

UC Berkeley

Research and Occasional Papers Series

Title

Hedgehogs, Foxes, Leadership Renewal and Succession Planning

Permalink

<https://escholarship.org/uc/item/2mx5f0n5>

Author

Gonzalez, Cristina

Publication Date

2007-11-01

Research & Occasional Paper Series: CSHE.17.07

CSHE | Center for Studies in Higher Education
UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA, BERKELEY
<http://cshe.berkeley.edu/>

**HEDGEHOGS, FOXES, LEADERSHIP RENEWAL
AND SUCCESSION PLANNING**

November 2007

Cristina González
University of California, Davis

Copyright 2007 Cristina González, all rights reserved.

Abstract: This article examines the intellectual history of *The Uses of the University*, including the influence of José Ortega y Gasset's ideas about higher education, with a view to exploring Clark Kerr's vision for the university and how that vision might be expanded to take account of present challenges, in particular, diversity. The paper, which calls for leadership renewal and succession planning, pays special attention to the two types of administrators defined by Kerr--the visionary hedgehog and the shrewd fox. We need to identify the hedgehogs and foxes of the future, who must be as diverse as possible if they are to raise the "multiversity" to "the height of the times."

Introduction

In the last few years, I have been teaching various graduate and undergraduate courses on higher education at UC Davis.* My focus has been the evolution of Western institutions of higher learning from antiquity to the present, with an emphasis on the

* This paper is an expanded version of a presentation I gave at the Center for Studies in Higher Education at the University of California, Berkeley, on February 14, 2006. I thank Jud King and the other members of the Center for their kind invitation. Without meaning to suggest that they necessarily share my views, I also am indebted to Steve Chatman, John Douglass, Marian Gade, David Gardner, Duncan Jacobson, Anne MacLachlan, Patricia Pelfrey and Sheldon Rothblatt for providing helpful comments at various stages of the project. I also am very grateful to my students, who have been a great source of inspiration for me. Finally, I would like to express my affection and esteem for Clark Kerr, whose search for meaning has inspired us all. He is remembered fondly and greatly missed. This article is dedicated to him.

United States. Drawing on the works of scholars such as Christopher J. Lucas, George I. Sánchez, Burton R. Clark, Martin Trow, Bill Readings and Patricia Pelfrey, my students and I begin our discussion with an examination of the scribal schools of Mesopotamia and Egypt. We then review the Greek and Roman pedagogical systems and study the cathedral schools and the rise of the secular university in the Middle Ages. After discussing the evolution of the university in the early modern era, we proceed to the New World, where we study pedagogical experiments in the bilingual schools of colonial Latin America and the establishment, in the 1550s, of its first full-fledged universities, modeled after the University of Salamanca and offering Bachelors, Masters and Ph.D. degrees. We then move to North America, examining the establishment of English-type undergraduate colleges in the 1660s, their development into German-style research universities with graduate schools in the 1870s, and their evolution into today's distinct institutions of higher learning which emphasize service to society. As we approach the present, we engage in a relatively detailed analysis of the University of California, focusing on policy, politics and leadership. Throughout this historical overview, we pay special attention to the education of women and minorities.

Most of my students are women and/or minorities, and many aspire to become academic administrators. They are not shy about sharing their views on the past, the present and the future. By far, their favorite readings are the presidential memoirs of Clark Kerr-- *The Gold and the Blue: A Personal Memoir of the University of California, 1949-1967*--and David Gardner--*Earning my Degree: Memoirs of an American University President*. My students say that these books provide more information about the inner workings of the university and the nature of academic leadership than all of their other readings combined. It is very interesting to see how, when they are a few chapters into the two memoirs, the students begin to speak about Kerr and Gardner as if they knew them personally. They try to understand Kerr and Gardner as individuals and to imagine what they might have done in their place. The fact that most of my students are not white males, however, interferes with the process of identification and invites reflection about the relationship between leadership and diversity.

Hedgehogs and Foxes

In preparation for discussing Kerr's and Gardner's memoirs, we read chapter 9 of the 2001 edition of Kerr's classic work *The Uses of the University*, entitled "The 'City of Intellect' in a Century for the Foxes?," which concludes with a very interesting comment about leadership.

Using an ancient animal metaphor, Kerr defines two types of leaders: the fox and the hedgehog. The 7th Century B.C. Greek poet Archilochus wrote: "The fox knows many things, but the hedgehog knows one big thing" (Kerr, 2001a, p. 207). In his famous work *The Hedgehog and the Fox*, Isaiah Berlin used this metaphor to distinguish between writers such as Plato, Dante, Pascal and Dostoevsky, who "relate everything to a single central vision," and those who "pursue many ends, often unrelated and even contradictory," including Aristotle, Shakespeare, Montaigne and Pushkin (p. 1). According to Kerr, hedgehogs are centripetal and foxes are centrifugal:

The hedgehog tends to "preach"--"passionate, almost obsessive;" while the fox is "cunning--clever, even sly. Order versus chaos, unity versus multiplicity, the big vision versus adjusting to miscellaneous unanticipated events, certainty versus uncertainty. (Kerr, 2001a, p. 208)

While Berlin uses this concept to shed light on Tolstoy, whom he sees as a fox trying to be a hedgehog, Kerr employs it to distinguish between two different kinds of leaders: the shrewd fox and the visionary hedgehog. Each deals with multiplicity in a different way: the fox, following his instinct, picks one option and runs with it, whereas the hedgehog uses his intellect to create a holistic model out of many fragments.

Kerr saw himself as one of the last hedgehogs but thought that modern universities were facing such complex conditions that they needed foxes to lead them. Gardner, on the other hand, can easily be described as a fox, although Kerr does not use this term to refer to him. Indeed, Kerr does not give any examples of foxes at all, perhaps because being a fox seems less elegant than being a hedgehog. His description of Gardner's deeds, however, points to positive fox qualities:

Under President David Gardner (1983-92), a wonderful combination of circumstances literally saved the University from academic decline. The economy of the state improved substantially, creating enhanced state resources. The new governor, George Deukmejian (1983-91), had campaigned for office on a program of support for education. Gardner saw the possibilities of the situation, took the risk of proposing, and then securing, the passage of an almost one-third increase in state funds for the university in a single year. His triumph equalized faculty salaries (they had fallen 18.5 percent below those of comparable institutions, see Table 27) and made possible many other gains. That convergence of circumstances and Gardner's efforts led to the academic rankings of 1993. (Kerr, 2001b, p. 414)

Gardner recognized the potential for gain and acted swiftly and decisively, a typical fox maneuver. Gardner discusses this and other similar episodes at length in his memoirs, giving us a fascinating insight into the mind of the fox and providing the perfect counterpart to Kerr's reflections. Although Kerr and Gardner both were presidents of the same institution, knew each other quite well and shared many values, they were strikingly different types of people. Kerr's focus was primarily on ideas, while Gardner's was on emotions.

This is not to say, of course, that Kerr did not have feelings or that Gardner lacked ideas. On the contrary, both were complex and sophisticated human beings: Kerr had many fox qualities, and Gardner had considerable hedgehog attributes, which is why they were both so successful. Great leaders combine hedgehog and fox traits, with one of them being dominant. Some, like Kerr, are primarily hedgehogs and, thus, more intellectual in outlook. Others, such as Gardner, are essentially foxes and therefore more apt to seek solutions through human interactions.

Kerr, by his own admission, was more intellectual than sociable. He says that he did not like to play golf. In other words, he was not one of the boys. Sometimes, he was not well-attuned to people's feelings. For example, he confesses that he failed to understand that student activists in the 1960s were moved by passion, instead of being guided by a rational cost-benefit analysis. There was a romantic movement, not one seeking compromise, but Kerr, who as a labor negotiator was accustomed to predictable behavior, did not understand that at the time:

I was too accustomed to rational thought within the academic community and the field of industrial relations: verifying facts, clarifying issues, calculating costs and benefits, trying to apply good sense and consider all aspects and consequences of actions. I was not accustomed to a more irrational world of emotions, of spontaneity, of sole adherence to some political faith. (Kerr, 2003, p. 238)

In part, this was due to his personality:

A second burden was that I was not easy-going enough and accessible enough to get along smoothly with some regents and legislators and students. I was all agendas and concerns and not given to easy conversation, not affable enough; by nature too shy, too reserved. (Kerr, 2003, p. 238)

Gardner, on the other hand, was certainly one of the boys. He constantly discusses the people he knew. Whenever he introduces a new character into the narrative, he explains when and how they had met--and he seemed to have met a lot of the players previously. He was a collector of people, constantly enlarging his network of useful contacts. As Nancy Diamond says, Gardner emphasizes teamwork. Accordingly, he was very focused on emotions, including his own, which he mentions often, noting the impact of his mood on events:

I was in an ambivalent and uncommonly pensive mood September 15 as the first day's meeting began: still shocked by the proximate death of my parents, exhausted from the events of the previous several months and of our family's move and the disruption to our family in making this move, wondering how the reorganization and several other items on the agenda would go. I decided that I was not very happy about it all when I should have been excited and anticipatory. I was in a sour mood, not usual for me. (Gardner, 2003, p. 172)

Conversely, he often notes the impact of events on his mood:

But as I left our July meeting, I really did wonder if our vaunted constitutional protections meant as much as I had always supposed (it was just as well that I left for our Montana cabin for a needed several weeks' rest immediately after the meeting, when I was in a negative and sour mood; I was in an upbeat and positive one on my return). (Gardner, 2003, p. 290)

As one might expect, the two leaders' achievements reflect this fundamental difference in attitude. Kerr's principal accomplishments, the California Master Plan for Higher Education, which combined access with selectivity, and the building of the UC system as an elite public research university in which all campuses are expected to reach the highest levels of excellence, was the result of his vision. Gardner's main contribution was his ability to convince the legislature and members of the public to provide generous funding for the institutions he represented. His most spectacular success--obtaining a thirty-two percent budget increase for the UC system during his first year as president--flowed from his shrewdness.

Kerr could see the big picture where everyone else was stuck on details. As Pelfrey says, he "had a singular ability to look at mountains of information and discern patterns and trends where others saw only a jumble of unrelated facts and statistics" (p. 39). He was able to connect the pieces into a workable whole, or as Howard Gardner (p. 129)

put it, “a story that made sense to the variety of constituents.” All the elements of the Master Plan were in place: the three systems of higher education--UC, CSU and the community colleges--each with its distinct mission. What Kerr accomplished was to transform confusing and unstable political arrangements into clear and solid policy. Over and over again in his memoirs, we see how he seeks to impose order on chaos by establishing policy.

Gardner, on the other hand, was more focused on politics than on policy. He had a sixth sense that told him when to jump and what to grab. Out of a multiplicity of options, he knew which to choose and when to choose it. At a time when his UC advisors would have been happy to accept an incremental increase to the budget, he sensed that a much more ambitious request might be granted and he audaciously pursued it. In Gardner’s memoirs, there are many examples of his extraordinary ability to obtain funding for the university by picking the right moment to ask for it.

If these two university presidents’ successes were different, so were their downfalls. Kerr’s painful dismissal was caused by a change in state government, in which his vision came into conflict with that of a different kind of hedgehog, Governor Ronald Reagan. In contrast, Gardner’s troubles arose from a perception that he was applying his legendary shrewdness to benefit himself, instead of the university, when it became known that he was going to receive a generous pension upon his retirement.

Both leaders made great contributions to the university: Kerr used his hedgehog’s vision to shape the UC system into an institution of the highest caliber, and Gardner relied upon the shrewdness of a fox to consolidate those advances and transform the UC system into an academic superpower.

My students enjoy both narratives tremendously and find comparing the two academic leaders a very useful exercise. While they profoundly admire Kerr’s visionary policies, they also show much appreciation for Gardner’s shrewd political achievements. They find Gardner’s literary style less demanding than Kerr’s. Gardner’s book, which is focused on his life, before, during and after his work at UC, is relatively short and easy to read.

Kerr’s lengthy memoirs are a history of the University California during his chancellor and president years and are full of background information. Their different literary styles probably reflect distinct personal goals. Kerr appears to be trying to prove his case, while Gardner seems focused on causing a good impression. One example of this difference is how each of these leaders reacted when attacked about his beliefs.

Kerr, whom Arthur Padilla calls “the Berkeley Quaker” (p. 79), was an independent thinker, which didn’t go over well in the McCarthy era. He was subject to investigation and harassed, as can be seen in the following episode:

After I became chancellor of Berkeley, I was interviewed by a whole line of investigators, of whom most were well informed and courteous though some were not. One in the latter category came to my office one day and sat down at my table, opened his note book, and asked me a question: “Are you a 100 percent American?” I replied that I could not answer his question unless he defined what he meant by “a 100 percent American.” He looked at me and said, “Anyone who does not know what is a 100 percent American is obviously un-

American.” He slammed shut his notebook, put away his pen, got up, and walked out of my office. That must have resulted in a black mark on my record. (Kerr, 2003, p. 49)

Indeed, as he says later, his independent attitude resulted in many more black marks and a thick FBI file with a note saying “Kerr is no good,” initialed by none other than J. Edgar Hoover. With characteristic humor, Kerr declares that he looks at this document “as the equivalent of an honorary degree” (Kerr, 2003, p. 69).

