6. Each major division of the company is expected (1) to be aware of trends and developments in other businesses and other institutions in matters covered by the foregoing paragraphs, (2) to participate in associations and consultations concerning these matters in the countries where they have substantial operations, and (3) to report to the directors on each July 1 on such involvements during the previous year, plus any conclusions reached regarding the application of what is learned to the company.

Concluding Note to Directors

These recommendations are made, as I said at the outset, primarily to start a new and regular flow of information to the directors. The procedures suggested here will establish that the interpretation of these data which the directors need for their policy decisions is different from what administrators need for their operating decisions. Therefore, the directors should begin to build their own independent source of advice to help them interpret the new data. Taking these steps (asking for the data and securing independent advice) will probably be disturbing to administrators, initially. But once the practice is established, and with regular discussions between directors and administrators about it, the administrators will realize that they can operate with greater assurance if the directors establish policy—clearly, firmly, and prudently.

If directors want a more socially responsible company (and this is written with the understanding that you, as directors, do want this) they should start the process by becoming more responsible directors. This will require some adjustment from administrators who are accustomed to nominal (and, therefore, less responsible) directors. Directors should accept that when they move to their proper role they create a problem, and that they should deal with it as a problem. The heightened quality of the company that will result will be to everybody’s benefit, including the administrators who will be disturbed by the adjustment they must make.

V

Servant Leadership in Education

A story is told about Frank Lloyd Wright, the pioneering architect, when he was based at his studio near Madison, Wisconsin. He was invited by a women’s club in Madison to talk to them on the subject “What Is Art?”

In his prime years Wright was a large impressive man with a good stage presence and a fine voice. He acknowledged the introduction, produced from his pocket a small book, and, without comment, proceeded to read Hans Christian Andersen’s fairy tale about the little mermaid. It took only a few minutes and he read it beautifully. When he finished, he closed the book, looked intently at his audience and said, “That, my friends, is art”—and sat down.

This story poses what I see as a central problem of education as it has developed in our country: how to serve perhaps eighty-five percent of the population who learn best from experience and have trouble with abstract concepts, which dominate school curricula.

Ivan Illich’s book, *Deschooling Society*, has shaken things a bit, but so much has been committed to the vast educational establishment that a comprehensive revolutionary approach such as he advocates does not seem likely. Yet there is a growing disquiet about the gap between what we need and what we now have in education. And there is a question whether any influential agency has the objectivity and the skills to examine the whole range of assumptions about what is done in education, and to chart a new course that pushes the outer limits of the reasonable and the possible.

Within the scope of my concern here, “Servant Leader-
ship,” I fault the whole educational enterprise on three major points.

First, I fault it for the refusal (and I believe it is that) to offer explicit preparation for leadership to those who have the potential for it. Not only do educators seem passive about it, but I suspect that some influential educators not only denigrate leadership but administer what has been called an anti-leadership vaccine. The resistance to encouraging the growth of leadership is so formidable that there seems no other way to account for it.

My second concern for the process of education is the general attitude of educators toward social mobility. Elsewhere I quote the president of my old college as defining democracy as "a state of affairs in which it is possible for the more able who emerge in the lower classes to get into the upper classes." He saw the college he presided over as, in part, a facilitator of this process. Further, the common practice of relating ascending levels of income to levels of education adds emphasis to this point of view.

I would like to see the opportunity offered, at both secondary and college levels, for the poor to be prepared to return to their roots and become leaders among the disadvantaged. This suggestion rests upon the belief that the situation of the poor, particularly the neglect of their children, is a national disgrace in our affluent country, and that, if this condition is to be made right, the natural leaders who arise among the disadvantaged will find the way and organize the effort themselves. The best service that a school can render to these people may not be to homogenize them into the upper classes but to help those who have a value orientation that favors it to develop their ability to lead their people to secure a better life for many. All people should have a choice about how they want to use their lives, and it is the right of the disadvantaged young people to upgrade themselves in whatever way they wish. But I would argue for educational options that will help those who would be challenged by the opportunity to learn to lead their own people.

The third concern I have for education is the state of confusion I sense regarding the teaching of values. Coincident with the retreat from the posture of schools as the upholders of moral norms there has been a substantial growth, due to student demand, for courses about religion. Along with this, religious services, where religion is practiced, seem to have declined on campuses. This leaves the question: Is it only appropriate to teach about values, and make no judgments about what they ought to be? Is this really an adequate role for schools and colleges? Should not schools be importantly concerned with value clarification so that students are given as firm a basis as possible for making the choices they have always made—even when the schools presumed to know what their values ought to be?

Educators carry two major liabilities that, I believe, stand in the way of rigorous training in value clarification. First they have assumed the role of credentialing. It is interesting to note that Thomas Jefferson would not allow the University of Virginia to give degrees as long as he was rector. He believed that degrees were pretentious and he wanted only students for whom learning was a sufficient motivation. The second liability is that collegiate education, which is optional for the student, has become expanded to the point where a buyer’s market governs. The combination of these puts the typical college in an uncomfortable bind and makes innovation difficult, even though innovation is essential to their long-term survival. Trustees have compounded the problem by giving faculties virtual control over academic policy.

The following four papers do not purport to cover the whole field but they do take into account the existence of these problems, among others. They come out of my effort to encourage greater preparation for servant leadership in schools.

FRIENDS SCHOOLS AND THE ISSUE OF "POWER AND AUTHORITY"


The whole process of education seems to be heading for a
radical shakeup in the next few years. We seem to be at the end of a period of euphoria about education. We have gone through a phase of fantastic increase of resources devoted to education at all levels in the apparent belief that this was the soundest investment we could make, and there has been little disposition for careful detached examination of the assumptions. Two kinds of disaffection have suddenly appeared: first, the Coleman report and the ensuing controversy among the experts which raises some searching questions about what investment in education, per se, will accomplish; and, second, the general view of a deteriorating society at a time when, if education were the panacea we innocently thought it was, the social fabric should appear stronger rather than weaker. With this disaffection there is a gnawing frustration: we have no alternatives. When we feel this way about other goods and services we usually have some options. Even if we decide to abandon something, we may be able to get along without it. But if our present style of education is viewed as counterproductive, as some critics are beginning to assert, we have no place to go because we have built a society on the assumption that it is best to keep people in school until age eighteen to twenty-two—and more—and, at this point, we have no other way for them to fit in. This is one of the consequences of building a social structure based on a labyrinth of limited-liability institutions rather than on community. We have the kind of structure that needs the careful oversight of some agency whose sole function is to judge the worth of what we are doing, as a society, and advise us—and be heard. But we do not have that and we are left at the mercy of the crude sanctions which a huge and powerful society, even if frustrated and leaderless, may impose. Our fragile educational institutions may have to bear the brunt of much of this in the next few years. I hold with the preacher in Ecclesiastes that "for everything there is a season and a time for every matter under heaven." My sense of the present tells me that now is the time to build anew. Only by building anew will some of our independent schools be likely to survive. And building anew will be carried on amidst the value confusion of our times in which power and authority are being subjected to a searching examination.

Power and Authority

Both of these words have a long and varied history of usage. Power takes two and one-half pages in the Oxford Dictionary of the English Language and even more in the Concordance to the Standard Revised Version of the Bible—and might, which is related, takes still more. There has been a preoccupation with these words, and the concepts they represent, from the earliest records—and it is at fever heat today.

Power has many meanings, but in this discussion let us take it to be coercive force—either overtly to compel, or covertly to manipulate. And let us take authority to mean a sanction bestowed to legitimate the use of power.

