erally are weaker than expected. Stock markets both here and in major economies around the world stand on very slippery footings. Major equity indices are either at or near lows. A further decline of, say, 15 to 20 percent will undermine consumer confidence and stall the incipient recovery in capital outlays and thus usher in another business recession. While such a drop in equity values will probably trigger further monetary easing, the full impact of such central bank actions would only be felt over a period of years.

An equally vexing question is: How long will the Fed sustain its accommodating posture if asset values remain in a narrow trading range? If investors begin to expect a monetary policy reversal, they will respond negatively. Will the Fed not reverse its stance until it is confident that the economy and markets are on a firm footing? Or will it act as soon as inflation begins to move higher again? It will be hard for our central bankers to resist the temptation to jump the gun in this regard.

Some also believe that the monetary options soon will be limited by weaknesses of the U.S. dollar in the foreign exchange markets. I doubt this will retard U.S. monetary policy any time soon. The U.S. dollar will not be challenged in any significant way in the near future. For one thing, investment opportunities are not very attractive elsewhere. Economic growth in Europe is stumbling, and is at best anemic in Japan. The key economies of Latin America are in trouble again. In both Japan and on the European continent, fiscal and monetary policies are caught in a quagmire, and strong political leadership is lacking. Of course, the U.S. dollar would suffer seriously, as would leading economies throughout the world, if the United States were to retreat back — or was forced to by war — from its broader responsibilities as the global economic leader. But I don't envision that happening, whether we go to war with Iraq or not.

Finally, policymakers can take positive action on the fiscal side as well. But if there is a war with Iraq, government officials will find it extremely difficult to legislate tax reductions.

Although we face large imponderables — from the war on terrorism, to the prospect of a "hot" war with Iraq, to the fallout from recent financial and business excesses — there is much we can ponder about how to proceed next. It is better, it seems to me, to bring as many of the current frailties in our economic situation into focus rather than plunging ahead with a false sense of confidence. Only by seeing clearly the pitfalls along our path can we hope to avoid them.

Philosophers In The Marketplace

TENDING THE COMMONS IN THE TEMPLE OF TRUTH

Address by ERNEST GRADY BOGUE, *Professor of Educational Administration and Policy Study, The University of Tennessee and Chancellor Emeritus, Louisiana State University in Shreveport*

Delivered to Lynn University, Boca Raton, Florida, September 4, 2002

Yestereve I saw philosophers in the marketplace carrying their heads in baskets, and crying aloud, "Wisdom! Wisdom for sale!" Poor philosophers! They must needs sell their heads to feed their hearts.

Kahlil Gibran, Sand and Foam

As American higher education enters the early years of the 21st century, several issues pressure the academy for attention and for change, while critics from within and without often lament the difficulty of dragging recalcitrant and reluctant faculty into the future. Improving student and staff diversity, utilizing technology more effectively, responding to calls for accountability, managing under revenue constraints, and making proper response to marketplace pressures invite our attention and energy. By no means, however, is this the first season of criticism nor the first call for change in American higher education. Indeed, it would be difficult to find any moment in the history of our colleges and universities when we were not perceived to be in a moment of crisis. It would seem, then, that chronic crisis, if we may frame that oxymoron, is an ongoing condition of the academy. Why is that?

Our colleges and universities are expected to be both cultural curator and cultural critic, to honor heritage and to assault the limits of common sense, to hold hands with the past even as we reach for the future, to tend the commons of our national life while respecting the pluralism of our national life. These are mission expectations of no small complexity, expectations guaranteed to keep higher education in the spotlight of public scrutiny and in the crucible of civic criticism. This morning I come with no intent of adding to criticism being lofted at the academy. I come instead with the intent of reflecting on, celebrating, and affirming the special nature of the community we hold in trust.

In the closing years of the 20th century, a concern for "community," a caring for the commons, enjoyed a renewed vitality in public conversation and literature, as reflected in such works as Bellah's Habits of the Heart, Etzioni's The Spirit of Community, and Purdy's For Common Things. What exactly is the nature of the "commu-

nity" we hold in trust as faculty? What are the barriers, the impedances to the cultivation of community in higher education? And what are the habits of mind that might promote positive engagement of the issues and challenges confronting our communities, to honor heritage and embrace change?

