process. In particular, Kells draws a number of important conclusions that provide essential guidance to any institution contemplating a greater degree of self-regulation. He also makes it quite clear that the design of the process can be time consuming and may take a number of years "...as it unfolds amid the complex political and financial conditions existing in most countries" (p. 151).

Can we afford to wait? Probably not. The alternative has never been more apparent in Canada than it is today: "...the threat of interference...by government can overcome even relatively high levels of professional reluctance to participate in self-regulation or to implement recommended changes" (p. 166).

Administrators and academics alike will not find the models and the procedures described by Kells the stuff of light-hearted common room banter. Those who persevere, however, in seeking an understanding of the potential of self-regulation will find Kells' work to be an invaluable guide and should be pleasantly surprised by the results.

Winchester, I., Jones, G.A., Hebeson, E., & Sadlak, J. (Eds.). *Interchange, Special Issue: The University and Democracy.* Dordrecht, The Netherlands: Kluwer Academic Publishers, 1992, 226 pages. Reviewed by Charles H. Bélanger, Professor of Management,Laurentian University.

Entitled *The University and Democracy,* this special issue covers a wide variety of topics ranging from Plato to Northrop Frye, distinguishing between elite and ordinary, examining the evolution of the university from its origins in mediaeval Europe to the modern age, presenting the pros and cons of the ivory tower and the "wired" university, comparing Chinese and Canadian universities, and tracing the Kameralwissenschaften of Humboldt Universität into the development of the social sciences, as a tool for democracy, at Harvard, Columbia, Chicago, Pennsylvania, and other universities of the West.

The *tour de force* of this special issue comes from the smooth linkage amongst the many similarities within a wide array of different topics, some more central and relevant than others. The Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council of Canada ought to be commended for helping to finance this Conference held at the Ontario Institute for Studies in Education. It was truly an opportunity for the promotion of democracy and for the articulation of the danger to democracy within inherent in the university.

What exactly are the most common undemocratic threats to modern universities? They can be characterized primarily as internal dilemmas. As Clark Kerr

said so eloquently in *The Uses of University* (1982), the contemporary university or "multi-versity" is no longer a community of scholars, a fellowship of teachers and students, as it once was. Since the early universities, such as Alexandria, Padua and Bologna, were democratically run by the students who paid, hired and fired teaching staff on the basis of needs, higher education institutions have enjoyed varying degrees of democracy. When the prime function of university was to prepare medical doctors, priests, lawyers and even civil servants, the associated apparatus of governance and administration remained relatively uncomplicated. With today's differentiated programs, courses, research and even functions, what was once a close-knit family has developed into a family feud of sorts. Special interest groups pit "hard" scientists against "soft" scientists, disciplines against professions, unionists against administrators, senior members against junior ones, feminist baby boomers against young women, and so on. Special interest groups, because of their narrowly focused exertion of energy, can be a threat to democracy in that they disproportionately affect outcomes.

If one accepts that no individual or group has a total monopoly on knowledge; that the more people who have ongoing control over more aspects of their environment, the more democratic it is; and that collective decisions made by means of voting are democratic to the extent that there is unbiased and effective input available to voters, it is *a priori* difficult to refute the "one person, one vote" approach in true democracies, something modern universities claim to be. As a "fortress" for freedom of speech, inquiry and criticism, universities should, in principle and in practice, function as direct democracies. The fact is that they do not. Like almost all democratic governments, universities have an opportunity of exercising democracy through representatives. As with government, it is reasoned that direct democracy is neither practical nor desirable to conduct orderly and informed business. Try to imagine what would happen if everybody voted on whether a school of Architecture or a department of Theology should be closed down. Would there be more potential for disaster in a university context on such an issue, than in having every Swiss citizen vote on the desirability of acquiring military fighter aircraft (which in reality occurred)? Although more democratic as a process, would the results be better? Doubtful! In theory, enormous amounts of time and effort would be needed to bring most persons to an adequate level of informed judgment. In practice, one might refer to the Charlottetown Accord Referendum as a print model of crossed, mixed, and self-serving purposes emanating from lobbyists, politicians and myriad interest groups. University members are not *une classe à part* when comes the time to

vote on issues close to the heart or the bones. Emotions do rise to the surface in a hurry. Because modern universities have become "bureaucracies," their policies and decisions are either made and/or influenced by representatives. The degree to which those representatives abide by the moral, ethical and political standards spelled out in Plato's *Republic* determines the degree of democracy exercised in universities. There exist huge variations. It is a living example the ideals, the theory and the critical thought, without the practice, can be a direct threat to democratic principles.

