Fasora, Lukáš; Hanuš, Jiří

The myth of contributing to society

In: Fasora, Lukáš; Hanuš, Jiří. *Myths and traditions of Central European university culture.* First published Brno§|§Praha: Masaryk University Press, 2019, pp. 125-158

ISBN 978-80-246-4380-9 (Karolinum. Praha) (paperback); ISBN 978-80-246-4497-4 (Karolinum. Praha) (online : pdf)

Stable URL (handle): https://hdl.handle.net/11222.digilib/142143
Access Date: 17. 02. 2024
Version: 20220831

THE MYTH OF CONTRIBUTING TO SOCIETY

In 1963 the president of the University of Berkeley, Clark Kerr, wrote: "*A university anywhere can aim no higher than to be as British as possible for the sake of the undergraduates, as German as possible for the sake of the graduates and the research personnel, as American as possible for the sake of the public at large....*"[278] Kerr also showed a sense of humour when presenting one of his serious books, mischievously stating that: "*I find that the three major administrative problems on campus are sex for the students, athletics for the alumni and parking for the faculty*."[279]

What does the university in fact contribute to society? Is it the provision of a comprehensive education, prioritizing interdisciplinarity and general critical thought, or is it on a narrower, occupational basis? Is it the education of scientists who are led step by step through basic research, adapting themselves to the working conditions of the academic community? Is it about the university's ability to be at the forefront of technological developments in close cooperation with the commercial sector, contributing to the expansion of the economy? Or should the university be a forum which debates complex social problems and looks for rational solutions? All of these and more are possible answers to the question posed. The narrative on the benefits of universities is motivated by the need to legitimize the social and political position of the university in a form which suits the different internal and external interest groups. Under their direction, therefore, it is a myth which serves to mobilize students to attain specific objectives, principally the rearrangement of economic priorities and power relationships in tertiary education, in the competitive environment of the university network and within the framework of the specific university. With regard to the global character of the

278 Kerr, Clark: "*The Uses of the University*". Harvard 2001, p. 14.

279 Rorabaugh, Wiliam Joseph: *Berkeley at War: The 1960s.* New York 1989, p. 12.

university, there are international examples and related arguments for practically every area of social benefit relating to Kerr's thesis.

Historically, four responses have appeared relating to the usefulness of the university:

a) The university is a "temple of science and education", maintaining a critical distance from society.
b) The university is a "training facility" for the highly qualified personnel of specific professions.
c) The university is a "service centre" for solving social problems in the broadest sense of the word.
d) The university is a "starting point for entry into the establishment".[280]

The first of these answers is strongly historicizing, it refers to the origins of the Bologna university and the predestined privileged position of the humanities and the social sciences in the portfolio of university disciplines; something which experimental disciplines and those focusing on professional qualifications would often dispute – though not by everyone and absolutely.[281] The second of these views also has a historicizing subtext and refers to the universities of the 12th–13th centuries, the prestigious sections of which were the professionally focused theological, legal and medical faculties. The last two mentioned also form the backbone of professional education in today's universities. Within these two faculties, however, are a number of disciplines which are mainly theoretical and for which the label "professional" is too narrow. The concept, of course, does not suit interdisciplinary-focused disciplines – not only natural sciences, the humanities and social sciences – but also economics and sport. It is a different style of working, a different style of thinking and a different style of intellectual creativity. Professional education aims at the social operationalization of university study, and is, therefore, mainly "egotistical" in character. A general education, on the other hand, aims at higher goals, at benefiting the whole of society under the label of "searching for the truth", usually at the core of the university sponsio (graduates' ceremonial oath) and the third answer to the question about the usefulness of universities. It denotes the accumulation of knowledge, the training of educated people, the development of new technology independent of economic profit in the narrower or immediate sense of the word, but with a vision for the benefit of society. The different focuses of the disciplines at a university also indicate fundamental differences in their attitude towards the third answer, in particular during a period faced with urgent, complex and global social issues. The fourth answer is

280 Wolff, Robert Paul: *The Ideal of the University*. Boston 1969, pp. 3–5.

281 Wagner, J. James: *Multiversity or University? Pursuing competing goods simultaneously*. The Intellectual Community Vol. 9, Nr. 4, 2007, http://www.emory.edu/ACAD_EXCHANGE/2007/febmar/wagneressay.html retrieved 8.7. 2017.

modernist in the way it combines education and power, and is potentially critical of the current social and political order.

Each university is to an extent a heterogenous organism, so it is impossible to unambiguously answer the question about its usefulness; which was why in the 1960s the term multiversity, coined by Clark Kerr in 1963, became popular. The term described "*congeries of communities – the community of the undergraduate and the community of the graduate; the community of the humanist, the community of the social scientist, and the community of the scientist; the communities of the professional schools; the community of all the non-academic personnel; the community of the administrators.*" These various communities, with their often conflicting interests, reach out in turn to other communities of the alumni, government officials, city neighbours, business leaders, foundation heads, NGOs, and many others.[282] Kerr saw this term as bridging two traditions embedded in American university culture – the Newman tradition, which he saw as being overly biased towards the humanities and emphasized Bachelor courses – and the Flexner tradition, which applied to those universities grouped around the reforms of Abraham Flexner (John Hopkins University of Baltimore, University of Michigan, etc.), which emphasized scientific research, applied skills and graduate and professional education.[283] The term multiversity was established as a criticism of alleged academic snobbery, which excluded non-university-educated people from influencing public life, and for increasing the chaos and heterogeneity of the *universitas* – this point is the most topical – by opening the university gates to market principles, in particular the highly controversial academic capitalism.[284]

The issue of usefulness in Czech university culture

Every answer to the question concerning a university's usefulness is embedded in the university culture of each country. They differ in the way they prioritize one interpretation over others. Sometimes the differences between university cultures are very small, in particular relating to the unifying tendencies of the Bologna model, where extremes blur and cultures converge. The relationship between university education and the establishment is embedded in the code of French, Russian, British and American university culture, albeit in a handful of elite schools. The concept of professional education is stronger in French, and to a lesser extent Russian, university culture, than in other university cultures. The

282 Wagner, J. James: *Multiversity or University? Pursuing competing goods simultaneously*. The Intellectual Community Vol. 9, Nr. 4, 2007, http://www.emory.edu/ACAD_EXCHANGE/2007/febmar/wagneressay.html retrieved 8.7. 2017.

283 Ibid.

284 Wolff, *The Ideal*, pp. 32–34.

British "Newman" tradition aside, the notion of the university as a "temple of science and education" is strongest with the Humboldtian *universitas* tradition in German-speaking areas, which has also influenced universities in Central Europe. However, there are numerous exceptions which quickly modify or destroy any schematically defined character of university culture, as František Drtina demonstrated in the story about a project for a series of public lectures at Cambridge. Drtina thought the ancient English universities were very elitist because "*the people were completely excluded and only the elite of the nation had access.*" Nevertheless, the Cambridge heads responded positively in 1872 to a call from societies and town leaders to become more involved in people's education, which Drtina quoted: "*We know that in the rural districts a large number of people are demanding the benefits of a higher education. People who are no longer of the age to go to school. They have neither the means nor the time to spend 3–4 years at university. Many of these people are young people belonging to the middle class, employed all day in a shop or office, many are also from the working class. How to care for the education of classes who only have the evening for self-study? In this predicament we turn to the old English universities, the national centres of our education. Why should the universities not come to us, when the people we speak for cannot go to them? Why could they not send us professors, men excelling in their specialist area of knowledge?*"[285]

From the mid-19th century, the Thun reforms (1849) meant that Austrian universities began to converge with the Humboldtian university in Prussia – i.e. more like a research university.[286] The difference was that although the Humboldtian organisational scheme was maintained, in terms of freedom of research there was greater conflict due to the Catholic-conservative nature of the monarchy and its ties to the Holy See (the Concordat of 1855), which under Pope Pius IX was strongly opposed to liberalism and free research at universities. In spite of attempts by subsequent regimes to revise, weaken or abolish Humboldtian ideas about the social benefit of the university in terms of basic research, its transference to teaching, and freedom of inquiry and research, these ideals have remained strongly rooted in the university community. To this day it is a legacy which the humanities tenaciously defends, despite the fact that at the end of the 19th century the Humboldtian university suffered a crisis of legitimacy, and accusations of it being divorced from the real needs of society became increasingly present in debates about the meaning of universities. For nostalgic supporters of the Humboldtian vision, the 20th-century history of Czech tertiary education appears as an era of constant attacks on university ideals, where the main argu-

285 Drtina, *Universita*, pp. 10–11.

286 Kernbauer, Alois: An elitist group at elitist universities. Professors, Academics and Universities in Habsburg Monarchy from the Middle of the 19th Centrury to World War I, In: Bieber, Florian – Heppner, Harald (eds.). *Universities and the Elite Formation in Central, Eastern and South Eastern Europe*. Zürich – Vienna 2015, pp. 93–110, esp. p. 100.

ment is the lack of a social contribution in various ideological contexts, always with organizational-economic consequences. Attacks based on arguments on the need to take universities away from the "ivory towers", where their attachment to the Humboldtian ideas had apparently led them, are refuted with the same vehemence as the negations of the very foundation of the university.