SPACES IN OUR TOGETHERNESS: THE MEANING OF COMMUNITY

Let me probe the meaning of community, and especially the idea of the whole being greater than the sum of its parts, with a quick personal story. While on the administrative staff of the University of Memphis in the 1970s, I enjoyed a renewing avocation playing second French Horn with the Memphis symphony orchestra. In the 1973-74 concert season, one of our programs concluded with Brahm's Symphony No. I in C Minor. There is a lovely moment in the third movement where the second horn answers a short melodic passage carried by the first horn, and I can still remember a frisson of inner pleasure as the first horn and I exchanged melodic expression. The closing and brisk pace of the third movement transitions into a bright and fortissimo fourth movement.

As we moved into the symphony's finale, every member of the orchestra could sense that we were performing on a plane of musical excellence beyond our ordinary reach. The talent of the Memphis symphony would not match that of a major orchestra such as the New York, Boston, Philadelphia or Chicago orchestras nor perhaps other orchestras closely following such as Cincinnati or Dallas. But on this evening, we were performing at a level of musical excitement that the patrons recognized; and the closing notes were followed by a ten-minute standing ovation. Members of the orchestra knew that we had enjoyed a magical moment, an emotional high, in which the combined performance of the eighty musicians clearly was something more than the individual talents. There was common purpose in that moment, disciplined and responsible talent at work before and during the concert, and a common love of music. And there was a lovely experience of common pleasure that could not have flowed from solo music making alone. There are works to be done, benefits to be derived, and pleasures to be enjoyed that are impossible in our oneness.

Shared purpose, shared relationships, shared responsibility-the need for community is a primal yearning and a practical necessity in our lives and in our society. Among my non-fiction reading interests this past year were two books entitled The Lexus and the Olive Tree, by American journalist Thomas Friedman and Jihad and McWorld by American political scientist Benjamin Barber.

In the latter work, Barber explores the contradictory tensions reflected in an increased world economic interdependence and a simultaneous tribal tug of centrifugal impulse. While on an international exchange visit to five former republics in the former Soviet Union in 1988 and a lecture tour to China in 1993, I was surprised to find McDonald's in both Moscow and at the Great Wall of China, the emerging signs of McWorld to which Barber refers.

Thomas Friedman frames a theme similar to Barber by noting the paradoxical movement to world economic interdependence represented by the Lexus automobile, and the human tug and allegiance to a sense of place, of identity, and yes of community, represented by the Olive Tree. Articulating what he describes as his "Golden Arches" theory, Friedman notes that "no two countries that both have McDonald's have ever fought a war against each other since they each got their McDonald's." If the theory holds, perhaps our first point of international policy would be to get a McDonald's in Bagdad. There is a hint in Friedman's work that perhaps economics will do our moral and ethical work for us, that the market will act as conscience. We may ask, however, whether liberty and civility are exalted in every nation in which there is a McDonald's.

A healthy community is one in which competing values and impulses are held in tensioned balance. In a healthy democracy, there is need to balance impulses that are philosophic anchors for a democracy- between access and excellence in education, rights and responsibility, justice and mercy, diversity and community, opportunity and disciplined effort, service and profit, self interest and self sacrifice, tradition and innovation, egalitarianism and elitism, cooperation and competition.

What happens without balance among these principles? Community degenerates. Taken to its negative extreme, for example, cooperation may lead both individuals and society to seek the lowest common denominator of performance, in which mediocrity is not just tolerated but fondled. Competition taken to its negative extreme may lead to a dog-eat-dog mentality in which our ambition causes us to climb over the backs of our colleagues, to sacrifice integrity for personal profit, to fashion climates where arrogance and ambition are ascendant. In their best expressions, however, cooperation multiplies the power of intelligence, and competition makes us stand on our performance tip toes.

Here's another illustration of the need for balance. In The Spirit of Community, Etzioni notes our inclination to focus on individual rights but to neglect individual responsibilities: "To take and not to give is an amoral, self-centered predisposition that ultimately no society can tolerate. To revisit the finding that many try to evade serving on a jury, which, they claim, they have a right to be served by,

is egotistical, indecent, and in the long run impractical." In a word, there can be no rights in any community-civic, corporate, or collegiate — unless those living there also discharge their responsibilities. Duty is an essential, but oft neglected motivator, and no less so in colleges and universities.

