances and thefts in our own neighborhoods, increasing delinquency — things of this kind force their way to the forefront of attention. They of course deserve attention. But now there is much less certainty that answers will be found in knowledge. At least not quickly. There is also less confidence that universities can, or will want to produce the requisite knowledge. And there is even less confidence that, if they knew how and wanted to produce the knowledge, they could also produce the people with the stamina and character to put it to work to accomplish the constructive ends.

Once again, it appears, we have returned to a beginning. Mr. Conant, whom we welcome here today, found himself contending with inherited financial depression, then with the overwhelming dislocations of wartime and its aftermath. Now, after a period of readjustment and phenomenal growth, there comes for another president an era of radically altered conditions, sharp change, and formidable obstacles — not just financial, but curricular, methodological and philosophical as well.

This is a time, therefore, which is less likely to be affected by a mere shift of presidents than by the external conditions of our national life, and by a natural process of rebirth and renewal.

A distinguished scholar who came to live and work here at a relatively advanced age nearly a half century ago had much to say in his philosophy of process about ages that were past and ages that were "waiting before." Professor Whitehead's intent was to substitute a philosophy of organism for what he said had been a philosophy of mass. A fundamental point of distinction was that for centuries — at least since Newton — thought had been shaped by the conviction that the basic realities in our universe were particles of matter — senseless, indestructible, valueless, purposeless revolving in



PRESIDENTS THREE — Derek Bok (left), Harvard's outgoing president Nathan Pusey (center) and former president James Conant. (Joseph Dennehy photo)

routine ways, reacting only when they were acted upon. He pointed out (this was very exciting at the time) that physics did not know any such particles, that physical things, large and small, were in fact only modifications in space-time, and that therefore any actual thing was only to be understood in terms of its becoming and perishing, that is as an event. And he took special pains to stress the potential for creativity latent in such events. The old world is always dying, he said, and a new one being born. Nature gives us temporal unities which have pasts, presents and futures. But what we experience is a continuous present; and because of its capacity for creativity and the potential that lies within it, this present, at any given moment, is always holy ground.

So is it here. One Harvard is passing into history and another being born. One is dying while another, burgeoning with new life, is eagerly waiting before. We salute it and welcome it.

Because so many currently question the value of universities, and their ability, in the face of challenge, criticism and increased financial stringency, to continue to serve in their ancient and honorable tradition, it would be easy to feel gloomy about their prospects. But this new present also contains within it great promise.

If the long list of new goals being set for society are to be realized in significant degree, it will only be because we shall have gained increased knowledge of the difficulties standing in the way; because we shall have found in knowledge promising means of attacking the problems; because we shall have discovered, prepared, and inspired individuals to take up the many tasks required with knowledge, with patience and with realistic resolution. The need for universities does not slacken. If anything it grows greater. Standing in this present moment of change, looking back and ahead, it perhaps behooves us simply to perceive that as in all previous periods of our College's history, so in this, challenge and opportunity both persist.

There is so much in Harvard that remains good, generation after generation. I think especially at this moment of certain Yankee traits of character. It was my good fortune to have been associated in the government of Harvard with individuals — some Yankees, some not — who possessed these qualities in exemplary fashion. Not easily impressed by passing fads or fancies, not easily thrown off balance by any sudden alarms or excursions, outside or within, they went steadily about the task of serving Harvard, determined to keep her sane, sensible, useful and strong. They and their kind are deep

in our tradition, and, this being so, we shall get on.

I should like now to add a personal word to leave-taking. What has impressed me most about Harvard during my years of serving her are her people. Not all of them of course, but surely a goodly number. There are many of us. "Thy fathers went down into Egypt with threescore and ten persons; and now the Lord thy God hath made thee as the stars of heaven for multitude." (Deuteronomy 10:22) If this could be said of us a hundred years ago, as it was, how much more so today.

If the recent years have been good years in both our own and the world's terms, their goodness has been owed to tens of thousands of individuals. Owed in the first instance to many fine students — fine as persons and as scholars — who have come here from all parts of our country and, especially at the graduate and professional levels, from abroad. From diverse backgrounds and cultures, with various interests and expectations — mostly high expectations — they have in considerable measure been the Harvard of these years; and with very few exceptions they have been good. If the passionate impatience with the wrongs of our society and the world which these students have increasingly come to feel stays with them in later years — that is, if their present concern proves to be more than a momentary impatience — then the world will be well served and Harvard will once again be highly honored in her sons and daughters.

