

UC Office of the President

Working with University Constituencies, Within and Without

Title

Address to the Assembly of the Librarians Association of the University of California, Alumni House, Berkeley, California

Permalink

<https://escholarship.org/uc/item/4w29f6db>

Author

Gardner, David P.

Publication Date

1984-12-01

Copyright Information

This work is made available under the terms of a Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial-NoDerivatives License, available at <https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/4.0/>

David Pierpont Gardner's Address
to the Fall Assembly of the
Librarians Association of the University of California,
December 14, 1984, Alumni House, UC Berkeley

[Introducing President Gardner to the Assembly, LAUC President Beverlee French noted that this was the first time a President of the University of California had addressed the Association. She added that those acquainted with the background and accomplishments of the University's fifteenth president have been encouraged to believe that the University is destined for an unprecedented era of greatness under President Gardner's stewardship.]

Well, I certainly couldn't ask for a warmer introduction than that. Thank you very much. I also appreciate your keeping it brief. Thank you. I'm sorry to be late, but I'm less late than I usually am. I very much welcome the invitation to visit with you today. I hope that the brief time I spend with you this afternoon will prove to be helpful and will contribute to your meeting rather than detract from it. I would like to make some general observations and then invite your questions. It's very hard for me to know what people are thinking, and it's important for me to know that. I don't learn about that if I'm always talking, so I'll take a few moments and then devote the rest of the time to conversation, if I may.

This past year I set out to accomplish three goals. I'm still working on them. I would like you to know what these are so that you can put into context my other remarks as well as the responses that I'll be offering to your questions.

The first objective I had was to reacquaint myself with the University of California. Few people acquaint themselves with the University of California. People acquaint themselves with their campus, or with certain schools or colleges within the campus, or even with certain departments within certain schools or colleges within the campus. Or with the libraries of the campus.

Or with the museums of the campus. Or with the athletic program, or whatever. My task was to acquaint myself with the entire institution. I think it's useful to gain a sense of the scope and scale of the enterprise. People tend not to think about it. Allow me just a moment to share it with you.

We have nine campuses. You'd be surprised how many people in the state don't know that, which tells me a good deal about my second task. We have nine campuses on which we enroll about 143,000 students. We have five teaching hospitals. And we have many more problems with them--I'll be the next patient. [Laughter] We have eight general campuses, of course, and one health science campus, San Francisco. We have our agricultural extension programs, cooperative extension programs, and our agricultural field stations to the north, to the south, to the east and the west--it blankets the state. We have several ships at sea, at any given time, working out of the Scripps Institution of Oceanography. We have agreements with 45 foreign universities in 26 countries for exchanges with the University of California generally, not to speak of campus affiliations abroad that are worked out unilaterally. We administer three major national laboratories for the Department of Energy, which is the source of not insignificant discussion. Los Alamos, Livermore, and Berkeley. We spend five-and-a-half billion dollars a year and we employ 105,000 people. We obtain resources from the State of California, the Federal government, corporations, foundations, private gifts, services, self-supporting auxiliaries and students. It is the world's largest university in the sense that all of our campuses are universities, unlike Wisconsin, New York, and so forth, where they have a mix of two-year and four-year institutions. It's unquestionably the finest public university in this country, probably in the world. Enormously complex, spread over a thousand miles, and full of very independent people who know exactly what they want. [Laughter]

So I needed to reacquaint myself with the University of California. I undertook to do that by visiting each campus for about two days, in the course of which I met with students, faculty and staff and those who have academic ranks, both Senate and non-Senate alike, administrators, alumni, donors, and the press, power brokers, and politicians. I'm in the process this year of visiting the Laboratories in New Mexico and in this state; and I'm visiting those parts of the state where we have no campuses and our agricultural programs across California. It will take me two years to acquaint myself with the University of California once again, and even that will be a fairly cursory effort.

