



The World's Largest Open Access Agricultural & Applied Economics Digital Library

This document is discoverable and free to researchers across the globe due to the work of AgEcon Search.

Help ensure our sustainability.

Give to AgEcon Search

AgEcon Search

<http://ageconsearch.umn.edu>

aesearch@umn.edu

*Papers downloaded from **AgEcon Search** may be used for non-commercial purposes and personal study only. No other use, including posting to another Internet site, is permitted without permission from the copyright owner (not AgEcon Search), or as allowed under the provisions of Fair Use, U.S. Copyright Act, Title 17 U.S.C.*

No endorsement of AgEcon Search or its fundraising activities by the author(s) of the following work or their employer(s) is intended or implied.

Western Agricultural
Economics Association.

Proceedings.



WESTERN AGRICULTURAL ECONOMICS ASSOCIATION



PROCEEDINGS 1970

Forty-Third Annual Meeting
July 19-22, 1970
RAMADA INN
TUCSON, ARIZONA



THE UNIVERSITY IN THE CONTEMPORARY SOCIETY¹

Emery N. Castle
Oregon State University

The main objective of this paper is to provide encouragement for everyone who needs it to reason through events that have occurred within the past twelve months on the campus with which each is most familiar. No university will ever be quite the same again after these past five years. Even those that have been relatively quiet pose an intellectual challenge. If they have escaped conflict, is this because of their strength, or because they fail to reflect fundamental stresses that emanate from the larger society? In this paper the following is attempted:

1. To state the paradox facing higher education as identified by Trow (16). This paradox is then viewed from the vantage point of the economic concept of product mix.

Beyond this, the issues of value judgments, degrees of knowledge and academic freedom are discussed.

2. To deal with the issues of governance and decision-making and to note contradictory trends in this connection.

Superficially, it might appear that the universities have responded to the current challenge with great vigor. Many universities have committees, commissions, or boards evaluating their goals, performance, practices, and operations (for examples, see 1, 15). Given a reasonable amount of social stability, the weight of evidence would suggest that much improvement will come from these efforts. As one reads these volumes, one cannot help but wonder if the really fundamental issues are being identified. If the right issues are being identified one should be able to predict, or at least to understand in retrospect, contemporary events on campuses on the basis of these many reports. I, for one, am not able to do this.

THE HIGHER EDUCATION PARADOX

The paradox which constitutes the focal point of discussion for this section of the paper is an old issue. It was faced squarely and decided early in the history of this nation. Robert Hutchins confronted the University of Chicago with the dilemma and forced it to make a hard choice. In the contemporary setting, the issue arises again, but conditions have changed and the best choice a century ago, or three decades ago, is not necessarily the best choice today.

The best recent statement of the paradox which I have found is an article by Martin Trow in the Winter 1970 issue of *Daedalus* entitled "Reflections on the Transition from Mass to Universal Higher Education" (16). I make considerable use of the dichotomy set forth by Trow because I believe it has relevance to the land-grant universities and to any university or college that is involved in mass higher education. By the use of Trow's own words, perhaps the paradox can be presented most efficiently.

"At the heart of the traditional university is its commitment to the transmission of high culture, the possession of which has been thought to make men truly civilized. --- Closely related to this, and certainly central to our conception of liberal education, is the shaping of mind and character; the cultivation of aesthetic sensibilities, broad human sympathies, and the capacity for critical and independent judgment. The second autonomous function of the American university is the creation of new knowledge through 'pure' scholarship and basic scientific research. Third, is the selection, formation, and certification of elite groups; the learned professions, the higher civil service, the politicians, and (though less in Britain than in the United States and on the Continent) the commercial and industrial leadership. The functions involve values and standards that are institutionalized in the universities and the elite private colleges, and are maintained by them autonomously and even in resistance to popular demands and sentiments.

"The popular functions fall into two general categories. First, there is a commitment on the part of the American system as a whole to provide places somewhere for as many students as can

be encouraged to continue their education beyond high school. For a very long time, it has been believed in this country that talented youth of humble origins should go to college. But the extension of these expectations to all young men and women—that is, the transformation of a privilege into a right for all—dates no further back than World War II. In part, this nation is a reflection of the erosion of the legitimacy of class cultures and of the growing feeling in every industrial society, but most markedly in the United States that it is right and proper for all men to claim possession of the high culture of their own societies. --- We are now seeing what was a privilege that became a right transformed into something very near to an obligation for growing numbers of young men and women.

"If one popular function is the provision of mass higher education to nearly everybody who applies for it, the second is the provision of useful knowledge and service to every group and institution that wants it. The service orientation of American higher education is too well known to need discussion. But the demands on the universities for such service is increasing all the time. In part, they reflect the growth in knowledge base created by the scientific explosion of the past two decades. Not only is much of this new knowledge of potential value applied to industry, agriculture, and military, the health professions and so on, but also new areas of national life are coming to be seen as users of knowledge created by the university. We may know more about how to increase corn production than how to educate black children in our urban slums, but it is likely universities will shortly be as deeply involved in efforts to solve our urban and racial problems as ever they were in agriculture."

The land-grant universities were created in the popular tradition. Much the same can be said for many other public universities in this country, although unless stated otherwise, I will be discussing the land-grant universities. The land-grant universities were designed to provide an education for those who did not have the opportunity for education in the more classic tradition. The service aspect was later explicitly recognized by the funding of research and extension activity. Yet, the autonomous functions of the university were never completely absent from the land-grant universities. Certainly today the autonomous functions are attributed considerable importance. Indeed, academic prestige and status are often accorded in rather direct relationship to excellence in the performance of the autonomous functions.

Conflict and tension will inevitably result when a university tries to serve both traditions. The root question then is—under what circumstances will this tension and conflict become constructive and under what circumstances will it become destructive? A potentially destructive situation exists when the larger society is evaluating the university in terms of one tradition, but the University is pursuing another, or when members of the university community are in fundamental disagreement as to which function they are to serve. A constructive situation prevails when there is recognition of the potential inconsistency of the two traditions but a recognition also of the self-reinforcing nature of one to the other. Ideally, this recognition should prevail both within and outside the university. The worst kind of folly is to fail to recognize that the two functions are potentially competitive; this constitutes a violation of one of the most elementary principles of enterprise selection. What then are the arguments for and against the production of two products? In organizing and marshaling these arguments, we must look both within and outside the universities because both the production possibilities and the choice indicators are important. We will first treat the outside influence.²

The easy answer is to say that Americans expect both products from higher education. It is obvious they expect the popular functions as they have been willing to tax themselves for these services. It is not so clear that Americans are as enthusiastic about the autonomous functions. However, the greatest prestige seems to reside with those educational institutions that are the best recognized for the excellence with which they perform the autonomous functions. The evidence suggests further that our values are such that we prefer to leave the autonomous functions more to the private colleges and universities, but that relatively greater weight is given to the popular functions by the public universities (16). We proceed on the assumption that both functions have utility to the larger society and carry a positive shadow price.

To obtain a more precise concept of what might constitute a desirable mix, one must also look within the universities. At the outset, we recognize that the performance of both functions does not mean that both will be

emphasized by every institution to the same extent. One might expect to find, as indeed one does, different degrees of emphasis as one moves from the community colleges to the more elite private institutions. Yet, the large universities, both private and public, strive for both products. Will they have to make a choice or does the production possibility function and the choice indicators suggest they should continue to try to do both?³

In the article referred to earlier, Trow argues that the University of California at Berkely should attempt to emphasize the autonomous functions (16). He believes the dangers are tremendous if the popular service function is embarked upon. He believes the university will then become a pawn in the political arena. In other words, he believes the governing structure will be affected to the point where the autonomous functions cannot be performed.

