Professional Education and the Soul of the American Research University

Harold T. Shapiro[1]

Presented at the University of Michigan School of Social Work's

80th Anniversary Symposium.

Ann Arbor, Michigan

September 21, 2001

1 President Emeritus and Professor of Economics and Public Policy, Princeton University.

Prologue

I must begin by noting how pleased and excited I am to be able to participate in the celebration of the School of Social Work's 80th Anniversary. My wife Vivian, an alumnus and former faculty member of the school, and I were eagerly looking forward to being with you. Unfortunately, a minor – and temporary – sinus infection prevented her from flying out to Ann Arbor with me. Nevertheless, I promised to send her special regards to her former colleagues and teachers. We both have great admiration and affection we have for Michigan's School of Social Work.

In addition, it is always a special pleasure to return to the University of Michigan where we have so many special friends that continue to occupy a special place in our hearts.

I. Introduction

The title of my remarks is, "Professional Education and the Soul of the American Research University," and I will focus, in an historical context, on three issues. I will deal first with the social legitimacy of institutions of higher education. My principal point in this respect is that universities are a public trust which has to be earned anew by each generation. For universities, therefore, their social legitimacy depends not on what they have achieved, but on what they are becoming. Secondly, I will address the question: Does professional education sit on the periphery of the "real" university? Third, and finally, I will address the questions of what exactly is a liberal arts education and how does it relate to professional education. With respect to these latter few questions, my conclusions are as follows: Professional education does not and never has sat on the periphery of universities, and that the basic aims of a liberal arts education are startling similar to the aims of professional education. As a result, a closer partnership between professional education and liberal arts education would benefit everyone.

II. The Social Legitimacy of the University

In the most general sense, the education sector is that particular set of social and institutional arrangements by which society provides the next generation with the capacities, the beliefs, and the commitments thought necessary to ensure society's goals. It is this civic purpose that is the foundation of the university's social legitimacy. At any historical moment, therefore, the particular array of institutions of higher education that society supports reveals a great deal about society's views regarding such important issues as: who should receive the most advanced education; the importance of traditional values; the importance attached to innovation and new ways of thinking; the most important sources of knowledge and wisdom; the value placed on particular cognitive abilities; the most highly prized virtues and skills; and the nature of the broad hopes and aspirations of the society itself.

Thus, what is the most appropriate type of education, or set of educational institutions and arrangements, is directly related to the nature of the society we wish to sustain, or to the agreements we have made about how we ought to relate to one another and what we value about the individual and his/her work. For example, the nature of an undergraduate education for citizens of a liberal democracy, with its focus on individual autonomy and self determination, and its associated desire to find new and better arrangements in both science and society, would be different from those societies who begin with other political and social objectives.

What is absolutely critical to bear in mind in this respect is that institutions of higher education are social institutions and their curricula, their scholarly and other programs are all designed, and should be designed, to serve some civic purpose. To put the matter simply, our teaching and research programs need to be viewed as a public trust. As a result, our institutions of higher education cannot be defended and should not even be imagined as designed to preserve a portfolio of medieval privileges granted to students and scholars and/or to preserve any right of

teachers, scholars, and students to special entitlements not enjoyed by other citizens. Rather, their continued social legitimacy depends on their continuing capacity to serve important civic needs.

The special freedoms and privileges enjoyed by contemporary university communities are justified only as mechanisms that enable universities to meet their current civic responsibilities in a more effective fashion. The idea that the contemporary university should be a socially-isolated "pure" seat of learning for its own sake, undefiled by any objectives beyond the personal transformation of its students and the advancement of a self-contained intellectual agenda, is a dangerous myth. Therefore, issues such as university autonomy and traditional academic values, privileges and responsibilities need constantly to be re-examined in light of the primary civic functions being served by higher education. As institutions of higher education evolved from their medieval roots, the important changes that took place all represented the adaptations necessary to meet a fresh set of civic responsibilities that were generated by important changes in society itself. It is not an accident, therefore, that the last of the great liberal revolutions initiated by the so-called enlightenment was the revolution in the nature of higher education. Within such a context, the issue of the university's autonomy, for example, should not be viewed as an ancient right that must be defended, but in terms of its current civic function. In dealing with autonomy, therefore, we should focus, on the question: In what way does the autonomy of universities continue to serve and promote the current civic responsibilities of higher education? Traditions are like genes left over from our evolutionary past: some still have functional value, others do not.