The ringing phrase from Zechariah, "Not by might, nor by power, but by my Spirit, says the Lord," suggests that in the ancient wisdom there was at least the hope that might and power might someday be superseded by spirit. My worm's eye view of things suggests that we have made some progress in checking the overt use of power (although modern mechanisms of destruction make the consequences of its use vastly greater), but, as people have grown more sophisticated, covert manipulation seems greater than ever.

As I have pondered these past weeks on the question of power and authority and their relationship to secondary education, I have centered on what I regard as two fundamental issues that should be faced before many minor issues are dealt with. The exploration of these two issues will, I believe, do much to provide a perspective that may be helpful in dealing with the many uses of and responses to power which those engaged in education at all levels confront every day.

Issue #1: The assumption that some individuals know what another ought to learn, and are justified in imposing their judgment—backed up by sanctions.

I can hear the protest: How would any kind of education ever be organized for the young unless some of the more experienced who are willing to teach them make that assumption? I
don't know the answer to that question. But I do believe that when people are of secondary school age they are old enough to understand that an assumption has been made, and that it might be wrong—and, for some individuals, that it might not be good for them. Such understanding might speed their maturation and enhance their respect for institutionalized education if the potential for error (perhaps even for evil) in making the assumption were freely acknowledged.

Because of an assignment I now have, I am immersed in the current problems of philanthropic foundations, and I have just read a most interesting book Private Money and Public Service by Merrimon Cuninggim who recently stepped down as president of the Danforth Foundation. Dr. Cuninggim was a theologian before taking the foundation presidency some years ago. As I read his book I kept wondering how a man of his background could deal with that subject without examining the obvious theological aspects. And, near the end, he did. Let me read a few cogent sentences:

[There is] a recognition that a foundation needs to make about itself, a belief having ethical significance that is basic to its self-understanding. This is the recognition of frailty, the belief in sin. As it applies to a foundation it is the realization—the consciously accepted value, if you will—that giving is potentially an immoral act. Jesus is supposed to have said that it is more blessed to give than to receive, though it was Paul, who wasn't there, who attributed it to him. When Jesus summed up his own list of blessings, benevolence was absent, yet he believed in it—viz., the story of the Good Samaritan. But on more than one occasion he took pains to point out that giving was ethically dangerous.

What Dr. Cuninggim says about giving is also applicable to teaching or to any helping role for that matter—doctor, nurse, social worker—where the helper presumes to know more of what is in the best interest of the recipients than the recipients know for themselves. I am not saying that the helper does not often, or even usually, know what is best. But if the situation is coercive, either overtly or covertly, then the potentiality for evil is there, just as Dr. Cuninggim says it is with giving. I have done enough foundation staff work to be certain in my own experience that the role of almoner is a corrupting one—for the almoner as well as for the recipient. The recently published Hospital Bill of Rights is an acknowledgment that hospital administrators are sharply aware of the potential evil in the caring role.

Part of the problem of all eleemosynary institutions is the presumption of virtue in the non-profit posture. There may be moral risk in any idealistic pretensions. An old sociologist friend of mine once, in an off-the-record comment about the relative quality of interpersonal staff relations in large institutions, made this generalization: "The relative quality of staff interpersonal relations is inverse to the idealistic pretensions of the institutions."

I have had a good deal of experience with large institutions—businesses, philanthropies, universities, churches—and my experience confirms the assertion that there is a moral risk in idealistic pretensions. Perhaps because of the more blatant use of raw coercion in some of the businesses, there is less ambiguity about power and authority than in the others. The real test, as I see it, is where compassion is called for. In a discussion of these issues, this question was once put to me: "If you were really down—demoralized, humiliated, disgraced—and nothing but pure compassion, readiness to go the second mile in an effort to restore you as a person would help, in what kind of institution would you have the best chance of being restored?" My instant reply was, "In a business, in a big business—any big business."

If Lord Acton was right when he said: "All power tends to corrupt, and absolute power corrupts absolutely" (and I think he was), and if some use of power is unavoidable—in a school or anywhere else (and I think it is unavoidable)—then what do those with tender consciences do? It seems to me they do at least two things: first, they acknowledge the potentiality for evil in the act of doing whatever they do (as Dr. Cuninggim suggests). They
acknowledge it to themselves and to all who may be touched by the use of power. In a school, this will be students, parents, teachers, administrators, non-professional employees—everybody in sight. Second, they make sure that the balance of power in the institution is optimal. If the teachers have power (as they must), the student, the parent, the administrator, and the non-professional employee must have some power. A generalization is offered: the institution is strongest when all the parties have adequate power for their role; it is weakest where one or more of the elements has too little power, because then somebody has too much and the corrupting influence of power is moving toward the absolute.

I will remind you that in offering these observations I am not presuming to tell you how you should think. Rather, I am offering what I think in the hope that you will say what you think and that, out of the dialogue, all of us will be wiser.

Issue #2: The fact that our whole system of education rests on coercion: first the legal requirement for attending school until age 16-18; then the built-in compulsion to continue academic education by the credentialing that begins with the secondary school diploma and continues through the Ph.D. degree—and beyond.

Did you ever reflect on what teaching would be like if all compulsory schooling were abolished and all credentialing in the educational process were prohibited by law—as Ivan Illich recommends? It might have a spectacular effect in the rewards to teachers by giving them greater opportunity to teach people who want to learn. What might it do for students?

As a young man I was asked to help a group of men ranging in age from 35 to 55 whose jobs were threatened by the introduction of a new technology that required them to make elementary algebraic computations—which they could not do. We worked at this in evening sessions twice a week. In our first meeting I discovered that they were very rusty in arithmetic, so a few sessions were devoted to that. Then I worked out a way of introducing them to algebra—without the use of a textbook—which took them in very few sessions as far as most high schools go in a year.

In my youthful enthusiasm I thought I had made a major pedagogical discovery. Then, about that time, I met the principal of a large high school and told him of my discovery and I asked whether he didn’t think my way superior to the dull approach that was common then in high schools. His response was, "There is a factor here that you are not aware of. You were teaching a group of people who wanted to learn algebra. Our problem is that we have to teach algebra to people who don’t want to learn it. Your method wouldn’t work with them." What a sad commentary! And yet, under compulsory education—either by law or by credentialing—what else can we expect? How much of the total educational effort is devoted to teaching people who do not have a motivation, other than responding to compulsion, to learn what we are trying to teach them? Is there any way out of this dilemma (if you concede that it is a dilemma) other than Ivan Illich’s revolutionary approach? Is there an alternative?

Hope for the Future?

I have raised two questions of power: the moral risk in the assumption of virtue, and the extent of coercion in the whole educational process. The least we can do is to acknowledge both the moral risk and the coercion to the students and help them to understand it as a part of the reality of life with which they should learn to deal. Can we go farther than this? Is there a ray of light at the end of the tunnel which may be dark and long? I suspect that the tunnel will be dark and long—but there is a ray of light there for those who believe in Light. Let me call your attention to the story of the Danish Folk High Schools (see Chapter 1). It tells how an oppressed, dispirited, impoverished people raised themselves by their own effort to assume responsible citizenship.

One might say offhand that there is little in common between mid-nineteenth century Denmark and the United States in the 1970's. However, there is one large common element: the need for rekindling the spirit of young people. The conditions of
both societies have a great similarity: oppressiveness. The cause of
the oppressiveness and the precise circumstances are different, but
the pervasive oppressiveness is very similar. And the remedy, I be-
lieve, is the same: raise the spirit of young people, help them
build their confidence that they can successfully contend with the
condition, work with them to find the direction they need to go
and the competencies they need to acquire, and send them on
their way. This is the task that is right for secondary education—
and the time is right.