A second objective was to do what I could to reacquaint the people of the state with the University of California. That's not to say that effort hasn't been undertaken--it has been. It's just that it hasn't been undertaken with the degree of intensiveness, thoroughness and systematic attention that I think is needed. We are, after all, a public university, we are a creature of the people of this state. We will prosper only so long as they know what we do and believe that what we do is worth their support. It's imperative that we never forget that. Thus, I've made a determined effort to accept rather than turn away invitations to speak, and to visit with the editors and publishers of the major newspapers in the state, view where the University of California has been, its present condition, and its future prospects, and to do everything I can to engender a sense of warmth and support across the state for what the University of California stands for and what it can contribute to the well-being and educational opportunity of our young people.

Third, I tried to do what I could to get the money that we need to run this place, convinced that if I could not succeed in finance, nothing else that I did would make much difference. I made a very careful analysis of the

University's fiscal condition, what had occurred the last 15-20 years, and the picture that emerged from that analysis was distressing in the extreme. Indeed, I did that before I accepted the position at UC, wondering whether or not I wanted to consider this position, were it to be offered. I debated long and hard. We were going down by any measure you want to use: student-faculty ratios, support budgets, salaries--faculty, staff, academic alike--were down. The State of California had not funded more than, eight buildings I believe it was since 1977, in a nine-campus system. We had more money at the University of Utah for capital outlay than this institution had in the same period of time, and I only had one campus. The University of Utah was recruiting faculty from the University of California. That would not have happened 15 years ago. I thought if we could not check the erosion at UC and reverse it, and do so promptly, my reacquainting myself with the University of California wouldn't make very much difference. I worked very hard at that. My approach was very straightforward. I undertook to share with the Governor and with the Legislative leadership what had happened to the University of California, where we were today, what it meant if those trends persisted unabated, how much time we had to reverse it, and the scale of resources needed to accomplish the task. They concurred with the assessment, agreed with the solution, and supported us. Now that must continue. Our efforts to negotiate the 1985/86 budget are within the context of a three-to-four-year plan, 84/85 being the first year of that series of years, for the purpose of rebuilding the fiscal health of the University of California.

Some random observations: I found that the environment within which issues and decisions were made here and the environment within which they were being made in Utah were very different indeed. By which I mean, the University of Utah had momentum, it was moving up, it was supported. The question then was, how do we pick the most promising from the inventory of opportunities

available to us? One went into meetings with that attitude. In coming here, I found that there was a different mindset: it was not a question of picking the best from among one's opportunities, it was instead how did one minimize the losses? Such an attitude, held for any significant period of time, tends to color the way in which people perceive their opportunities. I've been working very hard to shake people loose from a mindset that I regard as stifling, unproductive and unhelpful.

I was at the Riverside campus, for example, in the course of my visits, meeting with a group of students. One of them said, "There's been a cloud over this campus for years. Every time the University of California's in trouble fiscally, the prospect of closing either this campus and/or Santa Cruz is put on the table. We've been laboring under this cloud for years. How do you propose to dissipate it?" I said, "Well, you see that cloud over the campus?" "Yes." "It's gone," I said, "it's gone." The student said, "What do you mean, 'It's gone'?" I said, "Just that. It's gone. Don't look for it anymore. It isn't there." [Laughter] Now I mention that because if we think the cloud is over us, we will be rained on. There's a certain self-fulfilling character to the pessimism and survival mentality that, in my opinion, was afflicting too many decisions and attitudes within the University. So I've tried very hard to begin to shake us loose from that.

