

Göttingen in Baltimore or the Americanization of the German University?

Robert D. Reisz

West University of Timișoara, e-mail: robert.reisz@e-uvt.ro

Abstract: The paper intends to reconstruct the conceptual origins of the Humboldtian model and follow the way these were imported to the United States. After introducing the basic concepts of the Humboldtian reforms, as these were defined by Kant, Fichte and Humboldt, we analyze the fundamental concepts of Daniel Coit Gilman, the first rector of Johns Hopkins University. The differences between the “German” university and the “American” research university are discussed as conclusions to this analysis.

Keywords: Humboldtian university, research university, unification of education and research, liberalism

Introduction

At the end of the 20th century, the Humboldtian university model has gained an almost uncontested supremacy. For some time, competing models had an important standing, such as the Napoleonic model of the higher technical schools or Cardinal Newman's liberal arts college of medieval inspiration (Newman 1992). The collapse of Eastern European Communist states as well as the global triumph of the research university and its development to an exponential model of United States higher education, made the Humboldtian university take a hegemonic position.

The current paper intends to reconstruct the conceptual origins of the Humboldtian model and follow the way these were imported to the United States. My working hypothesis is that this Americanization was an essential factor for the success of the model and its later metamorphosis.

To better understand the model of the so-called German university, a recounting of its historical origins will be helpful. Wilhelm von Humboldt's reform plans were an intrinsic part of the construction of the modern Prussian state at the beginning of the 19th century. The Prussian reforms, later named by Friedrich Engels as the "Revolution von oben" (revolution from above) (Engels 1892), started in 1807, after the fall of the Holy Roman Empire of German Nation and had an essential liberal and romantic character. The main reformers were Karl Freiherr vom Stein and later Karl August Fürst von Hardenberg, giving the reforms also the name of Stein-Hardenberg reforms (Gray 1986).

It is self-evident that the modernization of the state under the Stein-Hardenberg reforms took place as a reaction to the French revolution, the diffusion of which had to be prevented, but they also reflected the liberal ideology blooming in Prussia at the end of the 18th century, as well as Kantian idealism and of course, enlightenment. The first step preceded the fall of the German empire. An agrarian reform

that included the abolition of serfdom was started in 1794. Later, between 1807 and 1812 a number of modernization measures would follow. Practically, the Prussian state is constructed during these years, the decentralized feudal structure of estates and vassal ties disappears and modern centralization is put in place. The reforms radically change state bureaucracy, introduce forms of popular representation, initiate a modern administration of local communities, a reform of taxation, freedom of crafts, emancipation of the Jews and agrarian reforms that again abolish serfdom and eliminate the corvee, as well a series of other seniorial rights (Gray 1986). It is interesting that the abolition of serfdom had to be reinstated just a few years after its first declaration, a proof that until feudal arrangements subsisted, radical social changes could simply not be implemented.

The educational reforms of Wilhelm von Humboldt took place in this context. Humboldt was named head of the department for culture and education, then a part of the ministry for internal affairs, in 1808.

The story of the Humboldtian reforms should nevertheless be started 100 years earlier. In 1694 the University of Halle is founded and in 1734, the one in Goettingen, both in the North of current Germany. These universities foreshadow and prepare the way for the entrance of the natural sciences in the university, and were from their beginning named reform universities (Reformuniversitäten). Reason for this name were the curricular reforms and pedagogical innovations initiated here, but also the fact that these universities were located in principalities that followed Luther's religious reforms (Lenhardt 1984). This led to the fact that the reform universities did not have to fully comply to the medieval university standards of the three higher faculties and the propaedeutic philosophical education of the liberal arts, that had a definite Catholic character.

The reforms of Halle and Goettingen can be considered as precursory to those of Humboldt mostly because they introduce the academic seminar of natural sciences to university education.

