



PROJECT MUSE®

Campus and Community: A World Turned Inside Out?

John R. Thelin

The Review of Higher Education, Volume 25, Number 1, Fall 2001,
pp. 1-14 (Article)

Published by The Johns Hopkins University Press
DOI: 10.1353/rhe.2001.0016



➔ For additional information about this article

<http://muse.jhu.edu/journals/rhe/summary/v025/25.1thelin.html>

The Review of Higher Education

Fall 2001, Volume 25, No. 1, pp. 1–14

Copyright © 2001 Association for the Study of Higher Education

All Rights Reserved (ISSN 0162-5748)

Campus and Community: A World Turned Inside Out?

John R. Thelin

One of my favorite books about higher education is Burton Clark's *The Academic Life: Small Worlds, Different Worlds* (1987). Its insights about the subtle contrasts among institutions and disciplines fascinate me. They also haunt me, even when I try to find sanctuary while watching television after having taught a late-night seminar. For example, a few years ago one episode of "Law and Order" featured a senior professor of physics who was charged with homicide. His plea to the jury was that, after all, his life had reached rock bottom. Although at one time he was considered a rising star, a contender for the Nobel Prize, in mid-career he had been driven to a life of crime. Why? Because he had suffered the ultimate insult: at physics conferences he was relegated to presenting his research papers at six o'clock on Friday evening. Who could really blame him for having committed murder?

John R. Thelin is Professor of the History of Higher Education and Public Policy at the University of Kentucky in Lexington, Kentucky. He served as President of the Association for the Study of Higher Education (ASHE) in 2000. This essay is drawn from his ASHE Presidential Address presented on November 17 in Sacramento, California. Address queries to him at Educational Policy Studies, 131 TEB, College of Education, University of Kentucky, Lexington, KY 40506-0001; telephone: (859) 257-4996; fax: (859) 257-4243; e-mail: jthelin@pop.uky.edu.

Author's Acknowledgements: I wish to give special thanks to Geraldine Joncich Clifford of the University of California, Berkeley; Jack Schuster of Claremont Graduate University; A. Sharon Thelin-Blackburn; James W. Thelin of the University of Tennessee; Peter C. Thelin of West Valley, California Community College; and Linda Eisenmann of the University of Massachusetts, Boston, and Program Chair for ASHE 2000; and Ann Austin of Michigan State University, ASHE President for 2001.

Well, here it is, six o'clock on Friday evening. But I am not a physicist. Burton Clark was right: The academic life is composed of small worlds that are very different worlds. In contrast to this unfortunate professor of physics, I wish to note that for one whose field is higher education and is part of ASHE, there is no greater honor than to be given the opportunity and invitation to talk with you on Friday at six o'clock.

I wish to raise questions and above all, to foster discussion about campus and community. This includes specific attention to the community and courtesies of the campus. Ultimately, I hope to connect this to some questions about the place of ASHE in the higher education cosmos. My remarks are shaped by some influential works from the past decade, namely, Ernest Boyer's Carnegie Foundation study, *Campus Life: In Search of Community* (1990) and Clark Kerr's essay, "Academic Citizenship in Decline" (1994). My concern about the topic has been rekindled by some recent works: Donald Kennedy's *Academic Duty* (1997) and Robert Rosenzweig's *The Political University* (1998). And, the recent work that has been most illuminating and insightful on these puzzles and problems is Patricia Gumpert's paper presented last year at a symposium sponsored by the Association of Governing Boards and the University of Virginia's Curry School of Education (Gumpert, 1999). My caveat is that although Patricia Gumpert may be clear-headed on these matters, I have yet to reach that threshold. This is literally an essay—an attempt to try to reach good resolution and clarity.

WHO KILLED THE FACULTY CLUB?

All this may sound a bit abstract. In fact, I prefer to deal with significant issues that surface in small, specific incidents. Years ago the board game of Clue might have included the mystery, "Who killed Colonel Mustard in the Faculty Club?" Today, my question is abbreviated and fundamental: "Who killed the Faculty Club?"

I want to investigate this mystery because it connects ultimately to a growing lament by senior faculty and administrators that a new generation of professors is absent from the revered Faculty Club. I stumbled upon the scene of this academic crime three years ago when I was simultaneously intrigued and troubled by an article in the *Chronicle of Higher Education* whose headline pronounced, "Empty Tables at the Faculty Club Worry Some Academics" (Schneider, 1997). The lead paragraph read: "Older scholars see a loss of a common meeting ground, but many younger professors see only a relic."

