

At long last, after a decade of vain attempts to bring this about, funds have actually been appropriated for Title XI of the Higher Education Reauthorization Act. Eight million dollars have been authorized for the current fiscal year for the Urban Grant University Act, now also known as the Urban Community Service Act. Larger appropriations are recommended in both the House and the Senate versions of the budget for fiscal year 1993.

Many individuals in universities, in higher education associations, and in the federal government made significant contributions to this long-awaited achievement. However, at the risk of slighting other toilers in the vineyard, it is appropriate to single out Jim Harrison's untiring work as executive director of the Association of Urban Universities (AUU). Jim has now retired, and the AUU, its principal goal accomplished, has disbanded. We all owe much to both, and also to Nevin Brown during his work at the National Association of State University and Land-Grant Colleges (NASULGC). Congressional leadership was provided by Senator Mark Hatfield from Oregon, who learned much about the matter from President Judith Ramaley of Portland State University, and by Congressman Thomas Sawyer from Ohio who worked closely with President William Muse, formerly of the University of Akron and now at Auburn University.

Of course, the amounts appropriated for this year and those anticipated for the coming year are still quite small as compared to overall need. Their concrete impact on recipient institutions is likely to remain limited. Yet the very fact that Title XI has been funded at all represents a significant event in the evolution of our metropolitan universities. In its way, it represents a recognition of our existence as a distinct and important category of institutions.

That recognition is largely due to the progress made in recent years in defining and promulgating the metropolitan university mission, which is emerging with ever greater clarity and with growing consensus. Chancellor Donald Langenberg of the University of Maryland System and President Hoke Smith of Towson State University recently co-hosted an informal meeting in Maryland of a group of heads of institutions dedicated to this mission. The universities represented at the meeting varied a great deal in size, in location, and in the spectrum of offerings. All had a diverse student profile, but with significant differences in composition. Yet in spite of all the variations, there was no question about the common focus of all the institutions. All were universities dedicated to improving the quality of life in their immediate region. All accept the obligation to respond to the instructional and other knowledge-based needs of their surrounding constituencies and communities. It is that direct bond, that commitment to neighborliness in the most positive and constructive sense, which constitutes the fundamental characteristic uniting our metropolitan universities. All see themselves as *interactive* institutions linked to their regions; all want to become, as President Ramaley stated so well

in her inaugural address at Portland State University in 1990, "the university next door."

The vital role that metropolitan universities are filling becomes obvious when one thinks of the crucial role that knowledge plays in modern society. It is all pervasive—both in terms of the educational needs of the citizenry and the workforce, as well as in terms of effective dissemination and application of new ideas and discoveries throughout both the public and the private sectors. Knowledge is needed everywhere, at the local and regional levels as well as at the national and global levels, and by everyone, regardless of background or age.

That knowledge is not an inert commodity, created in laboratory or study, to be stored in libraries like the gold in Fort Knox, or dispensed like a nostrum in classrooms or through extension. Knowledge is a dynamic entity, constantly enhanced and given new shape by its interaction with immediate issues and concerns. It forms the substance of an ecological system of which all parts are interconnected and interdependent, and throughout which knowledge is continuously shaped and augmented. New knowledge arises not only in laboratory and library, by survey and observation. It grows, as well, by means of dissemination and application, which yield new information, new understanding, new insights, and hence new knowledge. The effective acquisition and utilization of knowledge at the level of the individual, the small enterprise, and the urban or regional government agency require effective interaction between teacher and student, expert and client, university and region. That is the commitment and the characterizing role of metropolitan universities.

Of course the specific contours of each institutional region are shaped by geography, by demography, and by the extent to which there are other locally oriented universities nearby so as to allow differing relationships and emphases. But as institutions develop their distinctive modes of interaction and outreach, a fundamental matter must be kept in mind. Increasingly, the political borders between city and suburbs are swamped by the economic and social interdependence of the entire metropolitan region. In his article in the preceding issue (volume III, issue 1) of this journal, Robert Wood makes very clear that planning must take place on a metropolitan scale because all the relevant factors have an impact throughout the metropolis. This journal is called *Metropolitan Universities* so as to reflect the need for this breadth of perspective and to recognize the inescapable relationship of urban core with its surrounding suburbs and exurbs.

The metropolis is inclusive. It encompasses the city as well as the suburbs, the indigent as well as the affluent, and all of the full, rich mixture of the population. Metropolitan interests must include urban interests in every possible way. "Edge City" cannot turn its back on the urban core. Simi Valley could not exist if there were no Los Angeles.