In the medieval university, education was mostly delivered as a magisterial lecture, and "research" had no place in the university in a modern sense. There existed an important tradition of disputations, of theological debate. These had their high point probably at the university of Paris and were a continuation or even more a rediscovery of the ancient tradition of the dialogue, or research in the meaning Plato used for the word. Disputations always had a theological character often staging debates between religions, most commonly between Christianity and Judaism (Novikoff 2013).

What the academic seminar in Halle and Goettingen brings is first and foremost the focus on the natural sciences and the scientific research of nature. The natural sciences were previously of interest mostly to gentlemen scientists, amateurs, clever and unequal practitioners of curiosity. The entrance of the scientific seminar in the university imposes the norms of logical rigor that were common to philosophy and theology.

At the end of the 18th century and the beginning of the 19th a series of texts appear in Germany that propose educational reforms.

The most well-known of these were written by Immanuel Kant (*Der Streit der Fakultäten*, 1798) and Wilhelm von Humboldt (*Denkschrift über die äußere und innere Organisation der höheren wissenschaftlichen Anstalten in Berlin*, 1808, as well as *Antrag auf Errichtung der Universität Berlin*, 1809), but writings of lesser impact on the organization of education were also written by Johann Gottlieb Fichte, Friedrich Schelling, Friedrich Schleiermacher and others. All these texts refer deprecatingly to the term "university", connecting it to a medieval, dogmatic philosophy and propose reform of an illuminist, liberal character.

These texts were published at the moment when, although the two already mentioned reform universities existed, the overwhelming majority of educational institutions in Europe were still typical of the medieval university structure and curriculum. The medieval university had four faculties, one inferior and three superior. The inferior,

propedeutical to the others was the faculty of philosophy that usually comprised of two cycles including the seven liberal arts. During the first cycle the three subjects of the Trivium were taught: logics, rhetoric and grammar. All these of the Latin language, of course. The second cycle included the Quadrivium that included the arithmetic, geometry, astronomy and music. The first included the so-called arts of the letters, the second, the arts of the numbers or of nature. The philosophical faculty was sometimes also called studium general, the general school, a term that was sometimes also used to depict a school that was open to students of any origin. In practice the classes were not so general, but represented the study of one fundamental text of one of the arts: Aristoteles' Logic of Boetius' Arithmetic were typical classes, for example (Ruegg 1992).

After graduating from the philosophical faculty, the student could follow any of the high faculties: law, medicine or theology. Only these faculties could grant the doctoral degree that represented the graduation of the university. This also led to the usual appellation of doctor to any physician or lawyer, a habit still usual in Central Europe. The doctorate in theology was in fact the highest academic qualification and had nothing to do with pastoral theology, but led most often to positions in political-administrative offices.

In his *Conflict of faculties*, Kant analyses the relationship between the philosophical faculty and the high faculties, having one chapter for each of the debates with the theological, the legal and the medical faculty. The texts were written separately and collected in a common volume in one of the last works that Kant himself published. The main ideas of the Humboldtian reforms appear in this volume. First of all, Kant declares that the goal for academic education is the search for truth and not for utility. Here Kant also makes a case for academic freedom, research and education free from censorship and any form of state intervention. Moreover, the three debates sustain the thesis of the superiority of the philosophical faculty compared to the other ones. The philosophical faculty, of the liberal arts and sciences is proven to be the

most adequate to represent the path to universal truth because it educates for reason and critical thinking and prepares men for knowledge in the broadest sense and not for the narrow practice of a profession.

A fundamental text for the education reform was also published by Johann Gottlieb Fichte, one of Immanuel Kant's most important followers in a volume entitled *Über das Wesen des Gelehrten und seine Erscheinungen im Gebiete der Freiheit* (1805). The book contains ten lectures on education that connect education, freedom and truth. The sixth of these lectures is named „On academic freedom”. This chapter deals directly with the philosophical faculty, the faculty of the liberal arts and sciences. Fichte's position is similar to Kant's, but here the relationship between knowledge and the liberal arts and sciences is clearer. Here is also the place where the word liberal gets a new and essential meaning. If until Fichte, these arts were liberal mostly because they represented the education of the free man in general. Now, this liberalism is explicitly stated as academic freedom, the freedom to unrestricted, uncensored knowledge that is needed to search for truth.