Orchestrating the tension between individual interests and community interests, between the good of self and the good of the community is a major engagement of great literature. Surely there is creative force to be found in the individual and in our solitude. Might we find a more potent expression of individualism than in the philosophic fiction of Russian-born American nurtured novelist Ayn Rand Toward the end of her novel Fountainhead, the multiple-page soliloquy of fictional hero and architect Howard Roark is an eloquent testimony to the power of the individual: ". . the mind is an attribute of the individual. There is no such thing as a collective brain. There is no such thing as a collective thought. An agreement reached by a group of men is only a compromise of an average drawn upon many individual thoughts ... All the functions of body and spirit are private. They cannot be shared or transferred." Perhaps Rand's philosophic devotion to individualism was in some sense a reaction to the worst expressions of collectivism she experienced while living in Russia. Neither she nor her fictional hero Roark, however, lived without relationship. And relationship is central to community.

In non-fiction genre, Anthony Storr has written a work entitled Solitude. While the theme of community celebrates our relationships and interactions with others, Storr's work celebrates the idea that health and happiness flow from our ability to live in peace with self. The capacity to be alone, according to Storr, is as much an element of emotional maturity as our ability to cultivate relationships. The capacity to rejoice in our aloneness may thus be a mark of emotional security and maturity.

Kahlil Gibran also speaks to the contributions of solitude: "Solitude is a silent storm that breaks down all our dead branches; yet it sends our living roots deeper into the living heart of the living earth." American prisoners of war in Vietnam were isolated in their cells, deprived of conventional forms of power and denied relationship, often over a period of years. They learned, however, to communicate among their isolated cells via a "tap code" which allowed them to join in group activity such as prearranged signing. The acts of these POWs were subtle but not inconsequential exercises of power and spirit in nurturing community.

The human experience sings to our need for both solitude and relationship; and the symphony of life is as surely a composition of solo and ensemble passages as is Brahm's First Symphony in C Minor.

What then is community? Community is a laboratory of discovery in which we come to value the possibilities found in mistake, and error, and serendipity moments. Community is a venture in human leaming and association, where moral meaning-concepts of justice and fairness, concepts of human goodness and depravity, concepts of rights and responsibility-may be factored from moments that can be both elevating and wrenching to the human spirit. Community is a dance of paradox, in which personal aspiration and personal sacrifice are found in embrace.

A sense of "community" in any setting signifies the presence of what I call an agenda of common caring and grace. This agenda of common caring embraces a love for soul, for standard, and for system. There is a caring for the individuals in the community, for those whose welfare is held in trust. There is a caring for a standard of excellence and integrity. And there is a caring for the policy and physical systems in which men and women relate in both work and play.

In a community, there is a vision of shared purpose. There are shared values that shape and guide behavior. There is a shared giving, and yes sacrifice, to cause beyond self Gibran urges: "But let there be spaces in your togetherness and let the winds of heavens dance between you." And so there are spaces in community to respect private interests and public interests. There is a space for intimacy and a space for solitude. There is a space for laughter and a space for lament, for shared moments of joy and pain. There is a space for the harmony of our togetherness and the conflict of our differences. There is a space for dark struggles and night journeys and a space for dawn arrivals of imagination and inspiration. There is a space for fellowship of conversation and a space where our silence is honored. But why is "community" important to colleges and universities? Let us go there.

THE NATURE OF COLLEGIATE COMMUNITY

The concept of community is central to colleges and universities not just because community is a goal worthy in its own right, but because colleges and universities are custodians of competence and conscience, sanctuaries of our theories and moral dispositions, critics and skeptics of both scientific and moral truth. An educational community cultivates the multiple intelligence of head, heart, and hand— knowledge, value, and skill-and strives to promote wholeness or integrity among these.

Whether in the former Soviet Union, Nazi Germany, Cambodia, Rwanda, or the Balkans, the atrocities of the 20th century form a dark and disappointing testimony to the struggle of man's nobility and barbarism and highlight the unfinished work of conscience always set before us.