How do we do this when our schools are overburdened with
their present obligations and are struggling to survive? Your con-
ditions are not as tough as those Grundtvig faced. You have some-
thing to begin with, and he had nothing—nothing but his
own vision, and his spirit.

My suggestion is that at the outset you do nothing that
seriously interferes with your present obligations or that jeopar-
dizes your survival chances. But add something that is voluntary,
something that raises the human spirit. Try it and see if you are
not rewarded. See if the urge to venture further does not overtake
you.

In Elizabeth Vining's biography of Rufus Jones, *Friend of
Life*, there are a few very special lines from a talk he made in
London in 1929. "I am not interested anymore in just clinging to
the Society of Friends and preserving it. We stand at a crisis and
we can be bearers of the torch or we can carefully husband a little
flame and keep it from going out a little longer." I wonder what
Rufus, the great soul, would say to us here today—forty-four
years later—in the face of the kinds of questions that our schools
face.

I am sure that Rufus would say something to us about
change. And this would not be a new thought; all of us here are
aware of the pressure for change. In our schools we have already
changed—sometimes radically—and some of it may have been
painful. We know we must change some more, and some of us
may be wondering whether we will survive it, and whether, even
if we survive, in good conscience we can live with the con-
sequences of the adaptations we make. I know it is a serious
problem, and we need to give some thought to the preoccupation
with change.

One of the oldest books in the world is of Chinese origin; it
antedates Confucius, and is called *I Ching*, the Book of Changes.
The counter-culture has embraced it and you will find it in many
college bookstores. *I Ching* is primarily concerned with the philos-
ophy of change, with living with change as an organic part of
one's nature rather than thinking of the good as static and change
as threatening, as so many of my contemporaries seem to view it.

Back during World War II when Peking was occupied by
the Japanese, there was a little colony of Germans there. One of
them was a Chinese scholar, Hellmut Wilhelm, who had done
much to acquaint the world with *I Ching*. In an effort to keep
their intellectual lights burning during those dark days, they
asked Wilhelm to talk to them about *I Ching*. This resulted in a
series of eight lectures which are now available in translation. Let
me quote a few lines from Wilhelm's comment on ancient Chi-
nese thought about change:

Reflection on the simple fundamental facts of our experience
brings immediate recognition of constant change. To the un-
sophisticated mind, the characteristic thing about phenomena
is their dynamism. It is only abstract thinking that takes them
out of their dynamic continuity and isolates them as static
units. . . . [But] it is in constant change and growth alone
that life can be grasped at all. If it is interrupted, the result is
not death, which is really only an aspect of life, but life's
reversal, its perversion. . . . The opposite of change in Chi-
nese thought is growth of what ought to decrease, the down-
fall of what ought to rule. . . . Change is natural movement,
development that can only reverse itself by going against na-
ture. . . . The concept of change is not an external, normative
principle that imprints itself on phenomena; it is an inner
tendency according to which development takes place naturally
and spontaneously. . . . To stand in the stream of this
development is a datum of nature; to recognize it and follow
it is responsibility and free choice. . . . Safety is the clear
knowledge of the right stand to be taken, security in the assurance that events are rolling in the right direction... In this point of view, which accords the responsible person an influence on the course of things, change ceases to be an insidious, intangible snare and becomes an organic order corresponding to man's nature. No small role is thus assigned to man.

This may suggest our place today, to see ourselves as responsible people at the center of an organic process of change which, at this time, may be strenuous and confused. But what is done will be more than a saving action. It will begin with the struggle to survive. However, if survival alone is the aim, it is not likely to succeed. It will include a conserving role; there is much that is good in what we now have and it should be saved. More important, it will build anew, build something that may not yet be dreamed of. It will be voluntary, and it will raise the spirit.

A few weeks ago as we drove to a Meeting on a cold, bright New Hampshire morning, we noticed cars with several dogs inside and a dog sled tied on top and we knew that nearby there was a dog sled race. My memory jumped back fifty years and at the meeting I told the children the following story.

The setting was a cold January morning in a little town in Wisconsin, where I then was, on the southern shore of Lake Superior. It happened to be a Saturday when they had their annual dog sled derby on the ice. A one-mile course had been staked out by sticking little fir trees in the ice. The whole course was easily visible because of the steep slope of the shore.

It was a youngsters' meet and the contenders ranged all the way from large boys with several dogs and big sleds to one little fellow who didn't seem over five with a little sled and one small dog. They took off at the signal and the little fellow with his one dog was quickly outdistanced—he was hardly in the race. All went well with the rest until, about halfway around, the team that was second started to pass the team then in the lead. They came too close and the dogs got in a fight. And as each team came up the dogs joined the fight. None seemed to be able to steer clear of it. Soon, from our position about a half mile away, there was just one big black seething mass of kids and sleds and dogs—all but the little fellow with his one little dog who gave this imbroglio a wide berth, the only one that managed it, and the only one to finish the race.

As I reflect on the many vexing problems and the stresses of our times that complicate their solutions, this simple scene from long ago comes vividly to mind. And I draw the obvious moral: No matter how difficult the challenge or how impossible or hopeless the task may seem, if you are reasonably sure of your course, just keep on going!

**TRUSTEES CONSIDER A HYPOTHETICAL CASE**

In the course of helping to lead a conference on the role of trustees which was attended by twenty-five trustees from several universities, I presented a hypothetical case for discussion. This case assumes that the assembled persons are the trustees of Cheswick University and that I am meeting with them as the representative of potential donors who are offering a gift of ten million dollars under rather strict and unusual conditions. Two hours were taken for the discussion. Some excerpts from the record of the conference that represent the tenor of the discussion are given following the statement of the case. In this summary, "T" refers to a comment by a trustee and "D" represents remarks by the donors' representative.

**Case Problem for Trustees**

You are the trustees of Cheswick University, which is currently operating at a high level of excellence within the conventional wisdom of what a good university should be. Your financial condition and your fund-raising potential are such that you
can continue for some time as you are and handle the level of innovation that most universities like you customarily undertake.

You have just received the offer of a ten million dollar gift with these specific conditions:

1. You may not add any of this to your endowment—now or in the future.
2. You may not put any of this into the budget of your present program—now or in the future—or into innovations of your present program.
3. Two million dollars may be spent in analyzing the problem of how best to prepare young people to serve and be served by the present society and to grow with their opportunities, and in designing a wholly new program to accomplish this end that is feasible at Cheswick University. (By serve and be served by the donors mean that the students' education has prepared them to make a constructive contribution to the present society in a way that meets the students' legitimate needs, psychic and material.)
4. If, on the completion of this plan, the donors judge it to be wholly new and feasible, the remaining eight million dollars (plus any remaining portion of the two million dollars) will be available to help finance the introduction of the new program.
5. The advice of your present administration, faculty, and students may be sought, but no part of this fund may be used to compensate for this advice. In other words, until there is a new design which the donors have approved as feasible, and until the trustees have made a firm commitment to proceed to install it, no part of this fund may be spent within Cheswick University.
6. All decisions with respect to the use of this fund must be made by the trustees alone.

7. If you accept this fund under the above conditions, there is no commitment implied to take any action. However, any funds not expended within the above conditions at the end of five years will revert to the donors.

I represent the donors who are offering this fund. I am here to discuss it with you if you want to consider it.

