DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 092 038 HE 005 599

TITLE	Report of the Fifth General Conference of the International Association of Universities 1970.
INSTITUTION	International Association of Universities, Paris (France).
PUB DATE	71
NOTE	275p.; Report of the general conference of the International Association of Universities (5th, Montreal, Canada, August 30-September 5, 1970)
EDRS PRICE	MF-$0.75 HC-$12.60 PLUS POSTAGE
DESCRIPTORS	*College Faculty; *College Students; Conference Reports; *Foreign Countries; *Higher Education; *Interinstitutional Cooperation; Teaching Methods; Teaching Techniques; Textbooks

ABSTRACT

This document presents the report of the fifth general confernce of the International Association of Universities (IAU), held in Montreal, Canada, August 30-September 5, 1970. Chapter one presents the inaugural proceedings. Chapter two discusses international university cooperation in relation to university teachers, students, study programs, textbooks, and pedagogical methods and techniques. Chapter three reviews the university and the needs of contemporary society. Summaries of participant responses to the major topics are presented. (MJM)

REPORT OF THE FIFTH GENERAL CONFERENCE OF THE INTERNATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF UNIVERSITIES

MONTREAL

30 AUGUST — 5 SEPTEMBER 1970

INTERNATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF UNIVERSITIES

FIFTH GENERAL CONFERENCE
INTERNATIONAL ASSOCIATION
OF UNIVERSITIES
1970

REPORT OF THE FIFTH GENERAL CONFERENCE OF THE INTERNATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF UNIVERSITIES

MONTREAL
30 AUGUST — 5 SEPTEMBER 1970

INTERNATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF UNIVERSITIES
1, RUE MIOLLIS, PARIS-XV•
1971

FOREWORD

At no time in their history have universities been in as great a need as they are today to get together and exchange experience at every level : nationally, regionally, and internationally. The unprecedented demands placed upon them by the tremendous growth of their societies' requirements and aspirations and by the accelerating progress of knowledge, as well as the deep and widespread internal difficulties which they are enduring, call for every form of mutual knowledge, sharing and co-operation.

Since its establishment in 1950, the International Association of Universities has been dedicated to the service of this co-operation at the international level. Its quinquennial conferences are only one means by which it has attempted to accomplish this service. Each of these conferences from Nice to Istanbul to Mexico City to Tokyo to Montreal has made its distinctive contribution and has also, I am sure, been a memorable experience to those who participated in it. Through free and genuine exchange of ideas among representatives of universities from various geographical, cultural and political regions of the world, through the common concern of these representatives in the confrontation of problems affecting the development of their individual institutions and of their Association, and, not least, through the establishment and strengthening of friendly personal contacts, the conferences have had their part in stimulating and fortifying international understanding and cooperation in the field of higher education. By their progressively enlarged attendance and broadened interests, these meetings have also shown the steady development of the work of the Association.

The Fifth General Conference, held in the pleasant atmosphere of Montreal, August 30 to September 5, 1970, brought together more than 600 participants. Its formal work was, as usual, twofold : on the one hand, the members were engaged, for more than three days, in the discussion of two themes of timely importance to all universities : "International University Cooperation" and "The University and the Needs of Contemporary Society"; and, on the other, they reviewed the work of the Association during the preceding five-year period and laid the broad lines of policy for the coming five

years. The present Report is a faithful record of the views that were expressed and of the decisions that were taken. But in addition to its importance as a record of the Conference, it is also, I believe, a valuable document reflecting basic trends and ideas in the increasingly complex and critical realm of higher education today.

It is not my purpose in this foreword to comment on the rich contents of this Report. I wish merely to make two simple yet essential points. The first relates to what I may call the "spirit" of the Conference. It is my personal impression that the Conference revealed and, in its own modest way, gave support to certain attitudes which are basic to the continuance and the progress of universities : faith in reason and dialogue; receptivity to innovation to meet the revolutionary changes in societies and in universities; concern for the preservation and enrichment of the university's intellectual and moral legacy; and readiness to co-operate more closely and more widely across boundaries and in spite of differences and obstacles. Whatever views were expressed were impressed with these attitudes, and it is, in the last analysis, such attitudes, sustained by mutual confidence and free exchange, which will cement the university world and reinforce its endeavour to discharge its mounting tasks to its national and international communities.

The second point is that the Conference could not have achieved its task successfully without the generosity and cordial support of the Governments of Quebec and of Canada. Deep gratitude is due, and was unanimously expressed at the closing session of the Conference, to His Excellency the Right Hon. Roland Michener, Governor-General of Canada, and to the various other distinguished representatives of Canada and Quebec who honoured the Conference with their presence and their addresses at its various functions.

We owe also a great debt to our hosts, the Conference of Rectors and Principals of Quebec acting for the Association of the Universities and Colleges of Canada. Special words of thanks and appreciation are due to Dr. Roger Gaudry, Rector of the University of Montreal, who represented these two Associations, and to Dr. Lucien Piché and his team of collaborators and assistants who masterfully organized and executed the complicated material arrangements of this large international meeting. This team worked in close collaboration with the Organizing Committee of the Conference, appointed by the Administrative Board, which had the task of planning the programme of the Conference and with the IAU Secretariat which laboured for long and arduous months in translating these plans into concrete forms and details. All of these

preparations, worked out steadfastly and harmoniously, laid the basis for the success of the Conference. This success cannot be conveyed in printed words, but I am confident that it was generally felt and that it will long remain alive in the minds of the participants.

The Montreal Conference was to me personally the climax of a long and happy period of service to IAU, particularly during the quinquennium (1965-70) in which I had the honour and the privilege to serve as President. It is my pleasure to acknowledge my deep indebtedness to all those who made this experience highly rewarding to me--to my colleagues on the Administrative Board, whose wise counsel and generous collaboration were always a source of inspiration and strength; to the Secretary-General, Mr. H.M.R. Keyes, and his team of collaborators who carried on remarkably the day to day work of the Association; to the officers and representatives of member universities and Associate Members from whom I had the benefit to learn and whose individual and common efforts are gradually building up the emerging international university community; and finally, but no less deeply, to the Director-General of Unesco and to his collaborators in the field of Higher Education with whom I was privileged to work closely.

As I, in conclusion, turn from the past to the future, I am happy to express to the new President, my eminent colleague and friend, Prof. V. Merikoski, and to the members of the Administrative Board elected at Montreal, my sincere congratulations and my best wishes for their leadership in the coming period of the Association's life and work.

Constantine K. Zurayk.

INTRODUCTION

The Fifth General Conference was the largest in the history of IAU. More than six hundred people took part, including representatives of 307 member institutions of IAU in 81 countries; of its eight Associate Members; and of 54 international, regional and national bodies concerned with higher education and research. This attendance was all the more remarkable because the Conference took place at a most critical period in the history of universities. The crisis which seems at moments to threaten their very existence is now coupled with an unprecedented expansion of their responsibilities and of their numbers, and casts an alarming—in some ways mysterious—shadow over their growth. It has happened before, of course, that universities have been criticized, even derided, or left to carry on with their rites amid general indifference. There were times when some of them were actually suppressed. But these attacks usually happened when they were stagnating, when they were paralysing intellectual life rather than stimulating it. Over the last few decades, whatever reproaches may properly be addressed to them, it has to be recognized that universities have never before been so productive. The extraordinary development of knowledge which characterizes our epoch is largely owed to universities and the consequences of this, direct and indirect, mean that the university is now one of the most essential institutions of contemporary society.

If it is growing fast, however, it is also going through a major crisis. Whole sections of young people are in revolt against it, younger teachers and researchers as well as students. This revolt, in its extreme forms, has become so radical, goes so far beyond the criticism of institutional structures or methods of communicating knowledge, that it seems to be leading to the formation of two separate camps, no longer having the same cultural references, using words in quite different senses and scarcely understanding one another. The same phenomenon seems to be arising in world relationships, particularly those of the richer countries with the poorer. Such developments are particularly distressing for universities, since their wish is precisely to be places for rational dialogue, for the mutual understanding of different intellectual "languages", for the organized development of mankind in all the diversity that universal culture should make lucid and complementary, one element for another. For if there is no mutual understanding within universities, the road to exasperation and even the reflexes of terrorism seem nearer there than elsewhere.