Another example of that. (I can't be quite so specific.) I received a proposal from a chancellor recently for a new academic program. I met with him and said, "Why did you send me this proposal? It's a very modest proposal, a very conventional proposal, a very unimaginative proposal." It was a predictable proposal. He answered by saying, "Well, you know, we need this and we need that." I said, "Why did you send me this one?" "Well, that's all I thought we could get," he answered. I said, "Please don't send

me any more proposals like that. You tell me what you think you need and why. And then we'll see if we can get it." I want to share that with you because you're involved in some of the most innovative and complex and fundamentally interesting part of the University's entire work. And you know that better than I do. The opportunities, of course, for change in your profession create enormous problems. You have to affect people's attitudes just as I do. You're obliged to shake loose from comfortable conventions, things with which you're familiar, ways of doing things that are comfortable, and come to grips with forces for change that will inevitably affect your lives. It does seem to me that you should approach it as I'm trying to for the University as a whole, for your respective areas of responsibility: with a sense of anticipation and excitement about what's possible as against trepidation with respect to the risks associated with these initiatives.

I know that's easier said than done, and it's easier said than done for me too. In that sense, we're all confronting the same kind of problem. You're in one arena, I'm in another arena. I have to take account of your arena at least as much as you have to take account of mine. Thus, one of my jobs is to inform myself as best I can about what's happening in our libraries. I'm trying to do that. I would say I'm about 50 percent informed. And that's the easy 50 percent. It will take me some time to become as well informed as I need to be to assess the significance of proposals, ideas, differences, and resource needs that will emerge from your work.

A final point I want to make is that in spite of the problems this institution has had for nearly 20 years, because of unfriendly attitudes on the part of people whose attitudes count, the basic strength of the University of California somehow managed to slip through. It's still there. The trends were all wrong; the loss, if it had persisted, would have really accelerated.

So we should be, I think, very proud to be associated with this institution, for all of its flaws and inadequacies, and contribute as we can, sensing that we're part of an extraordinary enterprise.

One can take this campus, for example, and compare it with leading universities of this country. One can take another campus of the University, and compare it with the leading universities in this country. One can do that with all of our campuses. But if one takes all nine campuses as a single university, the world's never seen anything like it. Nothing can compare with it. When the Governor's budget for 1984/85 was made public in early January of this year, and the salary increases for those holding academic positions within the University of California were reported, I had a call from the president of a leading university in the midwest. He said, "Could it be true that the newspaper reports about salary adjustments for your academic staff are as they have been reported?" I said, "Well, I don't know. What have you read?" And he told me and it was correct. I said, "That's right." He said, "Well, I guess you'll be raiding us again." I said, "Damn right, we're going to be raiding you again." [Laughter]

I was at a meeting of OECD in Paris a couple of months ago keynoting a conference, and the regained momentum of the University of California was known by everybody there. These were directors, vice chancellors, some presidents of the leading universities of western, northern, and southern Europe, even some Eastern bloc countries, and several ministers of education and science from European countries were all there--and they all knew what was happening in California. That's not to say, and I'll close with this, that we've got it right everywhere. We have our share of problems. You have your share of problems. I hear about them. I hear about them from faculty, I hear about them from librarians, I hear about them from students, I hear about them

from administrators. Well, the fact that we have problems of a kind in the libraries that are associated with positive change as against deterioration ...I'm very happy to have those problems. I don't want to have the same problems all the time, however. [Laughter] And I hope that we can move forward to cope with the pressures that are upon you with the greatest measure of harmony we can secure, a minimum amount of friction, and with sustained momentum. I need to do my homework to make sure that I have a grasp of this endeavor and the problems you confront as well as an understanding of the problems those who use the libraries feel that they also confront, so that I'll have the capacity to be helpful as the opportunity arises.

I should like to stop now and invite your questions. Please do not feel at all reluctant to ask questions; I've been in business for 25 years. I can't think of any question that would embarrass me at this point. Please.

Question: As the President of so large an institution, the breadth of which you've noted, you hear many voices representing many interests, presumably more voices than you can really devote your attention to. How do you go about sorting out the relative importance of those voices, and listen to what those voices are trying to communicate?