According to the article, "The faculty table at the Johns Hopkins Club is all but deserted on a recent spring day. A lone professor, graying and spectacled, sits surrounded by seven empty chairs. The 'big table,' as it's known, has turned into a table for one. In the club's library, with its dark, oak-

paneled walls and red-leather couches,” chairs are either empty or occupied by octogenarians. According to the journalist, “The hands of the grandfather clock are frozen in place at 4:38. That’s appropriate, some professors would say, for a place where time seems to have stopped.” Some of the long-time members

want to restore the club to a place of prominence in Johns Hopkins’s intellectual life. They remember what it used to be like: During the club’s golden age in the ’50s and ’60s, some 16 chairs—every one of them filled—would be crowded around the big table. Departments would reserve tables in the main dining room, and come noontime, professors strolled over for lunch with their colleagues.

According to long-time members:

Those were the days when Milton Eisenhower, president of Johns Hopkins and brother of Ike, held court at the club, bantering with colleagues over meat loaf and mashed potatoes. Junior faculty members debated the issues du jour with senior professors, and scholars mingled across departmental lines. (p. 12)

This nostalgia is alluring. A reader’s initial response was to sigh, “Yes, those were the days. . . .” But that emotional rush can be tempered with the sober question, “How good were the good old days?” Does a moribund faculty club necessarily signal some alarm about the alleged decline of vitality and camaraderie in the campus and academic community?

The first caution is that the “good old days” of the 1950s had a few rough spots. Gender, race, and ethnicity certainly narrowed the composition of the idyllic Faculty Club—unless, of course, one included the kitchen help and service staff in the profile. In an interview published in October 2000 in the Berkeley alumni magazine, Professor Laura Nader of the Anthropology Department recalled how the few women faculty members at Berkeley in the early 1960s literally had to enter the Faculty Club through a clandestine window to attend faculty meetings that were held, curiously, in a building officially restricted to men only (Schoch, 2000, p. 29). Nostalgia, then, ought not deter investigation of the scene of the crime. And, if Laura Nader’s memoirs are correct, we may wish to change the offense from a sin of commission to a sin of omission—namely, exclusion carried out by the senior leadership of the university..

THE SCENE OF THE CRIME: THE LOGISTICS OF THE CAMPUS

Perhaps the death of the faculty club is due to structure and logistics: namely, inadequate parking and poor location. This hypothesis is plausible, at least as a partial explanation. Consider that in 1910 the largest enroll-

ment at any university in the United States was little more than 6,000 (Slosson, 1910). Even in 1940 many major state universities had total enrollments of around 2,000 to 7,000. Today, we accept as a matter of course a flagship state university campus enrolling between 25,000 and 60,000. When one seeks an example of a “small liberal arts college” in the public sector, Miami University of Ohio is often cited. This year “small” Miami University has an enrollment close to 18,000—three times the enrollment of the largest university of 1910. Contemporary pressures on facilities usage are sufficiently intense at the University of Minnesota that new faculty must get on a waiting list for campus parking passes.

The evidence suggests, then, that one obvious reason for this alleged diffusion of a sense of community on the American campus probably is partially due to a “curse of bigness.” No one is directly or individually “guilty” for the erosion of collegial spaces and atmosphere. Rather, it is the price one pays for institutions that literally carried out Ezra Cornell’s mid-19th century motto, “I would found an institution where any one could study anything.” Peter Drucker and others have argued that critical mass beyond a certain size makes an organization inaccessible. If so, then one solution would be to have more, not fewer, faculty clubs scattered throughout the sprawling modern campus, not unlike the practice of having “branch libraries” within a university setting. Perhaps a sprinkling of “Collegial Coffee Kiosks” would have been comparable to the vision of the “cluster college” that Clark Kerr, Dean McHenry, and Paige Smith envisioned for such campuses as the University of California at Santa Cruz where the idea was to “make the university seem smaller as it grows larger” (Kerr, 1963; Grant & Riesman, 1978). The opposite has proven to be true. The number of faculty clubs or other formal collegial enclaves has declined, not sprouted.