Chronologically, the next attempt to redefine the usefulness of the university in Czech and Central European cultural circles was the application of French and then later Soviet models, which meant a narrower reorientation of the university towards professional education. The French cultural influence on Czechoslovak and Polish interwar universities cannot be overstated, whilst in Hungary and Austria the influence was minimal. Several prominent individuals were bearers of the French university traditions – the mathematician Matyáš Lerch and the sociologist Inocenc Arnošt Bláha in Brno, and the neuropathologist Ladislav Haškovec in Prague. The philosopher František Drtina and the Czechoslovak president, Edvard Beneš, were considered by Czech academia to be true experts on French university education.[287] Despite the fact that they were certainly influential as individuals, their work in the academic community did not disrupt the dominant cultural attachment of the majority of academics to Austrian and German higher education. At that time, the leaders of the Czechoslovak sate saw professional education as undoubtedly the most powerful argument for financing universities. Being fully dependent on the state budget meant that universities risked giving decision-making powers to the political class, who saw the steep growth in higher education in the new republic in the years shortly after the revolution as too unstable and economically unsustainable.[288] It is worth recalling that the establishment of the universities in Brno and Bratislava had the character of a revolutionary act – the laws were approved by the Revolutionary National Assembly of the Czechoslovak Republic shortly after the revolution – in January and July 1919 when Hungarian troops were still being fought in Slovakia. At the same time, the Czechoslovak state allowed the German section of the Charles-Ferdinand University to remain open, and in 1920 it was renamed the German University in Prague, at that time the most important state university for members of an ethnic minority in Europe. Financing four universities proved to be no easy undertaking for the Czechoslovak state budget, and in the interwar period the government immediately sought ways to make savings, even employing radical steps.[289] Attempts at interference and cutbacks in the universities in Prague proved to be politically unfeasible as they would have damaged the Czech capital's university – the

287 Drtina, František: *Nástin dějin vyššího školství a theorií paedagogických ve Francii o doby revoluce*. Vol. 1, (1789–1814). Prague 1898; also: *Organisace školská předních kulturních států*. Prague 1901; Beneš, Edvard: *Školské poměry ve Francii*, Volná škola 20.8. 1908, pp. 55–57.

288 Jordán, František et al.: *Dějiny university v Brně.* Brno 1969, p. 124 ff.

289 Doležalová, *Ve vleku,* pp. 89–103.

only university catering for the needs of Czechoslovakia's German population in their own language. It also proved to be politically dangerous to make cuts in the budget of Bratislava's university, and although there were numerous minor and less obvious interventions, in view of the relationship with Slovakia, its organizational structure was left more or less untouched. There was also interference in Brno's university in areas which were deemed too distant from the concept of professional education at a university – the natural science faculty and the faculty of arts (1923–1925, 1932–1933). In the case of the natural-science disciplines, the argument concerned the difficulty in equipping the laboratories, which were unable to compete with other schools and private research teams without expensive technology. The argument was more interesting (from our perspective) in the case of the arts faculties, as it pointed to the supposed redundancy of the humanities, which with their general education were apparently unable to respond quickly to the needs of the labour market and produced an unemployed educated proletariat which could be dangerous to the regime because of its political views.

The line of defence from the heads of Masaryk University, the faculties and the mobilized (predominantly Moravian) public is instructive in terms of how people perceived the importance of the university in different ways – its role in the support of a national identity, democracy, as well as provincial patriotism, and its close ideological links to the educated elites of the Moravian towns, where most of the protests were centred. In addition to the committed network of graduates and families of students, there were also declarations of support from municipal representatives, teachers' organizations, cultural organizations, the Sokol movement and members of officers' clubs.

This close link that the university and its arts disciplines had to the national and democratic ideal would later be a reason for Nazi intervention: the universities were seen as being an obstacle to total Germanization. The Nazis acted with greater severity towards the universities in the smaller nations of Central Europe than towards the nations of Western Europe, though conditions in Czech education were not nearly as bad as in Poland.[290] Here the Nazis proceeded with the aim of exterminating the Polish nation, and soon after their victory in 1939 began to move ruthlessly against the Polish intelligentsia as the standard bearers of national identity. The university in Poznaň was immediately closed in September 1939, the buildings confiscated by the German authorities and any valuable equipment was transported back to Germany. The Polish intelligentsia were treated mercilessly as part of the objective of Germanizing the area of Greater Poland – a large number of teachers were imprisoned, some were executed and some were sent to the east to the General Government. The only university in operation in Greater Poland – now called Wartheland and transformed into

290 Rüegg, *Geschichte,* III., pp. 528–534.

a model province of the Great German Reich – was the Posen Reich University (Reichsuniversität).[291]

It is interesting that the professionally oriented disciplines from the legal and medical faculties avoided the issue of cuts during the interwar period. Medical education had the strongest position in the portfolio of subjects offered by the interwar universities. The medical disciplines were even kept partially open after the Nazis had closed down Czech universities in 1939, which was why they were suspected of collaboration with the Nazis, even though there were only a few reported cases.[292] In the historical memory of the Czech university community, those who resisted the Nazis were seen as mainly scholars from the humanities. Amongst them stood out two symbolic figures who were rectors during the period of the Nazi attacks on Czech universities – the Orientalist Bedřich Hrozný in Prague and the Czech scholar Arne Novák in Brno. The process of the collective remembering and forgetting of events during the occupation was usually recorded by the arts disciplines, with the result that a large number of the victims from the natural sciences were forgotten (e.g. Brno's natural science faculty lost a quarter of its teachers). These people were often involved in the resistance through their knowledge of technological processes, chemicals and explosives.[293]

After the intermezzo of the Nazi occupation, postwar Czechoslovakia, like other countries in the emerging communist bloc, looked to Slavonic systems of higher education for their model, in particular the Soviet university. This influence had only been marginal during the interwar period and was linked to left-leaning academics mainly from the arts faculties and their close intellectual circles – in Brno this applied to Vladimír Helfert and Bedřich Václavek,[294] while in Prague this was related to Zdeněk Nejedlý and intellectuals around the journal *Var* (Ferment) and *Nové Rusko* (New Russia).[295] Within a Central European context, Czechoslovakia was the exception due to its more receptive attitude towards interwar Soviet models, which was attributable to the strong influence of the communist movement in society, the general left-wing orientation of a great number of Czechs and a traditionally sympathetic attitude towards Russia, which still persevered despite the regime's anti-Soviet narrative based around the Czech Legion's struggle against the

291 Grot, Zdisław (red.): *Dzieje Uniwersytetu im. Adama Mickiewicza 1919–1969*. Poznań 1972, pp. 304–316.

292 Urbášek – Pulec, *Kapitoly z dějin*, pp. 10–11; Charles University Archive, Čestný soud vysokých škol fonds, i.d. 421–423.

293 Jordán, *Dějiny university*, pp. 228–229, 239.

294 Kubáček, Vojtěch: *Pokrokové tradice Univerzity Jana Evangelisty Purkyně*, Universitas 1/1979, pp. 3–5.

295 Kšicová, Danuše: K některým problémům kulturní politiky SSSR a ČSR v meziválečném období. In: Čerešňák, Bedřich (red.): *Padesát vítězných let: sborník prací z vědecké konference filosofické fakulty Univ. J. E. Purkyně k 50. výročí vzniku KSČ*. Brno 1974, pp. 139–144.

Bolsheviks in Russia. In the postwar Third Czechoslovak Republic (1945–1948), the influence of Soviet models increased and references to Soviet universities became normal in any conceptual debate about the form of Czechoslovak tertiary education, although there were still references to British models, and less so to American ones.[296] For understandable reasons, German-Austrian concepts were beyond the pale.

In 1946, debates between Czechoslovak reformers included ideas about "*industry's long-term mistrust of 'pure science' and universities*"; as well as the thesis concerning "*the close relationship between research and science carried out at universities*", and it was optimistically stated that at universities there is *"often research of a global standard, as well as a rising, or at least constant, standard."*[297] One of the few clear results from these fevered discussions was a fundamentally Humboldtian conclusion: the university's contribution to society lies in the combination of pure and applied science with teaching; the role of the university is to develop "*normalized education for practical purposes, to cultivate science as an educational tool with international scope.*"[298]

This search for inspiration in Czechoslovak tertiary-education reform from the Soviet Union resulted in Soviet models being uncritically and incompetently imported at the end of the 1940s. It was the most significant ever attack on the Humboldtian university tradition and the tradition of freedom of research in Czechoslovakia, when for tactical reasons both supporters of separating research and teaching, as well as its opponents, cited Soviet models.[299] The idea of separating basic and applied research from universities and transferring them to research institutes and the Czechoslovak Academy of Sciences was, in its extreme form, carried out inconsistently and only partially during the height of the reforms from 1951–1952,[300] nevertheless, the division of roles was to remain clear throughout the communist regime's existence. Both basic research and its practical application were the remit of research institutes and academies.[301] Universities were to focus mainly on professional education and partially on the training of science students. From 1952, universities were not supposed to be involved in research activities. For example, a report from the ministry in 1950 was very critical about the state of mathematics: "*...exclusively theoretical teaching at universities, without any connection to practical application; in the technical colleges they amass encyclopaedic knowledge but without any use for the student*", and the solution was to be provided

296 Archive MU, fond H III Sbírka historické dokumentace, sign. 110/7; Archive CU, Fond Akademický senát 1882–1945, box. 31, i.d. 559.

