

1. A Short History of the University

The sifting of human creations!—nothing less than this is what we ought to mean by the humanities Studying in this way, we learn what types of activity have stood the test of time; we acquire standards of the excellent and durable. All our arts and sciences and institutions are but so many quests of perfection . . . and when we see how diverse the types of excellence may be, how various the tests, how flexible the adaptations, we gain a richer sense of what the terms "better" and "worse" may signify in general.

William James

Higher education is suffering from a loss of overall direction, a nagging feeling that it is no longer at the vital center of the nation's work.

(Ernest Boyer, 1996)

In this opening chapter we will examine how academic beliefs and themes in universities have changed over the centuries. This review will help us understand how institutions of higher learning are deeply involved in the overarching interests and values of their epoch, but also how they have evolved on their own accord with their own values, as more than just a mirror of their place and time. Universities mirror the interests and values of their various epochs and countries but also resolve them in their own contexts.

We will see how each university has developed a culture with its own themes, principles, and beliefs. We argue that institutions of higher learning have evolved as an independent civil order in society with organizational affiliations outside themselves, but with their own way of life. This differentiation of higher learning as a civil order of society leads to our stories and our conclusion. Our proposal is that universities – administrators and faculties – are in a position to study their culture on their own terms and resolve the problems that critics pose to them.

In the Beginning

The English philosopher Hastings Rashdall (1858-1924) searched for the origins of the university in Europe and decided that it had started in the twelfth century. He found “the academy” emerging with a culture born between great principles that he called *Sacerdotal* and *Imperial*. The institutions of religion and the state were majestic powers "whose co-operation sustained the life of and health of people." All priestly or *sacerdotal* power had its source in

Rome, the papal city of the Seven Hills, while all secular or *imperial* power was vested in the Holy Roman Empire. But from the twelfth to the fourteen centuries, Rashdall says, a third power, *Studium*, began to evolve. This new power of general studies came to represent the "fountain-head of knowledge," a culture by itself, linked with other institutions but also going beyond them.ⁱ

The word "university" has etymological origins that anticipate what is mysterious and therefore interesting about these institutions of learning, which we will discuss further in our conclusion. In the tenth century, the word *universitas* referred to an aggregate of persons as a whole. When a letter was addressed to a group of people as *Universitas vestra*, it referred, in the second person plural, to "the whole of you." Since then, the university has been developing into an institution that would speak to people as a whole, an institution representing society, not a single government, or religion, or commercial activity.

By the end of the twelfth and beginning of the thirteenth centuries, the term *Universitas* began to refer to corporations or formal groups of masters and students, and to newly formed guilds and municipalities. The phrase "university of scholars" or "university of study" came to distinguish these new corporations as part of a higher education. Rashdall sees the "first universities" as spontaneous products of "that instinct of association" which swept like a great wave over the towns of Europe in the eleventh and twelfth centuries. In two places especially -- Bologna and Paris -- the scholastic guilds gained an importance which they possessed nowhere else.

Nearly all of the secondary studies (*studia generalia*), which arose spontaneously without papal or imperial charter, were established by a secession of masters or students from Paris or Bologna. The secessionists carried with them the customs of their alma mater. Slowly the word "university" was restricted to that kind of corporation that represented a general education, not just the specializations of the crafts and guilds. The pursuit of knowledge started as a training program for a community of masters and students but grew into a larger quest for learning. It had the support of the *imperium* and *sacerdotum*, as Rashdall puts it, but it also became an

autonomous way of life. Slowly, as we shall see, the core beliefs, values, and goals of higher learning developed as a modern order of society.

The Reformation: Catholicism, Protestantism, and Humanism

Ancient Greece and Rome knew of "higher learning" but in neither culture was it specifically organized or institutionalized. There was no body of licensed Masters, no formal examinations, and no degrees blazoning to the world that their possessors had achieved a modicum of learning and were now competent to teach others thirsting after knowledge. As the university grew from the medieval period, learning came to include both letters and sciences in the customary divisions of the *trivium* (grammar, logic, and rhetoric) and the *quadrivium* (music, geometry, arithmetic, and astronomy).

European universities were corporations composed of students and masters in different cities. In Bologna, for example, there was a federation of student corporations and in Paris a corporation of masters. A high church official supervised many early universities, but that official was in time to be succeeded by the election of an independent rector. Bologna soon founded a university specializing in law where the chancellorship was an honorific post. Universities gradually became independent of the local church, and when facing conflict with local bishops and townspeople, would seek the protection of the papacy. The Roman Catholic Church generally considered itself responsible for the advancement of education.ⁱⁱ

From the fourteenth to the eighteenth centuries, universities became part of the estate system. Faculty developed as a mix of theologians, lawyers, physicians, and independent thinkers. Then, again slowly, changes took place from its grounding in one overall religious belief to competing beliefs and doctrines. Those beliefs competing with Catholic orthodoxy came to be known as Humanism and Protestantism.

Desiderius Erasmus (ca.1466-1536) started the "break" from the Catholic Church. He was a priest loyal to the faith, working inside the Church yet with a vision of reformation, discontent with clerical behavior and the "cupidity of princes," as he said. He never attacked religious authority outright or sought to turn ecclesiastical into universal issues, but he wanted a simpler devotion and a purer pastorate that would challenge Church authorities. In the

university, he saw a learned, rational development of humanist ideals and aligned himself with this. His teaching was a sign of a great change about to take place in the thematic life of the university.ⁱⁱⁱ

Like Erasmus, Martin Luther was speaking as a priest of the Church as well as an academician when he issued his Ninety-five Theses in 1517 challenging colleagues to an academic debate over the selling of indulgences. For years, he had been giving lectures at the University of Wittenburg, dealing with academic matters. Catholic thought ruled but doctrines had also become a subject for debate. With Luther's protest the Reformation began in earnest and slowly the university opened to new beliefs and ideas.^{iv} Thus debates developed quietly at first with Erasmus and then noisily with Luther as doctrines being taught in the university were more and more under scrutiny and question.

From 1400 to 1650, humanists began to shape literary thought and called for a return to classical (non-Christian) writings. An increasing number of intellectual and educational leaders began to refer to variations on the word "humanist," which seemed representative of the age. The proponents of humanism asserted a greater independence. There was an expansion in trade, growth of prosperity, and widening social contacts all of which generated interest in worldly life, while still sustaining allegiance to Christian doctrine.

Walter Rüegg, emeritus professor at the University of Berne, describes the origins of the term. "Like all such *isms*, humanism is a party label," he writes. "It was first used in 1808 by Niethammer, a philosopher and educationalist in the Bavarian government, in a polemic against educational reforms which aspired to establish practical training of the kind already being offered at the philanthropinum in Dessau, for which he coined the term philanthropinism, claiming that it encouraged the animality of the child while humanism called forth its humanity. By humanism, Niethammer meant a curriculum based on liberal education and the teaching of language, which had dominated secondary education all over Europe since the fifteenth century and which, in expressions like *humaniora* (1617) or *humanity* (1484), *humanities* (1703), and *humanités* (1673), could be traced back to the Ciceronian of the *studia humanitatis*." According to Rüegg, Florentine secretary of state Coluccio Salutati took up the latter term in 1369 in

reference to the goals of the new intellectual movement as it pertained “to the content of new academic disciplines.”^v Humanists objected to Church control over what people could study and what they could discuss. One humanist principle at the time was that ideas and learning should be available to all people, not simply to a few elite who might use their authority to restrict the learning of others. Humanists believed that all manuscripts should be translated and printed cheaply on the newly developed printing presses. This would allow anyone to have access to the wisdom and ideas of ancient Greeks and Romans. Protestant leaders were interested in having the Bible printed so that all Christians might read it for themselves.^{vi} The beliefs set forth by humanists and Protestants began to contend for supremacy in the doctrines of the university, but that was just the beginning.

The Renaissance: *Empiricism and Utilitarianism*

The Renaissance was in part a struggle between religion and science. The university stood in a tension of differing worldviews as it began to remove itself from the controls of both the papacy and the monarchy. Francis Bacon (1561-1626) was an English essayist who championed empiricism, through which he hoped to make science accord with reason.

Bacon’s arguments came to be so persuasive that medieval theology could no longer stand at the center of higher learning. Some scholars argued that science should become the main theme of higher learning. The seventeenth century saw all sorts of scientific experimentation with the production of the microscope, telescope, and machinery for grinding lenses, time-measuring instruments, the thermometer, barometer, air pump, the apparatus for the modern laboratory, the observatory, and more. Bacon's vision of the future justified science in ways that some said led to the Industrial Revolution.^{vii}

The term “rational” gained popularity among seventeenth-century philosophers on the Continent. Descartes, Spinoza, and Leibniz were rationalists and, generally, in opposition to British empiricists, such as Locke, Berkeley, and Hume. The former privileged reason in the search for truth, the latter science and its experimentation. Thus a tension developed between reason (rationalism) and science (empiricism), as each outlook fought for supremacy. It would require a great philosopher, Immanuel Kant, to effect some reconciliation between the two.

Kant saw both empiricism and rationalism as a legitimate basis for university studies. Science, an integration of reason and experiment, advanced further into the life of universities. But soon science was advancing so rapidly as a ruling theme in the university that Cardinal John Henry Newman, writing in the 1850s, sought to temper it. He said that science promoted "useful knowledge" combined with an "unchecked mechanized productivity" and that this type of progress does not necessarily produce a good university. The university is an academic cloister for intellectual inquiry, not just a basis for scientific inquiry. He mapped out a territory for a way of thinking beyond science, arguing against Bacon's logic that all education should be useful and utilitarian. Liberal knowledge, Newman contended, is generated for its own sake, apart from its utility. His proposition countering Bacon included religious studies.

