



ALBERT WILLIAM TRUEMAN
President University of New Brunswick

THE INAUGURATION ADDRESS

**YOUR HONOUR, YOUR LORDSHIP, MR. PREMIER,
MEMBERS OF THE SENATE, MEMBERS OF THE UNIVERSITY,
LADIES AND GENTLEMEN:**

The occasion upon which we are gathered here this afternoon has, of course, a momentous personal significance for me; but the significance of the occasion far transcends the personal, and is regarded as so doing, I feel confident, by the Senate of the University, under whose authority and by whose desire this ceremony now takes place. It is well, it is necessary that from time to time the University appear before the public in the splendour and dignity of Academic ritual. A pageant of this type serves to remind us all that the University is committed to an enterprise of great solemnity; it reminds us, by the forms of language it employs and by the academic garb in which it is dressed, that the solemn enterprise to which I have referred had its beginnings long ago, it should remind us also that these beginnings arose in man's desire to conquer his ignorance and bewilderment in a vast and complex universe, in his desire to elevate human existence above the brute level, in his desire to be able to look into the past and into the ever-changing present acutely enough to find the way in which he should walk. To help men towards the fulfillment of these desires must ever be the aim of this unique society.

It is well, I repeat, that from time to time the University make official appearance before the public for the purpose of representing, by ritual ceremony and by plain speaking, the permanence of these truths. The inauguration of the President of the University and of its Senate, provides an occasion which appropriately may be used for this purpose. And the enunciation of these truths and the affirmation of academic faith in them I deem my role in the ceremony.

You will not expect me, then, to talk about the University of New Brunswick, its present state, its needs, the policies which should be devised for it. It would be an error in judgment for me to attempt a task of this magnitude and importance so early in my experience of

the University, a few brief minutes, in fact, after my inauguration. No. I shall deal with other matters more appropriate to the nature of this occasion, as I have attempted to reveal it.

Anyone who has followed current thought about higher education will know familiarly the names of many books which have been written on the subject in recent years; and the names of their authors:—Sir Richard Livingstone's "On Education," The Harvard Report, Ortega Y. Gasset's "The Mission of the University," Nash's "The University and the Modern World," VanDorens "A Liberal Education," The University of Toronto Series "Education of Tomorrow," Jacques Barzun's "Teacher in America," Pamphlets of the Student Christian Movement in England, C. S. Lewis' "The Abolition of Man," and several others. Of most of these writers, I believe it may be said that they hold at least one opinion in common namely, that higher education today is either in a state of un-balance, or is tending toward a state of un-balance. The authors of the Harvard Report put the opinion succinctly in the following sentence:—

The true task of education is therefore so to reconcile the sense of pattern and direction, deriving from heritage with the sense of experiment and innovation deriving from science that they may exist fruitfully together

The need for such reconciliation exists because there is a state of un-balance between heritage and science in the Universities of this continent. One end of the scale has been pulled down so heavily by science and technology that heritage has fairly kicked the beam. Professional education is everywhere prospering, with the painful exception of professional education for teaching. Here we have not yet been able to see our way so clearly or to secure adequate support from the general public. However casually study and research in the Humanities may have been supported in recent years, most Universities have been compelled to establish good laboratories and to provide good equipment and well-trained staff for the study of science. In other words the sense of experiment and innovation has scored a lusty triumph over the sense of pattern and direction which derives from heritage. Is it, in fact, too much to say, that the world of our time has little respect for inherited pattern, and only a confused knowledge of the direction in which it is going?

If what I have said is true, we must not be surprised to find that Universities are reflecting in their curricula and in their material equipment the value judgments of the society of which the University is a part and by which it must be sustained. Just as the astonishing discoveries of modern science and the slick efficiencies of modern technology press in upon individuals, and alter, with disturbing rapidity, the common usages of life, so they press in upon institutions of learning, immediate, urgent, inescapable. We are suffering then, not merely from change, but from the violently increased speed of change. Under these circumstances inherited patterns go unclaimed, the value of tradition is depreciated, and man's chief concern is to study, without the correctives which heritage can supply, how to meet the demands of the immediate. It is inevitable, I repeat, that Universities, as well as other institutions, reflect these value judgments. It is remarkable, too, with what rapidity these judgments or biases are being reflected. Part of the difficulty of coping with the situation is that it has emerged so suddenly.