297 NA, MŠK, k. 2085a, i.d. 44 I., Výzkum 1945–1948.

298 Ibid.

299 NA, MŠK, k. 2086, i.d. 44, Výzkum 1953.

300 NA, MŠK, k. 2086, i.d. 44, Výzkum 1953.

301 NA, MŠK, k. 2085a, i.d. 44 I., Výzkum 1950–1952.

by the Mathematical Institute of the Czechoslovak Academy of Sciences as an example of the new research structures built along Soviet lines, which was to remove all of the mistakes from the previous era.[302]

However, by 1953 it was the ministry's view that separating "*comprehensive* (i.e. basic – author's note) *research from universities is economically damaging*" and that it is necessary to find "*a balance between the two, as there is in the USSR.*"[303] In 1954, the rector of Prague's University of Chemistry and Technology produced some material for the minister's committee which criticized the state of research at universities, where he refuted the notion that there had been improvements connected to the management of research institutes, stating that, "*members of departments and faculties who have been employees, or have had experience with research activities at some departmental research institutes, believe that the new directives lead to the same poor state of research in universities as in the departmental institutes: the additional administrative work has a catastrophic effect on research. Instead, university research has to be research-oriented for the needs of industry. It is impossible, however, to foresee periods of completion or the direction and stages of development.*"[304] In 1952, the dean of Brno's science faculty said of research institutes that "*in the discussions the comrades from Brno's research teams stated that they felt it was unhelpful to have so many meetings, different announcements, directives and instructions, which meant they could not carry on with their own work.*"[305]

The separation of roles was indicated mainly by the level of centralism within university management. This could be seen in the guidelines for the admission of university applicants and the resulting system of so-called allocations, i.e. the employment of university graduates according to the needs of the national economic plan in accordance with government directive no. 20/1952 Coll. In Czechoslovakia, "allocations" in medical disciplines had been standard practice during the war and the system was revised again shortly afterwards; from the start of the 1950s it applied to all university graduates. Work places were allocated by directive, the only exception being 1968–1969 when a system resembling competitive management was introduced. When the communist regime tightened its grip, *c.* 1952–1956 and 1970–1974, the system worked quite thoroughly. For most disciplines this was connected to the political vetting of graduates, where it was very difficult to avoid the influence of the allocation committees. However, neither at that time nor later was the decision of the commission absolute and, nepotism and bribery aside, the result of the proceedings was greatly influenced by the applicant's family circumstances (caring for children or parents), the local and professional ties of

302 Ibid.

303 Ibid.

304 NA, MŠK, k. 2086, i.d. 44, Výzkum 1954.

305 NA, MŠK, k. 2085a, i.d. 44 I., Výzkum 1950–1952.

the husband and wife, and public activities within the area and region. The system failed due to poor communication between the ministry and the central planning structures on the one hand, and with the universities on the other. It was also impossible to realistically plan for the needs of the labour market over a longer time period, not to mention the ideological restrictions. Following the liberalization of the labour market after 1990 the "allocation" system was transformed into a type of survey whereby the university followed the careers of their graduates, and then used the data to varying degrees of thoroughness during the evaluation of their curricula. "Allocations" are also known to legal institutions in the Western bloc, and even today they are used in the Netherlands and Finland.[306] Their existence is a bond which binds the university to the narrower professional education of its students. "Allocations" as well as surveys about graduate careers legitimize the activities of the university in the eyes of the taxpayers, who are interested in whether or not the money invested in education by the public was not wasted on unemployed graduates.[307]

The majority of the Czechoslovak university community was reserved in its attitude towards the official redirection of universities towards a narrow professional, ideological education. In the eyes of the more experienced members of the academic community, the practical application of communist ideological principles to the level they desired was impossible and was incompatible with the basic rules governing the university. Many of the youngest academics – some students and the youngest teachers who were idealistic members of the Communist Party – believed in the application of ideology to the letter. It was as a result of their youth and inexperience that the image of the communist university-reform experiment from 1948 to 1956 appears as such a chaotic era, full of idealism and a lack of respect for traditions and real life in general.[308]

Older academics in particular spoke *ex post* of a "*dictatorship of the blue shirts* (i.e. the Youth Movement – author's note)," who combined incompetence and a lack of experience with placing ideology above scientific principles.[309] The older generation of academics then suffered from the clear drop in the quality of teaching in comparison with the interwar period. This applied to the new teachers who were loyal to the regime but incompetent from an academic perspective, as well as the drop in standards amongst the newly arriving students. The reforms carried out by the communist regime in sections of the university community – in par-

306 https://vsmonitor.wordpress.com/2014/05/13/jak-v-nizozemsku-urcuji-pocty-prijatych-na-vysoke-skoly/ (5.7. 2017)

307 Archive MU, Fond A4 Pedagogická fakulta, k. 1, sign. DXIII; Ibid, Fond A3 Lékařská fakulta, k. 1, sign. DXIII.

308 Novák, Mirko: *Úsměvné vzpomínání*. Prague 1998, pp. 183–184; Urbášek – Pulec, *Kapitoly*, pp. 9–186.

309 Pernes, Jiří: *Škola pro Moravu. 100 let Vysokého učení technického v Brně*. Brno 1999, p. 65.

ticular researchers from the natural science and medical disciplines – offered the possibility of building research teams instead of solitary researchers. In order to fulfil the strategic goals, they had to materially provide for younger scientists and offer them better career perspectives. A more vocationally orientated curriculum for university education was not seen as a problem – not even in the arts faculties, which remained the most important standard bearers of the Humboldtian tradition in the university.

In terms of a professional education, students and their families usually registered the dichotomy between the "ideological" and the "academic" subjects – the first were viewed as padding, the second as necessary for a professional career and a happy life. It was this that the school had to prepare the student for and thus legitimize itself. Naturally, there was an awareness, particularly in the humanities, that it was impossible to clearly separate both groups of subjects, which were often taught by the same teachers.

For the majority of students, their diploma in ideological subjects was the necessary price to pay for the opportunity to gain a professional education, as was stated in a report from Palacký University in 1962: "*The greatest danger* (for the socialist university – author's note) *is certain students' increasing indifference towards what we have built, to what is happening in the world and at home. They care little about the birth pains of our society and all that we have, the blood and toil that it cost. Their parents fought hard for their victory, but students take it for granted and just want to live well.*"[310] A similar situation was also described by the Brno professor of Marxism-Leninism, Silvestr Nováček, in 1983: "*In comparison with 1949, today's students are much younger and less experienced. More than 50% of them come from the families of workers and communists, though you wouldn't recognise this in the majority of them. A significant number seem to me to be politically indifferent, but I do not believe this is their fault – they are only a reflection of the circumstances in which we live... A smaller section of the more conscious students and Communist Party candidates follow my lectures with interest and reward my efforts with agreement and sometimes even with enthusiasm... However, it would please me greatly if they were not so reticent and could express more openly what they were thinking. I think they are afraid their political commitment will compromise them in front of the mass of their passive and indifferent colleagues.*"[311] In 1976 Kurt Starke stated that the relationship between students and teachers in East German universities was complicated and lacked comradeship. According to his research, the social and communication barrier was seldom overcome: "*Contact* (outside of teaching hours – author's note) *is limited to a small section of students, usually those who are more hard-working and socially active, and then the negative individual cases. During the school year there are so many students who never discuss political or ideological*

310 AUP, Rektorát UP II., k. 56, i.d. 141, sig. I/9A.

311 *Představujeme vám ... prof. Dr. Silvestra Nováčka, CSc.*, Universitas 3, 1983, pp. 42–45, here p. 44.

issues with the teachers outside of teaching hours, which becomes an even greater number when it comes to their personal problems. It is necessary to work on developing closer social contact between university teachers and students, even on an emotional level."[312]

The lack of understanding the practical side of specific professions was seen as a shortcoming throughout the existence of the communist regime, and in the eyes of the students this failing, alongside the burden of the ideological subjects, were the main problems concerning the legitimacy of university education. On the other hand, the demand for scientific study and the opportunity to participate in basic research were not viewed in this light. In his observation in 1983 "on the state of the student body", the Brno Czech scholar Arnošt Lamprecht noted that for the majority of teachers their work was first and foremost scientific, but the students did not usually share this Humboldtian enthusiasm for science: "*...the situation is basically the same. Even years ago, most people* (students – author's note) *just wanted a diploma so they could teach in a school, while they were not concerned about any deeper academic research. Those who were truly interested even worked outside of any scientific circles, but they constituted a relatively small number."*[313]

This provides evidence of how the communist management of universities created divisions within the academic community in its relationship towards the Humboldtian tradition of scientifically preparing students. There are also numerous documents revealing uncertainty on the part of the university management during the communist era. This was accentuated by its superficial knowledge of the "Humboldtian" or bourgeoise interwar university, which was, of course, officially supposed to be replaced. They were to imitate models, particularly Soviet ones, but they were also influenced by the everyday reality in local universities, where the main problem was a personnel policy which strove to find a balance between the departmental staff's ideological reliability and their academic competence.

Within this muddled political context the priorities set for the university changed quite rapidly and chaotically over time – at one point the main concern was ideological reliability, atheism and working for the party, at another it was specialization and the ability to carry out scientific work, and then at another it was the ability to work with industry in developing the socialist economy.[314] All of these changes in emphasis were hidden under the concept of comprehensive evaluation, which in practice was an extremely variable tool.[315]

---

312 Starke, Kurt: K vývoji osobnosti socialistických studentů v NDR. In: *O komunistické výchově na vysokých školách v BLR a NDR*. Prague 1977, pp. 37–79, here p. 64.

313 *Představujeme vám .. prof. Dr. Arnošta Lamprechta*, Universitas 1, 1983, pp. 48–51, here p. 50; a similar assessement from PU Olomouc cf. AUP, box 441, i.d. 1488, sig. D/II/5.

314 David–Fox, Michael – Péteri, György: On the Origin and Demise of the Communist Academic Regime. In: (eds.): *Academia in Upheaval. Origin, Transfers, and Transfromations of the Commuist Academia Regime in Russia and East Central Europe*. London 2000, pp. 3–38, here p. 11.

315 *Hodnocení výchovy na vysokých školách*. Prague 1977, pp. 54–56.