Newman became, as friends said, a "high protector of all knowledge." For him, knowledge has its own end, indeed, its own "self fulfillment" with a liberating quality for students. Newman believed the university should become a "center for liberal knowledge." Higher learning, he insisted, raised the tone of society and cultivated the mind. This fostering of general knowledge was enough to justify the academy.^{viii}

Cardinal Newman recognized religion as a subject to be taught in the university. Nonetheless, he brought together both intellectual and spiritual inquiry without losing science. He did not repudiate other philosophical notions such as reason and utility; but he argued that the quest for knowledge went beyond science and usefulness alone and included spiritual teachings that were vital to understanding the higher nature of humankind.^{ix}

Newman reconciled the pursuit of scientific ideas with the pursuit of spiritual inquiry but the debate stayed alive as higher learning moved also to America. How much emphasis should be given to one theme or the other? The debate over the relative importance of each -- rationalism, empiricism, utilitarianism, and doctrinarism in religion -- continued across the Atlantic.^x

Higher Learning in America: *Sectarianism and Secularism*

The first colleges in the United States -- Harvard, William and Mary, and Yale -- had strong ties to Protestant denominations. The first was Harvard College, founded in 1636. Then

the Anglicans founded William and Mary in 1693; the Connecticut Congregationalists founded Yale College in 1701; the Presbyterians Princeton in 1746; the Baptists Brown in 1764; the Dutch Reformed Church founded Queens College (Rutgers) in 1766; and the Congregationalists founded Dartmouth in 1769. Hundreds of other religiously affiliated colleges and universities were established across the country during the nineteenth century.

A marriage was sought between “faith and reason” and the positive result was a greater diversity of campuses with more competing traditions. Church leaders believed that combining Protestant teaching with classic writings and languages was the best way to build a "Christian civilization." The older perspective of some remaining American leaders advocated "useful" disciplines, as opposed to just religious and classical studies. Ben Franklin's pragmatic (utilitarian) spirit shaped the Charity School of Philadelphia, chartered in 1755, which later became the University of Pennsylvania.

The University of Virginia, founded in 1825 by Thomas Jefferson, gave students a choice of eight "schools" devoted to the humanities, law, and the sciences. Jefferson made plans that would mirror his philosophical vision. A college experience should take place within an "academical village," a place where learning infused daily life. There would be no teaching of religion, which he considered a private matter.

Major debates formed over what constituted a liberal education. In 1827, Yale issued a report *against* "the mere accumulation of facts" and premature training in utilitarian and professional subjects. Under the leadership of President Charles W. Eliot, Harvard sought to combine literature and science, but insisted on a "system of electives" that would allow students to choose the courses that they felt best suited their interests and talents. Eliot said that Yale's argument that the classics were necessary to make gentlemen was "beneath contempt." American colleges became aware of the need to move beyond memorization in order to cultivate "active understanding," and began to build graduate schools. Johns Hopkins University in Baltimore, Clark University in Worcester, Massachusetts, and the Catholic University of Washington, D.C., began to provide graduate-level studies.^{xi}

The earliest American colleges were established with a Protestant orientation, but before long Catholic colleges and universities were also being built. In 1800, Catholics in America numbered about 50,000 or about 1% of the total population. The flood of Catholic immigrants after 1840 transformed American Catholicism, however, and by 1850, the Catholic Church had grown to 2,000,000 members residing mostly in the urban Northeast. In 1900, a Catholic higher educational network was established, which consisted of sixty-three schools with approximately 4,200 students enrolled, mostly males. The institutions were founded by dioceses or religious orders and staffed mainly by brothers, and sisters, and priests. They offered a prescriptive, liberal arts curriculum, stressing character formation in an atmosphere permeated by Catholicism as a way of life.^{xii}

American higher learning thus developed a Christian outlook in the main and emphasized the development of *moral character*. Morality was a religious duty to God for both Protestants and Catholics. And the tension with scientific points of view continued. Noah Porter, a mid-century candidate for the Yale presidency, organized a course on the various duties of self-discipline, deference to friends, family, state, nature, and God. In 1869, he published a series of articles in the *New Englander*, entitled "The American Colleges and the American Public." His culminating essay defended the proposition that higher education had a "positively religious and Christian Character." Porter argued that, faced with an increasing emphasis on secular and scientific themes in academic thought, there could be no middle ground. The question is not whether the college shall, or shall not, teach theology, but what theology it shall teach, -- theology according to Comte and Spencer, or according to Bacon and Christ, theology according to Moses and Paul, or according to Buckle and Draper.^{xiii}

The choice between secular versus religious orientations in the university was polarizing at times. Teaching religious beliefs was unacceptable to humanists and in its extreme was labeled *doctrinarism* and *sectarianism*. Humanism developed around its own ethical philosophies that would "affirm the dignity and worth of people" and determine what is right by qualities that are considered "innate to humanity." When carried to an extreme, theologians called it *secularism*.^{xiv}

The differences between theologians and secularists deepened at the turn of the 20th century. In a three-part series on what was being taught at contemporary American colleges, the editors of *Cosmopolitan* magazine in 1909 summarized the studies of Harold Bolce, who visited campuses, sat in classes, and interviewed professors. In a muckraking lament, Bolce spoke in dramatic terms about this shift toward secularism:

Those who are not in close touch with the great colleges of the country will be astonished to learn the creeds being foisted by the faculties of our great universities. In hundreds of class-rooms it is being taught daily that the Decalogue is no more sacred than a syllabus; . . . that there are no absolute evils; that immorality is simply an act in contravention of society's accepted standards. . . that moral precepts are passing shibboleths; that conceptions of right and wrong are as unstable as styles of dress; . . . and that there can be and are holier alliances without the marriage bond than within it.^{xv}

In the last decades of the 19th century American colleges and universities, which had started with strong Christian religious values, changed toward humanist and secular ones. Secularization became a force in both Catholic and Protestant colleges. In fact, all educational institutions became secularized as universities moved into the twentieth century.

The Rising Tide: Secularization

Secularization for our purposes is the lessening of institutional commitments to religion. A secular movement at the end of the 19th century meant that religious groups would abandon much of their control over what was taught. Colleges and universities would lessen their emphasis on church sponsorship. The field of higher education became less centered on Christian beliefs and by 1900 the change became official, a matter of nationwide accreditation.^{xvi}

Regional accrediting groups, organizing in New England in 1885 and spreading to the West by 1918, were instrumental in setting common standards and procedures for institutions. These accrediting agencies took steps to secularize higher education, a move that was disturbing to those in Catholic schools. The University of Notre Dame was the sole Catholic institution included when the North Central Association published its first directory of accredited colleges and universities in 1913. That same year, the Association of American Universities recognized

119 institutions throughout the United States as offering college-level instruction. Only two Catholic schools made the list, Catholic University and Fordham.^{xvii}

The emphasis on religion as a subject to be taught on American campuses declined; evangelical teaching virtually disappeared in the 20th century. There came to be an ever-widening difference between what was taught in church pulpits and what was taught in colleges and universities. University administrators even fought to avoid overemphasizing religious subjects. They did not want to be labeled "sectarian," saying that the right to a "private religion" was valid but doctrinal religion should be kept away from the university.

As the subject of religious thought surrendered to secular thinking, faculty members began to use the phrase "nothing is sacred," meaning that everything is open to question. Secular thought, including the philosophies of science, utilitarianism, and pragmatism, returned as themes that became justified within a higher principle called "diversity."

The historian George Marsden describes "defining moments" of change in both state and private institutions. Virtually all of the institutions which had originally been based in religion -- Harvard, Yale, Princeton, the University of Michigan, Johns Hopkins, the University of California at Berkeley, and the University of Chicago -- became "nonsectarian" as religion was "disestablished." This secular trend was commendable in some ways, Marsden believes, but it also led to an infringement on the free expression of religion in academic life. A systemic belief in "nonbelief" was substituted as the only valid academic position to take in secular schools. However, just as the academy made room for ethnic (multicultural) beliefs, he protests, there should also be room for religious beliefs as part of this "newfound" diversity. There should still be at least some room for opposing views on campus between humanist and religious themes. A religious perspective based on the highest level of scholarship, he argues, would contribute to a greater understanding of "our cultural inheritance."^{xviii}

Backed by the Morrill Act of 1862, state universities were secular. The land-grant movement defined higher education as serving the agricultural and industrial population, that is, 90 percent of the American people, extending the access of "the masses" to higher learning. Land grant colleges continued a liberal arts curriculum as part of its "public education," but

added agricultural and mechanical training so those students could return home and contribute to local work and government affairs.^{xix}

The French philosopher Jean Jacques Rousseau thought that government was supreme in all matters. He coined the term "civil religion" in a treatise called "On the Social Contract" (1762), where he analyzed different arrangements between government and religion, which included theocracy, divine-right monarchy, and the divine emperors of Rome and Egypt. He rejected the absolutist monarchies, in which the head of state was also head of the church and took a negative view of Christianity because he believed it divided citizens' loyalties between their civic and spiritual obligations. His solution was to create a "purely civil profession of faith" that would be promoted by a nation's leaders.^{xx}

As we shall see later, in the Conclusion, sociologist Robert Bellah revived Rousseau's subject in 1967, saying that in American political theory, sovereignty rests with people and ethical principles, not the state. The ultimate sovereignty is attributed to God, as in the motto, 'In God we trust,' and the phrase 'under God' in the pledge of allegiance to the flag. For Bellah, civil religion meant "the religion of the republic." It was for him a public myth whose symbolism is rooted in the integral tradition of faiths and embodies no one religion in particular.^{xxi}

The tension between "secular" and "religious" principles never went away. Theologians disapproved of the shift away from the historical focus on religion in higher education, calling it *secularism*. Today they argue that secular principles guiding scientific studies are important but principles guiding religious studies are no less important. We argue that the principles of secularism, rationalism and humanism are not alone sufficient to define a liberal education.

The Early Twentieth Century: *Rationalism*

German sociologist Max Weber worried that something would be lost with the rise of rationality in the modern epoch. He argued that some things are sacred -- commitment, personal appeal, faith, grace, and the ethics of heroes – and that these virtues could be displaced in the "rationalization" of all orders of society. Rationalization led to the displacement of

religion from its central place in society, and this change affected society's trust and faith and destroyed much of the richness in myth and symbolism. The role of religion in western society had already changed significantly beginning in the 16th Century, as we have shown, with such charismatic leaders as Luther and Calvin, who undermined priestly powers in the Catholic tradition and substituted a "book religion" that became rationalized in the Protestant Ethic. And that same rationalization crossed into other civil orders as well.

