The Problematic Relation between University as a Topos and World-Epoch of Virtuality as a New-Arising all-encompassing Topos

N. Taghavian[1]•

1. Assistant Professor of Philosophy, Institute for Social and Cultural Studies, Tehran, Iran.

Abstract

In this article I have tried to conceptualize some problematic issues regarding the status of university in what I have named 'world-epoch of virtuality'. In my view, world-epoch of virtuality has changed the meanings and functions of the concepts of time and space as well as the concepts of knowledge, science and education which traditionally dealt with in/and through university. So, it seems that the idea and functions of university are being changed. The concept of 'topos' is central to my account, because it encapsulates all the meanings related to time, space and knowledge.

Key words: Topos, University, World-Epoch of Virtuality

• e-mail: taghavian@gmail.com

The First Episode

I was the manager of a large and private educational complex several years ago. There, a young person, named Nima, was in charge of computer and software affairs related to the various sections of the institution. Although he did not have any academic degree, he was very knowledgeable, skillful and competent in the area of his responsibility. He could carry out any task that was necessary for the institution regarding software and hardware-areas from programming in various languages to manipulation of the already prepared software codes and instructions and even designing and constructing some software packages needed by the institute. In fact, Nima was a self-educated, not a university-educated man.

I asked him one day that why don't you attend a university with all this knowledge and skill and why don't you make any effort for acquiring an academic degree so that more can be added to your value and credibility?

He grinned and said "I do not need an academic degree or its knowledge. I can learn whatever I want to. I can start working in one of the countless number of the institutions that want me without any academic degree". I asked his viewpoint with regard to future of his work and what does he want to do considering his professional interests? He said: "I want to enroll in the entrance exams of Microsoft Company and get a specialized degree from there. Microsoft has its own education system and the holders of higher academic degrees should also pass its entrance exams to be able to take part in its educational courses and acquire a degree from it. It is after acquiring such a degree that Microsoft provides the applicants with the employment possibilities. My final goal, as well, is employment in Microsoft. I am now studying the resources considered by Microsoft as its entrance test."

I asked him which authority has provided or confirmed these resources.

He said: "they belong to Microsoft itself and they are not dependent on any other university or scientific institution. In fact, Microsoft does not consider any other university as credible as itself".

The utmost level of Nima's wish for his future was employment in Microsoft.

The Second Episode

Consider the three companies of Google, Apple and Microsoft amongst the large number of the institutions that have the heartbeat of the world of computer and the Internet under their hands within the format of economic firms. The information flow and knowledge volume and quality, the capital and human resources circulating in these companies through their mediating role is to the extent that one can consider them amongst the superpowers of the virtual world. Their budgets and financial turnover sometimes exceeds the budgets of many of the countries. Their products and services are applied and have customers even in the most distant parts of the world. The geographical domain of their physical presence within the format of agency and exclusive representative and others of the like is spread all over the world. They have specialized and sophisticated human workforce at their service from any nationality. The exchange of information is rarely done without their intermediation, especially Google.

But, disregarding all these vivid realities, there is yet another bigger truth in the emergence and continuation of which these institutions have played an unexampled role: all the universities or educational institutions and higher research centers are in need of these companies' products and services. It means that the production and distribution of knowledge in its classical academic form is no more feasible without these three companies. More importantly, it seems that these companies essentially produce and distribute forms of knowledge that is entirely specific to them. They have their own educational systems for educating their required specialized human workforce. They have set up special research processes for producing their required knowledge. It appears that the concept of knowledge and its boundaries is essentially different for these