It is more than a little sobering to read David Patterson's book When Learned Men Murder, a report of the Wannsee Conference of 1942 in Berlin. Of the fourteen men gathered to design the Holocaust, the murder of an entire people, eight held doctorates from some of the best universities in Europe. The divorce of competence and conscience is an ever present challenge in collegiate community.

Here I want to accent the idea that community does not imply the absence of conflict. Conflict in any relationship or organization can have constructive and destructive valence. The conventional wisdom is that conflict signals individual or organizational pathology, and its presence is an alarm call to seize the nearest fire hose and douse the fire. This narrow view, however, misses the personal and organizational growth possibilities, the clearing-away and renewal promise that may be found in conflict. And it misses the necessity for creating conflict as an instrument to combat injustice and inequity.

Not the absence of conflict but its thoughtful orchestration is what marks the presence of community, and in that orchestration are to be found both harmony and dissonance. Designing and nurturing a sense of community in our colleges and universities is an imposing leadership duty. Here's why.

THE COMPLEXITY OF COLLEGIATE MOTIVE AND METHOD

There are challenges of both motive and method to be engaged in fashioning community within our colleges and universities. In our opening remarks, we noted that American higher education is expected to be both cultural curator and cultural critic, to honor heritage and to assault the limitations of common sense.

In encouraging our students to reach for and discover the far edge of their circle of promise, our colleges and universities constitute a system of both privilege and opportunity in which elitist and egalitarian impulses contend. It is a system in which the principle of autonomy, so essential in the pursuit of truth and in the nurture of democracy, is in dynamic tension with the principle of accountability, which is antidote to professional arrogance and intellectual narrowness. Citadels of reason and persuasion, guardians of liberty and democracy, homes of discovery and dissent, engines of cultural and economic development, repositories of artistic expression, instruments of curiosity and wonder-these are mission metaphors of arresting complexity and consequence.

In a democratic society and in a collegiate community, a continued and even contentious conversation regarding higher education mission and motive is not a sign of pathology but a sign of health and vitality. Indeed, dissent over mission may be seen as evidence that higher education is meeting its responsibilities for asking what is true, what is just, and what is beautiful and for equipping its graduates in motive and skill to challenge conventional wisdom.

In a more integrating sense, one might argue that a prime mission of a college or university is to encourage a search for meaning and wholeness in our lives and in the lives of our students, to encourage engagement of the question of what makes us glad to be alive. Surely there are issues beyond economic utility, beyond consumership and production in this question.

In his book Man's Searchfor Meaning, Dr. Victor Frankl pointed to this search as a premier motive force in human existence. This past year, I read Charles Handy's work The Hungry Spirit, which is first an inquiry on the limits and liabilities of market systems- but this work is also an inquiry in meaning. Handy notes that the lesser hunger in life is for money and materialism and the things that sustain life. The greater hunger is for an answer to the question of "why", of what gives meaning to life. In a capitalist society, Handy argues, we behave as though satisfying the lesser hunger will satisfy the greater hunger. An educated person knows that this is not so, and it is the work of our colleges and universities to nurture an educated person, a hungry spirit searching for meaning, a mind equipped with ideas to understand and work in the world, a heart able and inclined to go inward in the journey of self discovery.

In his book For Common Things, Purdy, identifies questions that every educated person should engage: "What am I doing, and for what? What is the meaning of my work, and what are its purposes? What attachments-to people, to places, to principles-am I working to maintain and why? Whose well-being is in my hands, and in whose hands is mine?" These questions mark the path in our search for meaning and wholeness; and the answers to these questions cannot be found in our isolation and in our solitude.

Contemporary marketplace pressures on higher education constitute yet another tension in the search for the soul of American higher education... and a challenge to community. Last week, I received my copy of a policy paper entitled "Who Owns Teaching?" released in August 2002 by the Knight Higher Education Collaborative at the University of Pennsylvania. "Who Owns Teaching?" Though engaged in the precious work of teaching every day, I confess that the question of "who owns teaching" had never entered my mind; and I wondered what had given rise to the question.

