

## **Arthur W. Chickering** **Re-claiming Our Soul: Democracy and Higher Education**

Things fall apart, the center cannot hold;  
More anarchy is loosed upon the world,  
The blood dimmed tide is loosed, and everywhere  
The ceremony of innocence is drowned;  
The best lack all conviction, while the worst  
Are full of passionate intensity.

W.B. Yeats, *The Second Coming*

I don't know the conditions that prompted Yeats to write those words in his poem *The Second Coming*, but they certainly seem apt today. They signal the basic theme for my comments. Twenty years ago, in *The Modern American College*, I wrote, "Frenzied, unbridled passion, whether in love or work, seldom serves us well. Indeed, it often harms more than helps. To be enflamed, carried away, by an affection, ideology, or cause is easy, but such a state shrinks from reflective thought, public scrutiny, and tough-minded testing. Maintaining a steady fire that is critical as well as creative is more difficult, especially when it suffers frequent doses of icy logic and frigid resistance. Cool passion seeks fulfillment by joining the forces of heart and mind, commitment and critical analysis. Such passion pursues its purposes with tenuous tenacity" (Chickering, pg. 783). This is the posture I believe we need to reclaim our institutional and professional souls, and to reclaim the soul of democracy.

This evening, provoked by the world changing events of September 11, by our nation's response to them, and by our historical complicity with them, I speak personally -- not academically. One meaning of academic is, "theoretical and not expected to produce a practical result." My aim is to kick off our time together in a way that will urge us toward practical actions to strengthen higher education in ways that will strengthen our democracy.

I will be making, and identifying myself, with some strong statements. I do not urge, or expect, your agreement. But I do hope to help create a context where we will all feel free to be authentic, to be open about issues of values and identity, of purpose and meaning, of spirit and spirituality. For me, one of the root problems of our culture, of our democracy, and of our colleges and universities, is the absence of safe spaces where we can share and explore those basic existential concerns.

I want to begin by talking about the "soul of democracy" and its current challenges. Then I'll turn to challenges we face concerning the "soul of higher education." Next I offer some concrete suggestions for reclaiming our institutional and professional souls. I end with a stanza from Robert Frost that has been, and continues to be, a guiding light for me.

Let me be clear here that I am not harking back to some "Golden Age" of democracy or of higher education. Both have come a long way in the past 100 years. Corporate greed was alive and well at the turn of the century. Women and blacks could not vote, where now they can. We have social security, more wide spread access to health benefits and a twenty five year increase in the life span, better standards of living -- make your own list. And higher education has gone from an aristocratic, through a meritocratic, to an egalitarian

orientation, now accessible to a high proportion of the population, where professional and vocational preparation, supported by loans and grants, is almost universally available.

But the challenges to both democracy and higher education are also very real. Neither institutions nor individuals claim their souls once and for all. It is a constant struggle to do better, to meet changing global and domestic, regional and local requirements.

### **The Soul of Democracy**

Bill Moyers wrote a powerful short article, titled *Which America Will We Be Now*, in the November 19 issue of *The Nation*. He said,

“The soul of democracy -- the essence of the word itself -- is government of, by, and for the people. And the soul of democracy has been dying, drowning in a rising tide of big money contributed by a narrow, unrepresentative elite, that has betrayed the faith of citizens in self-government.

But what has happened since the September 11 attacks would seem to put the lie to my fears. Americans have rallied together in a way that I cannot remember since World War II. This catastrophe has reminded us of a basic truth at the heart of our democracy: No matter our wealth or status or faith, we are all equal before the law, in the voting booth and when death rains down from the sky.

