

University of Notre Dame

"Knowledge for What?"

**Obstacles & Opportunities for Reinvigorating the
Social Purpose of the University"**

Meeting

June 3, 2019

KEYNOTE ADDRESS

MR. DESCH: Folks, I hope everybody has gotten enough to eat, enough to drink, and now it's time to start the intellectual part of the evening. It's my great pleasure to introduce our keynote speaker for the evening. Vice-chancellor Louise Richardson, a political scientist by training, received her undergraduate degree in history from Trinity College Dublin in Ireland. She, then, came over to the United States studying at UCLA and then Harvard; although, I'm pleased to report that her highest degree is an honorary doctorate from the University of Notre Dame, so she's finally made it.

I've known Louise since a long time ago --it wasn't that long for her; it was a long time ago for me -- when she was a government department faculty member at Harvard University. Louise is an expert in terrorism, which I think was probably the best training for being an academic administrator possible. Louise's accomplishments as both a scholar and an academic administrator are very lengthy, and I don't want to spend the whole evening recounting those. Other than to note that in addition to her faculty appointment at Harvard, she also ran a center at Radcliff University and then moved to St. Andrews University where she had the opportunity to deal with some very famous alums -- and I wonder if that was a double-edged sword -- before taking her recent position as vice-chancellor at the University of Oxford.

Along the way, Louise has been very active in supporting the efforts

of the Carnegie Corporation of New York in a variety of areas but particularly in an area near and dear to a lot of our hearts which is they're bridging the gap portfolio. So I can't think of a better person to kick off our discussion of Knowledge for What than Professor Louise Richardson.

MS. RICHARDSON: Well, good evening, everyone. I'm delighted to be back in D.C. at this historic time. It's a very good couple of days to be out of London. Now, the rivalry between Washington and London is of long standing, but I don't think we've ever before competed for the mantle of the most dysfunctional political family. If you've visited London recently, you will see that the landmark Big Ben is completely covered in scaffolding so invisible to the outside world as workers try to repair and rescue the decaying structure, which is quite a metaphor for what else is happening in Westminster in relation to our decision to leave the European Union.

But our subject of this workshop, of course, is another set of inward-looking institutions -- universities. But are they really inward looking? And I should preface my remarks by saying Mike assigned the title to me; it wasn't my choice. I did not ask was I losing it? The topic assigned was The Social Purpose of the University: Are We Losing It? But are universities really inward looking and have they ever been? Now, while I fully appreciate the concern especially in this country about the gap between the academic and policy worlds -- and I speak to that in a moment -- I would argue that universities have always had a social purpose and still do and that if we ever lose sight of this, our very future is in

doubt.

I'd like to speak briefly about my own experiences in academic in the U.S. I left Ireland and came to America to study international relations naively trying to escape from Irish nationalism not realizing that the study of international relations involves confronting rather than escaping nationalism. My interest in terrorism was due to the fact that I grew up in Ireland at a time when Northern Ireland was exploding. And I was driven by a desire to understand the motives of terrorists: how terrorist organizations function and how groups of otherwise reasonable people sharing the same confined space deploy different interpretations of the same historical events to justify their violent actions.

I studied political science because I was interested in politics but that was not true of everyone in the Harvard government department. I remember an article in *The New Republic*, while I was there, in which the author who'd gone into the office of the department chair and found it contained no books. He asked, what happens to political science when political scientists are not interested in politics? A kindly senior member of my own department told me in the 1990s, Louise, you've got to drop this terrorism stuff. It's academic suicide. He was right, of course, but my reply was that there was no point in being an academic if you couldn't work on the things you cared about.

Academics weren't interested in terrorism, but students were and so were policymakers. D.C.-based counter-terrorism officials used to visit to keep track on what we were working on and complained that we were not working on

the issues that they thought we should. I remember arguing that I wasn't interested in capturing terrorists, but in understanding them. And, if left alone to do what I wanted, the result of my work could well turn out to be very useful, but that was not my priority. As a result of one of these arguments, I gave a speech at the annual meeting of the APSA here in Washington -- I think it was in the year 2000 -- labeled "Mind the Gap" arguing for maintaining the gap between policy and academia. I think Mike realizes he probably wouldn't have invited me this evening, and I should confess that my position has softened a little in the interim. And, as we all know, the world of terrorism studies was transformed, like so much else, by 9/11. In the immediate aftermath of the attack, academic terrorism experts -- and there weren't very many of us then -- were consulted by the government and our advice was completely ignored because it did not fit the political predilections of the Bush administration. I still believe deeply that had our advice been followed, the world would be a far safer place today, but we never know. Instead, policymakers made vast sums available for research on terrorism and enterprising academics applied for it, and the nature of the advice changed.

My conclusion from all of this is that universities must be far more than the research arm of governments. We educate those who will work in government and, if we do our job properly, they will base their advice on evidence. They will think critically, write clearly, and question every assumption. The advice that governments choose to accept will be determined by a range of political factors, electoral timelines, and ideological predilections. The best

research, I believe, should be impervious to all of these constraints.