While Kerr did not compromise and suffered the consequences, Gardner was a master in the art of avoiding conflict and staying cool, as Neil J. Smelser points out. This can be seen in his job interview with the UC presidential search committee, when one of the Regents asked him if he was a Mormon and another followed up with a question about his position on the Equal Rights Amendment:

I wondered how best to respond and finally said something along the following lines: “These two questions are, in the first instance, legally impermissible and, in the second, wholly inappropriate unless it’s your intention to apply a religious and/or a political test to the appointment of the university’s next president contrary to the express provisions of the state constitution charging the regents to keep the university free of political and sectarian influence in the administration of its internal affairs. I will, therefore, not respond to your second question, nor elaborate on your first.” I let my words sink in for a moment, turned to the questioner, and said, “Why don’t you rephrase your question? Ask me about my views of the educational and employment opportunities women should expect to find or would hope to find at UC. Phrased that way, I will be happy to answer.” She said, “All right, what are your views?” With some brief mention of my having four daughters and being keenly aware of the implications attending her interest, I said that “women should have the same freedom over their lives as men do, including, and not by way of limitation, their personal and professional lives, and that neither the law nor university policies and practices should impede or otherwise interfere with the exercise of that discretion.” (Gardner, 2005, p. 145)

This answer, which was very deliberate, both in conception and execution, was calculated to produce a triple effect. First, it showed that he was tough, knew his rights and was capable of defending them; second, it demonstrated that he was a team player who could help a group move past a difficult moment; and, finally, it addressed the committee’s concern about his being too conservative by saying what its members wanted to hear.

In these two episodes, both Kerr and Gardner teased their critics, but Kerr did not give them an opportunity to save face, while Gardner did. Kerr’s goal was to prove his case and follow his principles, even if that did not please people. Gardner’s intent was to cause a good impression and please people without compromising his principles. Both narrate their adventures with great pride and relish.

These two academic leaders share many anecdotes about the attacks they had to endure and spend a lot of time analyzing their respective demises. Both went down in flames, in spite of their accomplishments or, perhaps, because of them. Their detailed narratives concerning the troubles afflicting them at the end of their presidential tenures usually lead my students to a philosophical discussion about the contingent nature of

power. Both narratives provide important lessons for aspiring administrators, and we conclude that it would be wise to contemplate administrative positions as a marathon in which the incumbents have to accomplish as much as possible before running out of power.

One issue that my students and I wonder about is whether Kerr was right about the current need for foxes. It is clear that we are in a fox-dominated period, but will this continue? Is the current displeasure with the ways of academic leaders not an expression of fox-fatigue? Might the public not eventually call for the return of the hedgehog?

Kerr did not anticipate such a call. In chapter 9 of *The Uses of the University*, he envisioned a future of foxes “looking around every bush, avoiding every trap, eating everything that happens to come along that can’t eat them. No great visions to lure them on, only the needs of survival for themselves and their institutions” (2001a, p. 209).

In this chapter, which is the last chapter of the last version of this famous book, and therefore can be read as his political testament, he concedes to the foxes and simply says that he hopes they will have a few hedgehogs around them to remind them to protect academic values. He also offers them some advice--the things that he would do if he were a fox--including having an in-depth discussion about the ethical systems of the future university. The book ends with the following words:

To the hedgehogs of the 1960s of which I was one: rest in peace; to the foxes of the twenty-first century: great expectations for success in your attempted escapes from the maze! (Kerr, 2001a, p. 229)

This is a depressing ending, a vision of a future without vision, but can there really be a future without vision?

The Ingredients of Kerr’s 1963 Vision of the University

As Steve B. Sample says, leaders are what they read, and thus was Kerr, whose 1963 vision of the university did not develop in a vacuum, but rather evolved from his readings. Of all the authors he quotes in *The Uses of the University*, there were six who, in my opinion, had a particularly strong influence on his thinking: Thorstein Veblen, Upton Sinclair, Abraham Flexner, José Ortega y Gasset, Sir Walter Moberly and Robert Maynard Hutchins.

Without their works, it would have been difficult for Kerr to make sense of the things he was witnessing and experiencing as an academic administrator. I believe that these thinkers, most particularly Flexner and Ortega, provided the bulk of the inspiration for Kerr’s 1963 vision of the university. Not coincidentally, Kerr later wrote introductions to Flexner’s and Ortega’s books about the university. These are the pillars on which he built his idea of the “multiversity.”

Thorstein Veblen, Upton Sinclair and Abraham Flexner

Thorstein Veblen, one of the founders of the American school of institutional economics, was a very original thinker who looked at economic systems from an evolutionary point of view. His approach was like that of an anthropologist describing a culture very

different from his own, with methods borrowed from sociology and psychology. His 1918 book *The Higher Learning in America* is a devastating critique of the university, which he considered to have become part of the business enterprise. According to Veblen, while early American colleges had been run by men of the cloth, American universities of his time were controlled by businessmen or “captains of industry.” These not only constituted their boards of trustees but selected their presidents, or “captains of erudition,” in their own image.

Upton Sinclair, a well-known and prolific socialist writer and outstanding investigative journalist, followed Veblen’s lead in his 1923 book *The Goose-step: A Study of American Education*. This is a study of American universities and their German-educated leaders, who, he believed, had acquired authoritarian tendencies along with their imperial German schooling. Sinclair’s theory was that universities were controlled by plutocrats, who were trying to keep students in the dark about what was really happening in the world. This was accomplished by keeping faculty members under control through a lack of job security and academic freedom. Based on many interviews conducted at universities around the country, as well as on published sources, this book provided a wealth of information and stories about events at institutions of higher learning.

In *The Uses of the University*, Kerr mentions Veblen’s and Sinclair’s books when he discusses the many faces of the multiversity president:

To Thorstein Veblen he was a “Captain of Erudition,” and Veblen did not think well of captains. To Upton Sinclair, the university president was “the most universal faker and most variegated prevaricator that has yet appeared in the civilized world.” (Kerr, 2001a, p. 23)

Kerr’s book, however, draws mostly on Abraham Flexner’s 1930 work *Universities: American, English, German*. While Veblen’s brilliant analysis was abstract and cryptic, and Sinclair’s juicy critique lacked scholarly rigor, Flexner, who had previously authored his famous report on the state of medical education, provided many concrete and well-documented examples about the increasing complexity of the university. His book is a defense of the “idea of the modern university,” that is, the German research university, modeled after John Henry Newman’s book *The Idea of a University*, which is a defense of the English liberal arts university. According to Kerr, just as Newman penned his book when the English model was disappearing, Flexner wrote his analysis when the German model was vanishing:

The Berlin of Humboldt was being violated just as Berlin had violated the soul of Oxford. The universities were becoming too many things. Flexner himself complained that they were “secondary schools, vocational schools, teacher-training schools, research centers, ‘uplift’ agencies, businesses--these and other things simultaneously.” They engaged in “incredible absurdities,” “a host of inconsequential things.” They “needlessly cheapened, vulgarized and mechanized themselves.” Worst of all, they became “‘service stations’ for the general public.” (Kerr, 2001a, p. 4)

Indeed, as Michael R. Harris emphasizes, Flexner was a counterrevolutionary who fought against the American land-grant university model of service. His book provides a detailed description of what he considered the excesses of this model, including

numerous undergraduate majors and professional degrees of a practical nature, which, in his opinion, interfered with the true education of students:

Can the trained intelligence of a young man be trusted to learn salesmanship, marketing, or advertising? Certainly not: the educational process has once more to be interrupted, suspended, or confused, in order that he may learn the “principles” of salesmanship from a Ph.D. who has never sold anything, or the “principles” of marketing from a Ph.D. who has never marketed anything. (p. 71)

Flexner, who is very critical of the “service station” function of the American university and of what he calls its “ad-hoc-ness” (p. 71), concludes that:

Neither Columbia, nor Harvard, nor Johns Hopkins nor Chicago, nor Wisconsin is really a university, for none of them possesses unity of purpose or homogeneity of constitution. Their centres are the treasurer’s office, into which income flows, out of which expenditures issue, and the office of the registrar who keeps the roll. (p. 179)

He proposes to eliminate all “the make-believe professions” and other, in his view, superfluous functions and return to the German ideal of the research university.

Noting that, with all the buildings and special events, athletics and alumni involvement, less than one-third of the typical university budget was devoted to what he considered proper university expenditures, Flexner questioned whether the university should change its name:

It has, however, become a question whether the term “university” can be saved or is even worth saving. Why should it not continue to be used in order to indicate the formless and incongruous activities--good, bad, and indifferent--which I have described in this chapter? If indeed “university” is to mean, as Columbia announces, a “public service institution,” then the university has become a different thing, a thing which may have its uses, but is assuredly no longer a university. In this event, in order to signify the idea of a real university, a new term may be requisite... (pp. 213-214)

Kerr expanded upon the idea and came up with a new term, not for what Flexner called the “real university,” but for this new model of university and his multiple “uses,” which he called the “multiversity.” I believe that *Universities: American, English, German* constitutes the primary source of *The Uses of the University* in terms of style. Flexner’s book was an elucidation of ideas contained in three papers he delivered at Oxford University as part of the Rhodes Lectures, and Kerr’s does the same with the three Goldkin Lectures he gave at Harvard University. Kerr’s first lecture, “The idea of a multiversity” draws inspiration from Flexner’s first lecture “The idea of a modern university.”

Although Kerr uses many of Flexner’s materials, his approach is completely different. Rather than fighting this new model of institution of higher learning and questioning its right to be called a university, he renames it and accepts it, albeit with reservations often expressed in witty language reminiscent of Flexner’s, Veblen’s and Sinclair’s humorous critiques. While these three commentators looked to the past, Kerr looks to the future. Rather than lamenting the loss of the Golden Age, he welcomes the coming of a new

one: the age of the “multiversity,” a term that he made famous although he did not invent it, for, as he says, it “was in the air” (2001a, p. 103).

José Ortega y Gasset and Sir Walter Moberly

What made Kerr turn Flexner’s lament for the past into a vision of the future? I think that José Ortega y Gasset’s book *Mission of the University* was instrumental in helping Kerr see what was happening to the American university in a different light.

Ortega published this book in Madrid in 1930 at the end of the Miguel Primo de Rivera dictatorship, when democracy was imminent, indeed arriving in 1931 with the establishment of the short-lived Republic. Based on a series of lectures delivered before the student federation of the University of Madrid, this book was the expression of a dream for a new state and a new university. Ortega, who was very concerned about the growing influence of the press and its ability to manipulate information, thought that the university should be an “uplifting principle, a “spiritual power” to fight that pernicious influence and stand “for serenity in the midst of frenzy” (p. 81).

Ortega had studied at Leipzig, Berlin and Marburg and thus was very much a product of the German research university. He was, however, quite critical of its excessive specialization and lack of attention to teaching, believing that these prevented it from being an acceptable model:

I have lived close to a good number of the foremost scientists of our time, yet I have not found among them a single good teacher--just so that no one will come and tell me that the German university, as an institution, is a model! (p. 71)

In fact, Ortega was very much against the idea of adopting the German, English or any other foreign model for the university. To the contrary, he believed it a fallacy that these nations were great because their schools were good and that other countries could become great by imitating their educational systems. According to Ortega, this erroneous line of thinking was very popular in the 19th Century:

The English rout Napoleon I: “The battle of Waterloo was won on the playing fields of Eton.” Bismarck crushes Napoleon III: “The war of 1870 is the victory of the Prussian school master and the German professor.” (p. 19)

Ortega wrote that in fact the opposite was true: great nations produced great school systems, just as they developed great economic and political systems. Therefore, imitating the school systems of successful countries would not achieve the desired results. Furthermore, he pointed out that those who imitate others are always behind the times. Ortega believed that each generation required fifteen years to become established, and that the world view it articulated lasted for another fifteen years. By the time a generation’s accomplishments became known and could be imitated, a new generation was developing a different world view. For all of these reasons, according to him, imitation of foreign models was not advisable.

Ortega believed that the German research university’s model, in particular, was flawed in that it produced what he called “new barbarians,” or people who knew a great deal about their own areas of research or professional activity and very little about any others (p. 28).

For Ortega, the most crucial question was “What is a university for, and what must it consequently be?” (p. 18). He concluded that there were four missions: preparation for the professions, training of new scientists, education of leaders and transmission of culture.

Ortega emphasized that, with the knowledge explosion, it was no longer possible for students to learn everything. Therefore, teaching should focus not on the knowledge that could be taught, which was vast, but on what students could learn, which was limited. Thus, he was in favor of a student-centered education that would provide a “general culture” (p. 26), that is, an understanding of “the system of vital ideas which each age possesses” or an awareness of their time and place (p.60).

Although this understanding had to be based on research findings, it was not provided by discovering new knowledge, but rather by integrating existing knowledge into a holistic construct. For him, what the university really needed was a “genius for integration” (p. 70), and its most important function was to bring students up to “the height of the times” (p. 30). This is a Spanish expression that means to be up to date, to be responsive to the changing realities of history, to be cutting-edge.

In *The Uses of the University*, Kerr quoted Ortega by name only once, to make a witty comment about student self-government:

Although José Ortega y Gasset, in addressing the student federation at the University of Madrid, was willing to turn over the entire “mission of the university” to the students, he neglected to comment on faculty reaction. (Kerr, 2001a, p. 16)

The influence of Ortega on Kerr’s book, however, is much greater than this comment suggests and is evident in a number of passages. For example, Kerr’s book begins by commenting that Newman and Flexner were behind the times:

The “Modern University” was as nearly dead in 1930 when Flexner wrote about it as the old Oxford was in 1852 when Newman idealized it. History moves faster than the observer’s pen. (Kerr, 2001a, p. 5)

This echoes Ortega’s comment about the impossibility of fruitful imitation: a university that copies a model from another country is, by definition, behind the times. Kerr explains that the “multiversity” is original even though it draws on many historical models:

The resulting combination does not seem plausible but it has given America a remarkably effective educational institution. A university anywhere can aim no higher than to be as British as possible for the sake of the undergraduates, as German as possible for the sake of the graduates and the research personnel, as American as possible for the sake of the public at large--and as confused as possible for the sake of the preservation of the whole uneasy balance. (Kerr, 2001a, p. 14)

This analysis rests on Ortega’s views about the English and German models and his advice to go beyond them to find an appropriate model for the times. As if this were not

sufficiently clear, Kerr goes on to speak about the transformations American society was experiencing and the corresponding evolution of the university, announcing that “by the end of this period, there will be a truly American university,” a unique institution “not looking to other models but serving, itself, as a model for universities in other parts of the globe” (2001a, p. 65).

