

ISSN 1848-0071
 378.4+323=111
 Received: 2013-12-07
 Accepted: 2014-02-11
 Original scientific paper

AUTONOMY OF UNIVERSITY: BURDEN OR FUNDAMENT?

FILIP ŠIPOŠ

Faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences, University of Zagreb, Croatia

e-mail: fsipos@ffzg.hr

In this paper the perspectives will be outlined from which the function and position of university could be altered, consolidated and improved, in the light of recent and current attempts of destabilisation of university. External causes of course are not the only culprit for gradually reduced role that university has in Croatian scientific, cultural and social scene. Students' struggle that started in spring 2009, caused a lot of commotion in public and showed injustices and inconsistencies in higher education system. The fight for free education was then articulated for the first time. Main thesis of this paper is that if the "burden of autonomy" is skillfully handled and properly situated, the "fundament of the university" can be strengthened. Improvement of the university as a whole can only be achieved through the permanent dialogue and cooperation between its components (faculties) and by strengthening relation faculty-university. Main question is how to change frames and relationships within the university itself in cooperation with institutions responsible for participation in the processes of creating science and social politics, without directly imperiling the autonomy of university.

Key words: university, educational policy, Croatian educational system, EU's educational guidelines.

Autonomija sveučilišta: teret ili temelj? U tekstu će biti iznesene perspektive iz kojih je moguće promijeniti, učvrstiti i unaprijediti funkciju i poziciju sveučilišta zbog recentnih i aktualnih pokušaja destabilizacije sveučilišta. Vanjski uzroci dakako nisu jedini krivac za postepenu ali jasno vidljivu smanjenu ulogu sveučilišta na hrvatskoj znanstvenoj, kulturnoj i društvenoj sceni. Studentska borba koja se javila na proljeće 2009. godine i uzburkala javnost i prokazala nepravde i nelogičnosti u sustavu znanosti i obrazovanja i prvi puta jasno artikulirala borbu za besplatno obrazovanje. Osnovna teza jest da se pravilno operiranje "teretom autonomije" i njegovo pravovremeno i precizno smještanje, "temelj sveučilišta" može ojačati. Unaprijediti rad sveučilišta moguće je jedino kroz konstantan dijalog i suradnju među sastavnicama sveučilišta i gradnjom jačih odnosa na relaciji fakultet - sveučilište. Glavno pitanje je kako mijenjati stvari unutar organizacije sveučilišta a u suradnji s institucijama koje imaju odgovornost sudjelovati u procesima stvaranja znanstvene i društvene politike, bez da se direktno ugrožava *autonomija* sveučilišta.

Ključne riječi: sveučilište, obrazovne politike, hrvatski sustav visokog obrazovanja, obrazovne smjernice EU.

INTRODUCTION

In this paper we will analyze the possibility of duality in the syntagm University Autonomy, and whether it represents a burden or a fundament. We will show the perspectives from which the position of the university can be altered, consolidated and improved. These

aspirations are happening under the premise of current position of the university, which does not fight firmly enough against the capitalist ideas. These ideas easily found its way into our everyday presence on intellectual "battlefield". On this premise, we can add that it is all happening under the

dictate of those who do not approve of the processes that are a potential source of profit and are being undertaken beyond their jurisdiction. People sending these messages are constantly finding new ways to oppress the locations where the spirit of education is perfected. A professor I. Padjen once said, during a conference, that the university of today is Humboldtian, or it is not a university at all. Also, he exquisitely detected that what makes the main axis of the autonomy and academic freedom, and that is: the freedom of research as a subjective right, and the academic activity from which the university autonomy derives

from, and that university can arrange its own structure of processes that are being conducted there.

In this article we will analyze four categorical frames from which we can observe the function and position of the university (political, legislative, academic and philosophical). Firstly, we will remind ourselves of the concept of the university and its etymological and historical genesis and then proceed with the analysis and seek out the potential impacts and influences the creation of scientific policy can produce in Croatia in times pierced by crisis.