We have also been reminded that despite years of scandals and political corruption, despite the stream of stories of personal greed and pirates in Gucci scamming the treasury, despite the retreat from the public sphere and the turn toward private privilege, despite squalor for the poor and gated communities for the rich, the great mass of Americans have not yet given up on the idea of “We the People.” (p. 11)

Recall with me some of the administrative and legislative proposals in September, October, and November. While New Yorkers were still attending memorial services for firemen and police and many were shedding tears for the dead and injured, and while the President called for “patriotism, prayers and piety,” Washington predators were pursuing private plunder at public expense. How did they propose to fight the long and costly war on terrorism? Restore the three martini, tax deductible, lunch. That will make al-Qaeda tremble. Cut capital gains for the wealthy. Eliminate the corporate alternative minimum tax, which prevents corporations from taking credits and deductions so that they pay little if any taxes. And don’t just repeal that minimum tax; but refund all the taxes they have paid.

Recall also that the Democratic National Committee, following the terrorist attack, called for widening the soft-money loophole in our elections laws. This after supporting election reform when they were a minority in the Senate, confident that it would not pass. How about that for patriotic integrity?

Moyers goes on to say,

“Democracy won’t survive if citizens turn into lemmings. Yes, the President is our Commander in Chief, but we are not the President’s minions. While firemen and police were racing into the fires of hell in downtown New York, and now while our soldiers and airmen are putting their lives on the line in Afghanistan, the Administration and its Congressional allies are allowing multi-national companies to make their most concerted efforts in twenty years to roll back clean air measures, exploit public lands, and stuff the pockets of their executives and shareholders with undeserved cash.... Against such crass exploitation it is every patriot’s duty to join the loyal opposition. Even in war, politics is

about who gets what and who doesn't.... The greatest sedition would be our silence. Yes there's a fight going on -- against terrorists around the globe, but just as certainly there's a fight going on here at home to decide the kind of country this will be during and after the war on terrorism.

We must define ourselves not by the lives we led until September 11 but by the lives we lead from now on. If we seize the opportunity to build a stronger country we too will ultimately prevail in the challenges ahead, at home and abroad. We will prevail only if we lead by example, as a democracy committed to the rule of law and the spirit of fairness. (Pp. 12-14.)

### **The Soul of Higher Education**

Many of us in this room may not agree with this analysis or with the political and social orientation behind it. But I suspect most of us support the powerful call for civic engagement, civic learning, and individual social responsibility.. And there are no institutions in the U.S. better positioned to address that call than our colleges and universities. It is a call to reclaim the soul of higher education, and by doing so, to help reclaim the soul of democracy. To do so requires major institutional transformation, accompanied by levels of professional authenticity, purpose, and spirit seldom apparent in our current cultures. And in my judgment, our most important aim is to empower our students by significantly boosting their civic learning, civic engagement and capacity for social responsibility.

Many of our colleges and universities are caught in dynamics similar to those described by Moyers. How can our institutions, supported by a capitalist economy, collaborating with, and supported by, local, regional, and national corporations, provide the critical research and reflection necessary for the common good? Noam Chomsky put it well. "Universities are economically parasitic, relying on external support. To maintain that support while serving their proper liberating function poses problems that verge on contradiction. Universities face a constant struggle to maintain their integrity, and their fundamental social role, in a healthy society." (Cornwell, pp. 5-6).

Phyllis Cuninghame, at the October conference of the Adult Higher Education Alliance put it more strongly. "Over the thirty years I have been in higher education there have been many changes. The current university is more and more a kept university: a digital diploma mill, developing a market model curriculum.... The university is selling out to a "bottom line" mentality by, 1) the uncritical acceptance of corporate giving (4.5 billion in 1998) often with strings attached; 2) downsizing the humanities, the full time teachers, and resources for instruction; 3) allowing an industrial rather than a social bias to shape research agendas; 4) complicity in withholding scientific discoveries for financial gain; and 5) the appropriation of researchers/teachers intellectual property." (Alliance Newsletter, pg. 5).

As the market mentality and its associated values triumphs nationally and globally, critical analysis of its consequences, intended and unintended, becomes ever more important. But instead we reduce ourselves to dispensing information and knowledge, credit hours and degrees, commodities to be delivered with maximum efficiency. Administrators and faculty members become producers, students become consumers, student affairs professionals put out fires, cool out the unruly, and struggle with drugs and alcohol to keep things running smoothly. A faculty caste system is alive and growing with a few highly paid star aristocrats at the top, a modest middle class of tenured and tenure track professionals, working long hours, stretched thin across multiple responsibilities, all outnumbered by masses of minimally paid adjuncts.