Following Ortega’s ideas about education and hegemony, Kerr states:

Each nation, as it has become influential, has tended to develop the leading intellectual institutions of its world—Greece, the Italian cities, France, Spain, England, Germany, and now the United States. The great universities have developed in the great periods of the great political entities of history. Today, more than ever, education is inextricably involved in the quality of a nation. (Kerr, 2001a, p. 65)

What Kerr is really saying here, although he probably would not put it in these words, is that the “multiversity” is the educational model of the American empire, which is the empire of what he calls the “knowledge industry” (2001a, p. 66).

Ortega had discussed the “pulverization of research” (2001a, p. 70). In a subheading entitled “Changes Still to Come,” Kerr reviews a number of pending matters for the “multiversity,” including the need to integrate knowledge and to create “a more unified intellectual world” (2001a, p. 89). In conclusion, he speculates that the university of the 21st Century will have to combine aristocracy and democracy, elitism and populism in order to rise to “the height of the times” (2001a, p. 91). Interestingly, this direct quote from Ortega’s book is attributed in a note to Sir Walter Moberly.

Moberly is the author of a book entitled *The Crisis in the University*, which offers a Christian vision of the university and is presented as an alternative to Flexner’s critique of the modern university. Moberly’s book, which he says was written by a committee and, as a result, does not always use proper quotation systems, draws heavily on Ortega’s ideas, sometimes without attribution. In particular, the idea that the university must “rise to the height of the times” is the central motif of the book. Moberly uses this idea to defend a practical vision of the university.

Indeed, he expresses quite a positive view of the British “red brick” universities, institutions of higher learning established in the second half of the 19th Century that offered broader access and a more practical curriculum than Oxford and Cambridge did. For him, the tradition of Oxford and Cambridge was paternalistic and linked to a feudal, rather than an industrial, model of society. Believing that the problem when he wrote was how to combine the pursuit of excellence with the demands of social justice, Moberly stated that, if the university could not enjoy all the advantages of the cloister, “it should make the most of those of the market place” (p 305).

Moberly thus used Ortega to oppose Flexner, whose book was very critical of the American university’s “extra-mural work,” which Flexner considered “sub-university,” suggesting that those activities should be undertaken by other agencies. Moberly questioned whether Flexner was right about this or if, on the other hand, universities should take this work more seriously.

At the end of the book, Moberly answered this question in unequivocal terms:

Should universities persevere with the activities represented by their Education and Extra-Mural Departments? They have for some time engaged in these, but for the most part, they have done so rather half-heartedly. Here they should make a decisive choice. If these activities are really “sub-university” in quality or are outside their proper function, they should gradually withdraw from them. Otherwise they should commit themselves to them more fully and energetically than they have yet done. We contend that, for both Departments, the second alternative is the right one. (p. 306)

For him, the university should be allowed to rise to “the height of the times.” Kerr’s acceptance of the “multiversity” shows that he had internalized this message.

Ortega’s contribution to Kerr’s vision of the university is, thus, considerable. If most of the information that Kerr used to describe the “multiversity” was taken from Flexner’s, Veblen’s and Sinclair’s commentaries, his approach came from Ortega directly and indirectly, via Moberly’s interpretation. Veblen, Sinclair and Flexner provided the flour, and Ortega and Moberly the leavening, that gave Kerr’s book its shape and stature. But there is more to *The Uses of the University* than flour and leavening. There is a third important ingredient: a flavor between sharp and humorous, with authoritative overtones, which I believe was provided by Hutchins.

Robert Maynard Hutchins

At the time that Kerr wrote *The Uses of the University*, Hutchins was the most popular American university president, or rather ex-president, for he had stepped down from his position as Chancellor of the University of Chicago in 1951 and become what has been characterized as “a prince in exile,” as noted by Mary Ann Dzuback (p. 229). Hutchins was indeed a charismatic character, very well-known in higher education and beyond. He was intelligent, charming and witty. He also was very independent, which is probably why his administrative career ended after his struggles at the University of Chicago. As founder and director of the Center for the Study of Democratic Institutions, Hutchins spent all of his time thinking, writing and speaking about education, an example that Kerr would emulate later, when he accepted the presidency of the Carnegie Commission on Higher Education after his dismissal from the presidency of the University of California.

In *The Uses of the University*, Kerr places Hutchins among the greatest American academic leaders. For him, Hutchins was the last of the giants, because “he was the last of the university presidents who really tried to change his institution and higher education in any fundamental way” (2001a, p. 25).

Hutchins became well known, in part because of his vision of the great books of Western civilization as the heart of a liberal education, and in part because of his personality. He maintained his focus, and he did it with great gusto, energy and humor. He also was a great defender of academic freedom and made very critical comments about the excesses of the McCarthy era, as can be seen in his book *Freedom, Education and the Fund*. Kerr, who held similar political beliefs, was in a position to appreciate Hutchins’s courage, which, Kerr says, was greater than his own.

Kerr discusses Hutchins’s distinction between a “troublemaker” and an “officeholder,” which he compares with similar analyses, including Harold W. Dodds’s “educator” and

“caretaker,” Frederick Rudolph’s “creator” and “inheritor,” Henry M. Wriston’s “wielder of power” and “persuader,” and Eric Ashby’s “pump” and “bottleneck,” as well as James L. Morrill’s “initiator” and John D. Millet’s “consensus-seeker” (2001a, pp. 23-24). In recent times, other terms have been used to express the same distinction. For example, Warren G. Bennis, Burt Nanus and John W. Gardner distinguish between “leaders” and “managers,” and James McGregor Burns writes about “transformational leaders” and “transactional leaders,” a very successful terminology that has been explained and expanded by Bernard M. Bass, who points out that the best leaders are both transformational and transactional, and the worst are neither. Great leaders do indeed combine hedgehog and fox traits.

The hedgehog/fox terminology has been used by a number of scholars in the last decade. Some do not favor one type over the other. For example, Stephen Jay Gould discusses two equally good kinds of scholars: foxes, who explore many different fields, and hedgehogs, who work on a big, single project. Philip E. Tetlock studies two types of forecasters: foxes, who are right more often on short-term predictions, and hedgehogs, who, when proven right about long-term predictions, are very right. Some scholars favor the fox. For example, Claudio Véliz used this terminology to distinguish between the Spanish and British Empires in the Americas, attributing the ultimate success of the latter to its fox-like innovative shrewdness, which prevailed over the old-fashioned hedgehog vision of the former. Finally, there are scholars who favor the hedgehog. For example, Jim Collins’s theory is that only companies with a hedgehog concept achieve true distinction.

Although, in the 1963 edition of *The Uses of the University*, Kerr did not use the hedgehog/fox metaphor, he discussed the same idea. Hutchins, by his own admission, was a troublemaker, that is, a hedgehog, a transformational leader, someone who makes things happen. So was Kerr, who endorsed his views:

The case for leadership has been strongly put by Hutchins. A university needs a purpose, “a vision of the end.” If it is to have a “vision,” the president must identify it.” (Kerr, 2001a, p. 24)

Kerr points out that Hutchins’s vision of the university was focused on the horizontal contacts of the undergraduate college versus the vertical relationships of the graduate school. Indeed, Hutchins, who was critical both of the research university’s excessive specialization and of the undue fragmentation of the land-grant university, was trying to find an academic glue that would hold the various parts of the university together, as well as to re-think its purpose:

My education as an administrator began when at the age of thirty-two I opened Aristotle’s *Ethics* for the first time and read, “In practical matters the end is the first principle.” I was shocked to realize that in the ten years I had been in universities I had never seriously asked myself what they were for. (p. 18)

Whereas Hutchins answers this question by rejecting recent developments and going back to the idea of a liberal arts education, Kerr moves forward and enumerates the multiples “uses” of the university, which he renames “multiversity.”

Kerr’s idea of the “multiversity” builds on Hutchins’s humorous remarks about the modern university:

Hutchins once described the modern university as a series of separate schools and departments held together by a central heating system. In an area where heating is less important and the automobile more, I have sometimes thought of it as a series of individual faculty entrepreneurs held together by a common grievance over parking. (Kerr, 2001a, p. 15)

Many of Hutchins's witty comments are still quoted by administrators today, as are Kerr's, both leaders having achieved legendary status in academia.

In chapter 6, Kerr compares himself to Hutchins, the only other sitting university president in the 20th Century who spoke openly about the modern research university, and says that both had to pay a high political price for being "indiscreet" (2001a, p. 160). This is a hedgehog problem. Visions need to be shared, but sharing visions leads to making enemies and shortening political lives, as Hutchins himself saw very clearly.

By introducing the metaphor of the fox and the hedgehog in chapter 9 (2001) and including both Hutchins and himself in this category, Kerr subtly echoes his statement in chapter 1 (1963) that Hutchins was the last of the giants and implicitly adds himself to that list. Kerr was indeed the last of the giants, but was he the last of the hedgehogs?

Diversity in *The Uses of the University*

When we examine *The Uses of the University* from an archeological point of view, we find that the first three chapters, which are the original 1963 text, are optimistic and forward-looking, while later additions (1972-chapter 4, 1981-chapter 5, 1995-chapters 6, 7 & 8) are increasingly gloomy, culminating with the strong pessimism of the last edition (2001-chapter 9), noted by David L. Kirp.

Kerr himself discussed this change in chapter 8 (1995):

I have moved from guarded optimism to guarded pessimism, but I remain an unguarded Utopian: I believe that we can become "a nation of educated people." (Kerr, 2001a, p. 196)

Kerr says that he shares this belief with Howard R. Bowen:

who set forth a vision of a "nation of educated people," taking better care of their health, investing their wealth more effectively, behaving more efficiently as consumers, developing more fully their economic skills, and participating more widely and more wisely in political and cultural life. (Kerr, 2001a, p. 226)

According to Kerr, Bowen was one of the last optimistic hedgehogs of the 1960s, with whom he shared "tunnel visions of a better world through the efforts of the modern university" (2001a, p. 226). In 2001, Kerr looked around and saw "many things occurring, not one or two big things, all at once and with and against each other--a natural habitat for the fox" (2001a, p. 228).

My conversations with my students about this change in Kerr's views became quite personal. Could he have missed something? After all, he was not in the middle of events and had not been so for a very long time. What if he had missed a key piece in

the puzzle? Wouldn't that have prevented him from connecting the other pieces into a meaningful narrative?

There is indeed one issue that Kerr seems to have underestimated, if not missed: diversity. The California Master Plan for Higher Education did not anticipate the present-day diversity of California, as noted by John A. Douglass (2000). In fact, most of the tensions surrounding the Master Plan today can be connected to issues surrounding diversity in higher education in one way or another. This is an area that does not seem to have fully entered Kerr's field of vision, although he was a pioneer in terms of his thinking about equality of opportunity. For example, he created the university's student outreach programs during his presidency. But Kerr probably did not completely understand the depth of feeling inspired by diversity issues or their increasing importance to the state, the country, and the world. This is not to say that Kerr did not know, or did not care about, the demands of a diverse society. He did, but he considered this to be one of many factors affecting higher education, whereas a growing number of people today see it as one of the most important challenges facing the university and the broader community.

Kerr's comments about gender and ethnic diversity in *The Uses of the University* seem to support this view. First of all, women and minorities have a very low profile in the 1963 version of the book (chapters 1-3), which does, however, discuss equality of opportunity. Although this was a topic of great interest to Kerr, he seems to have been thinking mostly about equality of opportunity for people of low socio-economic backgrounds. Gender and ethnicity are not discussed until chapter 4 (1974), and then only to say that their consideration had been introduced at the university by the federal government in the 1960s. This idea is further expanded in chapter 5 (1982), where Kerr says that, thanks to the efforts of the federal government, more women and minorities are attending college and obtaining faculty positions, "but most of them come from the higher income groups. Progress in increasing attendance from low-income groups has been meager" (2001a, p. 129).

Chapter 5 begins by reviewing some of the events that had taken place since 1963, including the establishment of affirmative action and the *Bakke* case. Kerr then identifies six recent changes, the last of which was that a growing proportion of students were women and minorities. But immediately after that, he states that "none of these is a fundamental change" (2001a, p. 123). The chapter continues with an analysis of "fundamental changes attempted--and failed." One of these does involve diversity:

Some changes of the 1960's were based not on academic but on political concerns and were forced into practice by student pressure, changes such as programs in Black studies, Native American Studies, and Hispanic studies. Faculty members generally never liked them; in fact, barely tolerated them. Born in the passion of student activism, they have mostly withered, or at least wilted, in the silent embrace of faculty committees. (Kerr, 2001a, pp. 127-128)

These programs, however, have not withered. On the contrary, they have prospered. Kerr acknowledged this miscalculation in the 1995 edition (chapter 6):

I was clearly wrong about one internal reform: the development of African-American Studies, Hispanic Studies, Asian Studies, Native American Studies, and Women's Studies--if these are looked upon as internal rather than external

reform efforts: actually they were both. These areas of study have taken off in recent years. One campus I know well has more than one hundred courses in these areas in its catalogue. I think this is because, once these areas were opened up, students chose them in substantial numbers (sometimes encouraged by requirements), and then budgets and faculty positions followed closely on student choices of courses. I did not anticipate this because such courses have few vocational or professional uses, and students had been generally moving in vocational and professional directions. The search for supportive academic environments has been much greater than I anticipated. Also, these developments had much external support. (Kerr, 2001a, p. 161)

This explanation shows that Kerr had failed to understand the students' feelings. Although he had a strong intellectual commitment to the idea of equality of opportunity, he had trouble putting himself in the shoes of women and minorities. He could not understand their emotions, their need to learn about themselves, their interest in discovering what was holding them back. He thought that gender and ethnic studies were divisive. He also wondered whether diversity led in the direction of greater social integration "or rather from the once externally enforced segregation toward more self-chosen internal separatism on the campus, and toward the teaching more of competitive and even antagonistic cultures than of an understanding of comparative cultures" (2001a, p. 167).