The critical point is that in an environment that is changing, the university will inevitably be drawn into debates about the relationship of its existing programs and commitments to the changing needs of society. We cannot and should not avoid such discussions. In particular, we cannot view such a dialogue as undermining our traditional values and autonomy. Rather, it is through this dialogue that our most important traditional values, such as autonomy, can be reinforced. Indeed, autonomy, as opposed to slavery, implies a level of responsibility and

thoughtful responsiveness that make such a dialogue imperative. Universities not only need a constantly refreshed vision of their role that reflects the emerging reality of their times, but the intellectual energy to enable society to envision them as an important component of society's own vitality.

With this overall context in mind, the purpose of my remaining remarks is to try to "debunk," or "deconstruct," two popular, but mistaken, notions regarding the desirable structure of contemporary universities. The first of these mistaken notions is that professional education lies at the periphery of higher education and, in particular, of the American Research University. Closely associated with this mistaken idea is that the soul of the Research University is to be found within the Arts and Science faculty which, therefore, has the primary responsibility for safeguarding the integrity of the institution. One of the perennial controversies in higher education has been not only the appropriate balance between so-called "liberal," and so-called "professional" education, but which of these lies at the heart of and represents the soul of the university.

The second and somewhat associated notion that I would like to examine briefly is whether or not there is something quite independent and coherent regarding the principal teaching responsibility of the Arts and Science faculty, namely, the undergraduate liberal arts curriculum. I will suggest that the concept of a liberal arts education has become so robust as to include almost all possible non-professional approaches to an undergraduate curriculum. As such it is often difficult to know what is distinctly special about a liberal arts education, other than it is not a professional education. This is especially the case when disciplinary concerns provide the framework around which a curriculum is designed. Indeed, I will make the claim that the aims of a liberal arts education and a professional education are becoming more and more similar.

The contemporary American Research University is quite a distinctive institution within higher education whose strongest roots go back to the German universities of the 19th century, the English colleges such as Oxford and Cambridge, and the special contingencies of American

society as it approached the 20th century. In this latter respect it is useful to recall that as the 20th century approached, the U.S. was rapidly becoming economically the most productive country in the world and could no longer depend on high tariffs and imported labor and ideas for its ongoing vitality. Like an archaeologist, my objective is to begin to remove some of the accumulated debris that has distorted our common memory of these developments and thus, not only hampered our clear perception of both the meaning of a liberal arts education and the role of professional education within higher education, but has distorted our perception of the history of this relationship and how it has been shaped by developments in the larger society. I will deal first with the notion that professional schools are at the periphery of the "real" university.

I begin by asking a provocative question and by providing what some might consider some equally provocative answers. First the question: why are so many professional schools, particularly professional schools at distinguished universities, anxious or uneasy about their status within the university? Now some possible answers.

a) They are anxious because perhaps some people still read Veblen, and Veblen suggested that law schools had as much reason to be part of the university as dancing schools. Now if law, one of the most ancient learned professions, occupies such an uneasy seat, perhaps the anxiety of other professional schools is understandable.

b) They are uneasy because their professional and/or scholarly claims are tenuous, or because they cannot establish fully the validity of requiring a certain knowledge and skill base before entrance to the profession is allowed.

c) They are anxious because they are not sure of the profession's prerogatives to judge one another's mistakes, to charge fees independent of outcome, and to control state licensing. In this respect, however, their colleagues in the Arts and Sciences may share this particular anxiety.

d) They are anxious because they believe that they are indeed at the periphery of the institution, particularly if they do not teach undergraduates.

e) Finally, they are uneasy because universities in the English-speaking world

> remain in the "thrall" of Cardinal Newman's assertion that "…a university, after all, should be formally-based and live in the Faculty of Arts…" He only rather grudgingly added, "…with a reasonable association with the learned professions of law, medicine and theology."