In most parts of the world, fortunately, these dangers are not immediate, but there are alarming enough signs in one or two countries, for it to be asked whether the humanistic values which marked universities during the last two centuries are not seriously threatened. In proclaiming the basic unity of mankind and in seeking to demonstrate this beneath the variety of different civilizations, universities have assumed that humanity was one and indivisible, and often saw world-wide human progress as their highest and most sacred purpose. It is not so much this universal ideal which is questioned today, but rather the ideological exploitations which have reduced it to abstractions. By talking of mankind in the singular, humanism contributed to the notion that society was a homogeneous whole, where conflicts were relatively superficial and where the rational advance of knowledge would always improve the conditions of life for all nations. Evidently, such a belief is extremely convenient for established authorities, of all kinds. Directly or indirectly, they control not only political power but the keys of knowledge and technical know-how as well and can easily pretend that they are the true interpreters of the public interest. They can claim that their policies are dictated by objective analysis and by the "needs", scientifically decided and arranged in order of priority, of "society". This process is precisely what a part of modern youth will *no longer* accept. They see that education—even if it wants to help all humanity forward in a single movement—has failed to bridge the gap between the rich and poor nations. In the rich nations themselves, it has not been able to prevent a growing mass of people from feeling deprived of full lives—despite their comfortable living-standards—caught as they are in the squirrelcage of producer-consumer relations. "Pockets" of poverty still exist alongside the well-filled pockets. The immediate result, the principal fact immediately evident, is that rather than unity, there is conflict. The world is divided into camps. If frontiers are indefinite between them and may even exist inside individual personalities, the divisions cannot be denied. And they are between oppressors and oppressed, exploiters and exploited. Such a Manichean view of the world may seem absurdly over-simplified, but many young men and young women now take it as axiomatic. In consequence, some among them decide to "contract out". They withdraw to other countries, into guitar-playing vagrancy or the psychedelic trip. Others rebel. Others wait and add their silence to that of the famous silent majority.

Universities have been the first to suffer from this—perhaps because many of their members are among those who feel that the frontier between the world of the oppressors and

the oppressed passes through their own personalities. By a well-known process, they seek to exorcise the demon by projecting it on to the institution closest to them. They accuse universities of allowing the established powers, for their own purposes, to take over those essential elements of political control which science and culture now are. And it is not certain that this elementary psychological process is entirely out of tune with the facts.

Universities in any case are certainly facing new problems and a person who had not kept closely in touch with recent university happenings would no doubt have felt surprise in listening to the President of IAU, Dr. Zurayk, speaking of the present university situation at the inaugural session of the Fifth General Conference.

Everything in the physical setting there reflected solidity and permanence, a stability able to contemplate time serenely. At the centre of the University of Montreal, where the buildings rise on hills dominating the city, members of the Conference took their seats in a well-proportioned amphitheatre, flanked by wide marble staircases. If the walls could have spoken they would surely have done so in that tone of polite, moderate and at the same time confident academic assurance which used to characterize formal university orations before the recent storms. There was little of this, however in the determined but anxious profession of faith made by President Zurayk. He was concerned with the survival of the university and the strenuous efforts that this would require. The hundreds of rectors, presidents, vice-chancellors, professors and other leading university figures who were present, from every region of the world, found nothing surprising in this, yet only a few years ago it would have seemed almost incomprehensible—or attributable to acute neurasthenia.

Later sessions of the Conference, for reasons of convenience, were held in a leading Montreal hotel. More than for these practical considerations, however, a hotel was an appropriate place for a university meeting at this time. Nothing very noticeable distinguishes modern hotel architecture from a great deal of modern university architecture, except perhaps that there are few anti-capitalist graffiti in hotel lobbies. Hotels are very appropriate reflectors of our age of mobility and change. They imply pauses between arrival and departure and they favour encounters; they provide a durable setting for the impermanent and the transient. Their walls and all their accessories of accommodation remain ready to receive an unending succession of

new groups of people endlessly re-constituted. The parallels to be drawn with the present university situation are obvious enough.

Hotels, in fact, now play a big part in most international meetings, since they provide for "informal" contacts between participants; and it has always been believed that contacts of this kind are specially important at IAU General Conferences. These conferences, in fact, are not intended to provide for a series of reports on particular scientific or learned topics—like most meetings of specialists—and less still do they seek agreement on the texts of executive decisions taken by people united by some common doctrine—as in political party conventions or congresses. Discussions at IAU Conferences are certainly carefully prepared. Background papers, documents, ideas and statistics are collected, systematically analyzed and placed at the disposal of participants in advance. But these background and working papers neither have nor can have the character of decisions which can be formally accepted and they certainly make no attempt to translate some agreed philosophy or ideology into a catalogue of practical results. They are a basis for discussion, and discussion is the essential task of the Conference. For obvious reasons, the Conference makes no attempt to pass formal resolutions. It tries not to limit the free development of debate, it does not look for simplified formulae and for compromises, and it wishes to avoid the waste of time involved in long argument about details of phrasing. Some participants, quite obviously, are disappointed by this abstinence —and other methods of work are certainly conceivable. But when five hundred or more university people are gathered in a single room—people for whom systematic disagreement forms part of their professional training—and when they have come from all over the world, representing the most diverse societies, cultures and schools of thought, it is probably best to benefit from their diversity rather than to spend precious time in trying to disguise differences by means of vague texts on which everybody, or even a majority, could agree. The method followed does not in fact prevent certain ways of thought or opinion from emerging more vigorously than others and one of the functions of the Conference is to identify these, to help them to stand out from the ordinary run of opinion and to take note of them. This entire process, it can be argued, would be vitiated if it degenerated into the mere search for a formula and a majority in favour of it. Free exchange of experience and opinion therefore constitutes the main purpose of IAU Conferences—and this can be carried on outside the formal sessions. Private conversations continue on naturally from the official discussions—especially

when they can do so in the same place, with no intervening bus journeys, as was the case in the big hotel conclave at Montreal.

It follows that only a partial account can be given here of the Conference and any attempt at a "balance-sheet" is risky. But encouragement can be found in the fact that member universities of IAU participated in it more widely than ever before, despite the internal difficulties many of them are facing. They could see the wood for the trees, so to speak. The present crisis seemed to be producing a strengthened awareness of the international dimension of university work rather than a retreat inwards. It was important for this to be demonstrated and one of the merits of the Montreal Conference was that it did so.

Another was that the Conference succeeded in maintaining that rational dialogue which seems now to be threatened in many universities. Throughout a week of discussions it proved that a multi-racial, multi-national, multi-disciplinary, multi-ideological, multi-almost-everything community could become a living reality provided that certain rules were obeyed. It might be argued that these rules were too restrictive and that the Conference remained outside rather than above the conflict, that it did not face up to the most difficult questions. Certainly, when the problems of "the university and the needs of contemporary society" were under discussion, no one stood up to declare that the first of these needs was revolution, either in his own country or a neighbouring one. The theme "The University and Revolution" was hardly raised, although in a number of countries, more or less explicitly, it is at the heart of university agitation. Most of the participants seemed to feel that universities in every kind of society, socialist or capitalist, had specific functions and they directed their attention to these. It is hard to see what else could be done. The Conference might well have broken up, and the Association with it, if—for example—Soviet participants had suggested to their United States colleagues that their first duty was the subversion of capitalist society, or if the latter had recommended to the former that they should fight for the re-establishment of private ownership of the means of production. All universities have to see for themselves the limits that must be set on their critical functions within their own communities. Should they directly challenge what they consider injustice or should they seek to constitute a *milieu* where knowledge can be more objectively pursued than elsewhere? An international conference can hardly provide the answer. If universities have in truth become an element of political life in the sense that they

produce knowledge, and therefore power, they can only struggle effectively against abuses of knowledge, both nationally and internationally, by developing a world-wide university community, really alive and vigorous and confident in its own strength. Just as they can only surmount the crisis of abstract humanistic ideals by setting up a genuine internationalism built on ever-growing interchanges between them. The main significance of the Conference, as Dr. Zurayk stressed as he closed its proceedings, was that it marked another stage in this creation of a real international university community. Only a stage, it must be said, for almost everything remains to be done. The Conference hoped that IAU could have greater future impact at every level of university life, and particularly among students and younger academic staff. The way so far chosen was agreed to be in the right direction and the IAU membership seemed ready to maintain their support for it, and to develop and participate in its work as directly as they could.