For Fichte according to the same text, freedom is necessary for the development of ethics and good morals. Choosing right over wrong, of virtue over vice, has to be free, unrestricted and resulting from knowledge to be an ethical choice. Choosing the good deed because no other option is available, is not an ethical choice.

Von Humboldt's fundamental texts on education continue explicitly Kant's argumentation and foreshadow Fichte's. Even if there are no citations conforming to modern rules, the references to Kant's work are obvious. Humboldt's short text has only 13 pages and was written in 1803 (“Denkschrift über die äußere und innere Organisation der höheren wissenschaftlichen Anstalten in Berlin”) as a text for the internal use of the Prussian government. It develops a proposal for the unification of „objective” science with „subjective” education. For this unification to function, Humboldt proposes changes to the university as an organization. This is the birth of the current university model,

founded on education and scientific research. This is what we generally mean when we refer to the Humboldtian university, more than Humboldt's administrative efforts or his other writings.

Wilhelm von Humboldt's fame is of course also connected to that of his brother, geographer and natural scientist Alexander von Humboldt, and was an important character of Prussian politics during the days of Friedrich Wilhelm the III. (he ruled between 1797 and 1840 as king of Prussia and margraf of Brandenburg, being until the fall of the Holy Roman Empire of German Nation in 1806 also prince elector). Next to his political, administrative and diplomatic position, he was an important liberal thinker and the creator of an individualist liberalism that valued diversity and authenticity of character.

Wilhelm von Humboldt was one of the founding fathers of classical liberalism in Germany, author of an important treatise on the limitation of the power of the state, written in 1792, *Ideen zu einem Versuch, die Grenzen der Wirksamkeit des Staats zu bestimmen*. The text only appeared in fragments during his life-time, the complete version being published posthumously. Even so it had an important impact. It is interesting to note that his argument for the limitation of the prerogatives of the state was written during a period when the modern state only emerged, replacing feudal arrangements. Nevertheless, his argument is a liberal and not a conservative one, the limits in discussion here being set by individual private life and not seniorial rights.

He influences liberal thought not only in Germany, his ideas being promoted in the anglo-saxon space by non-other than John Stuart Mill. In his fundamental work "On liberty", Mill refers to von Humboldt a number of times, also deploring his lack of notoriety (Mill 2014:300).

What is in fact the Humboldtian university model? A short analysis of Wilhelm von Humboldt's fundamental texts

Wilhelm von Humboldt starts his *Denkschrift über die äußere und innere Organisation der höheren wissenschaftlichen Anstalten in Berlin* by stating that the goal of the sciences should be the development of the „moral culture of the nation“. The main point of his proposed reform is connecting education with science, putting science as the supreme target to which education has to aspire to. The essential principles of sciences are declared to be "Einsamkeit und Freiheit", solitude and liberty. The liberty mentioned refers to the autonomy of the sciences from the state. Restating one of Kant's beliefs, von Humboldt declares extremely clearly that the state should not interfere in any way in science, because if it does it, it can only harm. As higher education should be connected to science, the state has to offer here as well, total freedom. The role of the state in higher education is only „of offer the external forms of organization and the necessary means“.

There is a very important observation in Humboldt's text at this point. He senses the major problem in the unification of education and science. Science approaches problems as open, never fully solved, while education traditionally offers knowledge that has a pretense of completeness, of closure. He argues that in the internal life of scientific organizations, this unfinished-ness of science subsists, and is generally accepted, because it is necessary for the development of knowledge. The fragment below pleads for critical thinking, for a science that always questions and is never content with superficial certainties:

“In science, as soon as we stop searching or as we imagine that this search does not have to go in the depth of our spirit, but could extensively follow step by step, we lose once and for all”

According to von Humboldt, continuing here again Kant, philosophy and the arts are the areas of study best fit for this kind of

research. The philosophical faculty is as such the one that can best satisfy the need for the inclusion of the sciences in the university.