Discussion

T. If the donors assume that Cheswick University is doing reasonably well in a conventional sense, and if they assume that the trustees are persons of integrity, would they not also assume that we already think we are operating this university to produce students who would serve the present society and would grow with their opportunities or we would have no business being trustees? I would think the donors would be looking for some institution that was concerned and uncertain about what it is doing. Why is this proposition being brought to us?

D. The donors are concerned that the best of universities are not adequately preparing young people to serve and be served by the present society and to grow with their opportunities. They are singling you out because you are strong, and they are simply asking you whether it would interest you to find a better way for a university to help its students in this way. Then if they are satisfied that you have found a better way, they are willing to help you install it, if you want to.

T. But what we may come up with may cost a whole lot more than eight million dollars to install. In that event, how would we finance it?

D. The donors are offering this to you because you are already strong and are able adequately to finance yourselves. They assume that, using the initial two million to find a better way, you will want to install it. They are saying, "If you find the better way (and if we accept it), and if you want to install it, we are prepared to put in another eight million." Obviously this is not going to solve your funding needs for all time. The donors assume that your fund-raising operation, which is quite good now, will continue to function.

T. We would have a lot of things to do if we made a radical change—our admissions policy, for instance; move from a homogeneous to a heterogeneous student body, for instance, in terms of age, economic background, academic proficiency, etc. To
do what these donors would want, probably, we couldn’t use this money to make a better run at the top ten percent of the scholars. Then there might be radical curriculum innovations. But you say we can’t pay, out of this fund, our own faculty, administrators, or students for working on this. I assume we could pay our trustees. Is that right?

D. Yes, you could pay your trustees out of the two million, if you accept it. You may pay anyone to work on this other than your own students, faculty, or administrators.

T. That is a curious restriction. What are the donors trying to accomplish with that?

D. The donors want the trustees to accept this as their problem. You are not obligated to take any action. You are simply offered two million to find a better way to prepare students to serve and be served by this society and to grow with the opportunity. If you do not want to (or cannot) install it at Cheswick, and if the donors think it is a good idea, they may find another college that wants to try it, and give that college the eight million.

T. I would take the two million.

T. I’m not sure what to talk to you about. I’m not sure whether in the back of the donors’ mind is the idea that we can be bought off for ten million. Are they trying to get us to create the kind of university they want?

D. The donors have only two things: (1) a sense of a need for more effort in universities to prepare students to serve and be served by this society and to grow with their opportunities, and (2) money. They don’t know how to do this. But they think some strong institution ought to find out. Then, if that institution wants to do it (and if the donors are satisfied with what it wants to do) they will give them eight million.

T. This smacks of distrust. I don’t like that part of it.

D. The donors do not trust the governance structure of the typical university in which trustees are in a nominal and reactive role. They believe that if the usual process of university governance were going to produce an answer to the need they clearly see, it would already have done it. The need, as they see it, is not obscure. So if a better way is to be forthcoming, something has to change. The change they are proposing is that trustees shift their role toward more affirmative educational leadership.

T. Won’t the faculty be up in arms about that?

D. The donors think in terms of leadership, not coercion. There is no suggestion that anything be imposed on the faculty. All that is proposed here is that the trustees (as a first step) be offered some money that they cannot give to the faculty. They, the trustees, must take the responsibility to find the answer—how to do the job better. The faculty, students, and administrators can contribute. The only limitation is that they can’t be paid for what they do out of the grant of these donors.

T. The donors are challenging our ability to match their minds.

T. I see. You came to us because you think we are good. That implies that we have something going for us, that we really believe in ourselves.

T. But with the resources we now have we are really doing the best that we can. We really believe in what we are doing. Now, you come to us and you offer us some money, and the money is awfully handy. And we’ve got some ideas of how we would like to do better and the only thing that is holding us back is money. I’m a little skeptical when you come to us and say that you want something entirely new. It makes me want to find out whether the donors feel that money can buy everything.

T. That’s nonsense!

T. Look, the spending of the two million is to be given to dedicated people—trustees.

T. Are the donors really saying that a school like ours that is doing such a good job should throw everything out? There must be something in what we are doing that is still good for the years ahead.

D. There is no suggestion in this proposal that anything be changed or thrown out. You can keep your present program as it is if you want to. But if you install a new program alongside of it,
one that prepares students to serve and be served by the present society in a substantial way, the program you now have may not long survive the competition.

As the donors see the present state of higher education, it is locked into a set of assumptions that need to be examined in a new way. They are willing to bet two million dollars that if a strong board of trustees would examine the assumptions and get some mechanism engaged other than faculty committees, a better way can be found. Frankly, they do not believe that the institution is as good as you say it is—when judged by what is reasonable and possible with its available resources, human and material. They believe that some strong institution should make a determined effort to break out of what looks to them like a monolithic pattern. And all they are asking is, first, does a trustee board like yours want to try to find a better way? They are sufficiently aware of the inertia in faculty processes and the lack of leadership of administrators not to want to invest the two million with them.

T. But are they suggesting that we, as trustees, move off in a way that indicates a distrust of our faculty and administrators? I would vote for turning down the proposal—all of it. It would upset the university more than it would help.

D. I am a little surprised, after this long discussion—and we have been at it for two hours—that none of you has suggested that, as trustees, you take no immediate action but simply circulate the proposal to your faculty, students, and administrators and ask them: “What do you think about this?” Don’t submit it to them for decision. Just ask them what they think. Perhaps some of you might sit down with them in small groups and discuss it. You take the role that I have taken here, as the donors’ representative. Try to explain to them why a concerned group with money to give might make a proposal like this. And listen carefully, as I have listened to you. Such a procedure might accomplish two things of value to you as trustees.

First, it would alert those of your constituencies that have not gotten the message that there are responsible people who value education but who have come to distrust the capacity of the typical university to govern itself wisely. And of late these people seem to be growing in numbers, among both private donors and public funding bodies. They are still giving support, but they are asking more questions and laying down new conditions. And these are friends of education. The university is seen as too anarchistic an institution to be as influential as it is. One hundred years ago, when only about one percent of college age young people were actually enrolled, not much note was taken of what kind of institution the university was. But now that fifty percent of the young people are involved in some post-secondary education, the structure of the institution and its impact on values have become a matter of concern. By presenting this proposal to students, faculty, and administrators you may add some helpful communication—helpful to all who are interested in the university—to the effect that all is not well with the university among those who have the power to turn the money on or off.

Then, second, you may learn some things that will be helpful to you as trustees in deciding how to respond to this proposal. As a representative of the donors, I get around the colleges and universities. And I hear some things that you might not ordinarily hear—things that I believe you will hear if you explore this proposal with your faculty. And what you hear when you engage with your faculty in this way might surprise you.

Some of your faculty, not all—perhaps not a majority—but an important segment, will agree with the donors on the three main arguments I have given as their representative in support of this proposal:

1. The university’s present program is not adequately preparing its students to serve and be served by this society and to grow with their opportunities. And it misses it by a wide margin.

2. As the university’s governance is now structured, it is not disposed to correct this deficiency.

3. Only the emergence of strong leadership in the governing board, the trustees, will set the university on a sounder course soon enough to recover the public trust that its survival as a viable institution requires.