A resolution from a meeting of the faculty council of the faculty of arts at Palacký University in Olomouc (FA PU) in 1951 criticized the lack of a link between research and education at the faculty, basically the absence of the Humboldtian ideal, albeit with a Marxist nod towards collectivism: "*In general the academic work of the individual members of departments does not correspond with the material from the lectures, they thus remain thematically and methodologically individual matters, matters of private interest. ..University work is not a purely private issue as the teacher is subject to criticism and has a responsibility towards the collective. The revision of academic attitudes in the development of Marxist science within a sociable collective becomes a personal matter for each individual.*"[316] Shortly after a visit by a leading Soviet academic, interest in applied research led to a campaign by the university community of Olomouc University to demonstrate its contribution to socialist management in this area: "*Scientific departments used to have the wrong approach: they would try to discover something new, write an article about it, but then show little interest in what significance this discovery had for practical life. That was for another category of scientists whose role it was to put these new ideas into practice. It smacked rather of science for science's sake.*"[317] In other words: disregarding the role of the university in basic research and scientific training, while on the other hand defining itself as a centre of specialized expertise and initiatives for the manufacturing sector. Another report arrived at the ministry from Charles University's Faculty of Arts in 1958 which saw the greatest success in the "*harmonized alignment of scientific work in the departments with educational requirements,*" while basic research was given "*centre stage*" in the first sentence of the report.[318]

Documentation relating to personnel policy at Palacký University's Faculty of Arts again testifies to the complicated combination of the awareness of the mission and ideas of the university in the daily life of the departments. To a large extent personnel policies were framed within "the situation", therefore, the requirements set were quite vague and, in many respects, conditional. The ability of an academic to carry out independent scientific research remained one of the most important requirements for a university career, even though it is impossible to overlook the various forms of clientelism and political influences. In particular for young academics, a lack of scientific research was a reason for losing their job, despite the fact that they might be politically committed, loyal to the regime, open towards the Soviet Union, etc. The formal route was to start the interview process once their contract had expired. If there was a more suitable candidate from the interviews, then the scientifically inadept applicant would fail, despite being

316 AUP, Rektorát UP I., k. 41, i.d. 83, sign. III/25.

317 AUP, Rektorát UP II., k. 56, i.d. 141, sign. I/9A.

318 Národní archiv, MŠK, k. 2089 (1958), document Zhodnocení práce na Filozoficko–historické fakultě UK.

strong ideologically. For the less politically committed staff, there was always the threat of a special interview for the post, where any scientific work was of secondary importance and not usually a powerful enough argument to save a university career. The third important factor in personnel policies was the worker's general behaviour, which took into account both positive features in political activity as well as activity in the research team – such as attitudes towards the opinions of the authorities, independent judgment, the level of self-confidence, work rate and communication skills.[319]

As a result of the relatively frequent ideological U-turns and course corrections by the communist parties of the Soviet Union and Czechoslovakia (1953, 1956, 1967–1969, 1985), it was difficult for any politically committed discipline to maintain its scientific integrity within the academic community on the one hand, and its political credibility in relation to the party authorities on the other. The result was basically a position whereby the importance of a discipline, its power within a university and its "penetration" into other disciplines was assured by its basic compatibility with the regime, but also by the political clout of its leading specialists. And this was determined by people's ability in high academic and party functions to accept the aforementioned political-ideological U-turns, often at the cost of intellectual contortions leading to psychological problems, alcoholism etc.[320]

The creativity in finding ways to circumvent ideological demands was also reflected in the university's contribution to the national economy. Here social-science students could only make a minor contribution at best – for example, by carrying out sociological or psychological surveys – and so they were forced to defend their social contribution by using ideological arguments about their part in creating the "new socialist man".[321] A last resort was industrial companies' formal patronage of faculties – for example, the shoe manufacturing Gustav Kliment Works in Třebíč and their patronage of the Medical Faculty of Brno University[322], or volunteer brigades of students working in industry and agriculture. There was no shortage of anecdotes about this collaboration, and there was no need to be under any illusion about its effectiveness: for example, in 1957 a group of "*forty comrades from Charles University Faculty of Arts*" volunteered for construction work. The comrades apparently "*caused many problems*" on site, but the ideological objective had been achieved.[323] One particularly absurd idea came from the Youth Organisation of Olomouc's Faculty of Arts in 1959–1960, calling for a separate

319 AUP, FF UP, k. 59, i.d. 71, sig. C/I/3.

320 Petráň, *Filozofové,* esp. pp. 168–196, 231–278.

321 Archiv UK, Fond Kolegium rektora, k. 38, zápis z jednání dne 9.4. 1990.

322 AMU, H III, i.d. 110/7.

323 AUK Celozávodní výbor KSČ, k. 1, zápis ze dne 28.3. 1957.

factory of the PREFA national construction company to be established on the faculty grounds.[324]

However, these issues should not disguise the fact the communist regime also enjoyed some successes in its reform of tertiary education. In the mid-1960s, Czechoslovakia was still able to compete in quantitative terms with West Germany, Austria and France; in global terms an impressive 12.5% of the year's population were university students while higher education's share of GDP was 3.5%. In qualitative terms, however, Czechoslovakia was not so successful; research gradually became less international, levels dropped, as did graduates' knowledge of foreign languages. The overall undemocratic atmosphere in society, coupled with the recurring purges in personnel and rigid centralism constricted and exhausted universities. However, the real deathblows to Czechoslovak tertiary education were to come in the 1970s and 1980s when the depleted universities were instructed to intensify their links with industry, which at the time was stagnating due to mistakes made by the heads of state and a lack of modernization and effectivization in manufacturing. The reforms to higher education in Western Europe, which were carried out to make mass education more effective and were linked to the changing economy, exposed Czechoslovak schools to a merciless and considerably gloomy backlog of underdevelopment.[325]

The fall of the communist regimes forced Central European universities to look for inspiration from the global *universitas* network, the centre of which was clearly the USA in the 1990s. It is remarkable that no-one attempted to imitate models from the Central European university tradition – in this regard, communism represented a complete rupture from the past. There was, however, a minority strand within academia and university management for whom the Humboldtian ideal remained an important value. The experience with pressure from the communist regime and isolation from developments in the West allowed the Humboldtian ideal of the university to survive in a form which the Czech academic community recognised from the interwar period and had been preserved in the collective memory. Some academics connected the reconstruction of the scattered glory of Czech universities with the need to closely follow on from the interwar traditions of university culture, forgetting the huge gap in time which separated the university in 1990 from its idealized example. Naturally, it was more nostalgia than an established programme that was apparent in the humanities, where academics focused on the ideal of the university and where the historicization of their attitudes to the theme was the discipline's approach to reality. Alongside a combination of historicizing ideas, the academic community was confronted by – as it was in other post-communist countries – phenomena which shocked

324 Urbášek – Pulec, *Kapitoly*, p. 251.

325 Fiala, Jiří a kol: *Univerzita v Olomouci 1573–2009*. Olomouc 2010, pp. 117–118.

it: the problematic standards of private academies and some newly established public universities, the sale of diplomas, and the fusion of political, economic and academic clientele.[326] These factors, combined with the chaotic state of the educational system, prevented any focus on conceptual and strategic issues for the long-term development of the university.

Few people in Czech academia at the start of the 1990s were aware of what was really happening in Western European public universities, and only a few people appreciated the level of Americanization in Western European and German higher education. It was seldom acknowledged that the large Western European universities had moved to the periphery of the global university network as a result of the enormous dynamism of the top private American universities and Oxbridge. There was little reflection on the loss of the prestige of their research in favour of specialist research centres or professionally orientated academies in Germany and Austria. The countries of the former Eastern Bloc saw the situation in Western European university education through rose-tinted spectacles, which was in contrast to the critical discourse in the Western world at that time.[327]

One special chapter is the relationship forged between some Czech academics and French universities, something which developed within the global university network in a quite specific and, for Central Europe, unique manner. The relationship was based on the distinctive political position of France within the Western bloc and the historical openness of some French universities towards their Czech partners during the communist period. The influence of the Francophile community on the post-November management of Czech universities reached its height shortly after the revolution in 1989, for example, in the figure of the rector of Brno's Masaryk University, Milan Jelínek. He was an exception, however, and was followed by those looking towards Anglophone countries for models. The symbolic victory of the Anglophiles can be seen in the establishment of English as one of the three official languages in Czech universities (alongside Czech and Slovak). Since the 1990s, English as the lingua franca of postmodernism has cemented its position in Czech university culture. Despite voices from the humanities calling for the maintenance of greater linguistic plurality in order to keep contact with cultural wealth of the world, the dominance of English would appear to be unstoppable, sometimes even at the expense of Czech.[328]

326 Udrescu, Claudia Maria: University and Politics between East and West. Faciing Challenges in post–communist Romania. The Case of University of Bucharest, In: Bieber, Florian – Heppner, Harald (eds.). *Universities and the Elite Formation in Central, Eastern and South Eastern Europe*. Zürich – Wien 2015, pp. 215–225, esp. p. 224.

327 Reading, Bill: *The University in Ruins*. Cambridge 1997[2].

328 Liessmann, *Teorie nevzdělanosti*, p. 91.

Challenges from Western European debates

The debate surrounding the social contribution of universities underwent dramatic developments in the West from the 1960s to the 1990s, something which went virtually unnoticed by the majority of Czech academics. There were five aspects in particular which influenced the direction of the Western European debate:

a) The fall in the prestige of Western universities in comparison with the elite American schools, with only a few of the ancient European schools being able to compete, while the others were greatly harmed by the flow of their most talented scientists across the ocean, the economic problems of a war-torn continent, and the discredit caused by academia's collaboration with the regimes defeated in the Second World War, most obviously in the case of the top German universities.

b) The Americanization of European universities, most markedly in the defeated countries of the Axis powers, but generally across all of Europe, holding up American universities as a suitable model and direction for the development of their country's own higher education system; naturally the image of American higher education being reduced to approximately ten elite private schools and several top public universities (University of Florida, University of California).

c) The democratization of universities in the 1960s, which definitively took away the influence of traditional teachers' committees in favour of more open academic institutions, led to students having more influence in universities, which significantly altered the debate about the objectives of university activity. This was reflected in the integration of a number of new disciplines into the academic community, resulting in a movement towards a left-liberal political ideology in most of the important universities.

d) The development of mass higher education in Western European universities, often multiplying the number of students and educators, auxiliary and technical personnel in enormous facilities with 50,000 or even more than 100,000 students; in the countries of the OECD, up to 80% of the year's population attend higher-education institutions.

e) The knowledge that public budgets are not capable of supporting the policy of "a university education for everyone" and are not large enough to develop high-quality tertiary education, but at the same time, the political leadership of the state is not willing to reduce the number of students or increase tax for education. As a result, this forces universities either to make internal savings or implement the academic capitalism known from private universities. This would require a significant part of the finance for the running of the university to come from the school's own entrepreneurial efforts, particularly through applied research.