Yet, we cannot turn back the clock. I believe the large public universities are irrevocably committed to the popular functions of mass education and service. If they are to sacrifice something, it will be their autonomous functions. If the universities are to become "pure" universities in the sense of emphasizing only the autonomous functions, we will have to start over. Both the internal power structure, as well as the inter-connections with the larger society are such that I cannot foresee the abandonment of the popular functions (10).

Will the universities go to the extreme of giving emphasis only to the popular functions? It is conceivable the universities will attempt to be so responsive to popular demands that the academic traditions associated with the autonomous functions will be sacrificed. Indeed, if only the popular functions are emphasized, there would be little need for some of the academic traditions that exist. We, for example, could expect academic freedom, as it is currently being exercised, to be changed considerably.

One of the real myths of higher education is the notion that it is the land-grant universities that do applied research and service while the other large universities, public and private, are concerned mainly with the autonomous functions. Such a conclusion is in the nature of a gross over-simplification. There is some evidence that John Kennedy tended to view Harvard University as his personal extension service. The National Science Foundation's current emphasis on "applied" and interdisciplinary research is not so much a shift from basic to applied, as it is recognition that social problems are changing and that a different kind of research is needed if tax dollars are to continue to be extracted for this purpose. The scientific workers may believe we have shifted from basic to applied research, but I am not so sure those who are providing the funding, or those whose principal function is to obtain funding, are so deluded. The problems of the "Land-Grant Universities" are a part of the total policy issue facing higher education in the United States.

If we cannot, and will not, shed ourselves of the popular service function, can we escape the inherent dangers that may result in our becoming a tool of the ruling group or being destroyed in our efforts to prevent this from happening? The answer will depend in part, but not entirely, on the policies and procedures of institutions of higher education during this crisis period.

The Values Inherent in Choice of Project

One of the most tragic losses in some university situations is an apparent abandonment of objectivity as an ideal (2). There are many pitfalls inherent in the concept of objectivity. There is no such thing as pure objectivity in practice, but it can be defined in principle and used as an ideal. A more powerful enemy of objectivity is the notion that administrators of educational institutions and scientists do not, or should not, make value judgments. When a research or an educational project is chosen, there are inevitable social consequences. These consequences are value loaded. To ignore these consequences, or to suggest that such choices do not have value implications, is most irresponsible. Whether such value choices are made within or outside the university, or by some interaction of the two, is a question of the degree of direction by society of the university. But when university people make these choices, they should 1) be aware of the value implications, 2) accept responsibility for their decisions, and 3) communicate with the larger community regarding the probable consequences of the application of research findings.

Scientific objectivity is something very different (4). It can be defined in terms of the method of inquiry and may serve as an ideal. When an area of investigation is such that replication and verification are difficult, objectivity as a guide to scholarship and inquiry is more important than when these procedures can be followed easily. Under such circumstances, a dishonest or biased scientist will be exposed easily by his colleagues. I suggest, therefore,

that as we move more in the direction of interdisciplinary and applied research, that greater, rather than less emphasis be placed on 1) the philosophical base of research methodology, and 2) the social consequence of the application of research results. If we emphasize these features in our graduate education, the result will be better scientists who will also be more "relevant".

Degree of Knowledge

One contributor to the crisis of confidence regarding the scientific community has been the failure of scientists to communicate with the public regarding the indirect or second and third round effects of the application of that knowledge. In many instances, the actual effect was and is still not known, but even the theoretical possibilities have not been discussed at all thoroughly. At the present time the university community is being asked to give attention to some of our most severe social problems. Yet, it is a rare social science which has been able to pose hypotheses which are capable of being refuted. Under these circumstances, we not only run the risk of being wrong and causing harm, we also run the risk of a loss of confidence in everything we do. By our silence we often imply that we can do that which we cannot, and then accept funds with the implied promise that we will obtain useful results. Administrators need not apologize for accepting funds for high risk projects, but there are two types of uncertainty they should identify: 1) that which is related to project results, and 2) that which is related to the consequences resulting from the application of knowledge. Given the massive nature of the social problems we are currently being asked to tackle, the rudimentary nature of our knowledge, and the level of funding being contemplated, it would appear that there is plenty of room for some words of caution to be expressed.

Academic Freedom and Institutional Neutrality

When both the popular and autonomous functions of the university are embraced, there will always be an uneasy tension between social responsiveness and academic freedom. The choice of projects becomes a joint responsibility, but the freedom of the academic person to choose the methods of investigation, to test, and to publish is essential to investigative integrity. This becomes complicated by an additional issue. If the institution, as an institution, becomes committed to a position on public issues, the risk is run of a loss of public confidence and the threat to academic freedom is great indeed. Professional schools, in particular, must avoid being captured by an industry or a profession. If they become the tool of an interest group, their research and their teaching will not be taken seriously; the correlary is that those scholars committed to the academic tradition will find such an atmosphere to be hostile (13).

It would be the worst kind of academic myopia to assume that threats to academic freedom always come from outside the university and from those who wish to maintain the status quo. Those of us who have the closest contact with the popular functions of the university and tend to be associated with particular industry groups should be alert to this threat. Yet, examples abound where academic people have become so committed to the objective of social change that any evidence supporting stability or the status quo is not admitted. The academic community will rise in wrath if a far-left speaker is denied a platform on a university campus. Yet, they remain strangely silent when a program is structured to give a particular point of view or when a person of conservative views is not permitted to speak in public meetings. I have heard experienced and respected public servants say they believe, at the present time, there is a more sincere searching for evidence on controversial issues in public meetings off than on campus. While I do not have sufficient information to reach a conclusion, it is an open question in my mind as to whether the greatest current threat to academic freedom comes from off-campus or from within the academic community itself.⁴

The above items are certainly not exhaustive. Nevertheless, it would be most helpful to harried administrators and concerned citizens who are committed to both the autonomous and popular functioning for someone to develop the implications of alternative decisions. Only by doing so can we begin to isolate choice indicators and production possibilities. If this is done, we can begin to appreciate the effect of sacrificing some of the autonomous (popular) function to acquire more of the popular (autonomous) function.

GOVERNANCE AND DECISION-MAKING

The tools of the economist have direct application to issues of product mix and level of output. Social psychology and political science are relevant disciplines to problems of governance and decision-making, but to the extent

that economics is a behavioral science, it also is involved.

The question of participation must be related to three issues: 1) the effect on what, as well as how much, is learned, 2) the impact on motivation, and 3) preparation for citizenship.⁵ The above are not mutually exclusive, but have distinctly different facets. As each is discussed, the costs and benefits of the delegation of decision-making should be kept in mind. People tend to delegate when:

- 1) the decision is of lesser consequence,
- 2) the smaller their impact on the outcome from participation.
- 3) they have greater confidence in those to whom they delegate.
- 4) there tends to be greater advantage to specialization and division of labor. The more complex the issue, the greater the tendency to delegate to the "expert".

Participation and Learning Motivation

A hypothesis may be advanced concerning college and university age youth to the effect that their motivation in learning is related to the degree of participation they experience in the learning process, as well as in what is to be learned. Both Whitehead and Dewey advanced this notion long ago (6, 17). Nevertheless, there probably has been a change as to the way this has been manifested on the college and university campuses. It has been true in the past that the possession of a degree provides an entry into certain occupations. A degree was also a measure of prestige and status. Under such circumstances the motivation may not have been so much to learn as it was to accomplish a particular goal to which learning, or at least passing a course was necessary. The cry for "relevance" may stem, in part, from this change.