BRIEF HISTORICAL REVIEW OF THE TERM

The term *universitas* originates in Latin and is used to designate a group of individuals who dedicated themselves to the creation or the discovery of the totality of something. As presumed, the instinct to create a totality of knowledge was a priority. The term *knowledge* is derived from Latin *scientia*, but in it we can find the Indo-European word *skei*, which forms the root of many other words. This root carries the meaning “to divide, to separate, to dissect”, but if put into the context of the process of gathering and spreading knowledge (as was the principle in Plato's or Aristotle's academies) we can interpret it as an analysis, critical thinking on given task or problem. Before *universitas*, there were the so-called *studium generale* that were opened to all those interested in scientific study. A substantial understanding of politics in Ancient periods, i.e. public speaking and involvement inside the community and for the community, set the guidelines for what used to be „places of doctrine“. This was an attempt to approach the absolute meaning of the concept of the university. How was this done?

This was done by introducing the phrase ‘the autonomy of university’. By autonomy we understand independent decision-making and the freedom to act within a group that preserves a type of specificity (compared with inertia by which nations preserve their languages). Nevertheless, there exists a new level, the level that involves public speaking. The autonomy of the university that existed in schools in Ancient Greece, did not mean a complete separation of the decision making processes in relation to political authorities. On the contrary, from what we know about those schools, such as Plato's Academy, and about the political ideas which were then defined, every activity demanded a certain relation to the community and the creation of local policies. We might even say that privacy (except the family one) was seen with a level of disapproval. *Vita contemplativa* is a great example, because this type of ethos promoted itself into the only truly free one. It shows us that *shole* is an exclusive place of contemplation without political interference. Today, autonomy is observed in contrary terms.

Thus, it today rests on full legal division of university management and competent law-making institutions. Although this formulation sounds somewhat unhandy, we refer to the law, because today autonomy is trapped in legal formulations. In most radical positivistic law interpretation they say: the area of the university cannot be impaired.

We can see that we have come far from *Academia* or *Lyceum* or later medieval institutions that bore the name *universitas*, *studium generale*, or *scholae monasticae*. It was there that enthusiasts gathered and with the help of *septem artes liberales* sharpened their skills, collected and shared knowledge in medicine, law, philosophy and theology. In those times, the universities' problems were not with laws, regulations, orders or statutes, rather with wars, epidemics, fires, unavailability of the works of distant scholars. The discovery of Aristotelian works had a crucial role in the rush for opening new schools. Simultaneously with the development of linguistic disciplines, a bigger emphasis was put onto a humane approach to science.

One of the first significant signs of autonomy was free movement of scientists in and out of countries and other educational institutions. Another one was granting different academic titles, with regard to geographical position and tradition. There are differences between the north and south of Europe; in Germany more preference towards art and theology, in Italy towards law and medicine.

The modern period in the development of educational institutions

began in the 15th century. Newly formed states are starting to place centralized supervision on universities, as well as on other formerly autonomous institutions (courts, guilds etc.). This brought on state administrators who performed supervision and executive functions. Up to this moment, universities were indeed autonomous in their operations and administrative organization, some even had student and professors as „managers“. Professional administration did not exist, although most universities had some sort of a chart, either from a king or the Church, that enabled free movement of students and professors. They were also given protection from civil government (e.g. in early periods of Bologna and Paris university). Later, state management that was established exactly these universities was taken as an example for future universities.

However, the real revolution occurred in the 19th century, with the idea of W. von Humboldt. At the very end of the heat of the French Revolution, he represented a form of abundance of individual knowledge, which then merged with the idea of “world knowledge”. The idea of Humboldtian university is impregnated with social aspects of studying.

In the past, the idea that caused turbulences in the foundation of the universities was the idea of a harmonized and humane approach towards education, which reflected the state of the world of the day and pretensions of its individuals. Today, turbulences are gradually disappearing, and following events are described in the next section.

POLITICAL FRAME FOR POSITIONING OF THE UNIVERSITY

Politics is an activity integrally oriented towards public communication area and social categories. On the other hand,

some premises in political reasoning need to be either concealed in public presentations or presented after necessary requirements have

been fulfilled for "policy" that is ultimately on some matter in the public domain („for public eyes“).