Higher education has come to be perceived as a private benefit rather than as a public good. Our policies, programs and practices increasingly collapse around helping student prepare for a better job, and meeting state, regional, and local economic needs. Many of us remember when education at state colleges and universities was basically free. Now in many states, tax support equals only 25-35% of total revenues; each cut in state support is accompanied by authorizing tuition increases, which we adopt simply to stay even.

Helping students prepare for a well paying job upon graduation is important. But higher education needs to be about more than that. State legislators concerned about crime, drugs, voter apathy, and public morality, withhold support for educational alternatives that foster critical thinking, multi-cultural understanding, and civic responsibility, in favor of professional and vocational certification. And there is a big difference between preparing for a job and preparing for a satisfying and productive career. A satisfying and productive career requires first and foremost interpersonal competence and multi-cultural understanding. Then it requires skills in problem identification and problem solving. It requires a sense of purpose and the confidence that you can act in ways that make a difference. These are the same competencies and personal characteristics required for effective citizenship, to create a lasting marriage, and to raise a healthy and happy family. So if we only focus on specific professional and vocational preparation we sell both our students and our society short.

Objectivity and empirical rationality feed the greed and materialism noted above. Parker Palmer put it best for me. "The mode of knowing that dominates higher education I call objectivism. It has three traits with which we are all familiar. The first of these traits is that the academy will be objective. This means that it holds everything at arms length; Secondly, objectivism is analytic. Once you have made something into an object (in my own discipline that something can be a person), you can chop that object up into pieces to see what makes it tick. You can dissect it, you can cut it apart, you can analyze it to death. Third, this mode of knowing is experimental. I mean by experimental that we are now free with these dissected objects to move the pieces around to reshape the world in an image more pleasing to us, to see what would happen if we did. objective, analytic, experimental. Very quickly this seemingly bloodless epistemology becomes an ethic. It is an ethic of competitive individualism, in the midst of a world fragmented and made exploitable by that very mode of knowing. The mode of knowing itself breeds intellectual habits, indeed spiritual instincts, that destroy community. We make objects of each other, and the world to be manipulated for our own private ends."

For me, Parker powerfully captures the link between our dominant policies, practices, and institutional cultures in higher education, and the policies, practices and cultures that concern Bill Moyers.

Now with any trend analysis there are clear exceptions and active counter weights. I am confident that many of you came here from such exceptional institutions. But most of us would probably agree about these general trends. And it also is true that in most of our own institutions we recognize that much remains to be done. That's why we're here.

This is the general cultural and higher education context hit by the September 11 attacks, the context within which our national responses and public policies emerge. Times of crisis chill dissent in colleges and universities just as in the body politic. "Loyal opposition" is often stifled, if not by administrators then by students and by public outcry. The October 5 Chronicle of Higher Education reports, "At California State University at Chico, students heckled a professor who criticized U.S. foreign policy during a campus vigil. News

coverage of the professor's speech unleashed an e-mail barrage of hate messages from around the United States... Paul K. McMasters, who is ombudsman at the Freedom Forum, says... "At a time when the country could most benefit from the diverse perspectives that we depend on academe to provide, there will be immense pressure on those in the academic community to repress their views."

Joseph M. Cronin, former president of Bentley College and a fellow member of SAGES, a group of senior academics who gather with support from the New England Resource Center for Higher Education, addressed this issue in a December 2 letter to the Boston Globe. "Some people expect colleges and universities to show nothing but total commitment to whatever the country decides it wants to do. Already, political commentators and more than a few trustees have shown anger at any professor or student who questions whether the new laws pursuing terrorists are just, or whether the heavy bombing of Afghanistan communities is fair to the refugees who evacuated their homes so that the United States could root out al-Qaeda terrorists."