In the field of law, Weber describes how the personalized dispensing of justice by wise leaders and elders changed into a codified and impersonal form of justice. This impersonal development had its progressive side but something was also lost in all the resulting bureaucratization. This problem spread into other civil orders, as Weber demonstrates, tracing the development of political authority from kings endowed with hereditary charisma, into cool heads of state, who ruled within stricter limits of legal prescriptions and rationally enacted law. In the field of art Weber contrasts the concise notations and tempered scale of modern music (the rigorous standardization that governs a modern symphony orchestra) with the spontaneity and inventiveness of the musical systems of Asia and primitive tribes. In the economic order, the market developed calculability, efficiency, and predictability. And science added its form of rationalization based on the manipulation and control of variables to build technologies.

Something was gained, something lost, and Weber worried about the sweeping change. How might people be imprisoned by "rationalization," trapped in an "iron cage of reason"?^{xxii}

No one knows who will live in this cage in the future, or whether at the end of this tremendous development entirely new prophets will arise, or there will be a great rebirth of old ideas and ideals or, if neither, mechanized petrification embellished with a sort of convulsive self-importance. For of the last stage of this cultural development, it might well be truly said: 'Specialists without spirit, sensualists without heart; this nullity imagines that it has obtained a level of civilization never before achieved.'^{xxiii}

Rationality, not spirituality, became the basis for organizing society. Weber senses that this might bring some good consequences, but warns that Reason could be overemphasized, undermining the personal and spiritual aspects of life. Hence, critics began to ask how much

universities had come under the sway of this sweeping change. Would the future university be based on rationalism and secularism, and thus advance other similar *isms*, such as pluralism and departmentalism?^{xxiv}

Pluralism

Abraham Flexner, an American university historian writing in the 1930s, saw changes in the 20th Century University that worried him. He was certain that universities had developed too many departments, institutes, and research libraries. Harking back to Cardinal Newman's book *The Idea of a University*, he said that in the university medicine had been taken away from professional physicians and given to scientists; specialists were replacing generalists: the university was becoming the opposite of what Newman had envisioned. He believed that pluralism had become predominant, and that as a result, the academy had moved too far away from that original quest for universal truths. The eternal truths of the natural order, he said, were replaced by discoveries about nature as an "evolutionary process." The practical needs of society were in the ascendancy, and the university was in hot pursuit of *useful* knowledge, i.e. solutions to everyday problems. In this trend toward specialties, no single faculty member could "master any subject." The "Renaissance mind" had disappeared.^{xxv}

Flexner studied universities in national settings noting how Lord Haldane had said, "It is in universities that...the soul of a people mirrors itself." It is not just the individual but also the collective soul of a nation that is reflected in university work.

[A university must be seen as inside] the general social fabric of a given era. It is not something apart, something historic, something that yields as little as possible to forces and influences that are more or less new. It is, on the contrary -- so I shall assume -- an expression of the age, as well as an influence operating upon both present and future.

But universities had become "too many things" -- vocational schools, teacher training schools, research centers, and business schools. They offered too many absurd courses, cheapening the purposes of higher education.^{xxvi}

As faculties became more specialized in succeeding decades, their personal identity with the university declined while their identity with their profession increased. In the 20th century,

controls over planning in the university were transferred to managers and trained administrators. Liberal arts colleges were experiencing a proliferation of disciplines, making it difficult to educate students as "whole person[s]," critics said. Generalists opposed relativism and the growing "specialization" in the university. A movement for interdisciplinary studies began then in the 1920s in philosophy, social science and education.

Advocates for a "general education" introduced courses with a common set of values, inspired by Cicero's classic model of the *doctus orator* -- a person who synthesizes the knowledge of the sciences with the problems of everyday life. They promoted the idea of students developing a "Renaissance mind." Some advocated a "civic model" for higher education. A "civic model" for them meant learning about human culture as taught through literary and nonliterary "classics." The thinking of Alfred North Whitehead and John Dewey inspired faculty whose goal in teaching was the "wholly educated person." Philosophers, educators, and social scientists joined to promote the civic model because of their concern about over-specialization and "vocalizing."^{xxvii}

Philosopher Ernst Cassirer, who had been impressed by the progressive mathematization of physics, supported this holistic thinking. He had concluded that in modern physics "we find a sensible reality transformed into symbols." His reflection on the meaning of symbols in the university led him to develop a *Philosophy of Symbolic Forms* in the 1920s. Symbolism, he maintained, distinguishes our understanding of the whole human enterprise, indeed, of the world itself. He looked at symbolism in myth and in fields like art and historiography.^{xxviii}

Others looked at how the culture of universities was shaped. In the 1930s and 1940s, scholars at the University of Chicago (u.a. George H. Mead, Franz Boas, and Robert Cooley Angell), started a campus reform to overcome "exclusionary tendencies" in departments and called for a social scientific perspective. This attempt at reform would encourage "cross-fertilization" through an "interactionist" model in culture-personality studies.^{xxix} In the 1940s, other social scientists (u.a. F.S.C. Northrup, Abraham Maslow, Pitirim Sorokin, and Clyde Kluckhohn) sought "integrative principles of modern thought."

Other intellectual movements brought forth other *isms*: classicism, positivism, interactionism, and integrationism. These disparate tendencies were driven by the common goal of broadening toward a larger outlook, the whole. At the time, none of them were thought to be narrow or extreme points of view. In retrospect they were like restive gods of the mind seeking unity in the growing diversity.^{xxx}

The university's original themes based on religious beliefs and classical studies began to lose support and declined further. The university mission would be formulated through secular departments, but the tension between great principles in academe remained: plurality vs. unity, reason vs. utility, and religious vs. secular. And there were more philosophies ahead.

Mid-Twentieth Century: *Relativism and Holism*

By the mid-twentieth century the concept of relativity had gained prominence. As a result of the comparative studies of foreign lands, relativity became popular in anthropology since, it was thought, no reasonable person could be an absolutist about what is morally right or wrong for everybody in the world. It was also a concept in physics popularized by Einstein's famous theory of relativity that later became part of quantum mechanics. Yet there remained professors who felt that there were general truths – not relative – about the world that needed to be recognized. A battle took place between these different outlooks, *relativism* versus *holism*. Relativists respected the wonderful and elusive nature of things and holistic advocates fought for a more comprehensive and larger view of the world.

By the end of the 1950s, these intellectual movements had lost strength as new concern was developing about excesses called “departmentalism” and “professionalism.” Soon there would be a call for the teaching of a “core curriculum” in the best American institutions.

A Core Curriculum: *Departmentalism and Professionalism*

By the mid-1950s, Harvard and Columbia Universities were leading an effort to overcome the tendency toward departmentalism and the "exclusionary trends" of learning institutions that by then had been a problem for some time. They focused on a search for “substance” and on teaching students about the essentials of learning.

Harvard University created a "Redbook" (*General Education in a Free Society*) calling for a "core curriculum." The core would review Western civilization and include literary texts, scientific principles, English composition, and an additional course in each of the humanities, social sciences, and natural sciences. Columbia University launched a forum to discuss common problems in society and the historian Frank Tannenbaum argued that students should discover a larger perspective on the world.^{xxxii}

Harvard's "core" referred to "general principles" that guide a liberal (general) education. It represented the essentials that faculty taught on campus. University administrators felt the need for students to find coherence in their work but a question remained as to whether anyone could define what the essentials were. Hence, the theme of diversity or plurality continued as national fact as educational associations worked on the question. When the American Council on Education in the 1960s composed a list of goals for higher education, they refused to "integrate," them or give them any consistency or common logic. Sustaining the pluralistic principle of diversity was compelling.^{xxxiii}

Clark Kerr, the Chancellor at the University of California, legitimized this principle in the 1960s. Kerr concluded that the concept of "university" has in effect been replaced by the concept of "multiversity." There was no longer any academic unity of thought on campuses. This "community of scholars" had become a group of "scholarly communities." Faculty members had lost any single purpose; they could no longer talk across their disciplines; there was no common vocabulary. The university possessed only an *administrative center* that held faculty and students together. Casting aside the interpretations of Newman and Flexner, Kerr celebrated diversity and specialization. Kerr even asserted that the university should be praised for its pluralism:

The Idea of a 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, and its transgressors. It also has its barkers selling its wares to all that 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.^{xxxiii}

For Kerr, the university was at war with itself through its many different communities -- the undergraduate and the graduate, the humanist and the scientist, the professional schools -- many competing with one another. And this was good. A pluralistic multiversity fosters a great war for ideas, which define what learning institutions are all about. Kerr said that pluralism served society better by its open battle to find answers as part of the quest for knowledge.^{xxxiv}

In 1973, the Carnegie Commission on Higher Education published a multi-volume study that purposely avoided “theoretical unity” within its series. The commission offered a summary paragraph in one volume regarding what they saw as the most important goals. These included: “cultivating the *intellect*,” promoting “*objectivity* based on facts,” *logical argument* and *methods of persuasion*,” and supporting “a wide latitude” for freedom of the *individual*. (*My emphases*) The commission said nothing about these goals as already embedded in and unifying modern thought. They said nothing about how these terms might diminish the importance of opposing terms such as *feeling*, *subjectivity*, *non-logical*, *order*, and *community*. They took their key words for granted as the ruling themes of modern universities.^{xxxv}

Put another way, the Commission avoided “unity” but did not think of the special accent they were giving to the quest for knowledge. They did not acknowledge the importance of themes contrary to the ones they promoted such as *spirituality*, *improvisation*, *spontaneity*, *intuition*, *emotion*, and *a sense of the sacred*. As we shall see in our Conclusion, we contend that antinomies should to be studied. We think that the co-presence of opposing themes in the university increases the dynamic of each. It is like a painting where the dynamically balanced arrangement and melding of opposing colors could be the features that make it a great work of art.