In conclusion, general observations on the Conference must stress the decisive part played by the hospitality of Quebec, and of Canada as a whole, in ensuring its success. Everyone is aware that Canada, the province of Quebec and the city of Montreal are facing problems—and opportunities also—which are not without resemblances to those of universities. They involve not only the relations between tradition and innovation, between the pluralities of cultures and languages but also the links between tradition, culture, language and economic and social power. Undoubtedly there were affinities between the Conference and the place where it was held. Its hosts, under the leadership of Dr. Lucien Piché, gave proof not only of exceptional generosity and powers of organization, but also of a quite special understanding of the needs of a gathering of university leaders. The atmosphere thus created—a combination of concentration on the work of the sessions and of contacts with the life of Montreal—enabled the Conference to carry out its programme both efficiently and memorably.

But the editors must recall, as they did in the introduction to the Tokyo General Conference report, that unfortunately it is not possible to reproduce the atmosphere of such a meeting in an account dealing only with its official work. Rather like a theatrical performance, an assembly is primarily a social event, of which the actual presence of people and the contacts established between them are an essential element. Any account, however detailed, cannot hope to recapture this, nor indeed the tone, the warmth, the accent of the interventions. Since each of the speeches

made could not be reproduced in its entirety—for reasons of space—no attempt has been made to give them *in extenso*, except for the opening addresses and introductory speeches to the themes. The rest of the proceedings has been summarized, and will inevitably contain defects. Speakers will rightly find that their ideas have lost some of their force, and their indulgence is requested in advance. It is hoped, nevertheless, that the essential elements of the views exchanged during the sessions have been reproduced faithfully.

The editors also wish to express their thanks to all who have lightened their task, to the chairmen, and rapporteurs, and to the speakers who kindly provided copies of their texts.

LIST OF
MEMBERS OF THE CONFERENCE

19/20

LIST OF MEMBERS OF THE CONFERENCE

PRESIDENT

C.K. ZURAYK

VICE-PRESIDENT

J. ROCHE

CONFERENCE ORGANIZING COMMITTEE

C.K. ZURAYK
K. BREWSTER, JR.
E.N. DAFAALLA
J. ROCHE
E.M. SERGEEV
H.M.R. KEYES

CANADIAN RECEPTION COMMITTEE

L.-A. VACHON
H. ROCKE ROBERTSON
R. GAUDRY
J.W. O'BRIEN
R. MALTAIS
C.L.O. GLASS

CANADIAN ORGANIZING COMMITTEE

L. PICHE
C. MCDOUGALL
C. ST-ARNAUD
L. LEMAY
A. BACHAND
P.P. PROULX
D. PEETS
G.L. D'OMBRAIN
A. MCCOLL

EDITOR OF CONFERENCE REPORT

H.M.R. KEYES

ASSISTANT EDITOR

G. DAILLANT

COMMITTEES OF THE CONFERENCE

ELECTIONS COMMITTEE

Chairman : Kingman Brewster, Jr., President, Yale University

G. Balanda, Official University of the Congo

E.N. Dafaalla, Former Vice-Chancellor, University of Khartoum

R. Frondizi, Former Rector, University of Buenos Aires

R.L. Huang, Vice-Chancellor, Nanyang University, Singapore

G. Lefoutre, Rector, Catholic Faculties of Lille

N. Ohama, Former President, Waseda University, Tokyo

H.R. Pitt, Vice-Chancellor, University of Reading

E.M. Sergeev, First Pro-Rector, University of Moscow

P. Zarev, Rector, Sofia University

CREDENTIALS COMMITTEE

Chairman : A.E. Sloman, Vice-Chancellor, University of Essex
A.A. Kwapong, Vice-Chancellor, University of Ghana

José Maria Latorre, Rector, National University of Colombia

B. Mazar, Pro-Rector, The Hebrew University of Jerusalem

CONSTITUTION COMMITTEE

Chairman : J. Baugniet, Honorary Rector, University of Brussels

Gaber Gad, Rector, Cairo University

A.C. Joshi, Former Vice-Chancellor, Banaras Hindu University

J.A.L. Matheson, Vice-Chancellor, Monash University, Melbourne

V. Merikoski, University of Helsinki

B. Svestka, Rector, Charles University, Prague

MEMBERS OF WORKING PARTIES ON THE TWO THEMES

International University Co-operation

Chairman	R.L. WEEKS
Vice-Chairman ...	I.M. TERNOV
Rapporteur	L.-Ph. BONNEAU
Opening Speakers.	L.K.H. GOMA
	J.M. HESTER
	R. RODEWALD
	J. ABU SAYED CHOWDHURY
	M. FOG
	T.M. HESBURGH
	I. KATO
	A. MURSI
	R.H. MYERS
	I. SUPEK
	P. TEYSSIER
	C. WILSON
	K.-H. WIRZBERGER

University and the Needs of Contemporary Society

Chairman	E. LAPALUS
Vice-Chairman ...	L. GORDON
Rapporteur	J.F. LEDDY
Opening Speakers.	Ungku A. AZIZ
	H. JANNE
	G. MASSIEU HELGUERA
Other Members ..	S.T. BELIAEV
	S. BHAN
	T. CARNACINI
	M. FASSI FIHRI
	B.E. GUTIERREZ
	F.R. MACGREGOR
	P. MARMIER
	G.E. MEULEMAN
	K. NAGY
	R. RENDTORFF

ADMINISTRATIVE BOARD OF IAU

Chairman	C.K. ZURAVK
Vice-Chairman ...	J. ROCHE
Members	Kingman BREWSTER, Jr.
	E.N. DAFAALLA
	R. FRONDIZI
	A.C. JOSHI
	B. MAZAR
	V. MERIKOSKI
	N. OHAMA
	E.M. SERGEEV
	A.E. SLOMAN
	J. Otao STEFANI
	W. ZIMMERLI
Honorary President	J. BAUGNIET
Secretary-General .	H.M.R. KEYES

REPRESENTATIVES APPOINTED BY MEMBER INSTITUTIONS

ARGENTINA

Universidad de Buenos Aires
Andrés A. SANTAS, Rector
Horacio Achaval AYERZA, Secretary for Academic Affairs
Vicente Patricio GUTIÉRREZ,

Pontificia Universidad católica argentina « Santa Maria de los Buenos Aires »
Mgr Octavio N. DERISI, Rector

Universidad del Salvador, Buenos Aires
R.P. Ismael QUILES, S.J., Rector
R.P. Jaime AMADEO, S.J., Director General of Studies

Universidad católica de Córdoba
R.P. Fernando STORNI, S.J., Rector
Arturo GRANILLO, Vice-Rector
Miss Susana MITCHELL, Secretary-General

Universidad nacional de Córdoba
Narciso A. HERNÁNDEZ, Dean of the Faculty of Medicine

Universidad nacional del Nordeste, Corrientes
Ernesto Joaquim Antonio MAEDER, Rector
Ernesto Ignacio GALDEANO, Secretary-General (Academic)
Carlos Alberto OJEDA, Secretary-General (Administration)

AUSTRALIA

University of Adelaide
A.C. CASTLES, Dean of the Faculty of Law

Australian National University, Canberra
P.H. PARTRIDGE, Research School of Social Sciences
L.M. BIRT, School of General Studies
C. DUKE, Director, Centre for Continuing Education
Richard C. REFSHAUGE, Student

The Flinders University of South Australia, Bedford Park
H.J. BUCHAN, Registrar

University of Melbourne
Hume DOW, Senior Lecturer

Monash University, Clayton
J.A.L. MATHESON, Vice-Chancellor

University of Newcastle, Shortland
J.J. AUCHMUTY, Vice-Chancellor
B.L. JOHNS, Head of the Department of Economics

University of New England, Armidale
G.M. PHILIP, Professor of Geology

University of New South Wales, Kensington
Rupert H. MYERS, Vice-Chancellor

University of Queensland, St. Lucia
Mrs. Elizabeth USHER, Head of the Department of Speech Therapy

University of Sydney
Bruce R. WILLIAMS, Vice-Chancellor and Principal

University of Tasmania, Hobart
Sir George CARTLAND, Vice-Chancellor

BELGIUM

Université libre de Bruxelles
J. BAUGNIET, Former Rector
H. JANNE, Former Rector

Vrije Universiteit te Brussel
A. GERLO, Rector

Rijksuniversiteit te Gent
D. VANDEPITTE, Rector

Katholieke Universiteit te Leuven
M.O. LOEYS, Professor

Université de Liège
Claude RENARD, Vice-President of Administrative Board
H. JANNE

Université catholique de Louvain
Miss Suzanne MANSION, Professor
J.J. MASQUELIN, Professor

Centre universitaire de l'Etat à Mons
J. FRANEAU, Rector

Faculté Polytechnique de Mons
P. HOUZEAU DE LEHAIE, Rector

BRAZIL

Pontifícia Universidade católica do Rio Grande do Sul, Pôrto Alegre
J. Olão STEFANI, Rector

Pontifícia Universidade católica do Rio de Janeiro
Rev. Ormindo VIVEIROS DE CASTRO, S.J., Rector
Rev. LAERCIO DIAS DE MOURA, S.J.