Universities, since the Middle Ages, have been safe havens for the search for truth and for the criticism of injustice and oppression. Thus, it is important to protect professors' ability to educate students about their changing world, the clash of cultures, the great issues of world poverty and hunger and alienation without a political leader demanding that he or she be dismissed for treason because their courses do not correspond to mainstream values.

Colleges and universities must defend their integrity as places where policies can be fiercely debated and challenged so that the truth may be discovered -- and set us free." (Boston Globe, December 2, 2001)

For me, that's an articulate reminder of a crucial aspect of the soul of higher education. To reclaim that soul requires significant institutional transformation accompanied by significant professional transformation.

### **Reclaiming Our Institutional Soul**

It seems fitting to let a Cardinal define the soul of higher education. Cardinal Newman's description of the aims of university education is remarkably pertinent to our current needs. This quote comes from *The Idea of a University*, published in 1852. Please excuse Newman's sexist language, Remember, one hundred years later, in the 1950's and 60's we were still talking like he does.

"A University training aims at raising the intellectual tone of society, at cultivating the public mind, at purifying the national taste, at supplying true principles to popular enthusiasm and fixed aims to popular aspiration. At facilitating the exercise of political power, and refining the intercourse of private life. It gives a man a clear conscious view of his own opinions and judgments, a truth in developing them. It teaches him to see things as they are, to go right to the point, to disentangle a skein of thought, to detect what is sophisticated and to discard what is irrelevant. It prepares him to fill any post with credit, and to master any subject with facility. It shows him how to accommodate himself to others, how to influence them, how to come to an understanding with them, how to bear with them. He is at home in any society, he has common ground with every class; he knows when to speak and when to be silent; he is able to converse, he is able to listen; he can ask a question pertinently and gain a lesson seasonably when he has nothing to impart himself; he is a pleasant companion and a comrade you can depend upon. He has a

repose of mind which lives in the world, and which has resources for its happiness at home when it cannot go abroad.â€œ

To reclaim that kind of soul, and to do so in ways that strengthen our democracy, calls for major systemic changes. Here are some of the things required.

We need to focus on outcomes critical for civic learning and socially responsible behavior. My own candidates are pertinent knowledge, intellectual competence, interpersonal competence, emotional intelligence, integrity, and the kind of motivation that cuts through a sense of entitlement and creates an identification with something larger than oneâ€™s own self-interest!

We need curricular content concerning the general structures, systems, and processes that characterize varied political and economic systems. We also need content pertinent to local, regional, national, and global issues such as prejudice, the environment, the economy, poverty, and morality.

This curricular content cannot be carried simply by special courses or programs. It needs to pervade all our curricular structures: general education; majors and concentrations; interdisciplinary institutes and programs; living and learning centers and communities; capstone experiences; freshman, transfer, and senior year experience courses; individualized degree programs; undergraduate research; and residential programming. It needs to cut across all our academic disciplines and professional preparation programs.

Curricular content â€œdeliveredâ€œ solely by texts, lectures, and multiple-choice exams will not have much impact, even if jazzed up with technological bells and whistles, PowerPoint presentations, and such. Pedagogical practices need to call for behaviors that are consistent with our desired outcomes and that generate learning that lasts. These include active learning that calls for problem recognition, analysis, synthesis, evaluation, collaborative and problem-based learning, case studies, learning teams and research teams, socially responsible learning contracts, and criterion-referenced evaluation.

These pedagogical practices need to integrate concrete experiences and reflection, applying and testing academic concepts, principles, and theories in real-life situations. Off campus, service learning, internships, field studies, and volunteer activities make powerful contributions to social awareness, pro-social attitude change, and motivation to invest time and energy in civic contributions. On campus, student government, student activities, residence-hall governance and decision making, and accreditation processes for fraternities and sororities, also can play a significant role in strengthening civic learning and social responsibility. Intercollegiate and intramural athletics provide potent contexts for reflecting on social stratification, interpersonal relationships, motivation, and integrity.