On the other hand society has a right to look to Universities for intellectual leadership. The University must regard itself as a centre for the intellectual activity of the wide community it serves; and therefore it must guard zealously the privileges and qualities which alone

make possible the discharge of that function—its freedom of thought and utterance, its integrity, its moral courage, its enthusiasm for learning. But it must also have respect for and be responsive to the values of its community. Otherwise it cannot continue to live. It may attempt to lead the community in certain directions; it may,—yes, it must attempt to effect changes in the community's scheme of values. But it will be greatly unwise to get out of touch with its community, and only at its peril will it defy its community. It is evident, however, that to be weakly acquiescent to the whims of the community or to be afraid to exercise its role of intellectual and cultural leadership in the community for fear of giving offence or of losing some of its support, is the ultimate betrayal of the faith in which the great Universities of the world were born and reared.

I have sought thus far, then, to make plain the inter-relatedness and the inter-dependence of the University and the wide community which it serves. I would not be misunderstood. It is not my purpose to excuse Higher Education for its deficiencies by the plea that Universities can do only what the Community will let them do, and that the Community has foolishly refused to let them do what is needed. The Universities must also say "mea culpa." They have been guilty of sins of omission and commission. I seek only to make clear a fact which is often forgotten, a fact which constitutes a limitation upon the program of all our institutions, this fact of inter-relatedness and interdependence. Furthermore, although there has never been a time when this condition did not exist, at the present time the condition is of more serious import than it ever was before. It is of more significance now precisely because the speed with which change is taking place has been so violently increased, and because immemorial usages and ancient patterns, a consciousness of which gave stability and purpose to our institutions, are now part of a neglected inheritance. What is transmitted, then, from Community to University, is more uncertain, more confused, and more unpredictable than it used to be,—that is, with one unmistakable exception. The Community is making it quite clear that it requires the University to furnish a steadily increasing number of scientists and technicians; it is insisting on professional education and is willing to support, for the purpose of meeting this easily recognized need, great professional schools.

Again, I would not be misunderstood. I am perfectly willing that support be given to professional education and to science. The need for this support in the modern world is obvious. My point is not that we should try to rectify the state of unbalance by tearing down our professional schools; that would be folly. My point is that the Community and the University should examine their scheme of values, and discover that they may best correct the state of unbalance by becoming interested in and by giving support to those educational aims which are comprehended in the term "heritage"; by making the effort to lay hold on the inheritance which is ours, and which is becoming increasingly neglected; by looking at it in relation to modern science and by effecting, if possible, not merely a balance, but a marriage of the two. No one will believe this to be an easy feat. As a matter of fact it will be most difficult. But one feels in one's bones that if it cannot be done, the way is indeed dark before us. The problem, I repeat, is a problem of restoring and maintaining balance. If we place too many of our men and women in technical and professional schools; if we educate too many of them only for the immediate needs of commerce and industry; if we consistently refuse to make the aims of education, as Van Doren has put it, "sufficiently remote"; if we train too few men and women in the great Arts, in History, Philosophy, Literature and the Social Sciences; if in other words, we allow our state of unbalance to continue and get worse, there can be but one conclusion of the matter, in my opinion. We shall create a rootless society; a people uncon-

scious of its past; unaware of the value of tradition; ignorant of the everlasting continuity of things and of ideas indifferent to its inheritance; exclusively concerned with the material surfaces of life, skilful, efficient, and condemned to defeat in the battle of civilization. For the battle of civilization will be won, if won at all, not by technological efficiency, but by pertinent qualities in the minds and hearts of a sufficient number of people. It is not that technical, vocational and professional education are wrong. On the contrary, they are right and necessary, but they are not enough. (Let it be remembered here that I am talking about education in the University. Obviously efforts must be made in the public schools and high schools to meet the needs of those who do not plan to go to University. It is a matter for hope that the Province of New Brunswick is making such a determined attack on this problem in its Regional High School scheme). The effort which we have to make on behalf of higher education is to clear from our eyes the dust which has been raised by the frantic speed and violence of the changes in our modern world. There can be no thought of turning back the clock. We cannot restore some vanished Golden Age. Any Golden Age we may achieve will have to be a new one, probably a stream-lined, jet-propelled one; but it will have to be a harmony of Science and Heritage. In it, the Lion and Lamb will have to lie down together. We may not "liquidate" either the one or the other.