BULGARIA

Sofiiski universitet « Kliment Ohridski », Sofia
Emil GEORGIEV, Pro-Rector

BURUNDI

Université officielle de Bujumbura
Mgr Michel KARIKUNZIRA, Rector

CANADA

The University of British Columbia, Vancouver
P.H. WHITE, Dean of the Faculty of Commerce

Brock University, St-Catharines
*James A. GIBSON, President
Alan James EARP, Provost and Vice-President
Albert A. TUNIS, Registrar and Secretary of Senate

Carleton University, Ottawa
A.D. DUNTON, President
John RUPTASH, Dean of Graduate Studies

Université Laval, Québec
Mgr Louis-Albert VACHON, Rector
Louis-Philippe BONNEAU, Vice-Rector
Napoléon LEBLANC, Vice-Rector
Larkin KERWIN, Vice-Rector
André BARNARD, Director of Public Relations

University of Lethbridge
Sam W.A. SMITH
William BECKEL, Vice-President (Academic)

McGill University, Montreal
R.E. BELL, Principal and Vice-Chancellor (elect)
M.K. OLIVER, Vice-Principal (Academic)
H.G. DION, Vice-Principal, Macdonald College
Hutton ARCHER, President-elect, Student's Society

McMaster University, Hamilton
W.F. HELLMUTH, Vice-President, Arts
W.J. McCALLION, Director of Continuing Education
D.R. McCALLA, Dean of the Faculty of Science

University of Manitoba, Winnipeg
Ernest SIRLUCK, President-Designate
J.C. GILSON, Dean of the Faculty of Graduate Studies
W.M. SIBLEY, Director of Planning and Priorities

Memorial University of Newfoundland, St. John's
Lord TAYLOR OF HARLOW, President
G.E. PANTING, Special Assistant to Dean, Arts and Science

Université de Moncton
Adelard SAVOIE, Rector

Université de Montréal
Roger GAUDRY, Rector
Paul LACOSTE, Vice-Rector (Executive)
Lucien PICHE, Vice-Rector (Development)
André ARCHAMBAULT, Vice-Rector (Academic)
DE GUISE VAILLANCOURT, Vice-Dean of the Faculty of Medicine
Jacques GIRARD, Secretary-General
Jean-Paul LUSSIER, Dean of the Faculty of Dentistry
Serge LAPOINTE, Dean of the Faculty of Sciences

Guy DESBARATS, Dean of the Faculty of Environment Design
René DE CHANTAL, Dean of the Faculty of Letters
Jacques LUCIER, Director of Services
V. DÉCARIE, Professor

Mount Allison University, Sackville
H. Roy CRABTREE, Chancellor
L.H. CRAGG, President
Anthony BAILEY, Vice-President (Administration)

Mount Saint Vincent University, Halifax
Sister Catherine WALLACE, President
Sister Margaret MOLLOY, Academic Dean

University of New Brunswick, Fredericton
D.C. BLUE, Dean

Université d'Ottawa
R.P. Roger GUINDON, O.M.I., Rector
Paul HAGEN, Dean of the School of Graduate Studies
Louis SABOURIN, Director of International Centre for Co-operation

University of Prince Edward Island, Charlottetown
R.J. BAKER, President

Université du Québec
Alphonse RIVERIN, President
Louis BERLINGUET, Vice-President
Léon A. DORAIS, Rector
André M. DESGAGNE, Rector

Queen's University at Kingston
G.A. HARROWER, Vice-Principal (Academic)
John P. MATTHEWS, Department of English

St. Francis Xavier University, Antigonish
Rev. Malcolm MACDONELL, President

University of Saskatchewan, Saskatoon
J.W.T. SPINKS, President
R.N.H. HASLAM, Vice-Principal (Saskatoon Campus)
R.F.E. HARVEY, Vice-Principal

Université de Sherbrooke
Mgr Roger MALTAIS, P.D., Rector
Roger BERNIER, Vice-Rector for Academic Affairs
Marcel GUY, Dean of the Faculty of Law

Simon Fraser University, Burnaby
John WEBSTER, Chairman of the Graduate Studies Committee

Sir George Williams University, Montreal
J.W. O'BRIEN, Principal and Vice-Chancellor
J. BORDAN, Vice-Principal (Academic)
C.C. POTTER, Professor of Finance

University of Toronto
Claude BISSELL, President
J.H. SWORD, Executive Vice-President (Academic)
R.C. PRATT, Director of the Programme in International Studies

E.F. SHEFFIELD, Department of Higher Education

Trent University, Peterborough
T.H.B. SYMONS, President and Vice-Chancellor

University of Victoria
Bruce PARTRIDGE, President

University of Windsor
G. Malcolm MORTON, Chairman of the Board of Governors
J.F. LEDDY, President
F.A. DE MARCO, Vice-President

York University, Toronto
David W. SLATER, President
Jules HELLER, Dean of the Faculty of Fine Arts

University of Western Ontario, London
D.C. WILLIAMS, President
O.H. WARWICK, Vice-President
P.A. FORSYTH, Professor

University of Winnipeg
Wilfred C. LOCKHART, President

CHILE

Pontificia Universidad católica de Chile, Santiago
J.J. BRUNNER, Professor
Fernando FLORES LABRA, Director for Academic Affairs

Universidad de Chile, Santiago
Edgardo BOENINGER, Rector

Universidad católica de Valparaíso
Raul ALLARD, Rector

CHINA (Republic of) (Taiwan)

National Taiwan University, Taipei
CHEN HSING YEN, President

COLOMBIA

Pontificia Universidad Javeriana, Bogotá
R.P. Ismael QUILES, S.J.

Universidad nacional de Colombia, Bogotá
Mario LATORRE, Rector

Universidad de Los Andes, Bogotá
Eduardo Wiesner DURAN, Rector-Designate

CONGO (Democratic Republic)

Université Lovanium, Kinshasa
Mgr Th. TSHIBANGU, Rector
Alphonse ELUNGU, Vice-Rector
A. MPASE, Secretary-General
Mgr L. GILLON

Université officielle du Congo, Lubumbashi
Gérard BALANDA, Professor

COSTA RICA

Universidad de Costa Rica, San José
Carlos TÜNNERMANN BERNHEIM

CZECHOSLOVAKIA

Komenského Universita, Bratislava
Emil HURAJ, Rector

Universita Karlova, Praha
Bedrich SVESTKA, Rector

Ceské vysoké učení technické, Praha
Bohumil KVASIL, Rector

DENMARK

Aarhus universitet
Søren SØRENSEN, Rector

Københavns universitet
Mogens FOG, Rector

Danmarks tekniske Højskole, Lyngby
Tom CHRISTENSEN, Director of Studies

DOMINICAN REPUBLIC

Universidad autónoma de Santo Domingo
Rafael Kasse ACTA, Rector
Tirso Mejia RICART, Professor
Julio César MARTÍNEZ, Student

ETHIOPIA

Haile Sellassie I University, Addis Ababa
Aklilu HABTE, President
Frank BOWLES, Academic Vice-President
Mulugeta WODAJO
Mengesha GESSESSE

FINLAND

Helsingin Yliopisto, Helsinki
V. MERIKOSKI, Professor of Law

Oulun Yliopisto, Oulu
Markku MANNERKOSKI, Rector

Turun Yliopisto, Turku
V. MERIKOSKI

FRANCE

Facultés catholiques de l'Ouest, Angers
M. l'Abbé HOUARD, Secretary-General

Université de Bordeaux
J. VALADE, Dean of the Faculty of Sciences

Université de Clermont-Ferrand
Etienne LAPALUS, Professor, Faculty of Letters

Université de Dijon
F. CABANNE, Dean of the Faculty of Medicine and Pharmacy

Facultés catholiques de Lille
M. le Chanoine G. LEPOUTRE, Rector
Mme A.M. LECLERCQ-MESLIN, Student