All these formal academic policies and practices need to be supported by faculty members who are psychologically, physically, and temporally accessible. For the last year or so I have had the good fortune to be in communication with Mary Alice Scott and Kavita Kapur who have been co-coordinating planning for the Education as Transformation/ Self Knowledge Symposium Conference which will be held October 13-15, 2002. They generously agreed to critique a draft of this presentation and to get reactions from some other students. Here is part of their feedback. â€œI think it is important that professors empower students to be pro-active critical thinkers in American public policy and social welfare because it is the students who will be determining the future of America as an international team player! It is very important that you say that faculty members themselves must be civically engaged,

and that that engagement needs to be visible. It is essential that students see how faculty members are living their lives and that those faculty members are willing to share their lives with students. Whether we admit it or not, we look up to our professors, look to them to be living the kinds of lives we hope to live. They are more than just professors, they are mentors. It is really important that we recognize this.â€

We also need to support peer cultures such as peer tutoring, study groups, and multicultural friendships, which emphasize mutual respect, reciprocity, active collaboration, and assistance. That means creating pertinent programs, providing professional staff support, allocating budget resources to such purposes, rewarding faculty members and student affairs professionals who invest in such activities.

Once these policies and practices are in place, institutional program evaluation needs to examine the degree to which varied interventions concerning curricula, pedagogical strategies, student-faculty relationships, peer interactions, and experiential learning improve civic learning and social responsibility among students, faculty, staff, and administrators.

The scholarship of teaching and the scholarship of application must be encouraged to broaden the reward system beyond narrow definitions of research and superficial evaluation of teaching. Criteria and processes for faculty renewal, promotion, and tenure need to reward community contributions and civic engagement on and off campus.

Most important, perhaps, we need to practice, not just teach, the arts of democracyâ€”dialogue, engagement, and shared participation. We need internal reviews of our institutional decision making processes, of faculty and student roles, of written policies compared with actual practices. Zelda Gamson, in her Afterword to *Civic Responsibility in Higher Education*, wrote, â€œOur ways of handling power differences and diverse points of view and cultures should be models of the civic life we wish to engender in our communities. Encouraging the articulation of differences, and then finding areas for collaboration, should be the norm rather than the exception.â€ (p. 372)

This kind of transformation can reclaim our institutional soul and help us rebuild the soul of democracy. But these changes will operate only on the surface if we professionals do not reclaim our souls. Ernest Becker says, â€œThe distinctive human problem from time immemorial has been the need to spiritualize human life, to lift it onto a special immortal plane beyond the cycles of life and death that characterize all other organisms.â€ (Becker, pg. 291) Higher education needs to create conditions where all of us professionals, as well as our students, can address this fundamental existential problem.

## **Reclaiming Our Professional Soul**

The first definition of â€œsoulâ€ in *Websterâ€™s New Collegiate Dictionary* reads thus: â€œAn entity conceived as the essence, substance, animating principle, or actuating cause of life, esp. of individual life manifested in thinking, willing, and knowing.â€ I have held off this definition until now because it captures what I believe many of us higher education professionals feel we have lost, or are losing. The â€œessence, substance, animating principle, or actuating causeâ€ which brought us to this calling, which has sustained us throughout the ups and downs of challenging careers, seems increasingly out of tune with the dominant directions of change in our organizational cultures, our institutional priorities, policies, and practices, our departmental norms, our collegial relationships. I believe

reclaiming our professional souls is essential to reclaiming our institutional souls. They must go hand in hand.

I should recognize here The Initiative for Authenticity and Spirituality in Higher Education. This group includes Alexander and Helen Astin, Tony and Lisa Chambers, Paul Elsner, John Gardner, Stuart Hunter, Jim and Cheryl Keen, Cynthia Johnson, Gene Rice, Laura Rendon, and Donna Shavlik. We have been struggling with these issues, with support from the Fetzer Institute, for about four years. Much of what follows comes from a draft position paper we are creating.