A second dilemma, as expressed by Husen "arises from the cleavage between, on the one hand, the demand for participation, security and freedom at the lowest level, and on the other hand, the demand for control and scrutiny by the community at large through a central bureaucracy." Direct democracy at the base and representative democracy at the higher echelons is the typical collegial model in modern universities. The lower the level of decisions, the more room there is for individualism and free expression. On the contrary, peer representation, due to its very nature, imposes some definite constraints on individual freedoms. It is at the various hubs of a central bureaucracy that all those creative tensions brought forth by representatives clash, to protect collectivism and pluralism. This approach is time consuming and not particularly efficient. The name of the game in universities, however, as in democratic governments, is not efficiency but effectiveness. If articulated responsibly, it is designed to work.

A third internal debate that is likely to rage for some time to come is whether universities are reducing their freedom of action and control over their affairs by devoting more energies and resources at the critical interface with industry and government. The answer to this is undoubtedly "yes" with some important qualifications. Academic institutions are quite unusual in that they are heavily funded by the state yet claim a significant amount of autonomy which translates into an ability to make their own decisions on a wide range of matters. This autonomy has often been at odds with accountability, which is the desire of government to know and sometimes to have control over the finances and activities of universities. When public funds are dwindling and costs of higher education are increasing, universities have the freedom to make some rather difficult decisions, and to live with the consequences.

Let us examine two obvious scenarios. In scenario number one, universities opt for celibacy in spite of attractive propositions for innovations and new developments from industry and government. The rationale is that such a partnership will reduce academic freedom and autonomy. The downside to this decision spells wide-spread famine across the entire university and/or some

major amputations and downsizing to maintain quality programs. Public finances, deficit elimination, and balanced budgets will, as a matter of fact, dominate the scene in the next twenty years and will make it extremely difficult to justify public funding in the universities without their responding to calls to participate in the creation of social policies, leading-edge technology, and societal wealth. Yes, universities have the freedom and autonomy to decide whether they will remain mostly ivory towers and not so much goal oriented. The economic price, however, for such an orientation (which has its merits) will be enormous.

Scenario number two depicts university/industry interaction. Universities would see it as one of their societal missions to be linked with commercial and government labs and hence to sustain a higher level of economic growth and technological innovation. This is the more popular option. Government, industry and the informed population want it; whereas, in most universities only certain segments favour this approach. This is commonly referred to as "the marriage between ivory tower and market place." Again, individual researchers or research groups who enter into such agreements know in advance what the benefits and the drawbacks entail. They are free to choose and to live with the consequences. More importantly, between the pure "ivory tower" or the "great refusal" and the "right" research or the "pot of gold," there seems to be room under the sun to accommodate all those who wish to stay clear of potential interference as well as those who are willing to limit their freedoms in favour of other benefits or interests.

In the end, is it not true that democracies, governments and universities present themselves with constant dilemmas? Those who seek to exterminate as opposed to debate opposing views, and who shy away from creative tensions, do not understand the democratic principles. *Er is ein Herr (sic) anderer Meinung,* which is the German definition of a university professor, is a fundamental operative paradigm to nurture as long as the *Gemeinschaft* is not ignored. The best promotion of democracy universities can offer truly rests on the rights and responsibilities that individuals and collectivities alike are able to put into practice. Perhaps this was Edward Shills' message in the last chapter of the *Interchange* issue when he was referring to the failure of the Social Sciences to promote democratic order.