In the same chapter, Kerr laments the disintegration of the guild status of the faculty, listing affirmative action among the contributing factors. So, as recently as 1995, Kerr seemed clearly uneasy about the consequences of increasing gender and ethnic diversity in the academy. But he continued to think about it, and in the prologue to the 2001 edition, he provided a critical comment about his 1995 views:

Looking back, I now note their generally pessimistic tone: the demise of "liberal education" for undergraduates, the fractionalization of the campus by fields of study, by ideologies, by gender and ethnic status. At the same time, however, it was clear that the American university had become the supreme research institution in the world. (Kerr, 2001a, pp. viii-ix)

Kerr understood that more needed to be done in the area of diversity and, in chapter 9 (2001), placed extending more opportunities to women and minorities on a list of unfinished business items from the 20th Century. In the same chapter, he enumerates fifteen factors affecting higher education that would be of interest to him if he were a fox in the 21st Century. These include "the changing demographics among state populations" (p. 227). He remains confused and pessimistic, however, as he says in the prologue:

I know that I no longer have the 20/20 vision I had in 1963, but it is still tempting to take a look at what may be coming down the road--a road I see filled with potholes, surrounded by bandits, and leading to no clear ultimate destination. (Kerr, 2001a, p. vii)

What my students and I wonder about when we read *The Uses of the University* is this: If diversity were considered a fundamental change--not one of a long list of factors affecting higher education but one of the top three or four--would a different picture emerge? Could diversity be the missing piece of the puzzle? Did Kerr concede to the

shrewdness of the fox because his hedgehog vision was getting blurred? Would he have arrived at a different conclusion if he had realized that the ultimate destination was “a diverse nation of educated people?”

Writing and Rewriting *The Uses of the University*

One of the questions my students ask is why Kerr didn't update his book instead of adding chapters over the years and leaving the original text (the first three chapters) intact.

Kerr probably did not want to tamper with the original version of the book, because it had become a classic, so he simply added chapters over the years. Thus, the interesting archeological nature of his book, which shows several layers of thinking. Nevertheless, it is interesting to speculate about how the original version of the book (the first three chapters) could have been rewritten in light of comments he made in later chapters and in his other works and considering what we know about current conditions affecting the university.

If we go back to the 1963 text of *The Uses of the University*, we see that Kerr's analysis was very concise. He studied the transformations the university was experiencing by focusing on three aspects of its evolution, namely, its new mission (knowledge production for a knowledge-based economy), its new funding pattern (the “federal grant university”) and its new structure (the fragmentation of the “multiversity”). These three developments had resulted in a very complex institution, which he calls the city of intellect, or “a city of infinite variety” (2001a, p. 31), as opposed to the two previous stages of the university, which he describes as a town and a village, respectively.

According to Kerr, life in the multiversity is complex. The students are “older, more likely to be married, more vocationally oriented, more drawn from all classes and races than the students in the village, and they find themselves in a most intensely competitive atmosphere. They identify less with the total community and more with its subgroups” (2001a, p. 31). Faculty members also have changed. Their “interests have become much more diverse; and there are fewer common topics of conversation at the faculty clubs” (p. 32). They are “less members of the particular university and more colleagues within their national academic discipline groups” (2001a, p. 33).

Although the “multiversity” has many problems, it has a great deal to offer, including “consistency with the surrounding society,” says Kerr, who states that “it has no peers in all history among institutions of higher learning in serving so many of the segments of an advancing civilization” (2001a, pp. 33-34). Critics such as Robert Paul Wolff have said that the “multiversity” does not always meet “human need,” although it might be quite responsive to “market demand” (p. 36). They also have found Kerr's comments about the “multiversity” excessively positive, indeed celebratory. Kerr, however, thought that he was just describing and accepting an imperative:

“The Idea of the Multiversity” has no bard to sing its praises, no prophet to proclaim its vision; no guardian to protect its sanctity. It has its critics, its detractors, its transgressors. It also has its barkers selling its wares to all who will listen--and many do. But it also has its reality rooted in the logic of history. It is an imperative rather than a reasoned choice among elegant alternatives (Kerr, 2001a, p. 5).

Whatever his feelings--and he clearly had misgivings--Kerr helped the University of California to prosper in this new environment, transforming it into the best "multiversity" in the land.

Kerr's "multiversity" was very much "at the height of the times," but the times are changing, and market demands and human needs are changing too. In addition, some previously unarticulated human needs are being expressed and, thus, becoming market demands. Accordingly, the three key aspects of the university that Kerr analyzed in 1963 are undergoing profound transformations:

Mission

One of the most consequential transformations taking place today is that the United States and other industrialized countries are becoming more diverse, as they function as magnets for people from less prosperous areas, including their present and former colonies. I believe this to be a fundamental change that is influencing society and affecting the mission of the university. The knowledge-based economy has turned out to be a transnational economy in which both goods and people circulate easily. Successful participation in this economy will require strong leadership on the part of the university, which will have to help manage this development by providing access on a much larger scale than previously experienced or envisioned.

Funding

While access to the highest levels of education by people from non-traditional backgrounds of various kinds is becoming paramount, the funding patterns of American universities are evolving to rely more on endowments and tuition and less on public support. The "federal grant university" is becoming the "private grant university," in Kerr's terminology (2001a, p. 188). This is an important change that is affecting the behavior of the university and its leaders as much as, or more than, the infusion of federal money did decades ago.

Structure

While the knowledge-based national economy and the "federal grant university" described by Kerr in his 1963 text formed a marriage made in heaven, the knowledge-based transnational economy, which requires expanded access, and the "private grant university," which offers less need-based aid, do not necessarily mesh well. Tensions between mission and funding are making universities very difficult to lead. The "multiversity" is much more unruly than it was when Kerr first defined it. In addition, its structural fragmentation has continued, making the need for integration of its various components, as well as of its mission and funding, more obvious and more urgent. To lead the "multiversity" in the coming years will require a great deal of shrewdness and a truly uplifting vision.

Wild Card

Discussing the future of the American research university in chapter 9 of *The Uses of the University*, Kerr mentioned some wild cards, including wars and depressions. That concept could be expanded, using the 1963 text, where he notes that each nation, when

it becomes dominant, tends to develop the leading educational institutions of its time. As Ortega says, great countries produce great educational systems, not the other way around--a sobering thought. That means that whether or not the American research university maintains its preeminent position will depend on how the country fares in the coming years, and that is the wildest card of all.

Rewriting *The Uses of the University* today would require a new vision, a vision for a world that contains multiple fractures, in which it is imperative that we find common ground, not by giving up what is different and unique about each of us, but by using it to advance the common cause of knowledge, wisdom and the pursuit of happiness.

The University of California's Hedgehog Concept

In their book *Built to Last*, Jim Collins and Jerry I. Porras compared a set of highly successful companies with a set of similar or "twin" companies that had not done as well and found that the former had a small number of core values that guided them through thick and thin and explained their success. Instead of relying on "time telling" or the vision of individual leaders, these companies depended on "clock-building" or a collective vision that sustained them over time (pp. 22-42). Most of these visionary companies chose their leaders internally and, although they did not begin with a great idea, they did have a strong sense of purpose. Their achievements came after much branching and pruning, and their struggles are on-going.

In his book *Good to Great*, which he considers a prequel to *Built to Last*, Collins examines companies that made the leap and sustained their success for at least fifteen years. All of these companies went through the same stages. First, at crucial moments of their development, they had what he calls "level 5 leadership" (pp. 17-40), that is, leaders who combined personal humility with professional will. These leaders started by getting "the right people on the bus" (pp. 41-64) before they confronted "the brutal facts" (pp. 65-89) and developed a "hedgehog concept," which Collins defines as "a simple, crystalline concept that flows from deep understanding about the intersection of the following three circles: what you can be the best in the world at ... what drives your economic engine ... what you are deeply passionate about" (pp. 95-96). Collins notes that there is a big difference between pre-hedgehog and post-hedgehog states:

In the pre-hedgehog state it's like groping through the fog. You're making progress on a long march, but you can't see all that well. At each juncture in the trail, you can only see a little bit ahead and must move at a deliberate, slow crawl. Then, with the Hedgehog Concept, you break into a clearing, the fog lifts, and you can see for miles. From then on, each juncture requires less deliberation, and you can shift from crawl to walk, and from walk to run. In the post-hedgehog state, miles of trail move swiftly beneath your feet, forks in the road fly past as you quickly make decisions that you could not have seen so clearly in the fog. (Collins, 2001, pp. 110-111)

According to Collins, the companies that failed to go from good to great almost never emerged from the fog, showing a desire to grow for the sake of growth that was lacking in the successful companies. The latter were focused on a vision and had a culture of discipline allowing them to stop doing things that weren't relevant to their purposes. They were totally focused on their vision, which did not come to them suddenly, but

rather was an iterative process that took years. This is what Collins calls the flywheel of success, as opposed to the doom loop of failure.

Finally, Collins points out that to build an enduring company of iconic stature, to go from *Good to Great* to *Built to Last*, requires “core values and a purpose beyond just making money combined with the key dynamic of preserve the core/stimulate progress” (p. 14). In other words, after a process of buildup and breakthrough, the enduring companies understood what was unique about their contributions and stayed faithful to their essence. Their focus was not merely on making money but on rendering a service to society.

As Collins and Porras point out, these principles apply to all kinds of institutions, not just to business corporations. Collins addressed this issue in detail in a book entitled *Good to Great and the Social Sectors*. His stated intention was not to suggest that the social sector should be run like a business, but that all institutions, whether businesses, churches, hospitals or schools, follow the same rules when it comes to what separates good from great. Indeed, the *Good to Great* principles most certainly apply to universities in general and to the University of California in particular.

In their book *The Rise of American Research Universities: Elites and Challengers in the Postwar Era*, Hugh D. Graham and Nancy Diamond evaluated institutional performance in new ways. Rather than ranking universities according to perceived quality, they counted numbers of federal research dollars, scientific journal articles and fellowships in the arts and humanities. They divided these by the number of faculty members at each institution, in order to determine research productivity. One of this book’s most interesting findings is the high performance by the faculty of all campuses of the University of California, whose extraordinary rise stands out as the most spectacular academic success story of the 20th Century. With ten campuses of top quality, six of which are members of the prestigious Association of American Universities (AAU), the University of California is a unique institution which many consider the best university system in the world.

How did the University of California achieve such high status? Obviously the size and wealth of California have contributed to UC’s success. As Ortega said, great states produce great educational institutions, and the State of California is the largest and richest state in the country. Indeed, according to Kerr, its history consists of a series of “gold rushes:” gold, oranges and grapes, motion pictures, military-industrial development, electronics and biotechnology (2001b, pp. 416-417). The conditions were certainly right for the creation of a great institution of higher learning, but this did not necessarily have to happen.

Other big and prosperous states developed good universities but not the kind of top-of-the-line university system that UC is. New York, perhaps because of its proximity to the Ivy League institutions, did not fund its public universities well and therefore could not develop a comparable system, nor has Texas developed a similar system, in spite of its prosperity and its location. Texas can be considered California’s “twin” state, the closest in many respects, including size, wealth and distance from the private universities of the East Coast. California might just as easily have created universities the same way Texas did. It could have built a few excellent state universities, but not a top-level public university system with across-the-board quality.

The University of California's success has to be attributed to extraordinary insight and commitment on the part of its members and supporters over an extended period of time. As Collins and Porrás would say, the University of California has been a visionary institution that has followed the same set of core values throughout its history. In particular, it has brought together democratic goals and aristocratic ideals. These were enunciated at the time of its founding in 1868, when the private College of California became a land grant university, combining the characteristics of both types of institutions.

These principles were affirmed when the California Master Plan for Higher Education, which provided a formula for the state's public institutions of higher learning to combine selectivity and access, allowed the University of California to develop and implement its "hedgehog concept" of an elite public university system. Like the enduring companies of iconic stature studied by Porrás and Collins, the University of California understood what was unique about its contributions and stayed faithful to its essence. Its focus was not on being good or even on being great, but on being great in a way that would match and promote the greatness of the Golden State, which is the most powerful expression of the American Dream.

As Pelfrey notes, "nothing could be more American--or more Californian--than the expectation that a UC Berkeley or a UC San Diego could be the equal of a Harvard or a Cambridge" (p. 93). Indeed, as alumna Joan Didion says, the University of California seems to be "California's highest, most articulate idea of itself, the most coherent--perhaps the only coherent--expression of the California possibility" (Pelfrey, p. 3).