Having said all that, let me now step back for a moment and talk about universities more broadly. What is their purpose? Oxford currently has a strategic plan. This was quite a shock to most of our academics who couldn't for the life of them figure out why we would possibly want one, but in any event, we now have one. And it states that our mission is the advancement of learning by teaching and research and its dissemination by every means. Now I can't imagine any university actually disagreeing with this. The social purpose comes, one could argue, in the teaching but, actually, I think in the dissemination by every means.

If our universities, especially our elite universities, are perceived as bastions of privilege open only to those who can afford to attend, to the children of graduates, or to those who have the educational background to make a competitive bid for a place, the dissemination is not going to be as broad as it should. If our universities are perceived as sharing one ideology, intolerant of those who disagree, and open only to those of liberal and left-wing persuasion, then the dissemination is not going to be as broad as it should be. If our research programs are exclusively so esoteric and our language so rarified that they serve the same purpose as the high walls and barred gates that surround many of our colleges, then they will be seen to serve the same purpose -- to keep others out -- and the dissemination will not be as broad as it should.

There have definitely been days when I've been losing it, but there has never been a day when I felt our universities were losing their social purpose.

Far from losing our social purpose, my own view is that universities are more acutely conscious of our social purpose than we have ever been before. My university is so old -- we don't quite know how old -- but we certainly don't have an (inaudible) version of the original strategic plan. But we do know is that medieval universities existed for the purpose of training clerics to run the government both church and state and as much as there was a clear distinction. I think of Thomas Becket seamlessly moving between chancellor and archbishop of Canterbury. The first Oxford student to be an archbishop was only slightly later in 1233, St. Edmond of Abington, from whom one of our colleges Teddy Hall is named. Universities carried clerical training but not primarily for parish priests. Law and divinity were considered important for leadership of church and state and there were few medics. And the secular government became less clerical and layman started to learn to read. Universities, which were all clerical institutions, had to decide whether they existed to train churchman for a church now more focused on parish service or public figures in effect becoming a finishing school for the gentry.

Oxford managed to do both from the late 17th to the early 19th century. It was in the 18th century in Scotland and the Netherlands where they favored the idea of a very open urban university with large numbers of students spending relatively little money each to attend big lecture courses. These had to be useful in order to attract large numbers. So curricula evolved to include subjects attractive to the middle classes like political economy, languages, ethics,

literature, and science. The Scottish curriculum of the late 18th century, itself heavily influenced by Dutch models, is the root of the U.S. liberal arts courses which today are often criticized for lacking practical application.

Two important Victorian inventions gave us something quite close to the modern mission: organized research and competitive examinations, both initially associated with Germany. So the classic 19th and 20th century model of the university was that it prepares people for highly competitive professional careers and advances the frontiers of knowledge. John Stuart Mill, on the other hand, had a very different perspective. He argued and I quote, "That a university is not a place of professional education. Universities are not intended to teach the knowledge required to fit men for some special mode of gaining their livelihood. Their object is not to make skillful lawyers or physicians or engineers but capable and cultivated human beings." His view was that one had to be educated first and then learn a profession. He said, "What professional men should carry away from a university is not professional knowledge but that which should direct the use of their professional knowledge." Mill, a polymath himself incidentally, rated the Scottish educational system far higher than the English one. He wrote, "Youth come to the Scottish universities ignorant and are there taught. The majority of those who come to the English universities come still more ignorant and ignorant they go away." I used to enjoy quoting that when I ran the Scottish university. It's the first time I've been able to quote it since running an English one.

So Mill had a view of the purpose of the university. It was, "A

university exists for the purpose of laying open to each succeeding generation the accumulated treasure of the thoughts of mankind." He had a very definite view of the social or moral purpose of the university. He said that the moral or religious influence, which a university can exercise, and again I'm quoting, "Consists less in any expressed teaching than in the pervading tone of the place. Whatever it teaches, it should teach as penetrated by a sense of duty. It should present all knowledge as chiefly a means of worthiness of life, given for the double purpose of making each of us practically useful to his fellow creatures and of elevating the character of the species itself, exultifying (phonetic) and dignifying our nature. There is nothing which spreads more contagiously from teacher to pupil than elevation of sentiment. Often and often have students caught in the living influence of a professor a contempt for mean and selfish objects and a noble ambition to leave the world better than they found it which they have carried with them throughout life." Now many of us would recoil from the sense that, as individuals, we are the moral tutors of our students though others would embrace the role. Some institutions, not least our sponsoring university this evening, is quite explicit about the moral and, indeed, religious basis of its philosophy. Others would be deeply uncomfortable in this role.

No doubt, however, I have a point especially today. The rate of technological change is breathtaking. The pace of change has never been as fast as it is today, and yet, it will probably never again as slow as it is today. We are educating students who will have jobs we cannot even imagine. So we must be

educating them with something to enable them to adapt to the changes they will face. In our teaching, we endeavor to promote certain qualities of mind. Our teaching is designed to produce intellectual self-reliance; to teach people how to learn; how to take charge of their thoughts; and how to direct them in an independent, analytical, and creative manner. We know that often what you know is not as important as what you do with what you know. So the crucial, but also the most difficult, qualities towards which we strive to educate our students are independence of judgment, understanding, the ability to distinguish the true from the apparently true. We must teach them an appreciation of tolerance, a celebration of difference, and, above all, that truth is an aspiration, not a possession.

