

Goćkowski, Janusz

University - the Guardian and Advocate of Scholars' Ethos

Organon 32, 105-120

2003

Artykuł umieszczony jest w kolekcji cyfrowej Bazhum, gromadzącej zawartość polskich czasopism humanistycznych i społecznych tworzonej przez Muzeum Historii Polski w ramach prac podejmowanych na rzecz zapewnienia otwartego, powszechnego i trwałego dostępu do polskiego dorobku naukowego i kulturalnego.

Artykuł został zdigitalizowany i opracowany do udostępnienia w internecie ze środków specjalnych MNiSW dzięki Wydziałowi Historycznemu Uniwersytetu Warszawskiego.

Tekst jest udostępniony do wykorzystania w ramach dozwolonego użytku.



Janusz Goćkowski (Wrocław, Poland)

UNIVERSITY – THE GUARDIAN AND ADVOCATE OF SCHOLARS' ETHOS*

As a man performing his job, the clerk has the sense of professional responsibility. He understands the indispensable relation between knowledge and teaching (...). In a great factory, that the universe is, the clerk must also participate, on his own post and according to his capacities, in creative work going on there. (...) Academics are clerks.
Jacques Le Goff, *The Intelligentsia in the Middle Ages*

Ethos and *koinonia* (ethos community) in the world of scholars

Scholars *sensu proprio* are the people for whom: a) science is a peculiar and separate form of knowledge and cognition; b) professional biography of an academic consists in striving for competence through self-improvement in the role of the researcher; a teacher of scientific truth; c) scientific truth is an autotelic value; d) gaming for scientific truth consists in research and reflection leading to creating, establishing and popularizing theses which explain, to those who are interested and adequately prepared, structures and processes of our reality; e) participation in this game is indispensably connected with enjoying freedom of speech and scientific thought, as well as freedom to choose the subject-matter and the field of research.

The population of people employed as researchers and academic teachers (considering the subject of this paper we will deal here mostly with the people of *academic science*, leaving out the people of *industrial science*) is always more numerous (often much more numerous) than the set of scholars *sensu proprio*. The history of academic life is not only the history of gaming for improvement of scientific theories and methods. It is also the history of gaming for the durability and development of social bond within the community of scholars *sensu proprio* and for broadening the social range of this community. Scholars *sensu proprio* perceive and treat their own canon of principles and dictates concerning the way in which academic activities should be performed as binding on themselves and suitable to become binding on other academics, especially other researchers and academic teachers. Thus, they are people who

* The present article reverts to problems discussed by the author in his previous works, especially in: *Tezy o uniwersytecie [Theses about the University]* in: *Teksty* 2/1981, pp. 5–37; *Sytuacje testujące wierność uczonych wobec ich ethosu [Situations Testing Scholars' Faithfulness to Their Ethos]* in: *Etyka* 21, 1984, pp. 103–129; *Ciągłość i zmiana ethosu uczonych polskich [The Continuity and Change of Polish Scholars' Ethos]* – this paper was printed in English in: *Organon* 20–21, 1984–1985, pp. 119–135.

accept, and manifest by their attitudes, responsibility for axio–normative order of the academic life as a whole, i. e. for themselves and the others. They perform the role of specialists (proving through their work the sense of responsibility for the quality and development of a scientific discipline or sub–discipline) and the role of intellectuals (manifesting through their behaviour their sense of responsibility for science as a *perspective on world*, a *function of the social life*, a *form of symbolic culture*, as well as for the culture of knowledge and cognition as a whole, since science is only one of *symbolic forms of cognition* and its vicissitudes are strongly and diversely connected with vicissitudes of other kinds of perceiving and depicting reality, such as: art, philosophy, technology, journalism).

If scholars share the canon of principles and dictates concerning cooperation and co–existence of researchers and teachers of scientific truth, if it is for them a professional orientation and a doctrine of life as well as a code and the way of thinking and scientific activity within a socially distinct and culturally specific community, then we can speak of the ethos of scholars, that is the ethos of people who distinguish themselves by the kind of profession and mission. The community of scholars *sensu proprio* becomes a *koinonia*, that is a community sharing beliefs and aims in regard to a particular kind of truth about our reality. Those who participate in *koinonia* are the searchers and preachers of truth implied by the *scientific perspective on world*. This truth constitutes for them the highest value and the primary objective. It lends meaning to their *intentional cooperation* as creators and teachers of scientific knowledge and as educators of new generations of academics.

Koinonia tries to attain hegemony in the world of academics. It means that its participants seek durability and universality of observing their ethos principles and dictates in order to achieve: a) full concordance between axio–normative order of academic life with the canon of these principles and dictates, and especially the operation of academic institutions and associations according to the requirements of this canon; b) a recognition by all the academics that the *koinonia*'s elite is the aristocracy of the world of scholars, authoritative on the questions of the code of performing the role of the researcher and the teacher of scientific truth; c) providing all the academics with education and bringing them under control which would serve to ensure the concordance between their beliefs and behaviour and the content of the code of their profession; d) embedding, in the social consciousness of academics, the belief that the scholar's professional development is equivalent with improving his performance as a person playing the role of the researcher and the teacher according to the code of his profession; e) internalization, in the scholar's conscience, of the belief in the need of constant faithfulness to the rules of the code.