Gardner: Well, that's a very good question. I'm a generalist. I'm not a scientist, I'm not a librarian, I'm not a musician, I'm not a chemist, I'm not a sociologist, I'm not a pharmacist, I'm not a nurse, I'm not a lawyer, I'm not a vet—but I'm supposed to know something about all of these disciplines. That's really quite an unreasonable expectation. So it depends entirely upon the quality of people with whom you're working. I don't care what the structure is. It's the quality of the people. You can have the world's worst organization, and if you have the right people, it'll work. You may have the

most optimal structure and with the wrong people, it'll collapse. So I put my faith in people. Who do I have? Well, I made a number of changes when I came, but I did not bring in a broom and sweep it out ... entirely. [Laughter] I rearranged some of the dust and put together an organization that, at least for me, made sense, and was able to pick within the University people whose judgment I thought was responsive to the functional arrangement that I put into place. My Academic Vice President Bill Frazer, for example, is from the San Diego campus. He's a theoretical physicist and a very good one. He was provost of one of the colleges there. I depend on him to work not only with you but with the standing committees of the Senate university-wide, and with all issues that arise out of University sponsorship of our academic programs. That includes every facet of it. So he has that. Now he has a stable of people to help him. But I rely on him. He's Senior Vice President for Academic Affairs. I have a Senior Vice President for Administration, Ron Brady. He had a comparable position at the University of Illinois for many years--a very seasoned person. ~~He's an economist by training.~~ He has all the administrative side of it -- personnel, accounting, auditing, contracts, business services, all of that. I depend on him. I have a Vice President for Budget and University Relations, who advises me on the budget, and after he's convinced me what to submit, I count on him to get it through ... there's a certain degree of incentive there ... the synergism's right. He handles all of our internal budgeting, is responsible for our governmental relations both in Sacramento and Washington, and is responsible for coordinating all of our PR and making sure the PR supports our political efforts. So he quarterback's all of that for me. I have a Vice President for Health Affairs, Dr. Hopper, former Vice President of Tuskegee Institute. He advises me on the health sciences and the problems of our hospitals. Finally, I have a Vice President for Agriculture and Natural Resources, Jim Kendrick, who has responsibility for that empire--he advises me on that. I have a

cabinet meeting once a week with them, my special assistant for University Relations, my executive assistant, and my executive secretary. It's a fixed agenda. If they're all in agreement on a very complicated issue, I'll take the opposite position and argue it, because they couldn't possibly all be in agreement. I could argue either side of it. Those are very free exchanging occasions. I meet with them on a regular basis alone as well, once a week. I count on them to be informed, to advise me forthrightly. If they think a course of action I'm considering is in error, they should say, "That's the craziest thing I've ever heard." I need to hear that. I expect them to be correct in their facts and judicious in their advice. I also expect them to be absolutely honest. I'm a trusting person until I'm crossed, and if I'm ever crossed, that's it. Until then I rely on them. And in the course of working with these colleagues over the years, I develop an understanding of their style, they develop one of mine, and we begin to work as a team. Similarly with the Chancellors -- nine of them who report directly to me. They have to have respect for the Vice Presidents so the Vice Presidents can work with them directly, because I can't possibly work with all of them on a daily basis. I meet with the Chancellors once a month. Similarly with the Lab Directors who report directly to me. I meet with them quarterly, but all the staffing associated with the Labs is done by my Academic Vice President. So we have structures, mechanisms, procedures, staffing arrangements, support services, competent people who advise me on these matters. I turn to Bill Frazer on a question regarding libraries, for example, and seek his advice. When he offers the advice I'll say, "Who agrees with you and who disagrees with you? What people have you not consulted? Are there any surprises here? What problems are there associated with this proposal that you haven't called to my attention? Have you considered such and such rather than what you're proposing? We'll have that kind of a conversation. It doesn't take long to know whether or not you're receiving advice of a kind that you can rely on.