Without being aware of it, the attempts by post-communist universities to return to the family of "European universities", the westernization of their own teaching and research, and the establishment or development of their contacts with the West, have brought them into a debate about deep structural problems which have been discussed in Western European universities since at least the 1960s. It has proven to be a very sensitive issue. For example, Hans Peter Herrmann used the example of the university in Freiburg im Breisgau to talk about an 80-year crisis (1933–2010) and attempts at reform which in one way or another moved the university further away from the Humboldtian ideal.[329] Since opening up to mass higher education in 1977, the West German university has dramatically changed. The number of students rose by 73% between 1977 and 1990, 48% of whom were in full-time study, and 106% were outside full-time study, but the number of graduates only rose by 20%. The rise in academic and non-academic personnel was only by 7%, the space for studying rose by 11%, university expenditure increased in absolute figures by 12%, but the share of university spending dropped from 0.78% to 0.65%.[330] This data was not analysed in the Czech Republic and only a few people realized that the Western European university – which many people wanted to copy – was going through a serious structural crisis and was at a crossroads in the search for answers to the question about its own social usefulness.

West German discourse on academic policy in the 1980s did not harbour many doubts about mass higher education being the correct response to the challenges of the era. It was only *ex post* and with a distance of approximately twenty years that the argument began to develop that the 1970s-1980s had witnessed the gradual end of the Humboldtian tradition and an undermining of the foundation of the university's identity.[331] In the 1980s the memories of the oldest generation of academics of the Humboldtian universities appeared as curiosities. They subconsciously interpreted it as a "golden age", while acting in an evident quandary when aware of the contrast with the current form of study. Johannes Weissinger, a professor of mathematics at Karlsruhe University, recalled his student days at Jena, and compared the position in 1930 with the current situation in universities: "*The professor's lecture* (in 1930 – author's note) *was attended by several assistants and senior lecturers, and if the professor had a coffee break over the two hours of teaching, the*

329 Herrmann, *Krisen*, pp. 9–24.

330 Müller–Böling, Detlef: *Entfesselung der Wettbewerb. Von der Universität zum differenzierten Hochschulsystem*, pp. 353–365, here pp. 353–354.

331 vom Bruch, Rüdiger: Langsamer Abschied von Humboldt? Etappen deutscher Universitätsgeschichte 1810–1945. In: Mitchell G. Ash (Hg.): *Mythos Humboldt. Vergangenheit und Zukunft deutscher Universitäten*. Vienna, Cologne, Weimar 1999, pp. 29–57; vom Bruch, Rüdiger: Universitätsreform als Antwort auf die Krise. Wilhelm von Humboldt und die Folgen. In: Sieg, Ulrich – Korsch, Dietrich (Hg.): *Die Idee der Universität heute*. München 2005, pp. 43–55.

assistants would remain in the classroom and debate broader scientific issues with the students. Today this scene would be held up as an example of the professor's elitism, as a waste of people and time. I am now so overloaded that it would be impossible to teach so freely, and neither would the students dare to get involved in a conversation with the assistants, they would probably not even listen. Students are more timid in the rude, impolite atmosphere of today, the senior lecturers thus maintain their elitist thinking and do not want to engage with the students. And students used to have a more general interest in their discipline and did not concentrate on one aspect as is the case today." Weissinger repeatedly apologized to readers for his "*elitist memories*", but nevertheless, he stood up for a positive Humboldtian tradition, which he saw as becoming extinct due to mass higher education. The professor took a very positive view of the tradition of a new colleague's opening lecture on a broader academic topic for the other professors, bringing them personally closer into the debate and "*their subsequent collaboration was thus far more less formal than today.*"[332]

The university culture within post-communist countries in the 1990s did not allow for complaints about the university being in political and economic crisis, which was a common feature in Germany and Western Europe. The academic community's vision was to aim for the same standards as Western universities. This position – perhaps slightly naïve – was hardly surprising given the dramatically backward conditions and the general greyness of post-communist universities.

"Bologna"

The real start to the debate about the objectives of university academics within the wider academic community was a very important political step – the Czech Republic's signing of the Bologna declaration on 19 July 1999. The original group of 30 countries, rising gradually to 49 (and the European Commission), agreed to increase the quality and accessibility of tertiary education. It was basically in response to the problems and challenges that postwar European higher education faced as outlined above.[333]

The objectives of the Bologna Process can be summarized in four points:

1) The convergence of higher education across Europe.
2) The increased internationalization and mobility of study.
3) The differentiation of the missions of the individual universities within the system.

332 Weissinger, Johannes: Die Universität gestern, heute und morgen. Erinnerungen und (unsystematische) Gedanken, In: Kahle, Heinz Gerhard (Hg.): *Die Hochschule in der Herausforderungen der 70en Jahre*. Karlsruhe 1980, pp. 11–26, here pp. 12, 15.

333 http://www.ehea.info/pid34248/history.html (6.7. 2017).

4) Developing links between university courses and the needs of the labour market.

There was a pluralistic character to the implementation of the Bologna system into the higher-education systems of the different countries – there was no single interpretation, nor will there be in the near future, of all the recommendations from the Bologna declaration for individual countries. The smaller European countries in particular have little choice and are under pressure to respond to the situation in the larger European countries and attempt to align their university education with the "main current". Ján Figeľ, the then Euro Commissioner for education, described the position of Slovak university management: "*Being part of the Bologna process does not mean that the other countries will acknowledge everything, it means it will be easier for them to acknowledge things.*"[334] Different aspects of the system are stressed differently, while the tempo for applying the principles also differs dramatically. Some examples: although a credit system for the Bachelor's and Master's degree was introduced, there were large differences. Nineteen countries opted for the system of a three-year Bachelor course and two years for a Master's, seven countries chose a 4+1 system and 23 offer a hybrid system. As for student mobility, smaller countries such as the Netherlands and Austria boasted the most mobile students, with 20% of students having studied abroad. On the other hand, larger countries such as Britain and Poland did not even exceed 5%.[335] A total of 76% of travelling students went to four countries within the Bologna system (Great Britain, France, Russia and Germany)[336], with the British system being the far most attractive. Smaller countries fared less well from these exchanges and there are particularly high deficits in Central, Eastern and South Eastern Europe. Some smaller countries have responded to the national weakness of a "small language" by making their education system more open (Austria, Finland, Norway), and the ratio between outgoing and incoming students is quite balanced overall; some countries are slower and less thorough at opening up their education system, and when taking into account the factor of a "small language", the result is a dramatic disparity in the number of outgoing students – a phenomenon often viewed negatively by the public as the sign of a brain drain, exacerbating demographic problems due to the predatorial policies of the richer Western countries (Slovakia, Lithuania, Serbia, Croatia).[337]

---

334 Čikešová, Mária: *Aplikácia Bolonského procesu na Filozofickej fakulte Univerzity Komenského*. In: Slobodník, Martin –Glossová, Marta: 95 rokov Filozofickej fakulty UK. Pohľad do dejín inštitúcie a jej akademickej obce. Bratislava 2017, pp. 503–524, here p. 504.

335 Teichler, Ulrich: Bologna – Kontinuität und Wandel der Hochschulentwicklung, In: Kellermann, Paul – Guggenberger, Helmut – Weber, Karl (Hg.): *Universität nach Bologna? Hochschulkonzeptionen zwischen Kritik und Utopie.* Vienna 2016, pp. 74–95, here pp. 74, 78–79.

336 Čikešová, *Aplikácia principov*, p. 518.

337 Ibid.

Interpreting the statistics from the Bologna Process is a tricky affair. The academic community is interested most in student mobility, which is relatively well quantified among the Bologna objectives. In the period 1999–2007, student mobility within Europe rose from 3% to 3.3% of the student year population,[338] which is not a particularly radical change. Questions are then asked about how effective these significant resources are in changing the university course system. A barrier to mobility – particularly for people going from East to West – is the cost of accommodation, a lack of course programmes in world languages, and the difficulty of incorporating a foreign study stay into a course plan, particularly for a Bachelor's course. In addition, much of the mobility is directed towards countries which are similar in language – students from Slovakia, based on their linguistic affiliation, study in Czech or Hungarian universities; Austrian students travel to Germany; Bavarian and Southern Tiroleans to Austria; Walloons to France, etc. Greater motivation to study abroad is often lower course fees and cheaper student accommodation rather than the Bologna principles.

In other areas the benefits of the Bologna Process are practically impossible to measure. Its supporters claim that the opportunity for the student to influence the speed and type of course is more suited to the mentality of today's youth, who are strongly focused on their individual interests and hobbies, with an almost exaggerated attachment to self-realization and the idea that courses should be "fun". In the "pre-Bolognian" European system of higher education, the system of a 4–6 year course prevailed, at the start of which the student usually chose a narrowly defined discipline – the extremes in specialization were particularly evident in the social sciences and the arts. Reform was based on the fact that with such a high percentage of university students in the population year, it was no longer tenable to target universities solely for producing graduates either in science or educational work for the lower school levels, and that in the first years it was necessary to make the courses more open in terms of the subjects to enable a narrower academic focus in the higher years. This Bologna system had, to a certain degree, already been implemented in the medical, legal and theological disciplines, which were more obviously vocationally orientated, unlike the majority of the more generally focused university subjects. The two-cycle course tried to limit the lack of success in courses and the loss of public money invested in the student, which did happen for some disciplines, though not for others, and it is debatable whether this aspect of the Bologna system had any major influence.