Striving to make their ethos the orientation and doctrine, the code and rule of performing professional duties by all the people of science, the participants of *koinonia* believe that a man who decides to become an academic chooses, at the same time, his career as a searcher and preacher of truth, since performing the role of the researcher and the role of the teacher is equivalent to seeking to arrive at and popularize such visions and interpretations of reality

to which the value of truth can be ascribed. This obliges the people of science to be honest in thinking and reliable at work. This also means that they should *intentionally cooperate* for the sake of the constant development of the axio-normative order which serves well the purpose of seeking and preaching the scientific truth.

Social mission of *koinonia*, as the collective creator, guide and advocate of the professional ethos of scholars, consists in endeavouring to ensure constant and universal observance of the principles and dictates of this ethos in academic circles. This will be successful if *koinonia* can perform:

- an educational function consisting in instructing the people of science in a way resulting in the internalization of the ethos as the code of professional behaviour of scholars. If these people manifest, in situations testing their faithfulness to the principles and dictates of the ethos, the willingness and ability to cope with these requirements, then we can say that the educational work was well-done;

- a therapeutic function consisting in identifying and eliminating (or at least minimizing) cases of anomalies and deviations proving the disease and degeneration of the normal academic life, that is the academic life concordant with the ethos of scholars as the code of their professional practice. The proper fulfillment of this function boils down to a quick and accurate diagnosis, therapy saving for the organism of science as many infected tissues as possible, as well as universal and effective preventive measures;

- a structural function consisting in devising and creating such axio-normative orders for academic institutions and associations which would make them places where ethos would be observed and propagated;

- a negotiating function consisting in communicating with those on whom the cultural identity of scholars expressed in their ethos depends, in exchange for the participation in *organic solidarity* (cooperation and co-existence within the framework of the society understood as a system of the division of labour) and service to the fatherland.

Ethos and *koinonia* serve the cause of the scholars' concerted quest for the common supreme good – scientific truth. Such a concerted quest makes academic circles real *unities in diversity* since the pluralism of cognitive orientations is accompanied by consensus about values and aims, principles and dictates of professional morality. However, the history of academic life is the history of gaming for durability and universality of the axio-normative order consistent with the ethos. This game is not always and not everywhere won by *koinonia*. It must be noted that the general line of *koinonia* has a lot of opponents (both within and outside the community) and that even some of the participants of *koinonia* become renegades or deserters. Thus, *koinonia* must continually strive to regain the lost fields and continually rebuild the ruins. Pathology, which must be fought against for the sake of the triumphing ethos, appears also within *koinonia*. Its strife for axio-normative identity requires the performance of a controlling and correcting function directed at itself, reeducating and re-socializing those who have deviated from the ethos but who, until recently, were true participants of *koinonia*.

An institution of a normal academic life

The general line of *koinonia* consists in fulfilling the mission of a defender and propagator of the scholars' ethos, that is effective gaming for: a) the axio-normative order of the *academic science* which we will call gaming for a normal academic life in the most important part of the world of scholars; the preservation of the cultural identity of science as a form of knowledge and cognition depends on the results of this game; b) a bond and cooperation between all the people of science; the importance of this game increases as various forms of *non-academic science* (especially *industrial science*) are developing and as demands, made on scholars by the governing or by employers who treat the people of science as their subjects, supporters or functionaries obliged to be mentally and behaviourally obedient and faithful to the official orthodoxy, are growing; this will be called gaming for the integrity of academic life in the scale of a global community of scholars; c) specific and separate character of academic life; the importance of this game increases as the importance of science, as a part of the global society, is growing and as the boundaries between science and technology, science and orthodoxy, science and propaganda, are getting blurred; this will be called gaming for the preservation of the identity of science as the *perspective on world*; d) cooperation of scholars with other authors of works which include visions and interpretations of reality; this will be called gaming for the unity of intellectuals in caring for truth, beauty and good.

The present paper will deal only with the first of these games. When can we say that in a given place and time a normal academic life exists (or existed)? Then, when we find that: a) scholars *sensu proprio* lay down the direction of *intentional cooperation* of researchers and teachers, take the lead in community life and shape the style of these people's work; b) people of science enjoy freedoms which are necessary to do their work properly, in concordance with the nature of scientific road to truth. The proof of the normal academic life is willingness, ability and possibility of observing and respecting, by the community of scholars, the content of the code of their profession which commands them to be the scholars *sensu proprio*. If academic life has an axio-normative order in accordance with the principles and dictates of the scholars' ethos, then we can say that it is normal in the full sense of the word.