To anticipate my own conclusion, I believe that Newman had it quite wrong, both as regards society's aspirations for the university and as a matter of the actual historical record. I prefer Alfred North Whitehead's view of the University as articulated in his "Aims of Education,"

> "…the justifications for a university is that it preserves the connection between knowledge and the zest for life (i.e., via the necessary movement of questions, ideas and scholarship between professional schools and centers of research and teaching in the Arts and Sciences,) and by involving the young and the old in the imaginative (i.e., speculative and reflective) consideration of learning.

In a similar vein recall the thoughtful remark of W.E. B. DuBois, "Education…[is] that organ of fine adjustment between real life and the growing knowledge of life…"

While American universities have, in fact, been shaped by rival beliefs about the ends they should serve (e.g., scholarship, the intellectual, virtues, practical service to society, etc.,) the bureaucratic or managerial categories we have developed to operationalize the university's objectives, like the establishment of distinct faculties in the professional schools and, at times, in graduate and undergraduate education, often serve, not only to erase some of the essential communal character of the university and university life, but to hide many of the common aims of the liberal arts and professional education. Indeed, no imperative is now more essential to the future vitality of a distinguished university than improving our communication across the bureaucratic lines that currently serve to separate the various faculties and their students. In my judgment, the rigid separation of professional education from undergraduate and graduate education within the same institution (which is an American innovation) is a serious bureaucratic error that has now become almost deified by a mistaken educational ideology that separates a liberal arts education from professional education. We should put aside the issue of whether to

mix the so-called professional and academic, and focus intently on the most effective way of doing so. It is an unfortunate fact that the distinctive bureaucratic categories developed by the modern American university (i.e., undergraduate, graduate and professional schools) have hindered this objective.

Interestingly -- to sound a historical note -- the medieval university, to which we trace some of the ultimate roots of the modern university, was dominated not by the Faculty of Arts and Science, but by the professional faculties of theology, medicine and law! Among the four faculties of the medieval university, Philosophia (Arts and Science) was the poor sister of theology, medicine and law. Indeed, preparation for the learned professions of law, theology and medicine was the primary "raison d'etre" of both the medieval and colonial university. In addition, medieval education, or even the education of the English Renaissance, which contains a more humanistic "air," was not motivated by the pure desire to know or read the "classics" for their own sake, but because such studies were thought to meet economic, religious, political and other civic needs. Moreover, as I have already noted, higher education in America, about which I will say more in a minute, quite clearly began as professional education. It is, therefore, a real puzzle as to why these simple facts remain at odds with the widespread myth that the liberal arts alone occupy the moral high ground of the university, and it is the Arts and Sciences faculty that must serve as the guardian of the university's soul. This distorted image of both the history and current reality of higher education needs to be "deconstructed," or put aside because it hinders the ongoing vitality of the entire enterprise.

At the same time, we are fortunate that the initial design of the American Research University kept undergraduate, graduate and professional education in the same institutions; and we retain, therefore, the exciting, if unfulfilled, potential this represents. This, indeed, is one of the great "hidden" and unexploited aspects of the American Research University. I would like, however, to take a broader look at how we arrived at the current configuration of the Research University.