This poses a dilemma in present day pedagogy. It is highly desirable for every teacher to examine and be able to explain why he teaches what he teaches. This is true even when the principal end product is learning for the joy of learning. Clearly, it is most inefficient for every teacher to involve every student on every item to be covered. Incentives need to be adjusted to the new situation. For example, pass-fail course grades with greater emphasis on comprehensive examinations over several courses provides a different learning incentive than does the existing system in most American universities.

Participation and Confidence

At the risk of being viewed as being hopelessly naive, I believe much of the present concern being manifested in our society is a reflection of a lack of confidence and trust among groups. On the university campus, one finds the full range. Some have dedicated themselves to a course which prevents the kind of activity that would ever permit confidence to be established. At the other extreme, there are students who are quite happy to accept as gospel that which is proclaimed by the authority. Most students fall someplace in between. Many faculty and administrators favor student participation in decision-making because they believe in reason and believe that such participation will restore confidence in the educational process. They may also believe students possess unique information and that the quality of decision-making will improve if they are involved.⁶

The joint student-faculty committee has become increasingly popular. One measure of progressiveness of an institution is the number of such committees that are in existence. Yet, it is a most gross approximation to assume students and faculty are equals in every respect. Surely we need a broader viewpoint.

If the objective of student participation is to restore confidence, the greatest impact would occur with the more important and delicate issues. These are usually found at the university-wide level. Because power has been diffused and decision-making fragmented on most campuses, progress is usually the slowest and the most difficult to observe at this level. On the other hand, at the Departmental or living group level, individual impact and change can be more easily observed. It is my observation that the more "active" students attempt to operate at the total university level where the frustrations and disappointments are likely to be the greatest.

If the above analysis is correct, there are two minor, but perhaps pragmatic, suggestions that result: 1) Student participation should occur at many levels of university governance. Participation should exist on issues of varying importance, as well as with issues that vary with respect to the impact of individual participation. 2) While joint student-faculty expression undoubtedly are desirable, it may also be desirable in other instances to keep the student viewpoint distinct.

Participation and Citizenship

At a recent conference with students, faculty, and administration, the following questions were raised:

"At some point, higher education may have to decide on the basic purpose of university governance. Or, is governance itself an integral part of the educational process? To pose the issue another way --- Is democracy the most effective way of achieving educational goals and objectives, or is democracy, in some sense, an end in itself?" (5)

If, as I suspect, a considerable amount of democracy is consistent with motivation in learning and in establishing mutual confidence which, in turn, is essential to the educational process, then students will have practice in democratic participation. If this is not the case, democracy is not the best means to the educational end. We should practice democracy to the extent that it enhances motivation to learn and establishes confidence in educational procedures; we should not be democratic for the sake of teaching citizenship.

While there is much discussion about and undoubtedly greater participation by students and faculty in decision-making, there are two notable exceptions to this apparent trend. One exception is in the classroom. Here the instructor reigns supreme. In the name of academic freedom, he is generally free to teach what he pleases, and is usually rewarded on the basis of criteria not directly related to classroom performance. To my knowledge, no other profession enjoys the autonomy to the same extent as does the college and university teacher.⁷

The other exception is the trend toward centralization with respect to the control of financial resources. This audience is quite familiar with PPBS and it is not necessary to recount the details of this procedure here. Suffice it to say that this tool and all it represents tends to strengthen the power of the central authority. There is a real inconsistency in greater participation in some spheres while going in the opposite direction with respect to financial management and, at the same time, putting what goes on in the classroom completely off-limits. It is an open question as to whether such contradictory policies can, in the long run, continue to exist side by side.

We are now witnessing the result of this by administrators finding themselves in an impossible situation. On the one hand, they grant greater participation to students and faculty; on the other hand, the public generally is demanding greater accountability. In such an atmosphere, I cannot be optimistic about professional autonomy. Internal reform may help, but it may not be sufficient. Frankly, I doubt that it will be, and expect that university administration will be strengthened. But, the arbitrary decisions of university Deans and Presidents are more to my liking than the arbitrary decisions of Regents and Legislators.

IN CONCLUSION

The current confused university scene may be better understood if we appreciate the constant tension in the large public universities between the autonomous and the popular functions. In this paper we have argued that the large public universities have passed the point of no return with respect to the popular function. They cannot sacrifice this without completely changing their nature. If, however, they completely sacrifice their autonomous function, our society will have lost one of its principal sources of insight and self-evaluation.

Our success in retaining both functions will depend, in part, upon:

1. Our self-discipline
 - a) in clarifying these two issues for the public generally,
 - b) being candid with respect to the prospects for success of our service work,

- c) indicating the uncertainty associated with the application of results,
 - d) retaining an open academic community so there is no intimidation from within the academic community to the search for truth and the examination of issues.
2. Keeping decision-making decentralized within the university providing, of course, that those who need to make decisions actually make them. The failure of universities in this respect are too apparent to need amplification. Decentralization will continue only if all segments of the university recognize the dual responsibility of the university, although all segments of the university will not necessarily concentrate on both functions.
 3. Design decision-units within the university that will provide for:
 - a) the establishment and maintenance of confidence,
 - b) motivation to learn, discover, and disseminate, and,
 - c) to the extent consistent with a) and b), prepare the student for participation in group decision-making upon leaving the university.

FOOTNOTES

1. Paper presented to the Western Agricultural Economics Association, Tucson, Arizona, July 19-22, 1970. This paper is a direct outgrowth of one year's service on the President's Commission on University Goals, Oregon State University. It is impossible to identify the source of all the ideas and material presented herein. Much of the material presented is the result of extended conversations with my two colleagues, Dr. James Knudsen, Assistant Dean of Engineering, and Dr. Warren Hovland, Chairman of the Department of Religious Studies, Oregon State University. I am also indebted to the following for penetrating comments on an earlier draft of this paper: John Edwards, Herbert Stoevener, Richard Johnston, and Frank Conklin.
2. A more rigorous statement would give explicit recognition to the fact that an educational effort is seldom completely autonomous. That is, it is designed to satisfy some clientele and is never completely independent of some outside influence. By the same token, "useful" and "popular" educational functions will almost always have by-products comparable to what Trow classified as the output of the autonomous educational functions. Certainly the tools of the economist help us to understand that the extremes would be exceedingly difficult, if not impossible, to attain in practice and that the "relevant range" really involves the relative emphasis that is placed on the two functions. I have chosen to remain with the Trow terminology because I believe it is sufficiently precise to permit the treatment of the issues I wish to discuss.
3. One might define products differently (say) as teaching, research, and service. Much discussion has occurred recently to the effect that the real enemy of good teaching is research. Trow points out that both the far left and the far right are united on this issue and believe that if research were eliminated, student unrest would tend to disappear. This subject is of sufficient importance to be examined in depth; I have chosen to focus this paper on other issues. Nevertheless, I believe this is too naive a view of the cause of student unrest. Furthermore, while the evidence is quite sparse, such as is available gives little support to the contention that research is the enemy of teaching that it is frequently assumed to be. In addition, student unrest exists in college and university settings where there is little research.
4. Relative to the autonomous and popular functions, it is not clear to me that social change should be an educational objective, although it is an obvious result of education. It is clear that the performance of either the autonomous or the popular function of education will result in social change. Inconsistent value systems, inefficient social institutions, and unapplied knowledge are all legitimate subjects for classroom and research analysis. Yet, that is very different from a commitment of an educational institution to change, per se. If this, or any other non-educational objective becomes paramount, it is not surprising if the ideals of objectivity and the pursuit of truth suffer.