companies from the one that has become classically prevalent in the universities. Amongst these three institutions, Google has a specific power in accessing any information and data from the contents of our personal emails to even the humans' interests and analysis of their personalities via tracking their likes and dislikes, tracing the frequency of every person's visits of the sites and internet pages and many of the other things that we might not even be capable to imagine. The legal dispute between Apple and CIA is per se a story showing that even such powerful intelligence organizations like CIA do not have the power of perfect influence on them, i.e. it is Apple that imposes its policy on the current policies of the US. The interesting point is that the founders of these companies, especially Apple and Microsoft, not only have not been educated by any university but they have also driven their classic academic system away from themselves and/or even had escaped from them. It was after this repelling that they could develop their own institutions. However, it is now as if the university has become dependent on its expelled students. These huge institutions have gathered in themselves amalgamations of knowledge production, specialized human workforce education, entrepreneurship, economic growth, participation in cultural and social processes in local, national and international levels, facilitation of the human communications and bonds, transcendence beyond the hedges of time and place and many of the other things. The ability and knowledge have become interwoven in these institutions in the most complicated possible form. They are both university and business entity; they exercise and create policies; it is as if they do everything. They are the manifestations of the mutation of the concept of knowledge.

The Third Episode

Institute for Social and Cultural Studies (Iran, Tehran) performed a survey in 2016 under the title of "university classroom survey" at the level of the country's universities thereby to monitor the general status of the universities. There were many various items assessed and measured in this survey. One of these items was "the university students' image of a good university". The university students had been asked underneath this item to provide an answer to the question as to "how do you describe a good university?" The answers have been distributed in five choices as follow: the good university is the one that "1) enhances the professional ability and expertise", "2) trains for the future job", "3) makes it possible for the university students to become socialized", "4) trains good citizens" and "5) helps the understanding of the truth". The frequency percentages are quite surprising and ponderable as shown in the table below:

Imaginations of a good university	Percentage
Enhancement of the professional abilities and expertise	39.5
Training for future job	27.5
Socialization	12.4
Training for good citizens	11.7
Helping the understanding of the truth	8.9

Table 1. The answers with regard to the question "How do you describe a good university?"

Considering the threefold function of the university – i.e. educational function (training of specialized human workforce), research function (production of new knowledge and discovery of the truth) and sociocultural function (socialization and sociocultural responsibility) -- it can be discerned that the options 1 and 2 refer to educational function, options 3 and 4 point to the sociocultural function and option 5 is related to the research function. Choices 1 and 2 have accounted for a totally higher frequency of the

answers for, as it can be seen, it is higher than the total sum of the other three choices' frequencies. This is expressive of a very important reality. It seems that the research function with the intention of understanding and discovering reality is no more important and desired by the university students. If a good job is available to a person, s/he would not be much motivated for entering the university. This is while the concept "truth" and making efforts for discovering it should be in itself sufficiently provoking. It seems that not many persons currently find a link between the university and the truth. However, the same university students are not so much hopeful and optimistic in their appraisals of the university's educational function (i.e. the same function that has to guarantee their professional future). They were asked about the idea that "how much they find their academic teachings applicable to their lives" and the answers to this question are also interesting:

Application rate	Percentage
Not at all	9.8
A little	27.2
To some extent	38.6
Much	20.8
Completely	3.6

Table 2: The answers with regard to the question "How much the subject-materials you learn at the university are applicable to your life?"

This is also expressive of this important fact that the university, at least in Iran, cannot even fulfill its educational functions. It seems that the meaning and function of the university in the mentality of the today's Iranian university students is not anymore like the mentality of the former generations, at least the mentality of such I's who were a university student during 1990s. The changes in the expectations from the university can be evidently observed from these two pieces of data in the classroom survey[1] .

Question

The mentioned content in the above three episodes are the realities from which a problematic situation is delineated for the entirety of the university in today's world. Some specifications of this problematic situation can be determined in these questions: how is the university related with these novel evolutions? What happens to the future of university? Would any university be left essentially? If yes, in what form and with what quality? Can university, as 'subjectivity', surround and encircle the entirety of such a situation as its own object? Hegel had once stated that "philosophy is its time held in thought[2]" . In German idealism tradition, philosophy is in a straightforward and robust link with the university, it means that the philosophy is, on the one hand, the thinking brain and the nous of the university; that is on the other hand, itself the thinking brain and the nous of the society. It means that the university is generally "the conversance of the thought over its time" in the traditional German idealism. Before now, university had turned anything into the object of its knowledge. Such an objectification of everything is no less than the domination of the nature, society and culture that peaked during the 19th and 20th centuries[3] . But, it seems now as if a territory has stemmed out of reality that not only does not lend itself to objectification but it also has somehow transformed university to its own object.