Let us presume then that the decline of the Faculty Club is due to two factors: (a) the campus core is congested and (b) the traditional activities and offerings of the club have little appeal to a newer generation of faculty. So, how then are universities responding to the new “faculty needs” of the 21st century” in terms of space and activities? Here’s an article from one university’s October 2000 faculty-staff campus newspaper:

GROUND BROKEN FOR UNIVERSITY GOLF CLUB

The weather could not have been better: clear skies dotted by broken clouds, temperatures about 68 degrees, and the air stirred by a gentle breeze. A perfect afternoon for golf. So it was appropriate that the university president, the athletics director and other university officials spent Thursday at the University Club golf facility, west of town, shovels in hand and tossing dirt to break ground for the new club. “Anyone who likes to be on a golf course can look around and see we will have something special,” the president told about 40 people at the groundbreaking ceremony.

The university entered a licensing agreement last year with University Clubs of America, a Columbia, South Carolina, firm that has established similar relationships with several other universities. . . . The president noted that the course is not limited to use by the varsity golf teams. The club also is open to university faculty, staff, alumni and students who choose to join.

Most important, “The University Club will provide a much-needed gathering spot for our faculty, staff, students, alumni, and friends to enjoy fellowship and recreational opportunities. The University Club agreement established a \$5,000 initiation fee plus \$150 monthly dues for faculty and staff of the university. The club has allocated 150 memberships for faculty and staff” (punctuation and capitalization standardized).

For some, this is good news. The central administration and board say that this was a “much needed” facility for university-wide fellowship. Perhaps. However, one doubts that many assistant professors will be rushing to join, given the \$5,000 initiation fee plus the \$150 per month dues. Bear in mind that this is the same university that bemoans lack of support from its state government. It also claims that it is sympathetic to faculty and student demands for laboratory space and research support as well as the more mundane matters of classroom building roof repairs and library book budgets.

THE FACULTY AS CULPRITS?

The purpose of this side trip to explore the university administration’s enthusiastic announcement about the new university golf club is to offer a clue to the mystery of “Who killed the Faculty Club?” In other words, beyond impediments of structure and size, some normative dimensions of contemporary academic life may also reduce faculty cohesion and participation in governance.

One predictable explanation is that today faculty, especially new and untenured faculty, have neither the time nor money for the long, leisurely lunches. Yet the most fascinating element of this rationale is that, to an older generation of faculty and presidents, the new faculty’s absence is viewed as an act of negligence, defiance, or disloyalty. Obsession with getting tenure, landing grants, writing articles, and other “selfishness” that takes untenured professors away from the Faculty Club is seen as a world turned upside down, a subversion of campus community values.

That’s plausible. However, it tends to gloss over the fact that the new generation of assistant professors did not create the standards or high-pressure climate associated with the research and publication achievements as requisites for tenure. An alternative interpretation is that the older generation of faculty and administrators who accuse the newer faculty of neglect-

ing campus citizenship may well be blaming the victims. New faculty are responding to a system of rewards and punishments concerning publications and research their elders have put in place. If new faculty are holding office hours for students during the customary lunch time, then clearly they are not neglecting proper faculty responsibilities. Furthermore, the new university golf club incident raises a reasonable doubt about whether faculty, especially newer faculty, are genuinely sought for inclusion in this university facility. Rather than saying faculty are staying away, I would say they are busy with legitimate professional activities and also are being excluded or evaded.

In returning to the on-campus Faculty Club issue, it is important to recall that one magnet of the traditional Faculty Club was that the president would dine and banter with faculty. Where is the president today? Would an enthusiastic assistant professor have much chance of chatting with the president or provost? Who stayed away first—the professors of the president? The crucial question is whether a president or provost or dean leads by example to meet, dine, and chat with the faculty?

Faculty are staying away in part because the Faculty Club has not responded to the wishes and demands of faculty. Indeed, the elaboration in the 1997 *Chronicle of Higher Education* article about the Johns Hopkins Faculty Club noted:

Only 10 per cent of the club's 3,900 members are professors or staff members. Some 80 per cent are alumni. The rest are trustees, donors, a few graduate students, and the spouses of past members. It's not exactly a scholarly crowd, nor is it a happening one. Most professors who join the club care more about retirement accounts than research grants. The bulk of the patrons are over 65. (Schneider, 1997).

Given this situation, a campus child-care center, for example, might be more attractive than a billiards room if the aim is to increase faculty participation.