The faculty members who support these three contentions
will tell you that the fundamental flaw in the structure of the university is that the faculty governs the institution, yet the primary loyalty of too many faculty members as individuals is not to their university or even to their students, but to their discipline, their professional expertise and reputation, and their colleagues that share these in universities generally. Perceptive faculty members know this, and the donors know it. And the donors are wise enough to accept that they cannot, and ought not, use their influence to try to change the predominant loyalty of faculty members. Perhaps this is what a good teacher-scholar has to be. The donors also know that the trustees have given the faculty so much power that the administrators cannot lead them in their educational goals. So the trustees must assume more leadership.

One of the interesting emerging sentiments among faculty is the acceptance that trustees must be strong. They aren’t sure what trustees need to do to be strong. But they know they have to be strong in order to maintain the university as an island of freedom in which creative teaching can take place.

What some faculty members now know, what all trustees should know, and what the donors are absolutely convinced of, is that this island of freedom cannot be maintained if the wider public sees trustees as merely acting as a front for a program that does not adequately prepare students to serve and be served by the present society and to grow with their opportunities.

The donors’ aim in making their proposal is primarily to give the trustees of a strong university (which means that it has a strong faculty) a way of asserting a new leadership that will build a new public confidence in the university. They are offering you a way (and some means) to rebuild the trustee role as one of, among other things, educational leadership. It is a task for dedicated trustees to build a strong institution to serve the public need in an acceptable way, through the work of a faculty whose predominant loyalty is to its several disciplines. This, in itself, is no small task. Now, if is likely, you find a small articulate minority of your faculty urging you to accept this proposal, and if, as is also likely, you have an equally articulate majority arguing against it, you, as trustees, then have a problem of leadership.

It is no challenge to lead when everybody is with you.

**LIBERAL ARTS EDUCATION AND THE WORLD OF WORK**

*In the spring of 1974 I spent ten days in residence as a Senior Woodrow Wilson Fellow at Dickinson College at Carlisle, Pennsylvania. The following is a talk I gave near the end of my stay.*

I spent a few days getting acquainted here at Dickinson College before I started to prepare this talk and I am aware that there is an unusual level of concern, and justifiably so, for the vocational and career outlook of many students. And this concern has raised questions about the adequacy of the college experience as preparation for the conditions that students now face after they leave college. I have been asked many questions in the hope that I could give answers that will give greater assurance for the future. I have no answers to most of these questions, partly because I am of another generation that has not experienced the problem as it is seen today, partly because I believe many of these questions are unanswerable except as one ventures into an experience and learns to respond, in the situation, to the immediate problems one confronts.

I would find it pretentious to talk about the subject “Liberal Arts Education and the World of Work” if the common assumption was how there is, or could be, a close linear relationship between one’s experience as a student in a liberal arts college and the subsequent events in the course of any role in society—whether in one’s income-earning vocation, or as a parent, or as a citizen. I do not see such a relationship, and I am glad that I live in a world where it does not seem possible. I am not speaking of professional education, such as preparation for careers in engineering, medicine, or law, or about some “bread and butter” sub-
objects that might be offered in an undergraduate college. There, obviously, the student expects an explicit rationale for most of what is learned; it is directly anticipating some later vocational need.

Not very much of a liberal arts education, as it is commonly experienced, can be taken as vocational in this sense. And it is not my intention here to assert that it should be. Rather, I would argue that, in a good society, every person who is capable of being educated at all should be liberally educated first, and without direct reference to any specific societal role, but with general reference to all of them. Professional or vocational education would be added to that.

Having made that assertion I am in the same trouble as any who assert such things: What do I mean by liberal education in this sense, and can what I mean be translated into how faculties might better design a liberal arts education and how students might better cope with what faculties have designed?

Liberal education suffers, in these times, for want of a contemporary definition. Your college catalogue has one of the better definitions I have read: "a quest after knowledge for its own sake, but also as leading to social involvement in practical affairs for the sake of social good and individual dignity." The editorial in the current Dickinsonian (which I thought was a very good editorial) quotes a previous president as stating it in these words: "The grand design of education is to excite, rather than pretend to satisfy, an ardent thirst for information; and to enlarge the capacity of the mind, rather than to store it with knowledge, however useful." My own inclination would be to state the goal in more operational terms: "to prepare students to serve, and be served by, the present society." By this I mean that a college, operating through the program its faculty chooses to design, will influence its students to be a more constructive building force in society, and do this in a way that helps them find their own legitimate needs, psychic and material, better served, than if they had not participated in the college program. I state the goal this way because I believe that new sanctions regarding all of education are emerging and that, with regard to private liberal arts colleges especially, the colleges will be better able to sustain what I regard as a vital and necessary role if they state their goals (and shape their implementing programs) in operational terms such as I have suggested—to prepare their students better to serve, and be served by, the present society. This has different connotations from the usual language used in defining the aims of liberal education, and I commend it to your consideration.

If I have anything of value to share with you in how to implement such a goal, it is because I have had an unusual opportunity to observe and participate in a wide range of contemporary institutions. And if a liberal education is to prepare its students better to serve and be served by the present society, it needs, it seems to me, to begin by giving students a realistic view of the institutional structure that students will enter as participating members four to eight years later.

Within my lifetime ours has shifted from a society dominated by small farmers to one dominated by large urban-based institutions: large government, large business, large university, large philanthropy. This complex structure is so new that we have not yet taken the full measure of it, and, I suspect, we have not yet learned how to prepare people to live in it and to cope with the challenges it presents. Along with this there has been a shattering of many certainties that I grew up with—certainties that made life less threatening, even though some of the assumptions that gave this certainty proved to be questionable.

I want in a few minutes to try to communicate a view of the vagaries of this institution-bound society as I see them from my particular vantage point. I will not do this in a closely reasoned way. That would take too long—and besides, I am not capable of it. Rather I want to read a brief quote from the early writing of G. K. Chesterton that sets the mood in which I want to discuss the subject "Liberal Arts Education and the World of Work." Chesterton wrote this in 1924 when I was coming of age and before the era of the computer had overtaken us:

The real trouble with this world of ours is not that it is an unreasonable world, nor even that it is a reasonable one. The
commonest kind of trouble is that it is nearly reasonable, but not quite. Life is not an illogicality, yet it is a trap for logicians. It looks just a little more mathematical and regular than it is; its exactitude is obvious, but its inexactitude is hidden; its wildness lies in wait.

As I have participated in the affairs of this world I have found that its wildness does lie in wait. I see a world full of ambiguity. But I am also aware that one person’s ambiguity is another’s regularity. All of us see the world through our own peculiar colored glasses. Let me give you a few examples of what loom as ambiguities through my particular colored glasses.

Coffee, tobacco, alcohol, marijuana, and heroin are all drugs. All, if used excessively, are health impairing. Heroin is so destructive when one becomes addicted (and addiction comes easily) that few would question the strict control of it. Coffee is so relatively mild that few would advocate its restriction. Of the middle three, a case can be made that marijuana is less addictive and possibly less harmful than the others. Yet tobacco and alcohol are freely available and you can be put in jail for having anything to do with marijuana.

The verbs correct and reform are frequently used to indicate the function of penal institutions, whereas crime-inducing would more accurately label the consequence of the usual imprisonment.

One would think that inspired and creative contributors to society would leave a liberating influence as their legacy. In notable instances, however, a cult ensues that obscures the teaching. It happened to Jesus of Nazareth two thousand years ago and to Kurt Lewin, the great experimental psychologist who died in 1947 leaving in his wake a succession of “groupy” movements: sensitivity training, encounter groups, etc. It even happened to a work that my wife and I originated twenty years ago. A few years after we had left it in other hands it was brought to us for review. It was codified, manualized, and ready for copyright, thereby to establish a jurisdiction. I will never forget the startled, almost panicked, expression on the face of the person who brought it when I said, “Why don’t you just give this away and go do something else?”

