Wilhelm Krull

"The Times They Are a-Changin" – Intellectual and institutional challenges for European universities
Keynote at the HUMANE 2018 Annual Conference: "Retaining public trust in universities in a post truth world", Malmö, 16th of June 2018

Come mothers and fathers
Throughout the land
And don't criticize
What you can't understand
Your sons and your daughters
Are beyond your command
Your old road is
Rapidly agin'.
Please get out of the new one
If you can't lend your hand
For the times they are a-changin'.

Bob Dylan

Distinguished Colleagues,
Ladies and Gentlemen,

It's a great pleasure and an honor for me to address you on the occasion of your Annual Conference. With "Retaining Public Trust in Universities in a Post Truth World" you have chosen a very pertinent topic which – whether we like it or not – has to be of great concern to all of us who care for the health of our universities as well as the well-being of society at large.

In this respect I can only congratulate you on the acronym you have chosen for your association: HUMANE. It implies being kind to people in need, caring for others as well as practicing compassion and empathy towards those who are suffering. This is exactly what we need more of if we want to work our way towards a sustainable future, not only of institutions like universities, cities, and nation states but also for humanity at large.

As many of you will no doubt have recognized, I chose for the title of my speech a famous line from singer-songwriter (and Nobel laureate) Bob Dylan: "The Times They Are a-Changin". In particular the fourth verse acquired a kind of cult status for all those who were

sympathetic to the various protest movements in the second half of the 1960s which most of us have come to identify with the culmination of student riots across the globe in the spring of 1968.

Well, 50 years ago the established elites, be it professors, politicians, or industrial leaders, probably felt much more threatened in their respective comfort zones than today. And yet I cannot help but acknowledge that despite all the differences between the intellectual and institutional challenges then and now, we seem to be also sliding down a slippery slope. No doubt, a different one than in the late 1960s, but also one that is affecting some of the fundamental pillars of our democratically organized welfare states. A lot of things we took for granted are now at best being questioned, more often, however, they are head-on being rejected and in some cases even violently attacked. More and more right-wing populist movements openly declare their distrust in scientific experts and consider research-based evidence to be yet another partisan view which can more or less easily be dismissed by presenting "alternative facts".

1. What is changing and why?

If we take a panoramic view of the political landscape on our planet, we cannot help but admit that we are living in turbulent times.

In 2015, Europe suffered from a refugee crisis, when rising numbers of refugees arrived in the European Union, travelling across the Mediterranean Sea or overland through Southeast Europe. These people included asylum seekers, but also others, such as economic migrants and in some cases even hostile agents such as militants from the so called 'Islamic State' disguised as refugees. Particularly in Germany some people felt that the government was no longer able to master the situation, notwithstanding the fact that since then, as a consequence of the EU-Turkey deal, the number of asylum seekers arriving in the European Union in general and in Germany in particular dropped quite significantly. Perhaps, the most embarrassing fact for Europe is that to the present day the Union has been unable to come to a joint European response to this crisis, and that the Member States still have diverging policies about how to deal with refugees, asylum seekers, or migrants. In consequence of this crisis and the fact that there was no common European response to this problem, nationalist and populist tendencies gained significant attendance. Let me summarize this development with a short synopsis of what happened in Europe in the aftermath of the events of 2015:

First, there was the United Kingdom European Union membership referendum on 23 June 2016. The referendum resulted in 51.9 % of voters opting in favor of leaving the European Union. In spite of the fact that this was a very tight result, the British government initiated the official EU withdrawal process on 29 March 2017 which put the United Kingdom on course to complete the withdrawal process by 30 March 2019 (what becomes more and more unlikely). Another significant event which attracted Europe wide attention was the Austrian presidential election, not only because a candidate proposed by the Greens, Alexander Van der Bellen made it to the run-off vote, but also because the alternative candidate was Norbert Hofer from the 'Freedom Party' of Austria, which in fact is a right-wing national populist movement that supports euro-sceptic views and opinions. The results of the second round of voting were very close: 49.7 % for Hofer, 50.3 % for Van der Bellen. However, they were annulled by the Constitutional Court of Austria due to voting irregularities affecting the postal voting. In the re-run on 4 December 2016 Hofer still received 46% of the vote but had to concede the election to Van der Bellen. The parliamentary elections in 2017 finally brought the 'Freedom Party' jointly with the Conservative Party back into the Federal Government.