This new realm, as I said in the second episode, besides altering the concept and function of knowledge, has metamorphosed the concepts and functions of "time" and "place". So, it deserves not to be only seen as a geographical domain rather history should be also infused therewith. This way, I call such a realm as "world-epoch of virtuality". This territory is truly a novel domain of reality for it seems that the borders of our world have equally undergone expansion in both areas of the nature and the culture. Does this newly emerged reality represent a truth? If yes, how does the university gain insight over such a truth considering the fact that the discovery and understanding of the truths have been one of its primary functions? If not, what would be the task of university? As I said in the third episode, it appears at least in Iran that the truth discovery and understanding function is not so much fitting the university students' expectations. Does it mean that truth, as held in the university students' subconscious, is no more graspable in the university and inside the academic relations? Is it true that our university students have found out of their keenness and without having a contemplation-driven awareness of the newly emerged reality of the world-epoch virtuality that it is the logic of this novel realm that would make their future? Moreover, as it was said by Nima in the first episode, it seems that even the specialized human workforce education function is not any more brought about by academic education. The creatures of this realm or the residents of the world-epoch of virtuality, i.e. the very Internet and computer giants, seem to be not so far away from putting an end to the university's prosperity and functioning. There would be left only the sociocultural function of the university that seems to be the only task accomplishable by the university or at least claimed by it. But, if the university becomes not much capable of serving its educational and research function, would there be remaining any desire and demand for attending that it can perform its sociocultural function? Furthermore, why can't the newly emerged reality of the world-epoch of virtuality per se take possession of this function of the

university, as well? For example, look at the way the virtual social networks like Facebook and Telegram and many of the others enable the human beings communicate with one another and set the ground for their socialization. See how the discussions in the general areas of literature, politics and science are streaming inside the social networks. Look at this massive and robust volume of reports and news and analyses that are produced, distributed and used with the intermediation of the social networks. Such an intermediation should not be only considered as a neutral instrument. It seems in this intermediation that a new type and form of subjectivity is at work; this is a sort of subjectivity that was previously embodied in the university in a macro-level. It is by the intermediation of this intermediation that the economic, social and political realities undergo variegation, the children and adolescents reach a sort of social maturity and the human actions are exposed to public judgment and inspection a lot more than ever before because it seems that the amount of transparency and revealing is more in virtual space than the traditional public spaces. Every individual human being has been provided with the ability of conversing with others no matter where they are and with what language they speak. It seems that the ideals of a common global language are being actualized in a world-epoch of virtuality.

Under such conditions, how can university even claim its accomplishment of its sociocultural function while there is a so strong and fully ready rival has infiltrated and is present outside and inside the university -- everywhere? Let alone the idea that, in my mind, university's claim for its capability of serving sociocultural function has just appeared in the academic research circles during the recent decades and that as a result of the mindset and though evolutions in the area of social sciences wherein the science and knowledge are realized as social institutions featuring social and cultural functions and expediencies more than being in possession of essence. In other words, following the huge social, cultural and political changes during the 20th

century, the university had been struck by crisis that made it consider a third function for itself beyond educational and research functions so as to keep pace with the caravan of the social evolutions. The crisis has become more deepened and intensified now by the reality of the newly emerged realm of world-epoch of virtuality.

In a nutshell, the problematic situation caused to university by the world-epoch of virtuality makes thinking about the past, now and future conditions of university important and necessary more than ever before. In this chapter, I tried to delineate the coordinates of the university's questionable situation in the world-epoch of virtuality so that to reveal a little of the importance and necessity of thinking about the future of university and such a way of thinking has to be actualized now in another form within the system of the new concepts. But, thinking about the university's future in the world-epoch of virtuality without thinking about the past and present of the university is fruitless and sterile. It is necessary to have a look at the university's past and trace the trend of its evolutions up to now and hope to make the horizon of thinking about the future of university clear a little more.