Gaming for a normal academic life is carried out simultaneously in many fields. A *university field* belongs to the category of the most important ones. University, one of the most significant inventions in the history of organization of academic life (understood and treated as the unity of research, reflection and teaching about truth, as well as moulding researchers and teachers of truth) is a key institution (*an organized system of purposive activity*) of the *academic science*. What a university really is, depends on its order and manners of the academic life, and especially on norms and rules concerning the cooperation of the academic staff of the university in basic areas of its activity which include the following: a) creating theses and propositions important for the development of knowledge and scientific cognition, as well as passing judgement on the value of these products; b) handing down know-

ledge to apprentices together with the ability of self-teaching; c) teaching and educating academic cadres, as well as establishing their professional competence through the conferment of degrees; d) making analyses and pronouncing judgements important for solving practical problems of the social life.

The research concerning morality and manners in the above areas of activity leads to the conclusion that we may divide universities into two categories: *sham universities* (which operate in a way incompatible with the code of the normal academic life) and *universities "sensu proprio"* (whose axio-normative order is consistent with the scholars' ethos). *Sham universities* are a significant factor of disintegration and degeneration of academic life and its transformation into the system of activities which is lacking in a genuine quest for scientific truth. On the other hand, universities *sensu proprio* are the main strongholds of science which fulfill the following criteria: a) it is *epistemic science* (its products are theories containing truth which is, for scholars, a value in itself); b) it is *autonomous science* (its activities are governed by the *scientific perspective on world* which implies the application of particular procedures, standards and criteria in research and reflection); c) it is *clerkist science* (its scholars establish independently what is the scientific truth and who is a researcher and teacher of this truth, and they do it on the basis of their own principles and dictates concerning their profession, aiming first of all at the development of knowledge and scientific cognition). Their professional activity testifies to the twofold affiliation – to the world of scholars and to the national community, that is to the culture of gaming for scientific truth and to *the method of the community life order* of people choosing the common homeland and the common fate. Thus, the university *sensu proprio* is doubly useful – knowledge is created there and cognition improved, and the cadres of researchers and teachers are educated there for science and for the fatherland; and by educating the elite of the intelligentsia, preparing expert reports and pronouncing opinions, not only are there important needs of the fatherland fulfilled, but also the status of science in the global community life is strengthened and improved. The twofold affiliation has an important influence on the nature of the university. The requirements of the quest for scientific truth and the requirements of creative work useful for the fatherland have a bearing on the following: a) the independence, duties and social responsibility of the university; b) the rights of the milieus and circles supervising the proper fulfillment of the university's social functions; c) the social role of an academic scholar as a researcher and teacher who is an active participant of the game for scientific truth and its principled advocate.

We can speak of the university *sensu proprio* if academic activities carried on in a higher education institution prove that this institution is:

– A miniature of science understood as *unity in diversity* and a living testimony to consensus and pluralism in science. A university operates then according to the rule of *triple multiplicity* (the multiplicity of academic disciplines and sub-disciplines, the multiplicity of styles and programmes of academic work and the multiplicity of schools and orientations of scientific cognition) and the rule of *double agreement* (an agreement to observe the canon of norms and rules of gaming for scientific truth, and an agreement to

connect an epistemic function with an educational function).

- A centre for interpreting, continuing and propagating academic tradition understood and treated as multi-generational continuity of observing the canon of norms and rules of gaming for scientific truth, that is the truth specific to a peculiar and separate form of knowledge and cognition.

- An island in a great archipelago inhabited by scholars, functioning as an active participant of an international system of cooperation and an international network of communication between higher education institutions – for the sake of the development of knowledge and scientific cognition, as well as for the sake of the defence of freedoms needed by scholars to game for scientific truth in a proper way.

- A model for other higher education institutions and an authoritative centre for creating knowledge and educating the intelligentsia necessary for schools belonging to the national education system.

- *Organic solidarity* of scholars specializing in many branches of science for the sake of analyzing and describing various structures and processes in a comprehensive way and thus perfecting scientific integrating narrations taking into account many angles and cognitive perspectives.

- An assembly of authoritative scholars participating in a serious way in gaming for scientific truth by creating new important cognitive values and by educating young scientists.

- An advocate of rights and needs of the people of science and other authors of works which depict and explain reality.

- A fair judge of anomalies and deviations in the community life which endanger the *method of the community life order* with which the university identifies.

The university *sensu proprio* is an institution of academic life because: a) its structure and operation are guided by the requirements and tasks of gaming for scientific truth and thus it should be appraised first of all as a centre for such a game; b) only as an institution of academic life does it participate in creating and perfecting national culture and in solving practical problems of the community life in the country.