In March 2017 the Dutch general election kept Europe on tenterhooks. Much to the relieve of pro-European minds, the Dutch nationalist and right-wing populist political party in the Netherlands, yet another 'Party for Freedom', was not as strong as expected and won only 20 of the 150 seats in the Dutch parliament.

No less exciting were the French presidential elections which followed in May 2017 and the French legislative election of June 2017. It happened that the political movement 'En marche!' which was founded only in April 2016 by Emmanuel Macron, a former member of the French socialist party and a former Minister of Economy, Industry and Digital Affairs, eventually won both elections. In particular the French legislative election led to a complete rearrangement of the political landscape in France with deep losses for the French socialist party and the conservatives. 'En Marche!' is a new centrist and liberal political power in France, and the only 40 years old Macron who managed to keep down the French right-wing nationalist party 'Front National' is now the President of France.

The German federal election last year showed that even in a country so well off as Germany which benefits enormously from the European Union and international trade, the right-wing nationalist party 'Alternative for Germany' was able to gain more votes than expected by election researchers. The party now holds 92 out of 709 seats at the German Bundestag.
The Catalan independence referendum of 1 October 2017 as well as the subsequent Venetian and Lombard autonomy referenda in October 2017 are three examples of regions

within Europe which strive for more independence and autonomy. These regions, however, are only examples of similar processes in other parts of Europe: Scotland, Belgium, i. e. Flanders, and the Basque region.

Andrej Babis, a Czech businessman and media mogul, is not only one of the richest men in the country but also the winner of the recent legislative election in October 2017. He seems to be something like the "Czech Republic's answer to Donald Trump".[1]

In autumn last year, the Hungarian Prime Minister Orban declared a "migrant-free zone" in Eastern Europe. After campaigning with a strong anti-immigration focus his coalition secured two-thirds of the seats in parliament in the general election in April this year and now holds a majority strong enough to even change the country's constitution.

Among other things, all of these developments indicate – I may say in advance – an increasing trend towards a retribalization of public discourse as well as an implosion of what we used to call 'the public sphere', which has more or less been replaced by echo chambers and populist networks of outrage. And to anticipate a later part of my talk, the nowadays extremely fragmented setting of (online) communication channels is deeply intertwined with this development. But what to my mind rests at the core of these changes is of a rather psychological or emotional nature. Perhaps, what has happened can also be captured with one of Dominique Moïsi's insights from his book "Geopolitics of Emotion":

> "The Other will increasingly become part of us in our multicultural societies. The emotional frontiers of the world have become as important as its geographical frontiers."[2]

And in her study of Tea Party adherents in America, the sociologist Arlie Russel Hochschild has described a similar finding of an emotional barrier separating people which she called an *empathy wall*,

> "an obstacle to deep understanding of another person, one that can make us feel indifferent or even hostile to those who hold different beliefs or whose childhood is rooted in different circumstances."[3]

---

[1] http://www.independent.co.uk/news/world/europe/czech-republic-elections-2017-andrej-babis-win-us-president-donald-trump-a8011596.html, viewed on 27 October 2017.
[2] D. Moïsi, The Geopolitics of Emotion, 2009, p. 144.
[3] A. R. Hochschild, Strangers in Their Own Land: Anger and Mourning on the American Right, 2016, p. 5.

Indeed, as we see fences and border walls rising, the emotional barriers rise just with them or may even precede them.

2. Specific threats and opportunities for European Universities

2.1 Threats

These developments are not stopping at the doorsteps of our universities – let me highlight just a few examples, which exemplify where this kind of New Nationalism is rather crossing them.

One of the most prominent – and saddest – examples is the Central European University in Budapest. The Central European University was founded and equipped with quite a considerable endowment by George Soros in the 1990s with a particular emphasis on the support of open societies in the post-communist era. The university is accredited in the United States, State of New York, and in Hungary, and it is located in the center of Budapest. In 2017 the Hungarian government introduced new regulations for foreign-operating universities, several of which affect the Central European University: Now the government asks for a mandatory agreement with the university's other country of operation and a corresponding campus with a similar degree scheme as well as working permits for non-EU staff. All these requirements are not met or only partially met by the Central European University. After massive protests and strong reactions from the European Commission the Hungarian government prolonged the Central European University's general license for one year. So the struggle continues and reached another climax when in April this year the Hungarian media outlet *Figyelo* published an article listing a few hundred people as so-called "Soros-mercenaries", many of whom work for the CEU. By now, the university is about to open a third campus in Vienna, which is seen by many as another sign that its long-term future in Budapest is quite uncertain. The same applies to the Open Society Foundation which moved its headquarters to Berlin earlier this month.