This is an educational mission but it's also a social purpose. For these are the qualities that a stable and successful society requires in each successive generation. Now, in looking at the remit of this working group, I realize I'm straying a little from your focus which is more on the growing gap between universities and society and, in particular, in the gap between the focus of research and the problems facing society. So let me address both briefly: One of the striking features of the U.S. presidential election and the British referendum on membership of the E.U. is the analysis of the voting patterns. The single biggest predictor of a vote for Brexit and a vote for Donald Trump was not income, age, or race, but educational attainment. A November headline in *The Atlantic* magazine captured the reality. It read, "American's educational divide put Trump in the

White House." Even controlling for race and income, the concentration of college degrees was the strongest indicator of whether or not a county voted for Trump. Education level mattered more than anything else and even when controlling for economic factors. More college graduates in a county hurt Trump's vote more than having more than having a large Asian population, more than having a large Hispanic population, more than having a larger black population. Now education could, of course, be a proxy for economic factors, but the education gap persisted even when controlling for a county's median income, its industrial base, and whether it had lost manufacturing jobs. While the white working-class males had long been Trump's base of support, money and race didn't decide the election; educational level did.

Very similar patterns applied in the Brexit vote. Those with post-graduate qualifications voted 75/25 for remain. Those left school without qualifications voted 73/27 for leave. Age and class mattered, but education mattered more. In general, areas with older and poorer voters tended towards leave but those with more immigrants and more college-educated tended to remain, but by far, the strongest indicator was education. Similarly, in France, President Macron won 84 percent of the votes of the most educated, 10 percent of French communes, and 53 of the least educated. The *Financial Times* analysis of the 2012 Dutch election found that educational level was the biggest predictor of support for Wilder's Party for Freedom, more than exposure to immigrants.

This, I think, is an entirely new phenomenon and this educational

divide could have portentous ramifications. It has the potential to undermine the bonds that hold representative democracy together. These bonds rely on trust and assume certain shared values, like respect for knowledge. If knowledge is perceived as simply a perk of the plutocracy, the underlining consensus, the basis of trust in which decisions are made, could be eroded.

So what are universities to do in this situation? In short, I believe that universities should respond by standing our ground and doing what we do best: pushing at the frontiers of knowledge and educating the next generation. But in doing so, we must be much more engaged, more willing to persuade and remain irrevocably true to our principles. The populous votes for Brexit and Trump are often explained as the revenge of those who are losing out to globalization. Certainly, we have all stood by and watched silently as the gap between rich and poor in both our societies widened. It's true that at a global level, hunger, poverty, illiteracy, and disease are at an all-time low, but that is of little consolation to British and American voters who see their jobs outsourced to another country or see their factory jobs taken by lower paid immigrants. None of us were paying attention confident that the influx of immigrants improved the culture of fabric of our society and enjoying the benefits of low-cost immigrant labor. In effect, we were too disengaged.

I see the fact that the votes for President Trump and Brexit came as a surprise to most of us in universities as something of an indictment. We should not have been surprised. If we are to play the role we claim in identifying looming

social and political issues and in seeking solutions to societal problems, we should be the first, not the last, to recognize their impact. We must be deeply engaged in the world around us. We cannot continue to assume that the value of what we do is self-evident to those outside the academy. We must persuade our society of the value of what we do if we are to retain public support and, through it, public funding. In doing so, we bring ourselves closer to our communities and to a keener understanding of the developments taking place around us. As educators, we try to inculcate a love of learning and a thirst for knowledge. We raise aspirations and we value achievement. We work in universities which are places of community, of belonging, of diversity, and of tolerance; places that must embrace rather than fear difference. Part of our role must be to export these qualities to the world through our students.

Inside a university, there's no such thing as an alternative fact. Facts become facts and they are supported by evidence, but populism feeds on misinformation and innuendo. Truth and opinion become deliberately blurred. To counter this, we must, as researchers and educators, teach our students respect for evidence. Help them to distinguish between opinion and information, between information and knowledge, and between knowledge and wisdom. Equipped in this way, we hope they will enter the world beyond the university and become advocates for evidence-based reason, policy, and decision making.

Finally, let me come to what I see as your primary concern; the gap between the work that are interest academics and the work that interests

policymakers. Personally, I see our social purposes far broader than this. We serve as engines of social mobility and drivers of local and often national economies. This, too, I see as part of our social purpose. Our social purpose must also extend to raising the aspirations of those who have not traditionally attended university in convincing them, their parents, and their schools that they have a fair shot at the most elite universities. The description of the workshop says that we have created an academic system that is more about the academy and the career of the scientist than it is about the public and the translation of research for the benefit of society. I believe this is overstating the case.