When we put aside (un)reality of recent world events and its influence on everyday lives, what interests us in political frame, it is something called education and scientific policies. This political variety is of great significance to the idea of the university. Yet, at the same time, this variety turned into an abomination, a phenomenon known as political machinations. Exclusive guilt for current condition in Croatian education, art and science cannot be put on series of unprepared and unfitted ministers, deans or other administrative officials, or on different reform and law changing attempts that failed. Problems are more profound and divers. There are some small disturbances in the foundation that are responsible for the shift of the entire system. Procedures that are producing relevant decisions all have the same constants, chronic lack of dialogue, unwillingness for cooperation, artificiality caused tensions between different levels and actors inside the academic community. Politic, as mentioned in introduction, today does not have substantial character (we say/lie to ourselves that we advanced from Ancient Greeks paradigm on politic), nowadays, Actually, since the beginning of new age (Machiavelli), approximately 15th century it has instrumental character, which means introduction of new categories that politic has to protect, like right to work, extracted from that right to property, institutionalizing prominence of social activities and adequate supervision on them, further, trichotomy of government, creation of authorities like courts, pleasant life under terms freedom for and freedom of etc. Politic is in the service, the service of unseen, invisible puppet masters, where the strings are corporative predators, and puppets sometimes entire nations or states. Liberal based assumptions in politic, are not an obstacle for creation of quality and

sustainable science and education system which can be seen in Finnish transformation example. Finland is not a socialist or communist country. It is democratic and free competitive-market country. What distinguishes it from other similar countries (like U.S.A or U.K), is that its society is not so. After World War II Finland lost a fair amount of its territory which led to significant number of refugees. In 1950's emerges (although still predominantly agrarian land and focused on selling timber) the idea how to achieve economic and social growth. The idea was not grounded on recovery of the financial and banking sector, yet on building democratic citizenship and by establishing quality social policies. For education it meant structuring the system on trust, a process that lasted for 20 years. Today, they simply applied new technologies and renewed infrastructure, and the founding principles did not require tinkering because of its sustainability.

Key for creating stable educational and scientific policy must be in distancing from political skirmishes, and instead carrying out the extrapolating process. Of course, this process can be risky, because what we know, and applying into unknown factors, so far did not show satisfactory results. Although, basic premises "where to" in value forms in education for some time now wander in public area on institutions that take part in creation of Croatian scientific and education policies [1]. This area that we are seeking is quite ambience where decision making processes are based on thrust.

Why then are we in problems when trying to find this ambience, oasis of peace? Because the most of crucial decisions made in the last 10 years or more, and which concern education, were placed from above, repressively, in rapid procedure, without dialogue, past ethical and legal standards. Examples are in plain sight, the Bologna process, tuition fees, pressure to indulge to European standards (economical in the first

place, implicitly educational and scientific, e.g. project [Horizon 2020](#)) and others. How to achieve solutions for this problems? It would be easier to begin if that "supreme politic" would not fear of sky falling on its head. With this metaphor from comic about Gallic chief we would like to show that leadership of this country and society (Croatian) does not know where it wants to go. If they would just say: we want tuition fees, we want that there is lack of money for books and journals, that professors have unapt work conditions, but we never hear these things. We hear that they support one request and the other one, phrases like "free education is great, but unrealistic" and similar after which follows a big "but", after that the financial penalization of un-regular and non-excellent students (whatever this qualifications mean), accumulated and

illusory administrative expanses, increasing precariousness of academic staff, or enormous financial amounts for doctoral studies. In this conditions, university must show that its capable to create new policy for science and education on new fudaments, but that can only be achieved with responsible actions.

The solution is not complete cesure between creation of education and scientific policy on one side and other social groups on the other. Education and scientific policies rely on competence of their participants that with cooperation and aspiration to consensus, creates favorable and stimulating academic atmosphere. Until this will be available, we dread of various legislative attempts of introducing order into science and education, which is the theme of the next section.

LEGISLATIVE FRAME FOR POSITIONING OF THE UNIVERSITY

In this chapter we will show the intention of Croatian authorities and European organisations that they are able to direct the development and progress of science, technology. Intention is always materialized through different documents and action plans.

Some of them are: *Plan sustava odgoja i obrazovanja 2005-2010 (Educational plan 2005-2010)*, *Akcijski plan znanstvena i tehnologijska politika RH 2007-2010 (Action plan for scientific and technological policies in Croatia 2007-2010)*, *OECD thematic review of tertiary education: country background report for Croatia*, *MZOS Akcijski plan za poticanje ulaganja u znanost i istraživanje (Croatian Ministry of science, education and sports: Action plan for investment encouragement in science and technology)*, *European commission: Recent developments in European higher education system, Izvješće*

od radu Sveučilišta u Zagrebu 2009-2010 (Report on the work for University of Zagreb 2009-2010) and others. In criticism of listed documents we will focus on value principles by which they were written. Then we will present their hidden negative impact on academic community while taking into the consideration contextual social, cultural, academic and institutional frame. Attempts are being made to transform science and education from traditional values *per se*, along with their significance for creation of all the humanistic and social constructs in Europe's history, into the new and unexplored, yet potentially very profitable sources for "entrepreneurship climate" or "science and the economy synergy". In one perspective, even on making the academic workers into a version of manual workers (we can call them intellectually-mental workers). These two attempts are in act for last decade or more in Croatia, in Europe

even more. What is hiding behind these transformation attempts we are all well aware of in various phrases (economic reductionism, deregulation of the market, self-sustaining economical reproduction) in a nutshell, capitalism and his mighty world-draining tentacles.