The guardian and advocate of scholars' ethos

Guarding the ethos of scholars means taking care of the concordance between the conduct of researchers and teachers of scientific truth and the requirements and dictates of the code of their profession. This care concerns especially the people with whom the guardian cooperates. It consists in undertaking educational, controlling or correcting activities if there occur anomalies or deviations in the conduct of those for whom one is responsible for reasons of one's duties within the milieu of scholars.

On the other hand, an advocate of the scholars' ethos is the person or an institution whose task is to present reasons and arguments for observing the principles and dictates of the ethos by people of science and for respecting these people's right to be guided by these principles and dictates.

The guardian and the advocate must do *a good job*. A *good job* done by the guardian means effective watching over the observance of the ethos by

people of science and over respecting it by other people. And effective watching consists in quick reacting or patient and solid educating and moulding. A *good job* done by the advocate means successful participation in disagreements about *the method of the community life order* of people of science and identifying situations which demand speaking up for the ethos as the professional code of the researchers and teachers of scientific truth. Both the guardian and the advocate should be conscientious and authoritative. The guardian's conscientiousness consists in proper reacting to actually existing or impending occurrences of the violation of ethos norms. The advocate's conscientiousness lies in proper reacting to objections and doubts raised in relation to ethos as *the method of the community life order* of people of science. Authoritativeness is achieved as a result of honesty in thinking and reliability at work. Being authoritative, one has a moral right to watch over his colleagues' conduct or to play the role of a public defender of scholars' principles and rights. It should be added that playing the roles of guardian and advocate is necessarily connected with manifesting such features as earnestness and firmness, as well as cleverness and resourcefulness.

A university becomes a guardian and an advocate if its academic staff fulfill two basic conditions: first, they have appropriate notions and convictions concerning the academic life, which we will call *the academic world view*; second, they properly perform their professional duties, which we will call *the academic practice*.

1. The academic world view

We can speak of it when the academic staff of a university is convinced that:

– The quest for scientific truth is a cooperative game played in a global milieu of scholars. This requires from its participants: a) *social conscience* (*taking interest in public matters, an ability to sacrifice personal interests for the sake of other people, that is generosity, ability to cooperate and the sense of responsibility for the social life*¹); b) *praxeology of science* (the point is to discover and popularize scientific truth through the cooperation of many people so there is no use dividing scholars into *the winners* and *the losers* as the development of knowledge and cognition that should be strived for is such that constitutes a collective success of the people participating in the game although they participate in it as advocates and protagonists of various *cognitive perspectives* and *research projects*); c) *professional orientation* (as a scholar specializes only in a certain field, thus he should identify with a disciplinary milieu where he can act as a competent researcher and teacher and which is a competent judge of his scientific endeavours and results of his work); d) *community bond* (all the people who seriously and solidly participate in gaming for scientific truth are colleagues, no matter where they work and what are their *cognitive perspectives* and *research projects*).

– In gaming for scientific truth and for *the method of the community life*

¹ M. Ossowska, *Normy moralne. Próba systematyzacji* [Moral Norms. The Attempt at Systematization], Warszawa 1970, p. 212.

order of people of science, the university is an instrument, not an autotelic value. Thus the academic staff should take into account the continuity and development of their institution and to care about the culture of cooperation and co-existence within their own circle, but they should do it with the awareness of belonging to the national and global milieu of scholars and to treat every properly operating academic centre (including their own institution) as a part of the normal academic life, i. e. one of the fields where the principles and dictates of ethos should be observed and respected. Thus, one should attach importance to the structural and functional values of the university. For the scholars *sensu proprio* it is a place where they perform their professional tasks as the participants of the quest for scientific truth. If a considerable number of enthusiastic and creative participants of the quest are gathered in such a place, they can influence the course of gaming for *the method of the community life order* in the world of scholars. Therefore, *a university is worth exactly as much as its share in gaming for truth and for morality and manners.*

– The following things are indispensable for the proper progress of gaming for scientific truth: a) autonomy of scientific cognition; b) freedom of thinking and scientific activity; c) scholars' autonomy in creating the axio-normative order of associations and institutions of academic life. Taking into account the benefits brought by science to a society which can understand and use it properly, these freedoms are necessary both for the scholars and the fatherland.

– The contents of the code and rule of the scholars' profession should constitute, for researchers and teachers or scientific truth, the elements of the order being *pays reel* of the academic life. On the other hand, they should understand and treat any edicts incompatible with these contents as the elements of the order being *pays legal* of the academic work sector. Thus, the principles and dictates of ethos are the most important for people participating in the quest for scientific truth, and if the possibility to observe them is threatened, the scholars are entitled to resort to *ius resistendi*.