It devolves upon the Universities, therefore, to give what leadership they can in relation to these matters. As I have said, they will need to have courage, to cherish their integrity and their love of learning. They will need the active support and co-operation of the Communities they serve. The Communities cannot leave this matter in the sole care of the University. They will need to re-examine their values, and to give community support to activities and projects which enable men and women, boys and girls, to lay hold on their inheritance.

To go back for a moment to the University,—I venture to say that all institutions of high learning have experienced a two-fold difficulty arising from the state of un-balance between science and technology on the one hand, and heritage on the other. There is that aspect of the difficulty with which I have dealt; namely, the pressure of public concern for science and technology; but there is another aspect of the difficulty, no less important; when the Universities enroll students in the Humanities and in the Arts—and we still enroll some—it is found that many of them have been conditioned by Society against the appeal of these subjects. In illustration of this point, allow me to read a passage from "The Abolition of Man," by C. S. Lewis; in this passage, Lewis is engaged in refuting the educational philosophy of two schoolmasters whom he calls Gaius and Titius:—

They see the world around them swayed by emotional propaganda—they have learned from tradition that youth is sentimental—and they conclude that the best thing they can do is to fortify the minds of young people against emotion. My own experience as a teacher (continues Mr. Lewis) tells an opposite tale. For every one pupil who needs to be guarded from a weak excess of sensibility there are those who need to be awakened from the slumber of cold vulgarity.

The task of the modern educator is not to cut down jungles but to irrigate deserts. The right defence against false sentiments is to inculcate just sentiments. By starving the sensibility of our pupils we only make them easier prey to the propagandist when he comes. For famished nature will be avenged and a hard heart is not infallible protection against a soft head.

I believe that the Bishop of Carlisle, quoted in "Towards the Conversion of England," is saying much the same thing in these words: ". . . for a revival of religion there is needed a great rebirth of poetry and of the highest literature." The great Archbishop Temple warned us against a type of education which could create a generation "adept in dealing with things, indifferently qualified to deal with people, and incapable of dealing with ideas."

This then, is the simple point I wish to make: that we must fight side by side, the Community and the Universities, against those powerful influences of our times which are conditioning men and women against the appeal of heritage, against the appeal of Music, Art, Literature, History, Philosophy, and blinding them to their values. Therefore, everything which the Community does in support of activities related to the values enshrined in these subjects, is vastly more than a contribution to the elegant disposal of leisure time; it is a contribution to mental balance, to sanity, to security, to peace, to the only purposes which make human life worth perpetuating.

To the joint prosecution of this great task, the Universities and the Community should dedicate themselves; the University, certainly, must never forget that it is committed to an enterprise of great solemnity, man's effort to conquer his ignorance and bewilderment in a vast and complex universe, to raise human existence above the level of the brute, and to find the way in which he should walk.

In conclusion, may I acknowledge my sense of the great honour which has been done me today by the Senate of the University of New Brunswick, and my great gratification at having received it from the hands of His Honour the Lieutenant-Governor, His Lordship the Chancellor, and the Premier of the Province. May I express, too, my high regard for the University and for its long record of most distinguished achievements. It has had a great past, and in keeping with the tenor of my remarks today, I venture to observe that a knowledge of that past will help us all to ensure for the University a great future.

I wish to make special reference to the presence here today of His Honour, Lieutenant-Governor MacLaren, Visitor to the University on behalf of His Majesty. It has meant a great deal to the Senate and to the University generally, and to me, to have His Honour in the Chair on this occasion. I desire therefore to extend to His Honour our grateful thanks for his having consented to take part in the programme.

It is an additional pleasure to acknowledge the presence of Monsignor Ferdinand Vandry, the distinguished Rector of the University of Laval, and Vice-President of the National Conference of Canadian Universities. Monsignor Vandry will bring greetings from the Conference on the conclusion of my address, which is imminent. I am sure that I speak for all when I express to him our thanks for the honour which his presence does to us.

May I also take the opportunity to express—and here again I speak on behalf of everyone—heartfelt appreciation to Lord Beaverbrook for his benefactions to the University and for his warm interest in the University's welfare. I had the honour of spending some time with His Lordship in England this summer, and from those meetings with him I came away profoundly impressed by his great interest in the University of New Brunswick, and by the wisdom and sympathy with which he analyzed her needs. It is a source of great satisfaction to us all that Lord Beaverbrook should be here again in Fredericton and in this University, where he discharges with so much distinction the duties of the high office of Chancellor.