But besides this description, we can show the situation inside the academic discourse as attempts that with and by knowledge a certain specific type of product can be made, with tangible price and market value.

This attempt, at least for now, made only smaller damage to science in Croatia (for example some scandals that occurred because of the profit ambition, some private and unfortunately incompetent universities predominantly for management, economy and businesses, or communication technologies and similar). Unfortunately, in the world and in other European countries a more significant damage can be seen.

Humanistic and social science institutions are being closed, either because of the alleged unprofitability or by the assessment of the authorities that it is not financially liquid anymore to invest state funds into some philosophy, sociology, philology or art.

Necessary for the survival of the university autonomy is not to allow the seductive "economic climate" to crawl into university structure like some cancerous growth. If this does happen we will have to bow to managers, boards which will choose lucrative investments, we will be dragged to bottom by statistical input/output tables and graphs, and we will have to beg for spare-change for a conference or a journal. Browsing through the preambles, conclusions and thematic chapters in documents listed at the beginning of this paragraph we can find very similar phrases. Here are some examples: "direct economic benefit that will come to certain institutions and to the Croatian economy by commercial

exploitation of the researches", "(...) technology development and (...) transfer into business environment", "the curriculum is not enough connected with economy needs"[2], "engineer students education in business planning and commercializing concepts"[2], promotion and support of the academic entrepreneurship"[2], "science (...) for which development a special significance is put on that scientific discoveries are transformed into successful commercial products"[2], "(...) biotechnology, new synthetic materials and nanotechnology will be recognized as priorities"[2], ", "stimulation of the excellence and competitiveness as main value criterion"[3]. All of these distinctly point in which direction and with what kind of the imperative and in what timeframe should science and technology be heading.

Now we will take a peek in some of the documents that arrive from European drives in which are offered visions and solutions of science, technology and education for the future.

On substantial level there can be found differences between Europe and Croatian visions and solutions, solely on the discourse level. Namely, those documents that come from Europe production are better at concealing true intentions and what exactly are they expecting from the educational institutions integrations, student mobility or defining of the future. These documents are filled with affirmations toward university autonomy and respect to the tradition of each state that are for example cosignatories of the Bologna declaration process.

Nevertheless, if read carefully and being mindful on the context, it can be penetrated to the core of these documents. Here are some examples that that portrait European education policy as lost inside bureaucratic labyrinth and enveloped by the fog of capitalistic power formations.

First indicator is too often mentioned World Bank and her contribution to either financing various projects either her notes where should European science and technology policy be directed. As we know how banks function, we surely are not expecting for beneficent intentions or equal representation of all the science areas. In text of two World Bank employees in the educational department, appropriately named *Skills, not just diplomas*, we cannot be surprised by current worldly founded capitalistic beliefs, claims that the only way to improve student *outcomes* is by introducing standardized tests ("Finnish model" apparently is not being taken into consideration), and not only that, they claim that student financing should be based on success, on the amount of points collected. One of the arguments in European commission research[4], is to pragmatize the "human capital" factor that should adapt and develop skills that labour market demands.

However there are positive examples of text and manifests that unfortunately come after suggestions like reduced funding or even closure of certain studies, departments or institutes are carried out. Other type of tempest arrives from the constant attempts of turning to the private

ACADEMIC FRAME FOR POSITIONING OF THE UNIVERSITY

Recently, there has been an example of a truly academic approach to education and science in Croatia, and that is the Academic Solidarity union's *Declaration on Science and Higher Education*. Its seven sections are very inspiring, showing alternatives to the bare statistics served to us by the European Union as the solution for European education in the near future. Let us remind ourselves of these propositions. Firstly, the Declaration stresses that there are

sector which invests too little into science, but when investment does happen, it is always there where cost-benefit analysis is proven positive, unfortunately, those areas are the IC-technology, nanotechnology and similar. One other interesting investment phenomenon occurred; it is called "knowledge economy". One of those good proclamation examples is *In defence of public higher education* that was put together by a group of authors, and co-signed by a large number of Great Britain's academic workers.