Marketplace pressures are making their presence felt in any number of ways in the life of our colleges and universities... from the selling of rooms and buildings to the selling of logo merchandise and services, from the selling

of credit cards and mobile phone options to the selling of teaching to the student customer and consumer. We outsource bookstore, food, and custodial services. Shall we to go ahead and outsource teaching to Walmart and advertise that "We Teach for Less." Who, indeed, owns teaching? The emergence and success of proprietary institutions are a welcome addition to the diversity of our American system of higher education. But will their success in attracting student customers and consumers to a role of teaching that is built on skill acquisition and application drive out a conception of teaching that is built on fostering habits of curiosity, critical thought, and civic engagement? In The Higher Learning in America Robert Hutchins wrote that "It is sad but true that when an institution determines to do something in order to get money it must lose its soul." I am not ready to accept that assertion as the whole truth, but I am willing to accept it as a call for vigilance.

Will market pressures confine and distort the search for truth in the distinctive culture and community of American colleges and universities? There are sufficient reports in both public and professional press in which economic interests confine and thwart the interests of truth to warrant our attention. Will college faculty become hired hands and eager entrepreneurs rather than discoverers and custodians of truth? Will the house of intellect become a house of merchandise where faculty are salesmen hawking their wares to students who are credential hungry customers? Knowledge and credential for time and money, will the college experience become one of barter and exchange between teacher and student rather than a shared journey of learning? Will the pursuit of profit and prestige pass a shadow over the pursuit of truth, justice and beauty?

And since, I have mentioned justice, let me offer this additional note. Colleges are not the only enterprise in our society under market pressure. For a sobering account of how the profit motive may influence the search for and the publication of the truth see Gardner, Csikszentmihayli, and Damon's book Good Work, a study on the interface of excellence and ethics in the fields of genetics and journalism. We could make a good argument that at least three and perhaps four rights provided in a democratic society-education, information, justice (the other being health) are fundamentally in the work of discerning, distributing, and deploying the truth. When profit and market motives distort and deter that work, we may expect damage to both democracy and community.

In recent months, we have been treated to the sad consequences that flowed from the wrongdoing of senior executives in Enron and World Comm, and in several other corporate entities. On the lower floors of the power towers, men and women of the rank and file lost their entire retirement savings while in the executive suite, some of the wayward leaders experienced the fauxpain of having to sell one of their several multi-million dollar homes. Justice will find its way in such events or democracy will die.

Meanwhile, in the collegiate executive suite, some college presidents have become captains of enterprise rather than erudition? Some American college presidents are starting to behave like corporate executives-expecting signing bonuses, salary/benefits packages, and departure financial arrangements similar to their corporate counterparts. The distance between the compensation of those on the production line and those in executive suite-for both corporate and collegiate cultures-is one of incendiary potential. Corporate and academic generals who do not look first to the welfare of their troops invite apathy and rebellion, conditions inhospitable to community and dangerous to democracy.

If marketplace models and ideology may prove injurious to community in our colleges and universities, so may some civic models. Our nation's history in the 2000 presidential election taught civic lessons in the power of vote and majority rule. But truth is not necessarily to be found in consensus, popularity, or majority vote. The religious majority may have weighed against Galileo, but Galileo had the truth. The medical majority may have weighed against Semmelwiess, but Semmelwiess had the truth. The military majority may have weighed against General Billy Mitchell, but General Mitchell had the truth. The civic majority in the South may have weighed against Rosa Parks but Rosa Parks had the truth.

How do the ambiguous governance processes of higher education affect the cultivation of community. There are many stakeholders who may claim a legitimate voice in addressing community questions of higher education mission/ purpose and in evaluating higher education performance: students, faculty, administrators, parents, civic friends and political officers, board members, and alumni. Thus, diverging views among this range of stakeholders on governance processes and the concept of shared authority, the often tedious processes of consensus decision making and the presence of diverging views on definitions of quality and accountability add to the challenge of building community.

And if mission complexity, marketplace pressures, and governance ambiguity were not a sufficient challenge to the nurture of collegiate community, let us consider method. Conflict and argument are central to the work of our colleges and universities. An organization whose mission constitutes an assault on common sense and on the bondage of superstition, whose methods include the adversarial testing of ideas in public forum, whose spirit embraces a

certain irreverence, and whose best work is done when its graduates exit with the competence and courage to question the authority of tradition will not find the search for community a tiptoe through the tulips.