Harvard's debt to faculty is no less large. Not everyone in every respect has measured up to the ideal of the inspired and inspiring scholar-teacher, loving his students and his institution, serving them loyally and imaginatively and selflessly, eschewing all pettiness and self-seeking. Yet the great majority of them surely have. Knowledge has advanced, and students have found help. There have been many creative moments. First-rate work in investigation and in teaching — intelligent and informed teaching, guided by principle and concern — has gone on — and will go on.

Nor can I fail to mention many others, not members of faculties, who have worked here in my time in many capacities, high and low — men and women of intelligence and character whose attachment to Harvard and whose diligence and competence are surpassed by none. Unsung, too frequently taken for granted, they are to be found everywhere in the University. Some have spent long years in the University's service. Of many of them it can truly be said that without their help very lit-

tle of consequence could be achieved in many parts of this university.

But above all I wish to express my appreciation to the many alumni who have contributed preeminently to make possible whatever achievements there have been in the Pusey years. I do not wish to be understood as speaking exclusively or even primarily in material terms, though my gratitude encompasses this range of consideration. What I want to say (and I hope very much that this will be heard especially by students and faculty) is that in endeavoring to discharge the responsibility of directing the administration of this great university, again and again I have found indispensable the understanding, the ardent concern, the stable belief in the viability and importance of what Harvard is trying to do, and the readiness to help shown on every emergent occasion by many loyal Harvard men who were here before our time. These alumni were clearly moved by fond remembrance of experiences they had had at Harvard, and by gratitude for what Harvard contributed to direction and enrichment in their lives. But, beyond this; by an awareness, which had grown in them after leaving this place, of what Harvard has meant and can mean in our national life, by conviction of the worth and importance of this contribution, this intellectual and moral contribution going out from Harvard which Sibley heralded long ago. What most moves the alumni, I believe, is a deepening realization — in face of the recurrently troubled condition of our world — of the importance of what has been praiseworthy in Harvard's past and a resolute determination that it shall go on.

This is the last time I shall speak to you as president. In thanking all of you — especially very many alumni — for what you have meant to Harvard in my time, it is a temptation to dwell on the changeless and the changing Harvard. The bricks of Massachusetts and Harvard halls, the great copper beech looming beside Wadsworth House, once the home of Harvard presidents — things of this kind endure. So does John Harvard sitting on his chair outside University Hall. But Harvard the changeless is also ever changing, ever beginning. Every June there is another Commencement, another in that continuum of endings and beginnings, death and life, which keeps the venerable university young — young, influential, attractive, perhaps occasionally even noble, but still and always worthy of love and of strong, new effort. Let us with high resolve once again rededicate ourselves to her service and may the Lord continue to look after us, strengthen us, and keep us true.

Graduate has sense of self

By Judith Brody Globe Staff

"I have a feeling of being somewhat at peace with myself. I feel fairly contented. Things have gone well for me. I can't complain about them. I'm looking forward with moderate enthusiasm to the next couple of years..."

Those are the words of Frank Raines, 22, a Rhodes scholar who was graduated from Harvard University yesterday. In one way, they are surprising words, because last year, not many seniors would have said them. Last year, most spoke of despair and hopelessness, not peace and contentment.

"You won't find as many despairing seniors this year," Raines says. "People know themselves better, they have become a lot more mature. They are better able to define where they started in the scheme of things."

Raines has a good sense of who he is and where he stands in the scheme of things. Part of that self-knowledge he attributes to his socio-economic background: "When you're poor or from a working class family, you're not so concerned with being alienated," he says. "When you're talking about going up the ladder, you know where the next rung is."

have to escape or that things couldn't be any worse. You can find worse than Harvard by going to Roxbury."

And a good share of his self-knowledge has come from his four years at Harvard, which he says broadened him, gave him insight into different kinds of people and exposed him to different kinds of lifestyles: "It's difficult not to be affected by the upper-middle-class things you do here," he admits. But the question is not how to avoid them, but how to take advantage of the different life styles and mold them into your own. That's what I've tried to do. But you have to go home a lot to maintain your ties and get back to your people."

Raines, one of six children and the first of his family to go to college, came to Harvard from a public high school in Seattle, where he was student body president and the state's debating champion. He immediately entered Harvard life. "Some Harvard freshmen are activities types... that's pretty much what I did here for awhile," he says dryly.

He was elected to the Student-Faculty Advisory Council, a committee set up after students demonstrated over the presence of a Dow Chemical recruiter on campus in 1967. That group plunged Raines rapidly and directly into Harvard politics. He learned how the faculty and administration operated, and debated with them on such philosophical issues as, "If Hitler came to the



FRANK RAINES ... more mature

campus, would you allow him to recruit for the Nazi army?" All the while, his political views were being tested, broadened, clarified.