Although the idea of creating a public institution of higher learning is as old as the state, the University of California was not established until the College of California's terms--that its campus be used to establish "a complete university" with the help of land grant funds--were accepted. The President of the College of California was Henry Durant, a Yale scholar who insisted that the new university teach the liberal arts in addition to agriculture, mining and engineering. He was the first permanent president of the University, following John LeConte's one-year tenure as interim president. Durant's successor as president, another Yale scholar, Daniel Coit Gilman, was a visionary leader who had to fight very hard to defend the institution from those who wanted it to be a vocational school, rather than a "complete university." Frustrated by the political attacks he suffered, he left for Johns Hopkins University, which he quickly transformed into the first American research university.

Gilman was followed by what Verne A. Stadtman calls "the era of powerless presidents" (pp. 88-106), including John LeConte, who came back as president and continued the struggle to turn the University of California into a research university. Although not well-suited for administration, he did not lack vision, and he made more progress than Stadtman suggests, because during his tenure, the University became a public trust with an unusual degree of autonomy, a fact that would facilitate its academic success. After LeConte, there were three short-lived and rather ineffectual presidents, who in turn were followed by the long tenure of Martin Kellogg, which Stadtman calls the "quiet, constructive years" (pp. 175-178). Kellogg seems to have been a very smooth and experienced fox. He made the Regents so comfortable that they eventually granted his office more autonomy, which allowed his successor, Benjamin Ide Wheeler, a young and determined hedgehog, to move the university forward.

At the beginning of the 20th Century, with the rise of the Progressives and their faith in education as a great social equalizer, and with the aid of philanthropy, California saw the creation and rapid rise of Stanford University. Not to be outdone, Wheeler proceeded energetically to expand the University of California. As Henry F. May points out, Wheeler, who was a Cornell professor educated in Germany, understood the importance of its land grant and research missions and transformed the University into an engine of prosperity for the state. Accordingly, he realized important innovations, such as separating the University from other institutions of higher learning and developing a unique budgeting method.

According to Douglass (2000), Wheeler contributed to putting in place the tripartite division of higher education consisting of the university, the normal schools and the junior colleges. The concept of the junior college as a bridge between high school and higher education emerged in the late 19th Century, and its most ardent proponent was William Harper, president of the University of Chicago. While David Starr Jordan at Stanford tried, to no avail, to implement Harper's ideas, Wheeler succeeded in doing so. The first such junior college was created in Fresno in 1910, and many others were founded in the ensuing years. At the same time, the number of normal schools expanded. In addition, during a budget crisis, Wheeler successfully negotiated an enrollment-based budget, which was to become a distinct feature of the University of California.

Wheeler built the elite public university Durant, Gilman and LeConte had dreamed of. During his tenure, the University of California hired many top-notch faculty from around the country and was ranked among the best American Universities by Edwin E. Slosson, who, in 1910, placed the University of California after Harvard, Yale, Princeton and Stanford.

Slosson said that the University of California had inherited the virtues of both parents and none of their defects:

I know of no other university which cultivates both mechanics and metaphysics with such equal success, or which looks so far into space, and, at the same time, comes so close to the lives of the people; or which excavates the tombs of the Pharaohs and Incas while it is inventing new plants for the agriculture of the future. (p. 149)

Slosson noted that the faculty respected each other's ideals and lived in an unusual degree of harmony. Indeed, ten year later, in 1920, immediately after Wheeler's resignation, this very cohesive faculty body demanded and won a great deal of autonomy with the recognition of the academic senate, which, according to Angus Taylor, "may be unique in its scope and the extent of its powers and privileges" (p. 112). This is probably the most powerful academic senate of any university in the country due to its system-wide nature. Among other things, the senate controls faculty appointments and advancements. There is a ladder system, and all faculty members undergo a performance review every few years.

This system, which is unique to the University of California and predates its tenure system, was a major factor in its success, as it created a culture of discipline, with clear academic standards for all its members. Whether tenured or untenured, all faculty members are subject to periodic reviews. Salary raises depend on promotion to the next

step. All campuses, large and small, are subject to the same requirements. This resulted in a very cohesive and competitive institution with high-powered and proactive faculty members who share governance with the administration.

Growth, governed by rigorous academic standards, continued under subsequent presidents and most particularly under President Robert Gordon Sproul, the first alumnus of the University to lead it. Although not an academic, he understood the institution and cared about it, guiding it during a very long period that included the Depression, the Second World War and part of the Cold War. Sproul was able to secure abundant funds for the University and to expand it according to previously-established parameters.

During Sproul's presidency, the University expanded to include other campuses and facilities, yet he continued to run everything centrally, sticking to the idea that, no matter how large it became, UC had to be "one university." Although his profile, as described by George A. Pettitt, is that of a fox, Sproul energetically advanced the institutional core value enunciated by the founding fathers of an elite public research university. His tenure represents the end of the period of "buildup" in Collins's terminology.

In 1958, Sproul, who had been president for twenty-eight years, was replaced by Clark Kerr, an honors student from Swarthmore College who was very focused on academic achievement. As first Chancellor of the Berkeley campus, Kerr had set enrollment caps, which had never before been accomplished at any public university. Like the leaders of the enduring business companies studied by Porras and Collins, Kerr did not want growth for the sake of growth. He understood the power of "no." As he reflects in his memoirs, people used to say that he had "the fastest 'no' in the West" (2001b, p. 26). When he became President of the University of California, he continued his efforts to rationalize growth, extending them to the entire system and, in fact, to the whole state, with the Master Plan.

Douglass (2000) points out the differences between Kerr's diplomatic style and Sproul's autocratic ways. Upon arrival, Kerr proceeded to decentralize functions and to give independence to the campuses, while maintaining the "one university" ideal by having the same high standards of quality for all its member institutions. Thus, the current system was born. The idea of systemic excellence, as opposed to campus excellence, was a "breakthrough" in Collins' terminology, the moment when the institutional core value of excellence morphed into a "hedgehog concept." This "hedgehog concept" was articulated in the California Master Plan for Higher Education, which assigned a uniformly high level of academic quality to the entire University of California system, in order to differentiate it from the other state institutions of higher learning.

After World War II, when a college education became almost as common as a high school education had been before, the so-called Strayer Report was produced. This "first master plan" (Douglass, 2000, p. 184) recommended expansion of junior colleges and creation of more state colleges, which now would offer masters degrees, while assigning exclusive responsibility for professional and doctoral degrees to the University. The so-called Restudy, produced in the mid 1950s, called for sending more students to the junior colleges and creating an independent board of trustees for the state colleges, which were under the control of the State Board of Education. Its recommendations were not followed, and the tensions among the three segments of higher education continued.

More conciliatory than Sproul, Kerr began his presidency by making significant concessions to the state colleges, such as agreeing for them to grant additional masters degrees. In exchange, he proposed that the state draft a master plan in order to provide universal access to higher education without duplicating efforts or compromising quality. Combining features of the Strayer Report with those of the Restudy, the Master Plan Survey Team established a very selective admissions policy, according to which the university and the state colleges would draw from the top 12.5% and 33.3% of California high school graduates, respectively, shifting the remaining enrollments to the junior colleges. This division of labor was very cost-effective and resulted in a high level of funding per student for the University of California, which allowed it to compete with the best private universities in the country.

The proposal called for an independent board of trustees for the state colleges, as well as a state coordinating council. Whether the state colleges should offer doctoral degrees was left for the coordinating council to decide. Concerned about the possibility of mission creep, Kerr did not accept this aspect of the agreement, proposing instead the creation of joint doctoral programs between the University and the state colleges. Anxious to secure Kerr's support for an independent board of trustees, the state colleges agreed, and a deal was struck. Kerr's "plan to end all plans" was endorsed by the Master Plan Survey Team and approved with minor modifications by the legislature in 1960. The Master Plan was an instant success and Kerr made the cover of *Time*.

This could have been the end of the story, but it was not. The University of California could have failed to benefit from the funds provided by the state by distributing them across the board, but it did not. With the culture of discipline it had developed earlier, it used the money it received from the state to reward faculty performance and to enhance institutional competitiveness. The administration did not have to tell the faculty what to do. Faculty members had a tremendous amount of self-discipline, which they used to implement the "hedgehog concept" of becoming the best university system in the world, a goal about which both faculty and administration have been passionate.

What drives the academic engine is that both faculty and students are subject to common standards of quality control. This is what President David S. Saxon called "endemic excellence" (Pelfrey, p. 55). The students must be among the best high school graduates in the state, and the faculty must meet the exacting requirements of a system-wide tenure, promotion and merit system with periodic pre- and post-tenure evaluations. The three circles of the "hedgehog concept"--"what you can be the best in the world at ...what drives your economic engine ...what you are deeply passionate about"--intersected to produce the institution of iconic stature that is the University of California.

Douglass (2000) reflects on the accomplishments and limitations of the Master Plan, which, he believes, balanced the goals of selectivity and access. Due to the division of labor among the University of California, California State University (the former state colleges) and the community colleges (the former junior colleges) the state's cost per undergraduate student has remained low, while the quality of research and graduate education has reached new heights, as shown by national rankings and the international reputations of Ph.D. programs. As Douglass (2000) points out, however, the Master Plan did not envision the growing diversity of California's population and the consequent fact that the three-tiered system, drawing applicants from schools of varied circumstances and uneven resources, would organize students along the color line: the

higher the level, the whiter the student body. As Sheldon Rothblatt (1992) indicates, equality of opportunity and equality of outcome “were not polemical issues at the time the Master Plan was first devised” (1992, p. 23). Indeed, the record shows that, in its eagerness to stick to its core value of excellence, the University of California slowly but surely sacrificed diversity in the first half of the 20th Century.

The Trouble with Hedgehogs

When, in 1910, Slosson ranked the University of California among the top universities in the country, he urged it to keep itself free of discrimination in order to fulfill its destiny as a great cosmopolitan university, stating that the University of California, “greater and more influential than a State or a national university will be the international university of the future” (p. 180). He obviously was very taken by California’s institutions of higher learning, as he expressed very positive views about both the University of California and Stanford University, which he found more open-minded than Harvard, Yale and Princeton. For example, comparing Stanford and Princeton, he said that Stanford did not exclude from the university persons “who do not belong to a particular race or sex” (p. 122).

Slosson was even more impressed by the University of California in this respect. For example, he reports his encounters with Japanese and Chinese students and tells pleasant anecdotes about them, stating that he did not hear at Stanford or the University of California the kinds of negative comments about them that he had heard at Harvard. Although he acknowledged that there was discrimination, he quaintly said that this was not “any stronger in the Californian universities than anti-Semitism in Princeton, Pennsylvania and Columbia” (p. 162). Slosson noted that in 1908 there were registered in the University of California seventeen students from China, eighteen from Japan and nineteen from India.

Indeed, the presence of students from other parts of the world was noted with excitement by Agnes Edwards Partin, a freshman who in one of her first letters to her family in the Fall of 1917, wrote that her English class was “quite interesting. There is a girl from Russia, a Japanese, a Hindu of some sort and two other boys who speak with a foreign accent” (p. 12). Of course, as Douglass (2007) points out, there was a great deal of discrimination against Asians in California during this period and, as Robert Nisbet explains, most of the students of color found at the University of California were foreigners funded by their well-off families or by their governments. Nevertheless, the University of California was more welcoming to such students than other institutions of higher learning due, in part, to Wheeler’s international predilections, which are reflected in his condemnation of racial prejudice:

A fixed prejudice is a case of arrested development. Like the petty village aversions, racial and social prejudices generally affect what is near at hand, what one sees and does not know. The man who has made up his mind that he dislikes Jews or Chinese or some other blood has introduced into his life a persistent source of narrowness, blindness, and poverty. He has raised a barrier between himself and the exceeding richness of human fellowship. (Douglass, 2007, p. 68)

This attitude greatly impressed Slosson, who also noted the high number and top performance of women at the University of California, where, according to the administration, they raised the average grade “to an abnormal height” (p. 167).

Maresi Nerad points out that, when, in 1870, two years after the University of California, Berkeley, opened its doors, eight female students enrolled, the regents had to pass a resolution to admit women. Apparently, many people disapproved of this action, which was defended by “The University Echo,” one of whose editors was Josephine Lindley, the first woman student ever to register. As William W. Ferrier writes, an editorial believed to have been authored by Lindley states that “men cry out against woman’s extravagance and trifling, yet they are the first to condemn the opening of paths to her,” stressing that “every young lady should be fitted to do something in life” (p. 332).

According to Nerad, by 1900, forty-six percent of the University’s students were women, a higher percentage than at any other co-educational university in the country, and by 1915, there were more women than men in the College of Letters and Science, “which began to resemble a women’s college” (p. 20). This is what Slosson saw and marveled about during his visit. It seemed like a new world to him, a preview of things to come. After that promising start, that moment of splendor in the grass, however, women and people of color failed to make significant gains. In fact, as A. Michael Otten says, Berkeley and the other campuses of the University of California have fundamentally “catered to the better-off classes and the white majority” (p. 205).

Geraldine J. Clifford expressed similar views in her study of the relationship between developments in the public schools and the role of women in the life of the University of California. Clifford shows, among other things, that the feminization of teaching in 19th Century American schools, due in large part to the increasing abundance of more lucrative jobs for men, resulted in women going to college in great numbers. This helped newly-established American universities grow at a fast pace, in addition to giving them some unique features such as the presence of schools of education. According to Clifford, most women students at Berkeley were trying to become teachers, for whom there was a great demand in California. Indeed, in 1907, women accounted for 967 of the 1070 teachers in the San Francisco schools. After this initial enrollment boom, Berkeley started to focus on prestige, experiencing what Clifford characterizes as “two divergent cultures” (p. 80). One was democratic, oriented towards meeting local teaching needs. The other was aristocratic, focused on satisfying national research standards. As Berkeley proceeded to strengthen its elite research university status, the presence of large numbers of women, who had been instrumental in getting the university up and running, became an embarrassment.