– While gaming for scientific truth one knows only scholars¹, and so any connections or divisions important outside the game cannot be of any significance during the appraisal of activities and work results of people participating in the game. Mutual solidarity and loyalty of people of science as researchers and teachers constitutes the guarantee of peaceful and safe participation in the game. Solidarity and loyalty of scholars, irrespective of their differences as far as non-academic convictions and affiliations are concerned, enables them to cooperate effectively in searching for and discovering scientific truth and to speak up in defence of rights which are indispensable *if science is to be science.*

¹ It means that scholars do not attach importance to their race, nationality, social standing, religion, and that they are interested in their colleagues' world view only then, when it is a philosophical component of a cognitive orientation or when it includes ideas which are incompatible with the principles of the normal academic life.

2. The academic practice

2. 1. Research

The research activity aiming at the improvement of the structure of scientific knowledge and the system of scientific cognition lends meaning to other kinds of professional activity of the university's academic staff. If serious research work is not carried on in a university, then the teaching activity conducted there cannot be called the academic instruction. An academic teacher is an academic researcher. What does it mean? First, it means that an academic teacher is not a person who: a) passes down to students the knowledge which is created outside his circle without his active participation; b) teaches skills and abilities similarly as an instructor or a master who trains an apprentice to practice a trade or to acquire a technical skill; c) acquaints students only with such knowledge and such skills which are needed by people who are to solve practical problems or to prepare expert reports and designs of engineering nature. Second, it means that an academic teacher is a person who: a) participates in research and reflection leading to creating, developing and popularizing knowledge constituting an autotelic value and possessing the value of a theory; b) teaches this knowledge and the ability to study it; c) educates and moulds new researchers who want and can create and develop such knowledge; d) in the course of his work (both as a teacher and researcher) indicates the value and benefits of science being a peculiar and separate form of knowledge and cognition; e) can show the students that fulfilling *the epistemic function* by science enables it to perform *a humanist function* and *a technical function*, as well as *an informative function*.

The research activity also constitutes a condition of educating and moulding the academic cadres. Since the education of young academics consists largely in teaching them principles and rules, abilities and skills needed for the pursuit of scientific research and reflection, therefore it requires the participation of a pupil in research activities a) under the supervision and guidance of masters; b) as a creative and cognitively active researcher forming, through the research work, his or her intellectual, moral and technical values. That is why, in the university *sensu proprio* a master is only such a person whose title of an educator is based on his competence as *a researcher–theoretician* (*the role of researchers–theoreticians consists in participation in the development of objective scientific knowledge through creating new systems of relative truths, based on less perfect systems of the predecessors and constituting the ground for more perfect systems of the successors*¹). Competence needed by the master is acquired due to cognitive achievements in the quest for scientific truth and due to skillfulness in directing the process of the formation of the personalities of mature and creative *researchers–theoreticians*.

The research work of a university's academic staff can be referred to as *the academic practice* if these people comply with the following requirements:

– The requirement of deriving projects and subjects of research and reflection from *the problem situation* (a complex of scientific questions of

¹ F. Znaniecki, *Spoleczna rola uczonego* [The Social Role of the Man of Knowledge] in: F. Znaniecki, *Spoleczne role uczonego* [Social Roles of the Men of Knowledge], Warszawa 1984, p. 469.

epistemological, methodological and ontological kind and, in a certain sense, axiological one, rooted in basic disputes and fundamental questions specific to the academic life of a given community of scholars). The influence of *the problem situation* on the academic life of such a community consists in the fact that these questions: a) generate research projects, as well as particular subjects of research and reflection pursued individually or collectively; b) determine the space for creating schools and orientations in a given discipline or sub-discipline; c) direct scholars' invention and activity indicating what is worth selecting; d) inspire and stimulate ideas concerning the scholar's profession and the function of his professional output. Thus, taking into account *the problem situation* has a bearing on the quality of scientific creations, researchers' cognitive achievements, their aspirations, programmes of research and reflection, subjects and issues discussed by them, as well as on understanding and treating the modern and inherited scientific output and models of educating and moulding academic cadres.

– The requirement of respecting the researchers' disciplinary and sub-disciplinary competence. The university's academic staff will cooperate effectively only if the programmes and subjects of research are formulated and interpreted taking into consideration specialist knowledge and skills of the people whose participation is needed for conducting the research.

– The requirement of taking into account that the objects of the researchers' cognitive interest can be viewed from many different angles. The acceptance of the fact that the objects of interest of specialists in various disciplines and sub-disciplines are many-sided opens the road to: a) conducting inter-disciplinary research in the university for the sake of *integrating narration* (relating which is more complete, and thus more objective, than particular, complementary reports derived from specialist *points of view* and *cognitive perspectives*); b) perceiving and treating disciplinary and sub-disciplinary divisions as important, but relative and changing, as the same objects, problems and methods can unite (and often do) the researchers from various fields and, as the result, these people can better understand the aspects and subjects preferred by them.