Capitalism and Nationalism

During the Vietnam War, radical students and professors rebelled against the policies of Clark Kerr. They argued that Kerr’s outlook on “multiversity” ignored the themes that were really dominant in American universities. The real themes, that in their view remained obfuscated, were “capitalism” and “nationalism.” *These* were the *isms* shaping academic thought and university research.^{xxxvi}

Students claimed that business and government interests ruled the whole teaching and course structure. Foreign policies and business contracts swayed campus pedagogy, research, and the very structure of authority. In free speech assemblies, they harkened back to the economist Thorstein Veblen who had argued against allowing business executives onto university boards. CEOs of big corporations, they argued, were defining university policies in America's best schools.^{xxxvii}

This was not just a political debate between Left and Right because some issues went deep into the ideologies on both sides. In some cases, conservative educators agreed with students that too much government power over academe was not a good thing. A few opposed what they considered the inordinate funding of universities by the Defense Department, and others argued that the growth of state universities was destroying the independence of colleges in the private sector: state universities had been growing in power in the 1970s and were now in competition with private colleges.

By the 1980s the word "governmentalization" had become popular among conservative scholars. An international study of higher education revealed that, "[t]he preponderant number of university systems around the world had become 'governmental responsibilities.'" Exceptions existed in the United States and Japan, but even in America the private sector was forfeiting its independence to greater government control. The studies concluded:

...[It] is of utmost importance to point out that great powers are concentrating increasingly in government, and that government itself is not always aware of this and often not cognizant of the effects of its actions on the higher education it seeks to nourish.^{xxxviii}

In the 1990s, some observers thought that state universities might replace private ones because of the high tuition costs of the latter. One study showed that when a kindergartner was ready to attend four years at a first-rate private university like Harvard, the cost would approach \$267,000. Costs for the senior year alone would be about \$75,000 -- if tuition, fees, books and housing expenses increased only 7 percent annually. Costs at the more typical private liberal

arts colleges would run to \$200,000. These observers predicted the decline of private education. The low-tuition state universities would win the battle for supremacy.^{xxxix}

The Late Twentieth Century: *Postmodernism and Essentialism*

In the last two decades of the 20th century, postmodernists opposed essentialist and “core” thinking in the university. Their opposition to a core or an “essence” of anything challenged Harvard’s Redbook and what theologians might call the most sacred. Critics like Richard Rorty said that “16th, 17th, and 18th century philosophers had set forth suppositions about the core of truth,” but there is no such thing; and this, he went on, is the problem today. Michel Foucault and Jacques Derrida opposed “foundationalism”; indeed, all metaphysics should be rejected, starting with Plato. Derrida and other deconstructionists argued that *the full meaning of ideas could not be present in consciousness*. The task of faculty is to deconstruct any *logos* (meaning) that might be taken as sacred or at the core of knowledge or deemed as “the truth.”^{xi}

In the 1980s Allan Bloom, a professor of social thought at the University of Chicago, asked from a more traditional perspective: “What is sacred?” Bloom said that the sacred tradition of “rounded learning” had been lost. In fact, the political crises of the whole twentieth century could be traceable to this loss. He argued dramatically that the university's curriculum was not fulfilling its original mandate to offer students a sense of purpose in the full span of learning. Young people on campus “lack any real understanding of history and have no vision for the future.” American universities no longer support the core of philosophy and literature that had made students aware of nature and their own place in humanity. Higher education “fails to nurture that tradition of self-knowledge” that had been the basis for serious learning.^{xii}

A conservative critique followed to support Bloom’s analysis. In the early 1990s, writers connected the Bloom debate with a new phrase, “political correctness.” Roger Kimball, managing editor of *The New Criterion*, contended that the academy was over-emphasizing specialized studies in feminism, racism, deconstructionism, and postmodernism. Faculties were arguing over “correctness” and missing the real issues. According to Kimball, administrators were continually adding more institutes and centers, overloading majors in the name of “diversity.”^{xlii}

Minorities in turn protested against this conservative reaction. They did not want universities to discriminate against them. Universities, they said, needed a diverse body of students and a curriculum that would respect cultural differences. Deconstructionists argued that "difference" is in the nature of things; there is no basis for any unity in anything. No single idea could define a university, except perhaps, difference. And now the university walked into the middle of a muddle about what constitutes "difference."

End of the 20th Century: *Careerism and Commercialism*

Studies in the 1990s showed that the proportion of graduate students pursuing the humanities had dropped steadily for three decades. The same trend had taken place among undergraduates. The structure of the university was changing. Among freshmen entering college in the fall of 1989, 24.5 percent proposed to major in Business or Management, 10.2 percent in Engineering, and 9.2 percent in Education. Arts and Humanities attracted 8.7 percent. A liberal education had become less popular for students than finding a practical career. The explosion of professional and prevocational training in community colleges and two-year colleges swamped the learning system. And at the same time a great influx of part-time students arrived -- mostly women and minorities -- whose needs were career-oriented. Their purpose was not to learn about the nature of things or how to change the world. The question was how to get a job.^{xliii}

At the end of the 20th century, opinion polls showed a lack of "trust" in higher education that has continued today. The public was concerned about money-minded university athletic directors who made contracts with sports firms to advertise commercial products; the misallocation of indirect cost funds, price fixing and athletic abuses at the prestigious universities; and about special college endowments ("chairs," "schools," "professorships") based on the money of donors for whom they were named -- sometimes to insure that these donors' interests were followed. Universities now devolved sharply into what critics called commercialism -- competing against one another in a profit-driven market.^{xliv}

Critics today who are concerned about how the university is losing its core values say that the campus has turned mainly to wealth getting. Capital and commerce are governing presidential decisions. Leon Botstein, president of Bard College, said that wealthy universities

were acting more like banks than educational institutions. Institutions such as Harvard (with a \$25 billion endowment) have financiers working like fiduciary capitalists on Wall Street.^{xlv}

Robert Zemsky, Director of the Institute for Research at the University of Pennsylvania says that a hierarchy has always existed in private education but *ranking by wealth* is emphasized now more than ever before. The “very wealthy” can withstand a boom-and-bust cycle, but others, with endowments less than a billion dollars, may not weather a future based on competition.^{xlvi}

Accredited degree granting universities became for-profit businesses at the end of the century. The University of Phoenix, with 60,000 students, garnered 1997 profits of \$24 million; DeVry, Inc., with 48,000 students, had \$24 million in profits. Phoenix taught its students with a total of 45 full time faculty members and 4,500 adjuncts. It had no campus library; its library went onto the Internet, which saves costs on campus. The university became super efficient, competitive, and businesslike, operating in shopping malls and industrial locations; it had no need to maintain a beautiful tree-lined campus. It advertised practical not liberal learning. Sylvan Learning Systems, a company known for its tutoring and testing programs, developed a network of private, for-profit universities overseas. Joseph D. Duffey managed the international venture, coming to his job as a former president of American University, past chancellor of the University of Massachusetts, and director of the U.S. Information Agency. High enrollments and high profits were said to be “good business.”^{xlvii}

A Turn into the 21st Century: *Capitalism and Globalization*

Commerce has now begun to move full steam ahead on campus. Colleges created a record number of start-up companies based on the inventions of professors and students in the 2004 fiscal year. Universities collected more than \$1-billion in revenues from licenses on a host of new drugs, agricultural products, high-tech components, and other breakthrough technologies. Professors own stock in companies that, in turn, fund their research. Administrators in universities copy business practices; large universities operate technology-licensing offices to manage their patent portfolios. They guard their intellectual property as

aggressively as any business. Schools with limited budgets are pouring money into commercial fields of research.^{xlviii}

There is a boom in business- and industry-endowed chairs, with strings attached. Kmart, for example, endows a chair in the management school at West Virginia University that requires its holder to spend up to thirty days a year *training assistant store managers*. Freeport McMoRan, a mining company *embroiled in allegations of environmental misconduct in Indonesia*, has created a chair in environmental studies at Tulane University. *The Daily Californian*, an independent student newspaper at the University of California, Berkeley, says that buildings throughout the Haas School of Business are “plastered with corporate logos.” One major contributor to the school is Don Fisher, the owner of The Gap, whose company is featured as a case study in a business-administration course. Laura D’Andrea Tyson, formerly one of President Clinton’s top economic advisers, is officially known as the BankAmerica Dean of Haas.

Critics continue to raise issues regarding commercialism and globalization. Ross Gelbspan, in his book *The Heat Is On: The High Stakes Battle Over Earth’s Threatened Climate*, documents how fossil-fuel companies bankroll academic studies that downplay the threat of global warming. Gelbspan says this practice distorts the public-policy debate; commercially sponsored research is putting disinterested inquiry -- a core value of higher education –^{xlix} at risk. In a study of 800 scientific papers published in a range of academic journals, Sheldon Krimsky, a professor of public policy at Tufts University and a leading authority on conflicts of interest, in 2005 documented that slightly more than a third of the authors had a significant financial interest in their reports.¹

Critics who favor recent trends argue that nonprofit universities are like for-profit corporations. Scientists are now business executives who want secrecy in their research and proprietary rights. For government the question is not whether secrecy is wrong but how long scientists can keep their secrets. What constitutes a “reasonable period” of secrecy? The National Institutes of Health currently recommends that universities should allow corporate

sponsors to prohibit publication for no more than one or two months (the amount of time usually necessary to apply for a patent), but in practice lengthier delays are standard.^{li}

Jackson Lears, Board of Governors Professor of History at Rutgers University, is not happy. He says that today's problems can be traced back to the early 20th century when universities began to embrace the Prussian ideal of productive scholarship. Prussian productivism melded with American vocationalism and the result was the accentuation of a fundamental conflict in the university's mission between furthering the pursuit of truth and serving the needs of institutional establishments. The American university was to preserve a place for the free play of ideas, and equally to provide technical expertise for government and business. But the "liberal arts" began to seem dilettantish by comparison to hard-nosed managerial disciplines, and World War II and the Cold War hastened the triumph of what he calls the "managerial outlook."