And then if I'm still uneasy, I'll seek additional staff work from him. There was a proposal, for example, that there be a law school at San Diego. I constituted a committee to advise me on it. The committee submitted its report to me. The Academic Vice President and I discussed it. I must have had 20 questions which had not been answered. I asked them, and we sent it back. We kept doing that until I was satisfied. So that's how we try to do it. I really have to depend on other people and, therefore, have to be careful in terms of choosing those people who will be advising me. Second, and finally, I have to get out and around enough to have a sense of the enterprise unfiltered, which is why I visited the campuses, sat down with the students and others, without the Chancellor there, and had a conversation. I need to get out and around, getting feedback as well as sharing my ideas--that helps too. It's a very fast--although it's been a long answer--a very fast treatment of a very complex problem. I hope it's helpful.

Question: ~~Along the lines of regaining momentum, can you tell us about some things that have happened that make you glad you took your job?~~

Gardner: The question is, what's happening that should cause me to be pleased I took this opportunity. Well, I was born and raised in Berkeley. I worked in this building for four years with the Alumni Association. I worked on the Santa Barbara campus as a Vice Chancellor and member of the faculty for nearly seven years. I went back as one of the Vice Presidents under Charlie Hitch in the early '70s, and then went to Utah for ten years. We were happy there: it was all up, all up. When you live someplace for ten years, you put a lot of roots down, you've made many friends. I liked the university, I liked having my own campus ... and I've had a number of opportunities at other places which I've not pursued. It was not an easy decision to come. I think this is the only other presidency I would have taken, because of the regard I

have for the University of California. I saw the opportunity--which didn't mean that I could meet it--but I saw the opportunity for reinvigorating an institution that had been badly battered for a very long period of time, and in the battering, by implication, had brought about adverse effects for all of American higher education. It was not just the University of California. The University of California affects higher education in this country. And I thought ... well, I think I know what they need. It tends to fit my strengths rather than my weaknesses. I've been at my job at Utah for ten years. I was 50. I'll try it. What pleases me is that the fundamental strength that I had presumed was still present, was; and that the political climate in the state proved to be positive rather than negative, contrary to the information I had received, by the way. Third, the trend has been more up than down. Fourth, we're getting reacquainted ... we had many of friends here anyway. And fifth, if we succeed here, I will feel as though I've made a contribution that was worth the trouble. In spite of the salary that was reported for me, I made an absolute lateral transfer. ~~In fact with the price of housing, I'm~~ worse off here than I was in Utah. [Laughter] And so it was not for the money. It was for an opportunity to contribute to an institution for which I have enormous respect and the hope that I can do something. I hope that I can. The moment that I feel that I'm not, I should move out.

Question: I would like to call your attention to a problem that I consider needs a higher level decision. And just to give you a short background -- in 1977 the University decided that the whole University as one library system will have one online catalog that is MELVYL. It's functioning, it's really come a long way. However, MELVYL has to be updated and maintained. And for that reason we need some new kind of technical processing systems. And here is where the problem comes. The three bigger campuses -- Berkeley, Los Angeles, and San Diego -- did manage to have their own technical processing

system, Bliss and Orion. And when we are talking in committees about developing the system that we have already -- the online catalog -- the smaller campuses are told that you should get your own technical processing system. Unfortunately, the University does not provide in the budget any of the regional funds. My campus [San Francisco] has \$300 for the year for automation purposes. So we're really looking forward to a central development because I feel if all six campuses have to have developed their own system, the software and the duplication of work, really doesn't pay off. So I'm calling that problem to your attention, and I hope that sometime there will be a decision made whether the University wants the small campuses to work on developing their own system or whether we can tie into a technical processing system for all nine campuses.