There is, of course, a difference between public and private universities, although, few seem to notice that the most selective public universities receive about as much taxpayer funding as private universities. Public universities are not allowed to forget our obligations to the taxpayer. We are reminded of it by politicians and the press every single day. Government funding mechanisms and the research councils in the U.K. ensure that knowledge exchange and the impact are always considered in grant applications. The Research Excellence Framework which evaluates the quality of research at every university and department in Britain in an exhaustive process undertaken every seven years emphasizes what's called impact. Now one could challenge how this is defined and we spend a lot of time challenging how it's defined, but the thrust is clear. Now the results are important to universities, not just reputationally, but also financially as it the mechanism for distributing what's called QR, that's

quality-related research funding to universities. Impact counts for 20 percent of the grade for research, so 20 percent of the assessment of the quality of the piece of work is considered in its impact.

So this is certainly one effective way of ensuring that academics consider the impact of their research. Grants from funding councils also insist on grantees demonstrating the impact of research as a condition of funding.

Academics chaff at this and it certainly mitigates against curiosity-driven or blue skies research. For the divide isn't entirely clear cut. In the U.K., our academics helped to write the industrial strategy for the country. The industrial strategy is then used to set the research agenda which, in turn, help to set the priority for the research councils. Academics rightly argue that every major technological innovation has been predicated on a piece of basic research usually pursued without thought or practical application. From GPS and the internet and general **relative concern (phonetic 0:29:28.9)** respectively, in modern times, back to transistors from quantum mechanics of solids, all the way to the discovery of electricity and electronic magnetic waves, basic research has underpinned every new technology for at least the past century. Even fears as esoteric as number theory has produced tangible results as in modern cryptography.

One of the many concerns British academics have about Brexit is that it may entail loss of access to funding from Horizon Europe, the European Research Council. The British government has told us not to worry, that if we lose access to European funding, we can keep the money in Britain and distribute

it nationally. This is not reassuring. Because of the scale of the European Research Council, they can afford to develop large networks of academics who benefit from the free movement of the E.U. They can also afford curiosity-driven research. Our concern is that if the money is distributed nationally, the criterion of excellence would be a victim of politics, which will require regional distribution of awards. As important, the funding is likely to address the short to median term goals of the government and, as a result, blue skies research would be lost.

One way that universities can work on applied problems is to bring together its academics in a center devoted to a particular problem: a center for cancer research, for climate change, for the internet, or refugee studies, and so on. This is far less radical than trying to transform the structure of universities, which have proven to be remarkably durable structurally none more so than my own. Academics can continue to get training in a particular discipline and then later join with others from different disciplines with an interest in a particular societal problem. So this would be a new twist on Mill's suggestion that one gets an education first and then learns a profession. This is to suggest that one learns a discipline first and then addresses the societal problem and then attempt to bridge the gap between university and society.

So, to conclude then, I do not believe that universities are losing their social purpose. I think we have a keener sense of our social obligation than ever before. The task for us is to convince the public and not just our natural constituents that we do have a social purpose, that we do advance societal interest,

that we are the engines of the economy and of social mobility, that we are guardians of our culture and generators of important new ideas, that we are in effect worth the investment from the public purse. One way to do this is to help to apply our research prowess to addressing societal problems. But there are many other ways too. And we have to pursue all of them if we are to regain public confidence, secure public funding, and maximize our ability to advance the societies that sustain us. Thank you.

MR. DESCH: Thank you very much, Louise, for a tour-de-force that touches on many of the issues that we're going to explore in greater depth tomorrow. Professor Richardson has agreed to entertain questions, comments, discourses, dissension so the floor is open. Louise.

MS. RICHARDSON: I thought this was a general discussion, not that I was on the spot all night but okay. Please, Mark.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: You commented that one of the historic purposes of the universities is to transmit the accumulated knowledge of earlier generations to the next generation. The challenges that we, in the United States and I think other developed economies, are having it's not the younger generation that necessarily falling short in terms of their ability to participate in the modern economy; it's their fathers and uncles and aunts and mothers that are middle-aged, and it's a group who, I believe, would argue needs access to some kind of educational experience but not one that's appropriate to the 18, 19, and 20-year-olds. And, I think, most research universities have ignored that group. That's the

nub in my view of the political problem and I'm curious whether one, you agree with that line of thinking and how should universities, particularly research universities, reach out to that audience who has a need that cuts to the heart of the disintegration of our social purposes.

MS. RICHARDSON: No, I think that's a very fair point and I do agree, and I think there are two ways we can deal with it: one, some universities are engaging actively in continuing education programs. We do. It was initially started to, I think, address the not unfounded criticism of us as being a very elitist institution, so some years back, in fact early part of the last century, started a continuing education program which in the local community is enormously influential. I suspect, and as a social scientist you should know better than making predictions but, I suspect that in the future, universities, particularly those of us reliant on public funding, will have to expand our sense of commitment to our students way beyond the four years or three years that we have them. And that coming along with the cost of their education will be life-long access to the university to participate in continuing education.

