

The Role of Trust in Higher Education

Maurice E. Troyer

Introductory Remarks to a convocation lecture given at the Seventeenth Founders Day Anniversary and the before Dr. & Mrs. Troyer return to the U. S. A.

Yesterday in my research I discovered that as Adam and Eve were leaving the Garden of Eden, Adam said to Eve, "My Dear we are living in an age of transition."

Mrs Troyer and I are in Transition.

ICU is in Transition.

The world is in transition.

I hope it continuous.

Let us give great credit to the apple.

It is still a most enjoyable fruit.

I don't know much about farewell addresses. I know the emphasis the term in convocation has been on the nature of the university. And trust was the focus of religious emphasis last week. It therefore seems appropriate today to discuss the role of trust in the university.

There are two historic definitions of a university. *Universitas--Magistrorum et Scholarium* and *Universitas Universalis*. *Universitas* has a purpose. It is concerned with *Universalis* - pertaining to the truth of universal experience of mankind and of the universe—, facts forces, principles. These are its substance. *Universitas Magistrorum et Scholarium* is its system.

As in the beginning, substance of the *modern* university is truth. Now as then we should trust truth. We should trust the *best methods* of discovering truth. We should trust the best channells of learning truth. That is, we should trust the best more than the second best. Truth is basic to trust. Validity of our *foundations* for decision is limited to truth.

We are understandably apprehensive of the individual or group that seeks to solve the problem without first seeking relevant truth. This applies to administrators and professors within and between their areas of responsibility. It applies to students in their quest for learning and when they seek to participate in administration of the university. I'm not implying that they shouldn't try to participate. Students need room to mature. I'm simply pointing out that no one in education adds to his reputation as a professor, student or administration when he seeks to solve problems without first seeking relevant truth. And this is not ordinarily done by seeking struggle before seeking truth.

This brings us back to the nature of the university. In addition to *universitas universalis* - the university is *universitas magistrorum et scholarium* a guild of teachers and students. This is true in a historical sense if not in the modern university. Historians from this platform at least twice in the last 3 years gave this definition and then went on to say that the students in the University of Bologna hired and fired the teachers. Now this doesn't happen to be very good history from the standpoint of truth. First because we scarcely find in the history of the guild that apprentices fired or dismissed the masters. At Bologna students were apprentices and if they remained students they remained apprentices until the master was ready to make them full fledged guildsman. If these guildsman remained in the guild, ultimately they became recognized scholars.

Bologna was a community of scholars, but in a very loose sense. If the students paid a professor they could study with him. If they didn't, it didn't mean that he was fired from the community. He might still have one or two apprentices who did pay. And he could remain in the university community or leave as best served his purposes. The university didn't need to keep student records. There were no certifying agencies for

doctors, lawyers, teachers. Each professor was a law to himself. The student was free to pay or not to pay, but he wasn't free to be a student without paying.

Their average age was between 30—35 years. It also is true that they were organized. In fact Balogna has two major student organizations, two *gakusei-kais* that vied and fought over housing and eating and other facilities. One organization represented apprentices from Italy. The other represented the foreigners—the apprentices from outside Italy. They were about equal in number. And as history tells as they made life very interesting indeed. Perhaps more so because they were about equally divided. It doesn't follow, however, that half the students at ICU should be from abroad.

But I do want to emphasize that the guild either at Balogna or elsewhere was not a place where apprentices grabbed freedoms from the master. It was a place where freedoms were earned and that is the nature of universities today.

I believe it is easier for students to earn more freedoms in universities today than centuries ago. And I believe that students at ICU can earn almost unlimited freedom and autonomy, in dormitories for example, if they are willing to study the responsibilities that go with those freedoms and then commit themselves to accepting fully those responsibilities. I am sure too that such freedom and responsibility can be lost if students do not live up to the responsibilities that go with their freedoms. For it is clear that in order to be trusted one must accept responsibilities that go with freedom.

There has been a trace of the guild system in the universities of Japan. It came largely from Europe. It served Japan well in many ways until 1945. Since that time Japan has moved very rapidly far beyond Europe, to expand opportunities in higher education for her young people. However, the guild system is very sluggish in serving these expanding purposes.