My colleague, Warren Hovland, has asked "Does the university every properly take a public stand on a public

issue?" The question poses an exceedingly difficult dilemma. When it does, it may expect a reprisal from some segment of society and the prospect of loss of autonomy. On the other hand, when the consequences of a particular policy choice is judged to be disastrous to the future of the society of which the university is a part, there the cost of remaining silent may also be very great. The best I can do with the dilemma is to say one simply has to judge which course of action carries the greatest cost and then choose. If this line of argument is accepted, it follows that a public stance on issue is indeed rare, but is not precluded. It should be noted that a university is not a single organism and that a judgment as to whether a particular policy is likely to be "disastrous" is indeed dangerous and difficult.

5. Most of this discussion was written relative to student participation. Space and time limitations prevent a treatment of faculty-administration governance tensions. Of course, many of the same principles apply.
6. If the only issue is one of information, students may be persuaded or permitted to provide such information without actual involvement in the decision process.
7. An analogous situation exists on some campuses with respect to the individual project leader. It is not unheard of for a Department to operate by the most formal procedures which guarantee faculty participation or faculty control of all important policies and decisions, especially as these affect personnel. Yet the Chairman of such a Department may preside over a number of professors who rule supreme in the classroom and who administer their research grants and the people working on the grants as virtual dictators and with very few guidelines.

REFERENCES

1. Aims and Goals of the California Institute of Technology, Volumes I-VIII. Pasadena, California, 1969.
2. Bruker, Herbert. "What's Wrong with Objectivity?" *Saturday Review*. October 11, 1969, p. 77.
3. Buchanan, James M. and Nicos E. Devletoglou. *Academia in Anarchy: An Economic Diagnosis*. Basic Books, Inc., New York, NY, 1970.
4. Castle, Emery N. "On Scientific Objectivity." *American Journal of Agricultural Economics*, Vol. 50, No. 4, pg. 809, November 1968.
5. Castle, Emery N. "Where Are We Now? Why Are We Concerned? The Administration and the Larger Community." Conference on University Goals, Cottage Grove, Oregon, April 11-12, 1970.
6. Dewey, John. *Democracy and Education: An Introduction to the Philosophy of Education*. The MacMillan Company, New York, 1916.
7. Gardner, John W. *Excellence*. Harper and Row, New York, 1961.
8. Gardner, John W. *Self-Renewal*. Harper and Row, New York, 1963.
9. Gardner, John W. *No Easy Victories*. Harper and Row, New York, 1968.
10. Goodman, Paul. *The Community of Scholars*. Random House, New York, 1962.
11. Machlup, Fritz. "In Defense of Academic Tenure." *AAUP Bulletin*, June 1964, p. 112.
12. McConnell, T.R. "Faculty Interests in Value Change and Power Conflict." *Value Change and Power Conflict in Higher Education*. Western Interstate Commission on Higher Education, Boulder, Colorado. October 1969.
13. Nadar, Ralph. "Law Schools and Law Firms." *The New Republic*. October 11, 1969, p. 20.

14. Potter, Paul. "Student Discontent and Campus Reform." *Order and Freedom on the Campus: The Rights and Responsibilities of Faculty and Students*. Proceedings of the Seventh Annual Institute on College Self-Study for College and University Administrators. Western Interstate Commission for Higher Education. Boulder, Colorado, October 1965.
15. *The Study of Education at Stanford*. Report to the University, Volume I-X. Stanford, California, 1968.
16. Trow, Martin. "Reflections on the Transition from Mass to Universal Higher Education." *Daedalus*. Winter, 1970.
17. Whitehead, Alfred North. *The Aims of Education and Other Essays*. Williams & Norgate, London, 1932.

THE UNIVERSITY IN THE CONTEMPORARY SOCIETY: DISCUSSION

Arnold B. Larson
University of Hawaii, and Visiting Scholar, Stanford University

I decided to approach the assignment of discussing this provocative paper by adhering strictly to three basic guiding principles:

- 1) I would stick to the issues and topics explicitly raised by the paper. After all, everyone has pet ideas on the general subject, and it would not be fair for me to distort my assignment to permit my unloading mine on you in your present semi-captive state.
- 2) I would react insofar as possible in terms of my own experiences as a student and faculty member at public and private universities, and avoid unsupported (and unsupportable) generalities.
- 3) I would make very sure that I unload at least my most **cherished** pet ideas about universities, whether or not they relate to this paper or to my presumed area of competence.

With the ground rules clearly established, then, let me proceed to my observations.

THE CONFRONTATION

An underlying theme, or a basic premise, of Professor Castle's paper, as I understand it, is that the events of recent years, such as the Kent State killings and the Jackson State killings, the sit-ins, teach-ins, and love-ins, the demands by students and by others not in authority that people such as college Deans and Presidents who, at least by ancient standards, are in authority, exert themselves to end the war, end poverty, end racial injustice, end urban blight, end repression and intolerance and lack of love—all of these events and all of these demands have forced upon colleges and universities an agonized and agonizing reappraisal of their role in society. I suppose that, as a practical matter, this is so. But while the deplorable violence and destruction might impart a sense of urgency, and while the withdrawal of expected financial support because of campus disorders, as happened in California this year, may inject new reasons to act, I submit that there has been no fundamental change in the proper role of the university nor in its need for self-examination. What is a good university today would have been a good one yesterday, and will be a good one tomorrow. Violence, or the threat of violence, is not so new, and its message in the present instance is not so clear that I am willing to have it fundamentally alter my thinking on what universities ought to be and what they ought to do.

By the same token, I am unwilling (and unable) to rank universities and university Presidents in terms of how they have fared in the recent wave of campus disorders, of which I fear we have not heard the last.

I might inject parenthetically that you may have noticed that I did not include the population explosion or ecology in my list of campus grievances. This is partly because I think that these complaints come largely from another quarter, but, more significantly, I have little sympathy with "environmentalists" who seem to give equal importance to smog (a real evil, but really part of the city fiasco) and the plight of an endangered species such as the black-footed ferret (which is not a real evil). Also, I deny that people are the ultimate pollutant on earth! I distrust the judgment of the Chicken Littles who tell us that the sky is falling. It isn't falling, it's just a little lower and thicker.

On the other hand, I think urban blight is really bad! In my four-year-old son's version of "Farmer in the Dell," the Rat takes the Child! And we live in a fairly nice part of town.

The student demands are not very new, except in detail. "Get Out of Cambodia" is but a variant of "Live in Peace"! Indeed, I sense a remarkable similarity between the entire list of current student demands and the platform of the Socialist Norman Thomas, who, incidentally, was always very popular on college campuses. The tactics the students are using are likewise not new, but their use is more widespread. I deplore the fact (as it seems to me) that

more attention seems to be focused on placating the students than on considering their demands. I also regret that the students spend so much of their time demonstrating and so little time explaining the reasons for their demands. For example, I feel sure that the real difference of opinion on Vietnam centers on the need to combat Communism. Yet this issue is seldom joined in public debate, largely, I think, from a fear of Neo-McCarthyism. We can't discuss Communism calmly without being suspected of being sympathizers. Nevertheless, I feel that the students may yet serve as a catalyst of change, nor can I escape the conclusion that, basically, the students are right!