An important part of the manuscript refers to the relationship between universities and academies of sciences and arts, organizations that were dedicated to the sciences, but had a mostly associative character. Von Humboldt finds that these two types of organizations should interrelate, member of the academies teaching and holding conferences and lectures at the universities. On the other hand, as the importance of the academies was lesser in the German countries than in other states (the reference is obviously to France and England, but these are not explicitly mentioned), von Humboldt grants a higher importance to the universities.

To complete the presentation of von Humboldts educational ideal another longer quote is worth giving:

„There certainly exists knowledge that has to be general, and more than that, a certain education of attitude and character must not lack anybody. Each person is a good artisan, merchant, soldier or businessman, only if, independent of his individual profession, he is a good man and citizen, honest and according to his status, enlightened. If education in school offers him what is needed to accomplish such qualities, it will be easier for him to accumulate the abilities that are specific for his craft, and he will always have the liberty to change his profession, as often happens in life.”

The fragment is from a report to the king, addressed in December 1809 and summarizes a position on education that fundamentally determines the academic education differs from professional education.

Wilhelm von Humboldt's second text that we mentioned, the *"Antrag auf Errichtung der Universität Berlin"*, is a formal request addressed to the king of Prussia to establish a university in Berlin. The text contains almost only administrative and organizational subjects concerning the unification of research organizations and universities, the financing of education and research as well as the fate of the universities existing in Prussia at that date.

For our analysis here, the repeated reference to the German nation and the responsibility of the Prussian state towards the entire German nation are interesting and important. Moreover, where financing is dealt with a clear distinction is made between sources of the crown (from revenues of the crown originating from its properties) and sources of the nation (from taxation). This separation is a very modern one, and another proof of von Humboldt's liberal ideology. The costs of education in the university are planned to be covered in the beginning by the crown, but have later to be taken over by the nation, as the role of the university is a national one. The report also mentions the possibility to use financial sources from the secularization of church properties. Here again we find the spirit of the enlightenment.

Another interesting element is von Humboldt's plea for the use of the name „university“, a name used to depict the medieval organization that his reforms actually departed from. The texts that we previously mentioned, foreshadowing his reforms did not use the name, or were at best ambiguous to its use, preferring other names, that can be translated as scientific organizations, higher education institutions or higher schools.

The Humboldtian model of the university, as it is presented in his own writing, is as such characterized mainly by the following:

- The unification of education and scientific research, an important role for science in education and especially in the creation of the enlightened citizen.
- Academic freedom in education and research, for teachers as well as students, as a necessity for the progress of science
- The inclusion of natural sciences in the philosophical faculty, the promotion of this at an equal level with the higher faculties and the creation as a consequence of the doctorate in philosophy, that will also be granted for the natural sciences.
- The national role of the university as an organization intended to develop the moral culture of the nation.

Wilhelm von Humboldt could implement his reforms by establishing the university in Berlin in the years 1809 - 1810, a university named initially Alma Mater Berolinensis, to change its name in 1828 to Friedrich Wilhelms Universität, and then in 1949 to Humboldt Universität.

The Humboldtian model was nevertheless mostly a conceptual construct. The university in Berlin did not exactly follow the initial plan, so that when Humboldt retired from his administrative position, he declared himself unsatisfied by the organizational construct resulted.

National mission, the role of the university in developing the moral culture of the nation

The transformations of the university brought by the Humboldtian model are fundamental not only for higher education but also for the concept of citizenship. As Guy Neave, and later Marek Kwiek observed, the Humboldtian model unites „political and cultural motives” (Neave 2000, Kwiek 2006). The Humboldtian texts unite the enlightenment subject of the competent citizen with the idea of education through sciences. His reasoning is based on the open, investigative character of science, its impact on the development of critical thinking. The search for truth in solitude and liberty is not done (only) for the furthering of science itself, but also for the development of the „moral culture of the nation”, a phrase very close to the way Fichte saw the liberty of knowledge as a fundamental prerequisite of ethics. Neave also considers that the German model of the university reunites in fact the goal of the „search for truth” with the „public responsibility” of the university. According to Neave, von Humboldt „nationalizes” the university, putting it to the use of the nation (Neave 2000). In fact, the whole *raison d’être* of the Humboldtian university can be understood in the logic of the establishment of the national state (Readings 1996).