Consider next the so-called Brexit and its consequences for research and higher education in the UK: On 6 October 2017 the European Commission published a note concerning the participation of UK researchers in the Research Framework Programme:[4]

> "If the United Kingdom withdraws from the EU during the grant period without concluding
> an agreement with the EU ensuring in particular that British applicants continue to be

---

[4] http://ec.europa.eu/research/participants/portal/desktop/en/support/about.html, viewed 6 November 2017.

eligible, you will cease to be eligible to receive EU funding or be required to leave the project on the basis of Article 50 of the grant agreement."

Indeed, losing the right to participate in the Research Framework Programme would cause serious damages to the UK research system which benefits heavily form EU research funding. This is particularly evident from the success of UK applicants winning prestigious ERC grants. Moreover, currently UK universities receive 15 % of their funding from the EU. And over 200,000 British students have benefited from the Erasmus exchange programme.[5] And while higher education experts estimate a continued high demand among domestic and international students to study at higher education institutions and universities in the UK, it remains unclear how this will affect particular institutions. Even the country's top ranking universities, Oxford and Cambridge, have noticed diverging trends and effects: While Oxford has seen a 10 % rise in the number of international applications from within the European Union, this figure makes striking contrast with Cambridge which saw a 14.1 % drop in applications from the continent.[6]

In consequence it is difficult for the UK universities to foresee the development of revenues from tuition fees. Some university bursaries hope that after Brexit EU students may be charged tuition fees at more expensive international rates. According to a report from the Higher Education Policy Institute[7] (HEPI) there is a potential to increase tuition fee revenues by £187 million in the first year which would set higher education institutions in an even better position. Furthermore, the institute estimates that a 10 % drop in the price of Sterling could lead to around 20,000 additional international students.

The preconditions for these prospects, of course, are that European and international students will not shy away from the high costs and the uncertainties about the future development of the United Kingdom outside the European Union. At the moment, uncertainty concerning visa arrangements, participation rights in EU funding programmes and brain drain pose the greatest problems for the research and higher education landscape in the United Kingdom. "Uncertainty about whether British researchers will be eligible for grants after we leave in 2019 is already having a chilling effect," said Wellcome Trust Director Jeremy Farrar in September 2017. "Wellcome knows of some who have already been excluded from grants,

5 http://www.telegraph.co.uk/education/0/will-brexit-impact-british-universities/, viewed 27 October 2017.
6 http://www.telegraph.co.uk/education/0/will-brexit-impact-british-universities/, viewed 27 October 2017.
7 http://www.telegraph.co.uk/education/0/will-brexit-impact-british-universities/, cf. http://www.hepi.ac.uk/category/publications/, viewed on 27 October 2017.

abandoned potential collaborations, or chosen to work in another country with more certain funding."[8]

The situation in Poland is alarming, too. That Polish rectors are cautious and praise the current Polish Minister of Science and Higher Education, Jarosław Gowin, reservedly as "well-informed" is due to the fact that he develops a major higher education reform which aims at strengthening the dynamics of the Polish higher education system by reducing bureaucracy. On the other hand, and irritatingly enough, Gowin announced that he would like to foster a subject which he calls "Polish Humanities" which seems to be no less than reshaping and 'polonizing' the humanities against the background of partisan political views and intentions.[9] Under the auspices of the right-wing populist and national-conservative party 'Law and Justice' the humanities in Poland seem to be under severe pressure. This can also be seen from the fact that the longstanding deliberations on editing and continuously appraising a joint German-Polish History Textbook are now in turmoil due to conflicting interpretations of national histories influenced by national-conservative policies in Poland.