In what follows, I am going to search the overall coordinates of the university's current genealogy in the archetypes of ancient Greece's modes of knowledge enterprise and exhibit how the threefold function of modern university (educational, research, social and cultural functions) are rooted in the modes of enterprising knowledge that emerged in ancient Greece. The goal in doing so is, of course, setting the ground for a new concept based on which the relationship between the current university and the world-epoch of virtuality can be clarified; however, the explanation and elucidation of this relationship needs a much wider time and opportunity that might be out of this article's scope. But, anyway, looking at the university's past in the light of more novel concepts is per se an inevitable endeavor.

Archetypes of Knowledge Enterprise

I have borrowed the term "archetype" and its concept from Carl Gustav Jung's analytical psychology to explain and track the genealogy of university's modern functions in ancient Greece. I think the expression "archetype" can be utilized with a little manipulation in its main concept as held by Jung for explaining the way our current imagination and perception of the university's functions is formed out. Archetype, as it has been dealt with in Jung's mind, forms an important part of our collective subconscious and organizes our current images and symbols in the course of history thereby to be transformed into a part of the clear-cut structure of the human perception. In other words, archetypes determine the shape of our current images and symbols and not their contents. The contents of our current perceptions of the world and the various phenomena have per se risen up from inside the grounds of our current relations and events but this content cannot convey meaningful implications unless it is poured inside the patterns inserted in our collective subconscious[4] .

1)   The Ionian knowledge enterprise archetype: Ionian scientists represent the first knowledge enterprise archetype in ancient Greece or even the entire history of the world. The thing that was important to them and they give it a value more than anything else was purely intellectual research into the nature of the world's realities and phenomena. In fact, they were seeking for the discovery and understanding of the world's truths. Contemplation and pondering over the foundations of the universe were the most substantial of their concern. Such scientists as Thales and Anaximenes and Anaximander gave priority and superiority to research over any other education method in such a way that teaching their research findings to others or

4. To become more familiar with the concept of archetype and, especially, its application method in social sciences, refer to Gray, R.M. 1996. Archetypal Explorations: Towards an Archetypal Sociology. London: Routledge.

creating a certain school for their thoughts was not important to them. The pure truth about the whole universe and world and its phenomena was superior to them. Therefore, their knowledge enterprise was not limited and unique to a given place or space. Each of them alone dealt with contemplation about the foundations of the world whenever the time was deemed right. They conversed with their other peers at most about their contemplations and research and did not mind if the results of their research were useful for their own and others' works and life or not. They had completely separated the realm of knowledge from the economic, political and artistic domains, though they happened occasionally to benefit from the results of their research in their economic life. It is known that Thales of Miletus estimated the olive harvest of the next year by predicting the rainfall rate and, based thereon, he bought and stored olive beforehand as much as he could and acquired a lot of wealth by doing so. But, this same Thales is also known to have been so sunken into contemplation and monitoring of the sky that could not see a hole in front of him and fell into it; for the same reason, he is sarcastically reproached that he can carefully forecast eclipse but cannot save himself from falling into a hole. To them, the story of the universe and not that of the social and political life of the mankind was amazing and questionable in its natural whole. Thus, they had zealously and eagerly made the entire nature the arena of their own research.

In short, if we wish to enumerate the general and outstanding characteristics of Ionian archetype of knowledge enterprise, four attributes can be underlined:

1.   theory is superior to practice,
2.   research is superior to education,
3.   pure truth is superior to interests and benefits,
4.   research is not limited to any special place and time.