If student protest has as its purpose the reshaping of society and of national goals (as I have suggested), why has so much of the protest been directed at the universities themselves? I'm sure many university Presidents must have thought bitterly "What can I do about Cambodia"? Is it, as some people have said, that the students are spoiled brats lashing out in a temper tantrum at the nearest object? Or is it just that they are appalled at the calm and prosperity and the beauty of the typical campus in contrast to the urban blight, the racial oppression, and the horrible war in Indochina that form the nexus of their real concern? These may be factors, but I think Professor Castle is right in saying, or at least intimating, that the real reason students are demonstrating against the universities is that they are dissatisfied with what the universities do and with how they are run. I agree with much of what Castle says on these two points, and find his views, if anything, too sober and well-balanced. As I said before, I found the paper provocative, and the thing that provoked me most was that Castle does not show in concrete terms what he thinks a good university should be like. I want to fill this gap, to some extent, by a few random remarks of my own.

First, let us consider the "paradox" of accommodating "autonomous" and "popular" functions in the university. I didn't find these *Daedalus* terms particularly congenial, but I guess I figured out what was meant by them. For my part, I think that scholarship validates teaching, and that continuing intellectual growth via study and research is absolutely vital to making classroom lectures worthwhile. I also think that scholarship and the capacity for intellectual growth are vital to good applied research. The autonomous and popular functions of the university are paralleled by the professional (or self-directed) and the institutional (or outwardly-directed) lives of each professor, and very little specialization of function is possible. Giving professors time to pursue their own interests is a necessary part of the price of their services. As a consequence of these opinions, I feel that the compatibility, or lack thereof, of autonomous and popular functions is largely a synthetic issue. It is more likely to be a public relations matter than a crucial element in planning the course of university affairs.

I suppose there are ways in which a university can alter its product mix by administrative action (or from "above," as it is laughingly called). For instance, one can establish a "Center." Out in Hawaii we have an East-West Center which I feel has done a great deal of good for our university. But there also is needed a North-South Center, a Left-Right Center, an Up-Down Center for the physical scientists, and an In-Out Center for semanticists. Why none of these has been formed is beyond me! There are other ways in which a university can, by conscious direction, alter its posture. For instance, it can try to grow its own Nobel Laureates, rather than raiding other institutions for them. It can televise all football and basketball games for the benefit of the tax-payers who support the university. But, basically, the product mix is in the hands of the faculty, or at least I would hope so.

HOW TO RUN A UNIVERSITY

Could anyone be presumptuous enough to tell other people how to run a university if he hasn't done it himself? Well—yes, I would be glad to do so.

In the first place, you don't run a university by pretending to give students a voice in government (I can't bring myself to utter the word "governance"!). For one thing, it must strike everyone involved as an insincere and cynical attempt to placate the students without really dealing with their complaints. But more fundamentally, it's undignified.

I would not give a nickel for a university president who didn't arrogate to himself every bit of authority he could manage. His actions are sufficiently circumscribed by the very nature of his job, as it is.

I would be among the last to claim that being a "taxpayer" confers any special rights on man—indeed, I doubt that anyone really knows who "pays" the taxes in our present society. But I do think that society, as a whole, should have its interests represented by a board of regents or trustees with broad powers of securing financial support

and directing the patterns of expenditure. If the faculty aren't a bunch of sheep, they will always be firmly in charge of the real intellectual life of the university anyway, as surely everyone must realize. Whether the board of regents should include plumbers and cowboys, or be composed exclusively of oil millionaires, should depend primarily on who can contribute most to an understanding of how a university should function. I reject the proposition that only a plumber can represent the views and interests of plumbers; at the same time I question the idea that oil millionaires are especially adroit at representing all of us.

As a final point, I would like to suggest that it is a mistake to set the university up as the last stronghold of truth, beauty, and goodness. More especially, it is a mistake to insulate the university from reality by setting up endowment funds, by conferring an "academic" freedom not shared by carpenters and certified accountants, or by surrounding the institution with a mystique of putative excellence which is not to be challenged. Rather, the university should rest its case on doing its job reasonably well, in spite of human frailties, and this job is to educate the young and to sponsor scholarship.

THE UNIVERSITY IN CONTEMPORARY SOCIETY: SOME COMMENTS

John W. Malone, Jr.
University of Nevada Reno

Castle, in his paper, identifies two of the issues which he believes to be fundamental to conflict and tension on the university scene. These two issues revolve around the higher education paradox; that is, the conflict between the autonomous and the popular functions of the university and the subject of university governance.¹ It is apparent that the quest for maintaining or increasing the share of power in academic governance on the part of the various bodies or components involved in the functioning of the public university is an outgrowth of disagreement over the goals of the university and its role in society.² An increased share in academic governance would presumably lead to achievement of a stronger voice in changing or modifying ends or goals which may be in conflict. In my reaction to Castle's paper, I (1) will argue that divergent attitudes and values, especially at this period of time, threaten the autonomy of the university and their reconciliation is basic to the dilemma faced by higher education and (2) expand somewhat on Castle's treatment of academic governance in order to identify some of the problems that must be solved if autonomy with respect to internal affairs of the university is to be retained.

VALUES AND ATTITUDES

That differences in values and attitudes toward the ends of higher education and the role of the university in society exist between members of the university community is readily apparent whether one attends meeting of governing boards, faculty or student senates, administrators or some combination of these groups. Certainly, at a university one would expect to observe such differences. At a time when a high degree of conflict is occurring over the issues of individual and social values in our system, one might expect a deep cleavage between and within components of the university relative to agreement concerning the goals of the university and its role in society.

I would suggest that the model of "rationalism" and its critics who express opposing views concerning the individual's relationship to society and the approach to seeking knowledge is a factor contributing to the conflict between the autonomous and popular functions.³ Although these differences have persisted for a few hundred years, they take on meaning and significance during times of crises.

Critics of the "rationalistic" approach assert that it assumes a stable order and reduces human behavior to merely a rational response to the needs of the system. Opponents of the "rationalistic" model might say, "You may or may not be consciously supporting results for the political or social ends of a given system, but the effects are real."⁴ These critics would advocate going beyond the limits of any given system in order that social and individual values have priority over an established system. Finally, the critics of the "rationalistic" model might say, "Certainly the university and its intellectual resources have something to contribute relative to social conditions in the larger community. Your "rationalistic" model, whether you believe it or not, is perpetuating the established system, a system which is in dire need of change."

It is difficult to deny that there are individuals and groups who hold deep convictions at least with respect to elements of one or the other viewpoints described above.⁵ Aiken, in discussing the deep maladies in universities, states:

"In a larger sense the entire university is dominated by the baneful ideology of "rationalism" which puts a premium on the theoretical explanatory conception of knowledge and hence, automatically downgrades all form of understanding that does not conform to the model. The whole domain of meaning and value, recourse to which is indispensable for all practical reflections and decisions of policy is disposed of as something purely 'subjective,' 'emotional' of interest to scholars only for what it symptomizes. And teachers or students who concern themselves in depth with this side of life of mind are treated as pariahs who, lacking any proper objective subject matter and methodology, therefore have no proper place in institutions of higher learning."

Although threat to the autonomy of the university, and in particular to the university serving the popular functions, has always had to be considered as a real possibility, there is little doubt that it strongly exists today.

Autonomous and Popular Functions

Castle's evaluation of the conflict between the autonomous and the popular functions of the university lays a fertile ground for developing hypotheses concerning the future role of the university in our society. He suggests that both functions have a utility to society and that large public universities cannot escape the popular function. Divergent values and attitudes have indeed placed a strain upon Castle's "product mix and level of output decision" with respect to the autonomous and popular functions.