– The requirement of objectivity during the whole process of research and reflection (from conceptualization to presentation). As the university is a classic institution of *the academic science*, its academic staff should set an example of adopting the attitude of the clerk pursuing the knowledge about the nature of *episteme*. Objectivity, which is a form of manifesting such an attitude, consists in: a) giving priority (before other motives and reasons) to the quest of knowledge which has a value of a theory, is a value in itself and gives a genuine satisfaction to the scholar *sensu proprio*; b) readiness to reinterpret and revise knowledge which is already established and applied in the research in order to improve its theoretical value; c) taking account of any reflections or arguments (no matter who presents them and what is the motivation behind it) significant for the improvement of a research process; d) rejecting any reasons (irrespective of the high office and importance of their advocates) which, if they were accepted, would lower the status of the subject of cognition in the research process as they would introduce a bias and limitation ob-

liging the researcher's intellect.

– The requirement of taking responsibility for continuity and development of pure science, that is caring about that, which is a cognitive value typical of science as it constitutes presentation and explanation of structures of reality in the form of a theory. This care consists in the following: a) defending the rule that *a scholar selects a cognitive problem – someone else tries to find the way in which the solution of this problem can be applied to solving a practical problem*; b) selecting such subjects which enable the scholar to conduct research and reflection aiming at the improvement of knowledge which has a theoretical value (it does not mean that other values of the subjects should not be taken into account, but that each subject should possess this value); c) caring about clear and explicit definition of expert reports and projects which serve solving practical problems (academic scholars can produce such works but they should be aware that while doing them they are not engaged in scientific research and they are not playing the role of a *researcher–theoretician*). Pure science is what distinguishes science as *the perspective on world*. That is why: a) caring about the continuity of conducting research by academic scholars, for the sake of theory as an autotelic value, is the defence of continuity and development of science as a separate and peculiar form of knowledge and cognition; b) projects of utilization of university research constitute threat for scientific cognition *tout court*.

2. 2. Establishing values

In the university whose academic staff complies with the requirements of *the academic practice* discussion is understood and treated as a form of science–generating activity, equally important as research and closely connected with it. Discussion performs the following functions:

– A judicial function. Participants of a discussion try to: a) judge activities and fruits of research with regard to their compatibility with standards and criteria binding in gaming for scientific truth; b) establish the importance and meaning of notions, theses and ideas which are candidates for cognitive values of scientific type; c) determine the level and range of the competence of scholars who conduct these activities and who are the authors of the analyzed and judged works. Scholars participating in a scientific discussion control the process of production, products and producers in the sphere of scientific research. The discussion results in disqualifying or promoting verdicts.

– A uniting function. Cooperation of people participating in the discussion makes it possible to: a) arrive at common interpretation and reinterpretation of theories and methods which operate in the academic life; b) adopt common rules and directions concerning the understanding and treatment of fundamental principles and dictates of gaming for scientific truth; c) agree about the contents of *the problem situation* which should be the object of common interest¹.

– A teaching function. Ideas presented by the participants of the dis-

¹ However, unity in discussion is achieved in two ways: establishing which ideas, presented by the participants of the discussion, are complementary, and which are alternative.

cussion: a) indicate new aspects and components of researchers' objects of cognitive interest; b) outline new problems and subjects which are worth being included in plans of research and reflection; c) demonstrate new possibilities of the perception and application of procedures, criteria and standards which function in the sphere of scientific research; d) reveal mistakes in conceptualization and realization of research and in interpretation of the research results; e) help to understand various aspects of the objects of research and complementariness of the points of view of the researchers who are interested in structures and processes of the same kind. Scholars participating in the discussion learn from one another. *The need for discussion and its essential function arises (...) from limitations and imperfections of creative, and especially cognitive, powers of an individual. It also frequently arises out of the awareness of our one-sidedness, so often unavoidable, as it springs either from the kind of our talents and abilities or from our predilections, changing it so often into a bias, the lack of inner freedom. Discussion (...) which is about seeking help from others, checking that, which we have achieved on our own and supplementing it with that, which we would not be able to achieve unaided, serves to overcome these human imperfections. And in this very function of mutual help and cooperation, discussion should and can achieve this freedom which we should all demand as a human right and, at the same time, as something which can make it a fair discussion*¹. Thus, discussion is a form of cooperation of people participating in the quest for scientific truth. Participants of a discussion learn in a twofold way: a) they get acquainted with ideas and concepts, reflections and suggestions uttered in the course of the discussion which enables them to improve their knowledge (enrich and refine it); b) they learn the art (method and etiquette) of presenting their views and reacting to views presented by others, which helps them in the quest for truth and improves them intellectually and morally.

– A complementing function. Discussion is a form of researchers' cooperation: separately from research activities and by means of joint, sober and objective analysis of premises, the way of conducting and the results of the research. This makes discussion a complement to research as in the course of the discussion scholars can: a) consider the meaning of notions and formulas applied *in the course of purposive proceedings*; b) put theses and conclusions obtained in the course of the research to the test of logical analysis; c) discover relations between the content of various research projects concerning issues of similar kind; d) reveal philosophical options and methodological orientations adopted by researchers and analyze advantages and consequences of these options and orientations; e) reflect on a culture-generating function of the analyzed research; f) examine the influence exerted on the researchers' intellect and morality by the content of the research and the way it is conducted.