According to Nerad, women students at Berkeley sustained losses as the administration proceeded to marginalize them, by moving them from the College of Letters and Science to Home Economics. While Stanford set quotas for women, capping their number at five hundred, the University of California created a ghetto for them. In both cases, there was a fear that the presence of a large number of women students would prevent the institution from being able to compete with the most prestigious institutions, which were more male-oriented. This attitude was shared by other university presidents around the country, such as Henry Tappan, who was worried about the effect that having women students would have on the “perception” of the quality of the University of Michigan, as noted by Douglass (2007, p. 24). Kerr’s 1955 decision as chancellor at Berkeley to

close that campus's Department of Home Economics, studied in detail by Nerad, must be understood in this context.

Kerr was not the only academic leader to have negative views about Home Economics as a discipline. Indeed, some of the scholars he admired expressed similar views in their books. For example, Flexner, who was very critical of all "vocational" schools, makes devastating remarks about departments of "domestic science," which were blooming at major research universities at the time:

The departments of domestic science or household arts at Columbia and Chicago boast staffs that undertake to deal with nutritional problems and to offer advanced degrees (A.M., Ph.D.) indifferently to persons who write theses on underwear or on topics in the field of physiological chemistry. A course on catering is found side by side with research in food and nutrition. It is of course absurd to suppose that either competent teachers or competent students can be found in departments of this kind. (p. 153)

Flexner's comments are repeated by Moberly, who says that professors should not encourage students to study unimportant subjects simply because it has never been done before, noting that

As usual, America leads the way in extravagances. Dr. Flexner pillories a large number of these, including M.Sc. theses on "Trends in Hosiery Advertising," "Buying Women's Garments by Mail," and "A Time and Motion Comparison of Four Methods of Dishwashing." (p. 182)

Kerr's decision to close Berkeley's Department of Home Economics did not happen in a vacuum. It was part of the University of California's relentless quest for prestige, and he writes proudly about it in his memoirs:

Actually, the problem with home economics at Berkeley was that it was a miscellany. We took its best part, nutrition, and made that into a high-quality specialty. The most popular home economics course had been "Marriage" with ten lectures, the first on "courtship" and the last on "venereal disease." The students relabeled the course "From Courtship to Venereal Disease in Ten Easy Lessons." It was popular, in part, because there were no reading assignments and nobody flunked; and the subject matter held substantial student interest. But the course was a source of embarrassment to the department and the campus. (Kerr, 2001b, p. 87)

The elimination of Berkeley's Department of Home Economics was part of a trend affecting major research universities and was the logical conclusion of Kerr's plan to place the University of California among the top institutions of higher learning in the country. The theory behind it was that women could study other subjects and did not have to limit themselves to Home Economics, but as a practical matter, this move reduced female presence at the university. As Nerad notes, the highly accomplished female scientists of the Department of Home Economics had to endure seeing how the strong nutrition program they had developed with very little support from their colleagues was taken away from them and put under male leadership, while the more applied programs of the department were sent to Davis. After this move, the number of women faculty on the Berkeley campus went from 6% in 1950 to 3.5% in 1968.

Nerad's well-researched study shows how the cost of excellence was diversity. The university leadership, in its efforts to create a first-rate university, eliminated everything that it believed would make the University appear less competitive. Women, who had entered the university with innocent optimism, were progressively marginalized and would not regain strength until the affirmative action era.

People of color also suffered setbacks. For example, during World War II, Japanese American students from the University of California, Berkeley, were sent to internment camps, which considerably reduced the number of people of color on campus. Indeed, the best student of the class of 1942 was taken away before he could pick up his diploma and his medal. This is what the May 13, 1942, *Oakland Post-Enquirer* reported:

When the University of California awards the medal to the senior having the highest scholastic average at today's commencement exercises, the recipient will not be present to receive it. He is an American-born Japanese and has been evacuated! A student in the college of chemistry and enrolled in a premedical course this semester, [Akio] Itano, who is 21, maintained a straight "A" average for four years at the university in Berkeley. He is a member of the Phi Kappa scholastic honor society; Sigma Xi, chemistry honor society, the university Y.M.C.A. cabinet and the student health committee. He was evacuated on April 22. As soon as the university authorities determine where he is, Itano will be sent his diploma--and his medal--by mail. (Douglass, 2007, p. 46)

Although the number of Asian American students increased after the war, there were relatively few students of color, particularly African-Americans and Latinos, at the University of California when the affirmative era action began.

Richard Delgado and Jean Stefancic seem to believe that the Master Plan was a deliberate attempt to keep the University that way by creating a caste-based society. While I do not think that Kerr intended this result, I do believe that his dedication to advancing the core value of excellence made him overlook the importance of diversity. In 1960, very few academic leaders were thinking about gender and ethnicity. Kerr, who was sincerely interested in equality of opportunity, was probably more sensitive about the plight of marginalized individuals than most of his contemporaries were, but the great university he aspired to create was a culturally white and male institution engaged in a prestige race, as reflected in its rankings. Very little value was attached to the cultural contributions of women and people of color during that era. In fact, excellence at that point was construed as the opposite of diversity. As Deborah L. Rhode has shown, the pursuit of prestige has had adverse consequences for American universities. Veblen, who saw this coming, spoke about the various actions universities were taking in order to enhance their competitiveness. These included such non-academic measures as beautification of the campuses to make their buildings and grounds look like palaces and gardens and convey a feeling of opulence and gentility. That is why, as Delgado and Stefancic say, the building of the University of California campuses resulted in gentrification of the surrounding areas, as evidenced by the fact that the town of Davis lost most of its people of color when the campus was established. The quest for excellence--identified with prestige--literally drove diversity out. Kerr's hedgehog vision had a blind spot: He could not see the adverse consequences of his push for competitiveness.

As a result, Kerr had a very hard time understanding the student revolts, which can be interpreted as an early reaction to the push for prestige that underpins the Master Plan. To Kerr's great dismay, the students' revolutionary discourse was taken from his description of the "multiversity." In 1964, one year after the publication of *The Uses of the University*, Hal Draper published a widely-read pamphlet entitled *The Mind of Clark Kerr: His View of the University Factory and the New Slavery*, which is a cogent, if inflammatory, critique of the "multiversity." This work, which mentions the plight of Japanese Americans, as well as that of Latinos, uses the rhetoric of liberation associated with the civil rights movement. Indeed, the Free Speech movement's most visible figure, the quintessential hedgehog Mario Savio, made that connection explicitly in his introduction to Draper's book *Berkeley: The New Student Revolt*, when trying to explain why the students revolted at Berkeley before they did so at other universities. Savio said that, just as what oppressed blacks was an exaggerated version of what oppressed the rest of the country, what was wrong with Berkeley was an extreme example of what was wrong at other universities, namely "the factory-like mass miseducation of which Clark Kerr is the leading ideologist" (p. 2). Indeed, in his speech "An End to History," Savio says that Kerr's "multiversity" is "a factory that turns out a certain product needed by industry or government" (Draper p. 181), concluding that

The most exciting things going on in America today are movements to change America. America is becoming evermore the utopia of sterilized, automated contentment. The "futures" and "careers" for which American students now prepare are for the most part intellectual and moral wastelands. This chrome-plated consumers' paradise would have us grow up to be well-behaved children. But an important minority of men and women coming to the front today have shown that they will die rather than be standardized, replaceable, and irrelevant. (Draper, p. 182)

Ironically, Savio and Draper had appropriated Kerr's critique of the "multiversity," including his concern for the welfare of undergraduates, and turned it against him.

While white students rebelled against being standardized by the "multiversity," students of color demanded a place in it. Kerr's hedgehog vision had turned into a nightmare. If Kerr had been a fox, the Berkeley Free Speech movement might never have happened, for he would not have negotiated the Master Plan, nor would he have written his book about the "multiversity," thus depriving the students of a powerful vision to rebel against. In a sense, Ronald Reagan was right: Kerr was instrumental in creating "the mess at Berkeley," not because he failed to control the students, but because he provided the ingredients for their very successful revolutionary narrative, which was based on his vivid description of the "multiversity." The trouble with hedgehogs is that they have visions, and visions, besides having blind spots, have a life of their own.

Foxes to the Rescue

Foxes look in all directions and adjust their behavior according to what they see. They don't have big visions, but they also don't have the problems that come with them. As Kerr says, their goal is to find food and avoid trouble. Kerr's immediate successors were foxes who tried to guide the university through the rough years that followed his presidency. According to Brian Pusser, the University of California started affirmative action programs at that time with considerable prodding from the influential African-American politician Willie Brown. Dean C. Johnson noted that Charles J. Hitch, in his

inaugural address on January 1, 1968, called for greater access for minority groups. By the end of his tenure in 1975, the number of students of color had increased dramatically. Douglass (2007) notes the importance of the pressure exerted by another politician, John Vasconcellos, on Hitch and his successor, David S. Saxon, who concentrated on improving academic preparation in the schools through the UC Partnership Program, so that more minorities could enter the university. As Johnson says, by the end of the 1970s, UC was working with 10,000 students around California, which made its partnership program the largest of its kind in the country.

Both Hitch and Saxon had to deal with difficult political circumstances and bad budgets, so when Gardner was appointed president in 1983, he decided that the best thing he could do for the university was to get a large budget increase to compensate for the financial losses of the last two presidencies, and he did. Gardner was able to obtain a spectacular thirty-two percent budget increase during his first year on the job. He also made friends with the governor and other important players, restoring confidence in the university. During his tenure, endowments grew and research funding increased, which resulted in a building boom. Under Gardner's watch, enrollments expanded and the student body became more diverse.

According to Johnson, in eight years, African-American enrollments increased by 38.8 %, Latinos by 108% and Asians by 65% (p. 16). What is more, three of the seven chancellors Gardner appointed came from non-traditional backgrounds: the first two women and the first Asian-American to lead UC campuses. In addition, Gardner convened an all-University Faculty conference in 1990 to discuss affirmative action issues. Johnson says that, although efforts to diversify other areas of the university came slowly, "Gardner's commitment to encompass the changing face of California within the entire UC Community was unqualified and consistent" (p. 18). Johnson also praises Gardner's leadership in international education, noting that he fostered the expansion of the Education Abroad program to include more countries outside of Europe.

What made Gardner so sensitive to diversity issues? His memoirs provide multiple clues as to reasons. First of all, he spent his army years in East Asia, where he did what he describes as dangerous intelligence work with people of diverse backgrounds. As he says, this experience "upended" many of his "world's realities" (p. 20). Second, as discussed previously, during his interview for the position of President, he was quizzed about the effect of his Mormon faith on his political views. But that was not the end of the matter. After his appointment as President, but before he started work, Gardner was approached by Willie Brown's Education adviser, Celeste Rose, who asked him if he would be willing to meet with the legislature's minority caucus. Gardner says that he welcomed the request, as he was eager to "discuss their concerns about minority interests and gender in UC personnel and admission policies and practices before such issues came up in the context of specific and tangible legislative or budgetary differences" (p. 153). In other words, Gardner's fox instinct told him that this issue could affect his ability to succeed. Brown was a key political figure, and the minority caucus included some fifteen or twenty legislators. In addition, John Vasconcellos made his views clear early on. These were not people Gardner could afford to alienate. Thus, from the very beginning, Gardner was under pressure to do something about diversity in a way that no other president had been before. As he says about this meeting,

I accepted but, reading their unexpressed intent, realized that if I were a Catholic, a Protestant, a Jew, or a Muslim they would never have thought it right to inquire into my religious faith; and it was always the same with the press as well: “Gardner, a Mormon,” but never “Smith, a Catholic,” or “Jones, a Baptist,” or whatever. (Gardner, 2003, p. 153)

Gardner had to prove himself because he was a Mormon. In addition, being a Mormon probably gave him some appreciation for discrimination, as he experienced some in the course of his career. After he became President, he was criticized for his “Mormon greed,” first because he got a good salary and then because he got a good retirement, as he notes bitterly. He also discusses how, in his youth, he was treated with hostility by the Berkeley draft board, which would not promise him a deferment to see him through law school, a development that made him enlist in order to get military service out of the way.

The army, on the other hand, favored him because he was a Mormon, which, he says, struck him “as being quite odd, indeed astonishing and in each instance quite wrong” because he believed “that persons should be judged as individuals on their own merits and for their own lives and not because of any one or any combination of reasons based on their associations, ethnicity or religion” (pp. 17-18). Gardner adds that his interest in the loyalty oath, the subject of his first book, *The California Oath Controversy*, was connected to his commitment to this principle. Gardner, thus, had experience with the double image of the other--either exceedingly good or exceedingly bad, but never normal--that affects women and minorities of all kinds, and this gave him a glimpse of their troubles.

In addition to having reasons to be more sensitive about diversity issues than his predecessors, Gardner had lived through some of the most difficult moments of the student revolts, which, no doubt, made him understand the depth of feeling surrounding gender and ethnicity. As he says in his memoirs, he heard radio accounts of Mario Savio and others holding a police car in Sproul Plaza when he was moving from Berkeley, where he had worked at the alumni association, to Santa Barbara, where he had accepted the position of assistant to the chancellor. He did well in this capacity and was promoted, first, to assistant chancellor and then to vice-chancellor-executive assistant, according to him, because increasing levels of student unrest made his services more important. Thus Gardner’s success was tied to the upheavals that cost Kerr his job. According to Gardner, the student revolt of 1964-1965, was a “dry run” for the “real thing,” which came when “the antiwar protests at UC gathered force and momentum, as newer minority issues appeared” (2003, p. 37).