Humboldt in America or "Goettingen in Baltimore"

Following the spread of the Humboldtian model further, we find that it knows its most important fame and prestige probably in the United States. Research universities, are in fact not a majority of the over 3000 higher education institutions in the United States, but are viewed as the most important and most envied ones especially abroad. This has started during the second half of the 19th century, the first „German“ university being according to most authors, Johns Hopkins University in Baltimore, Maryland (Muller 1985, Baker 2014, Powell et. al. 2017).

The university, named after a philanthropist, donor of the foundation that set the basis for the establishment of the university, started its activity in 1874 (first documents) / 1876 (first classes taught). It was far from being the first university in the present day United States. This primordially goes to Harvard University, established in 1640 on a model inspired by tradition medieval universities in Western Europe, its source of inspiration being the university in Cambridge, the place that also gave its name to the town that developed around the American university (Baynes 1878:732). A number of further universities appeared until the second half of the 19th century, but the research intensive university we are speaking of emerged as we have seen, relatively late.

The fundamental text for the establishment of the university is the testament of Johns Hopkins (1795 – 1873). Fragments of this last will were published together with the charter of the foundation and its regulations, but the text said nothing on the university model it was going to establish. It is an extremely dry, simple, legal text including no explanatory remarks. The major impact on what was to become „Goettingen in Baltimore“ lies somewhere else. The first president of the university, Daniel Coit Gilman (Muller 1985) was the person to design and implement the model of the American research university. Gilman has studied between 1854 and 1855 in Berlin, and later, in 1875,

preparing for the organization of Johns Hopkins, has visited a number of universities in Germany: Strasbourg, Freiburg, Göttingen and Berlin.

Johns Hopkins became the first American university founded explicitly as an organization dedicated to higher education and advanced scientific research and was also the first to grant doctoral degrees in different scientific domains. Even if it might not have much of a causal impact, it should not be neglected that an important part of the initial teaching staff consisted of professors that were educated in Germany (Muller 1985).

This contributed to the fact that Johns Hopkins was always considered a „German“ university even if Gilman clearly stated that: “We did not undertake to establish a German university, nor an English university, but an American university, based upon and applied to the existing institutions of this country.”

Muller considers that the American university is in fact the superposition of a system of education through research on Humboldtian model over a first level of college education of English inspiration, according to the Oxford – Cambridge model that led to the initial form of Harvard University as well as other schools until the mid 19th century. The German influence that would produce after Johns Hopkins, other universities such as Cornell, Chicago and a number of large public universities, would later bring post-graduate education to almost all the rest of the system and also lead to breaking the close ties between universities and religious groups that have been previously the norm.

Gilman’s address at the inauguration of the university is the most important, programmatic text for the creation of the organization. We will briefly analyze this text in the following paragraphs. The talk was held on February, the 22nd in 1876 at the Music Academy in Baltimore. The governor of the state of Maryland was present, as well as the mayor and a number of invited personalities and professors from different American colleges and universities.

The first part of the speech, a part that interest us less, refers to the personality of the donor of the foundation and a number of financial details on the donation and competitive advantages that the new university could benefit from. Nevertheless, already here, there are two points that are interesting as they put Gilman in the same ideological family as von Humboldt. On the one hand, Gilman declares himself explicitly as a liberal and praises the city of Baltimore for its liberalism. On the other hand, Gilman also explicitly states as desirable the separation of the university both from state and church.