III. Higher Education, The Narrative Begins

Our working image of society and its institutions (our common working memory) is often best understood as a series of overlapping narratives and/or myths which serve to make our individual and group efforts meaningful to us. The role of these grand narratives (revealed, or otherwise) is to assure us that regardless of how things turn out that our efforts make some sense and the construction of these narratives have, over the millennia, consumed enormous intellectual resources. In addition to these grand narratives, however, there are many sub-narratives dealing with our understanding of the roles of certain institutions. With respect to higher education there is the historical narrative which informs us, for example, that some of the principal characteristics of the contemporary university can be traced to the sociology of the medieval university. Another narrative is the liberal arts narrative where the Arts and Sciences are represented as the heart and soul of the university. Yet another narrative, however, is the professional education narrative which sets the aims of professional education at the center of the historical evolution of higher education. Together these interwoven narratives form our common memory and understanding of the contemporary university.

For example, although the western university stands today considerably transformed from its medieval profile, we believe it owes certain aspects of its social organization and a good deal of both its self-image and its legal form to a number of rather remarkable institutional innovations introduced in twelfth century Europe.

We have clung proudly to this medieval ancestry, with its privileges and protected status for many reasons, but chief among these were that these medieval institutions, at their best (a) represented a far more open and diverse institution of learning than any that preceded them, (b) provided special protection to the student and scholar, (c) developed refreshing ideas regarding the fair assessment of achievement, and (d) formed a kind of international community of learners united by a common language (Latin), a common church (Catholicism), and a common

commitment to advanced education.

For my purposes (i.e., understanding the role of professional education,) however, it is important to enrich this "birth" narrative by noting that the medieval universities themselves replaced the monastic schools of the 10th and 11th centuries which had been preparing monks for "another" life. This "other-worldly" approach was displaced by the secular purpose of the medieval or scholastic university of the 12th century that clearly centered on professional training. This was the most distinctive and important shift in higher education's long narrative. It is this scholastic impulse, which has a very practical or civic orientation, that has been the dominant theme in the development of the western university as well as professional education ever since. It was this scholastic impulse that over time provided the rational counterpart to faith, namely, the establishment of a rational explanation of the environment that we experience that would provide, in turn, the 'know-how' to do new and very practical things.

By the 14th century, while the focus of the university remains on professional education, ? logic also becomes the fundamentia and summa of the Arts Faculty, it is true that the subsequent development of the Renaissance Humanism curriculum – a literary education focused on preserving a canon of "classics" provided a temporary counterweight to the scholastic impulse. Indeed, to some this represented a victory of art and literature over society and politics. In reality, however, within the leadership of the medieval and renaissance university there was at very least a considerable tension between what we might consider a humanistic training of aristocrats (to give them a distinctive culture and equip them for wielding political power) and the great civic need for the training of lawyers, doctors, clergy, and other professionals. Both objectives, however, had a very practical or civic basis. In Medieval Europe the thirst for education was motivated by two strong civic forces. They were Christian and secular pragmatism. Natural philosophy may have carried an increasing weight, but it was often overwhelmed or barely able to keep afloat in a Christian sea of professional learning (i.e., theology.) For many, natural philosophy was pumped, at least in part, from un-Christian wells and felt a bit like contaminated water.

IV. Colonial America and Beyond: The Narrative Continues

The American colonists had two principal ideas in mind in founding their colleges. They were: the preservation of what they believed were the most important aspects of western learning (including, most importantly, Christianity) and the training of citizens to fill key posts in the new society (namely, the clergy and government service.) Moreover, the preservation of western learning, attitudes, values and professional training called -- they believed -- for very much the same educational program; namely, an education -- at its best -- focused on the Bible and classical literature. It was, therefore, a particular “take” on the humanistic curriculum of the English Renaissance that was emulated in Colonial America. The important point, however, is that the early Colonial education, the accumulation of certain cognitive, technical and professional abilities as well as an understanding of -- and commitment to -- important cultural values were thought of as one and the same thing!