The campus club represents not so much a world turned upside down but rather a campus world whose sense of communities turned inside-out. Whether at Johns Hopkins or elsewhere, what was once the Faculty Club really now ought be called the Alumni Club. Why would an assistant professor want to pay monthly membership dues and take two hours to table-hop with alumni and athletic boosters? And the recent celebration of the new university golf course extends the observation that university officials and boards, not just faculty, have not followed the gyroscope of proper mission and priorities. The president and administration must share some responsibility for the death of the faculty club.

FACULTY INVOLVEMENT AND ACADEMIC DUTY

Restaurants come and go in their popularity. By that litmus, a decline in the appeal of the Faculty Club as a dining place is in itself of limited concern. Hence, the next and more important question is, “Does the specific erosion of the Faculty Club as a campus meeting spot indicate a larger, more significant decline in faculty’s involvement in the governance and life of the campus as a community?” And, if so, how to explain this trend? There is some recurrent tendency, implicit and explicit, that once again, the faculty are depicted as the culprits in this erosion. Going from the Faculty Club to the larger, more significant issue of the Faculty ethos, here’s what Clark Kerr wrote in his essay, “Academic Citizenship in Decline” in 1994: “My greatest concern about academic ethics is with the decline of academic ‘citizenship’ across American higher education, and less with the performance of specific contractual obligations” (p. 149).

By “good citizenship” he meant observance of the code of academic ethics and “willingness to participate in shared governance effectively.” It also included a “commitment to protect the academic institution from political disruption and violence,” and “care not to exploit the name of the institution or its facilities for economic gain.” Kerr warned, “I fear that we may be on a slippery downward slope,” then elaborated:

It is more difficult than it once was to get university teachers to take seriously their departmental and college responsibilities. They are more reluctant to serve on committees, and more reluctant to make time readily available when they do, and more reluctant to accept the responsibilities of writing good reports. They wish to concentrate on their own affairs and not those of the institution. (p. 151)

FACULTY INDIFFERENCE: EXCEPTIONS TO THE RULE?

These are serious allegations. Presuming that Clark Kerr is correct about this decline in faculty participation, one can follow his observations with another question: “Have colleges and universities neglected *their* academic duty to the faculty?”

The central question is whether there are significant exceptions to that general rule of faculty avoidance and evasion? What I have found over the past 25 years in a variety of institutions and locales is an underappreciated phenomenon: a discernible group of dedicated professors. My own inclination is to be a gentle campus loyalist—not a booster, not a major donor, but an academic citizen. From this perspective and standard, there are, indeed, numerous colleagues who again and again crop up in varieties of shared governance and service situations. Think of the vocabulary faculty encounter: task forces, advisory committees, ad hoc committees, councils, senates, and assemblies.

The imbalanced profile is that much of the depiction of the professoriate in the popular press has focused on the neglect of teaching in favor of emphasis on research. Overlooked is a “multiplier effect”—faculty who escape the false dichotomy of teaching versus research and who also go a step further: They achieve excellence in teaching, research, and service. The question—not a conclusion—is whether this is a group that has been underappreciated and even used and abused by the institution, especially by the central administration?

Economists talk about the “free rider” syndrome that renders voluntarism ineffective. The classic example is one who listens to public radio without making donations. And, indeed, voluntarism and self-regulation pervade American civil life. A fascinating feature today about the American campus is not the alleged decline in faculty community and citizenship but rather how to explain that it is as strong as it is. Why aren’t all professors “free riders” within the campus community? Why do professors who are busy with teaching, advising, writing, grants, and consulting voluntarily find time and take initiative to serve on the university senate or other campus committees?

One answer, drawing from sociologist James Q. Wilson’s study of bureaucracies, is that in many institutions—ranging from military units to civil service—the transmission and tenacity of a professional code of values and behavior are the most important elements in shaping how professionals define and carry out their duties. It is conduct that, in large part, is impervious to administrative fiat (Wilson, 1989). For sociologist Wilson, a good illustration of this universal principle was that police officers highly respected fellow officers who were able to resolve neighborhood disputes without making arrests—even when police chiefs had issued memos urging officers to emphasize arrests so as to bolster statistical records of performance. For the university, within faculty ranks there is high respect for peers who do serve on committees and task forces even though there is little if any connection between service and such benefits as salary increases or promotion. That is the academic ethos at its best, a sign of enduring institutional commitment that is not mistaken for mere loyalty to a particular president, provost, or dean.