Under the subtitle "Discussions elsewhere", Gilman continues to contextualize in international terms the mission of the university. Among others, he says:

„In following, as we are prone to do in educational matters, the example of Germany, we must beware lest we accept what is their cast off; lest we introduce faults as well as virtues, defects with excellence”

It is as such, that the German model has to be followed, but the clear intention of Gilman is to have a critical look, eliminating as much as possible the „faults” and taking over the „virtues”. To be able to decide between these, Gilman refers to on-going debates in Germany on the problems of the educational system.

Another interesting fragment of this section of the address refers to the way American education was already influencing the rest of the world at that time:

„Our caution is nonetheless needed when we remember that at the present moment Americans are engaged in promoting the institutions of higher education in Tokyo, Peking and Beirout, in Egypt and the Hawaiian Isles. The oldest and the remotest nations are looking here for light.”

For this analysis, the central part of the speech is the intended structure of the university, i.e. what Gilman considered according to his research to be the part of the German model that was worth taking over. This structure is presented in the following section of the speech, entitled "The Higher Education".

The section begins by stating as clearly as possible, that universities are extremely different in different countries, and sometimes even within one country. This is followed by the next fragment:

„But while forms and methods vary, the freedom to investigate, the obligation to teach, and the careful bestowal of academic honors are always understood to be among the university functions. The pupils are supposed to be wise enough to select, and mature enough to follow the courses they pursue.”

Gilman enumerates after that 12 principles that we consider to be the basis for his model, and before consistent conclusions he also discusses in some detail the special problems of medicine, the humanities and academic freedom in general. I have extracted from the 12 principles the following abstract. Most of the wording is Gilman's own. I have shortened some of the text and paraphrased some of the longer sentences:

1. All sciences are worthy of promotion; or in other words, it is useless to dispute whether literature or science should receive most attention, or whether there is any essential difference between the old and the new education.
2. Religion has nothing to fear from science, and science need not be afraid of religion.
3. Remote utility is quite as worthy to be thought of as immediate advantage.
4. As it is impossible for any university to encourage with equal freedom all branches of learning, a selection must be made by enlightened governors, and that selection must depend on the requirements and deficiencies of a given people, in a given period. There is no absolute standard of preference. What is more important at one time or in one place may be less needed elsewhere and otherwise.
5. Individual students cannot pursue all branches of learning, and must be allowed to select, under the guidance of those who are

appointed to counsel them. Nor can able professors be governed by routine. Teachers and pupils must be allowed great freedom in their methods of work.

6. The best scholars will almost invariably be those who make special attainments on the foundation of a broad and liberal culture.
7. The best teachers are usually those who are free, competent and willing to make original researches in the library and the laboratory.
8. The best investigators are usually those who have also the responsibilities of instruction, gaining thus the incitement of colleagues, the encouragement of pupils, the observation of the public.
9. Universities should bestow their honors with sparing hand; their benefits most freely.
10. A university cannot be created in a day; it benefits from a slow growth.
11. The object of the university is to develop character — to make men. It misses its aim if it produced learned pedants, or simple artisans, or cunning sophists, or pretentious practitioners. Its purport is not so much to impart knowledge to the pupils, as whet the appetite, exhibit methods, develop powers, strengthen judgment, and invigorate the intellectual and moral forces. It should prepare for the service of society a class of students who will be wise, thoughtful, progressive guides in whatever department of work or thought they may be engaged.
12. Universities easily fall into ruts. Almost every epoch requires a fresh start.

Even if there is no explicit reference in the text, the 12 principles have a polemic character; they are written as if they would be a response to skepticism or outright critique of the “new” education Gilman intends to implement in the university. Written almost 150 years ago, the debate that seems to be ongoing is so-actual debate

between liberals and conservatives. Nevertheless, some of its elements were different then, then they are now. The first two principles are clearly intended as a response to conservative values.