The work of the colonial college, therefore, was designed to sustain a certain minimum understanding of medieval and Renaissance learning and to create, within the student body, a personal piety and a passing acquaintance with the Bible, with classical languages and literature, and with Renaissance art and literature that was considered suitable for America's cultural elite. Thus, while the college curriculum was designed both to develop the mental faculties of the students and to ingrain in them the habits of "right" thinking (as opposed to innovation and/ or criticism,) its raison d'être was professional training and the preservation of western culture in the wilderness that was America. Innovation and critical thinking were the last things on anyone's mind. The educational theory behind this curriculum assumed that a special moral character inhered in both the linguistic and cultural content of classical languages and literature and that a special mental discipline was imparted, quite uniquely, by their study -- a rather discredited educational theory. It seems clear, therefore, that while the curriculum of American higher education in the pre-Civil War period was inspired by the Renaissance Humanism curriculum, its objective was to fulfill specific civic roles.

In the post-Civil War period, the need for change in American higher education became ever more apparent. American society was changing in dramatic ways, new scholarly disciplines were emerging at a rapid rate, and likewise the world of scholarship and education was being dramatically transformed. These changes reflected, for example, a renewal of faith in the primacy of reason and cognition, in the potential and desire for material progress, and in the responsibility of educated individuals to engage in independent and innovative thinking. It was, if you like, an enthusiastic return to the scholastic impulse within the social and political context of emerging liberal democracies. This translated into an understanding that the capacity to learn and develop new ideas (i.e., to innovate) had become an immensely practical requirement. For example, sustained national economic leadership would now require, among other things, more people to receive an advanced education in a broader range of areas. The historically innovative notion arose that society could benefit, economically and in other ways, from institutions of higher education that were centers for free, open, and thoughtful debate (concerning society and science); deliberative and critical practices that were non-coercive; and the development of new knowledge and understanding of all kinds. While it is often claimed that the ideals of the 19th century German university provided the model for this transformation, that is, at best, a half-truth since America educators such as Tappan, Angel, Wayland, Eliot, White and others developed quite distinctively American institutions. Perhaps most important in this latter respect was to create distinctive faculties for graduate, professional and undergraduate education, but, on the other hand, to retain them all in a single institution.

As the twentieth century approached, the civic function of higher education in America increasingly was seen as requiring: (a) the incorporation of engineering and applied science (with basic science added a little later) and other specialized expertise into university faculties and curricula; (b) the professionalization of all faculties; (c) the development of a disciplinary structure for both programs and governance; and (d) the adoption of new organizing principles that focused on the development of new knowledge, graduate education, and a more critical and discerning understanding of our society and its beliefs. As a result, the small paternalistic

colonial college, its concerns with the piety and morality of students, and its curriculum centered on the study of classical languages and literature gave way to the larger and more secular university and it did so in a manner that also transformed the meaning and nature of professional education and its relationship to other parts of the university. Moreover this transformation of American higher education was not led by the colonial colleges, but by entirely new institutions.

The broad range of new developments that transformed American society in the post-World War II period was again reflected in the changing nature, scope, size, and heterogeneity of American higher education. Key among these changes were: major investment in the state universities, federal government support of university based research, expanded student aid policies, the development of community colleges, and the broad expansion of overall access.

The full emergence in this period of institutions devoted to education in the context of a constantly renewed search for new ideas strengthened even further what was a rather radical and distinctive achievement. At its best, the university became a place for dialogue between generations, between cultures, between past and present, and between alternative approaches to understanding. For the most part, it is only the university of the late 20th century that has finally recognized and incorporated in its curriculum the inevitability of complexity, ambiguity, and the need for competitive views in most of the important issues confronting humankind and scholarship. It is able to retain its coherence as an academic community through its shared beliefs in the open pursuit of truth and understanding, a commonly held set of rational and humane standards to govern the modes of scholarship, and the ultimate value of the products of the mind.

The contemporary university, however, continues to suffer from the artificial separation of undergraduate , graduate and professional education. At its best the contemporary university should be characterized by intellectual conversations both across the generations and across the various academic disciplines. Properly conceived, the disciplines and other more bureaucratic categories, which have often served to separate parts of the universities, have much more in

common than is reflected in current institutional and operational arrangements. Indeed the current failure to bring these distinct elements into a more common effort sacrifices one of the great benefits of having these various programs within a single institution. It is, in my judgment, a grievous error to have graduate programs focus primarily in research, undergraduate programs on cognitive capacities and intellectual virtues, and professional schools on so-called practical matters. The hope I have for the American Research University is that of an institution that merges the scholastic impulse with the educational themes of the English Renaissance and the Colonial era in a successful effort to build a much more socially relevant institution.