Consider the time a professor invests in serving as chair of a self-study subcommittee for regional accreditation. The odds of an established college or university having its accreditation revoked are minuscule. The prospect of financial reward for such committee service is virtually nonexistent. In fact, a poor showing on an accreditation review probably would be seen more as a sign of administrative failure and embarrassment than as indicative of faculty negligence. Yet despite such a rational calculus, senior faculty continue to accept such service assignments. Ironically, the weak link in this arrangement is uncertainty whether the administration and trustees appreciate or acknowledge the faculty commitment.

A personal example illustrates my general contention. This is an episode that is just one of many tales from the archives of advisory committees. I served for seven years at one campus as a member of the honorary degrees advisory committee. The faculty committee met about six times per year—including intensive work sessions in which we absorbed criteria and then talked among ourselves about possible nominees and candidates. Great care and thought was then followed by documentation. One particular standard was that the board would give strong consideration for one honorary degree slot to nominees who were natives to the state and who had made a contribution to humanity beyond the specifics of their expertise. For seven years in a row, I nominated Arthur Ashe. For seven years, this nomination (along with others) went forward from the faculty committee to the board. And for seven years, Arthur Ashe's nomination was turned down by the board, with no explanation. (The important and thankful sequel is that, several years later, Arthur Ashe was selected for the honorary degree—one year before his death.)

The feedback that this faculty committee did get from the board was that the board preferred nominations for Gerald Ford, Mother Teresa, General Norman Schwartzkopf, and Vince Lombardi. These nominations seemed to have a high correlation with individuals recently featured on the covers of *Time*, *Newsweek*, or *People* magazines. Candidates suggested by the Board of Trustees were worthy but fairly predictable and usually unavailable.

Why does this matter for the alleged decline of shared governance? It matters because shared governance is an institutional arrangement that often has treated faculty shabbily. It also underscores the view that a weak link in the community and governance of the American campus is the inordinate detachment and unaccountability combined with the exceptional power of board members over the full-time campus constituency.

This gulf that faculty face with the board can also extend to their “shared governance” with high level administration. Many campuses appoint a budget advisory committee. Here are some questions to consider: Do members of the budget advisory committee have access to detailed, comprehensive, and timely budget data? Do they have to ask for it? Are university administrators required to meet with the committee and provide information? Are faculty truly included in the budget deliberations? My sense is that the response will be a demoralized, reluctant acknowledgement that, “No, faculty are not included or informed in a meaningful manner.”

The policy implication is that, if presidents and boards value shared governance, why not appreciate those professors who volunteer to serve—and who serve well and often? Why not show substantive courtesy and respect? More specifically, why not transform “advisory” committees into decision-making bodies? Undergirding my suggestion is the fact that I respectfully disagree with Clark Kerr's recent estimate on the relative decline in faculty

citizenship. The norm I have observed over the past decade is that faculty committees draft good, thoughtful reports. My lament is that they often have no assurance that such reports are heeded, let alone implemented, when institutional policy is crafted.

THE GULF BETWEEN FACULTY AND ADMINISTRATION

The literature on higher education has abundant coverage of the tensions between faculty and administration in the modern American university, past and present (Veysey, 1964; Breslin, 2000). ASHE colleagues—including, for example, Gary Rhoades's (1998) work on professors as “managed professionals”—contribute to that literature. One mild reservation about this literature is that it tends to depict dramatic splits. It could be that the faculty vs. the administration is comparable to shepherders vs. cattle ranchers of the Old West. Or, in an industrial age, it conjures the images of highly visible struggles of labor vs. management. There is some appeal to that latter depiction, given the announcement in November 2000 that graduate teaching assistants at some public universities in Massachusetts are opting to affiliate with a branch of an auto workers union. And, in a similar vein, 25 years ago John Silber, then president of Boston University, playfully predicted that a faculty alliance with the Teamsters Union was the wave of the future (*Change*, 1976). Yet when we survey the entire landscape of tensions between faculty and administration, the drift toward high drama seems exaggerated.

Instead of high drama, the tension between administration and faculty is often banal. Rather than the metaphors of heroic industrial wars of labor vs. management, the disputes in academe bring to mind the everyday nuisances of landlords vs. tenants. Or, even more dismally, the lines are drawn in the scale and scope of apartment resident managers vs. tenants. As a result, the disputes are demeaning, the academic equivalents of “Who is responsible for repairing the leaky faucet?” or, “Is the tenant using too much heat?” These symptoms reveal a drain on vitality and energy within the campus community and the academic ethos.