The land grant university has, for the most part, carried on the popular function and at the same time maintained a reasonable degree of autonomy over its internal affairs.⁶ It is remarkable, indeed, that with the tremendous effort in the popular functions of research and public service that the university has been openly involved in so few political and social issues which might have affected its autonomy.

A number of members of the public university community, especially outside the professional schools but not restricted solely to those outside these schools, have looked and continue to do so, upon the popular function with apprehension over its possible negative effect on the autonomy of the university. A good share of these individuals were trained in the traditional private university where autonomous functions reigned supreme. Yet today, there are members of the public university, a sizable portion of which are young faculty members from schools other than professional schools, but not entirely, who maintain that the university, traditionally an institution dominated by "rationalistic" ideology, should be actively engaged in social and political issues. The divergent views on the role of the university in political, social and moral issues are pointed up by the following quotations excerpted from the spring issue of A.A.U.P. (6). A proponent of institutional involvement states:

"There are occasions today when political and moral issues are so inextricably tangled with issues of educational policy that faculties are not only justified but indeed obligated to take positions."

An advocate of institutional neutrality remarks:

"Let a governing board, an administrator, or a collection of faculty pronounce judgment on a disputed political or moral question and a doctrinal orthodoxy is established."

Indeed, the tendency toward universal higher education has created problems relative to the autonomous functions of the university.⁷ Certainly, there are a considerable number of students, faculty and members of the other components of the university community who find fault with the "rationalistic" model which they believe assigns contemporary human values a secondary position relative to the "stable order" or "establishment." There is an element within this group, which advocates such policies as open admissions, along with elimination of grades and other performance comparisons. Such proposals are a rejection of the elitist tendencies perpetuated by classical rationalistic ideology. There are educational policies which must be resolved internal to the university, and if not, the threat to its autonomy from the larger society can become real indeed.

Granted that societal pressures are having a tremendous impact on the university campus, a good deal of the threat to the university's autonomy emanates from conflicting viewpoints within the institution. Those in the university community who do not recognize that individual social values deserve more recognition than has been the case, are contributing to dissension on the campus.

On the other hand, those elements of anti-"rationalistic" persuasion who would use the university as an agent for social and political change also pose a threat to the autonomy of the institution.⁸ Surely, there is room for different values and attitudes on the university campus where, of all places, divergent viewpoints should be subject to direction toward consolidating rather than disintegrating the university.

Academic Governance

The state legislature, along with the governor, is responsible for two areas of decision-making with respect to publicly supported institutions. These two areas include determining the overall structure of higher education in the state and setting the level of support for public higher education. All other policy decisions for public higher education must be the responsibility of those bodies which govern the institutions. A public university, if it is to maintain autonomy over its internal affairs, must face up to its problems of internal governance. Can today's university community with its divergent viewpoints concerning our value system come to agreement over the goals of the university and its role in society?

Trow (8) describes how the multiple functions of the university and the decentralization of academic decision-making has minimized the occasions for conflict involving educational values and philosophies. He goes on to say, however,

"But the events of the past few years have revealed basic weaknesses in the system which are in a sense the defeat of its virtues."

The existing governing bodies in the university are afflicted with short-comings as seen by the student and the faculty. As Castle indicates, there is a lack of confidence and trust among groups and that the full range is found on the university campus (3). There are administrators and governing boards who give token expression to recommendations by faculty senates while there are some who have abdicated a good share of their authority and responsibility to a faculty. In some universities, the faculty senate or council is looked down upon as almost useless by a number of faculty; useless because it is powerless in many ways or, it is not necessary. Many professors would assert that their function is teaching, scholarly work and research and that as long as the administration and the governing board are providing the proper environment, there is no need to be involved in university-wide governance. Dykes (4), in a study related to faculty participation in university decision-making, reported that although a majority of faculty gave as a first reason, special competence, for their colleagues' participation in governance, the second reason cited was a discreditable motive; they were perceived to be attempting to compensate for incompetence in their own discipline. There are faculty who believe in participation in university governance, but assert that all too often deliberations are dominated by an atmosphere of politics between schools and colleges rather than studying and making recommendations for general educational policies of the university.

- If one thinks the above observations are not a glowing assessment of some faculty attitudes toward their role in governance, observations and comments relative to student senates are often no better. Many student critics of student government contend that its function is of little importance. When decisions of major importance are to be made, student government is not an effective body.

The governing board of the university is viewed by some students and faculty as representative of the system which they feel is not effective in dealing with humanitarian issues. Board members are thought of as being unknowledgeable about university affairs and, hence, incapable to make decisions concerning broad policy issues. Members of boards are often described as "absentee managers." University administration, since it is delegated the authority and responsibility of managing the institution by the board, is often considered as a tool of the system.

From this brief description, it is not difficult to grasp the problems confronting the governance of the university. As a result, the current emphasis on increasing the share of power by students and faculty in order to effect change has evolved. The difficult problem to solve, if it is agreed that existing conditions of governance are not satisfactory, is substitution of a workable replacement. The town-meeting approach has been virtually rejected, and the bicameral governing unit with a student senate and a faculty senate has been looked upon by many as ineffective. Unicameral units at some institutions have been established but have not been in operation long enough to assess the ability of such a body to overcome the deficiencies apparent in existing forms of governance.

Members of student bodies and of faculties have been concerned with how the bureaucratic nature of the university has "clogged" the lines of communication on issues pertaining to the mission of the university. It is claimed that information is not forthcoming which is necessary for them to form opinions on issues which are essential to their role in the university. Given such information, students and faculty want the opportunity to participate in

deliberations and make recommendations. Participation at this level of policy formulation is generally acceptable to the administration and governing board since it is recognized that such input is beneficial to the institution. Where the "going gets tough" is when students and faculty seek voting power on decisions heretofore recognized as being in the domain of the administration or the governing board. The same situation generally applies when students seek voting rights in matters that have been traditionally under the jurisdiction of the faculty. Even in those cases where a voting right is gained by one faction, additional pressure is applied by some in the attempt to attain an equal vote.

Governing boards of public institutions have been given the charge by the state through the legislative process to make decisions concerning the broad policy issues of the university. Boards are wary of university issues which may result in adverse reactions by the public which appointed or elected them. Some boards have performed effectively in defending the autonomy of the university. However, all too often this has not been the case. Given their charge by the larger society, governing boards are not prone to relinquishment of their power in decision-making to faculty and students. Some boards may be willing to grant "speaking seats" and in some cases a minority vote, but do not entertain thoughts relative to equal voting power.⁹ University administration is delegated authority and responsibility for management of institutions, and where the relationship between the two is one of trust and confidence, the administration tends to have considerable influence on the board. Under such circumstances, the potential for a significant degree of power by students and faculty on governing boards seems unlikely. The bypassing of the administration by students and faculty would appear to be an intolerable situation for an administration under the existing governance of the university community.

University faculties have responsibility and authority in the basic areas of curriculum, subject matter, methods of teaching and research and for those concerns of students related to the educational process. There are faculty who are disenchanted with the manner in which university goals are set and their resultant impact on the educational process and are seeking a greater role in the decision-making process. At the same time, faculty are being challenged in their areas of authority by students. Although a large number of faculty endorse student participation in areas reserved to the faculty, very few find equal voting rights for students to be an attractive arrangement. The university student has some legitimate concerns relative to the functioning of the university community. They have made gains, and rightly so, in matters pertaining to their social and personal lives while members of the university. Students are also concerned with the decision-making process in the university as it affects the goals of the university and its role in society.

