Sooner Scene

These are crucial days for American universities. The tragedy of Columbia and the specter of Berkeley symbolize the problems and issues facing all colleges and universities and serve as grim warnings to their leaders—and to everyone. When two of the nation’s greatest institutions are wracked and paralyzed by internal upheaval which expose deep schisms within their walls, when spectaculars of disruption and violence flash across campuses in every corner of the country, when rumblings of discontent portend even more severe seismic shocks, when an atmosphere of uneasiness, disenchantment, and malaise pervade so many schools, it is a time for serious—and urgent—inspection and reevaluation.

One thing seems painfully and conspicuously clear: the terra isn’t so firma in academe. Divisions, distrust, and misunderstanding among administration, faculty, students, alumni, and the public exist in varying degrees everywhere. In many places a failure to communicate exists. In most cases there is a need for a reassessment and clarification of goals and purposes. It’s obvious that some of the present methods and structures are no longer viable. A few are effete, irrelevant, even absurd.

“The modern American university seems to have lost its soul amidst unprecedented material growth,” writes Princeton professor James H. Billington in an article in the May 24 issue of Life magazine. “The university, as the center of rational criticism in our civilization, has an obligation to become its own most searching critic. It should not leave the job by default to the demagogic anti-intellectualism of either reactionary politicians or revolutionary students.”

Billington finds a poverty of educational thinking in the United States: “Universities which presume to analyze everything else in our society have failed to take serious stock of themselves.”

The University of Oklahoma, in a period which calls for institutional introspection, is acting. A change in administration is providing a propitious occasion for critical self-examination. If major surgery is required, a better time to operate could scarcely be found.

President-Designate J. Herbert Hollomon, who officially assumes leadership of the University on July 1, has used his year of transition as a year of planning. Last fall he created a score of “panels” whose job it was to define the purposes and goals of the University of Oklahoma, and of higher education, and to determine what they should be and how they could be carried out in the next twenty years. The panels have come to be known as the “Hollomon committees” and their months of study are drawing to a close. An article about the procedures they used and the results they will probably bring begins on page 4.

The committee reports, which are due this summer, will eventually be translated into a “master plan” for the University, and though there is some apprehension—and even alarm—about the committees as well as some skepticism about the effect of their findings and recommendations, the prevailing mood is one of enthusiasm and optimism.

There will probably be new structures, new priorities which will emerge from the work of the Hollomon committees. New programs and new approaches are almost certain. For change to be workable and lasting, however, thoughtful, carefully controlled planning is necessary. “There is no point in starting to construct a building without a plan,” said Hollomon in announcing the creation of the committees in November. “The more time spent in planning, the more likely you are to get the kind of building you want.”

Hopefully the University of Oklahoma will get the kind of university its students, its public, and its faculty want. Certainly its leaders and the people it serves cannot be criticized for inaction during the difficult days of decision for the American university.