Again, as I mentioned, just the speed of change is such that people are going to have to be retrained and reskilled constantly. And I fully expect that it will become one of the expectations of universities that we have a system for doing so. It's more likely to happen, I suppose, first in this country where people are paying such enormous amounts of money for their education that they may be in a position to insist on having access to the university for the rest of their lives or

for a particular period. And, in countries like mine where we are all funded by the government, the government, I think, is likely to insist on it; although, they'd have to give us a bit more money if they expect us to do it. So I take your point.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Along those same lines and I love that change will never be as slow as it today. Probably it's never been this fast and then you just touched on something that I'm fascinated with in terms of the way that -- you said that the institution you're a part of hasn't changed for thousands of years and yet, I think, what you're intimating is there's going to be tremendous amount of change in the way that we think about education. This whole idea that we won't go for four years, but we might go for the rest of our lives. What do you think that means for the difference in a liberal education and a vocational education? And then, does the data that you looked at in terms of the way that people voted for Brexit or for Trump take into consideration the difference between a liberal education and a professional education or a vocational education along the lines, of say, of Germany? And what implications does that have on the politics of those societies in Neo-Nazism, far-right fascism, other things like that? I'm just fascinated on where that's heading.

MS. RICHARDSON: The short answer is no, I don't have that data. I haven't seen any breakdown. It's purely been along educational attainment, but I can't resist -- forgive me --

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: I'm with you.

MS. RICHARDSON: -- coming -- I was going to say I can't resist

coming back to terrorism because, actually, there has been some very interesting work on the educational background of terrorists. And so the data is poor, but the data that we have points in very clear directions which is not quite as tang- -- if you bear with me for a moment -- not quite as tangential to your question as you might think. So it turns out that different types of terrorist groups attract people with different types of education. So the most violent Islamists groups, for example, have a preponderance of engineers whereas --

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: That makes total sense to me.

MS. RICHARDSON: Me too, actually. Whereas extreme groups, but extremismless groups, which are less violent, tend to attract other prestigious degrees like medicine and law. On the other hand, left-wing groups tend to attract much more from the humanities and the social sciences. So that suggests that different type of degree do lend themselves to different types of development as it were.

But as to the breakdown between vocational and liberal education, my gut instinct -- but I've absolutely no evidence to support it -- is that a liberal education is the antidote to -- having just said that some historians have joined left-wing groups, but I do think it is the best antidote. But again, that's a hunch. Yes.

MR. DESCH: Just one comment and then an observation about Brexit -- one is in English, we use the word education, whereas in other languages, it's used in a different way. For example, in Italian, you can be a di colto or

istruita. Istuita means you know how to behave correctly. Excuse me, istruita means you have taken courses. You have what we call an education, but you're not well-educated because you don't really know enough to behave well. But the comment about Brexit is there's also a recent book you've probably seen on *The Road to Somewhere* and this an analysis which he looks at the vote for Brexit and divides the U.K. into somewheres and anywheres. The somewhere are people who, basically, have lived within 20 miles of the same town for 4 or 5 generations. Whereas, the anywheres, who are probably represented by most of the people here, are people who feel comfortable in different parts of the country, in different parts of the world, and see themselves in quite a different manner. So I'm not sure it's well-instructed people or maybe we should have more been well-educated people.

MS. RICHARDSON: Well, I think there's a close correlation between people who stay within 20 miles of where they were born and those who don't have advanced education because they, in general, have had to move. On Brexit, I mean, Prime Minister May gave this famous speech. I trust it was covered here. I know it caused a huge amount of upset amongst the 25 percent of our staff, who are citizens of the E.U., in which she said, these people who supported remain -- as it's worth remembering she did initially -- don't understand what citizenship is. They're citizens of nowhere was how she described them, which you can imagine. As one of my colleagues who wrote to me and said, look, I've lived in the south, had three children in this country. I'm a governor of my

child's school. I give blood every year. What more do I have to do be a citizen of this country?

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: We, of course, had people being accused of being deplorable as a result not the wisest statement to make either.

MS. RICHARDSON: Indeed. Yes. Please.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: I appreciate the emphasis you put on the teaching and the education that we do with our students. I agree with you about the long term, but even just dealing with the theories that they're undergraduates and some of that is substantive with knowledge and discipline and our history and much of it, as you said, is the skills of critical thinking, analysis, and communication. They really stick with them because they are going to change careers many, many times. I guess my question or concern is whether we put enough emphasis on the teaching both in how we train our PhD students, but also in how we do hiring and tenure and promotion. That we find sometimes there is a tendency to kind of almost pay a little bit of lip services to that when, in fact, it's so important. The think tanks often refer to themselves as universities without students and someone would think it's a positive, but, I mean, I think our roles as universities is we do have students. What's your sense of where that stands in the U.K. or generally about factoring teaching into how we really cultivate --

MS. RICHARDSON: I think the debates we have in Britain are exactly the same as the debates happening in the U.S. This sense that teaching is undervalued and that it's primarily lip services paid to it. And I was involved in

identical debates in Harvard and in Oxford about whether we should have separate tracks for people who are terrific teachers so that they could climb the career ladder as well. Oxford is slightly peculiar in this given the nature of undergraduate teaching which is so much a part -- the individual tutorial is still so much a part of the DNA of the place we're teaching. It is taken enormously seriously but even that in departments with rational actors like economics. We're finding it very, very difficult to recruit people who are willing to spend time doing the kind of intensive teaching we like to practice, so I wish I had a solution. We have exactly the same debates and same problems, and I don't know anybody who's quite solved this. You may. Steve.