What type of governing structure will be effective in the public university? Will a unicameral body be successful? After the gains achieved by faculty over the years in university governance and the more recent gains by students, will university governance revert back to an autocratic type, or even worse, as a result of the inability of the university community to effectively govern itself?

Certainly, such issues as war and racism and differing viewpoints concerning our value system have created a high degree of tension between and within components of the university. If the university is to reflect to the larger society the humanistic and scientific achievements of which its resources are capable, then it must subject itself to some type of internal reform; but beyond that, what can philosophers and social scientists tell us about understanding differences between values of people and resolving these differences which result in conflict? Increased participation by students and faculty through "the shaky" forms of governing units which now exist may work as a temporary measure, but is not sufficient to resolve confusion on the campus which threatens the loss of autonomy with respect to the internal affairs of the university. As Clark Kerr has remarked:

"Internal harmony is the price of autonomy and this price is not now being paid" (5).

FOOTNOTES

1. The autonomous functions include those activities and purposes the university defines for itself and the popular function includes those it takes on in response to external needs and demand (2).
2. The various bodies or components referred to include the state legislature, the governing board, the university administration, the faculty and students.

3. Some would affix the term "neo-romanticism" to those whose views differ from the "rationalistic" model. I declined to use this term since there are so many different notions as to what it means (2). Some would term the opposing viewpoints as scientific rationalism and humanistic rationalism.
4. The quotes in this paragraph reflect, in general, comments from various papers, speeches and discussions with those who hold such views.
5. Those interested in economic methodology will note some of the same basic differences when contrasting orthodox economic theory and institutional economics.
6. It is true, however, that as a result of the large expansion in public institutions of higher education and attendant increasing costs, policy decisions concerning size of institutions, facilities and overall budgets are being more tightly managed by state governments.
7. Some would argue that the issues related to universal post secondary higher education is a conflict between the principles of "meritocracy" and "egalitarianism" (10).
8. It has never been entirely clear to me how the university as an entity could speak out on a public issue. Within the university community it is almost inconceivable that on any public issue at least two viewpoints do not exist and usually there are many shades in between.
9. In the State of Nevada, members of the Board of Regents are elected by popular vote of its citizens. At least four University of Nevada students at Reno have filed for the two open positions this year. They have either convinced themselves or have been convinced by others that this is the best approach for gaining a role in university policy decisions or are well aware that the Board will not relinquish its authority.

REFERENCES

1. Aiken, Henry D., "How Late is It," *Value Change and Power Conflict in Higher Education*, Western Interstate Commission on Higher Education, Boulder, Colorado, October 1969, p. 37.
2. Barzun, Jaques, *Classic, Romantic and Modern*, Doubleday and Company, Inc., New York, 1961.
3. Castle, Emery N., "The University in Contemporary Society," A paper presented at the Western Agricultural Economics Association Meeting, Tucson, Arizona, July 1970.
4. Dykes, Archie, "Faculty Participation in Academic Decision Making," American Council on Education, Washington, 1968.
5. Kerr, Clark, "Governance and Functions," *Daedalus*, Winter 1970, p. 112.
6. Koster, Donald N., and Solberg, Winton V., Comments: "On Institutional Neutrality," *A.A.U.P. Bulletin*, Spring Issue, March 1970, p. 12.
7. Linowitz, Sol M., "Campus Tensions: Analysis and Recommendations," A Report of the Special Committee on Campus Tensions, Washington, D.C.
8. Trow, Martin, "Reflections on The Transition From Mass to Universal Higher Education," *Daedalus*, Winter 1970, p. 112.
9. Wilson, Logan, "Merit and Equality in Higher Education," *Educational Record*, Winter 1970.
10. Wilson, Logan, "Changing University Governance," *Educational Record*, Fall 1969.

CASTLE ON THE UNIVERSITY IN THE CONTEMPORARY SOCIETY: A REACTION¹

L.L. Sammet
University of California, Berkeley

I am asked to comment on a topic of enormous complexity and importance and on a thoughtful and perceptive paper by Emery Castle, this is to be accomplished in 15 minutes and on six double-spaced pages for the proceedings. With so small a ration of opportunity, let me proceed forthwith.

Castle has drawn from my distinguished Berkeley colleague, Martin Trow, a description of modern United States universities. The image is familiar. Castle finds in it a paradox. The paradox consists of a contradiction, or inconsistency, in two basic function—sometimes appearing singly in different institutions, sometimes combined within the same institution. These functions Trow has labeled the "autonomous" and the "popular" functions.² The autonomous function is the traditional concern of the liberal arts college—the transmission of culture, the shaping of mind and character, and the capacity for critical and independent judgment; the creation of new knowledge; and the certification of elite groups. The popular function is the role fostered in the land grant universities—the provision of mass higher education and service to outside groups and institutions.

To Trow, and perhaps Castle, this functional dichotomy assumes importantly different dimensions in the public (and especially land grant) institution as compared with the private university. I will not contest this assessment beyond noting the dramatic trend, beginning in World War II, in the assumption of the public service aspect of the popular function by major private universities. A simplistic measure of the importance of this shift is the ranking of universities according to the magnitude of federal funds received. In fiscal year 1967-68 the three leading recipients of federal funds were, in order, Massachusetts Institute of Technology, Stanford, and Harvard. Of the top 10 recipients, 4 were private; and, of the top 20 recipients, 11 were private universities (1)

It seems unlikely that the service aspect of the popular function assumed by major private institutions will be abandoned. This function rests on the presence of nearly overwhelming societal problems, the existence within the universities of resources of extraordinary diversity and quality, and a powerful drive both within and without universities to turn these resources in part to more immediate employment in the social interest. On a less general level is the resource need of modern scientific research. Advances in knowledge and techniques demand laboratory equipment of impressive scale and sophistication and of corresponding cost. University resources cannot support such efforts and university science research will continue to require, and I believe to receive, strong federal support.

The flow of public funds to university support reflects in part such characteristics as diversity of institutional and staff interests, excellence, prominence, and size. The financial rewards come in recognition of these qualities, and the rewards inevitably bring responsibilities in the popular function. In brief, and in regard to the popular function, the private universities look to me less different from the public institutions than they do to Trow and Castle.

Another recent trend, of interest to Castle, is the shift in federal support for basic as compared to applied research. This recalls the perennial debate as to what is basic and what is applied and, as well, the question as to what is professional and what is scientific. Is, for example, numerical analysis "science" when dealt with in the atmosphere of Letters and Science but "application" when it appears in engineering? Is virus research basic when it occurs in a setting devoted purely to studies of molecular biology but applied when it takes place in a medical school? As is so between basic and applied work, the boundary between the scientific and the professional is fuzzy, and it may become more so. The designation of specific activities as autonomous or popular becomes less certain. An optimist might even imagine that complementarity rather than competitiveness could define the relation between these functions and that the Castle dichotomy and paradox might eventually disappear.

Castle, Trow, and many others are concerned about survival of the university in its present mode. And well they might be. The issue is joined in terms of what university governing boards, administrators, faculties, students, and staffs wish the institution to be and what the providers of resources are willing to support. Preponderantly, the universities seek protection of the freedom of inquiry. As eloquently put by Richard Hofstadter, the university

"exists so that its members may inquire into truths of all sorts. Its presence marks our commitment to the idea that somewhere in our society there must be an organization in which anything may be studied and questioned. Not merely safe and established things, but difficult and inflammatory things—questions of politics and war, of sex and morals, of property and national loyalty" (2).