It is clear that the Bologna system was the death knell for the pointlessly specialized disciplines of the social sciences and the arts. But did this also bring about a demise in scientific thinking as part of the study? It is impossible to expect Bachelor's students in the majority of subjects to be able to delve deeply into the

338 Teichler, *Bologna*, p. 74.

discipline's scientific discourse – the courses are too short, they have to make up for the weaknesses in secondary-school education, while the majority of students do not set great store by an academic training. But this was a reality which university educators faced long before Bologna![339] The problem had accumulated over decades; its roots were in the vague answers to the question of what scientific education actually was, or rather scientific thinking, and what specific competencies for resolving problems does the graduate acquire in comparison with other types of study and individual personal development. It would appear that academics argue strongly in its defence in a way which the public does not listen to because they do not see the need for scientific education in this form and level.[340]

Humanities teachers at Masaryk University have subconsciously admitted for many years that they have been providing academic training to students with the awareness that in a (large) year group, only a few individuals are interested in an academic career, while the others are headed to a career in education or elsewhere.[341] For a long time this failure of the university to meet the public demand was deflected using references to academic freedom in teaching and research. A gulf thus started to emerge between the public (taxpayers) and academics, which manifested itself in waves of anti-intellectualism and anti-academism, made all the more powerful with the new communication methods in alternative media and social networks where everything is permitted. Placing "scientific thought" above social need, and work for the "wisdom of the majority", creates an explosive mixture of anti-university aversion amongst sections of the public.[342]

Was "Bologna" the final nail in the coffin for the Humboldtian ideal of the university's useful contribution to society? Yes and no.[343] From the perspective of respect towards the university traditions of different countries and regions, the Bologna reform was based mainly on the British tradition of Bachelor's study; it more or less leaves untouched the tradition of the narrow vocational education of the French and Russian university culture, and interferes to the greatest extent in the German or Humboldtian tradition. If we ignore the extreme views that have been heard in the long and contentious debates, then the Bologna Process can be characterized as an effort to adapt the Humboldtian tradition to the challenges

339 Arnold, Rolf: *Bildung nach Bologna! Die Anregungen der europäischen Hochschulreform*. Wiesbaden 2015, p. 14.

340 Ibid, p. 15 ff.

341 *Představujeme vám .. prof. Dr. Arnošta Lamprechta*, Universitas 1, 1983, pp. 48–51, here p. 50; a similar assessment from PU Olomouc viz AUP, box 441, i.d. 1488, sig. D/II/5.

342 Teichler, *Bologna*, p. 92.

343 Cf. Seibt, Gustav: *Ende einer Lebensform. Von Humboldt zu Bologna: Der atemberaubende Untergang der deutschen Universität*, In: Süddeutsche Zeitung 21.06.2007; Langewiesche, Dieter: *Ende einer Lebensform. Welche Folgen hat der Umbau der europäischen Hochschullandschaft?* In: Süddeutsche Zeitung 29./30.12.2007; Bollenbeck Georg – Wende Waltraud (Hg.): *Der Bologna–Prozeß und die Veränderung der Hochschullandschaft*. Heidelberg 2007.

of globalization, digitalization and the curricular changes (the content of education) – thereby maintaining the positives contained within the Humboldtian tradition. One of the positives from the process is the systematic attempt to shift rigid tertiary education to a direction where it reflects public demand, despite the fact that from the outset the package of Bologna reforms contained many problematic elements and ill-considered consequences.

There are many critics of the Bologna Process. In many academic communities it is difficult in the lower levels of the university hierarchy to find anyone with anything positive to say about "Bologna". These include academics and political traditionalists and conservatives, who often quite understandably refer to the Sorbonne declaration of the ministers of education from France, Italy, Germany and Great Britain from 1998, which proposed a united framework for European education with the objective of mutually recognizing academic courses. The subsequent implementation process, which was increasingly associated with the structures of the European Union, was seen as bureaucratic and overly complicated in the manner in which it arrived at its objective, and fundamentally harmful and dangerous due to its unintended repercussions.[344] Its critics also include supporters of various forms of identity movements who are against external interference in the national interest of education. In addition, there are university trade unionists, concerned by the academic capitalism inspired by the Bologna Process in the USA and Great Britain, and also members of the reform movements in Western countries which tried to transform academia "pre-Bologna".[345] Rather than its actual substance, many critics base their dislike of the process more on its clumsy presentation, bureaucratism and reforms stimulated by large sums of money from development funds. They look on with suspicion at the conflict between the superficial adoration of Humboldtian traditions in gala speeches by "pro-Bologna" university dignitaries and politicians, and the sequence of major as well as minor managerial and bureaucratic steps which are in fact removing that Humboldtian tradition, or at the very least altering its foundations.[346]

The mid-1990s was an auspicious time for "Bologna" to arrive in the Czech Republic as it helped politicians and university managers overcome their quandary concerning the future direction of university education. It offered them an opportunity to respond credibly to two of the main problems contemporary universities face: the lack of a link between teaching and the needs of the labour

344 Liessmann, *Teorie nevzdělanosti*, p. 73; Arnold, *Bildung*, p. 19.

345 Stucke, Andreas: Mythos USA – Die Bedetung des Arguments „Amerika" im Hoschulpolitischen Diskurs der Bundesrepublik. In: Stölting, Erhard – Schimank, Uwe (Hg.): *Die Krise der Universität.* Wiesbaden 2001, pp. 118–138, here p. 125.

346 Schwarz, Karl: *Die Bologna–Reform erzwingt die Frage nach einer neuen Universitätskonzeption*. In: Kellermann, Paul – Guggenberger, Helmut – Weber, Karl (Hg.): *Universität nach Bologna? Hochschulkonzeptionen zwischen Kritik und Utopie.* Vienna 2016, pp. 217–225, here p. 217.

market, and the high level of course failure in many university disciplines.[347] It was precisely in the usefulness of its work for students and its contribution to society that the university began to lose its credibility and social prestige, and it was this situation which led to the German, Dutch and British attempts at reform in the 1980s, which would later form the basis of "Bologna". In the post-communist countries of Europe the Bologna process was a welcome sequel to the first waves of reform in the 1990s which attempted to expunge the legacy of communist rule over universities. Here "Bologna" was part of a wide-ranging political programme of European integration and a decidedly idealistic attempt to "catch up" with the West.[348] Nevertheless, the position of university graduates in the fast-changing labour markets of the post-communist countries was significantly different from Western countries and more favourable due to the higher demand in the labour market for university graduates with a knowledge of languages and the basics in information science. An important element of the public debate surrounding tertiary education in the Czech Republic has been the fact that universities and university teachers have manged to maintain a relatively prestigious position within society.[349]

In its initial stages the implementation of the Bologna directives in universities with a Humboldtian culture was considered by many to be a shocking change, particularly due to the doors being opened to mass higher education and the threat to the scientific character of disciplines from the influx of students with only a general and superficial interest in the subject. These were people with no ambition to participate in the highly academic and specialized debates of what supporters of the Bologna vision and many students would term the "ivory tower", a place where a large number of academics perhaps unwittingly found themselves.

According to its critics, Bologna has reduced the academic level in Bachelor's courses. Graduates from Bachelor's courses have difficulties finding employment in the labour market and many of them become proverbial employees at call centres or make deliveries to drinks machines in fast-food restaurants. Those students who continue on to a Master's have to write a thesis at the end of their Bachelor's course, often of dubious academic quality due to the level of knowledge and skills acquired. Notwithstanding, usually two years after writing their Bachelor's thesis, they can expect to write a Master's thesis.

The Master's course found itself at the centre of demands for "excellence". This pressure was implicit within the Bologna rules as an argument for the defence of every school on the university map. The constant and increasing pressure

347 Hüther, Otto – Krücken, Georg: *Hochschulen. Fragestellungen, Ergebnisse und Perspektiven der sozialwissenschaftlichen Hochschulforschung*. Wiesbaden 2016, pp. 35–61.

348 Cf. Roth, Oto: *Integrace vysokého školství v EU a česká vysokoškolská politika*. Prague 1997.

349 Prudký – Pabian – Šima, *České vysoké školství*, p. 68.

on excellence, whether in terms of exceptional research quality or the quality of the vocational education, threatens to sharply differentiate university disciplines. Those disciplines which search for a "golden middle way" are seen as uninteresting, grey and worthless in the competitive university struggle. Value lies in excellence: therefore, some universities focus on teaching and throw overboard the relevant research, others do the exact opposite. As a result, however, the relationship between research and teaching is destroyed and the university's identity along with it. In its place might be an academy of sciences research centre, the Max Planck Institute, or an academy focused narrowly on professions.[350]

Nevertheless, the Bologna Process is just the first, albeit symbolically the most important stage, in fundamental curricular reform which aims to prepare universities for the challenges of the 21st century. In the Czech Republic, a country with an extremely unstable ministry of education and chaotic development in educational policy, the visionary aspect of curricular reform fell away in the mid-1990s, and after many twists and turns, the reformist vision returned with the education act of 2016, particularly in relation to changes to subject accreditation.[351]

If the university as an institution is to survive the changes in the public's demands, it will have to find a way of adapting its culture to six sets of challenges. Each of these will mean – optimistically speaking – important innovations in the historically rooted university culture. From a more pessimistic view, these are changes which are so fundamental that many of the ideals formulated by Wilhelm Humboldt and John Newman will cease to exist. Therefore, what are these challenges that universities face on a global level?

– ***Reacting to the demands of society***

The university has to react to the demands of society – it cannot shut itself off in a realm of "pure science" in the style of the early 19th century and expect to receive in this apotheosis the support of the administrators of public budgets who have to answer to taxpayers and voters. The idea that universities are given a considerable sum from the public budget each year to spend as the administration of the university sees fit is erroneous from the outset and incompatible with the way in which democratic societies operate. Historical reminiscing on this point is unhelpful and misinterprets the reality – the modern university has either been entirely economically dependent on the state and carried out its wishes (the French and Russian model), or there has been a combination of state and private financing (the British and German model) with autonomy in some competencies. In the Czech and Central European tradition there has been a huge dependency

350 Matuschek, Stefan: *Zerreißprobe. Zur gegenwartigen Hochschulreform*. In: Jamme, Christoph – Schröder, Asta von (Hg.): *Einsamkeit und Freiheit. Zum Bildungsauftrag der Universität im 21. Jahrhundert.* Munich 2011, pp. 125–138, esp. pp. 128–135.