In the discussion which is a form of *the academic practice* the most important thing (from the point of view of gaming for scientific truth) is establishing new, significant cognitive values and assisting people conducting

¹ R. Ingarden, *O dyskusji owocnej słów kilka* [A Few Words About the Fruitful Discussion] in: R. Ingarden, *Książeczka o człowieku* [A Booklet About the Man], Kraków 1972, pp. 189–190.

research and reflection leading to the creation of such values. In such a discussion the participants are obliged to: a) be critical, b) aim at consensus, c) ensure genuine pluralism. Consensus, as an objective, lends the meaning to the discussion. Criticism, as the way of approaching issues under discussion, ensures contributing to the development of knowledge and cognition. Pluralism, as a *structural axiom* permits revealing which of the researchers' attitudes and views are complementary and which are alternative.

2. 3. Moulding scholars

Continuity of *the academic practice* is continuity of observing and respecting the code and rule of gaming for scientific truth. It is not possible without *generations' relay* of people who can create and establish cognitive values, that is without continuing, from one generation to another, the education of academic cadres. The education of academic cadres being a form of *the academic practice* consists in self-teaching and participation of young academics in systems of academic activities, as well as performing them in concordance with the principles and dictates of scholars' ethos. It is education for science, for scholars' community, for a disciplinary community, but not for a university, as for the scholar *sensu proprio* each university is *an inn in our long journey* in the world of science. A cardinal rule on which such education is based, consists in using by teachers, in relation to their pupils, a technique of social *field structure*, i. e. moulding the pupils' intellectual, technical and moral qualities through their presence in many milieus of scholars, professional activity in many academic centres, getting acquainted with attitudes and views of advocates of many orientations, participation in work of many research teams and academic seminars, as well as in congresses, conferences, *summer schools* and other debates.

Educating the apprentices of science consists in conducting, by masters, such educational activity which teaches their pupils to understand and treat their profession in accordance with the following requirements:

- the requirement of *historism*, i. e. the duty (taken over from the predecessors and masters) to continue faithfulness to norms of the code and rules of gaming for scientific truth and passing down this duty to one's pupils and successors;

- the requirement of *universalism*, i. e. an obligation to see the academic life as the field of gaming for truth whose only limits are those delineated by the operation of milieus and groups conforming with the principles and dictates of the game. Therefore, the education of apprentices consists in instilling the notion that in normal academic life one knows only scholars. Their views and attitudes, activities and works are appraised with a view to these principles and dictates. Thus, the apprentices should be taught to disregard any differences, in the scholars' community, which do not spring from *the problem situation*;

- the requirement of *autotelism*, i. e. an obligation to understand that for a scholar a process of scientific cognition is the road to truth as a value in itself. The apprentices are taught that endeavouring to understand the structures of reality in order to present and explain them in the form of a theory is a proper

motive of scientific research and reflection, and thus participation in the quest for scientific truth is sufficiently satisfying and the man of science does not have to look for other justifications of his participation in the quest. The highest reward for the hardships of research and reflection is contributing to the development of knowledge and scientific cognition;

– the requirement of *cooperativeness*, i. e. an obligation to understand and treat each cognitive success as a common victory and each established cognitive value as the common good of all the people gaming for scientific truth. As *intentional cooperation* is the condition of continuity and development of the game, then it is indispensable that people participating in it should act in a way which promotes continuity and development of this cooperation;

– the requirement of *criticism*, i. e. an obligation to question spoken and written scientific utterances in order to perfect knowledge and scientific cognition. Therefore, apprentices are educated properly if their masters teach them to manifest criticism which is characterized by the following features: a) *integrity* (criticism concerns the content and form of any utterances aspiring to the status of scientific utterances and possessing such a status, and especially propositions explaining the reality and indications concerning the way of conducting research); b) *consistency* (criticism is aimed at attaining theoretical grounds of analyzed utterances, their philosophical and methodological premises and at revealing cognitive consequences of propagated propositions and suggested indications, indicating a possible influence on the course of gaming for scientific truth); c) *adherence to principles* (criticism concerns issues which are important for the progress and results of gaming for scientific truth, it does not concern matters which are interesting for curiosity or scandal hunters); d) *constructiveness* (criticism combines indicating faults and imperfections in analyzed utterances with presentation of conceptions which can enrich these utterances by complementing them or improve them by change or replacement); e) *conventionality* (criticism is made in accordance with the etiquette of scientific debates, that is with kindness, goodwill and sobriety, with the sense of responsibility for one's words and care about continuity and development of solidary and loyal cooperation of people gaming for scientific truth); f) *concreteness* (criticism points clearly and distinctly to particular faults and imperfections of analyzed utterances, presenting arguments justifying the grounds for recognizing them as faults and imperfections).