A few years ago I was serving as consultant to the trustees of a college. This was a period in which there was considerable pressure from students to relax parietal rules, and I sat in as the trustees discussed the issue. Among the trustees, the conspicuous holdouts for hard-line adherence to the old rules were two who were noted as playboys.

The killing of wild animals is widely accepted as a sport.

In the last few years I had two revealing conversations with the heads of two of our very large institutions. In the first I was in a counseling relationship and was listening to an outpouring of frustrated feeling of a very able chief executive who was trying to lead his institution (a large and influential one) out of a vexing problem. I must have listened for nearly an hour to the details of his unsuccessful effort to get this institution to deal realistically with the problem. When he finally concluded, I made a statement something like this: “I have no answer to your dilemma and, from what you have told me, you have exhausted every avenue open to you to deal with it. In such a situation, with the problem still urgently needing a solution, I see no course open to you but to set in motion an inquiry to get a deeper and more comprehensive understanding of the problem, in the hope that out of this larger understanding will emerge the clue to a new course of action that you haven’t thought of.” I took a little longer than this to state my position, and while I was doing it I noted the color rising in his neck, and I knew that when I finished my little speech I was going to catch it—and I did. He glared at me as he pounded his desk with his fist and literally shouted, “Damn it,” he exploded, “I don’t want to understand anything. I just want to know what to do about it!”

In the case of the second top executive, I had come to him with the account of a serious situation, a major flaw, I had uncovered in his institution that I thought was urgently in need of correction. In this case, after stating my position, I got a gentle lecture something like this: “There are a lot of things wrong with
this institution that need correcting. At any one time I can deal with only a limited number of them, and the only way I can sleep at night so that I can come back tomorrow and keep working at it is to pretend that most of these problems are not there. And that is what I am going to do with the one you mention. This job of mine is tolerable only because I am capable of living with the illusion that things are a lot better than they really are."

Any who were members of the academic community in the late 1960's must be sharply aware that its wildness lies in wait. Colleges and universities, like other institutions, tend to forget their histories. There have been earlier periods of wildness; the late 1960's was not the first one. Early in 1969 I attended an off-the-record meeting of twenty-five university presidents who met to discuss, among other things, the current student unrest. Two of them were conspicuous by their superior air of "it won't happen at my university." But before June, both their campuses were a shambles and those two presidents had resigned.

I could give you many more anecdotes and illustrations of this kind. These are a representative selection of recent ones out of a wide range of experiences over many years that give meaning to Chesterton's sharp observation fifty years ago.

The world of affairs, as I have experienced it, is a very ambiguous one. The problem of preparing people to serve and be served by this society is, as Chesterton says, that the world is nearly reasonable but not quite. It is not illogical, yet it is a trap for logicians.

Part of the ambiguity that students need to learn to deal with in the course of their preparation to serve and be served by the present society is that it is a high form of art to ask the right questions. But it is also unrealistic to expect that someone else has answers for them. I said at the outset that many of the questions students have asked me during these days I regard as unanswerable except as one ventures into some experience and learns to respond, in the situation, to the immediate problems one confronts. And to do this one must have learned how to open one's awareness to receive insight, inspiration, in the moment of need. One must accept that only by venturing into uncertainty with faith that if one is adequately prepared to deal with the ambiguity, in the situation, the answer to the questions will come. The certainty one needs to face the demanding situations of life does not lie in having answers neatly catalogued in advance of the experience. That, in fact, is a formula for failure—one is surprised, sometimes demoralized, by the unexpected. Dependable certainty (which we all need a lot of) lies in confidence that one's preparation is adequate so that one may venture into the experience without pre-set answers but with assurance that creative insight will emerge in the situation when needed, and that it will be right for the situation because it is an answer generated in the situation. A liberal education provides the best context I know of for preparing inexperienced people to venture into the unknown, to face the inexactitude and the wildness, with assurance. But, having said that the conventional liberal arts curriculum is the best context for such preparation, I must also say that it usually does not contain the preparation—and it should.

I have said this in a way to lead up to something. The usual assumption about liberal education is that the preparation I am talking about is implicit. I would contend that, as in the song in "Porgy and Bess," it ain't necessarily so. I am not judging whether the impact of a liberal education at Dickinson gives the preparation I am urging because I am not close enough to have an informed opinion. I will only say that it ain't necessarily so. If you want to assert that it does happen here, or that there is a high probability of its happening here, then I would be interested in hearing a more explicit case for it than I have been aware of in what I have encountered thus far.

Let us assume for the moment that my view of it is correct, that what you have in a conventional liberal arts program is a good context for preparing students to venture into the unknown with assurance, so that students are better able to serve and be served by the present society, but that the preparation itself is lacking. I would like to address the issue thus presented as a student of organization, of how things get done, not as an educator.

As an organization theorist, I am an idealist—as you will
find if you read the three essays I have written on the theme of servant: one on leadership, one on institutions, and one on trustees. But, as a consultant, I am a gradualist because I am disposed to work with the ambiguities and not try to impose idealistic solutions. Rather, I try to take the time to understand the ambiguities in order that my own creative processes will respond in constructive ways. So, in addressing the problem as it might be identified here at Dickinson, I am assuming that you are being guided by a consultant who is providing this creative service. With this reservation, here is my advice.

First, I think you need a goal that is stated in operational terms. I have suggested one: to prepare students to serve and be served by the present society. You might find a better one, but I urge you to ponder mine for a while before you discard it. I urge your consideration of it because I believe it is on the wave of the future. We are beginning to see our society as one of limited resources and the people who have the power to turn the money on or off are going to scrutinize the goals of all institutions, including colleges and universities, and make critical judgments of performance, more so than they have done in the past. They may continue to support a few elite institutions for scholars (I hope they do), but I am sure that they (the people who have the power to turn the money on or off) are not going to continue to support, on the scale we now have them, institutions that state their goals wholly in scholarly terms.

Second, I would not state the initial operational goal, prepare students to serve and be served by the present society, as an immediate substitute for the one you now have. I give this caution because I suspect the college is not prepared to deliver on it. Rather, I advise you, initially, to state it as the goal for a quite limited program for a few students who are immediately attracted to it and for faculty who wish to participate in it. At the start, there probably will not be many of either. But I have met both faculty and students here who I believe would respond to the opportunity.

You need, at the start, at least one strong faculty member (supported by a consultant) who meets these tests:

1. He or she is deeply committed to the goal of helping prepare a few students to serve and be served by the present society. They will probably keep their scholarly involvement, too, but they will be more deeply committed to the new goal.

2. They have prepared themselves by thoroughly understanding the two basic needs: learning to cope with the inevitable ambiguity, and faith in the dependability of one’s creative resources to produce, in the situation, answers to one’s going-in questions as one ventures into new experience.

3. They are prepared to make their way through the faculty decision process and to keep their colleagues informed and at least acquiescent. This is a formidable task, but I have participated in it, and it is manageable—by even just one strong member of your faculty who wants to do it. And that faculty member can be from any subject matter field.

With a faculty member thus prepared, the basic approach is to set up a group of close-knit students in a non-credit program soon after they arrive as freshmen. The faculty member would communicate to the entire freshman class somewhat in these terms:

You are offered the opportunity to become a Dickinson Fellow, the purpose of which is to form a close-knit, highly committed group of students who will accept a discipline at least as exacting as participation in a major sport, and with the following aims and obligations:

1. To learn to understand the college community as a real and typical community within which you will become effective in societal roles that are comparable to those you will experience in the next stage of your career, after you leave here.