In April 1969, after the student takeover of University Hall, Raines and a number of others drew up a statement urging the university not to call in the police, but also suggesting some basic safety measures if the police had to be called. The administration, Raines says, did not heed the warnings and as a result, a number of bystanders were hurt in the police bust.

"I was bitter about some of the things members of the administration did," he recalls. "They openly lied about the police bust. They said it wasn't coming."

He organized the Memorial Church group, a group of moderate students who called a strike after the bust. Raines' interest was not in shutting down the

university but in restructuring the Harvard Corporation to make it less "hierarchical" and more representative of student and faculty interests. He also argued for a strong student organization which had the power to tax.

"Students want to participate in the decisions which affect them," he says. "They also want their institution to respect certain social values — to be against the war and against racism. The argument that Harvard shouldn't be involved in political issues is a cop-out. By not voting against General Motors, for example, they vote for them... It's difficult to be neutral when you hold vast amounts of stock and land. To claim neutrality is to mean that you don't want anyone involved in making decisions."

But Raines found himself in a cross-fire between the administration and radical members of the Progressive Labor Party, who called his proposed reforms "liberal" and said Harvard couldn't be changed unless capitalist society were changed.

Ill will was directed at him from both sides, he says. Worried that every activity he was involved in would be "tainted," he withdrew from campus politics and spent time in other kinds of activities. He was a summer intern for Presidential adviser Daniel Patrick Moynihan and served as a special assistant to the chairman of the White House Conference on Children and Youth.

Honor graduates from Massachusetts

Here is a list of Massachusetts residents who were graduated with honors from Harvard University basic colleges:

- ARLINGTON — Daniel Gannon, Martin Gidrean, Paul Kearns, Roger Swain, Marjorie Waxman.
- BELMONT — Donald Grace.
- BEDFORD — Carol Davis.
- BELMONT — John Makidial, Donald Olive, Robert Resuscita, Susan Smart, Mary O'Hare, John O'Neil.
- BEVERLY — Christine Cabot, Christopher Huntington, Robert Berger, Judith Bissau, Thomas Ayres, Lee Daniels, Lawrence Dicara, Stephen Dong, Grasmund Haynes, Paul Jarvie, Laura Van Mavor, John Pierce, Roger Rosenblatt, Allen Satelec, James Stark.
- BRIGHTON — George Marina, Brookline — Francis DeLuce, Lawrence Bowers, Paul Harris, Joel Schwartz, Walter Sluetti, Thomas Waldstein, Robert Wolfe.
- BURLINGTON — Charles McCortick, Nicholas Ingram, Ann Cambridge — Thomas Aminger, Dechandra Jantz, Dickson Edmund Cohen, Frances Cohen, Philip Collins, Roslyn Damm, Anne Dechandra, James Dickson, Neven Dragoviclov, Gary Epstein, Kenneth Evans, Robert Gordon, John Gregham, Lani Guinter, Alice Hirtge, John Houston, George Hunsinger, Nicholas Ingram, Ann Injokes, Joseph Kalin, Ann Kinder, Daniel Kellner, Ann Khalia, Lance Koven, George Kinder, Patricia Kowale, John Koster, Philip La Follette, Richard Lander, Dennis Landis, Allen Leithner, Kenneth Livingston, Lowell Margolin, Manuel Marichal, Grace Mazur, Michael McCann, James McGibbon, Charles Monet, Maria Monet, David Montano, Martin Mueller, Douglas Munk, David Revell, Isaac Stodman, John Taurnan, Martin Terry, Edward Towle, Michael Youssouf.
- CANTON — Scott Holmberg.
- CHARLESTOWN — Jonathan Gosser.
- CHELSEA — Michael Kilo.
- CHESTERFIELD — Frederick Backell, CHESTNUT HILLS — Keith Ballard, Ross Gattner, Robert Feldman, Stephen Kotler.
- GLYNN — Harvey Gould.
- CONCORD — John Hucerty, James Whittemore.
- COHASSET — Sally Bond, Charles Browne, Robert Garrett, William Hobbs, Robert Mack.
- DEBHAM — David Bouzopoulos, Stephen Owen, William McDermott, Lewis Shea, Arthur Snow.
- DUXBURY — Jonathan Galassi, Elizabeth Banka, John DeBartolo, John DeBartolo.
- FAIRHAVEN — Peter Patch, Paul River, Malcolm Hill.
- FARMINGHAM — Sheldon Bishov, Christopher Dubose.
- HAMILTON — John McKean, Paul Harvey, Elizabeth Campbell, Hingham — Catherine Rivin, Hyannis — George Cavanaugh, Edward Park, William Janeson, JAMAICA PLAIN — Kenneth Leachman.
- KINGSTON — Peter Lemieux.
- LEANSINGTON — Leonard Bogaardt, Elizabeth Cohen, Robert Shrook, Douglas Stewart, Anthony Thurnton.
- LINCOLN — Henry Adams, Bob Koziol.
- MALDEN — Marjorie Brodsky, Mitchell Diamond, David Mahoney, Ellis Roubicek, Norman Spector.
- MANCHESTER — Leslie Cutler.
- MARLBOROUGH — Stephen Scott, Vincent Gibbons, Stephen McCarron, Robert Natus, Michael Marhon — Thome Perkins.
- MARLBORO — Nicholas Grabitsas.
- MATTAPAN — Lee Dunn, Toby Hyman.
- MEDFORD — Patrick Clancy.
- MELROSE — Arlan Fuller.
- MILFORD — Mark Zundorfer.
- MILTON — Cornelia Browne, John Kagan, John Kelly, Lawrence Murphy, Richard Nesto, Philip Role.
- NANTUSET — Paul Cort, Joseph Litchman.
- NATUSET — Charles Manuel, Martin Siedel, Stanley Werth.
- NORFOLK — Dean Talley.
- NORFOLK — David Blocker, Anthony Bolt, Philip Fine, Judith Gorb, Richard Ginsburg, Jonathan Grossman, David Guberman, Janne Leventhal, Geoffrey Modest, Andrew Myerson, Ernest Silliano, Howard Stecker, Steven Tanimoto, Mark Wolf.
- NEWTON CENTER — Donald Carlson, Leonard Einstein, Jeffrey Mann, Richard Weinberger.
- NEWTON HIGHLANDS — Jane Kurlin, Spiros Pantis.
- NEWTON UPPER FALLS — Richard Eisenberg, Eliot Keener, Michael Keener.
- WABAN — Martin Beck, Richard Cohen, Eliot Nicot.
- NORTH BILERICA — Daniel McNulty.
- NORTHFIELD — James Snelton.
- NORTH WEYMOUTH — Ellen Cooney.
- NORWELL — Jonathan Vincent.
- PLYMOUTH — Lawrence Newman.
- ROXBURY — George Middleton, Michele Slingo.
- QUINCY — Susan Harrington, Joseph Shea, Frank Yeomans.
- READING — Nancy Anderson.
- ROCHESTER — James Kelly.
- ROSLINDALE — Edwin Woodson.
- SHIRLEY — Nicholas Arguinbau.
- SOMERSET — George Harad, Houghton — Thomas O'Neill, Joseph Maloney, Romney Moore, Godfred Outeave, Elliot Smith, Otto Yudkin.
- SOUTH DARTMOUTH — Stephen Smith.
- SOUTH DARTFIELD — Raymond Wadlow.
- SOUTH HADLEY — Sarah Alderman.
- SOUTH WEYMOUTH — John Oiserson.
- SPRINGFIELD — Donald Blair, Donald Erdemman, George Elopoulos, Scott Levine.
- SUDBURY — Jeffrey Nima, Meryl Stowbridge.
- SWAMPSCOTT — Douglas Albert, Paul Epstein, Stuart Johnson, Thomas Murray.
- TEWKSBURY — David Thistle.
- TOWNFIELD — Gregory Banua.
- WABAN — Martin Beck, Richard Cohen, Samuel Van Dem, Albert Turco.
- WALTON — Joel Brenner.
- WALTHAM — James Stevenson, Vincent Vaccarella.
- WATERTOWN — Thomas O'Neill, Richard Brown, Virginia Clarke, Donald Hopkins, Kenneth Lopata, Weyland — Theodore Parker, WELLESLEY — Alan Gerlich, Harold Levy, Hills — Ellen Burt, Frederick Lane, John Fulham, Charles Hovey III, Anne Liddin, WILMINGTON — Jill Curti.
- WEST BOSTON — John Goldron.
- WEST DENNIS — Claude Stark.
- WEST ROXBURY — Robert Ambrin, Loraine Lunden.
- WESTWOOD — James Hunnewell.
- WHITMAN — Gerard Shepherd.
- WINCHESTER — Thomas Downes, Douglas McVicar, Joseph Biles, Rhoda Whitman.
- WORCESTER — Frederick Murphy.