Even worse is the situation in Turkey. When the Volkswagen Foundation announced its decision to fund a Turkish-German 'Academy in Exile' for researchers who were dismissed for political reasons by the Turkish government in the aftermath of the coup d'état of the Turkish military in 2016, the Volkswagen Foundation was immediately attacked by Turkish nationalist media with the aim of demonstrating that the funds were made available for what they thought were terrorists and adherents to the Gülen movement. The fact that the selection of candidates will be based on quality criteria with a strong focus on the scholars' academic performance was of no interest to the Turkish correspondents. Instead, they villainized the Turkish born initiator of this 'Academy in Exile' as "an academic who gained her reputation in Germany with anti-Turkish scholarship and defaming Turkey". At the VolkswagenFoundation we decided after extensive consultation with the German Foreign Office not to take legal action against this, so that we would not provide further ammunition for the Turkish media.

But I should also add two remarks on what happens inside science. First, and sadly, the lack of trust which science faces today may also be rooted in defects which occur within the academic system. We have to admit that many studies are financed by companies or interest groups and that this is a challenge for credibility and academic independence. According to a

---

8   https://sciencebusiness.net/framework-programmes/news/uk-scientists-told-no-deal-brexit-scenario-they-will-have-leave-eu, viewed 27 October 2017.
9   Jan-Martin Wiarda, „Wissenschaftsfreiheit", DSW Journal, 1/2017, p. 17-18.

recent study, 76 % of Germans think that one reason for distrust in science is that researchers depend on external financial sources[10] – an issue which is indeed problematic in times when the basic-funding of universities is stagnant or even decreasing. Researchers have to be careful that they contribute to evidence-based policy making instead of taking part in policy-based evidence making.

Furthermore, first and foremost my home country Germany has witnessed a series of plagiarism scandals. During the last few years many prominent people, among them several politicians had to recede from their positions. This applied to the former Minister of Defence and even the former Minister of Education and Research, because obvious – in the former case – or latent – in the latter case – forms of plagiarism were detected in the politician's PhD theses. And even within academia it is clear that the PhD phase faces serious quality assurance difficulties in some disciplines, in particular with respect to subjects like medicine in Germany where the doctoral phase is more or less integrated into the regular course of studies. While plagiarism seems to be an issue predominantly within the humanities and social sciences, the experimental sciences face the problem of reproducibility. According to an Economist article[11], the majority of studies in the life sciences cannot be reproduced. "How Science Goes Wrong" was the memorable headline of an issue in October 2013. While this must not necessarily be an indicator for faked experiments or made up results, the mere fact that so many studies are affected is in itself alarming indeed. No wonder that this provides fertile ground for distrust against science and scholarships.

Secondly, we should be careful not to dismiss the growing populism and nationalism I mentioned as only happening outside of academia. It is easy to conceive it (and it is often described so) as being connected to a more general distrust and resentment against the so-called "elites". But consider the example of the 'Alternative für Deutschland' which as I mentioned earlier now occupies about 12 % of the seats in the German Bundestag: It was founded in late 2012 and in the beginning often called a "Professoren-Partei", because many of its active members were established academics at German universities. The New Nationalism is not just rising at the margins of our societies but threatening them from deeply within. Furthermore, across Europe and North America the voters most hostile or the least supportive to liberal democracy are the centrists (and not the far right and the far left).[12]

---

[10] Wissenschaftsbarometer 2017, https://www.wissenschaft-im-dialog.de/projekte/wissenschafts barometer/wissenschaftsbarometer-2017/, viewed 7 November 2017.
[11] The Economist, 19-25 October 2013, How Science Goes Wrong.
[12] David Adler: Centrists are the most hostile to democracy. In: The New York Times International Edition. Thursday, May 31, 2018, p.15.

2.2 Opportunities

In times like these, it can be helpful to remind ourselves of the lines of the German poet Friedrich Hölderlin: „Wo aber Gefahr ist, wächst / Das Rettende auch." – or literally translated to English: "But where the danger is, also grows / the saving power." So let us not be devastated by the current political climate and overlook the opportunities which arise out of this for our European universities.