2)   Agoraean knowledge enterprise archetype: the sophistic educational movement is the outstanding and index characteristic of the Agoraean

archetype of knowledge enterprise[5]. Unlike the Ionian scientists to whom the world system and the foundations of the natural universe was attractive and worthy of research, it was this cultural and social human world that instigated the sophists' to make a move and speak and act. To them, it was important that how human beings are fostered in practice and in their individual and collective life and how they reach happiness. This saying by Protagoras, the famous Athenian sophist, has been narrated in every ancient Greece history that "the humanity is the scale of everything". Thus, the sophists were truly in search of practical wisdom than the theoretical knowledge. Due to the same reason, the "truth" was not in itself so much valued and credited by them and they were not much in search thereof; instead, the mankind's benefit and happiness was more important and wanted to them. The human life and soul and all the things that were important for its flourishing were also important to them. In lieu of searching for the truth in the skies and the universe, they attempted to establish felicity and happiness on earth. Their field of action, as well, was this very social and political ground of the mankind. Polis or the Greek city was the locus of their activities. They searched in the city and tried attracting adolescents to themselves and training them. They held sessions of discussion and conversation inside Agora, the city plaza in ancient Greece. But, Agora was not a surrounded and separated place from the body of the city; everyone could participate in Agoraean activities. In ancient Greece, Agora was both the place of discussion and decision-making as well as acting. Education and training of the youth was carried out at the side of economic and political actions all inside Agora. The subject-matter of the youngsters' education was predominantly economy, law and politics. Sophists earned a living via teaching the adolescents.

_____

5. In his valuable book, Paideia (Jaeger 1939), Werner Jaeger recounts sophistic movement as essentially an educational and cultural movement. I feel too much sympathy with his judgment about sophists but I am of the belief that the streaks of research can be traced and seen in the sophists' works.

Furthermore, they practically applied their skills in the political and judicial arena. They endeavored to foster the adolescents through participation in the practical areas of the Athenians' life in market and court and senate. They were truly in search of educating specialized human beings in business, judgment and politics-related affairs. The subjective knowledge and scientific truth were important to them and they pursued them as far as they were deemed useful and applicable in life. Hence, they were not so much looking for doing pure scientific and philosophical research. Their research was mostly of practical and objective dimensions than scientific and subjective ones. If they happened to take part in subjective and theoretical discussions, they would majorly attack the insufficiency of the others' claims of scientific and theoretical truth. Gorgias, another well-known Athenian sophist, as clearly understood from Plato's writings, emphasizes in his debates with Socrates on the point that there is firstly no truth and, secondly, even if there is, it is not unique and single and, thirdly, we do not have any way for discovering and discerning truth, so we had better discard truth and engage in our life and happiness.

This way, the general and outstanding properties of Agoraean archetype of knowledge enterprise are:

1. practice is superior to theory,
2. education is superior to research,
3. benefit and expediency are superior to the scientific truth,
4. the activity domain extends to the entire society, Agora.

3) Academic knowledge enterprise archetype: this third knowledge enterprise archetype stemmed from the ancient Greece by Plato's laying an academic foundation therein. By recognition and theoretical configuration of the parallel dyads like subject/object and theory/practice, Plato made efforts to somehow overcome the separation between the thought and the universe. He could truly make a problem of the contradiction and the gap recognized by his preceding thinkers between the natural world and the cultural world, or between the human awareness and the material universe, and began overcoming it somehow in a more sublime unity. The world was divided into two parts in its whole since the time the rays of philosophical and intellectual thinking started glowing in Greece, i.e. with the very efforts made by the Ionian scientists for transforming the universe into an object of their knowing faculty and accordingly establishing themselves as the subject and independent awareness of the world. Since then, this separation and division between the human beings and the world became the pesky conscience of the Greece and urged them towards a struggle the product of which was florescence of the humanity as humanity per se and an unprecedented leap in the process of the human beings' material and spiritual growth. But, this division had become a new problem with all its countless and unexampled accomplishments and blessings. One manifestation of this newly emerged problem was wandering and idleness of the Greeks before Plato on the dilemma of "thought or universe": the idea as to which of the two should be and deserves being the primary subject of the mankind's knowledge enterprise? Should the human beings themselves and their life and soul be the subject of the intellectual efforts or should the universe and the world in its natural generality be the subject of thought? Is the issue of soul more important and more superior or is the matter of material? The difference and confrontation of the knowledge enterprise archetypes, as well, was also rooted in this same wandering and dilemma. As it was mentioned, the Ionian knowledge enterprise archetype favored the story of the matter and the Agoraean knowledge enterprise archetype was inclined towards the story of soul. These two knowledge enterprise archetypes were always in quarrel in pre-Plato Greece and none could drive out the other from the arena. This eroding dispute caused the emergence of a crisis in the Greek civilization's center of power. Plato astutely figured out the existence of this crisis and tried to find a solution thereto. He wanted to restore the lost unity and wholeness between culture and nature and