In these principles we also clearly find a number of Humboldtian themes (academic freedom, the unification of education and research) next to other liberal elements as well as progressive, almost anti-conservative thought. There are also a number of points of view that we can consider as foundational for the model of the American research university and its differentiation from the German one. As, Gero Lenhardt also pointed out, this difference lies in the importance that the American model grants to personal development and development of character next to professional-academic education (especially principle no. 11). Lenhardt analysis in detail how this theme, which he considers of Protestant origin, became the motor of American higher education, and especially college education (Lenhardt 2005).

Let us take a closer look at principle 11. and try a brief critical discourse analysis:

“The object of the university is to develop character — to make men. It misses its aim if it produced learned pedants, or simple artisans, or cunning sophists, or pretentious practitioners. Its purport is not so much to impart knowledge to the pupils, as whet the appetite, exhibit methods, develop powers, strengthen judgment, and invigorate the intellectual and moral forces. It should prepare for the service of society a class of students who will be wise, thoughtful, progressive guides in whatever department of work or thought they may be engaged.”

The foreground of the fragment is definitely the student; the role of the university is clearly directed towards the individual student. All depictions of the potential “object of the university”, its “product”, are expressed in individual terms. There is a clear masculinization of this subject, but this should not be taken as a form of chauvinism, but rather as an instance of the hegemonic male discourse of the period. The education of the student, the development of his character, takes place on the background of the role of the graduate as a somebody offering a

service to society and this service is leadership. This foreground / background relationship: student / society is framed in terms that are liberal and elitist at the same time. The graduates are defined as “guides” and their qualities are expressed in terms such as: “powers”, “judgement”, “force”. All these concepts are clearly masculine, but they also relate to a traditional image of the power elite, the leading class of society.

Another interesting element of this text fragment is the way it portrays what Gilman considered the failures of education: “learned pedants, or simple artisans, or cunning sophists, or pretentious practitioners.” There are two categories here. On the one hand the pedants and the sophists, too far from the reality of everyday life, lost in the ivory tower of science, lead us back to an essential part of Humboldt’s argumentation for the use of knowledge. Science should not simply be done for science sake, but as a way to develop moral character. On the other hand, the simple artisan or practitioner are also not desirable graduates for the university. While, these are immersed in everyday life, they are incapable to lead society, being mere doers.

The intended structure of the universities implemented these points and included the four traditional faculties. The philosophical faculty was named here philosophical department and was to contain chairs for the languages, mathematics, ethics, history and sciences (the order here is the one used by Gilman). In the more detailed discussion following, elements of Humboldtian thought are very present. Gilman refers to the importance of academic freedom, education through science, the overall importance of both the natural sciences and of culture for moral development.

What we find maybe even more important and definitely surprising is some that is missing from Gilman’s speech. He makes no reference to the national element of education. What was most important in the way the Humboldtian model was imitated in most of the other places in the world, and especially in Europe, had not relevance to Johns Hopkins University. There is during the whole, very

long, address only one use of the word national. Gilman mentions at that point that the potential students of the university are expected to come from Baltimore and the state of Maryland and maybe later other states of the nation ("a slow development; first local, then regional, then national influence"), but a reference to the American nation or to nation-states is completely missing.

For Gilman the national role of the university seems to be largely irrelevant, all his fundamental values are related in classical liberal tradition to the human being as an individual. The unification of education and science is not intended for the moral development of the nation, but of the moral character of the individual. If Humboldt has "nationalized" the university (according to Neave, Kwiek and others), the Americanization of the university was its "individualization".

During the 20th century the model of the research university had a global diffusion. This Western university model spread first to Eastern Europe, then to Japan during the Meiji reforms, later being exported by Japanese occupation to other East Asian states, the discursive justification being in all these cases nation building and/or the modernization of the state (Zha 2004). Similar themes led to the creation of universities in Africa and most of Latin America. As good as all these universities were developed along the creation or consolidation of national states, the initial link between university and nation being an important element in the success of the "German" model. The American version of it, focusing on individual virtues, rather than national ones did not spread as much. The conclusion. It was not the hegemonic position of the United States, that led to the hegemonic position of the Humboldtian university.