"Since 1975, the number of non-tenure-track jobs has increased by 88 percent, while tenure-track positions have declined by 9 percent," Lears writes. But he contends that economic insecurity does not promote intellectual creativity; absence of tenure does not help people keep their edge. The managerial mentality of current universities is not concerned with the quality of intellectual life. The dependence on short-term faculty is "a symptom of a short-term managerial perspective, an emphasis on quick payoffs, which has the same impact on the university that it does on other workplaces: the erosion of loyalty and of long-term commitments." The old tradition of open-ended curiosity cannot survive in the current entrepreneurial climate. Universities should stop confining their research agendas to the needs of industry and reassert the core value of a liberal arts tradition: the pursuit of truth for its own sake.^{lii}

The emphasis on market competition is visible in continuing tuition hikes. The cost to attend a private college continues to rise faster than inflation. For the 2004-2005 school year, the average tuition and fees at public four-year colleges or universities rose 10.5% to \$5,132, according to the College Board report "Trends in College Pricing 2004." For private four-year

colleges and universities, average tuition costs rose 6% over the previous year, to \$20,082. Add the cost of room and board, and the average bill at public institutions rose 7.8% to \$11,354. For private institutions, the combined bill rose 5.6% to \$27,516.^{liii}

Top educators began reconsidering the structure of the university when President Larry Summers notified the Harvard Corporation that he would resign on June 30, 2006. His scheduled departure indicated to university presidents that it is time to confront the areas of chronic conflict. Warren Bennis, a distinguished professor of business, university professor at the University of Southern California, and chairman of the advisory board of the Center for Public Leadership at the John F. Kennedy School of Government at Harvard University, argued at the time of Summer's resignation that three major trends have emerged that require university self-examination: *The rise of science and technology, the rise of campus entrepreneurship, and the rise of individual mobility.*

The rise of science and technology has produced a structural inequality among the disciplines and schools that make up a university. Scientific and technological advances – like the explosion of tools and techniques for decoding genes, watching the brain at work, peering into the secret lives of galaxies -- have been revolutionary. But the revolution in science has also divided campuses, creating a two-tiered culture of campus haves and have-nots, and non-science departments have been increasingly marginalized and undervalued. The arts and humanities -- disciplines like history, sociology, philosophy, the visual arts, and literature -- were once at the heart of the university, respected as sources of wisdom about the human condition. But in the last 10 years, faculty members in those disciplines have been undermined by the hard-sciences where there are higher salaries, greater abilities to hire, and better chances of attracting the best students. With the rise of campus entrepreneurship, departments and faculty members are expected to find their own financial support for programs. The pay-your-own-way philosophy has reshaped the university. At Harvard University, Bennis continued, almost one-fourth of the annual operating budget -- \$626-million -- is the university's share of sponsored research, almost all of it from science and technology programs.

Today's universities must compete not only for top students but also for top faculty members. Those faculty members, unlike college professors of the past, are likely to have involvements outside the university, including, on occasion, financial interests that conflict with traditional academic values. Now more than ever, university presidents must strive for campus-wide transparency, and those who do not do so are vulnerable. They will be accused of condoning activities that breach ethical boundaries.^{liv}

Summary

We have seen how different types of universities have existed in different epochs and different countries. The university has carried themes, doctrines, and systems of belief as various as Catholicism and Protestantism, rationalism and empiricism, sectarianism and secularism, pluralism and universalism, relativism postmodernism, commercialism, and so on. The key point is this: Universities developed as an independent civil order in society. Institutions of higher learning became relatively independent of other social orders. Indeed, they became a place to study all orders, their different doctrines and *isms*. They developed to teach patterns of thought in society and to bring the various social orders into their sphere for teaching and research -- including those of government, business, religion, the professions, the arts, sciences, and others.

The *Zeitgeist* affects institutions of higher learning in each epoch as they transmit current knowledge to students; but they also create knowledge. They mirror the problems of their time but also solve problems and build new disciplines within their own campuses. Universities have become increasingly autonomous and capable of treating problems, like those posed by critics. Faculties are participant observers: they participate and identify with institutions; but they also stand apart from them as observers.

Some critics today claim that universities have lost their soul by becoming identified with the market, a place for business to make money. We noted in the Preface how Derek Bok asserts that university presidents, enterprising professors, and administrative staff find seductive opportunities to turn knowledge into profit. Sprawling campuses create a vacuum into which

material pursuits enter easily. While entrepreneurial universities may succeed in the short term, Bok argues, only institutions that vigorously uphold academic values will win public trust in the long run and retain the respect of faculty and students.

Put more bluntly, today's universities should not develop in the future as agencies of the government, nor act in the service of individual businesses or religions. They have been and ought to remain independent centers of thought, culture creators, the carriers and transmitters of knowledge. While universities reflect the culture of a particular country and the values of an epoch, they also stand apart. They transmit the knowledge of history and the wisdom of past civilizations, as well as teach students how to participate effectively in their country and the world at large.^{lv}

The heads of universities during the middle ages could not have imagined the *studia generalia* that would evolve in the future. They could not have anticipated the discovery of the New World and would never have been able to picture universities as they are today. They had no thought that scholars might one day look back and criticize early American colleges as “Christian” or “sectarian,” or our contemporary universities as “Western” or “nationalist.”

And so what about the future of the university in this 21st Century?

Given the changing perspectives in this university history, who could predict the future? The majority of American colleges and universities will certainly not return to a Christian system of belief, and most would not think of introducing instruction about a non-Christian religion (Hinduism, Judaism, Islam or Buddhism) into core courses on their campuses. Yet, we know that universities are developing a strong international perspective on all subjects, and that during this century they will produce startlingly new scientific discoveries. We do not know to what degree they will provide stronger oversight on the ethics of scientific research. Nor do we know whether they will introduce studies on a new world governing system for international organizations. We do not know whether they will search for that “lost soul,” perhaps find a focus on spirituality. And we do not know whether they might introduce what we would propose: a program in academic self studies.

Our stories now pursue the possibilities for a new future.

The stories are written in the spirit of legendary figures and great myths. They show how values, trends, and interests of the United States in its epoch influence universities but also how these institutions are nonetheless intent on the quest for truth and knowledge beyond time. Faculties in our stories will battle over the mission of their institutions. They will confront the problems posed by critics.

The stories call for courageous, perhaps outrageous, bold, imaginative leadership among America's top university presidents, educators, faculties, administrators and accreditors. I argue that faculties should study the question: What is the purpose of higher learning today? Faculties and administrators should create models for the 21st Century.

ⁱ “. . . going beyond them.” Rashdall contends that the university (Studium) developed in that tension between the Papacy and the Empire and became an authority by itself, but we see this as a process evolving in a more complex manner than his argument allows. As the university began its separate quest for knowledge, it helped to close the middle ages but it also became caught up in western thought and Christianity. Hastings Rashdall, The Universities of Europe in the Middle Ages (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1936) pp. 2-3. Rashdall describes how the term studium generale was a common one in the thirteenth century, used to indicate that an institution attracted students from all regions and was a place of higher education with subjects taught by a plurality of masters. The idea of a "university" became associated with scholastic guilds, but usually without the express authorization of a king, pope, prince, or prelate. Rashdall concludes that the universities -- bequeathed to the modern period by the Middle Ages-- are of "greater and more imperishable value than its cathedrals." The university is a medieval institution -- as much as the “constitutional kingship,” or “parliaments,” or “trial by jury.” The universities constitute the great achievement of the Middle Ages because their studies so strongly affected the progress and intellectual development of Europe, indeed, he claims, more powerfully than schools are likely ever to do again.

ii “. . . advancement of education.” As universities stood in the tension of Sacerdotum and Imperium, and as they continued to diversify to meet the needs of other associations in society, they trained students for careers in religious and political organizations. , Nathan Schachner gives us a colorful picture of the emergent universities, where learning sat on a throne by itself and was respected accordingly. It is a fascinating story of universities as being as indigenous to the mediaeval scene as their sister aspirations, the Gothic cathedrals. The very names of those old Universities breathe nostalgic fascination; Salerno, Bologna and Paris; Salamanca, Oxford, and Padua; Montpellier, Valladolid and Prague; Angers, Heidelberg, and Upsala. Nathan Schachner, The Mediaeval Universities (London: George Allen & Unwin Ltd. 1938) p. 4. Schachner goes on to describe times prior to the rise of universities, from the sixth to the eighth centuries, when the Church frowned on secular instruction even as some outside knowledge was essential for learning (p. 5).

iii “. . . life of the university.” The shift in the Zeitgeist (the spirit or mindset of people in any given age) is at first unnoticeable to many. People in the 13th century, like those in the 16th century, had begun to interpret the great figures of antiquity in the thought of their own day. From the beginning of the twelfth century and onwards, one sees subtle changes in art, music, and poetry. By the 15th century, art had become autonomous, not confined to the service of God. Changes in art forms were one signal that the Christian hegemony and the ecclesiastical monopoly were breaking up. In 1455, the first true printed book appeared in Europe, the Gutenberg Bible. In 1450, it would have been unusual for a parish priest to own a Bible. A century later, it was likely that a priest had one, and in 1650 it would have been remarkable if he had not. J.M. Roberts, The Penguin History of the World, (England: Penguin Books Ltd., 1980), p. 356. The teachings of Erasmus became the background for the Reformation during the sixteenth century. Joseph Ben-David, “Universities,” International Encyclopedia of the Social Sciences, David Sills, ed. Vol. 16, (N.Y. Macmillan & The Free Press, 1968), p. 191.

iv “. . . new beliefs and ideas.” The different connections between early universities to church and state are complex, but they can be illustrated by a look at the history of the University of

Copenhagen. In 1479, it was founded as a typical late medieval university with the traditional four faculties: Theology, Law, Medicine and Arts. The university was a part of “the universal Catholic Church,” and modeled after the University of Cologne. After the Lutheran Reformation began in Denmark in 1536, the University was re-organized as the center of the new Danish Lutheran State Church. The main function of the university was to train ministers for the State Church. During the next two centuries, along with ministers, the University began to train officials for other positions in Danish society. A system of degrees was developed beside the traditional academic B.A., M.A. and doctoral degrees, with special university exams in different professions, and the degrees began to serve as qualification-marks for a university career. In 1788, the University moved from being a traditional university to a “modern institution of research and education.” In 1848, a new examination in economics was introduced into the Faculty of Law and the equivalent of a Ph.D. was introduced. The natural sciences expanded and permanent chairs were created in chemistry, physics, geology, zoology, botany, etc. The university’s government gradually enjoyed more autonomy secured in the Royal Statutes from 1537, 1732, and 1788.