MR. VAN EVERA: Really Mike or Bruce can ask this question better because they have more data around. What would you say that sort of counter-argument to the picture you painted when you say universities are serving the public. They should be and they are. Would you say, very well, we've got data showing that there is a growing disconnect between especially U.S. social science and public policy? Lee Sigelman -- can anyone quote? A study he did some years ago recently gave me this article from (inaudible) of time and asked, how many of the (inaudible) in there? How many of them (inaudible) public policy? Back in the day, a quarter of them did and now it's down to what? A teensy-weensy, it's way, way down. We've talked about tenure, the tenure standards we're now using really privileged methods and (inaudible) almost universally over the importance of the questions asked. The quality of questions is

almost not a factor in tenure letter writing and (inaudible). Maybe Mike or Bruce could say more about this, but this is a new and kind of an empirical question. Has a gap developed? I remember learning with this (inaudible) American social insurance for my friend Dave (inaudible) who wrote a book on it. Where did the whole (inaudible) thinking (inaudible) ratio, the unemployment insurance, social security, worker's comp, and all that come from? It came out of the academic world. It's a product of U. of Wisconsin social science. You don't have things like that going on anymore. And so what would you say to the argument that well, there is a problem? There's a drifting apart here that's the problem.

MS. RICHARDSON: Well, I'm a product of the Harvard government department which is Exhibit A for the point you're making. I think there are in individual departments, absolutely, and in individual professions and as speaking as a political scientist, I mean, it's 30 years since I could bear to tried to read the *APSR*. Sorry, I hope that -- oh, Andrew (phonetic) isn't here. So individual departments yes, have tried to do -- this has been a trend -- again, a trend in sociology. It has become a trend in political science and, because of the way the tenure system works, you tend to see it as a fad, but actually, fads last so long because of the nature of the training of one's graduate students who then go on to become the teachers. So, in individual departments and individual subjects, I do think this happening. It doesn't mean that it's true across the piece. It doesn't mean there's isn't room for -- university should be pluralists so find out people who are preoccupied with methods provided those also people who are focused on

public policy. But, again, I would resist the notion that especially political scientists should become the research answer for the government because they should be able to step back and think about things of no concern currently to the government which may, in fact, prove to be of concern to the government 10, 20 years out or even 5 years out since it occurred. As I say, I recognize exactly what you're describing in the department I left. Yes.

MS. MC CAFFREY: Ma'am would you think that -- my name is Rachael McCaffrey. I don't have a PhD. I have a bunch of masters degrees. I did my undergrad at Notre Dame and then spent 28 and a half years in the air force. So I have a masters in English from Maryland and two masters in strategic studies. I think maybe part of this question is about the PhD level, the tenure tracks and everything, but as an undergrad who got my degree from Notre Dame, I served my country for 28 and a half years and I feel like I got a really good grounding in asking questions, in being analytic in just war theory which, believe it or not, just war theory matters to the woman who is running the ISR campaign for the Libyan campaign.

And so I think part of the teaching that happens at Notre Dame, the focus on undergraduate work -- we have a pretty big ROTC program at Notre Dame; I think we still do today. We did back in 1988. And so, to a certain extent, are you judging yourself only on what's happening with your PhD and your research? And I'd be very interested to hear what your terrorism recommendation was considering that I ended up doing the Global War on Terrorism for 25 years

apparently according to a strategy you may have recommended. But do you think there's a delta between that and do you think universities, they actually need to differentiate between how are we doing for our undergraduates who go out and go and do real work and don't have any real interest in coming back and doing a PhD but go out and are the foundation of the practitioners?

MS. RICHARDSON: Absolutely. There's no doubt about that and I think students vote with their feet especially in this country where they can shop, was the term they used at Harvard between different courses. So students, undergraduates in my experience are much less interested in the verified methods that our PhD students are finding they have to adopt if they want to be successful. And I think that's fine. So we're educating for different careers, so I think it's entirely appropriate that there should be a difference between those who are studying undergraduate degrees and those who are training to enter the profession.

MS. MC CAFFREY: So maybe there's not as big a gap if the bulk of the people you're producing are undergraduates to go out and do certain things and at least I hope at Notre Dame with the graduates you're producing are doing the kinds of things that I did for 28 and a half years. I would say that the university's pretty successful, and their connection to the outside world is very strong. And the impact Notre Dame had on air force operations at certain times, at least through an individual, was pretty significant.

MS. RICHARDSON: Well, no, I think that's fair. So I'm curious as to how Steve would respond to the point you just made.

MR. VAN EVERA: I had to think about it. I guess the thing that troubled me the most has been research and not teaching. In other words, it's been a departure from kind of not only government doing government's thinking for it but doing everybody's thinking for it. Helping the centers to figure out what policies they might want to support to change the status quo. So I'm not going to give you academic researched statement. There's a reason you're on par with everybody who is concerned with governing society and how we are organized. I guess I am separating these two functions of teaching and research.