On November 22nd, this last Thanksgiving Day, my wife Jo and I celebrated our fiftieth anniversary. Most of our good friends know that our marriage has suffered significant challenges. We have survived diverse cultural contexts, serious personal and professional difficulties, injuries and illnesses. In many ways we are both quite different persons from the 22 and 24 year olds who married in 1951. We still go hand in hand because we have respected, supported, and celebrated each other's souls. We give each other space. We learn from each other. We love each other.

The major transformations required to reclaim our institutional soul will not be achieved unless our professional souls are similarly respected, supported, and celebrated. That kind of institutional transformation cannot be achieved with organizational cultures, institutional policies and practices, departmental norms, and collegial relationships that view administrators, faculty members, and student affairs professionals as instruments for production, to achieve competitive advantage, in a market driven enterprise. It cannot be achieved if students are simply consumers generating credit hours and credentials.

In *Let Your Life Speak* Parker Palmer suggests the orientation we need:

“There is a simplistic brand of moralism among us that wants to reduce the ethical life to making a list, checking it twice against the index in some best-selling book of virtues perhaps and then trying very hard to be not naughty but nice.

There may be moments in life when we are so unformed that we need to use values like an exoskeleton to keep us from collapsing. But something is very wrong if such moments recur often in adulthood. Trying to live someone else's life, or to live by an abstract norm, will invariably fail and may even do great damage!

Vocation does not come from willfulness. It comes from listening. I must listen to my life and try to understand what it is truly about quite apart from what I would like it to be about or my life will never represent anything real in the world, no matter how earnest my intentions.

That insight is hidden in the word *vocation* itself, which is rooted in the Latin for “voice.” Vocation does not mean a goal that I pursue. It means a calling that I hear. Before I can tell my life what I want to do with it, I must listen to my life telling me who I am. I must listen for the truths and values at the heart of my own identity, not the standards by which I *must* live but the standards by which I cannot help but live if I am living my own life. (Pp. 3-6)

Parker's emphasis on listening for our own identity, for our own standards, suggests some specific things we and our colleagues can do to start reclaiming our professional souls. I recognize that there are tough obstacles to addressing these problems with the sustained attention they require. Structural limitations and reward systems are bedrock issues. There is little financial support. Discretionary time, energy, and emotion, which needs to be invested over several years, is scarce. The prevailing cultural mindset works against open

sharing and exploration. In addition, it is difficult to frame our malaise in ways that resonate widely.

The emphasis on rational empiricism, on conceptions of truth as objective and external, and on knowledge as a commodity, de-legitimizes active, public, discussion of issues of purpose and meaning, authenticity and identity, spirituality and spiritual growth. Meaningful dialogues concerning these issues require communities of trust, openness, and candor, where participants can expose vulnerabilities, knowing they will be heard and supported in their searching. Limited self-understanding and self-reflection, and fear of being vulnerable in competitive, individualistic environments, leaves us swamped with conflicting impulses and ambivalent about appropriate actions.

Our prevailing structures and organizational assumptions make any institution wide change most difficult. At a general level we are a system, a set of interlocking and interdependent units, bound by shared policies and practices, glued together by a host of unexamined assumptions. But at the operational level, we are a collection of schools, colleges, institutes, centers, departments, populated by individual scholars, entrepreneurs, and diverse professionals, who value, and strongly defend, their autonomy. And we all compete for limited financial resources. The tensions between the general and operational make significant change for any part very difficult, and make systemic change almost impossible.

The reward systems reinforce these barriers to change. They reward unit productivity based on FTE credits produced and the dollar value of grants and contracts. Individuals are rewarded similarly, where external recognition for research and publication outweighs teaching and direct involvement with students, and where community engagement and service barely get a nod. Despite these powerful obstacles there are things we can do, individually and collectively. As individuals we can seek out trusted colleagues and create times and spaces to share our experiences, our feelings, our conflicts and ambiguities, and our ideas about how to find some better resolution. We can legitimize such conversations between ourselves and our students, and among our students. We can encourage students to organize such activities as a way to show the university system what they truly value. We can read pertinent literature, write for ourselves and for others, and speak about these issues in public settings when given the chance. We can encourage faculty members, administrators, and staff to become public intellectuals and active learners, and not just scholars in their own circumscribed fields. We can undertake systematic inquiry concerning our own institution or our own unit, as to the gaps between ideals and realities, between espoused values and values in use.