V. A Liberal Education

For almost two thousand years, the idea of a liberal education has attracted the attention and loyalty of thoughtful educators, scholars and citizens concerned with higher education. Indeed, few educational ideals have attracted more adherents, sustained more controversy and had more "staying power" than the concept of a liberal education. Since Colonial times, educators, scholars and citizens across a broad range of the political, social and cultural spectrum in the United States have urged colleges and universities to meet their civic responsibility of providing a curriculum that fulfills the imperatives of a liberal education [5]. This consistent devotion to an educational ideal is all the more remarkable given the enormous and continuing growth in our stock of knowledge, changing notions of what the word "liberal" implies, the ever-shifting nature of society's educational objectives, and the rather more startling fact that even at a particular point in time there has rarely been much agreement regarding what educational program or programs the coveted label of "liberal education" implies.

The only organizing ideas that stand steady and clear over these two millennia are that the aims of a liberal arts curriculum are 1) to achieve important educational objectives that are complementary to those of a professional education, and 2) to help create a certain type of citizen. As a result, the whole idea of a liberal education is defined, in part, by what we consider to be a professional education. More importantly, as time has passed the aims of professional

and undergraduate education have moved closer together as both have taken on the roles of preparing individuals for societal roles as well as developing their intellectual skills and their respect for certain virtues. As a result, the objectives of professional and liberal arts curricula increasingly overlap.

The principal point to remember is that while some notion of a liberal education goes back to classical times, so too does the controversy over its structure and purposes. Despite this history of controversy, change and evolution, the pursuit of this amorphous ideal remains an article of faith in much of American higher education. This continuing "devotion" has been bought at a certain price; namely, we have continuously expanded the constellation of ideas the term accommodates. Thoughtful educators now use this venerable term--liberal education--to include everything from a narrow focus on the "old" or "new" canon of "great" texts to a serious study of any and all aspects of liberal arts subjects. The catalogue of liberal arts subjects is, of course, now greatly expanded beyond the trivium and quadrivium and includes all of the burgeoning sciences.[2] The label "liberal education" may cover educational curricula in which the institution prescribes students' choices as well as curricula, which leave all such choice to the individual students. It incorporates all sorts of pedagogies, which distribute responsibility and initiatives for learning in quite different ways between student and teacher. It embraces approaches ranging from those that emphasize breadth of knowledge to those that emphasize depth of understanding in a relatively narrow area. All this in the name of the true liberal education!

Even the Greeks, who are credited with articulating the basic components of the liberal arts, had several different educational strategies that focused variously on literature, the search for truth and new understanding, and the training of effective civic leaders. For Thomas Aquinas in late Medieval Europe, a liberal education included, in addition to the Septem Artes Liberales,

[2] *It must also be acknowledged, however, that at least within academic circles the incorporation of the theoretical and experimental sciences into a liberal arts curriculum remains incomplete in the sense that the literary and philosophical traditions--which themselves displaced a near monopoly held by the classical curriculum--still seem to retain a special stature.*

natural philosophy, moral philosophy, and metaphysics. As time passed, however, additional objectives for a liberal education were developed, such as the freeing of the individual from unexamined ideas, the disinterested search for truth, the development and integrity of the individual and of his or her power of reason. In many ways, of course, this expansion of the agenda of liberal education was a natural development as society's educational requirements expanded and evolved over time. But as a moment's reflection reveals, these same characteristics are also the objectives of a serious professional education.