351 Walterová, Eliška: *Kurikulum – proměny a trendy v mezinárodní perspektivě*. Brno 1994; http://www.msmt.cz/ministerstvo/novinar/poslanci-schvalili-novelu-vysokoskolskeho-zakona (6.7. 2017)

on state financing in the modern era, and the arguments made to taxpayers either referred to vocational education or the national character of a university's activities – during the communist era there were references to building a national variant of a socialist society. Today this concept of state financing is unsustainable. Taxpayers may hear about the role of universities in vocational education, but the other aspects of a university's work – more or less political and ideological – are considered by the public to be untrustworthy, problematic, replaceable or unnecessary. This section of the public endorses the idea of introducing tuition fees on a sliding scale, noticeably in course programmes with unclear links to the labour market. This section of the public does not listen to arguments about the abstract cultural mission of universities, and suspects academics of quietly misusing public funding and influencing the youth in certain ideological directions. This might include the national dimension of a university's activities, its regional or provincial importance, concepts of multiculturalism and Europeanness, or of a democratic forum for free discussion and thus an incubator of democracy.

The role of the Humboldtian university as an unbiased participant in public (national) decision-making was generally accepted up until the 1870s. These were wonderful times for Humboldtian professors, and even today a substantial number of academics look back on them with nostalgia. José Ortega y Gasset cited two famous quotations idolizing Humboldtian-Newman education: the statement by Arthur Wellesley, the Duke of Wellington, that "*The Battle of Waterloo was won on the playing fields of Eton,*" and Otto von Bismarck's remark to the French emperor, Napoleon III, that: "*the victory of 1870 was a victory for German teachers and professors.*"[352] There was also a somewhat more sober voice from across the ocean: "*The German professor was a legendary figure in educational circles in the USA at the time. He was regarded as infinitely wise. As a servant of the throne he could educate young people to serve the Crown, and as a representative of high German culture he could demand befitting, seemly and formal treatment from those around him. The government would ask him for advice... Amongst the German public and academic circles, pride in the position of the university was connected to pride in the growing importance of the German Reich amongst other nations. The position of the German professor was leagues away from the position of the professors of little renown as was typical in the USA.*"[353]

As a result of democratization, political pluralization and the radicalization of the public from the 1830s, this concept has been eroded and the university's authority has become a relative concept. For some, the university continues to be an authority and impartial institution, standing apart from daily political skirmishes, while for others it is an institution which has been discredited by pompous political activism, concealing its separation from the general concerns of ordinary

352 Ortega y Gasset, José: *Mission of the University*. London 1946, p. 37.

353 Cited Paulus, *Vorbild USA?*, p. 61.

people. The role of the university as the provider of impartial, complex analyses to solve social problems is an extremely difficult challenge, but failing to accept it would lead the university to losing its legitimacy as an authority in society. Its demise goes hand in hand with the demise of rational experts' credibility in public life, and in the best case scenario the university will survive as just one of many participants in a multipolar debate.

– ***Global contextualism***

Some of a university's tasks are global in nature, while others are more local – what is needed is for them to be interconnected. It is necessary to remember that some university subjects respond more to global challenges, while others respond to local or regional challenges, and that it is through concerted interdisciplinary teamwork that the demands formulated by the public and political leaders can be met. Whether a discipline has mainly global or local ties has to be reflected in its curriculum, its financial model, as well as the demands on educators. Globally focused disciplines are not qualitatively superior to locally or regionally focused subjects, and vice versa. Overrating global perspectives leads to an ideological assessment of reality; in an extreme form this can lead to the position that the challenges of globalization are the only ones today that every "modern and rational" person has to face. The acceptance that disciplines are different has to be the foundation for decision-making at university. Often small signs of simplistic thinking can be phenomena of the utmost importance for university culture, such as the failure to take into consideration the different traditions and ties of disciplines – one typical example is the complete superiority or dominance of English compared to other languages in everyday academia, which is particularly harmful for the humanities, characterised as they are by their linguistic variety. Or there is pressure to publish in high-impact academic journals which are predominantly Anglophone in their cultural references. The concept of *global contextualization* has emerged from current academic debates. The idea means considering global theories in all of their political, historical, religious and geographical aspects, raising unsettling questions and looking for appropriate responses. The search for context has been the principle objective of the humanities and social sciences since the Enlightenment – the Humboldtian tradition in particular was predestined to help the public perceive contexts. Unfortunately, the specialist areas of the disciplines have lost their ability to broadly contextualize, while there are usually very few opportunities for universities to provide the public today with comprehensive interpretations which link the global and local.

– ***Redefining academic freedom***

The main reason why the university community seldom responds to the global challenges of interdisciplinary-oriented academic expertise within the framework of global contextualization is a poor understanding of academic freedom. In the Euro-American university tradition, the true holders of the absolute right to freely

research are the professors – the chair holders. Due to economic dependence, that freedom is inaccessible to lower-level academics at the start of their career or PhD students. Changes to this tradition have been brought about by the assessment processes of the European Research Council (ERC), but also by national research councils, which in the first case systematically, and in the second as the result of organisational chaos, facilitate a situation whereby a professor's projects and work are assessed in some cases exclusively by lower-grade academics, sometimes even by people without any basic academic titles. The influence of academic capitalism also brings a hierarchization of professorships and professors according to scientometric and economic perspectives. The principles of change management in universities encourage the university management and its bureaucratic apparatus to weaken the ties between the professor and his/her institute or department, and instead transfers the competencies for evaluating the work of a professor from the departmental head to the dean. But in spite of all of the modernist pressure, the Humboldtian-Newman tradition is quite clear: at university, only the professor can investigate whatever he/she chooses.

This arrangement proved to be highly productive in terms of research, and it is not a thesis which is only advocated by nostalgic and stubborn Humboldtian conservatives. The weak point of the thesis – within the Humboldtian tradition of *Freiheit, Lehre, Forschung* – was and remains the transfer of research activity to teaching. Many professors simply teach what corresponds to their research activities. Therefore, they often focus on very detailed, specialized areas of research, or research with an applied character which is incredibly difficult for students. The link here between the topic and the subject curriculum is often very loose or completely inadequate. And this trend weakens the relationship between the social responsibility of the academic, the discipline and the narrow specialization. From the perspective of students and taxpayers, this is an evident abuse of academic freedom and an avoidance of social responsibility. By being overly detailed and specialized, the academic community cuts the branch of social legitimacy from underneath itself. With the expansion of such bad practices it is not surprising that the public and political leaders demand restrictions to academic freedom, tighter control of universities and economic cutbacks, which in turn provokes a response from the academic community, which attempts to barricade itself in, referring to the historical principles of university autonomy at any cost – even at the cost of excessively ideological arguments.

– ***Fundamental reforms to the curriculum***

Responding to mass higher education through fundamental changes to the curriculum, whereby each discipline, according to its own specific characteristics, has to come to terms with the fact that only a relatively small number of students display any academic ambitions. From an academic perspective, some of them even show only a very superficial interest in the subject, its methodologies and

research inquiry. A significant number of students are not sufficiently motivated for specialized course study and require a more eclectic education, which through good management of the university's courses could be transformed into a demand for interdisciplinary education with practical potential – something which the labour market greatly requires. And most importantly – the curriculum has to reflect the fact that in the digital age the university has lost its centuries-old undisputed position as the sole accumulator of knowledge, with this role being taken over to a large extent by the internet. The role of the teacher is also undergoing fundamental change. Under the influence of mass higher education, the Humboldtian ideal of the teacher-scientist has been divided into three groups of university teachers. The first contains those who take on a large share of the teaching and as a result – in many cases also due to their competencies and priorities – are not part of larger research projects, they do not generate any finance for the university for research from external sources, they do not form research groups around them, and their publishing activities are below average. The advantage of these educators is their ability to handle the teaching material and to interest and motivate students who are not properly prepared for university study, who are poorly motivated and out of their depth. The second group of educators are those who are nearest to the Humboldtian ideal: people who teach but who are also scientifically active. However, their research results are usually average or slightly above average, but not excellent in a wider international context. These educators have a difficult role. They have to be adept teachers who have an influence on students in their later years of study, as well as scientists who are capable of presenting students with a comprehensive range of scientific inquiry. They select some of them to be trained for research work and others for a more vocationally orientated education according to the subject's requirements, and – particularly in the arts and social sciences – they show them the way towards a broader interdisciplinary grasp of reality. It is with this group, forming around 80% of the academic community, that it will be the most difficult to implement the challenges facing the university. The third group consists of academics who are visible on the international scene in their specific disciplines, *principal investigators* and *visible researchers*, whose goal within the framework of university research is to generate and lead research teams across generations of researchers, link up to prestigious research projects and grant competitions, bring in external funding for research and "look after the brand" of the discipline and the university in relation to politicians, the public and the commercial sector.[354] In the digital age, university teachers can no longer rely on their role as an unwavering authority and a superior guardian of knowledge and facts. They will have to come to terms with the existence of alternative sources of knowledge and respond to a new educational role

354 Dörre – Neis, *Das Dilemma*. Berlin 2000, p. 95.

where they manage the debate on various interpretations of reality by emphasizing different contexts.[355]

– ***Bridging the gap between vocational and general education***

In the future the differences between the demands of vocationally orientated education and interdisciplinary/general education will increase. Presently, the tendency for disciplines to develop their own path towards vocational education has been muted by Czech higher-education legislation which required an unacceptably high share of practical teaching for accreditation in vocationally focused courses. As a result, many *de facto* vocational disciplines at the university preferred not to define themselves as such and found themselves straddled between the general focus of the discipline *de jure* and the professionally focused content of the teaching *de facto*. It is likely that the medical and legal disciplines will try to improve the narrow definition of a vocational course rather than develop research, in particular research of an interdisciplinary nature; such a narrow definition of a discipline will obviously be incompatible with the university's complex role in society. It can be expected that some of the disciplines which are not willing or able to respond to the challenges of interdisciplinary research will move outside of the university – one example has been the rapidly expanding network of universities specializing in law in Germany since the 1970s, and the specialist medical universities (Medizinische Universität) in Austria that have been established since 2004. The binding role of the university community will be increasingly passed on to the arts and social sciences, the courses of which are now the closest to the structure of the three-stage education: i.e. the general Bachelor's course aimed at developing critical thought, the more professionally orientated Master's course, and the academic preparation of the PhD course. However, as a result of political turbulence and radicalization, the legitimacy of the arts and social sciences amongst the general public has been shaken. Additionally, over the long term these disciplines have suffered from the incompatibility of the results of their work with the dictates of economizing scientometrics as established by the political leaders of the country. Some of them have fallen into line with the state's rules and have looked for financial sources mainly in educational activities, including the acceptance of mass higher education and lower requirements from students, while others strive to preserve the research character of their discipline and the selective nature of the course, and subsequently suffer economic restrictions due to their "virtuous poverty". The conditions for the humanities acting as a university bond do not seem particularly favourable. Maintaining both the unity of the university and its legitimacy as a socially useful institution is obviously going to be the toughest problem in the coming decades.