^v “. . . new academic disciplines’.” Walter Rüegg, “The Rise of Humanism,” General Editor of A History of the University in Europe, Volume I, Universities in the Middle Ages (Cambridge University Press, 1992), pp. 442-443. The word humanista, appeared in an Italian letter of the rector of the University of Pisa in 1490, and as the Latin title for the incumbent of the new chair of literae humanitatis at the University of Bolgna in 1512.

^{vi} “. . . read it for themselves.” Protestants taught that this world is nothing more than a preparation for the Kingdom of God in the next life. This idea was an abomination to humanists who emphasized living life here and now. The humanist principle of free inquiry (and anti-authoritarian critiques) developed as soon as Protestant leaders came to power. Protestant doctrines were advanced in learning academies just as previously, Roman Catholic doctrines had been advanced before the Reformation.

^{vii} “. . . to the industrial revolution.” Francis Bacon, educated at Cambridge, constructed a Utopian vision of the university that was accepted by other writers, such as François Revelais. In the sixteenth century, he envisioned a lavish, regal Abbey, contending that the hope of people for abundance would come about through the growth of science and technology.

^{viii} “. . . justify the academy.” Newman distinguished between the classic notions of mechanical arts and liberal arts. For an up-to-date discussion of Newman's original thinking, see: Jaroslav Pelikan, The Idea of the University: A Reexamination (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1992).

^{ix} “. . . nature of mankind.” The term, "liberalism" can be traced back to the Enlightenment as a reaction to the excesses of the church, and the church's reaction to the scientific discoveries of Galileo and others. Some European intellectuals concluded that the Catholic Church could no longer justify its claim to perfect knowledge. But Cardinal Newman sought to make the term “liberal” part of a larger perspective in the pursuit of knowledge.

^x “. . . across the Atlantic.” University systems of governance changed markedly over the centuries. Students in the guilds of Bologna, for example, governed their university. The Bologna pattern had its impact elsewhere, in Spain and Latin America, but leading educators argued that this type of governance was not viable in the long term. Student interests were too partial to themselves -- sometimes too political, and at times aiming to lower standards. Thomas Jefferson had favored faculty-student joint governance for universities in the 1820s but he could not determine how to do it effectively. Before World War I, there was a wave of interest in student government. The movement gained in its control over extracurricular programs such as debating, theater, literary work, campus newspapers, campus speakers and entertainment, and the like. Student power in the United States today remains only in the area of "course electives," suggesting how students do affect what courses should be given administrative support. The guilds of masters ran the University of Paris. The same was true later for Oxford and Cambridge. Faculty control at Oxford and Cambridge operated through the colleges.

In the U. S., the first grant of power to the faculty of a major university was at Yale in 1817, during the regime of Jeremiah Day, but it never "caught on" in other universities. Faculty did achieve nominal authority over such areas as admissions, courses, and exams, granting degrees and making faculty appointments. But since the mid-twentieth century, there has been less and less faculty participation in overall educational policy. Faculty authority over the direction of American universities has been minimal, even as their influence over research has grown by financial grants and the formation of institutes. As they became specialized, faculty lost interest in promoting Newman's original concept of the university. In sum, the overall direction of universities in the United States today is largely in the hands of appointed presidents, managers and administrators.

^{xi} “. . . graduate-level studies.” During the first decade of the twentieth century, however, the elective system was re-examined. Harvard president Abbott Lawrence Lowell challenged it by requiring freshmen and sophomores to select courses from groups of subjects designed to provide a variety within an "inner unity," while offering a "concentration" to juniors and seniors. Other colleges followed Harvard's lead.

^{xii} “. . . Catholicism as a way of life.” William P. Leahy, S.J. Adapting to America: Catholics, Jesuits, and Higher Education in the Twentieth Century (Washington, D.C., 1991). Preface, p. ix.

^{xiii} “. . . to Buckle and Draper.” Quoted in George Marsden, The Soul of the American University: From Protestant Establishment to Established Nonbelief (NY: Oxford University Press, 1994), p. 127.

^{xiv} “. . . called it *secularism*.” Humanism had begun as a movement away from medieval Christianity. We mentioned Desiderius Erasmus (1466-1536), a humanist occupying a position midway between extreme piety and open secularism. But there was also Francesco Petrarch (1304-1374), who represents conservative Italian humanism. Secularism, with its intellectual independence from the church, could include Niccolò Machiavelli (1469-1527) and Francesco Guicciardini (1483-1540). In England, John Colet (c. 1467-1519) and Sir Thomas More (1478-

1535) were humanists. We mentioned Francis Bacon (1561-1626) who represented a skeptical humanism. In France, classicists like Lefèvre d'Étaples (1453-1536) were succeeded by more devout skeptics like Michel Montaigne (1533-1592), and anti-clerical satirists like François Rabelais (c. 1495-1533).

^{xv} “. . . bond than within it.” Harold Bolce, "Blasting at the Rock of Ages," Cosmopolitan, 46 (May 1909), p. 665.

^{xvi} “. . . of nationwide accreditation.” Another definition of secularization is "the transformation of a society to a more rational, utilitarian and empiricist outlook of life and a reduction in supernaturalistic explanations." Keith Roberts, Religion in a Sociological Perspective, 3rd ed. (Belmont: Wadsworth Pub. Co., 1995), p. 338. Also see: Seyyed Hossein Nasr, Knowledge and the Sacred (Albany: State University Press of New York, 1989). Ralph Metzner, "The Split Between Spirit and Nature in Western Consciousness," in Noetic Sciences Review, Spring, No. 25, 1993.

^{xvii} “. . . Catholic University and Fordham.” Op cit. Catholic historian William Leahy, S. J., describes different themes in academia at the turn of the twentieth century. First, there were those educators who emphasized secularism and utilitarianism. Harvard's selection in 1869 of Charles Eliot as its first non-clergyman president reflected the shift toward secularism as opposed to sectarianism. Andrew White of Cornell and Daniel Gilman of Johns Hopkins also led the argument for their institutions as intellectual enterprises, showing less concern with the earlier priorities of character building and religious instruction. Indeed, Eliot and White led a campaign for a utilitarian approach, believing that education should prepare students for useful service and for meeting contemporary needs. Certain intellectuals like Thorstein Veblen, followed the German tradition, which emphasized research. Another group of leaders, a vocal minority that included Irving Babbitt, George Woodberry, and Josiah Royce, could be described as secular humanists, reacting against utilitarianism and “minute investigation,” arguing for a more humane and liberal culture. pp. 17-18.

^{xviii} “. . . ‘our cultural inheritance’.”Op. cit., Marsden. Marsden says that only a century ago, state universities held compulsory chapel services, and some required Sunday church attendance. State-sponsored chapel services were commonplace until the era of World War II. As late as the 1950s, some leading schools referred to themselves as Christian institutions.

^{xix} “. . . and government affairs.” When Congress passed the Morrill Act in 1862 (giving rise to America’s public land-grant universities), it instructed the states to establish schools that would teach “agriculture and the mechanical arts ... in order to promote the liberal and practical education of the industrial classes,” rather than just a classical curriculum. Some critics say that European universities have taken more pride in pursuing knowledge for its own sake than have America’s educators, like Thomas Jefferson and John Dewey, who argued that universities ought to be engaged in the world, and that knowledge is to be put to use. Henry Newman’s protest against “unchecked mechanized productivity” is debated today.

^{xx} “. . . by a nation’s leaders.” Rousseau argued that the dogmas of civil religion ought to be few and simple, acknowledging a Divinity but no more.

Robert N. Bellah, “Civil Religion in America,” *Dædalus*, Journal of the American Academy of Arts and Sciences, from the issue entitled, "Religion in America," Winter 1967, Vol. 96, No. 1, pp. 1-21.

^{xxi} “. . . no one religion in particular.” We return to this academic question in our Conclusion. Robert N. Bellah, *Beyond Belief: Essays on Religion in a Post-Traditionalist World*, (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1991). Bellah defends his position in this chapter written for a *Dædalus* conference on American Religion in May 1966. (See p. 168). His essay was reprinted with a rejoinder to comments in *The Religious Situation*: 1968. Bellah defends himself against the accusation of his supporting an idolatrous worship of the American nation. He sees the central tradition of the American “civil religion” not as a form of national self-worship but as the subordination of the nation to ethical principles that transcend it. He believes that every nation and every people come to some form of religious self-understanding. Rather than simply denounce what seems inevitable, he thinks that it is more responsible for him to seek within a

civil religion those critical principles which undercut “the ever present danger of national self-idolization.”

^{xxii} “. . . ‘iron cage of reason’.” Lewis Coser, *Masters of Sociological Thought*, (Waveland Press Inc; 2nd edition, 2003), p. 233. According to Weber, the process of rationalization – i.e., the progress of reason and freedom ushered in with the Enlightenment -- had liberated humanity from traditional constraints, but at the same time, it had produced a new oppression in the "iron cage" of modern organization.

This theme of rationalization developed along with the themes of secularization and commercialization. Secularization led to the loss of spiritual beliefs, the loss of passion, the loss of the Divine as a principle in university studies. In other words, it was the loss of the sacred. Commercialization led to the loss of substantive values, as it was constructed around a calculating mind. The sciences, the professions and commerce became birds of a feather flocking together. Professionals (lawyers and doctors) and scientists (chemists and biologists) moved easily into commerce, ready to make profits. They were less inclined than in the past to advance substantive values of public health, safety, and justice in the market.