Thus, while the concept of a liberal education continues to reign as an article of faith that seems to unite many of us, it often masks many important differences in educational philosophies and objectives. There never has been a "right" curriculum and, given rapidly changing circumstances and aspirations, the best we can hope for in the future is a continued exploration of the various possibilities. Perhaps our two chief errors in all of this, however, has been, first, to shape our rhetoric on this issue as if there were no history of change and controversy on these issues and only one proper curriculum for everyone; and second, to imagine that the ultimate objectives of a liberal education were different from those of a professional school.

I do not mean to infer from all of this that the liberal education program of the faculty of Arts and Sciences is hopelessly lost in the wilderness. There are some very important and compelling objectives of a liberal education, especially within a liberal democracy in which there is some broad based agreement. First there is broad agreement in the need, in order to understand ourselves, to understand the great traditions of thought that have informed the minds of those who came before us. There is broad agreement on the need to free our minds and hearts from unexamined commitments of any kind, in order to enhance the possibility of finding new arrangements that might enhance our lives, improve the human condition, and build a more sympathetic understanding to those quite different from us. Finally, there is the hope that a liberal education, whatever its specific form, will prepare us to lead a thoughtful and independent life of choice that fully appreciates the interconnectiveness of things and people. On all this, and

this is a great deal, there is widespread agreement. The fascinating thing, once again, is that these objectives are also the objectives of a serious professional education!

V. Conclusion

I conclude, therefore, that the underlying objectives of a liberal education, or graduate education, or professional education are so similar that we should work to more effectively integrate these separate faculties so that their synergies are more fully realized. All in all, the western university has been a remarkably durable and adaptive institution. Although always the focus of criticism and some disappointment, these institutions have continued to be valued by western societies, sometimes as society's best hope for change and sometimes for reassurance regarding traditional moral commitments. Despite their many shortfalls, despite changing demographics, changing expectations, changing public and private priorities, and despite a sometimes shaken faith (both internal and external) in their potential civic contribution, I believe these institutions will continue to prove capable of adapting in a manner that enables them to continue to meet their evolving civic responsibilities. There are few institutions with such continuing potential to deliver new social dividends to society, and, therefore, there is little reason to put them on the endangered species list. Nevertheless, universities have a continuing responsibility to conduct a searching re-examination of their programs in the light of contemporary realities. But I believe that their unique potential for learning, their demonstrated capacity for thoughtful evolution and largely peaceful interaction across many cultural divides, and their continuing ability to challenge the familiar will make them indispensable assets for the future I now see unfolding.

We know who we are. We also know what we currently want to become. However, the key ethical question for both professional school faculties and Arts and Sciences faculties concerns what we should become and why (i.e., whose interests this will serve.) I am sure the University of Michigan, and especially the School of Social Work, will take the leadership

necessary to light the path ahead.

Bibliography

1. Fitzgerald, F. Scott (1920). This Side of Paradise. New York: Charles Scribner & Sons.

2. Grafton, A., & Jardine, L. (1986). From Humanism to the Humanities. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press.

3. Graff, Gerald (1989). Professing Literature, An Intellectual History. Chicago.

4. Hamilton, Sir W. (1853). Discussions on Philosophy and Literature, Education and University Reform (2nd edition). London and Edinburgh.

5. Kimball, Bruce A. (1995). Orators and Philosophers. New York: The College Board.

6. Rackham Reports (1988-89). Horace H. Rackham School of Graduate Studies, The University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, Michigan

7. Santayana, George (1913). The Genteel Tradition in American Philosophy in Winds of Doctrine. New York.

8. Siegel, J.E. (1968). Rhetoric and Philosophy in Renaissance Humanism. Princeton, New Jersey.

9. Sinclair, Upton (1936). The Goose Step: A Study of American Education. New York: Albert

and Charles Boni.

10. Stone, Lawrence (1983). Social Control and Intellectual Excellence: Oxbridge and Edinburgh 1560-1983. In Nicholas Phillipson (Ed.), Universities, Society and the Future. Edinburgh: University Press.

11. Veblen, Thorstein (1935). The Higher Learning in America. New York: Viking Press.