One such opportunity for academia was brought to focus by the French President Emmanuel Macron in a speech held at the Sorbonne on the 26th of September last year, where Macron laid out his thoughts for the future of Europe and the European Union. He argued that the "cement that binds the European Union together will always be culture and knowledge" and thus argued that we

> "… should create European Universities – a network of universities across Europe with programmes that have all their students study abroad and take classes in at least two languages. These European Universities will also be drivers of educational innovation and the quest for excellence. We should set for ourselves the goal of creating at least 20 of them by 2024. However, we must begin setting up the first of these universities as early as the next academic year, with real European semesters and real European diplomas."[13]

Similarly, on the 14th of November, 2017, the European Commission published a proposal to create a "European Education Area" by 2025 which also includes (although at a slower pace than envisaged by Macron) the establishment of a European universities' network and a so-called Sorbonne-process to achieve mutual recognition of higher education, school leaving diplomas, and study periods abroad. Let me just sketch briefly some of the other reactions to the proposal of "European universities" as it was delivered at the Sorbonne:

On the 10th of March this year, the four universities of Charles University in the Czech Republic, Heidelberg University in Germany, Sorbonne University in France, and the University of Warsaw in Poland founded the European University Alliance "4EU". And although this cooperation had been in the making for two years, and representatives of the universities emphasized that it was therefore not motivated by Macron's proposal, they also said that they would like to be seen as a pilot for a new type of European university.

---

[13]   http://international.blogs.ouest-france.fr/archive/2017/09/29/macron-sorbonne-verbatim-europe-18583.html, viewed 18 April 2018.

Similarly, "Eucor – The European Campus", in which the universities of Basel, Freiburg, Haute-Alsace, and Strasbourg, as well as the Karlsruhe Institute of Technology are involved, was founded already in late 2015 to establish "a clearly defined economic and research epicentre without walls and borders and with an international flair"[14]. But on 12th April this year, a joint declaration was signed, expressing the intention to develop Eucor further into a European university. Another one that has been in existence for quite some time is the "U4-Network" of the universities of Ghent, Göttingen, Groningen, and Uppsala. Its protagonists have also expressed a strong interest in being a contender for the envisaged status of a 'European University'.

A lot of the existing or proposed networks are set up as small clusters of close-by universities which jointly develop programmes for masters and doctoral courses as well as research projects and possibly even share some infrastructure. But a proposal for a quite different kind of European university has also been made by German journalists Manuel Hartung and Matthias Krupa recently: They argue for establishing just one rather large university with around 75.000 students. This university should in turn consist of five institutes focusing on different subject fields: One focusing on the future of society, the next one on digitalization, and another one on technology and engineering. Location-wise, Hartung and Krupa argue for distributing these institutes among the countries at the periphery of the European Union: Portugal, Estonia, the Czech Republic, Sweden, and the Netherlands – each institute building on already existing infrastructure and professional experience.[15]

Of course, the mission and vision of truly European universities needs to be more clearly defined and substantial funding be provided by the EU Commission as well as the respective member states. But together with some other suggestions for changes to be made in higher education, research and innovation policies, there are signs of forward thinking and hope for a more sustainable future of academic life in Europe. Perhaps we can even help to create truly European scholarly communities like the ones that came into being soon after the founding of universities in Bologna, Paris, Prague, Oxford and Cambridge in the 11th and 12th century.

3. Institutional and managerial challenges

Let me give you a short summary of what I've tried to say so far:

---

[14] http://www.eucor-uni.org/en/eucor-european-campus, viewed 25 April 2018.
[15] https://www.zeit.de/2018/06/europaeische-union-bildung-universitaeten-forschung, viewed 25 April 2018.

- The times are rapidly changing, and in many ways this seems threatening to the existing order. Many people feel especially unsettled by the increasing speed with which our societies are changing (not last due to scientific and technological developments).
- Two major aspects of change on which I focused in my talk are the rise of populism and New Nationalism on the one hand, and the increasingly complex and fragmented setting of (online) communication channels on the other. Both are of course intertwined and may even be mutually reinforcing.
- Universities are in the middle of this change; they can no longer be considered neutral institutions at the margins of the political sphere (if they ever were…). For quite some time they have been focusing on institutional autonomy, and perhaps forgotten that academic freedom must be secured first of all.
- At the same time, rapidly changing times also provide opportunities to shape the future. I have mentioned as one example of such shaping the prospect of "Europeanizing" our universities further, of bringing societies closer together by fostering interaction and exchange of students and researchers across European countries, but also by opening up our classrooms and laboratories to the wider public.

In the remainder of my talk, I would like to focus a bit more on three aspects which I consider crucial when it comes to the question of how we should actually develop our individual institutions: Trust, transparency, and the changing role of leadership.