^{xxiii} “. . . never before achieved.” Max Weber, *The Protestant Ethic and the Spirit of Capitalism*. Translated by Talcott Parson (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1904/1930) p. 181.

^{xxiv} “. . . pluralism and departmentalism.” Reason in its most principled form was highly creative in this modern period, but some scholars said it went to extremes with the developments of French deconstructionists -- Foucault, Baudrillard, Lyotard, and Derrida, among others. Derrida's deconstructionism is especially interesting as he questions the *logicism* and the standardized character of dichotomies, such as legitimate/illegitimate, rational/irrational, fact/fiction, or observation/imagination.

^{xxv} “. . . ‘Renaissance mind’ had disappeared.” Abraham Flexner, *Universities: American, English, German*, (NY: Oxford University Press, 1930.) pp. 3-4.

^{xxvi} “. . . of higher education.” Flexner had no idea how far this tendency to specialize would go in his century. Harvard University “even had a Graduate School of Business” that he contended should be dismantled. And Schools of Journalism and Home Economics and football and other such sports had no place in the university. According to Flexner, the heart of the university was the School of Arts and Sciences. Earlier scholars had also decried the growth of specialization. They were concerned about the formalization of too many disciplines: economics in 1885, political science in 1903, sociology in 1905, and so on. When the University of Berlin was founded at the beginning of the twentieth century, there was an attempt to counter such trends with a focus on “universal education,” but administrators could not stop the growth of specialized departments building new dimensions of learning.

^{xxvii} “. . . over-specialization and ‘vocationalizing’.” In the 1920s, the Social Science Research Council was established to overcome the “exclusionary tendencies” of competing departments in universities. Council leaders wanted to transcend the “craft exclusiveness” developing in social science because their “jurisdictional disputes” were inhibiting research. A valuable source on the history of interdisciplinary studies is Julie Thompson Klein, *Interdisciplinarity: History, Theory, and Practice*, (Detroit: Wayne State University Press, 1990). Some of my references are drawn from this source.

^{xxviii} “. . . art and historiography.” The three volumes of *Philosophie der symbolischen Formen* were published between 1923 and 1929. Ralph Manheim translated this work as *The Philosophy of Symbolic Forms* (New Haven, Conn: Yale University Press, 1953-1957). George H. Mead was also building “symbolic thought” at this time, drawing social-psychological concepts from philosopher G.W.F. Hegel.

^{xxix} “. . . culture-personality studies.” Other scholars at the University of Chicago sought an “objective dimension” to studies that would unify the “sciences.” They wanted to link scientific thought through “logical positivism,” emphasizing the analysis of language. The movement gained some administrative attention before it finally declined to end simply as a part of intellectual history. There have been more attempts to transcend and connect isolated studies

than can be mentioned. For example, the *International Encyclopedia of Unified Science* was a project undertaken by Otto Neurath, Rudolf Carnap, and Charles Morris to integrate thought in the natural and social sciences. From a different perspective, Robert Hutchins' "Great Books" program at the University of Chicago was an attempt to return to "basics," as teams of scholars tried to develop a greater sense of coherence in teaching the humanities.

^{xxx} “. . . the growing diversity.” Seeking to distinguish "content integration" from "process integration," educators aimed for a teaching program that would provide a “holistic education” for students. The notion of "integration" assumed a broad meaning in the school of education. By connecting course content with teaching method, movement leaders sought a new pedagogy and new body of universal principles. Alastair Taylor, "Integrative Principles and the Educational Process," *Main Currents in Modern Thought*, 25 (May/June 1969).

^{xxxi} “. . . .perspective on the world.” Ronald Gross, "Columbia's University Seminars: Creating a Community of Scholars," *Change, The Magazine of Higher Learning*, 14, No. 2 (1982). Certain departments and schools remained conducive to interdisciplinary thought, including the Harvard University Department of Social Relations, as well as the University of Chicago's Committee on Social Thought and the Chicago School of Social Science.

^{xxxii} “. . . diversity was compelling.” E. Gross and P. Grambsch, University Goals and Academic Power (Washington D.C.: American Council on Education, 1968).

^{xxxiii} “. . . among elegant alternatives.” Clark Kerr argued against the “great ideas” of Robert Hutchins. Kerr said with humor that the university had no center. Faculties have become individual entrepreneurs joined by a common grievance over parking. Robert Hutchins, former president of the University of Chicago, described the university as a series of separate schools and departments held together by a central heating system. Clark Kerr contended that the increasing number of separate schools and centers had become so complex that there was no longer any core. Clark Kerr, The Uses of the University (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1963),

^{xxxiv} “. . . quest for knowledge.” At the same time, there were those who sought a sense of community on campus. Paul Goodman contended that the idea of a university meant that students could specialize in the context of general studies and that this integration of knowledge was to be developed by a local community of scholars. Others argued that the university was an idea embodied in the notion of a "community of disciplines" (universitas scientiarum) and a "community of teachers and students" (universitas magistrorum et scholarium). Paul Goodman, The Community of Scholars (NY: Random House, 1962); Georges Gusdorf, "Past, Present, and Future in Interdisciplinary Research," *International Social Science Journal*, 29, No. 4 (1977).

^{xxxv} “. . . themes of modern universities.” The Carnegie Commission on Higher Education, *Reform on Campus* (NY: McGraw-Hill, 1972). p. 32. In the following year, the Commission devoted its early chapters to specific goals of higher education and suggested different frames of reference, such as "rationalism" and "pragmatism." However, the commission noted the wide gap existing between philosophies of education and the extent to which institutions depend on their "surrounding conditions." Carnegie Commission on Higher Education, *Purposes and Performance of Higher Education in the United States* (NY: McGraw-Hill, 1973).

^{xxxvi} “. . . and university research.” Alan Rosenberg and Gerald F. Myers, *Echoes from the Holocaust: Philosophical Reflections on a Dark Time* (Philadelphia: Temple University Press, 1988). The effort to distinguish between the authority of a university and a state is an issue in many nations. Faculties in Canada have called for more accountability and openness in the governance of their public universities. In a report sponsored by the Canadian Association of University Teachers, a panel says that to safeguard their mission, the university must operate in a "more open manner." Among their recommendations are a stronger voice for faculty senates on governing boards which make overall financial decisions, fewer closed sessions of governing boards, greater accountability for the quality of teaching and research, and an annual national summit on higher education. The university should take a stronger stand against outside influences: "The failure of boards to insure public accountability will invite political intrusion just as the failure to prevent intrusion will erode academic integrity." Quoted in Jenifer

Lewington, "More Openness and Accountability Sought in Governance of Canada's Universities," in *The Chronicle of Higher Education*, February 17, 1993, p. A33.

^{xxxvii} “. . . America’s best schools.” Thorstein Veblen, *The Higher Learning in America* (NY: L. B.W. Huebsch, 1918).

^{xxxviii} “. . . seeks to nourish.” Nell P. Eurich, *Systems of Higher Education in Twelve Countries* (NY: Praeger, 1981) pp. 28, 29.

^{xxxix} “. . . battle for supremacy.” This rise in cost held across the United States. At an institution like the University of Massachusetts, it would cost that same student \$75,000 for four years. The taxpayer would contribute four times that amount. Tuition does not cover the total cost of educating a student at either a public or private college, of course. The remaining cost is covered by funds from other sources like endowment income, annual gifts, research grants, and income from other operations, such as state appropriations at public colleges. At some universities, tuition and fees are less than one-half of the actual cost of education. Thus the real eventual cost of educating a child at Harvard who is currently kindergartner may be more than \$600,000, of which the student will be charged \$300,000, depending upon how fast tuition rises in the next 12 years. Experts say these estimates err on the low side. See: Daniel S. Cheever, Jr., *The Boston Sunday Globe*, April 26, 1992, p. 73. Cheever is President of Massachusetts Higher Education Assistance Corporation, a guarantor for federal student loans and former president of Wheelock College.

^{xl} “. . . deemed as ‘the truth’.” Richard Rorty, *Philosophy and the Mirror of Nature* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1979). Michael Confino argues that postmodernism and deconstructionism have run their course in the humanities and the social sciences. The "Sokal Affair" was a demonstration of the lack of substance behind an opaque, bombastic and at times incomprehensible jargon. Postmodernism and deconstructionism are still on the scene, but theirs is a rearguard skirmish in a lost battle over the form and content of some major scholarly disciplines. Michael Confino, "Some Random Thoughts on History's Recent Past," *History &*

Memory - Volume 12, Number 2, Fall/Winter 2000, 1926, pp. 29-55. Daphne Patai and Will H. Corral, eds. *Theory's Empire: An Anthology of Dissent*, (Columbia U. Press, 2004.)

^{xli} “. . . basis for serious learning.” Allan Bloom, *The Closing of the American Mind* (NY: Simon and Schuster, 1987). Humanists advanced his argument that students are no longer grounded in the liberal arts. They argue further that students are no longer taught a sense of morality and ethics, no longer have any feeling of awe and respect for nature. They have no appreciation of the fine arts, or any first-hand knowledge of the great symphonies, paintings, and literature. The top subjects on the menu for students today are business, the professions, the sciences and technology. Students are not schooled in the art of living, seldom encouraged to use their creative imagination. The university should encourage students to write poetry and experience the inner life instead of leading them into the narrow outlooks of career-oriented professions (business, law, medicine, etc.) and their themes of *pragmatism, utilitarianism, economism, legalism, and instrumentalism*. The university should challenge students to reach for higher values and ask them the "fundamental questions" of life. Liberal scholars have described Bloom's book as a mindless rant against the sixties counterculture. Others have seen beneath it a note of pathos, Bloom's longing for a university that has lost its direction See George Levine, et.al., *Speaking for the Humanities* (NY: American Council of Learned Societies, 1989).