In this proclamation as basic suggestions are those supporting the *Magna Charta Universitatum* from 1988. Some of the proposals are: public education is an important link between current and future citizen generations, education cannot be treated as a commodity, globalization and internationalization leads to neglecting of the local cultures and communities, and maybe the most important proposal that also appears in *Magna Charta* is that university autonomy is being fully accomplished only in intellectual independence from political authorities or economic power. This is the place to ignite academic zeal for the next two sections, academic and philosophical categorical frame for position and function of the university.

great deficiencies when copying economic and managerial models into the governing university structures and faculties where education and science are readily cultivated.

Science and education are two enterprises that need to be recognized as values in their own right and not as commodities intended for the market. Furthermore, there is a need for a cultivation of democratic values throughout the curriculum, without the implementation of

an entrepreneurial spirit. In order for democracy to have a practical side, it is necessary to realize that all of the branches of science are equally valuable and that only on such a foundation can we create quality content based on cooperation. There is a great emphasis on free higher education within the Declaration, which requires the state to ensure equal access to higher learning for everyone and to pay special attention to the regulation of the private and public education sector. By this the Declaration entails that currently there is an open door for those who use their employment in public scientific institutions as a pretense while working at private institutions for higher education. Finally, the Academic Solidarity union calls for a systematic approach when making education and science policies in Croatia [1].

The thoroughbred academic approach to learning and teaching requires an active presence of the individual within the active academic field as a moral, inquisitive, fair, and humane person. He or she must be open for discussion not only with other individuals within the physical field of the university, but also with those whom he or she shares a generational flare, the very same flare that has placed these institutions in the epicenter of every social and cultural advancement. The places where academic integrity is achieved in full scope are the same places where a plurality of opinions and individual scientific integrity are respected. At today's institutions where the processes of learning and studying are being conducted, integrity is disrupted in two particular instances. One is the very clear, yet sometimes somewhat inadvertent separation of scientific disciplines. Some of them rest on tradition and therefore, in our age, are not providing enough of academic satisfaction to those who wish to engage with them, which does not mean that they should be pressured or marginalized because of their alleged unprofitability. Some other

disciplines are on the opposite side of the spectrum, are very interesting and are attracting a great number of people. Their problem lies in the fact that they often lose focus of the essence of their own science and hasten with conclusions that rest on whether discovering and introducing new routes or new technologies can change science and its contribution to society.

Furthermore, these scientific disciplines are prone to succumbing much quicker to the myth of market profitability of technology and quick earnings from manufacturing consumable and/or entertaining technological inventions and products. Another case in which the integrity is openly violated is found in activities that breed corruption. I call corruption an activity because as an occurrence it might have sprung from the psyche or it stems from a deeply rooted anthropological core. Therefore, corruption as an activity isn't necessarily tied to money. The corruption I am referring to is in the form of spontaneity that emanates from a human deficiency, a deficiency that lies in the fact that an action is often (in the case of academic activity too often) not carried out from the beginning to the end. This leaves the matter disjointed and only provides space for more, this time not only spontaneous, but calculated action, and this is certainly worse than mere spontaneity and has much severe consequences than the latter. What changes are needed and are possible? For starters, a clear position of each of the participants must be established within the system, as well as their obligations and their rights.

In order to achieve this zero premise it is necessary to articulate and give options to each organizational unit within the system to allow them to independently care for its own progress and development whilst indisputably respecting all of the regulations. However, as we have state earlier, a law shall not be adopted without the contribution of those that are directly affected by it. The

whole previous premise then requires that the communication channels be thoroughly cleansed from unnecessary noise or barricades, compounded out of the automatic responses of public relations' services that only serve to pollute these channels on all possible levels.