One humorous, customary explanation is to invoke the saying sometimes attributed to Henry Kissinger: “Academic politics are so vicious because the stakes are so low.” I always thought that this statement got garbled—either a misperception by the author or a copy editing error by the reporter. The problem with shared governance and academic politics is not that they are so vicious—but rather, that they are so *viscous*. One may recall from high school chemistry and from motor oil advertisements that “viscosity” is the ability to resist flow. It is this pervasive low-level evasion and decline of trust between administration and faculty that impede the fluidity and clarity of campus governance, thus eroding a positive sense of

campus community. This is an undramatic but consequential dry rot—to change the metaphor—that is lamentable.

Were this commentary merely anecdotal speculation or spleen, it could be readily disregarded. But in fact, the anecdotes illustrate some substantive trends that have been discussed and systematically analyzed in the higher education research literature. For example, 1994 analyses of the character and prospects of the American academic profession indicated disturbing trends: namely, decline in autonomy, prestige, and resources (Altbach, 1994, pp. 225–248). One of the more alarming developments was the tendency of administrations to hire part-time instructors, meanwhile reducing the number of tenured or tenure-eligible positions. That in itself is troubling. Yet in some ways my particular focus on the declining official courtesy toward faculty is different and perhaps especially surprising. One regrets that part-time instructors are underpaid and disenfranchised from the institutional life—which is precisely one of the reasons that this hiring tendency is odious to the academic ethos. What is perhaps more surprising is the declining respect that presidents and boards show toward full-time tenured or tenure-eligible faculty—a startling scenario for a faculty group that one would expect to receive courteous treatment. The upshot is that, in the past decade, faculty of all ranks have been losing ground as citizens in the academic community. Indeed, one interpretation of such trends in the academic profession concludes by reference to, “Demographic Changes and the Decline of Community” (Altbach, 1994, pp. 236–237).

It may well have been that such deterioration was closely linked to the immediate financial problems that most colleges and universities faced in the late 1980s and early 1990s. However, recent research suggests that the deterioration and tensions have increased—even though the U.S. economy (including university investment portfolios) stood at a record-high level between 1995 and 2000. In research sponsored for the Association of Governing Boards of Universities and Colleges, Patricia Gumport (1999) reported:

A chasm exists in contemporary public higher education between management and governance. Faculty members often are characterized as unwilling to learn the principles of quality and efficiency espoused by trustees, presidents, and deans. They commonly are cast as scapegoats, hunkering down to protect their turf from downsizing and restructuring, even when the good of the whole is said to depend on such changes. (p. 1)

And, to accentuate the breakdown of consensus, Gumport summarizes, “On the other side, trustees, presidents, and deans often are accused of bypassing norms of faculty consultation and acting to further their own partisan interests or agendas. This chasm can also be viewed as a gap between the common good and self-interest” (p. 1).

The dilemma in trying to resolve this tension and gridlock is to distinguish between genuine common good versus self-interest in the academic institution. Presidents, provosts, and deans tend to equate support for their particular priorities with the long-term interests of the college or university. One wishes that overlap were universal—but, as the preceding examples illustrate, there is reasonable doubt that administrators and board members have such a gyroscope any more so than faculty do. The result is that, at the start of the 21st century, the colleges and universities of the United States, for all their successes, are in a situation of extended gridlock over legitimacy and trust.

THE CAMPUS AND THE LARGER COMMUNITY

One potential source of the misunderstanding and declining trust between professors and presidents is the messages that presidents broadcast when speaking to external constituencies. In recent years numerous presidents of public colleges and universities have told the following tale at banquets and fundraisers: “We used to be state supported. Now we are state assisted. And soon we will be merely state located.” The interesting feature of this liturgy is that, even though it has been around for years, presidents invoke it as if they had just made the connections—as if this were some profound and original insight. My own research tracks this polemic back at least to 1978 in University of California alumni publications and fund-raising materials (Corten, 1978). It is not necessarily incorrect, but it is no longer original and can sometimes be misleading.