Université de Lyon
R. NERSON, Former Dean of the Faculty of Law

Université de Nancy
A. BEAU, Dean of the Faculty of Medicine

Université de Paris,
Jean ROCHE, Former Rector

Institut catholique de Paris
M. l'Abbé J.J. LATOUR, Vice-Rector
R.P. Dominique DUBARLE, O.P., Dean of the Faculty of Medicine
Bernard LEVALLOIS, Student

Université de Reims
M. DEVÈZE, Dean of the Faculty of Letters
M. SANOUILLET, Professor, Faculty of Letters
M. ERRERA, Lecturer

Université de Rennes
Y. COUTEL, Professor, Faculty of Medicine

Université de Strasbourg
C. HAURET, Faculty of Catholic Theology
Jacques COHEN, Student

Institut catholique de Toulouse
M. le Chanoine Gérard LEPOUTRE

GERMANY (Democratic Republic)

Humboldt-Universität zu Berlin
K.H. WIRZBERGER, Rector

Technische Universität Dresden
M. LIEBSCHER, Rector

Technische Hochschule Ilmenau
H.H. ELSTER, Rector

Karl-Marx-Universität Leipzig
M. WINKLER, Rector

Technische Hochschule Otto von Guericke, Magdeburg
M. BECKERT, Rector

Universität Rostock
G. HEIDORN, Rector

GERMANY (Federal Republic)

Rheinisch-Westfälische Technische Hochschule, Aachen
M. AMELING, Pro-Rector

Freie Universität Berlin
Rolf KREIBICH, President

Technische Universität, Berlin
Alexander WITTKOWSKY, President

Technische Universität Carolo Wilhelmina, Braunschweig
Hans RUMPF

Ruhruniversität Bochum
Hans FAILLARD, Rector

Rheinische Friedrich-Wilhelms-Universität, Bonn
K.J. PARTSCH, Pro-Rector

Technische Hochschule, Darmstadt
Friedrich BECK, Pro-Rector

Universität Düsseldorf
A. DIEMER, Rector

Friedrich-Alexander-Universität Erlangen-Nürnberg
N. FIEBIGER, Rector

Johannes Wolfgang Goethe-Universität Frankfurt a/M
W. ZIMMERLI

Georg-August-Universität, Göttingen
Eduard LOUSE, Rector

Universität Hamburg
Richard MÜNZNER

Ruprecht-Karl-Universität, Heidelberg
R. RENDTORFF, Rector

Universität Hohenheim
U. RIEMANN, representing the President

Universität Karlsruhe
M. DRAHEIM, Rector

Christian-Albrechts-Universität, Kiel
Diedrich SCHROEDER, Rector

Universität zu Köln
H. HÜBNER, Rector

Universität Mannheim
Gehrard ZEITEL, Rector

Philipps-Universität, Marburg/Lahn
Lothar TENT, Rector
L. FROESE, Professor

Ludwig-Maximilians-Universität, München
Peter WALTER, Rector

Technische Hochschule, München
H. ENGERTH, Rector

Westfälische Wilhelms-Universität, Münster
Heinz ROLLHÄUSER, Rector

Universität Regensburg
Hermann KAMMERER, Chancellor

Universität Stuttgart
Heinz BLENKE, Rector

Bayerische Julius-Maximilians-Universität, Würzburg
Werner UHLMANN, Rector

GHANA

University of Science and Technology, Kumasi
E. EVANS-ANFOM, Vice-Chancellor
Anthony S. YAW ANDOH, Registrar
Albert Morgan WRIGHT, Senior Lecturer, Faculty of Civil Engineering

University of Ghana, Legon
A.A. KWAPONG, Vice-Chancellor
E.A.K. EDZII, Registrar
E.J. THOMPSON, Senior Lecturer, Faculty of Agriculture

GREECE

Aristotelelon Panepistimion Thessalonikis
C.K. ANASTASSOPOULOS, Rector

HONG KONG

The Chinese University of Hong Kong
M. CHOH-MING LI, Vice-Chancellor

University of Hong Kong
Kenneth E. ROBINSON, Vice-Chancellor
Ronald HSIA, Professor of Economics

HUNGARY

Eötvös Loránd Tudományegyetem, Budapest
Károly NAGY, Rector
József VICH, Vice-Dean

Nehézipari Müszaki Egyetem, Miskolc
Janos SZABO, Vice-Rector

INDIA

Calcutta University
B.N. SEN, Vice-Chancellor

Panjab University, Chandigarh
Suraj BHAN, Vice-Chancellor

Delhi University
Sarup SINGH, Pro-Vice-Chancellor

Osmania University, Hyderabad
R. SATYANARAYAN, Vice-Chancellor

Madras University
N.D. SUNDARAVADIVELU, Vice-Chancellor

Banaras Hindu University, Varanasi
K.L. SHRIMALI, Vice-Chancellor

IRAN

Dânechgâhé Pahlavi Chiraz
S.E. NAHAVANDI, Rector

Dânechgâhé Mashad
M. ALIZADEH

Dânechgâhé Tabriz
M. TASLINI, Chancellor
B. SARKARATY, Head, Department of Inter-University Relations

Dânechgâhé Tehran
Keshi AFSHAR

IRAQ

University of Baghdad
A.L. BADRI, President

University of Basrah
Hussain ABBAS, Acting President

University of Mosul
A.K. JAWADI, Vice-President

IRELAND

National University of Ireland, Dublin
Jeremiah J. HOGAN, Vice-Chancellor

University of Dublin, Trinity College
Albert Joseph MCCONNEL, Provost

ISRAEL

Ha'Technion - Machon Tecnologi Le'Israel, Haifa
Shragga IRMAY, Faculty of Civil Engineering

Ha-Universita Ha-Ivrit, Jerusalem
Jacob KATZ, Rector

Universita Bar-Ilan, Ramat Gan
M.Z. KADDARI, Dean of the Faculties of Humanities and Social Sciences

Universitat Tel Aviv
George S. WISE, President

ITALY

Università degli Studi di Bologna
Tito CARNACINI, Rector
Gabriele GOIDANICH, Pro-Rector
Guglielmo GOLA, Faculty of Economics and Commerce

Università degli Studi di Catania
Tito CARNACINI

Università degli Studi di Firenza
Tito CARNACINI

Università cattolica del Sacro Cuore, Milan
Leonardo ANCONA, Member of Administrative Board

Università degli Studi di Milano
Tito CARNACINI

Università degli Studi di Modena
G. VIGNOCCHI, Rector

Università degli Studi di Parma
Carlo BIANCHI, Rector

Università degli Studi di Pisa
Tito CARNACINI

Università degli Studi di Sassari
Giovanni PAU, Professor

Università degli Studi di Trieste
Manlio UDINA, Director, Institute of International Law

IVORY COAST

Université d'Abidjan
J. GARAGNON, Rector (Acting)

JAPAN

Osaka Shiritsu Daigaku
Yuzuru WATASE, President
Tohoku Gakuin Daigaku, Sendai
Kei NISEKI, Dean and Professor of Law
Gakushuin Daigaku, Tokyo
Masao KONDO, President
Jochi Daigaku (Sophia U.), Tokyo
Rev. X.T. OIZUMI, S.J., President
Meiji Daigaku, Tokyo
Tomiya NAKAGAWA, President
Nihon Daigaku, Tokyo
Tatsuo KAMEI, Vice-Dean of the College of Commerce
Seishin Joshi Daigaku, Tokyo
Setsuko MIYOSHI, rscj, President
Tokyo Daigaku
Ichiro KATO, President
Morihiko OKATSU, Dean of the Faculty of Education
Tokyo Kikeikai Ika Daigaku
Kazushige HIGUCHI, President
Waseda Daigaku, Tokyo
Kyojiro SEMEYA, Director of Academic Affairs

JORDAN

University of Jordan
Abdel Karim KHALIFA, President

KOREA (Republic of)

Seoul Dai Hak Kyo
Soo SUNG LEE, Special Assistant to the President

KUWAIT

Kuwait University
Anwar AL-NOURI, Secretary-General

LEBANON

Al-Jami'ah al-Amirikiyah fi Bayrut (American University of Beirut)
Samuel B. KIRKWOOD, President
Robert W. CRAWFORD, Vice-President
Constantine K. ZURAYK, Distinguished Professor of History
Jami'at al Qiddis Yusuf (Université Saint-Joseph Beyrouth)
Rev. A. DAGHER, S.J., Rector
Jami'at Bayrut al-'Arabiyah (Arab University of Beirut)
Shams EL-WAKIL, Rector