Gardner (2003) explains that the University of California increased student diversity too suddenly and without sufficient preparation. Minority students found themselves alienated in an overwhelmingly white institution, which had very few people of color among the faculty, staff and administration. This resulted in unrest, including demonstrations and building takeovers. The university administration found itself sandwiched between the students and the governor, Ronald Reagan, who had run on a platform of stopping campus revolts. For Gardner, both the students and the governor were unreasonable. In fact, he saw the coercive character of the new student activism as a mirror image of the coercive nature of government.

Gardner was involved in helping minority students and faculty members at Santa Barbara write proposals for a Department of Chicano Studies and a Department of Black Studies, as well as for interdisciplinary research centers in these fields, an accomplishment of which he was proud, because “they helped demonstrate to the minority community, on and off campus, that there were alternatives to political action” (p. 46). Gardner adds that the campus’s success with minority students and faculty left “a much reduced field of open issues for the white radicals to protest than would otherwise have been the case” (p. 47). The goal of his actions seems to have been to smooth things over in a fox-like manner. As for his feelings, he is more negative about white students than about minorities:

We also made real progress in responding to the concerns of minority students, whose agenda, if not their tactics, at least possessed a strong element of reasonableness, in contrast to the mostly middle- and upper-class white radicals drawn from one faction or another of the Students for a Democratic Society (SDS), whose purposes I saw as principally scapegoating the university for problems they had at home, with the draft, with the Vietnam War, with social or governmental policies, or with other issues that were disturbing or complicating their lives. Whereas the minorities not only had a greater moral base for their demands (aside from the war) but were also more single-minded in seeking their objectives than were the Radical Student Union (a spin-off from the SDS) and other mostly white organizations whose tactics were as random as their issues. (Gardner, 2005, p. 46)

Although he disapproves of everyone’s methods, he finds minority students more reasonable and justified than white students. During these “apprenticeship years” at Santa Barbara Gardner says he learned that “the political center of gravity fits between the opposite ends of the political spectrum and how crucial it was, therefore, that the center hold during times of stress” (pp. 64-65).

With this background, it is not difficult to understand Gardner’s grasp of the political importance of women and minorities and his efforts during his tenure as president to improve their circumstances, not only in the case of undergraduates, but also for graduate students, postdoctoral scholars, faculty members and administrators. In his memoirs, he gives credit to Eugene Cota-Robles for creating many good programs to enhance diversity at the University of California. Another important figure during this period was the chancellor of the Berkeley campus, Ira Michael Heyman, who, according to Douglass (2007), took the lead with respect to admissions. In addition to supporting these efforts, Gardner diversified the leadership team. When Tomás Rivera, the system’s first minority chancellor, suffered a fatal heart attack, Gardner proceeded to add women and minorities to the chancellor’s group by appointing an Asian male--Chang-Lin Tien--as chancellor at Berkeley and two women--Barbara Uehling and Rosemary Schraer--as chancellors at Santa Barbara and Riverside, respectively.

Thus, almost half of the seven chancellors he hired during his tenure as President were women and minorities. I do not think that there is any question that Gardner made a considerable effort to diversify the UC system at all levels. Anti-affirmative action Regent Ward Connerly understood this very well when he declared that “the Regents fell asleep at the wheel during the Gardner era” (Douglass, 2007, p. 162). From Connerly’s perspective, Gardner got away with a lot. Contrary to what Connerly suggests, however, the Regents were informed about Gardner’s efforts, which many of them encouraged.

Gardner states that he discussed diversity issues in his inaugural address and in many of his speeches and worked on them consistently throughout his tenure, explaining that he was aware of the history and the issues, and did the best he could, “which was thought by some to be quite enough, others not enough, and others too much” (2005, p. 258-259).

According to Pusser, the Master Plan, by creating intense competition for admissions to the most prestigious institution of higher learning in the state, contributed to the demise of affirmative action when those who felt displaced by women and minorities revolted. Gardner’s efforts to increase diversity at the university without changing the terms of the Master Plan backfired when these people endorsed proposition 209 shortly after his departure. For them, he had indeed done too much.

Calling All Hedgehogs

Kerr’s Master Plan for Higher Education was a remarkable achievement, but his hedgehog vision had one blind spot: he did not anticipate that this plan would segregate the student population along the color line, which was indeed the problem of the 20th Century, as W.E.B. DuBois (1903a) predicted over one hundred years ago. This, however, did not become clear until the second half of the century, after the approval of the Master Plan. By reducing access to the University of California and redirecting students to California State University and the community colleges, the Master Plan put obstacles in the way of the preparation of minority elites, or, as DuBois (1903b) called them, “the talented tenth.” In one of his last publications, Kerr (2002, p. 7) discussed the existence of “backward movements since the Master Plans of 1960,” such as huge differences among neighborhoods in terms of the availability of high school advanced placement courses and transfer programs in community colleges, stating that this had increased “inequality of opportunity.”

Kerr had acknowledged that there were problems before that. For example, in his 1997 introduction to Alain Touraine’s book *The Academic System in American Society*, he conceded that American institutions of higher learning, including the University of California, reproduced the existing social order and that Touraine was “onto something very important: that a gigantic worldwide struggle is underway over the location of power in society” (p. XIX). Kerr agreed with Touraine that this struggle ran along horizontal lines, such as gender and race, more than along vertical lines, such as class.

In fact, I believe that he sensed from the start that he had missed something, for on December 11, 1963, less than three weeks after John F. Kennedy’s assassination and exactly six months after the President’s famous June 11 address proposing what would become the Civil Rights Act of 1964, Kerr gave a speech noting that the university had provided “equality of opportunity,” but perhaps had not “actively searched for the means to increase opportunity for equality” (Douglass, 2007, p. 76). This comment built on the Kennedy’s statement about students of all races being entitled to equality of opportunity to develop their talent, ability and motivation and to make something of themselves. Had the Master Plan been drafted after these important events, it might have been different, but it was negotiated and approved in 1960, during the presidency of Dwight D. Eisenhower, when diversity concerns had not yet appeared on the radar screen.

Besides, in 1960 when the University of California was growing fast, there appeared to be room for everyone in its classrooms. This, however, changed quickly, as the population continued to grow, and competition for admission to the most selective campuses increased. Gardner, feeling pressure, made room for women and minorities by bending the rules, but he did not attempt to transform them in any significant way. Thus, his efforts, although successful, did not result in a new vision.

At present, UC is dealing with the aftermath of proposition 209, painfully trying to develop a new *modus operandi* by a process of trial and error. Rothblatt has noted that this new *modus operandi* seems to be building on the idea of worth, associated with social democracy, which is different from the idea of merit, associated with liberal democracy. Merit is related to measurable ability. Worth has to do with strength of character. The appearance of the concept of merit is a relatively new phenomenon in the history of universities, which historically have favored the idea of worth. According to Rothblatt, “the conflict between these two democracies is built into the California Master Plan itself” (2006, p. 271). This was a compromise between merit and worth, providing a balance between selectivity and access.

The problem is that this balance did not last. The prestige race in which American universities engaged during the second half of the 20th Century heavily favored the concept of merit, so the concept of worth had to be reintroduced through the back door of special admissions, an issue that went all the way to the Supreme Court twice, first with the *Bakke* decision and then with the *Grutter* and *Gratz* cases. The *modus operandi* UC is trying to develop at present relies on increasing the importance assigned to worth. But UC needs more than a *modus operandi*, it needs a new vision of balance, and this can only come from the top.

So whom do we need at the top, foxes or hedgehogs? My students think that we need both, although they favor the latter for this particular moment in the university’s history. Kerr and Gardner were the right kinds of leaders for the times in which they lived, but each era creates its own challenges. At present, the university, like the country as a whole, seems to be experiencing a considerable degree of fox-fatigue. There is a sense that the leadership of our institutions is intellectually exhausted, and there is a yearning for a fundamental change in thinking. The challenge of our times is to find a vision that will guide these institutions—including the university—in the 21st Century. Vision is primarily the office of hedgehogs.

This is not to say that we do not need foxes. Foxes are always valuable. Any administrative team should have a good number of them, perhaps even a majority. The problem is that we need hedgehogs in key positions and have almost none at all at a time when the university, like the country, is feeling lost. My students believe that we need a new generation of hedgehogs and foxes and that these must be as diverse as the population or, at least, as diverse as they are. I agree with them.

Both Kerr and Gardner were white males. However sensitive or caring they may have been as individuals, they looked at the world from a particular perspective. We need leaders who can bring other perspectives to higher education. Identifying and developing a broad pool of talent should be a top priority at this time for the University of California. As Collins emphasizes, truly successful institutions choose their leaders from within their ranks. Indeed, this was the case with Kerr and Gardner.

Both presidents were given opportunities for leadership very early in their lives, as they explain in their memoirs. Kerr was made Chancellor of the Berkeley campus without ever having served as department chair, dean, provost or, for that matter, chair of an important committee. He had distinguished himself as a member of the academic senate during the loyalty oath controversy and, on the basis of that promise, he was appointed Chancellor.

Gardner's rise was even more spectacular, because he was not even a faculty member when he started out. He was a young staff member on the Berkeley campus, the director of the newly-created alumni foundation, when he was told that, if he ever wanted to become Chancellor, he should get a Ph.D. and a faculty position first, which he did. This led to his appointment as Vice President for Extension of the UC system and later as President of the University of Utah. Senior administrators saw leadership potential in both young men and gave them opportunities to develop it, which was the right thing to do.

The University of California needs to develop more internal talent this way. It should engage in succession planning by identifying "the talented tenth" and giving them a chance to develop and lead. It must look for men and women, gay and straight, white and minority, native and foreign-born, scientists and humanists, in short, for all kinds of people, because it needs them all. The more complex the university becomes, the more diverse its leaders must be. Only a diverse group of foxes will have enough shrewdness to identify and seize important opportunities, and only a diverse group of hedgehogs will know how to connect the pieces into a powerful vision that will raise the "multiversity" to "the height of the times."

And the times are changing. As James J. Duderstadt (p. 196) points out, the country needs "to come to grips with the fact that those groups we refer to today as minorities will become the majority population of our nation in the century ahead." Indeed California is already "a majority- minority state." Giving a diverse student population access to the top tier of universities is one of the biggest challenges facing the state at this time.

At the undergraduate level, the biggest challenge is the admissions process. A recent University of California initiative seeks to abandon mechanical criteria, sorting applicants according to a few potentially biased indicators, and instead to consider candidates individually, evaluating both past accomplishments and leadership potential, as recommended by William G. Bowen and Derek Bok. This new initiative shows a great deal of promise. In addition, UC should consider expanding eligibility to at least the top 15% of high school students. At the graduate level, the biggest challenge is geographical expansion. The need for graduate education is almost as great today as the need for a college education was after World War II. Providing access to graduate education to a larger and more diverse student population in more locations will be crucial in the years to come. The opening of a new campus at Merced, in the heart of the ethnically-diverse San Joaquin Valley, is a step in the right direction. More campuses in other underserved locations will be needed in the future. At the same time, having CSU offer professional doctorates in areas of need makes sense, as these advanced degrees today are what professional Masters were in 1960. A serious conversation about what the Master Plan should mean today for graduate and undergraduate education is much needed. Also much needed is a plan to diversify the faculty and the administration.

Daryl G. Smith says that there are four dimensions of diversity that coincide with phases of its evolution: representation of previously-excluded groups, inclusive climate, inclusive curriculum and institutional transformation. She adds that without sufficient diversity of representation, an institution cannot engage the other three dimensions. Thus, while the student body may be quite diverse, the lack of significant diversity among faculty members and administrators places institutional decision-making at risk, due to a lack of multiple perspectives. This is certainly the case with the University of California, whose faculty members continue to be mostly male and overwhelmingly white. It would take strong leadership on the part of the administration to change this trend. The problem is that the administration itself continues to be heavily white and male, particularly when it comes to the kinds of academic leadership positions that could make a difference in this area.

According to Belle Rose Ragins, there are three structural indicators of unequal power relations among diverse groups in organizations. The first and most obvious is rank: women and minorities hold lower positions than white males do. The second is tracking: when women and minorities are given high-level positions, these tend to be in relatively unimportant areas. The last is positional power, which varies according to the identity of the incumbent. Thus, women and minorities have less authority than white males who occupy the same positions do (pp. 98-99).

A cursory examination of the senior management teams of the various UC campuses and the Office of the President reveals that they lack diversity. In fact, not only do they not reflect the gender and ethnic composition of the population or the student body, but for the most part, they are even not meeting their modest stated affirmative action goals. The affirmative action plans of the UC campuses and the Office of the President show “underutilization” of women and minorities year after year. “Underutilization” exists when the percentage of women and minorities in a job category (“incumbency”) is smaller than the percentage of their presence in the workforce (“availability”). When incumbency is smaller than availability we have underutilization. The UC system’s various executive teams are not as diverse as they could be if they were not underutilizing qualified women and minorities and failing to tap “the talented tenth.”

Second, women and minorities who are members of executive teams tend to have positions in the non-academic areas, while the key academic positions such as provosts, vice chancellors for research, vice provosts, deans and graduate deans are usually occupied by white males. Finally, the few women and minorities who occupy such key academic positions seem to have low positional power, as suggested by their apparent shorter tenure--the revolving door syndrome. This, coupled with their chronically small numbers, is an impediment to them having a real impact on an institution. The University of California has never had a critical mass of women and minorities in key academic leadership positions, which has prevented it from developing a new vision for the changing world it serves.