If we may borrow a thought agenda from Neal Postman, American educational institutions are asked to serve many gods: the god of economic utility (get a job and be a competent worker), the god of consumership (spend money and acquire material possessions), the god of technology (use tools and be efficient), and the god of multiculturalism (accent separatism and divisiveness), which is not the same as cultural pluralism. Postman suggests that the story of America is a story of question and argument, a continuing journey of experiment and debate.

In some ways, then, American higher education is a guarantor of democracy and a guardian of liberty because higher education can be seen as a form of organized and continuous argument. Thus, colleges and universities serve a critical and civilizing purpose in our society via the maintenance of argument, in serving as a forum in which contesting ideas may be evaluated in public view and in a manner in which civility of discourse is honored.

Continuing with our concern for method, we should observe that colleges and universities are sanctuaries for scholars seeking truth on many fronts, utilizing diverse methods, and honoring a wide variety of philosophic assumptions about the nature of truth. Scientists want an experiment and lawyers an adversarial hearing. Mathematicians want a logical argument and theologians a search of sacred literature. Sociologists want a compilation of opinion and historians an analysis of prime sources. Novelists, musicians, and visual artists bring an interpretative spirit to the enterprise. Professional scholars look to the practical application of ideas.

Is truth revealed, discovered, or constructed? Does truth exist independent of the observer or is the observer a part of the truth event? Is truth relative or absolute? And is the answer to all these questions "Yes!"? Colleges and universities are companies of fact and faith, enterprises in which ideological conflict and argument are central to their very existence, their raison de 'etre. Our colleges may be seen as an epistemological Mobius strip in which we start with the culture of evidence found in science. Before we can return again to science, we may find we have taken a joumey of inversion and traveled to a culture of faith and theology. The Big Bang theory of the origins of the universe is an effect without a cause, but the theologians have an idea on this. Physicists suggest that there may be a dark matter in the university and realities of which we are unaware. Is the hallway between science and religion shorter than we thought?

Here also is an enterprise often criticized for its fossilized views and processes, its reluctance and resistance to change. There is something to be said, however, for the andante majesty of higher education in its pace of change. Nurturing truth and talent is an eminently personal occupation, a work of the long term whose success is not found in a neat balance sheet for the current quarter or year. It is a work largely of faith and optimism. Colleges and universities are not built to bob up and down to every new ideological or technological fad or whim sweeping onto the beaches of our society.

Computer and communications technology offer promise of forever transforming relationships in educational institutions and for enhancing learning effectiveness and efficiency. However, we are often invited and tempted to jump on the technology bandwagon without thinking about the liability side of an emerging technology. You can blow up banks and tree stumps with dynamite, trade stocks and embezzle financial accounts with computers ... and the technology doesn't care. How many management fads from the corporate sector have made their fanfare entry into collegiate administration only to make slow digestive passage and quiet exit, leaving behind modest positive residue from MBO, PPBS, and TQM ... and also leaving behind a few pedestrian souls awaiting the arrival of the next acronym to which they can become attached.

At first I hated email because I could not imagine that ten or twenty people would want to contact me each day and require response. And so I became an expert with the "Delete Button." Now I have to confess that in my office I am like one of B. F. Skinner's pigeons, pecking away at the "Webmail"icon to find out who wants to talk to me. In a recent meeting of freshman honors students instructors, I was asked if I was using the Blackboard. "Well sure, I replied, though I tend to use magic markers instead of chalk." In a note of irritation, the colleague led me to understand that there is now an electronic blackboard. It is frustrating to realize that I have not yet mastered the finer artistic points of SPSS, Webmail, and Wordperfect; and now I have to find this Blackboard thing or be considered a technology laggard. When will we find time to think, to reflect? Might our communications technology take so much to master and maintain that we will have little if anything of substance to share because we've had no time to think?