One event that has to a certain extent purified these channels (at least for a short period of time) was the activation of the students by organizing protests in the spring of 2009. There is little possibility that one day we might witness that all of the pores have been cleansed and that the damaging substance that is preventing the reactivation of the immune system of the Academy and its members has stopped secreting into the system. The academic way of life is one in which there exists a certain symbiosis

between the students, professors and science. By its meaning and its importance, this symbiosis is specific because the benefits that arise out of its symbionts have an impact on the entire culture, society and the survival of the identity of the university. Without the identity of the university, the identities of entire peoples and nations could become obsolete and become replaced by artificial structures created for everything except true science. It is these creations that quietly kill each grain of humanity and each potential for a new revitalizing abundance, which science and education can provide. With this I approach the philosophical polemics on what exactly is the true meaning of science as the focal point in the creation of the autonomous subject – man.

PHILOSOPHICAL FRAME FOR THE POSITIONING OF THE UNIVERSITY

Now I will try to synthesize the thoughts of three great philosophers (Kant, Schelling, and Nietzsche) with the help of a fourth "living" helper and see whether they are on the trail of finding the true absolute concept of the university. These ruminations are published under the anthological name of *Ideja univerziteta (The Idea of the University)*; originals: *Kant's gesammelte Schriften 1917*, *Friedrich Wilhelm Joseph von Schelling's sämtliche Werke 1856-1861*, *Friedrich Nietzsche's Sämtliche Werke 1980*).

The main and starting assumption for entering the magical world of the academia is youth: the youth of spirit, an enthusiasm that serves as a provocation and a means to place itself and everything around it in order. In the beginning there was an illusion of chaos, Schelling notes[5]. Chaos, not so much caused by the impulses of the outside world, but rather by an inner disorder, because it still does not know where to turn.

Spontaneity when breaking misconceptions and untruths in one of the sciences is always welcome, but spontaneity when choosing of one of the sciences (a wandering from one discourse to another) just continues the initial chaos. One must adhere to one particular science from the beginning to the end. The second, but by no means less important than the first, assumption of science is that science itself must absorb the universal and the absolute[5]. Coming from a perspective relevant for the position of the modern university, with the absolute we can certainly tie in Kant's remark that whoever suggested that all erudition and science be organized into universities where scholars acted as depositories of knowledge had "good intuition" [6].

Who is our most trusted friend while we walk the path towards absolute science? The *Demon*, our inner friend, helper, and inspiration [5].

Imagine the possibility of a communion formed of all the *demons* from which we receive knowledge in the purest and most appealing form: a communion of professors and teachers, who above all never stray away from the condition in which they can feel like a student. All of these *demons*, as well as their *owners*, have to undertake action as an inclination towards universality after acknowledging that science is the absolute. There is often a delusion that everyone can act just because they have free will, but that knowledge is not for anyone [5]. However, activity is a necessary condition in order to approach science to the full extent. Reality is derived from ideality and in turn complements it. Knowledge is a tool of science and is utilized in order to reach the purpose of science. Schelling asserts that "science and action can never be in true harmony in any way but through the equal absolute," [5] and emphasizes the everlasting actuality contained in the relation of state-progress-science. He also remarks on the potential desire of the state to industrialize science and educational drives so that the individuals who come out of such drives could to the greatest extent serve as pinions (i.e. state officials) in state maintenance.

Moreover, Schelling notes that the state will also not benefit from this formalized approach which in its core does not have the wellbeing of talent and genius in mind, the two faculties that are gain the most from science. Academies, according to Schelling, fulfil another purpose, an absolute purpose, which is inherent to the expedient civil society, and this purpose places science on the top of the list of goals and means of enabling the development of society. Schelling adds that, accordingly to this process, those who spread ignorance and spend time in dispirited pleasures should be removed [5]. This stems from the fact that the concept of a wider study branches into two divisions. One is *historical* and is

shaped during the mere process of studying. In this division we are forced to obey when giving over our intellect to lecturing structures and are somewhat more strained than active. Schelling resents the lack of activity.

The only way of achieving and acquiring the totality of knowledge is not to skip the relevant internodal member, in other words, the individual has to be focused on the goal, on the absolute which science and knowledge have set as their goal. Schelling's critique of the higher education institutions of his own time is based on his notable non-thoroughness and his excessive tendency to lecture on any subject.