2. Under the leadership of the faculty adviser, the Fellows will examine together the impact of the total college experience on their growth as persons and will learn to plan and manage their own growth—now and after college.
3. You will be counselled, both by your colleagues and by your faculty adviser, in how you can best be served by the resources of the college in order that you will learn how to relate later to other institutions so that your own legitimate needs will be optimally served by whatever your later participation in society will be.

4. The Fellows as a group will organize and execute missions in the service of others, both for the benefit that you can give to others at this time and so that you can learn how best to organize to serve and to discriminate between good and poor service—in preparation for later stages of your career.

5. The commitment required is that you place this work as the first priority after your academic program—and ahead of social life or other extracurricular activities. The reason for this is that the work of the Fellows program requires it, and offers an opportunity to establish the habit of voluntary discipline in the use of your time as a preparation for organizing an effective life for the remainder of your career. Periodically the level of commitment of Fellows in the program will be reviewed.

This is a rough suggestion for an extracurricular offering that might be made to all freshmen. I have a little experience with this sort of thing and I believe that, if a strong faculty member undertakes to organize and direct it, there will be some takers, maybe not many at first, but enough to start.

You can see in the way I have stated this that I reject the idea (which I have heard from both faculty and students here at Dickinson) that there is a real world outside beyond these walls and that what you have here is something else—a place where you prepare for the real world. If I hear you correctly, you have accepted a terrible limitation. This place is just as real as anything its students will ever experience. It is real because the ambiguities are here—as rich an assortment as will be found anywhere.

In the two basic life skills I have mentioned, making one's way in an inexact and ambiguous world and venturing into the unknown with unanswered questions—and I call them skills because both call for rigorous preparation—the chance to learn these skills in a way that makes one both marketable and assured in taking the next step beyond college is actually better in these undergraduate years than it may be at any later stage in one's life. And the context of a liberal arts curriculum, I believe, is a better setting for it than is any other post-secondary opportunity I know about.

This is a long way around to the answer to a question you may have brought with you about the implication of the title of this talk, "Liberal Arts Education and the World of Work," in which you may have assumed that I was going to present some new rationale for liberal arts education, or argue for its relevance to business or some other calling, or give you my judgment about whether any particular vocational emphasis within the college should be expanded or contracted. The great asset of a broad liberal arts education, as I know it, is that it does not have much bearing on any vocation in particular but has great relevance to all vocations in general—provided that the college environment within which it is carried out is accepted as real, as real as any chapter in one's life, and provided that an explicit effort is made to prepare students to serve and be served by the present society, using the college experience as the working laboratory.

As your uninvited consultant, I have tried to suggest a way that you could move toward making the connection between the liberal arts and the world of work necessarily so, with a minimum of claim on the resources of the college and with no disturbance of its present academic program.

As I say this I call to mind the thoughtful face of one of your seniors with whom I discussed some of these ideas this week. "I wish somebody had talked to me like this when I was a freshman," she said.

CAMPUS USE OF RESOURCE PEOPLE

The Woodrow Wilson Foundation, under a grant from
the Lilly Endowment, administers a program with about seventy-five colleges (mostly liberal arts) in which visitors from the fields of business, government, and the professions spend periods of one to three weeks on campus as Senior Woodrow Wilson Fellows. In the fall of 1974 the representatives of seventy participating colleges met at Wingpread Conference Center at Racine, Wisconsin, for a discussion and evaluation of their first year of experience with this program. I made the following talk at the opening of that conference.

I regard the three-year term of the grant that supports the Woodrow Wilson Foundation Senior Fellows program as a testing period for what I believe is a basically sound idea. It also provides an opportunity to learn how best to use such resources as Senior Fellows for the optimal yield of educational benefit to students, with the hope that there will be valuable by-products for the Senior Fellows, for the campus coordinators and other faculty, and for the colleges. But service to students is the primary goal.

I have no idea what the priorities of funding agencies will be a year or so from now when the need to re-fund this program arises. Nor can I predict how their staffs might then view the value of work of this sort. Therefore, the best contribution I can make to your discussion is to exploit my relatively detached, yet somewhat informed, position and present a view from my own experience that may suggest ways that service of the Senior Fellows to students may be made significantly greater than I believe it usually is. This is the best way I know to help assure that this program will continue.

I believe that the Senior Fellows program has had an auspicious start, that a good beginning has been made; but the evidence of accomplishment that I have seen thus far does not assure me that the best use is being made of Senior Fellows. If my judgment is correct, the burden of the necessary action in this program rests on the colleges rather than on the Woodrow Wilson Foundation, which, after all, can only advise. Consequently, I will address what I have to say to the colleges. And I will address the question, How can a college make the visit of a Woodrow Wilson Senior Fellow of optimal value to students?

As I have assessed the possible contributions to students that are made by visitors of all kinds on college campuses, they are in three categories. (1) There are the "big names" who will draw a crowd and give the students the feeling of being in touch with the controversial issues that make the current news. (2) Then there are those whose primary contribution is to enrich the culture of the campus by reading their poetry, giving concerts, general lectures, etc. (3) Finally, there are subject matter specialists, scientists and the like, who may excite little interest outside of faculty and student groups that are identified with their specialties. Occasionally a visitor will serve in more than one of these ways. But these, I believe, are the main categories. All of these people make their contributions and, to the extent that the college can afford them, they are a vital part of the college program. Also, the usual college is prepared, administratively, to schedule the use of visitors in these categories in a satisfactory way.

However, the usual Senior Woodrow Wilson Fellow is not chosen to fit any one of these categories. By chance some of them may do very well in one or more of these ways; but, if they do, it is a bonus that was not bargained for. And, as I read the reports, it seems to me that the colleges are attempting to use the Senior Fellows as if they would serve in one or more of these customary ways, and sometimes it works out reasonably well. But, even if it does work well in terms of audience response, it is not necessarily evidence that the Senior Fellows were being used in their strongest roles.

In my own case, the one time I have been a Senior Fellow, the report sent back by the college suggested that the audience response was good. But, from my standpoint, with some perspective on what a Fellow like me can do for students (because I have had considerable experience working with them as an outside resource person), I do not believe that I was well used. It was not even close to the kind of educational benefit to students that is easily possible.

As I study the backgrounds of the people who serve as Se-
Senior Fellows, I believe I am fairly typical of them. There is an occasional person on the list, like ex-Senator Margaret Chase Smith, who would readily fit into the first of the three categories I mentioned—she would be well known enough to draw a crowd, and she would contribute in other ways. But, the credentials of most of us are what the purpose of the program states: we are persons with substantial experience from business, industry, the professions, and government. If the colleges were spending their own money to bring people who fit into one of the three categories, and if the credentials of all of us on the list so far were fully known, very few of us would be invited—because we would not serve well in any of the three ways that resource people usually are expected to contribute. I have had other invitations to be a campus visitor in recent years because, in a few places, there is a fourth category clearly established where my kind of qualifications are readily of service to students. Let me describe the kind of students, and the arrangements needed, for a resource person like me to be well used.