355 Brzeziński, Jerzy Marian: Od uniwersytetu Humboldta do e–uniwersytetu, In: Drozdowicz, Zbigniew (red.): *Uniwersytety. Tradycje – dzień dzisiejszy – przyszłość*. Poznań 2009, pp. 109–122.

– ***Meeting the challenges of academic capitalism***

From today's perspective this is perhaps the most fundamental challenge of all. For example, in 2016 the Austrian legal expert Manfred Nowak approached the issue of the social contribution of the university very reductively and defined the university as "*a community of highly specialized academics designed to look for and create new knowledge and maintain and expand their scientific disciplines by recruiting students whose activity is based on the traditional demand for independence and self-determination.*"[356] He saw the greatest tension resulting from the incorporation of the university's independence as a basic element in a university's identity and "*the increasing calls to be more orientated towards the customers, for the university structures to adapt to their demands, including management and control mechanisms.*"[357] According to Nowak, with the loss of its own self-determination in terms of its objectives, the university as an idea has come to an end, as society will no longer need it, turning instead to specialist academies.[358] Concerns are raised by theoreticians of science regarding the narrowing of scientific knowledge as a result of economism and the pursuit of international visibility, which disregards basic research with its unclear link to a tangible result at a predetermined time.[359] The successes in this pursuit are interpreted as a foregone conclusion because the approach of the handful of top universities towards their financial sources, including their attractiveness to elite researchers, is already very different today from the other universities. As a result of academic capitalism this difference will increase and prevent any real changes within the hierarchical status of universities. He thus refutes the thesis that it is possible for them to raise their profile due to the quality of the research work and teaching, at least in certain parts of the world.[360]

Klaus Dörre and Mathias Neis even had the courage to predict the development of the relationship between the university and academic capitalism, which is obviously very rapid and largely unpredictable. Universities will become increasingly entangled in a global system of competition and mercilessly judged according to criteria set by the top American universities; the Americanization of university culture will gain in intensity in spite of the fact that the principles of academic capitalism are presently being questioned in the USA as a foundation for the holistic development of the university network. They predict a movement of power in universities into the hands of the *visible scientists* or groups partly made up of professors – the top researchers, as well as people in various opaque

356 Nowak, Manfred: *Universitäten zwischen Freiheit und Verantwortung. Entwicklung und Perspektiven einer Rechtsbeziehung.* Wien 2016, p. 5.

357 Ibid, pp. 5–6.

358 Ibid, pp. 7, 12–24.

359 Münch, Richard: *Akademischer Kapitalismus. Über die politische Ökonomie der Hochschulreform*. Berlin 2011, 155–180.

360 Ibid, pp. 218–235.

though undoubtedly exclusive and close relationships with the commercial sector, the state bureaucracy, the political class and the media. The importance of these elite teams will continue to grow. One typical example is the role of the Central European Institute of Technology (CEITEC) in Brno, a successful research centre established by a consortium of universities and other research institutes. The internal culture of the CEITEC is clearly managerial and international, the official internal language is English. The existence of the CEITEC brings elements into the institutional culture of Masaryk University and other universities which often conflict with the culture of faculties and traditions. An interesting and understandable aspect is the gradual movement of the CEITEC culture towards the culture of the science and medical disciplines, where there is a crossover in terms of research projects and personnel, while the humanities perceive the CIETIC as a foreign body in the university corpus. The ruthlessly efficient character of the management is sometimes literally viewed with horror, giving rise to further reflection on the theory of a multi-speed university. Sometimes it is even seen as a foretaste of management practices for research at universities, where the objectives of a university's work are set by managers and regional political representatives and their definitions of policy development.[361]

However, Jacek Sójka has rejected such a catastrophic scenario. By referring to the Polish experience, he pointed out that some elements of academic capitalism have always been part of universities, while he also used the example of Cambridge to demonstrate that academic culture is compatible with university capitalism. He also highlighted the fact that a large number of disciplines will respond more to the demands from the public sector rather than enter into close contact with commercial firms, and thus capitalism will be able to be regulated and managed, with pressure also applied from the European Union.[362] Finally, in his famous work from 1988, *Homo academicus,* Pierre Bourdieu pre-empted the main debate on academic capitalism when he spoke about four varieties of capital on the university grounds: scientific (reputation, innovators); social (personal ties, connecting science with furthering a career); economic (links to external financial sources, influence on financial channels within the university), and political (the right to strategic decision-making).[363] From this perspective, the academic-capitalism invasion is (slightly) deflected by the ancient university culture and the powers at universities towards economism, which evidently signals another stage in the long historical develop of university culture, though not its extinction.

361 Dörre, Klaus – Neis, Matthias: *Das Dilemma der unternehmerischen Universität. Hochschulen zwischen Wissenproduktion und Machtzwang*. Berlin 2010, pp. 18–23.

362 Sójka, Jacek: Zarządzenie strategiczne a idea Uniwersytetu. In: Drozdowicz, Zbigniew (red.): *Uniwersytety. Tradycje – dzień dziesiejszy – przyszłość*. Poznań 2009, pp. 169–188, esp. pp. 181–185.

363 Bourdieu, Pierre: *Homo academicus*. Frankfurt am Main 1988, p. 151 ff.

Conclusion

The current narrative about the usefulness of the university is basically the result of institutions, disciplines and individuals searching for their place within a system of differentiated higher education, the power of which we have seen around us for almost two decades. The system has emerged without clear political goals, without defined objectives which could be traced back to long-term trends in financing higher education and research, or from the response of universities and their external partners to these long-term issues. A chain of the actors' actions and reactions emerges, along with a sequence of strategic and less strategic moves and countermoves. It is difficult to distinguish its beginning and ascertain who was exactly reacting to what. The disorientation of the academic community is the logical outcome from this confusion, and academics become attentive and grateful listeners to mythical narratives. This makes it easier for them to adopt a position in this chaotic situation, face to face with the complex and difficult issue of determining the university's position in today's society. And in pragmatic terms, it makes it easier for them in the struggle for posts and control of decision-making and influencing financial channels. At present this narrative has maintained an eschatological character and, therefore, has the distinct contours of a myth which combines the social usefulness of the university with extremely important values: social progress, democracy, freedom, truth...

There are three basic forms of myth. The literature terms the first of these as traditionalist or conservative, and its objective is to defend the classic form of the university as best it can, and in Central Europe this is linked to the Humboldtian ideal of the university. This myth disguises the fact that the Humboldtian university is a product of the Early Modern Age from the 18th and 19th centuries, related to the level of a discipline's specialization, the development of the national state and the parameters of market development. It removes one segment of the university ideal from its context – academic freedom in deciding the direction of research and education. The mythical narrative states that all contemporary trends limiting this freedom are dangerous for the very foundation of the university. The bell tolls for the university either due to the mass increase in students, pressure on the effectiveness of its financing, or for a number of other reasons seen as part of a dangerous modernizing experiment.

The second type of mythical narrative is also historicizing, but it searches for a compromise with the challenges of the period: the challenge of considering the early modern ideal of the university anew. This mythical narrative has a more dynamic form – it reflects on the Humboldtian-Newman vision, but focuses more on attempts at reforming it and on the successes and failures of the 20th century. Experiments range from attempting to surpass the Humboldtian ideal, to not necessarily viewing it bipolarly it as dangerous, but simply as an attempt which was

successful in some aspects and less so in others. It is inhibited in its approach to the two most famous Central European attempts at reforming the Humboldtian university – the Nazi and communist experiments – and in this regard it is an incomplete discourse and, therefore, untrustworthy. However, one of its advantages is its openness to counter-arguments and the subsequent attempt to reflect on the changes in public demands and admit that the university is required to respond to them, without losing its own identity by so doing.

The third mythical narrative is labelled modernist due to its links to the differentiated system of higher education – a decades-old innovation in the long history of higher education. Conservatives view it as the anti-myth to the Humboldtian ideal, but more precisely it is an extensive revision of the university ideal from 1810 with a view to the needs of the 21st century. This narrative explains the reality which has existed in the Czech Republic over the past twenty years – that in the future, universities will have to count on a much greater level of differentiation than the academic community of traditional universities has been used to. The traditional "bricks and mortar" universities will continue to be incorporated within the global university network. Alongside them will be universities with highly differentiated levels of disciplines, or schools with incomplete discipline structures with ties to the region and regional employers. And finally, narrow, vocationally focused, specialist (private) universities with a limited choice of subjects and little research, but with an unusually high reputation within a narrow professional community. The mythical narration does not interpret this in a bipolar way as the defeat of the Humboldtian university. The pluralist demands of society are capable of inundating all of these aforementioned parts of the university landscape, and each in a specific way without it being possible to say that one way was superior or inferior. It accepts the fact that external partners will have a greater say in the running of the university, but weighs up the pros and cons which are associated with it.