As Kerr and Gardner say, leadership does matter. Joyce Bennett Justus, Sandria B. Freitag and L. Leann Parker make a distinction between “leaders” and “managers,” in terms of how they approach diversity. “Managers” use external incentives, while “leaders” draw on internal motivation. “Managers” talk about practical reasons, while “leaders” invoke moral reasons (pp. 59-63). Indeed, “managers” or foxes can be successful in the short run, but only “leaders” or hedgehogs can effect lasting change by

developing a vision for an institution. The University of California's "hedgehog concept" needs to be revised to include a new balance between merit and worth, but no revision is possible without a change at the top.

In order to develop and implement a new vision, the University of California would have to build women and minority presence from the top down, beginning with the Regents, President and chancellors and following with the provosts, vice provosts and deans, all the way down to department chairs and faculty members, who are going to educate the new generations of students.

As the first decade of the 21st Century nears its end, it is becoming clear that some of the most important problems facing the world in this new era are going to be related to the color line or, rather, to the multiple color lines separating marginal groups from dominant ones in various countries around the globe. Diversity is a practical, as well as a moral, imperative. Interactions among people from different cultures are increasing abroad and at home, most particularly in California, which must once again address the balance between selectivity and access, as its population fully engages the knowledge-based, global economy. Thus, we must ask ourselves again what the university is for: What are the uses of the university?

Kerr answers this question in the final paragraph of the 1963 version *The Uses of the University*:

It seems appropriate to conclude with Alfred North Whitehead's prophetic words in 1916 on the place of intellect: "In the conditions of modern life, the rule is absolute: the race which does not value trained intelligence is doomed. Not all your heroism, not all your social charm, not all your wit, not all your victories on land or sea, can move back the finger of fate. Today we maintain ourselves. Tomorrow science will have moved forward yet one more step, and there will no appeal from the judgment which will be pronounced on the uneducated."

These are the uses of the University.

Without trained intelligence and trained leadership we are indeed doomed, so one of the most important uses of the university today must be the preparation of diverse elites for a diverse society, that is, the identification, mentoring and promotion of "the talented tenth." As DuBois (1903b) warned, if we do not lift marginalized peoples up, they will pull us down. We must urgently increase "opportunity for equality" in order to raise the "multiversity" to "the height of the times."

The clock is ticking ...

REFERENCES

- Ashby, Eric (1962). The Administrator: Bottleneck or Pump? *Daedalus*, 91 (2), pp. 264-278.
- Bass, Bernard M. (1985). *Leadership and Performance beyond Expectations*. New York: Free Press.
- Bennis, Warren G. & Burt Nanus (1985). *Leaders: The Strategies for Taking Charge*. New York: Harper & Row.
- Berlin, Isaiah (1953). *The Hedgehog and the Fox*. New York: Simon & Schuster.
- Bowen, Howard R. (1982). *The State of the Nation and the Agenda for Higher Education*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Bowen, William G. & Derek Bok (1998). *The Shape of the River: Long-term Consequences of Considering Race in College and University Admissions*. Princeton, New Jersey: Princeton University Press.
- Burns, James McGregor (1978). *Leadership*. New York: Harper & Row.
- Clark, Burton R. (1995). *Places of Inquiry: Research and Advanced Education in Modern Universities*. Berkeley, Los Angeles & London: University of California Press.
- Clifford, Geraldine J. (1995) "Equally in View": *The University of California, Its Women, and the Schools*. Berkeley, California: Center for Studies in Higher Education and Institute of Governmental Studies, University of California, Berkeley. Chapters in the History of the University of California, 4.
- Collins, Jim (2001). *Good to Great: Why Some Companies Make the Leap...and Others Don't*. New York: HarperBusiness.
- Collins, Jim (2005). *Good to Great and the Social Sectors: Why Business Thinking is not the Answer: A Monograph to Accompany Good to Great: Why Some Companies Make the Leap...and Others Don't*. Boulder, Colorado: Jim Collins.
- Collins, Jim & Jerry I. Porras (2004). *Built to Last: Successful Habits of Visionary Companies*. New York: HarperBusiness.
- Delgado, Richard & Jean Stefancic (2000). California's Racial History and Constitutional Rationales for Race-Conscious Decision Making in Higher Education. *University of California Los Angeles Law Review*, 47 (6), pp. 1521-1614.
- Diamond, Nancy (2006). "Time, Place and Character": The American College and University Presidency in the Late Twentieth Century. *Perspectives on the History of Higher Education*, 25, pp. 157-181.
- Dodds, Harold W. (1962). *The Academic President-Educator or Caretaker?* New York: McGraw-Hill.

- Douglass, John Aubrey (2000). *The California Idea and American Higher Education: 1850 to the Master Plan*. Stanford, California: Stanford University Press.
- Douglass, John Aubrey (2007). *The Conditions of Admission: Access, Equity, and the Social Contract of Public Universities*. Stanford, California: Stanford University Press.
- Draper, Hal (1965). *Berkeley: The New Student Revolt*. New York: Grove Press, Inc.
- DuBois, W.E.B. (1903a). *The Souls of Black Folk: Essays and Sketches*. Chicago: A.C. McLurg & Company.
- DuBois, W.E.B. (1903b). *The Negro Problem: A Series of Articles by Representative Negroes of To-day*. New York: J. Pott & Company.
- Duderstadt, James J. (2000). *A University for the 21st Century*. Ann Arbor, Michigan: The University of Michigan Press.
- Dzuback, Mary Ann (1991). *Robert M. Hutchins: Portrait of an Educator*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.
- Ferrier, William W. (1930). *Origin and Development of the University of California*. Berkeley, California: The Sather Gate Book Shop.
- Flexner, Abraham (1994). *Universities: American, English, German*. New Brunswick, U.S.A., & London, U.K.: Transaction Publishers, with a new introduction by Clark Kerr.
- Gardner, David P. (1967). *The California Oath Controversy*. Berkeley & Los Angeles: University of California Press.
- Gardner, David P. (2003). *Earning my Degree: Memoirs of an American University President*. Berkeley, Los Angeles & London: University of California Press.
- Gardner, Howard (1995). *Leading Minds: An Anatomy of Leadership*. New York: Basic Books.
- Gardner, John W. (1990). *On Leadership*. New York: The Free Press.
- Gould, Stephen Jay (2003). *The Hedgehog, the Fox, and the Magister's Pox: Mending the Gap Between Science and the Humanities*. New York: Harmony Books.
- Graham, Hugh D. & Nancy Diamond (1996). *The Rise of American Research Universities: Elites and Challengers in the Postwar Era*. Baltimore, Maryland: Johns Hopkins University Press.
- Harris, Michael R. (1970). *Five Counterrevolutionists in Higher Education: Irving Babbit, Albert Jay Nock, Abraham Flexner, Robert Maynard Hutchins, Alexander Meiklejohn*. Corvallis, Oregon: Oregon State University Press.

- Hutchins, Robert Maynard (1956). *Freedom, Education and the Fund: Essays and Addresses, 1946-1956*. New York: Meridian Books.
- Johnson, Dean C. (1996). *The University of California: History and Achievements*. Berkeley, California: Regents of the University of California.
- Justus, Joyce Bennett, Sandria B. Freitag & L. Leanne Parker, Eds. (1987). *The University of California in the Twenty-First Century: Successful Approaches to Faculty Diversity*. Berkeley: University of California.
- Kerr, Clark (2001a). *The Uses of the University*. Cambridge, Massachusetts, & London, England: Harvard University Press.
- Kerr, Clark (2001b). *The Gold and the Blue: A Personal Memoir of the University of California (1949-1967), Volume 1: Academic Triumphs*. Berkeley, Los Angeles & London: University of California Press.
- Kerr, Clark (2002). Shock Wave II: An Introduction to the Twenty-First Century. *The Future of the City of Intellect: The Changing American University*. Ed. Steven Brint. Stanford, California: Stanford University Press.
- Kerr, Clark (2003). *The Gold and the Blue: A Personal Memoir of the University of California (1949-1967), Volume 2: Political Turmoil*. Berkeley, Los Angeles & London: University of California Press.
- Kirp, David L. (2003). *Shakespeare, Einstein, and the Bottom Line: The Marketing of Higher Education*. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University, Press.
- Lucas, Christopher J. (1994). *American Higher Education: A History*. New York: St. Martin's Griffin.
- May, Henry F. (1993). *Three Faces of Berkeley: Competing Ideologies in the Wheeler Era, 1899-1919*. Berkeley, California: Center for Studies in Higher Education and Institute of Governmental Affairs, Chapters in the History of the University of California, 1.
- Millett, John D. (1962). *The Academic Community: An Essay on Organization*. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Moberly, Sir Walter. (1949). *The Crisis in the University*. London: SCM Press Ltd.
- Morrill, James L. (1960). *The Ongoing State University*. Minneapolis, Minnesota: University of Minnesota Press.
- Nerad, Maresi (1999). *The Academic Kitchen: A Social History of Gender Stratification at the University of California, Berkeley*. Albany, New York: State University of New York Press.
- Newman, John Henry (1996). *The Idea of the University*. Ed. Frank M. Turner, New Haven: Yale University Press.

- Nisbet, Robert (1992). *Teachers and Scholars: A Memoir of Berkeley in Depression and War*. New Brunswick, New Jersey: Transaction Publishers.
- Ortega y Gasset, José (1997). *Mission of the University*. New Brunswick, U.S.A., & London, U.K.: Transaction Publishers, 1997, with a new introduction by Clark Kerr.
- Otten, A. Michael (1970). *University Authority and the Student: The Berkeley Experience*. Berkeley, Los Angeles & London: University of California Press.
- Padilla, Arthur (2005). *Portraits in Leadership: Six Extraordinary University Presidents*. Westport, Connecticut: ACE/Praeger Series on Higher Education.
- Partin, Agnes Edwards (2006). *Student Life at the University of California, Berkeley, During and After World War I: The Letters of Agnes Edwards Partin, 1917-1921*. Ed. Grace E. Moremen. Lewiston, New York: The Edwin Mellen Press.
- Pelfrey, Patricia A. (2004). *A Brief History of the University of California*. Berkeley, California: University of California.
- Pettitt, George A. (1966). *Twenty-eight Years in the Life of a University President*. Berkeley, California: University of California.
- Pusser, Brian (2004). *Burning Down the House: Politics, Governance, and Affirmative Action at the University of California*. Albany, New York: State University of New York Press.
- Ragins, Belle Rose (1995). Diversity, Power, and Mentorship in Organizations: A Cultural, Structural, and Behavioral Perspective. *Diversity in Organizations: New Perspective for a Changing Workplace*. Ed. Martin M. Chemers, Stuart Oskamp & Mark A. Costanzo. Thousand Oaks, London & New Delhi: Sage Publications, pp. 91-132.
- Readings, Bill (1996). *The University in Ruins*. Cambridge, Massachusetts, and London, England: Harvard University Press.
- Rhode, Deborah L. (2006). *In Pursuit of Knowledge: Scholars, Status, and Academic Culture*. Stanford, California: Stanford Law and Politics.
- Rothblatt, Sheldon, Ed. (1992). *The OECD, The Master Plan and the California Dream: A Berkeley Conversation*. Berkeley: Center for Studies in Higher Education.
- Rothblatt, Sheldon (2007). *Education's Abiding Moral Dilemma: Merit and Worth in The Cross-Atlantic Democracies, 1800-2006*. Oxford: Symposium Books, Oxford Studies in Comparative Education, Volume 16, Number 2.
- Rudolph, Frederick (1962). *The American College and University: A History*. New York: Alfred A. Knopf.
- Sample, Steven B. (2002). *The Contrarian's Guide to Leadership*. San Francisco, California: Jossey-Bass.

- Sánchez, George I. (1970). *The Development of Higher Education in Mexico*. Westport, Connecticut: Greenwood Press, 1st reprint.
- Sinclair, Upton (1923). *The Goose-Step: A Study of American Education*. Pasadena, California: Upton Sinclair, 2nd edition.
- Slosson, Edwin E. (1977). *Great American Universities*. New York: Arno Press, 1st reprint.
- Smelser, Neil J. (2005). Coolness in Controversy: The Story of California President Emeritus David Gardner. *California Monthly*, 116 (1), March/April, pp. 28-29.
- Smith, Daryl G. (1995). Organizational Implications of Diversity in Higher Education. *Diversity in Organizations: New Perspective for a Changing Workplace*. Ed. Martin M. Chemers, Stuart Oskamp & Mark A. Costanzo. Thousand Oaks, London & New Delhi: Sage Publications, pp. 220-244.
- Stadtman, Verne A. (1970). *The University of California, 1868-1968*. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company.
- Taylor, Angus E. (1998). *The Academic Senate of the University of California : Its Role in the Shared Governance and Operation of the University of California*. Berkeley, California: Institute of Governmental Studies Press, University of California.
- Tetlock, Philip E. (2005). *Expert Political Judgment: How Good is it? How Can We Know?* Princeton, New Jersey: Princeton University Press.
- Touraine, Alain (1997). *The Academic System in American Society*. New Brunswick, U.S.A., & London, U.K.: Transaction Publishers, with a new introduction by Clark Kerr.
- Trow, Martin (2003). *In Praise of Weakness: Chartering, the University of the United States, and Dartmouth College*. University of California, Berkeley: Center for Studies in Higher Education Research and Occasional Paper Series, 2.03.
- Veblen, Thorstein (1918). *The Higher Learning in America*. New York: B. W. Huebsch.
- Véliz, Claudio (1994). *The New World of the Gothic Fox: Culture and Economy in English and Spanish America*. Berkeley, Los Angeles & London: The University of California Press.
- Wolff, Robert Paul (1997). *The Ideal of the University*. New Brunswick, U.S.A., & London, U.K.: Transaction Publishers, 2nd printing.
- Wriston, Henry M. (1959). *Academic Procession: Reflections of a College President*. New York: Columbia University Press.