between thought and universe in another level. He configured this unity in the theory of forms in such a way that he considered a contrastive and parallel hierarchy for the ranks of thought and universe. The ranks of the universe begin from the lowest ranks of the perceptible natural things, pass through the rational mathematical realities and reach the world of ideas and forms. In the same way, the ranks of thought, as well, begin from the knowledge of the perceptible things in natural sciences and reach the intellectual knowledge existent in mathematics and are thence enhanced to the philosophy as the knowledge of the world of ideas and forms. The ranks of the universe and the ranks of thought (knowledge) eventually meet one another and become united in the utmost goodness. This way, the lost oneness between thought and universe and between theory and practice are again retrieved in a superior and ethical universe.

I disregard the details of Plato's theory and deal with its implications in respect to knowledge enterprise archetypes because this theory is the vanguard of the third archetype. If, on one hand, the arena of research about universe, as thought by Ionians, was the whole natural world and they did not consider a special place for it, and if, on the other hand, the arena of dealing with life and soul of the mankind, as imagined by sophists, was the intra-Polis Agora, neither the nature and the whole world nor the polis and society cannot be anymore the main arena of science production for Plato. There should be another place independent from the nature and polis so as to render unitary their separation inside itself. This place is the very 'academia' that is a garden with a well-thought and well-calculated design as a mixture of gardening and architecture and nature and culture. So, academia should be established and founded not like polis that has come about spontaneously in the course of the human beings' collective life and not even like the realm of nature that had been existent a priori. Academia is a place more superior to the nature and the society; it is a place wherein the nature and the society are supposed to be intermixed

in a loftier level. Academia is indeed the only place of all the knowledge types rather it is the locus of the sublime good. Academia's superiority is not only scientific rather it is an ethical one. More importantly, the most excellent rank of science is also knowledge of the sublime good. Natural scientists and mathematicians who wish to pursue their scientific research to the maximum possible extents should be elevated to the rank of a philosopher. Philosophy encompasses both natural sciences and mathematics. Additionally, a philosopher is also an educator. He has to take the others' hands and show them the way to the utmost good. A philosopher is the person who thinks about the sublime good of both the nature and the society and makes efforts for their well-being. A philosopher is a scientist and at the same time an activist; he performs Ionian and Agoraean knowledge enterprise. He does research, does educate and does foster. Since a philosopher is an all-knowing person, he is simultaneously a teacher, an economic entrepreneur, a social activist and a politician. Thus, the whole of a sovereign is the territory of his thought and action. Academia, as well, is the nous of both the nature and the society. In addition, the truth is not just this scientific truth about the universe and its phenomena; the idea or the example of the sublime truth is a mixture of the scientific truth, artistic beauty and ethical goodness. So, the benefit and expediency of the polis is also absorbed and dissolved in this same sublime truth. The fostering of the human soul, human happiness -- the way it was targeted by the educational activism of the sophists -- is feasible not in Agora and city plaza but in academia. This way, teaching and research, expediency and truth and practice and theory are all intermixed inside academia, and hence the sublime example of refinement and the eternal knowledge enterprise archetype of academia is created. Plato's competent pupil, Aristotle, also followed this same archetype and founded Lyceum. Aristotelian knowledge enterprise does not essentially differ from the knowledge enterprise archetype of academia.