Computers and cell phones-I know that these and other technologies bring many blessings personal and professional. But we need a little time to ponder the liabilities. The automatic teller machine will not listen to my reasons for being overdrawn, my computer cannot hug me, my cell phone has no interest in sharing an early morning sunrise, and my GPS system does not enjoy a good joke. The Intel processor neither laughs nor cries. These issues of

electronics and communications technology are kindergarten issues when compared to those of genetic engineering, which present new headaches not easily treated by Advil or Tylenol. Will man design man and will the affluent design a brave new world in which we all must live?

A moment ago, I confessed to technology negligence. I confess also to occasional technology rebellion in that I regularly practice not using power point presentations. There are moments when I want to look students and audiences in the eye and form a communication relationship rather than put on a show. I harbor some suspicion that our students might often yearn for us to abandon our power point presentations for two reasons. One, they are generally better at designing such presentations than we are. Two, they also yearn for communications intimacy... for relationship, for community. There is no need to fear new technologies, but we should not neglect a sober evaluation of their effect on community nor begrudge the time it takes to do so, even though the pace of change may be slowed thereby.

THE SOUL OF COLLEGIATE COMMUNITY

Is it my imagination, or is the term "soul" finding more frequent appearance in contemporary literature? One would not be surprised to find such a term appearing in religious literature, but here is a book by Bolman and Deal entitled Leading with Soul and one by Marsden entitled The Soul of the American University. There is an article by Frank Newman in the October, 2000 issue of Change Magazine entitled "Saving Higher Education's Soul" and I crafted a recently published essay entitled "Searching for the Soul of American Higher Education." Now what do these ruminations on soul in general and on the soul of the university have to do with the nature of community in colleges and universities. For those of us who give life and meaning to our colleges and universities, we live in a climate occasionally less friendly, and sometimes downright hostile.

There are cost containment pressures and revenue regimens, civic and political leaders expecting sharper mission focus and less across-the-board mentality in dealing with fiscal retrenchment and corporate leaders expecting efficiency and productivity improvements. There are parents and students expecting their college tuition investment to yield a good paying and satisfying job and policy makers relying increasingly on market mechanisms to define educational goals and priorities. There are impatient wizards expecting immediate and uncritical adoption of new technologies and competitive pressures from an emerging proprietary sector. There is civic dissatisfaction with attention to teaching and impressions of recalcitrance to change, an egalitarian discomfort with higher education as a haven for a protected and privileged class. There are academic policy scholars eager to tell us what our problems are and not so quick in suggesting solutions.

So how do we cherish and honor the call of tradition and embrace the call to change? How do we tend the commons in the temple of truth? How do we respect our own labors and respond to the concerns of our critics? Perhaps a useful first reaction is that current criticism and pressure for change may bring us to a more imaginative consideration of our enterprise. After all, the current rich profile of American higher education is not the product of small minds and timid spirits. It was no less management scholar than Peter Drucker who observed that the American University is an exemplar of notable entrepreneurship.

Second, we may want to take advice from Emerson and throw ourselves on the side of our assailants to see what weaknesses we may uncover. In an organization that prospects for truth in adversarial forum, holding that we have not understood or acquired a truth unless we have contended with its challenge, we could hardly feel comfortable if our policies and practices, our assumptions and ways of doing business went unchallenged. The mind of the scholar is hospitable to dissent and disputation and should remain hospitable when the dissent and disputation touch and target the heart of the collegiate enterprise. When one's occupation is to search for the truth, we would hardly run in fear if a prepared and persistent mind finds a more effective way to pursue truth.

Third, we must recognize that a college or university, whose principal work, as we earlier noted, is to assault the limitations of common sense may itself come under assault. Today's truth was yesterday's heresy, and the harbingers of new truth, whether individuals or institutions, are not always greeted with warm and friendly embrace.

Fourth, the mind of the scholar may find cause for celebration that Americans have made such a magnificent philosophic and financial investment in our colleges and universities and that Americans are willing to pay for an organization to be critical of the social, culture, economic, educational, and political status quo.

Fifth, it should not be offensive to the mind of the scholar that the quality and range of public criticism is a performance indicator of higher education's success, a pleasure measure of some importance and validity. We want our graduates to think critically, do we not? Did we believe that our graduates might think critically about every organization in society and every policy in our democracy without turning their curiosity to the academy? Kahlil Gibran notes that "I have learned silence from the talkative, toleration from the intolerant, and kindness from the unkind; yet strange, I am ungrateful to these teachers." It is easy to be ungrateful to our critics, but we should resist that impulse.