For one thing, it is not good history. If presidents had taken the trouble to look earlier than 1950, they might have found that the real American heritage has been uncertain and insufficient funding of state colleges and universities. In the late 18th and 19th centuries, legislatures granted charters but little else (Whitehead, 1973). A highly uneven mix of lotteries, land donations, and sporadic appropriations was the norm far into the 20th century.

Second, such presidential laments also call for scrutiny because a feature of the enterprising campus is its diversified sources of support. After all, didn't Clark Kerr (1963) use the term, “federal grant university” about forty years ago? (p. 46). My question is, “Can't some of the declining percentage of ‘state support’ be explained by some developments beyond allegations of declining cutbacks in state support?” And, finally, from the point of view of faculty, if we are in such lean times, how come universities are constructing new golf courses?

One residual impression that emerges from the articles and books by presidents and former presidents is that they depict their own office as under attack both from within and from off-campus. Intrusive trustees, stingy

and unappreciative governors, demanding alumni and parents, and—the most unkindest cut of all, as Hamlet ungrammatically but vividly puts it—a selfish, disengaged faculty have made the contemporary presidential role a thankless task. That is plausible—but I also hope my examples and analyses have tempered the interpretation a bit and that higher education stakeholders will at least consider that some of the tensions may be due to the excesses and ambitions of what might be termed, “imperial presidencies and administrations.”

In sum, there is much that is compelling in Arthur Levine’s (1997) observation that higher education is a mature industry. Public cries of financial malnourishment no longer make complete sense whether one is on or off campus. Were I to try to put this into historical perspective, I would say that in 1930 the American campus was underfunded. Today, the American campus is overextended. Each situation is a cause for concern, but they hardly represent the same problem.

Unfortunately, our collective memories are short. Today colleges and universities ride the crest of a prosperous national economy. Many graduate students may not recall—but senior ASHE members remember all too well—that a decade ago campus budgets were endangered either by drastic short-falls in state revenue projections or by the dramatic descent of university endowments and stock portfolios. It may well be that several years of prosperity temporarily mask—but do not resolve—some of these underlying tensions about citizenship and legitimacy within the academic community.

REFERENCES

- Altbach, P. G. (1994). Problems and possibilities: The American academic profession. In P. G. Altbach, R. O. Berdahl, & P. J. Gumpert (Eds.), *Higher education in American society* (pp. 225–248). Amherst, NY: Prometheus Press.
- Boyer, E. (1990). *Campus life: In search of community*. Princeton, NJ: Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching.
- Breslin, R. D. (2000, November 10). Lessons from the presidential trenches. *Chronicle of Higher Education*, B24.
- Change Editors (1976). *The third century: Twenty-six prominent Americans speculate on the educational future*. New Rochelle, NY: Change Magazine Press.
- Clark, B. R. (1987) *The academic life: Small worlds, different worlds*. Princeton, NJ: Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching.
- Corten, D. (1978, June–July). Our Gift to Santa. *California Monthly*, 16.
- Grant, G., & Riesman, D. (1978). The communal expressive: Kresge College at Santa Cruz. In their *The perpetual dream: Reform and experiment in the American college* (pp. 77–134). Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Gumpert, P. J. (1999). *Academic governance: New light on old issues*. Washington, DC: Association of Governing Boards, Occasional Paper, No. 42.

- Kennedy, D. (1997). *Academic duty*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Kerr, C. (1963). *The uses of the university*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Kerr, C. (1994). Academic citizenship in decline. In his *Higher education cannot escape history: Issues for the twenty-first century* (pp. 149–156). Albany: State University of New York Press.
- Levine, A. (1997, January 31) Higher education's new status as a mature industry. *Chronicle of Higher Education*, A48.
- Rhoades, G. (1998). *Managed professionals: Unionized faculty and restructuring academic labor*. Albany: State University of New York Press.
- Rosenzweig, R. (1998). *The political university: Policy, politics, and presidential leadership in the American research university*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press.
- Schneider, A. (1997, June 13). Empty tables at the faculty club worry some academics. *Chronicle of Higher Education*, A12.
- Schoch, R. (2000, November). A conversation with Laura Nader. *California Alumni*, 3(2), 28–32.
- Slosson, E. (1910). *Great American universities*. New York: Macmillan.
- Veysey, L. (1964). The price of structure, 1890 to 1910. In his *The emergence of the American university* (pp. 263–446). Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Wilson, J. Q. (1989). *Bureaucracy: What government agencies do and why they do it*. New York: Basic Books.