MS. MC CAFFREY: Because if you think I wasn't a virus sent into our government at certain times to question the policies of what we were doing and why they were doing them, then you don't give yourself credit, sir.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: I just want to make a comment because I think the connection is that there are a lot of places where the course is being taught reflect the problems that Steve has identified. I mean people who are -- whose research has become very narrow and very methodological. I mean they're teaching students things that the students in fact -- I mean that's not why the students signed up for those classes. You started it. Students, for example, will sign up for political science class typically at the beginning because they're interested in politics. So they get in one of those classes and that's not what they're getting and then they're mainly getting math. Then, they lose interest and so, in fact, what you see at a lot of universities over the last, I would say the last, 10 or 15 years, you see political science declining as a major and you see international

relations taking off as a major because the substance of the classes in international relations is more interesting to the students than what they're getting in political science. It sounds like Notre Dame was a perfect place to be an undergraduate student which is great but my experience from being at -- looking at different universities and talking to people who've been in different universities is that this is where the experience really varies for an undergraduate and many of them are being taught by people who are focused on research that's not speaking to them as a student who's interested in understanding another culture, politics, things that are grounded. In many places, that's not where political science classes have gone over the last 10 or 15 years.

MS. RICHARDSON: I think Mike wants to come in on this.

MR. DESCH: As a company man, I will assure you, Rachael, that Notre Dame today is every bit as good as it was when you were an undergraduate. With that being said, the tension in terms of teaching versus the other part of what we as faculty do is really palpable. We aspire to be a research university. Most other research universities, the teaching loads are declining very dramatically. Most other research universities, the role that undergraduate -- success in undergraduate teaching plays in a positive evaluation is very, very different. And so the modern research university is about research. Now you can make an argument that that enhances undergraduate education, and I think in some ways it does, but in other ways, it undermines it. Also the dirty secret of research universities is we now have two or three track faculty experiences. You have the

research faculty who do very little teaching and a lot of the teaching is done by graduate students or by adjunct faculty, who are very good at what they do, but they're also not really the intellectual core of the institution.

And so I think the number of places where you could get the quality of undergraduate education that you had when you were an undergraduate is much smaller today than it was previously. And so, I guess, since I've got the floor, I'll just ask you one other question, Louise, which is there's a tension in your argument, it seems to me. On the one hand, your confidence in the continuing social purpose of the university but also your recognition that a lot of people outside the guild don't see that. And we saw it, by the way, in our discipline 10 or 15 years ago when the Congress defunded political science funding through the National Science Foundation. And the argument that was made by the then majority whip in the house of representatives Eric Canter was a very sensible question. He said, why should we spend a dollar on political science that could otherwise be spent on curing cancer? And we didn't have an answer for that. Now, I think there's an answer out there that could have been given, but the puzzle is why we didn't have that and why it wasn't apparent to the members of Congress or a lot of our fellow citizens that, in fact, potentially, our discipline could make contributions as worthy as curing cancer. But that disconnect was pretty clear, and I wonder if it was just a lack of communication.

MS. RICHARDSON: Well, I do -- I mean I think Steve -- and as I said, I'm a product of the Harvard government department which is very much the

kind of department where the people who were interested in politics gradually left, and what has happened in universities is you've had, as Jim says, the growth alternatives like international relations or graduate level the proliferation of public policy schools for people who are interested in public policy. I'm not going to defend the political scientists who are not interested in politics, but, again, good universities should be plural institutions where the mistake is when there's the orthodoxy is methods instead of having plural approaches to problems. That it seems to me is the solution and not all of us can cure cancer, but actually we do need a social sciences to help figure out how people will respond before they go back to their communities after chemo, whether they will take their -- we need to understand human behavior to know whether they will follow the regimens they're supposed to and so on. So in fact, going back to the earlier point about interdisciplinarity, I think if you take it as problem focus, bring in people with different disciplinary backgrounds, I think you would be much more effective at effective cures for cancer than if you just focus on the science and the oncology. Yes.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: I have a slightly different question about interdisciplinarity as a faculty member. I'm a law professor. I work in what I call law and biosciences. There's are about 5000 to 6000 law professors in America, full-time law professors, of whom, depending on how broadly or how narrowly you define the term, 20 to 100 work in my field. When I talk to young people, I feel compelled to tell them that before they get tenure, they need to write long,

boring articles with 80 pages and 500 footnotes that no one will read except their tenure committee and the people who are asked to read them so they can write letters about them. And then once they get tenure, they can write the stuff that is important and that they care about: the 3000-word articles in *Science* or *Nature* that get read by 300,000 people. I always feel unclean when I give that advice, but I also feel compelled to give that advice. Do you have any solutions to -- the combination is needing to be grounded in a discipline, but also needing those disciplines to be open to interdisciplinarity?