Education of apprentices is equivalent to moulding scholars only then, when the masters care about instilling in their pupils the belief in the necessity of observing and respecting the set of deontological directives. They can be described as follows:

– *An academic is a man, whose professional obligation is to be disobedient in thinking. His service to the society consists in the fact that while performing his professional activities he cannot be obedient in thinking. In this respect, he cannot obey neither a synod, nor the party, nor a minister, nor Caesar, nor God. If he is obedient, if he changes his views at someone's order or if his thought is not in agreement with his words, he departs from his obligations, in the same way as an engineer does if he, for profit or out of laziness or meanness, or just because he wants to be left in peace, replaces*

reinforced concrete with air-bricks or granite with wood¹.

– Any state of limiting freedom of speech in science is the state of conflict, and compromise in this respect is equivalent to giving up the social role of scholar. An academic without freedom of speech becomes either an office worker, or a gambler, or a conspirator².

– Sacrificing the sense of truth, intellectual purity, faithfulness to laws and methods of the spirit to other interests, fatherland including, is a treason. If, in the course of the struggle between these interests and slogans, the truth is threatened with the same devaluation, degeneration and violation as an individual man, as a language, as all the kinds of art, as everything that is organic, or sophisticated, then our only duty is to oppose it and to save the truth, or rather to continue the quest for truth constituting the highest article of our faith. A scholar who as a speaker, as an author, as a teacher consciously tells an untruth, consciously supports lies and falsifications, not only breaks organic rules, but also, contrary to all present-day appearances, does not bring any profit to the nation, but does great harm to it (...) and supports everything which is bad and hostile, which threatens the nation with destruction³.

We must be aware that in the course of discovering and correcting mistakes we need people (and they need us), and especially those, who have been brought up in different circumstances and on different ideas. This is also the road to tolerance. (...) *We must learn that the best criticism is self-criticism, and that criticism made by others is necessary. It is as good as self-criticism*⁴.

3. The academic system

A university which aspires to fulfilling the mission of the guardian and advocate of ethos should have a system in which the following things are particularly important: a) organizational structure which takes into account disciplinary structure and permits cooperation in *the problem situation* (the division into segments and cells proves that the order of gaming for scientific truth determines the system of work division in an institution); b) *field structure* as the concept and method of functional situating a university in the academic life (cultural diffusion and changes in the academic staff due to scholars mobility make a university *open* and *cooperative*, i. e. belonging to the world of participants of the quest for scientific truth); c) autonomy in conceiving research and teaching projects, which the academic staff of a university can use in a way proving their knowledge of duties resulting from the participation in the quest for scientific truth and their knowledge of

¹ S. Ossowski, *Taktyka i kultura* [Tactics and Culture] in: S. Ossowski, *Marxizm i twórczość naukowa w społeczeństwie socjalistycznym* [Marxism and Scientific Output in the Socialist Society], Warszawa 1957, pp. 92–93.

² S. Ossowski, *Problematyka swobody słowa w dyskusjach naukowych* [Freedom of Speech in Academic Discussions] in: *Kultura i Społeczeństwo* 4/1983, p. 8.

³ H. Hesse, *Gra szklanych paciorków* [The Glass Bead Game], Poznań 1971, p. 365.

⁴ K. R. Popper, *Dwanaście tez o zawodowej etyce inteligencji* [Twelve Theses About the Professional Ethics of the Intelligentsia] in: *Prezentacje* 7/1983, pp. 14–15.

obligations towards their own national culture; d) elementary structures, i. e. small academic groups: stable, representing interests of particular disciplinary or sub-disciplinary communities, combining the activity of a research team, debating group (seminar) and teaching team.

The academic system originates and lasts thanks to the proper academic staff of a university. The university which is to fulfill the mission of the guardian and advocate of ethos, needs *people who have the strong backbone and do not waver with every change of the wind*, and such a backbone results from *possessing the hierarchy of values to which one is attached and which one is not going to give up*¹. And such people doing their job within the university will be guided by a directive which can be summed up as follows: *The man is clearly created for thinking, that is all his dignity; and the only thing he deserves the credit for and his only duty is to think properly. (...) The man is only a reed, the frailest in nature, but a thinking reed. (...) All our dignity lies therefore in thought. (...) Let's exert ourselves then to think well: this is a moral principle. (...) I should look for my dignity (...) in the order of my thought*².

¹ M. Ossowska, *Przebyta droga* [*The Covered Distance*] in: M. Ossowska, *O człowieku, moralności i nauce. Miscellanea* [*About the Man, Morality and Science. Miscellaneous*], Warszawa 1983, p. 559.

² B. Pascal, *Myśli* [*Thoughts*], Warszawa 1959, p. 126, p. 144.