Collectively we can work with regional and national organizations to surface and explore these concerns. We can survey the higher education landscape and aim for a vision of what it might become, in terms that are relevant and tangible for our diverse institutions and constituents. We can tackle the cultures of our graduate schools to help future professionals recognize the importance of addressing issues concerning purpose and meaning, authenticity and identity, spirituality and spiritual growth. We can create a series of publications, principles for good practice, and state of the art reports. We can create a national teleconference which brings some of our most thoughtful and active leaders together with professionals from diverse institutions.. We can recruit some high profile presidents and administrative leaders to help create a political and multi- institutional inquiry and action base for sustained effort. We can bring these issues to the attention of larger audiences outside higher education, to explore their significance for the larger cultural context within which we work.

So, despite the obstacles, there are individual and collective initiatives we can pursue to reclaim our souls,. To reclaim the "essence, substance, animating principle, or activating cause" that brought us to this calling.

## In Conclusion

I'll conclude with the last three stanzas Robert Frost's *Two Tramps in Mudtime*. I remember first sharing this poem with my children one fall back in the early 1960's. That Christmas my daughter Susan, then in elementary school, gave me the last stanzas, copied out in her own hand with drawings of fall leaves, and nicely framed. That gift has been on the wall of every office I've had since then.

"Out of the mud two strangers came  
And caught me splitting wood in the yard.  
And one of them put me off my aim  
By hailing cheerily, "Hit them hard."  
I knew pretty well why he dropped behind  
And let the other go on a way.  
I knew pretty well what he had in mind:  
He wanted to take my job for pay!"

Nothing on either side was said.  
They knew they had but to stay their stay  
And all their logic would fill my head:  
As that I had no right to play  
With what was another man's work for gain.  
My right might be love but theirs was need.  
And where the two exist in twain  
Their's was the better right -- agreed.

But yield who will to their separation,  
My object in living is to unite  
My avocation and my vocation  
As my two eyes make one in sight.  
Only where love and work are one,  
And the work is play for mortal stakes,  
Is the deed ever really done  
For Heaven and the future's sakes."

Thank you.

## References

Becker, E. (1970). *The Denial of Death*. New York: Simon and Schuster, New York.

Chickering, A. W. & Associates. (1981). *The Modern American College*. San Francisco: Jossey Bass Publishers Inc.

Cornwell, G. H. (2001). The Future of Liberal Education and the Hegemony of Market Values: Privilege, Practicality, and Citizenship. *Liberal Education*, 87(3).

Cronin, J. M. (2001). Colleges must defend their independence and integrity. Letter to the Boston Globe.

Cunningham, Phyllis M. Globalization: Higher Education Response, in *Alliance Newsletter*, Winter, 2001, pp. 2-9

Gamson, Z. F. (2000). Afterword. In T. Ehrlich (ed.), *Civic Responsibility in Higher Education*. Phoenix, AZ: American Council on Education and Oryx Press.

Lathem, E. C. (Ed.) (1969). *The Poetry of Robert Frost*. New York: Holt, Rhinehart and Winston.

Moyers, B. (2001). Which America Will We Be Now. *The Nation*, November 19, 2001, 11-13.

Palmer, P. (1999). Community, Conflict, and Ways of Knowing: Ways to Deepen Our Educational Agenda. *Change*, September/October.

Palmer, P. (2000). *Let Your Life Speak*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Wilson, R., & Cox, A. M. (2001). Terrorist Attacks Put Academic Freedom to the Test. *Chronicle of Higher Education*, October 5.