EDITORIAL

Universities have now grown accustomed to being rated, berated, even castigated. "This," writes Michael Oakeshott, "is not a supremely desirable situation to be in. . . . But one must take one's time as one finds it, and do one's best to participate in its own peculiar urgencies."

More than ever before, the urgencies are manifold. Among other things, they relate to access, to size, even to essential character and purpose. Who should be admitted as students to universities? How large and diverse should universities be allowed to grow? What indeed *is* a university in twentieth century terms?

It is no good trying to answer these and similar questions in terms of historical precedent alone. For example, a university *is* "a community of scholars." With the advent of professional schools a number of decades ago, Stephen Leacock had fun with this one:

> And as if civics and social welfare were not enough for the already overburdened curriculum, a chariot creaking up the rough slope of Parnassus, "Business," in the form of schools of commerce, must needs leap on top of the load. It handed so heavy a tip to the driver that it could not be put off, and more than that it began to demand that the oldest and most respectable of the passengers be thrown out to make room for it.*

And so from curriculum to finance.

It is to be hoped that the modern university remains, at least in substantial part, a community of scholars. But a university *is* what it has become, and unless *scholar* is defined rather differently than in its classical context, the university has become something more than this kind of community. What kind of community? Is it a community at all any longer — having in mind that community implies communication if not communion?

Our first three articles deal with such questions. Oakeshott addresses himself by way of curriculum to the question of access. What is it that a university has to give, and to whom should it be given? Although his answer is not purely elitist it will surely challenge those who see in the modern university an institution of much broader purposes and clientele. Devall is especially concerned with the *mass* aspects of the modern university, and with their impact on its ethos and goals. Readers will no doubt wish to judge the degree to which his description of this impact and its secondary manifestations is an accurate one; also the degree to which these manifestations may or may not be *results* of mass organization. Hampton's skilful diagnosis of and prescriptions for drama

---

*Stephen Leacock, *Too Much College* (New York: Dodd, Mead & Company, 1939).

in the university setting have intriguing broader implications—posing as they do some central queries about the nature and purposes of a university education.

Our last three articles return us to the level of the public schools, and to some of their more persistent questions. One of these is the question of curriculum organization and method. Koch has approached this through a largely unexploited kind of systems analysis, one which is likely to be practical as well as theoretically appealing. Kitchen brings us face to face with the question of value orientations and dispositions, and offers some suggestions as to how we may be more sensitive to ways of recognizing and coping with them.

Charles Phillips wrote so stimulating an article for us in an earlier issue (our first, April 1967) that we asked him to do another. This he has done with reference to educational aims, and in an equally stimulating (not to say provocative) way.

The editors will welcome letters from readers who wish to offer *pro* or *contra* viewpoints on those in any of the above articles.

H. S. Baker.