For the guild also has the function of protecting its guildsman against over-population in the guild. It is a strictly closed shop. And the graduate schools of the major universities of Japan have been behaving in accord with the guild tradition since 1945 as if they had no responsibility for preparing qualified faculty for 400-500 new post-war colleges and universities.

This should be enough to indicate that truth is as important about the *system* as about the *substance* of higher education. Trust in the system leans on truth as much as trust in the substance leans on truth.

But how do we come by this truth. We know that truth is developmental. It is discovered. It emerges. It merges into new truths. How do we gain confidence that it is truth? Mainly through circumstances, and the *most* characteristic circumstance, the most tried, time honored and trust-worthy is the *circumstance of academic freedom*--assurance that there will be no obstacle to keep truth from the full light of day or to prevent it from being tested and retested for its validity.

One month ago one of our convocations was given to this topic. I wish to add some footnotes of direct relevance to ICU. This is an International Christian University. The international and the Christian create two concerns the curiously are quite the opposite in their significance. There is danger that the *Christian* orientation could be an inhibiting factor to academic freedom. The *international* orientation is so broadening that it could become the target of inhibition in the guise of national and cultural traditions or biases.

If the *religious* orientation of ICU in any way prevents freedom to question, analyze or criticize Christianity there is valid basis for distrusting the integrity of this institution as a university. If the religious orientation of ICU prevents the study of, or commitment to other religions it is failing in its commitment to academic freedom and is inviting distrust in its integrity as a

university. If the religious orientation of the university prevents the study of secular ideologies the integrity of ICU is thereby reduced.

If the *international* orientation invites successful cultural or nationalistic defensive inhibitions to academic freedom, *universalis* is no longer characteristic of this institution and it is something less than a university.

On the other hand ICU is not a political agency. From the beginning and consistently ever since, it seeks to be a laboratory where students and faculty together have opportunity to study and experience the values and processes of democracy. We are not here speaking of a political system but of some fundamental concepts of man.

This means a belief in the worth and integrity of each individual and that each individual has a right to develop to the fullest of his potential. To do so each individual must be free to think, to believe and to speak according to his own lights. Academic freedom is an extension of this concept of the worth of the individual and of these freedoms to teachers and students in the pursuit of truth.

Being committed to these values ICU is also committed to seeking the most effective processes of human relations that protect and extend the worth and freedoms of the individual—all individuals. In the university, this includes students, faculty and administration.

These processes however are achieved most appropriately without the university, the administration, faculty or students becoming a political party or under the domination of a political party.

Let me explain. The distinction is a fine point, but quite clear. Faculty and students must be free to seek and express truth as they see it without pressure or embarrassment from an "in group". The clearest way to protect academic freedom from

political control is to adopt a policy that the administration, faculty meeting and student association *as agencies of the university* will be non-political. Being non-political they are in a position to protect academic freedom from political interference. For example, I do not want the faculty as a faculty to speak for me on any political issue. I do not want them to speak for me as a political agency on a position to which I do not agree. I must therefore insist that they do not speak for me on any political issue whether I am in agreement or not. I do not regard it as a political issue, so the faculty might prohibit by vote, the use of freedom to destroy academic freedom. Even that is dangerous. Nor do I want anyone or group in the university to tell me how I must interpret truth in my field of study.

At the same time, there should be no limitation on administration, faculty and students as *individual citizens* or *members of political parties* to participate in political activities. I firmly believe the university should encourage and not inhibit such participation. But when they so speak on political issues they speak as *citizen* and *not for the university* through its administration or faculty or for students. This distinction becomes clear when we see that academic freedom is something more than the freedoms of the citizen. It is an earned freedom, a privileged freedom that can be lost or forfeited when the scholar joins an organization where someone in authority determines the boundaries within which he is required to interpret truth.

Two more points must be made here very briefly. Academic freedom like other freedoms carries corresponding responsibilities. One of those responsibilities is diligence in seeking truth. Academic freedom is generous but it does not respect or trust persistent and repeated irresponsibility—libel, license or carelessness with truth. Anyone who so persists creates disrespect and distrust not only of himself but of the intellectual community.