The general characteristics of the academic

knowledge enterprise archetype can be enumerated as below in comparison to the two foresaid archetypes:

1.   practice and theory are intermixed with in the idea of the sublime good,

2.   educational and research processes are interlaced,

3.   the practical expediency and the scientific truth and the artistic beauty are all inserted in the idea of the sublime good,

4.   the locus of knowledge enterprise is a place independent from and superior to the nature and the society; it is the academia.

Functions of University in the Light of Knowledge Enterprise Archetypes

The modern university holds the heritage of the knowledge enterprise archetype of academia. This is a point the vividness of which is currently unquestioned and undisputed although the academia has undergone frequent quantitative and qualitative evolutions since Plato's time and mid-centuries till the modern era. Although these changes are very strong and epoch-making in their quantity and quality, the nature of academic knowledge enterprise has not been changed. The today's university, the one we knew up to now, not only accommodates the threefold functions of knowledge enterprise all in one place but it has also spread its shade over the nature and the society like the very Plato's all-knower. The threefold functions of the university, including educational, research, and sociocultural functions, are in fact the functionalist configuration of the academic knowledge enterprise. Again as the Plato's academia, today's university is a place independent from and superior to the nature and the society; it is a locus wherein the general expediency of the mankind and others is at least claimed and efforts are made for it. The today's university makes lawyers, ministers, merchants, teachers, engineers and physicians for the society and, at the same time, the scientists who are zealously eager to understand the stories of the universe and the world. The story of the soul and the story of the universe are both equally important and investigable to the today's university. The scientific truth, the artistic beauty and ethical goodness are all equally searched in the modern university. The truth and beauty and goodness are all three topics that have been discussed and debated by the human beings since Plato's time until now. Truth is searched inside the science and knowledge; beauty is created in arts and literature and justice and fairness, as well, are founded and pursued in ethics and politics. These three arenas are in fact three topoi in which the university not only maneuvers but also tries to unite them in the sublime topos of academia. The today's university seems to be the topos of all topoi. It is not a topos parallel and on the same level as the other topoi. The today's university is utopia, i.e. the nowhere with which the position of the other loci is determined.

The Last Episode

Let me return to the world-epoch of virtuality and the questionable relation of the university with it. Can the utopia of university also absorb the topos of the virtual world in itself? In the three episodes of this writing, I resolved the difficulty of such an important issue to some extent. But, the countenance of this difficulty will be revealed to us with a more prominent contour when we figure out that the world-epoch of virtuality, as well, is not a topos of the same rank and level of the other topoi. The virtuality era's world is per se a new utopia that has not only risen up against the former utopia of university and challenges it, but also it is quite likely to have transformed university into its own maneuver field. University utopia seems to have digressed far away from its utopian feature and has per se become a topos alongside the other topoi for the virtual utopia. Is it the same as the crisis in which the Greeks before Plato had fallen in such a way that Plato was forced to find a solution for it and founded academic knowledge enterprise? Are we now in the verge of bearing witness to the emergence of another form of knowledge

enterprise beyond the ancient Greek's archetypes? The entire of this short piece of writing has been seeking for highlighting this question. But, the answer to it is not so easily reachable.

References

- Gary, R.M. 1996. Archetypal Explorations: Towards an Archetypal Sociology. London: Routledge.
-
- Jaeger, Werner. 1939. Paideia: The Ideals of Greek Culture: Volume I: Archaic Greece: The Mind of Athens. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
-
- Mahoozi, Reza. 2016. Daneshgah: Ta'ammolate Nazari va Tajrobeye Irani (in Persian) [University: Theoretical Reflections and Iranian Experience]. Tehran: Institute for Social and Cultural Studies.
-
- Rorty, Richard. 2007. Philosophy as Cultural Politics. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
-
- Seddighian, Ameneh. 2016. Peymayeshe Kelase Dars (survey report in Persian) [Classroom Survey]. Tehran: Institute for Social and Cultural Studies.