The other branch refers to the *formal, formative* concept of education. For this studying ideal to be achieved it is necessary to know how to move away from the subject matter and start practicing. For us, the most important types of forms are the special forms, the ones that embrace the spirit of science [5]. What is this special form? It is the one that satisfies the imperative of a new creation, or as Schelling himself proclaimed: "Only by this divine might [≈possibility; to study is to create something new] of production, man is truly a man, without it he is only a bearable smartly arranged machine" [5]. Therefore, the person who actively engages with, as Schelling calls them, profitable sciences (although he thinks that none of the sciences deserve this nomination) cannot and should not consider any science as a mere instrument into which results or effects are let in. The other approach entails that one interacts with a science in order to achieve some external purpose. Those that approach science this way would be labelled as barbarians by Nietzsche - the ones that bring in easy and quickly usable ideals that go against the parameters of science itself. Barbarians of this century [7] (19. c.) are especially visible in contrast to the barbarians of yore precisely

because of this feeling that knowledge and education have reached completion.

Nietzsche created a two-epochal dialogue between a leader and a follower on the path to reaching the requirements of nurture and education. In one epoch he portrays the same *young men* shown before by Schelling, young men who have adopted different points of view, but without giving it any thought and so are in need of a "router", an *old philosopher*. In the second epoch, the "young" men reflect back on the past and realize that there are only a small number of truly educated people in the world. Most of the others tricked, deceived by an illusion; it is easy to fool others under the guide of a genius.

Still young, the two philosophical disciples examine where education is heading – one side is trying to extend it, others are trying to weaken it [7]. Nietzsche comes up with a formula of sorts that can calculate the benefits of education. On the one hand there are a greater number of new realisations and educated individuals that further contribute to the needs of production, which in the end create opportunities for happiness. On the other hand, he observes that there is a yearning to reduce and weaken the tendency towards education. This tendency stems from the fact that there is a reduced concern for the other scientific areas because of the scope of a particular science. Nietzsche asserts that these scientists are not capable of producing nothing more than "a tool" [7]. The nineteenth century, we see, is not too different from the present – already then the premise that a man can take

advantage of science, like a machine in which you insert new minds and knowledge, while at the same time producing state personnel or pure economic profits, was widely accepted.

For the conclusion of Nietzsche's reflections on liberating people from this apparatus, we shall shortly review his display of academic freedom, which is linked with the autonomy of the whole - the university. Academic freedom is in such a state that we can say that there is none. It hangs on a thin thread that extends from the ear of the listener (the student) to the mouth of the teacher (the professor). Usually, it is exactly this type of relation that is taken to be the main idea during the arrangement of academic-educational communities.

However, Nietzsche does not want this kind of arrangement, which only has the semblance of an academic shell without content. Nietzsche stresses that "one speaking mouth and many ears, along with half as many writing hands - this is the academic apparatus, this puts the university machinery into propulsion" [7]. What is the task of those that teach and those who are taught? It is their responsibility to accept the rejection of what is now being praised as academic freedom, obedience, subordination, discipline, and service [7].

The need for a stability that consistently collapses leaders and thwarts the ones seeking leadership must be brought down! Wounding ourselves, in this misty and destructive march of demon-ascending creation, leads us to the discovery of the fantasy of knowledge.

CONCLUSION

In the introduction, I have presented the possibility of duality: whether the autonomy of the university represents a burden or a foundation. This doubt is substantially, formally and contextually a

false one. In fact, autonomy of the university is a preliminary condition for the activity of academic subjects and for the creation of new areas for new academic freedoms. If this is so, we have to ask ourselves who is

converting faculty councils and administrations into bureaucratic machines, rectors and deans into marionettes, professors in tools that serve just for advertising and disseminating information, students into cannon fodder for different study models and into a source of payment, and why are they doing so.

Is it not easier to distribute autonomy on a larger number of shoulders, even if we can observe it as a type of a burden? The most important thing is to place prudence of thought and act in the foreground of matters of scientific and educational policies, as well as academic critique and support.

REFERENCES

[1] Declaration on science and higher education, Union Academic solidarity, Zagreb, 2012.

[2] Action plan for scientific and technological policies in Croatia 2007-2010.

[3] Croatian scientific and technology policy 2006-2010.

[4] Recent developments in European higher education systems, European Commission working document 2011.

[5] Schelling, F.W.J., "O metodi akademiskog studija" in G. Gretić, Z. Posavec (ed.), *Ideja univerziteta*, Globus, Zagreb, 1991.

[6] Kant, I., „Spor fakulteta“ in G. Gretić, Z. Posavec (ed.), *Ideja univerziteta*, Globus, Zagreb, 1991.

[7] Nietzsche, F. "O budućnosti naših obrazovnih ustanova" in G. Gretić, Z. Posavec (ed.), *Ideja univerziteta*, Globus, Zagreb, 1991.