^{xlii} “. . . in the name of ‘diversity’.” Roger Kimball, *Tenured Radicals: How Politics has Corrupted Our Higher Education* (NY: HarperPerennial, 1990), p. xi.

^{xliii} “. . . how to get a job.” The study notes how these overall trends are not characteristic of life on certain campuses, such as Swarthmore College or Cornell University, where statistics show differences. Francis Oakley, *Community of Learning: The American College and the Liberal Arts Tradition* (Oxford University Press, 1992).

^{xliv} “. . . profit-driven market.” Arthur Levine, “How the Academic Profession is Changing,” *Daedalus*, Vol. 126, No. 4, Fall 1997, pp. 1-20. Parents complain about the use of drugs on campus, the amount of student gambling on sports events, the exorbitant tuition costs. Critics speak about academic deans who encourage large classes, which leads professors to create

"objective" tests (true/false, multiple choice). Professors teach hundreds of students in a class without ever getting to know any of them on a personal basis. Faculty themselves are profiteering through moonlighting, doing outside consulting and research for corporations. At worst, faculties publish fraudulent data, or do not publish their findings because the true data are unfriendly to a corporate interest.

^{xlv} “. . . capitalists on Wall Street.” Goldie Blumenstyk, “How One University Pursued Profit From Science – and Won,” *The Chronicle for Higher Education*, 2/12/99, p. A39-A40. University presidents know that great capital returns take place by making an “academic transfer” of campus inventions into business use. Since 1978, Michigan State University has collected more than \$160 million in royalties on sales of drugs, known generically as cisplatin and carboplatin. Michigan State made a deal with a technology-licensing organization known as Research Corporation Technology (RTC). RTC helps commercialize inventions for more than 100 other universities. Michigan State University has fought legal battles with RTC for a greater share of the profits gained from these drugs that were invented at its own institution. The drugs were developed from inventions licensed to Bristol-Myers Squibb. Michigan signed its patent-management agreement with Research Corporation, a charitable foundation created in 1912. By 1987, however, Research Corporation had determined that it could not accomplish its business goals under its charitable umbrella. Under the Tax Reform Act of 1986, the organization created Research Corporation Technologies (RTC) as an independent, non-profit company that pays taxes and has no shareholders.

^{xlvi} “. . . future based on competition.” Joyce Mercer, “As Elite Universities Increase Spending, Many Others Strive to Keep Pace,” *The Chronicle of Higher Education*, October 9, 1998, pp. 45-47.

^{xlvii} “. . . to be ‘good business’.” Sylvan has an exclusive option in Spain to buy an existing for-profit institution, The European University of Madrid. The University has 7,200 students in 20 undergraduate and graduate programs in dentistry, law, language translation, and the liberal arts. Sylvan has offered to pay about \$51-million, including the assumption of about \$22.5-

million in debt, which is 54 per cent of the university's total indebtedness. The company plans to create a network of universities in a dozen countries. Sylvan's university administrators appeal to students who cannot afford to come to the United States. Sylvan plans to develop institutions at a pace of about one a year; most of the institutions would be in Western Europe or Latin America. Sylvan's president, Douglas L. Becker, points out that in most countries, government "rations" higher education. Higher education is almost free, but governments have limited capital and so they limit the number of slots available to students. The president says that he hopes to buy existing universities, although he could start from scratch if local governments were willing to provide such benefits as land or regulatory relief. He said that they should make a profit by not teaching obscure courses, training students, rather, for the local needs of employers. Kit Lively and Glodie Blumensyck, "Sylvan Learning Systems to Start a Network of For-Profit Universities Overseas," The Chronicle of Higher Education, 1/29/99. pp. A 43-44.

^{xlviii} " . . . commercial fields of research." Eyal Press and Jennifer Washburn, "The Kept University," The Atlantic Monthly, March, 2000. Goldie Blumenstyk, "Universities Collect Near-Record Revenues From Commercial Activity in 2004, Study Finds," The Chronicle of Higher Education, November 18, 2005. In this process of commercializing the university, humanities and the arts are downsized.

^{xlix} " . . . core value of higher education —" Ross Gelbspan, The Heat is On (NY: Perseus Books Group; Updated edition (September, 1998). Such entanglements inspired the economist Thorstein Veblen to say acerbically in 1908 that "business principles" were transforming higher education into "a merchantable commodity, to be produced on a piece-rate plan, rated, bought, and sold by standard units, measured, counted and reduced to staple equivalence by impersonal, mechanical tests." Eyal Press and Jennifer Washburn, Atlantic Monthly, vol. 285, nr. 3, March, 2000.

For earlier signs of this problem in the university see the historian David Noble who documents in his book America by Design (1977) that the rapid growth of the U.S. industrial economy at the turn of the century coincided with a surge in university-industry collaboration. Engineering and chemical giants underwrote research in exchange for the services of academic scientists; universities established industrial-research centers to furnish corporations with personnel; some schools even went into business themselves, with the University of Minnesota operating its own mine and New York University running a macaroni factory. For more see Eyal Press and Jennifer Washburn, "Secrecy and Science," The Atlantic Monthly, March, 2000.

¹ ". . . interest in their reports." Sheldon Krimsky says that the culture and values of academic science have changed radically over the last quarter-century. University science is now entangled with entrepreneurship, and researchers with a commercial interest are caught in an ethical quandary. Sheldon Krimsky, Science in the Private Interest (Boston: Rowen and Littlefield Publishers, 2005). Although Krimsky does not believe that the mere existence of such ties makes an academic study suspect, he advocates full disclosure. Yet in none of the nearly 300 studies in which Krimsky found a conflict of interest were readers informed about it. Also see Michael McCarthy, an editor at the British medical journal The Lancet who says such university links to markets are so common that he often cannot find anyone who does not have a financial interest in a drug or therapy that the journal would like to review. The Securities and Exchange Commission has also detected this trend and is now investigating numerous academic researchers suspected of engaging in insider trading. In a case filed recently in Pennsylvania, the SEC charged Dale J. Lange, a Columbia University neurologist, with pocketing \$26,000 in profits after Lange bought stock in a company that was about to release promising new findings concerning a drug to treat Lou Gehrig's disease. Lange expected the stock to soar because he had conducted the confidential clinical trials.

^{li} ". . . delays are standard." Berkeley's contract with Novartis, for example, allows the company to postpone publication for up to four months. A survey of 210 life-science companies, conducted in 1994 by researchers at Massachusetts General Hospital, found that 58

percent of those sponsoring academic research require delays of more than six months before publication. “One of the most basic tenets of science is that we share information in an open way,” says Steven Rosenberg, of the National Cancer Institute, who is among the country’s leading cancer researchers. “As biotech and pharmaceutical companies have become more involved in funding research, there’s been a shift toward confidentiality that is severely inhibiting the interchange of information.” A few years ago Rosenberg confronted this problem firsthand when he tried to obtain information on safe-dosage levels for a reagent he sought to use in a clinical trial involving an experimental cancer treatment. The company asked Rosenberg to sign a confidentiality agreement, and when he refused, they withheld the information. Rosenberg has become so alarmed about secrecy that he now urges all scientists and research institutions to reject confidentiality restrictions on principle. Few have heeded his call. A 1997 survey of 2,167 university scientists, which appeared in the *Journal of the American Medical Association*, revealed that nearly one in five had delayed publication for more than six months to protect proprietary information—and this was the number that admitted to delay. “The ethics of business and the ethics of science do not mix well,” Rosenberg says. “This is the real dark side of science.”

^{lii} “. . . for its own sake.” Lears goes on to argue that the drive to enhance productivity is most apparent in the effort of colleges and universities to get part-time and temporary employees who do not require expensive benefits packages. The adoption of this corporate tactic has transformed the status of the faculty. Temporary faculties have no reason to develop long-term relationships with students or to acquaint themselves with the enduring goals of the university. In the past, freedom from market pressures allowed the university to fund the kind of research that had no immediate commercial application, but ultimately led to unexpected rewards. He describes how in 1994, Educause, a consortium of 1,600 academic institutions and 150 corporations produced a "national learning infrastructure" initiative as a study of what professors do, breaking down the discrete functions that could be automated or outsourced for "productivity enhancement." In the university, as in the corporation, information technology is a

means of controlling budgets. Lears insists that business and Internet technology now manage the university. “Cybermania” is an attempt to substitute technology for human interchange in the classroom. Any use of computers that undermines face-to-face contact is for Lears potentially destructive to education. The enthusiasm of administrators for distance learning is part of a long-term strategy to contain labor costs in the academy, but that’s not all. Jackson Lears, “The Radicalism of Tradition: Teaching the Liberal Arts in a Managerial Age, in *Hedgehog Review*, What’s a University For?” Fall, 2000.

^{liii} “. . . to \$27,516.” “Tuition Costs, H & R Block,” www.hrblock.com/index.html.

^{liv} “. . . breach ethical boundaries.” Big money is pouring into science departments, especially neuroscience and the biological sciences, which attract money from federal agencies, foundations, alumni, and philanthropists. This trend has led to a more decentralized university in which departments and schools have large budgets that operate virtually like separate institutions. Smaller schools in a university, like education and divinity, have budgets and endowments far below others on campus. The moneyed programs contribute directly to the university's bottom line.

Warren Bennis and Hallam Movius, “Why Harvard Is So Hard to Lead,” *The Chronicle of Higher Education*, March 8, 2006. Hallam Movius is director of assessment, coaching, and training at the Consensus Building Institute in Cambridge, MA, a nonprofit organization that helps groups negotiate more-effective agreements.

^{lv} “. . . the world at large.” For example, departments of political science, institutes of public affairs, and international centers provide training skills for government, but equally they stand apart; faculties consult, teach, and do research on governments and teach about governing systems that have developed down through history. At best, government does not rule universities. Similarly, university departments of economics and schools of management teach skills in finance and economic values, but they also stand apart from markets and study them on the basis of their own core values. Nor are universities religious organizations (churches,

temples, synagogues, or mosques); rather, they study religions and teach about religious subjects expecting that students will learn how to participate effectively in religious organizations.