Sixth, we will want to commend American colleges and universities as organizational oysters where mistake and error incubate pearls of new leaming and knowledge. The history of ideas is the history of failed hypotheses and flawed inquiries where patient and persistent minds turned such failures and flaws to new directions of thought. What a splendid paradox that current notions of truth form the very platform from which we discover that some ideas we thought were true never were. The home of paradox ... another way to think about the university.

Finally, we will want to embrace those values that further mark the mind of the scholar. We have already mentioned a hospitality to dissent and disputation. Such dissent and disputation are inevitable and welcome outcomes of our inclination to curiosity, which is the hallmark of an educated mind. Accompanying that curiosity should be the values of courage and persistence that enable a good mind to stay the course. Such a mind does not run and hide at the first sign of disappointment, failure, challenge or criticism. A servant and steward attitude is a disposition that keeps us from the arrogance that can often afflict those who think they know more than others. Those who know more owe more. Finally, a compassionate and empathetic heart establishes the basis for placing knowledge in service of noble purpose, to confront issues of both soil and soul erosion.

THE UNITING FORCE OF CURIOSITY AND WONDER

With all this complexity in mission and motive, what provides the uniting force for the special and distinguishing character of community in American higher education? We have advanced in this essay some answers to this question, The community of higher education is a forum of fact and faith, where some truths reside in the numbers and some in the mist—but the search for truth is a uniting aspiration. It is a lively and often contentious argument over the nature of truth. It is a museum of ideological heritage, ideas once fresh and energizing but now quaint and outmoded. It is the home of our hope, where scholars labor to solve those problems that rob men and women of their dignity, their promise, their joy. It is conservator of the record of our nobility and barbarism. It is the theater of our artistic impulses. It is a forum where dissent over purpose and performance may be seen as evidence that higher education is meeting its responsibility for asking what is true, what is good, and what is beautiful. It is a place where all in the community-students, faculty, staff—are called to ask what brings meaning to their lives and makes them glad to be alive. It is, above all, a community in which we celebrate the humanizing force of our curiosity and wonder, a place for those T. E. Lawrence might have described as dreamers of day.

What Is Good Journalism?

FIGHTING TO KEEP IT WORKING FOR US

Address by GENEVA OVERHOLSER, *Pulitzer Prize Winning Editor, 2002 Recipient of the Anvil Award*

Delivered to the Anvil Freedom Award, Estlow Lecture, University of Denver, Denver, Colorado, October 22, 2002

Thanks to Estlows, D.U., greetings... I want to be gin by paying warm tribute to Jean Otto, who started this lecture series. An old friend of mine, and a true friend of the First Amendment. Also want to tell you how deeply grateful I am for this award. Nothing in my professional life means more to me than this quest, to protect journalism's role in service of democracy — under the First Amendment, which makes that role possible. I want to pay my respects as well to the distinguished winners and lecturers who come before me, each of whom I've had the good fortune to know. You've selected an interesting bunch. Now let me see if I can earn my way into that — "interesting bunch" — characterization this evening by sharing a few thoughts with you.

First, why am I talking to you tonight about this question: What Good Is Journalism?

I'll put it to you right away: Because I think that journalism in America is dangerously threatened. And I think that a decline in America's journalistic health leads directly to a decline in America's civic health. And I think that the best hope for protecting journalism — for once again nourishing it — lies in a public clamor for good journalism.

Now I'm not a fool — or at least not a COMPLETE fool — and so I'm under no illusion that this is the current public inclination: To speak out in support of journalism. Indeed, journalists have been experiencing a plummeting public reputation for years, and currently show up in surveys right down there with used-car salesmen.

People think journalists are pushy and obnoxious, cynical and superficial, self-infatuated and bent on hobnobbing with the powerful. They think we confuse news and entertainment, embrace sensationalism, and care more about prizes than we do about the public. The books about the media that sell well have titles such as "Bias" and "Slander."

And, you know what? I am here to tell you that things are even worse than all that. The picture is actually MORE worrisome, actually significantly drearier, than you know.