LIBERIA

University of Liberia, Monrovia
Rocheforte L. Weeks, President

LIBYA

Libyan University, Benghazi
O. Shebani, President

MALAWI

University of Malawi, Limbe
L.K. Goma

MALAYSIA

University of Malaya, Kuala Lumpur
Ungku A. Aziz, Vice-Chancellor

MALTA

Royal University of Malta, Msida
E.J. Borg Costanzi, Vice-Chancellor

MEXICO

Instituto politécnico nacional, México
Enrique G. León López, Technical Sub-Director
Manuel Zorilla Carcano, Dean of the Faculty of Mechanical and Electrical Engineering

Universidad autónoma del Estado de México
Guillermo Ortiz Garduno, Rector

Universidad iberoamericana, México
Ernesto Meneses, Rector
Juan Lafarga, Associate Professor of Psychology

Universidad nacional autónoma de México
Luis Garrido, former Rector
Alfonso Bernal
Joaquim Sánchez MacGregor

MOROCCO

Université Mohammed V, Rabat
Mohammed Fassi-Fihri, Director, Centre for Scientific Research
Brahim Boutaleb, Dean of the Faculty of Letters

NETHERLANDS

Vrije Universiteit te Amsterdam
Gezinus Evert Meuleman, Rector (Acting)

Rijksuniversiteit te Groningen
W. Verburg, Department of International Affairs

Rijksuniversiteit te Leiden
F.L. MULDER, Director of the Office of International Relations

Katholieke Universiteit te Nijmegen
Ch. M.A. KUYPER, Acting Charman of the Board of Governors

Nederlandsche Economische Hogeschool te Rotterdam
C.F. SCHEFFER

Katholieke Hogeschool te Tilburg
C.F. SCHEFFER, Rector

NEW ZEALAND

University of Auckland
S. MUSGROVE, Deputy Vice-Chancellor

NICARAGUA

Universidad nacional autónoma de Nicaragua, León
Carlos TÜNNERMANN-BERNHEIM, Rector

NIGERIA

University of Ibadan
Justice E.O. FAKAYODE, Member of Council
T.A. LAMBO, Vice-Chancellor
N.K. ADAMOLEKUN, Registrar
M. OYENUGA

University of Ife
H.A. OLUWASANMI, Vice-Chancellor

University of Lagos
S.O. BIOBAKU, Vice-Chancellor

Ahmadu Bello University, Zaria
I.S. AUDU, Vice-Chancellor
U. SHEBU, Director of the Institute of Health
Iya ABUBAKAR, Head of the Mathematics Department

PAKISTAN

University of Dacca
Justice Abu Sayed CHOWDHURY, Vice-Chancellor

University of Sind, Hyderabad
Ghulam Mustafa SHAH, Vice-Chancellor
M.A. KAZI, Director of the Institute of Chemistry

PANAMA

Universidad de Panamá
Edwin FABREGA, Rector
Jerónimo AVERZA, Academic Vice-Rector
M. BERMUDEZ

PARAGUAY

Universidad católica « Nuestra Señora de la Asunción », Asunción
Juan MOLEON ANDREU, Rector

PERU

Pontificia Universidad católica del Perú, Lima
Rev. Felipe E. MACGREGOR, S.J., Rector

PHILIPPINES

Saint Louis University, Baguio City
Rev. Paul P. ZWAENOPOEL, President
Florentino HORNEDO, Dean of the College of Human Sciences

Foundation University, Dumaguete City
V.G. SINCO, President
Edmondo SINCO

De La Salle College, Manila
Brother H. Gabriel CONNON, FSC, President

Philippines Women's University Manila
Belen E. GUTIERREZ, President
Mrs. Lourdes E. GUILLERMO, Professor
Mrs. Amelou REYES, Assistant to the President

University of the East, Manila
Francisco T. DALUPAN, President
Pablo D. TOBIAS, Vice-President for Business Affairs

University of Santo Tomas, Manila
Fr. Jesus DIAZ, O.P., Rector
Antonio M. MOLINA, Vice-Rector for External Relations

University of the Phillippines, Quezon City
Salvador LOPEZ, President

Centro Escolar University, San Miguel
Pilar H. LIM, President
Mrs. Minerva G. LAUDICO, Executive Vice-President

POLAND

Politechnika Gdańska
Janusz STALINSKI, Rector

Uniwersytet Jagielloński, Kraków
Franciszek STUDNICKI, Professor of Civil Law

Uniwersytet Warszawski
Władysław RODEWALD, Pro-Rector

Uniwersytet Wrocławski im. Bolesława Bieruta, Wrocław
Włodzimierz BERUTOWICZ, Rector

PORTUGAL

Universidade do Porto
Manuel CORREIA DE BARROS, Jr.

RHODESIA

University College of Rhodesia, Salisbury
D.T. THOMPSON, Senior Lecturer, Faculty of Medicine

RUMANIA

Institutul Politehnic « Gheorghe Gheorgiu-Dej », Bucureşti
George BĂRĂNESCU, Rector

Universitatea « Babeş-Bolyai », Cluj
Stefan PASCU, Rector

RWANDA

Université nationale du Rwanda, Butare
T.R.P. Georges H. LÉVESQUE, Rector
M. LEFRANÇOIS, Dean of the Faculty of Science

SALVADOR

Universidad de El Salvador, San Salvador
Gonzalo Yanes DÍAZ, Vice-Rector

SAUDI ARABIA

University of Riyadh
Rida OBEID, Dean of the Faculty of Science

SENEGAL

Université de Dakar
Paul TEYSSIER, Rector

SIERRA LEONE

University of Sierra Leone, Freetown
Rev. Canon HARRY SAWYERR, Vice-Chancellor

SINGAPORE

Nanyang University, Singapore
Rayson L. HUANG, Vice-Chancellor

University of Singapore
TOH Chin Chye, Vice-Chancellor

SOUTH AFRICA

University of Cape Town
D.P. INSKIP, Deputy Principal

SPAIN

Universidad de Barcelona
Alfonso BALCELLS-GORINA, Professor, Faculty of Medicine

Universidad de Navarra, Pamplona
Francisco PONZ, Rector

Universidad de Salamanca
Felipe Lucena GONDE, Rector

Universidad de Santiago de Compostela
Manuel J. GARCÍA GARRIDO, Rector

SUDAN

University of Khartoum
O.M. OSMAN, Vice-Chancellor

SWITZERLAND

Université de Genève
Bernard DUCRET, Secretary-General

Eidgenössische Technische Hochschule Zürich
Pierre MARMIER, Rector
Alexander von ARX, Secretary of the Rectorate

SYRIAN ARAB REPUBLIC

Jamia't Dimash'k, Damascus (*University of Damascus*)
A. MURSI

TANZANIA

University of Dar es Salaam
Justice P.L.U. CROSS, Dean of the Faculty of Law

THAILAND

Chulalongkorn University, Bangkok
Tab NILANIDHI, Rector
Rong SYAMANANDA, Deputy Rector

TUNISIA

Université de Tunis
Hamadi SAIDI, Assistant Secretary-General

TURKEY

Ankara Üniversitesi
Tahsin ÖZGÜÇ, Rector

Ege Üniversitesi, İzmir
Vehbi GÖKSEL, Pro-Rector
Celâl SARAÇ, Pro-Rector

Hacettepe Üniversitesi
Ihsan DOĞRAMACI, President
Abdullah KENANOĞLU, Vice-President
Ilham KUM

Istanbul Teknik Üniversitesi
Kâzim ERGIN, Rector
Bedri KARAFAKIOĞLU, Pro-Rector
Muzaffer UÇDOĞAN, Secretary-General

Istanbul Universitesi
Nazim TERZIOĞLU, Rector

UGANDA

Makerere University, Kampala
F. KALIMUZO, Vice-Chancellor

UNION OF SOVIET SOCIALIST REPUBLICS

Kazahskij gosudarstvennyj universitet, Alma-Ata
U.A. DŽALDASBEKOV, Rector

Irkutskij gosudarstvennyj universitet
L. PARPAROV

Kazanskij gosudarstvennyj universitet
M.T. NUŽIN, Rector

Kievskij gosudarstvennyj universitet
M.U. BELYJ, Rector

Kišinevskij ordena Trudovogo Krasnogo gosudarstvennyj universitet
A.M. LAZAREV, Rector