The second point is that those committed to academic freedom have an understandable cause for suspecting or distrusting individuals or groups who use freedom to destroy freedom. This provides a fundamental criterion for assessing the trustworthiness of an ideology or pressure group. Individuals or groups that use freedom of speech to destroy that freedom believe that the end justifies the means—dishonesty or breaking a contract is justifiable if the end or intentions are good. This breeds distrust between individuals, groups and nations.

Now I would like to turn to a point that has been of growing concern to me in the fifteen years I have been in Japan. Specifically it is the matter of trust between students and administration, students and faculty, faculty and administration. Time does not permit review of events in the last 2 decades that have brought wide mistrust of administration and exaggerated the normal and usual tension between youth and adults in Japan and in my own country. But my colleagues, students and events have taught me that this distrust grows out of traditions and experiences with administration that is basically *power and authority motivated*.

The basic values of democracy as I have described them and as Dr. Kojima has stated them in his Syllabus on Conceptualization of Democratic Value for Education in Japan conceive administration in a *service motivated role, not in a power or authority motivated role*. Aristedes put it in perspective: "Not houses finely roofed or stones or walls well-built nay, nor canals and dockyards make the city, but men able to use their opportunities." A leader in democracy is *one who* opens possible alternations, which otherwise would not be opened — a person with a passion for service.

During the first decade of this university the administration diligently tried to be service motivated. How well we succeeded is not for me to say. I would be the first to admit that I have

not learned how to be fully service-centered in all situations. Growth in that direction depends on continuous effort. It will always be a process of becoming. I am confident that the present administration is consciously and diligently trying to be service-motivated.

What does this mean? It means that they look on faculty and students as *ends to be served* rather than as *means to be used*. More specifically it means;

- a) that they have tried to provide the resources for high quality education—well trained international faculty with a faculty-student ratio of 1-10. This is expensive education. It cost ¥ 360,000 per student. Each student pays approximately 72,000 Yen. This means that the administration must go outside the university to get 288,000 yen for every 72,000 yen a student pays. This is not easy. It takes time and energy. To get this amount of outside support the administration must be able to convince donors that students, faculty and program are worthy of it. Administrators who do this thus regard students and faculty as ends to be served rather than means to be used.
- b) In support of the policy that no students qualified to enter ICU will be prevented from doing so nor, will any student have to leave ICU for purely financial reasons, we put ¥ 2,000,000 in the budget for scholarships the first year, 1953. That amount has increased each year. Last year it was ¥ 21,000,000 for student financial aid. The administration went outside the regular income of ICU got this money in service to students.
- c) In 14 years the ICU Library has accumulated 125,000 volumes. This is twice as many volumes as you will find in the average private university established within the last 50 years. The yearly appropriation for books and magazines at ICU averages about ¥ 18,000 per student. Few colleges anywhere

spend \$50 per student for a year for the library. This too is tangible evidence of service motivation to students and faculty.

- d) There are other services such as freedom to change majors without starting over as a freshmen. It would be more profitable to the university to require a student who wishes to change his educational program to reapply and start over. Evidence of service motivation again shows in the raising of funds for the first student union in Japan. Another evidence of service is dedication to the principle of uninhibited freedom to criticise.

The next time someone uses this freedom to write or talk about the oppressive nature of administration, perhaps it would be in accord with the nature of *universitas* to ask, "In what way has the administration regarded students as means to be used rather than as ends to be served?" You may find some. There are some. But we really do not know what kind of administration we have until we also ask, "In what ways has the administrator looked on students and faculty as ends to be served?" Then we can cast up a balance sheet.

I do not wish to discourage valid criticism. Valid criticism is desirable and necessary and appreciated by those who are service motivated. It should be encouraged. Valid criticism does not tend to create distrust especially if directly and forthrightly given whether in open dialogue, campus newspaper or individual conference or correspondence. But invalid, irresponsible, and circuitous criticism creates distrust. It does more than that. Invalid criticism destroys integrity of the criticised and eventually of the critic, thus ending in *mutual* distrust. Finally it is undemocratic. We all understand that it is undemocratic for an administrator to disregard or destroy the worth of a student or faculty member. But it is equally undemocratic

to destroy the integrity and sense of worth of an administrator. He too is an individual human being. And he can be hurt or destroyed by irresponsible criticism, or, by expecting him to do the impossible.