3.1 Trust and Transparency

Protectionist policies, the erection of walls and fences, and attempts at closing internationally minded institutions such as the Central European University in Budapest are among the most alarming signs of an increasing tendency to restrict or even discard the principles and preconditions of an open society. As far as academia is concerned, it will be essential to regain trust in scientific and scholarly expertise as well as in its mode of operation. However, achieving this is not at all straight forward, and what we need is a fundamental change in the hitherto common practices of communication.

To a large extent, universities are still committed to a linear sender-receiver model of communication. Press releases, glossy university magazines and annual reports – science communication often consists of researchers proudly telling the public the extent of their

capabilities and achievements. But raising expectations for scientific breakthroughs, and maybe even overselling the importance of one's research, can easily undermine trust as well. So we should be careful not to mistake communication with public relations, and furthermore have to conceive it as an interactive activity (which starts with listening carefully to local voices).

The crisis of trust, which is so often invoked, is just as much a crisis of *the public* (if there ever was such a thing) falling apart into various less and less connected public spheres. So instead of primarily speaking to the public, it will be essential for scientists and scholars to first of all listen to the people in front of them, to take their concerns seriously, to pay attention to the social pressures they are exposed to, and to accept that overcoming emotional differences – breaking down empathy walls – may in the beginning matter just as much or even more so than the coherence and consistency of the respective arguments. Given the fact that in several of the most recent surveys conducted in Europe the share of people who support the view that higher education and research contribute significantly to the future wellbeing of our societies has been rapidly declining (in particular among the less well-educated parts of the population), we have more than enough reasons to open up labs and classrooms for critical as well as creative thinking, and to embark upon new modes of interactions in at least some of the quite diversified public spheres.

With regard to opening up labs and universities, "transparency" is often invoked as a panacea for creating trust. However, it is important to not conceive of "transparent universities" as some kind of magic solution, but be aware of the corresponding double-edgedness. Let me quote the philosopher Byung-Chul Han in stating that

> "[t]oday the word 'transparency' is haunting all spheres of life […]. Transparency creates trust, the new dogma affirms. What is forgotten thereby is that such insistence on transparency is occurring in a society where the meaning of 'trust' has been massively compromised."[16]

To see the sense in which trust has become compromised, consider a definition of trust provided in a study by Roger Mayer, James Davis and David Schoorman as

---

[16] Byung-Chul Han, The Transparency Society, 2015, p. vii

> "the willingness of a party to be vulnerable to the actions of another party based on the expectation that the other will perform a particular action important to the trustor, irrespective of the ability to monitor or control that other party."[17]

They further argue that judgements of trust are made along three dimensions of perceived trustworthiness. Applied to the case of science, these take the following form:

- A judgement of expertise: scientists are able to solve problems and generate knowledge.
- A judgment of integrity: scientists adhere to a set of justifiable methods and principles.
- A judgement of benevolence: scientists do research for society and the public good.

In other words, an essential part of trusting someone consists in being to a certain degree dependent on the good-will of that person – otherwise trust simply becomes supervision. So we should not expect that full transparency will automatically create a trusting atmosphere; instead it rather runs the danger of only aiming at a demonstration of integrity: By making science as transparent as possible, it might only be shown that scientists comply with the right principles and methods. And, even further, one might get used to assuming that there is a need for controlling scientist's integrity – that it is necessary to prevent scientists from betraying societal trust. Ivan Krastev puts this very succinctly in stating that "[u]nfortunately, most of the initiatives that claim to rebuild civic trust are in reality helping arouse a democracy of mistrust. This trend is nowhere more evident than in today's popular obsession with transparency."[18]

In a recent survey German citizens were asked, why they trusted scientists, and they were given possible answers like "Because scientists are experts in their field.", "Because scientists work according to rules and standard procedures." and "Because scientists do research in the public interest.". While about 70 % and 53 % agreed with the first two answer options, only 40 % chose the belief that scientists do research in the public interest as a reason for their trust in science. And many people feel that scientists depend too much on their funders and their funders' interests, especially when these are from the private sector. It seems that the most work with regard to establishing trust has thus to be done along the dimension of "benevolence". Let us consider this as a first hint at what new modes of science communication should strive for: establishing an understanding and feeling that science is

---

[17] Mayer, R. C., Davis, J. H., Schoorman, F. D. (1995). An integrative model of organizational trust. The Academy of Management Review *Vol 20, Issue* 3, p. 712.
[18] Ivan Krastev, The Transparency Delusion, Eurozine, 2013, https://www.eurozine.com/the-transparency-delusion/, viewed 5 June, 2018.

actually done *for* society in general and with society in mind – and first of all, listening to people to get an understanding of what it is that concerns them and what according to them it would mean for scientists *to have society in mind*.