Gardner: You know more about this than I do. Procedurally this is how I would deal with that. You point out that three campuses, in whatever fashion has been possible, ~~have undertaken to develop their own capability in this~~ area, and six have not. Now that reflects the absence of a central decision to put these systems into place uniformly across the University, and instead suggests that there's a degree of latitude on each campus such as to permit this uneven development. When I receive a budget request from Campus X and Campus Y and Campus Z, the Chancellors set forth their needs and their priorities. As one examines priorities, for example, between one campus and another, they are not the same. It's not to say there isn't some overlap; of course, there is. But there is considerable dissimilarity. So the amount of attention that any given Chancellor feels should be given to one program as against another will vary from campus to campus. When we receive these requests, we extract those costs of new programs or programs that should have uniform treatment across the University, and incorporate them as separately identifiable requests in the budget. Those that are not separately

identifiable are simply part of the overall base, amorphous, unspecified, just a dollar figure. And as we go forward with the Governor and the Legislature in considering that, they rarely look at the base -- they look at the improvements, new initiatives, new programs, and so forth. For example, I have a million dollars in the 85/86 budget for telecommunications in connection with our microwave links. I think we will get that. But it was identified as such. When we receive appropriations from the State, I allocate them to the campuses, essentially as a block of money. I'll indicate what the salaries are, how much money needs to be set aside for benefits, which new programs were funded, and things like that. But beyond that, no instructions. It's up to the Chancellor to allocate the funds consistent with his best judgment. So the first thing, it seems to me, is for you to persuade the Chancellor that the need for automation on your campus is crucial: "Look what's happening on the other campuses and what it means for us not to be developing it." You need to make that case. If you can't make the case to the Chancellor, it's very hard for the President to impose it on him. ~~Now there are some issues~~ that shouldn't be left to the Chancellor's discretion. They should be made by the President. We do that with salaries, for example, and some other things. I'm not sure into which of these categories this issue falls. In some sense, you're in a very good position to help us and advise us on this. If it is an issue for which resolution should be sought within the University generally, a case for that should be made. Maybe you have made it. Maybe I haven't heard it. But if it's not that, then you really have to work through the individual Chancellor on it as I've suggested.

Assembly Delegate: I think perhaps the issue falls into a situation where there is an AVP for library planning up here, but that person is not the boss of the University Librarians on the nine campuses. The University Librarians report to the Chancellor, and I think in some ways that may be the root cause

of some of the issues that [the previous Questioner] is addressing here. It creates an autonomy of sorts and may work against a cooperative spirit within the whole University system for library development.

Gardner: I understand. But that would also be true in a number of other areas. For example, we have staff working with the Vice Presidents in virtually every aspect of our work. I have a Vice President for Health Sciences and there are health sciences on several of our campuses. He works directly with the people most affected -- the directors of the hospitals. But the directors report not to me, but to the Chancellors. He works with the Directors on University-wide issues and policies. The directors share this with the Chancellors. The Vice President shares it with me. I will then pick it up with the Chancellors as I do monthly, on the regular agenda. I pick items up like this all the time ... ask them about them. That's how it works. Nothing really mysterious about it. I hope that's helpful.

Question: You mentioned earlier that you had filled in perhaps about 50 percent of what you'd like to know about the university libraries. Could you give us some idea of that other 50 percent? Have you identified things you would like to know more about where we could be of help?

Gardner: Yes, thank you. I know something about the conventional library. I know about MELVYL, I know less about campus automation, as was doubtless evident from my response. And I know about microfiche, microfilm, videotapes, online -- I know that well enough to converse with some reasonable degree of comfort. What I do not know is what the library will look like 15 years from now in light of these forces and trends with which you're contending. Now, I need to know that because when I go up, for example, and argue for our 85/86 budget for capital outlay, there are two multi-million dollar items on there.