MS. RICHARDSON: Well, again, my approach is that one has to -- for interdisciplinarity to work, you've got to have a grounding in a discipline whether it requires -- I mean, you can tell what it takes to ground somebody in a discipline; I have no idea what it takes to ground them in yours. But it seems to me if we're talking about -- pick terrorism -- if you want military who are effective at countering terrorism, you want psychologists who understand the psychology of terrorists. You want anthropologists who'd understand the culture they're from and so on, different people trained in different disciplines coming together to try to understand a problem and affect a solution to a problem. It seems to me that they need to have the grounding. They need to have a disciplinary education. That's a separate question from whether to be a good lawyer, they need to write these 300-page tomes that nobody will read.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Only 80 pages, but 500 footnotes.

MS. RICHARDSON: Oh, 80 sorry. 300 footnotes. Eighty pages,

300 footnotes. It seems to me that that's a question of how does one affect change? And it seems that we need the political scientist who believe that political science should be more applied, that lawyers who feel that law should be more applied, should be making these arguments, not in a gathering like this, but amongst your lawyers, amongst the political scientists within your own departments and affecting change there. That's the only way to change it seems to me. Ross.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: I'm the executive publisher of *Science Magazine*. I would like to think that you could publish in *Science* without having the life almost sucked out of you.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: I've done it many times. I'm very happy with it although my faculty thinks it an op-ed.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: I wonder if a perceptive genius like John Stuart Mill today would say that the goal of the university is to, given this situation in which we find ourselves, is to equip the citizen. You sort of touched on this that if the, I think, glaring problem in citizenry now is the inability to distinguish opinion from evidence -- and you elaborated on that a little bit -- I wonder if it isn't that lesson that needs most to be communicated in the university. I would propose that teaching the sciences as a liberal art isn't maybe the best way to do that. That's really training for citizenship.

MS. RICHARDSON: Well, I think, we would have a very interesting conversation if we were to decide what do we think is the makeup of a

liberal education as somebody who hasn't studied the sciences since I was -- I come from a much more specialized system so -- probably since the age of 15 or 16, yes, I couldn't agree more that I think that we should have science literacy. We should have quantitative literacy just as we should have linguistic literacy; anybody who only speaks one language it seems to me is really at a disadvantage in understanding the world around them, and the more languages they speak the better. So yes, if we were deciding on a curriculum it would be -- mine would be very different from the one in the university I run, or indeed run in most of the universities represented here. I think we could come up with something altogether more creative. Yes.

MS. SUPER: I'm Betsy Super. I work in the American Political Science Association. I sign the checks.

MS. RICHARDSON: I'm sorry about that.

MS. SUPER: That's okay. My question was really about the evidence base between this move to methodology and the lack of relevance because I recognize that articles written by methodologists in our scholarly publications are not necessarily acceptable -- or sorry, accessible -- and yet, if we look at the list of people that Mike name checks as big methodologists, at least two of them are probably two of the most influential social scientists that I know in terms of both training future workers for government -- getting back to our teaching point -- regularly consulting with government departments in training some of the highest level bureaucrats in foreign governments. And the reason why

that they are so influential is because people in government think that big data is really influential. And those are the people who sit on the National Science Board and who also serve in high levels of government. So how can we draw the conclusions -- there seems to be some paradox in the evidence base. Why is it that a focus on methodology and quantitative methods has led to less policy relevance? So I'm just curious about the narrative path there. And maybe Mike can -- maybe that's a better question for Mike, but I would love to hear some more about -- even if people aren't putting on their CV, they're still doing that consultation so why does that -- I mean, if the discipline's irrelevant.

MS. RICHARDSON: Well, I think if they are doing that kind of consultation it's exactly what -- we should be celebrating it. I think the criticism is of people who are doing the methods who are not then applying it. It is the people who are, as the *New Republic* article all those years ago said, what happens when people who study politics are not interested in politics, and they were not the people -- in the department at the time were not acting in government or consulting with government at all. So I'm curious as to who the methodologists are who are so influential in government, but I think we would, both Steve and I for whatever our different perspectives, would celebrate them I just thought.

MR. DESCH: I'm trying to sell a book, and so I'm just trying to resist the obvious temptation to sell a book by engaging Betsy in this debate, but that would be inappropriate given my role as a moderator this evening. And also I should point out that Vice-Chancellor Richardson has come all the way from

England to give this talk and then is getting on plane tomorrow evening to go back and I was going to say that if I could be one-third as cogent under as much jet lag as you're under, I'd be very happy.

MS. RICHARDSON: At two in the morning my clock says.

MR. DESCH: If there is one more question for Louise rather than me, I think we could take it. If not, I would ask you all to join me in thanking her for giving us a lot of food for thought, not only for dessert tonight, but also for breakfast and lunch and high tea tomorrow. Louise, thank you very much. Since I have the floor, let me just give you a little bit of an overview of tomorrow. The doors open at eight. and there will be breakfast available I hope by the same caterer that gave us this superb meal tonight. The formal program begins at 9:00 tomorrow and winds up at 4:30 in the afternoon, and lunch will be served. So I look forward to seeing you all tomorrow and also wishing you a good evening tonight. Is the bar still open if people wanted a -- well, it's possible that the bar might still be open. If not, the bar at the Darcy Hotel, I'm confident, will be open for some time so again, Louise, thank you very much and thank you all.

END OF RECORDING