Leningradskij gosudarstvennyj universitet
N.A. BELJAEV, Pro-Rector

Belorusskij gosudarstvennyj universitet, Minsk
I.M. TERNOV

Moskovskij gosudarstvennyj universitet
E.M. SERGEEV, Pro-Rector
I.M. TERNOV, Pro-Rector
L. PARPAROV, Vice-Dean

Universitet Družby Narodov im. Patrisa Lumumby, Moskva
S.V. RUMJANCEV, Rector

Novosibirskij gosudarstvennyj universitet
S.T. BELJAEV, Rector

Taškentskij gosudarstvennyj universitet
S.H. SIRADŽINOV, Rector

The representatives of the above member Universities were accompanied by :
M.T. CISOC
V.D. JARUSIN
G.A. DENISENKO
B.S. FOKIN

UNITED ARAB REPUBLIC

Ain-Shams University, Cairo
M. KOTB, Rector

Al-Azhar University Cairo
Badawey Abd EL-LATIF AWAD, Rector

Alexandria University
A.R. EL-SADR, Vice-Rector

Assiut University
Mohammed Hamdy EL NASHAR, Rector

Cairo University
GABER GAD, Rector

The American University in Cairo
Osman L. FARRAG, Director, Division of Public Service
Richard F. CRABBS, Dean of the Faculties

UNITED KINGDOM

University of Aberdeen
W.S. WATT, Vice-Principal
J.N. MILNE, Member of the Court

University of Birmingham
John WALKER, Professor of Applied Nuclear Science

University of Bradford
E.G. EDWARDS, Vice-Chancellor

University of Bristol
F.J. LLEWELLYN

University of Cambridge
Owen CHADWICK, Vice-Chancellor

University of Durham
Kenneth R. ASHBY, Department of Zoology

University of Essex, Colchester
A.E. SLOMAN, Vice-Chancellor

University of Exeter
F.J. LLEWELLYN, Vice-Chancellor

University of Glasgow
Sir Charles WILSON, Principal

University of Hull
Sir Douglas LOGAN

University of London
Sir Brian WINDEYER, Vice-Chancellor
Sir Douglas LOGAN, Principal

University of Manchester
Sir William Mansfield COOPER, Vice-Chancellor

University of Oxford
W.O. CHADWICK

University of Reading
H.R. PITT, Vice-Chancellor

University of Salford
D.W. HILL, Pro-Chancellor
C. WHITWORTH, Vice-Chancellor
R. MYERS, Pro-Vice-Chancellor

University of Sheffield
H.N. ROBSON, Vice-Chancellor

University of Strathclyde, Glasgow
Sir Samuel CURRAN, Principal and Vice-Chancellor

University of Wales, Cardiff
F. LLEWELLYN-JONES, Vice-Chancellor

University of Warwick, Coventry
J.B. BUTTERWORTH, Vice-Chancellor

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

University of Alabama, University
Douglas JONES, Dean of the College of Arts and Sciences

University of Arizona, Tucson
Albert F. GEGENHEIMER, Chairman of the University Faculty

Boston College, Chesnut Hill
Rev. F.X. SHEA, S.J., Executive Vice-President
Richard E. HUGHES, Dean
Ralph H. SMUCKLER

University of California, Berkeley
Charles J. HITCH, President
Vernon CHEADLE, Chancellor
William H. ALLAWAY, Director, Education Program

Catholic University of America, Washington
Clarence C. WALTON, President

University of Cincinnati
George RIEVESCHL, Vice-President for Research

University of Colorado, Boulder
F.P. THIEME, President

Columbia University, New York
Andrew W. CORDIER, President
Luther EVANS

Cornell University, Ithaca
Robert A. PLANE, Principal

Dartmouth College
John S. DICKEY, President Emeritus

University of Detroit
Rev. Malcolm CARRON, S.J., President

Duke University, Durham
Craufurd D. GOODWIN, Vice-Principal

Emory University, Atlanta
Sanford S. ATWOOD, President
Judson C. WARD, Jr., Vice-President and Dean of Faculties

Fordham University, New York
Rev. Edward B. ROONEY, S.J.

Harvard University, Cambridge
Nathan M. PUSEY, President

University of Hawaii, Honolulu
Harlan CLEVELAND, President
Charles NEFF, Academic Assistant to the President

Howard University, Washington
Andrew BILLINGSLEY, Vice-President for Academic Affairs

University of Illinois, Urbana
Eldon L. JOHNSON, Vice-President

Indiana University, Bloomington
Herman B. WELLS, Chancellor, Former President
Byrum E. CARTER, Chancellor

The Johns Hopkins University, Baltimore
Lincoln GORDON, President

University of Kansas, Lawrence
E. Laurence CHALMERS, Chancellor

Kansas State University, Manhattan
Joseph HAJDA, Director, Office of International Activities

Miami University, Oxford
Phillip R. SHRIVER, President

Michigan State University, East Lansing
Ralph H. SMUCKLER, Dean of International Programs

University of Michigan, Ann Arbor
Barbara W. NEWELL, Acting Vice-President for Student Affairs

University of Minnesota, Minneapolis
Stanley J. WENBERG, Vice-President

University of Mississippi, University
Alton W. BRYANT, Vice-Chancellor

University of Missouri, Columbia
James OLSON, Chancellor
A.G. UNKLESBAY, Vice-President for Administration
C.B. RATCLIFFORD, Vice-President for Extension

New York University
James M. HESTER, President

University of North Dakota, Grand Forks
George W. STARCHER, President

Northwestern University, Evanston
Robert H. STROTZ, President

University of Notre Dame
Rev. Theodore M. HESBURGH, C.S.C., President
Edmund A. STEPHAN, Chairman, Board of Trustees
Father John WALSH, Academic Vice-President

University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia
David R. GODDARD, Principal

University of Pittsburgh
Wesley W. POSVAR, Chancellor
Charles H. PEAKE, Principal
Carl BECK, Director, University Center for International Studies

Princeton University
Robert F. GOHEEN, President

University of Puerto Rico, Rio Piedras
Jaime BENITEZ, President

Purdue University, Lafayette
Frederick L. HOVDE, President

University of Rhode Island, Kingston
Werner A. BAUM, President

Rutgers, The State University, New Brunswick
Ardath W. BURKS, Director of International Programs

St. Louis University
Rev. John W. PADBERG, S.J., Academic Vice-President
Rev. Harold BRADLEY, S.J., Director of International Programs

Southern Illinois University, Carbondale
Delyte W. MORRIS, President
Oliver J. CALDWELL, Assistant to the Vice-President (Area and International Services)

Syracuse University
John E. CORBALLY, Jr., Chancellor

Tulane University, New Orleans
David R. DEENER, Provost and Dean of Graduate School

Yale University, New Haven
Kingman BREWSTER, Jr., President
Miss Pauline CHAO, Student
Donald J. LIPKIND, Student

URUGUAY

Universidad de la República, Montevideo
Washington BUNO, Professor
J. RUCKS, Student

VATICAN

Pontificia Studiorum Universitas Sanctus Thomae Aquinatis in Urbe, Roma
Very Rev. Georges PERREAULT, O.P.

Pontificia Universitas Gregoriana, Roma
Rev. Hervé CARRIER, S.J., Rector

VENEZUELA

Universidad de Carabobo, Valencia
José Luis BONNEMAISON W., Rector
Rubén Pérez SILVA, School of Law
César GUZMAN, President, Federation of University Centres

Universidad central de Venezuela, Caracas
Antonio Espinoza PRIETO

VIET-NAM (Republic of)

Viện Dai-Hoc Saigon
TRẦN-QUANG-DỆ, Rector
TRẦN-VAN-TẦN, Dean of the Faculty of Pedagogy

YUGOSLAVIA

Sveučilište u Zagrebu
Ivan SUPEK, Rector

ZAMBIA

University of Zambia, Lusaka
Lameck K.H. GOMA, Vice-Chancellor

REPRESENTATIVES APPOINTED BY ASSOCIATE MEMBERS

Association of African Universities
E.N. DAFAALLA, Executive Vice-President
Mgr T.H. TSHIBANGU, Vice-President (President Elect)

Association of Arab Universities
Mohammed Hamdy EL NASHAR, President
A. MURSI, Secretary-General

Association of Commonwealth Universities
K.L. SHRIMALI, Chairman
Sir Charles WILSON, Vice-Chairman
John F. FOSTER, Secretary-General
Hugh SPRINGER, Secretary-General Elect