A second hint might be taken from a group of scientists from Bucknell University in the USA which is developing what they call the "Social Structure of Science Index". They aim to test the hypothesis that providing knowledge about the social organization of science – about how collaborative research is done, how scientific results get checked through formal or informal peer review etc. – is conducive to citizen's trust in science, and although they are still in the process of developing the necessary tools and methods to empirically test that hypothesis, the first tentative results do point in this direction. It also suggests another goal new modes of science communication should strive for: creating an understanding of how science is actually being done as a social process of knowledge generation.

Finally, new modes of communication should aim at including citizens into these very processes of knowledge generation themselves. Not just does society need academia, the reverse holds true just as well: Citizens and society in general offer a multitude of ideas and viewpoints which can be harnessed as resources and new inspirations for science.

However, achieving such an inclusion and, more generally, regaining trust in scientific and scholarly expertise as well as in its mode of operation will require various steps and measures. They include:

- New, interactive modes of communication that try to overcome still existing asymmetries;
- Enhanced transparency with respect to processes and procedures involved in the generation of new knowledge;
- Increasing opportunities for the participation of citizens in agenda-setting processes as well as citizen-science based projects;
- New modes of operation such as focus groups, consensus conferences, and online consultations;
- More bidirectional exchanges of views and concerns as well as the mutual perception of risks;
- Reconfiguring consultation processes in order to facilitate debates on scenarios of desirable futures and the co-creation of common positions.

In all of this we should be fully aware that trust is a particularly vulnerable social bond. It is easy to get lost but hard to rebuild.

3.2 The Changing Role of Leadership

Clearly, establishing such measures requires a lot of work and provides many challenges for our academic institutions and thus for the leadership and management of these institutions. Let me therefore conclude my talk with a few reflections on leadership in our rapidly changin' times and what we might aim for when it comes to shaping institutions for the future.

On that latter part, it is my firm belief that what we should aspire within our universities is first and foremost a culture of creativity. Admittedly, 'creativity' just like 'innovation' is also one of the most overused and under-defined terms in current policy discourse. The common denominator seems to be that creativity manifests itself in a piece of work that requires not merely mechanical skills to produce, but intelligence and imagination. I would like to describe such creativity as one of the main components of the elementary conditions for innovative and successful research work. While reflecting on other relevant aspects a model of the seven 'C's – not to confuse with the 'seven seas' – came to mind:

1. **Competence:** The first precondition of successful research is to provide the best training for the future generation of academics and to enable researchers in general to develop their skills freely and in the best learning environment. This is a basic prerequisite without which no further scientific development appears to be possible.
2. **Courage:** Not only researchers, but also the institutional leadership and external funders must be both courageous and adventurous. You can only encourage people to enter new fields and leave the beaten track if you are prepared to share the risks. The readiness to take risks must be complemented by a high degree of trust and error tolerance.
3. **Commitment:** Not only researchers, but also the institutional leadership and funders must make proof of their reliable commitment. People, and scientists in particular, can often only be encouraged to enter new fields and leave the beaten track if a certain degree of security is provided. While funders and supporters will always take risks, the strong commitment of supported researchers must always be one of their selection criteria.
4. **Communication:** Thought-provoking discussions are essential for achieving progress in research, in particular cross-disciplinary and transcultural exchanges, but also interactions with the outside world. Such communication processes should not

regularly be the central aspect of research projects, but their inspirational value should by no means be under-estimated.

5. **Co-operation:** Working closely with partners and informed actors cannot only leave a positive impact on one's own efforts. It can also be an opportunity to engage local and regional actors to benefit mutually and to ascertain a solidly rooted project base. International co-operation is fundamental in modern science and scholarship.

6. **Continuity:** Forging new paths in a barely known territory often takes longer than two or three years, the usual lengths of project funding. Mistakes must be allowed as well as changes of direction, but an overall continuity should be upheld.