Rarely has this relationship been as clear, as important, and as urgent as it is now in the aftermath of the Rodney King verdict and the subsequent disturbances in Los Angeles. The choice facing this country is tragically clear. We can either try to maintain the chasm between inner city and suburbia, two worlds communicating only by violence, with exces-

sive and inexcusable force on both sides. That option would require an increasing reliance on massive police intervention and perhaps even physical isolation. Indeed, one presidential candidate is reported to have suggested the construction of fences and ditches. Or else we recognize the urban plight as a shared concern, a national emergency which affects Simi Valley even as it devastates South-Central Los Angeles. To choose the second option is not only a moral imperative: it is the one which makes economic sense. In its column "The Talk of the Town" of the issue of May 11, 1992, the *New Yorker* magazine put it so well:

"The kind of cost-benefit analysis that implicitly underlay [the increasing reliance on police intervention and on the prison system]—the idea that it is cheaper and more efficient to spend money on police and prisons than on the people who live in our inner cities—collapses utterly before the economic calamities we are only beginning to face: the losses in jobs, in housing, in property values."

If one accepts the interdependence of all parts of the metropolitan area, it follows that every metropolitan university has an obligation toward the entire metropolis in which it is located. Each institution must, of necessity, set priorities and make choices with regard to the profile of its student body, the focal points of basic and applied research, the principal targets for extension and technical assistance. But the necessary choices must be made with an inclusive, metropolitan perspective, recognizing the social, economic, and political interdependence of *all* constituencies and *all* areas of the metropolis.

It is easy to understand that a number of individuals who have dedicated themselves to improving the social and economic conditions of the inner city harbor the suspicion that the use of the term "metropolitan" implies an abandonment of the core. And indeed one hears some voices which, in more or less guarded fashion, say that the future of this country is exclusively in "Edge City." But that view is not shared by those who are leading the movement to define and establish the model of the interactive university that relates to *all* constituencies within its metropolitan area. The roster of metropolitan universities cannot include the academic equivalents of Simi Valley institutions which try to isolate themselves in the illusory security of a middle class and mostly white suburb. Metropolitan universities are inescapably urban universities because the core of each city is an inseparable part of the city as a whole. The two labels are interchangeable. Both refer to institutions dedicated to the improvement of the entire region they serve.

This editorial note is written less than three weeks after the King verdict. Much rhetoric about the plight of our cities fills broadcasts, magazines, and newspapers. That is likely to be the case still when this issue of *Metropolitan Universities* is distributed during the presidential campaign. One can only hope that the rhetoric will turn into longer term reality. There is desperate need for sustained attention and concerted action with regard to the urban condition and the deep racial and socio-economic divisions in our country. Metropolitan universities must engage themselves deeply in this effort, but they must do so in ways which are very different from the mode of academic involvement in the sixties

and early seventies. We must abandon the collective hubris dominant at that time. We believed then that academic expertise could "solve" complex social and economic problems. Our current goals must be both more modest and, paradoxically, more demanding. Through substantial commitment and effort we can make significant contributions to society's collective ability to alleviate the negative impact of these problems and to improve the conditions which caused them. We have a massive educational task, not only in improving the knowledge and skills of those now deprived of them, but also in enhancing the understanding of the more privileged about the nature and the causes of contemporary problems. In addition, as partners in a shared efforts we can help by means of research and outreach to identify the issues, to design modes of intervention, and to evaluate outcomes. Never has the role of metropolitan universities been more important than it is now.

---

In order to further bridge the perspectives of urban and metropolitan universities, it is my great pleasure to welcome a new set of colleagues as fellow editors of *Metropolitan Universities*. Our new senior editor is Dr. Mary Ellen Mazey, founder and current director of the Center for Urban and Public Affairs at Wright State University, and chair of its Department of Urban Affairs. She is chair of the Governing Board of the Urban Affairs Association and a member of the Editorial Board of the *Journal of Urban Affairs*. Her assumption of the pivotal role of senior editor for our journal is both a symbol of and a commitment to the substantial congruence of urban and metropolitan concerns described in the preceding paragraphs. Joining us as managing editor and associate editor, respectively, are Denise Thomas and Jane Dockery, both also at Wright State University. We will all be working closely together in our continuing effort to make *Metropolitan Universities* a strong voice and advocate for its eponymous institutions. Our thanks are due to Chuck Hathaway, who for so long managed to fill the role of senior editor in addition to his many obligations as vice president for Academic Affairs of Wright State University, and to Carol Siyahi, indefatigable managing editor for so many issues.

This issue of *Metropolitan Universities* carries an announcement of the second national conference on metropolitan universities, to be held March 28–30, 1993, at the University of North Texas, a major metropolitan university serving the Fort Worth-Arlington area. At that conference, as in the pages of this journal, we will pursue our collective and continuing task of defining ourselves. We have made great progress in formulating the philosophy that characterizes us, and in identifying the changes in policies, procedures, organization, and attitudes that are needed to reach our goal. Each year, we have to do a little less explaining; each year, the term "metropolitan university" is more widely understood and accepted as an institutional model. And each year we come a little closer to widespread recognition that, as Chuck Hathaway, Paige Mulhollan, and Karen White put it in their lead article in our very first issue, the metropolitan university is indeed *the* model for the twenty-first century. As stated by one of the participants at a recent meeting in Maryland, we really are beginning to transform the paradigm of American higher education.