I know from my own experience that on every campus there is a substantial group of students (perhaps not the majority, but substantial) who have the potential to become carriers of responsible roles in society, roles like those most of the Senior Fellows now occupy or have recently occupied. These students are already committed to a servant ethic, they are willing to work hard (without the incentive of grades, credits, and degrees) to build the competence that is required to act responsibly, and they have the potential to develop that quality of intuitive judgment, the gift of knowing, that sets successful bearers of responsibility apart from others. Usually, in their college years, students are but dimly aware, if at all, of their potential in these regards, nor do they always clearly see the significance of these talents as they enter their careers. Some of them mature their talents, but some of them do not—at a great cost to themselves and to the society they are potentially capable of serving well. These are people who may make a quantum leap in their growth as responsible persons while they are in college if someone on the faculty will take an interest in finding and coaching them, much as the athletic department finds and coaches athletes. And the growth of these students in their college years can be just as spectacular as is athletic prowess. I have watched it happen.

It is these students that most of the Senior Fellows are best qualified to serve. But optimal educational benefit is not likely to result from their interaction with the Senior Fellows if there is not an ongoing program in the college, however informal, that prepares these particular students to exploit fully the opportunity that the visit of the Senior Fellow presents. I have served as a visitor in several colleges where this particular type of student has been identified and prepared to connect with my particular experience, and I have visited and met with students where this sort of preparation has not been done. I can assure you that the difference in the service I can render to students is enormous. And, remember, I think I am quite typical of the Senior Fellows in this program.

There is a hazard, I know, in using the athletic program as a model. But I use it because it is the best way I know to emphasize that potential bearers of responsibility need special help to mature their talents just as athletes do. And it is at least as important that the college concern itself with their growth—as a distinct mission.

I have said that such students need to be identified. In the case of athletes, this is easy. They come to college with a record. In the case of potential bearers of responsibility it is difficult. The talent is usually latent and not clearly evident and often not known by the student. What is required is a faculty member who will articulate the concept so that students can see it and respond if they feel they have it. I have talked to enough students to know that, if this talent is latent within them, they know what I am talking about.

What I mean by a potential bearer of responsibility—a leader, if you want to use that term—is not a vocational category, and it is quite independent of career choice. It may be latent in the potential lawyer, doctor, engineer, businessman, scientist, or
scholar in the classics. And it is not something to be taught about in an academic way. It is a talent to be coached, using the campus as the laboratory for learning to bear responsibility well.

The college should not depend on the Senior Fellow to awaken the students' awareness of their latent talent. Senior Fellows usually are not teachers and do not know how to do this. Furthermore, they do not have the established relationship with students that is required. It is a faculty responsibility to awaken the students' awareness and prepare them to work with the Senior Fellows. Also, the Senior Fellows are not there as a role model. They are there as a special kind of wisdom source for those students who have a sharpened awareness of what the Senior Fellows, out of their experience, can give them.

I realize that the assumption has been made that this kind of preparation is implicit in a liberal arts education. It may be, and it may not be. As far as I am aware, it is one of those unexamined assumptions. All I can say is that, in my experience, between those situations where an interested faculty member takes the initiative in finding and coaching these students as consciously and explicitly as the athletic coach does (maybe even in competition with the coach), and where this is not done, the contrast is very great when viewed from the vantage point of a visitor like a Senior Fellow.

Why have the colleges generally chosen not to make this a part of their established programs? Why do colleges not want to identify and coach those students who have the unrealized potential to become exceptional bearers of responsibility? There is a definite reluctance to do it, I can assure you. I have worked at this for the past ten years. In a few cases, I, and others who have similar beliefs, have been able to persuade a college to do something—where we helped raise the money to pay a faculty member to do it and invested a lot of our own time. But when we stopped (and the money stopped) the effort stopped.

This has puzzled me. Colleges make a real effort to do the things that they think are important in the education of their students, and they stretch what money they have over all of those things. Yet what I have described is rarely accepted as an obligation by the college. Occasionally, there are faculty members who, on their own, wield an influence that has this effect—sometimes, I believe, without being conscious that they are doing it. In one college I know of back at the turn of the century, a few professors, one in particular, wielded an influence that lifted the quality of the culture in a whole state. One teacher performed this service for me in a significant way. But why is this not explicitly acknowledged as an obligation to all students in all colleges—and at least a pass made at doing it in a formal way? I have puzzled over this for a long time, and I would like to construct a very speculative theory in answer to that question, using one tiny fragment of evidence.

When I served as a Senior Fellow last spring, I was watching the process closely because that was partly why I was there. Although I had many ideas about how I might best be used, I did not offer them. I wanted to see what the experience was like when the college handled it its way. And it was handled very well—I was kept enjoyably busy. There was not the preparation of students that I have advocated here. But I doubt that that has been done in many places. My wife and I had a pleasant time, and we valued it as a plus experience. But in the course of going about, I was several times introduced as a representative of the real world. Finally, I challenged some faculty members on it. "What are you saying when you say that? This place is as real to me as anywhere I have ever been. And it seems to me terribly important that students see it as real." Folks were startled by that question and I did not get a good answer to it. Afterward I speculated on whether there were some deep Freudian implications in the frequent use of the word real in referring to the non-academic world, with the suggestion that the college is unreal. Is there the possibility that there is the unconscious wish for the colleges not to be seen as real because then the institutions might escape the implications of the kind of obligation I have been pressing on them?

The burden of my argument is that these students who are
potential bearers of responsibility should see their college years as being as real as anything they will ever experience. Therefore, they should conduct themselves in the college environment in a way that develops to the full their capacity for responsible behavior. But they need help.

Even the communication from the Woodrow Wilson Foundation reinforces this unreal image when it refers to business, industry, the professions, and government as "the world of practical affairs." Does that suggest that the college is the world of impractical affairs?

One hundred years ago, when only one percent of the college age population was actually enrolled, there was not such concern about what kind of place academe was—it could be unreal or impractical, if it wanted to. But now that fifty percent are enrolled, there is much concern with the nature of academe because it is so very influential. It cannot be unreal or impractical in any sense.

Senior Fellows may, of course, contribute to the program of the college in many ways, such as giving lectures (if there really is a place for them), visiting classes, meeting with faculty committees, talking with those who want a personal conversation, and socializing with both faculty and students. But these, as I see it, are peripheral reasons for their being there. The central reason for the Senior Fellows' presence is that the college has a sustained program for identifying and coaching those students who are most likely to achieve, in some field, positions like the ones the Senior Fellows now hold in their own fields, and who will be greatly stimulated by a substantial opportunity to share with the Senior Fellows if they are prepared for it in advance of their coming. This, I believe, is the strongest case for the Senior Fellows' presence, and it should not be left to chance that the students will identify their own needs and arrange for this service for themselves. This, it seems to me, is part of what a college is for.

As I have pondered the sad state of leadership in our country in recent months—not just in Washington but everywhere—I have wondered whether there is any other single opportunity in our colleges and universities today that ranks greater in importance than finding and coaching those students who have the potential for being exceptional bearers of responsibility. All of the other great services of higher education may not avail us much in the future if the talents of students with this particular gift do not mature now, while they are in college. It is neither difficult nor expensive to do—but it does take the will to serve, clarity of purpose, and determination. Any college that does it and makes it known will find the ablest people from the non-academic world knocking at its doors eager to help. There is no surer way to guarantee the future than to have strong ethical leaders in the making now.

I was not involved in the decision to make the grant that supports the Senior Fellows program, but I know that it grew out of conviction that communications between the academic and the non-academic sectors should be encouraged. It was hoped that, in three years, we could learn enough about it so that a much better judgment could be made by all concerned about the problems and opportunities in doing this. I am a part of the process of learning and I welcome the chance to share with you some of my learnings thus far. I want very much for the Woodrow Wilson Senior Fellows program to continue and I look forward to learning much from you as the conference proceeds.