7. **Centers/clusters:** Research initiatives can be improved by bringing together outstanding experts from similar fields. While this should not result in an isolationist approach, the exchange and merged competence can be a source of stronger results. In times of increasing (international) co-operation, centers and clusters are a sensible institutional response.

Thinking and working in terms of complex and possibly time-consuming endeavors is not favored by the current framework conditions for resource-allocation, at least not in Germany and other Central European countries. We all too often pursue a "we don't trust you, we know better, and we want results now" kind of approach which extinguishes small flames of creativity, and certainly prevents them from turning into strong fires of transformative research. No doubt, the implementation of evaluation processes and assessment exercises at regular intervals has brought about not only a wealth of information about the respective unit of analysis but also initiated a lot of learning processes as well as numerous improvements. But if we look at the current situation of an almost ubiquitous array of monitorings, reviews, rankings, ratings, assessments, and evaluations, we cannot help but recognize that these various instruments in one way or another have fallen victim to their own success – instead of a culture of creativity, we observe an increased emphasis on compliance.

Let me illustrate at least some of the weaknesses of the widespread kinds of efficiency-oriented approaches to the concept of a modern university by referring to a quite different domain with the following anecdote, in this case referring to an analysis of Schubert's Unfinished Symphony and the performing orchestra. The analysis of the concert summarized in five points by a specialist for streamlining public administration reads as follows:

1. For large parts of the concert the oboists had nothing to do. Their part should be reduced, and their work is to be delegated to other members of the orchestra.

2. All of the 12 violinists played the same notes. This is an unnecessary duplication of effort. Therefore, this group should be drastically reduced. If it is really necessary to have a huge orchestral volume, electronic devices should be used to achieve the same effects.
3. It seems totally unnecessary that the horns were repeating the same notes which had just been played by the violinists.
4. If all repetitious elements were deleted, the concert could be reduced from about half an hour to four or five minutes.
5. Had Schubert been able to receive and follow this piece of advice, he surely would have been able to complete his (unfinished) symphony.[19]

It takes a reliable, high trust mode of long-term funding for teaching and research in order to fully reap the fruits of scholarly explorations. Despite the many errors and failures that do occur in our universities, the answer cannot be to introduce ever more and ever tighter reporting, rating, and control mechanisms. To my mind we rather need a leap of faith based on high trust principles that allow us to thoroughly rethink common wisdom and to conduct research in unknown territories and off the beaten track areas.

However, you may already sense the tension implied by these remarks: On the one hand, we have to foster creativity, strategically provide opportunities to create free spaces for innovative thinking and risky research projects – while on the other hand regular and reliable work-processes have to be established and legal requirements to be fulfilled.

To a certain extent our universities simply cannot just be lead from the top, but only be strategically moderated and incentivized. They consist of a variety of different actors who are, sometimes tighter and sometimes looser, interacting and working both with and against each other. And as my comments on compliance and efficiency-orientation hopefully have demonstrated, it is just as well not an option to solely rely on rules and regulations – in the hope, that a university will self-adjust and be regulated through automatic control mechanisms and feedback loops – just like a thermostat keeps a room on a constant temperature without a need for any human to intervene.

So, one of the biggest challenges for us consists in ever again finding the right balance between holding on to governance processes and knowing when to let go of them. We need to have the courage to intervene personally and change the adjusting screws where we

---

[19] Translated and adapted from the newsletter "Rundblick", No. 160, Hanover, 20 August 1996.

deem it necessary. And we need to have the courage to not intervene, to give people free spaces for their endeavors, and just be surprised by what emerges from those.

This demands new ways of leading universities as well: Gone are the days in which they were (more or less successfully) managed by single rather authoritative presidents or maybe a tandem of president and chancellor. Instead, power is shared between presidium, senate, university boards, professors, and many others; and universities as autonomous and creative institutions will resist many attempts of mere top-down management. But this should not be mourned as a loss of power or 'postheroic leadership', but instead as an opportunity for a modern day Sisyphus, whom – with a slight nod to Albert Camus – we should consider a happy man.

Changing times, indeed. But, to quote Bob Dylan once more, let us not simply get out on the new road and watch it evolve, but rather lend our hands and shape the new one which is to come – as challenging as that may be.

Thank you very much for your attention!