While not all universities can now be considered as research universities, there seems to be a shared understanding of the research university as the model of the "good", the "desirable" university. Nevertheless, the current discourse on quality in higher education has departed more and more from the moral role of the university. Research in general and science in particular are now the measure of quality for

their potential economic benefits. The connection between science, freedom and the moral culture of the nation, as intended by Humboldt, or of the individual, as proposed by Gilman are mostly forgotten.

References

- Baker, D. P. (2014). *The schooled society: The educational transformation of global culture*. Stanford University Press.
- Baynes, T. S. (Ed.). (1878). *The Encyclopaedia Britannica: a dictionary of arts, sciences, and general literature*. C. Scribner's sons.
- Engels, F. (1895). Einleitung zu Karl Marx' "Klassenkämpfe in Frankreich 1848 bis 1850", in Karl Marx/Friedrich Engels - Werke. (Karl) Dietz Verlag, Berlin. Band 22, 3. Auflage 1972, unveränderter Nachdruck der 1. Auflage 1963, Berlin/DDR. S. 509-527
- Fichte, J. G. (1805) "Über das Wesen des Gelehrten und seine Erscheinungen im Gebiete der Freiheit" (Prelegere ținută la Erlangen în semestrul de vară din 1805), Felix Meiner, 1921.
- Gray, M. W. (1986). Prussia in transition: Society and politics under the Stein Reform Ministry of 1808. *Transactions of the American Philosophical Society*, 76(1), 1-175.
- von Humboldt, W. Freiherr (1851). *Ideen zu einem Versuch, die Gränzen der Wirksamkeit des Staats zu bestimmen*. E. Trewendt, 1792 (1851).
- von Humboldt, W. Freiherr. (1960) *Werke in 5 Bänden*. Hg. Flitner u. Kiel. Darmstadt, contains among other writings *Denkschrift über die äußere und innere Organisation der höheren wissenschaftlichen Anstalten in Berlin* (1808), and *Antrag auf Errichtung der Universität Berlin* (1809).
- Kant, I. (1798). "The Conflict of the Faculties" (Der Streit Der Fakultäten), translated by Mary J. Gregor (New York: Abaris).
- Lenhardt, G. (1984). *Schule und bürokratische Rationalität* (Vol. 466). Frankfurt am Main: Suhrkamp.
- Lenhardt, G. (2005) *Hochschulen in Deutschland und in den USA: deutsche Hochschulpolitik in der Isolation*. Vol. 2. Springer-Verlag.

- Kwiek, M. (2006) "The Classical German Idea of the University, or on the Nationalization of the Modern Institution (CPP RPS 1/2006).".
- Mill, J. S. (2014) *Despre libertate*. Humanitas.
- Muller, S. (1985) "Wilhelm von Humboldt and the University in the United States." *Johns Hopkins APL Technical Digest* 6.3: 253-256.
- Neave, G. (2000) "Universities' Responsibility to Society: An Historical Exploration of an Enduring Issue". In: Neave, Guy (ed.). *The Universities' Responsibilities to Societies*. International Perspectives. Amsterdam: Pergamon Press
- Newman, J. H. Cardinal. (1992) *The idea of a university*. University of Notre Dame Press.
- Novikoff, A. J. (2013) *The medieval culture of disputation: Pedagogy, practice, and performance*. University of Pennsylvania Press.
- Powell, J. J., Baker, D. P., & Fernandez, F. (Eds.). (2017). *The century of science: The global triumph of the research university*. Emerald Group Publishing.
- Readings, B. (1996) *The university in ruins*. Harvard University Press.
- Rüegg, W. (Ed.). (1992). *A History of the University in Europe* (Vol. 1). University Press.
- Rüegg, W. (Ed.). (2004). *A history of the university in Europe: Volume 3, universities in the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries (1800–1945)* (Vol. 3). Cambridge University Press.
- Zha, Qiang. (2004) "Foreign influences on Japanese and Chinese higher education: a comparative analysis." *Higher Education Perspectives* 1, no. 1.