One is to build a new library at San Francisco and major improvements to the Shields Library at Davis. The space that's being requested for those two libraries is essentially conventional space. In the same budget, I'm asking, as I've already noted, a million dollars for telecommunications. The question is asked of me, "Which do you want, conventional library space or unconventional library space? You're asking for both. Why can't you make your mind up? If the library in the year 2000 won't look like the conventional library, don't ask for it. If you can tell me what the library is going to look like in the year 2000, ask for that and we'll give it to you." I've got to be able to build the bridge between where we are and where we're going with a degree of understanding that permits me to be persuasive. As it is, the argument I make is, "You tell me where you're going to be in the year 2000, and I'll tell you where I'll be in the year 2000." Life's just not that neat. We're in a business, with respect to libraries, that's changing dramatically. Some of the change is within our capacity to control and influence and some of it is not. There are enormous complications in assimilating whatever technology may be perceived to be available in ways that permit us to make orderly and harmonious progress. And so I say to them, "I'm asking for both at this point because I don't know what else to do. What would you do?" I try to argue as best I can along those lines. It's working and probably will for a short period of time. But that answer will be less and less acceptable with each passing year.

So I need to have a more complete sense of the directions, the possibilities, and the realities, so that we can fit our capital outlay and our operating budget requests to realities of the kind that we think are attainable within specified time periods. Now who can give us those answers? You're the professionals. I needed advice on the changes in medical practice. I've been talking with mostly the M.D.'s. I'll also be talking with the nurses and the

clinical pharmacists, and so forth. But you are the ones who know this business better than anyone else. And in a collective sense you know what the University of California's present resources are, the problems and potentials that we have, and how in your opinion we should move from A to B. That's the advice we need. We'll have hard questions to ask of you, intended to be helpful and not hurtful, because we have a common objective here, not different objectives. In that sense I'm very glad that we have an organization of the kind that can advise us across the University, as against our having to work individually with each campus. Now what you want and what I can get for you, of course, are two different things. But at least we know what we want and we will try. And if we know what we want, the chances of getting it will be substantially enhanced, as against stumbling around as we tend to do at this point.

Question: You mentioned the context of a five-year plan in contrast to the difficulty of getting to the vision, and I think the libraries are very much struggling with that ... there's a vision, although meanwhile the enrollment increases and the bodies are there, and so forth. Were you referring to an internal University of California plan, or is there some sense in the State Legislature and in the Governor's Office that there's some kind of context of a five-year plan?

Gardner: No. The understanding we have with the Governor is that he will over a period of three to four years, including 84/85, undertake to rebuild the fiscal health of the University of California -- that's the plan to which I have reference. In terms of library plans, I don't know whether three years or five years or seven years, or ten years is right. I don't have much confidence about anything more than five years out anyway, which isn't to say we shouldn't think about something beyond five years as I have already noted.

It's just that I don't have a lot of confidence in it. You will recall that in 1970, NASA laid off thousands of engineers -- a glut of engineers on the market, unemployed engineers everywhere. So the students who came to us in the fall of 1971 were counseled to major in anything other than engineering. Those who ignored our advice had the best jobs upon graduation in June of 1975. [Laughter] I was at a conference in Moscow several years ago, and the rector of one of their leading universities, best unnamed, gave one of the major addresses. His address dealt with the remarkable capacity of the Russian universities to prepare people, almost in a precise fit, for the jobs available. I happened to sit next to him at lunch; the subject was manpower. I said, "I was really taken by your remarks and find the degree of success that you've experienced in fitting the preparation and training of young people to your job requirements as a most uncommon accomplishment." He leaned over and he said, "It doesn't work worth a damn." He said, "I was given the speech, and I read it." [Laughter] Well, we don't have quite that kind of society, so we have a variety of views to express. While I don't have unlimited faith in our capacity to plan for too long a period of time, it's not to say we shouldn't be thinking about it. I think we should be thinking about it.

I've strained your attention span beyond reasonable limits this morning, and if I haven't, I should have. I want to thank you for your service to the University of California. You're involved in a very interesting part of the work, and the decisions you make have significant educational and resource implications for the University of California. I wish you well in your efforts. I was not aware that I was the first President to visit with you, but having been advised of that, I'm very glad that I have been; and I thank you warmly for the invitation. [Applause]