When the atmosphere that freedom of inquiry demands is jointly shared with the popular function and when some students and faculty ardently seek change in the outside society, there is inevitably, as Castle has noted, a high level of tension. The tension is real and its significance enormous, for the university and its members must press such demands on the same outside public from which is sought a rich level of financial support. We have seen such tensions in the relatively simple realm of university public service in agriculture. The potential for stress is enormously heightened when the object of such attention becomes, for example, the urban crisis. The situation, at best, is perilously tenuous, and it contains serious contradictions. Thus, the university seeks autonomy from those on whom it is totally dependent for sustenance. It cultivates elitism when the popular mood is egalitarian and when that ideal is frightfully complicated by the issue of race. The precarious nature of these relationships is not unique to the public institutions. Certainly the private universities must carefully cultivate alumni donors, and they may be increasingly susceptible to societal pressures for equal opportunity in such matters, for example, as admissions.

Survival in the face of strongly entrenched and emotionally charged contradictions is possible only through restraint—restraint that avoids absolutes, that strives for a climate of tolerance, and that inevitably limits freedom. A hard lesson to be learned and relearned is that there are necessary limits to freedom and that these limits must be largely self-imposed and not forced from without.

For the university the limits on freedom begin not with restraint on inquiry but with the expectation that the first and compelling obligation of its faculty and students is commitment to the generation and transmission of knowledge. This is not to deny the right and even obligation to exercise a lively interest in the surrounding society. It does preclude, as Castle has noted, abandonment of the university goal of detachment and objectivity. It does not assume or require the abstraction from values. It does require that the values applied be made explicit and that the alternative outcomes, when other values are admissible, be investigated and the results explained. It does not require insulation of the university from reality or the protection of the outside public from awareness and concern about new knowledge. It does not restrict a responsible exercise of academic freedom nor does it limit freedom of individual political expression. It does not permit either covert or open arrogation of university prestige in support of private goals, no matter how worthy; nor does it permit the university to assume an institutional position on public issues that do not concern itself as an institution. As Hofstadter has said: "A university does not make corporate judgements on public issues, and it has no appointed spokesman for that purpose" (2).

In reference to such views, Castle identifies a major current issue—that is, the growing pressures within the university that it, as an institution, assume a position on matters of major societal concern. Castle is troubled by this trend yet suggests the possibility that public crises may arise that are of such gravity as to require abandonment of institutional detachment. He suggests that, when society faces potential disaster, the university may have to choose among costly alternatives—that is, it may have to weigh the cost of speaking out and compromising its detachment against the cost of remaining silent. He concludes: "If this line of argument is accepted, it follows that a public stance [by the university] on issue is indeed rare, but not precluded."³

On this point I depart from my previous injunction against absolutism. I recognize the dilemma that Castle defines, but I would avoid the pragmatic concession and, I believe, with good reason. First is the question of competence. The university as an institution is competent to speak only to its own institutional goals and needs or on other matters of institutional import. It is not competent as an institution to make pronouncements on scientific or technical matters nor on social or political issues. Its function is to assemble scholars and students, to provide them with resources for pursuit of scholarly and professional objectives, and to allow them to report on such matters. The university must permit, and, in fact, should encourage, its members to express themselves as citizens, if they wish, on any matter of individual concern. Moreover, the university is an institution peculiarly devoted to individualism and to the protection of the right of the individual to exercise that quality. That right is seriously compromised if, through administrative decision or popular vote of its members, an institutional position is assumed on controversial public matters. There is also the ominous prospect of political reprisal. Can the university claim immunity to outside reaction if, as an institution, it intervenes on matters of public debate? I may have moved but a millimeter from

Castle's position on this question, but it is a distance I would wish to maintain.

One could scarcely speak about the contemporary university without dealing, as Castle does, with the question of governance and the role in it that is properly played by faculty and students and—on a near horizon—also by academic and nonacademic staff. Faculty involvement already is far advanced in major institutions, so much so in some instances as to raise serious questions about the diversion of faculty effort from primary functions and about interminable, or at least damaging, delays in reaching crucial decisions. In some institutions there appears to be rapid movement toward significant involvement of students in governance. And there is much to be said for this, as student welfare and progress is the first business of the university. Institutional decisions do affect student interests, and good decisions on such matters do, as a minimum, require full and precise communication of student needs and attitudes.

This does not necessarily mean, however, a full partnership—a one-man-one-vote participation—in all aspects of university governance. The rush to respond to student anxieties in this regard might well be slowed to allow consideration of some important questions. We should, for example, ask what is it that motivates student demands for participation in university decisions? Is it at base a seeking of power to guide the university into more effective educational processes, or is the goal to redirect the university effort toward reformation of the outside society and, thus, to make the university "relevant"? Will participatory democracy in university governance—which is a widely expressed ideal—in fact produce democratic procedures? Or is this form of governance in the end—through mass neglect, boredom, preoccupation with scholarship, or otherwise—likely to fail to involve actively the whole constituency and so fall victim to minority manipulation? Do we have evidence on the extent to which decisions in the specialized environment of a university are improved through the participatory process? Does "voice" in governance really motivate students to learn? If so, does the benefit justify the cost? How much should be invested in participatory governance for the purpose of training students for citizenship? These are not unimportant questions, but they are not receiving systematic attention; rather, we are engaged with ad hoc responses and not carefully considered solutions.

At no great length, and perhaps mainly in hope, Castle suggests that analysis of problems in the university might benefit from the application of economic models with which we are familiar. I am less sanguine and, for the sake of brevity, will mention a single reason. This is the difficulty of measuring output. The most important output is graduates, and the most important variables with respect to that output are numbers and quality. We can count the numbers—and do—but we have no measures of quality, and I do not see such measures in prospect.⁴ Economic models can, I agree, help by analogy and by causing us to focus more sharply on alternatives as to program and on the allocations of resources required. But the outcome will continue to rest largely on judgment, intuition, and pragmatic resolution of forces, for the most part not quantifiable, in the structure of academia.

Reaction generally is taken to mean "against," and in that respect I have contributed little in my assignment beyond a bit of pessimism about the utility of our discipline in the solution of problems in the university. I have chosen, rather, to try to reinforce what Castle has said with respect to the ultimate base of the university—that is, its commitment to free inquiry—and its politics, both inner and outer. For, among the multitude of problems that face the universities, these are the most immediate and the most urgent.

FOOTNOTES

1. Comment on a paper by Emery N. Castle, Oregon State University. Presented to the Western Agricultural Economics Association, Tuscon, Arizona, July 19-22, 1970.
2. As defined by Trow (3), the popular function involves two aspects: one is the commitment to mass higher education initially embodied in the land grant college as a privilege open to all (a privilege that over time has been transformed, first to right and then to a public obligation to provide access to all who wish it); the other aspect is a commitment to serve outside groups and institutions. Castle focuses, and I with him, on the service function. Trow, however finds great significance in the enlarging commitment to mass higher education and grave danger posed by it to the quality of education and to institutional governance.
3. See footnote number 4 of Castle's paper, p. 7.

4. An additional difficulty is that, to be meaningful, the variable on quality of output would need to be lagged 10-20 years, an aspect that would seriously limit the utility of results.

REFERENCES

1. U.S. National Science Foundation, *Federal Support of Research and Development at the Universities and Colleges and Selected Non-Profit Institutions, Fiscal Year, 1968*. National Science Foundation Report No. 29-33, September 30, 1969.
2. Hofstadter, Richard. "The Role of the University in a Democratic Society." Paper prepared for delivery at the University of California, Berkeley, April 28, 1967. Columbia University, New York.
3. Trow, Martin. "Reflections on the Transition from Mass to Universal Higher Education," *Daedalus*. (Winter, 1970).