As an example of expecting the impossible, I would mention faculty pressure for increased resources and salaries from one side and student fee struggles on the other, both catching the administration in the cross-fire, and both demanding so much time in *hanashiai* that administrators have neither adequate time or energy to cultivate necessary sources of funds off-campus.

I speak frankly and specifically. ICU was founded (and this is Founders Day) for purposes that were clear and compelling then. Those purposes are still valid. But some of them have become clearer, more relevant and indeed crucial. The role of education in bias reduction, the place of trust in education, and the function of academic freedom in the development of more wholesome processes and relations between students, faculty and administration are elements in the test tube in this International Christian University Laboratory. We can all enter this laboratory and be catalysts in the experiment. And may the product be individuals and groups with clearer purpose, more enthusiasm and greater resources in a richer and fuller life, one that sees each in his role as an end to be served rather than a means to be used. This role of ICU is more significant to me now than a decade ago.

Psychologists have regarded values as operating in the realm of attitude, feelings and emotions. The values study at ICU shows clearly that values have energizing and direction giving components in the affective domain (the emotions) and they have energizing and direction giving components in the cognitive domain (the rational). It is clear also that where the cognitive or rational maintains the ascendancy over the affective or emo-

tional there is more trust and more stability. This is mainly because values operating in the cognitive domain are based more on the exploration, testing and use of truth, while value operations in the affective domain tend to avoid truth that doesn't fit the predisposition. This is the kind of frontier of theoretical and applied study in which some university should be preeminent. ICU could be.

In summary trust is nurtured by fearless confidence in truth. Paradoxically this means also that trust is born in the challenge of truth by honest doubt. The substance that faculty and students deal with in the university is truth - the validation of truth to the point where it merits trust. But trust also depends on the system. Here truth is concerned with means and ends in human relations. Truth derives the validity of its relevance from the values that operate in shaping means and end.

Maslow in *Religions, Values and Peak - Experiences* says, "The ultimate disease of our time is valuelessness. This is more crucially dangerous than ever before in history."

Truth is a tool. We need tools that are trustworthy but truth is not enough. It needs direction. - as Bruno Bettelheim says - "A hammer can be used to shape a beautiful cathedral or crush a skull." Maslow also refers to, "An airplane test pilot out on a test flight who radioed back to headquarters: "I'm lost, but I'm making record time". This is amusing, but not when it happens to be a nuclear arms race; or any kind of conflict born of misplaced distrust. ICU by virtue of its purpose should consciously strive to have the kind of administration, faculty and students relationship that shows the way by which this and other societies may outgrow their over riding distrust of any and all administration. It is indeed wasteful of human resources and difficult for any society, be it a university or a nation to rise to its full potential without that reasonable trust by which leaders can render effective service.

After writing what I thought was the concluding paragraph, our May 21 issue of the *Saturday Review* arrived. In the Education section is an article about West Virginia State, formerly a negro college but integrated since 1955. The title of the article is A Living Laboratory of Human Relations. I could wish nothing more significant for ICU than that it become a functional dynamic Living Laboratory of Human Relations in every aspect of its commitment and nature, the international; the Christian, including not only the Christian attitude toward what is Christian, but a Christian attitude toward the way in which God speaks through all of his children of whatever religion; the Academic including academic freedom of faculty and students and the human relations pertaining thereto. We have made a good start at ICU. We have so many opportunities and there is so much to learn. This then is my toast to ICU. May we become an ever more effective Living Laboratory of Human Relations.

One final word prompted by the nature of this occasion from Mrs Troyer and me. Our prayer for all who enter here is that their benefits educational and spiritual may be as rich as ours have been these years. For all of these blessings we shall be everlastingly indebted to all of our colleagues and every student of ICU. You have been patient and understand teachers and friends.