Association des universités partiellement ou entièrement de langue française
Claude RENARD, President
Etienne LAPALUS, Vice-President
Maurice BEUTLER, Acting Secretary-General

Association of Southeast Asian Institutions of Higher Learning
CHOH-MING LI, President

International Federation of Catholic Universities
Rev. Hervé CARRIER, S.J., President
Mgr G. LECLERCQ, Secretary-General
Mme O. MOREAU, Permanent Secretariat

Standing Conference of Rectors and Vice-Chancellors of the European Universities
A.E. SLOMAN, President
Alain NICOLLIER, Secretary-General

Union de Universidades de América Latina
Carlos TÜNNERMANN BERNHEIM, President
Rafael KASSE ACTA, President Elect
Efrén C. DEL POZO, Secretary-General

OBSERVERS

UNITED NATIONS

Unesco
Joseph HERMAN, Director, Division of Higher Education
Victor ONUSHKIN, International Institute for Educational Planning

International Labour Organisation
F.B. WILSON, Chief, Agricultural Education Branch

International Labour Organization
Paul B.J. CHU, Chief, Workers' Education Branch

World Health Organization
Ramon VILLARREAL, Chief, Department of Human Resources Development - Pan American Sanitary Bureau

INTERNATIONAL ORGANIZATIONS

Centre for Educational Research and Innovation (OECD)
Abdul G. KHAN

International Association for the Advancement of Educational Research
Gaylan R. WALLACE

International Association of Arts
Mme. Marcelle FERRON

International Association of University Professors and Lecturers
Louis JOUGHIN

International Congress of Adult Education
Edwin K. TOWNSEND-COLES

International Council for Philosophy and Humanistic Studies
Hugh MACLENNAN
Révérende Sœur Ghislaine ROQUET

International Council of Scientific Unions
L. KERWIN

International Federation of University Women
Mrs. R.A. BELL

International Student Movement for the United Nations
Miss Lillian NAUSEDA

International Student Travel Conference
Jack EGLE

Pax Romana
John B. TSU

World Student Christian Federation
Pat COLEMAN

World Union of Jewish Students
Myer BIC

World University Service
A.C. JOSHI
A.A. KWAPONG
Carlos TÜNNERMANN BERNHEIM

REGIONAL ORGANIZATIONS

Association of Caribbean Universities
Jaime BENITEZ, President

Committee for Higher Education and Research (Council of Europe)
Jean ROCHE

Consejo superior universitario Centroamericano
Cecilio ZELAYA LOZANO, President
Sergio RAMÍREZ MERCADO, Secretary-General (Acting)

Federación de Universidades privades de América central y Panama
Jorge A. SERRANO, Secretary-General

NATIONAL BODIES

AUSTRALIA

The Australian Vice-Chancellors' Committee
J.J. AUCHMUTY, Chairman

BRAZIL

Conselho de Reitores das Universidades Brasileiras
Guilardo MARTINS ALVES, President
Oscar OLIVEIRA, Executive Secretary

CANADA

Association of Universities and Colleges of Canada
Roger GAUDRY, President
A.D. DUNTON, Vice-President
Colin MACKAY, Past President
G.C. ANDREW, Executive Director
Mgr J. GARNEAU, Associate Director
W.J. WAINES, Associate Director
Lucien F. MICHAUD, Research Director
Frederick TATLOW

Arts Council of Canada
Guy ROCHER, Vice-President

Canadian Association of University Teachers
Gwen BURLAND, Executive Secretary

Committee of Presidents of Universities of Ontario
J.B. MACDONALD, Executive Chairman
M. HANSEN, Director of Research

Conférence des Recteurs et Principaux des Universités du Québec
Roger GAUDRY, President
Pierre-Paul PROULX, Administrative Director

Conseil des Universités du Québec
Germain GAUTHIER, President

Department of Secretary of State, Government of Canada
David MUNROE, Special Adviser

Medical Research Council
G. Malcolm BROWN, President

National Research Council
W.G. SCHNEIDER, President
D.J. LEROY, Vice-President (Scientific)

Science Council
O.M. SOLANDT, President
P.D. MCTAGGART-COWAN, Director-General

GERMANY (Dem. Rep.)

Hoch-und Fachschulrat der Deutschen Demokratischen Republik
Manfred NAST, Secretary

GERMANY (Fed. Rep.)

Westdeutsche Rektorenkonferenz
Hans RUMPF, President
Wolfgang KALISCHER

INDIA

Inter-University Board of India and Ceylon
Suraj BHAN, Chairman

ITALY

Conferenza permanente dei Rettori delle Università italiane
Tito CARNACINI, Vice-President

JAPAN

Association of Private Universities
Tamotsu YATSUGI, Executive Director and Secretary-General

Akita KUSAKA
Tomokado HAYASHI

University Accreditation Association
X.T. OIZUMI, President

MEXICO

Asociación nacional de Universidades e Institutos de Enseñanza superior
Alfonso Rangel GUERRA, Executive Secretary-General

NETHERLANDS

Netherlands Universities Foundation for International Co-operation
H.G. QUIK, Director General

Rectoren College
C.F. SCHEFFER

NIGERIA

Committee of Vice-Chancellors of Nigerian Universities
H.A. OLUWASANMI, Chairman
I. OGBUE, Secretary

PERU

Consejo nacional de la Universidad Peruana
Werner GÖRRITZ-ARBULU, President
Mario SAMAME-BOGGIO, Executive Director

SOUTH AFRICA

Committee of University Principals
P.G.W. DU PLESSIS

SWITZERLAND

Conférence des Recteurs
Pierre MARMIER

UNITED KINGDOM

British Council
J. CAYTON

Committee of Vice-Chancellors and Principals
A.A. BATH, Secretary

Inter-University Council for Higher Education Overseas
J.B. BUTTERWORTH, Chairman
F.J. LLEWELLYN

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

American Council on Education
Logan WILSON, President
Fred C. COLE
Richard DODSON, Director, Overseas Liaison Committee

Association of American Universities
Charles P. McCURDY, Jr., Executive Secretary

College Entrance Examination Board
Arland F. CHRIST-JANER, President
Adolfo FORTIER, Executive Director for Latin American Activities

Council on International Educational Exchange
John BOWMAN, Executive Director

Education and World Affairs
Herman B WELLS, Chairman of Board of Directors
Vincent M. BARNETT, Jr., Vice-Chairman of Board of Directors
Douglas KNIGHT, Vice-Chairman of Board of Trustees
Maurice HARARI, Vice-President

Institute of International Education
Mrs. Pearl G. PURCELL, Vice-President and Special Assistant to the President

National Association of State Universities and Land-Grant Colleges
Ralph K. HUITT, Executive Director

National Catholic Educational Association
Rev. Edward B. ROONEY, S.J., Overseas Educational Consultant

National Higher Education Association
Alan G. STRATTON, Director

FOUNDATIONS

Alexander von Humboldt Stiftung
Heinrich PFEIFFER, Secretary-General

Fundação Calouste Gulbenkian
Victor DE SÁ MACHADO, Trustee

The Edward W. Hazen Foundation
Paul J. BRAISTED, President

The Ford Foundation
George F. GANT, Special Representative, South East Asia
James W. ARMSEY, Division of Education and Research

UNIVERSITY INSTITUTIONS

Universidade federal de Santa Catarina (Brazil)
J.D. FERREIRA LIMA, Rector

Loyola College, Montreal (Canada)
Very Rev. Patrick G. MALONE, S.J., President

Marianopolis College, Montreal (Canada)
Sister Mary MACCORMACK, *President*

Université Saint-Paul (Canada)
Rev. Marcel PATRY, O.M.I., Rector

Universidad de Deusto, Bilbao (Spain)
R.P. Mariano Q. IBAR

University College of Cape Coast (Ghana)
E.A. BOATENG, Principal

University of Sulaimaniyah (Iraq)
Muhammed Muhammed SALIH, President
A.T. KADIR, Secretary-General

Slovenká vysoká škola techniká Bratislava (Czechoslovakia)
A. BLAŽEJ, Rector

CONFERENCE SECRETARIAT

International Association of Universities (Secretariat of the Association)
H.M.R. KEYES, Secretary-General
D.J. AITKEN, Executive Secretary
G. DAILLANT, Head, Research Service
Mrs E. BUCKLEY, Secretary
Miss B. SUNDLÖF, Secretary

Canadian Organizing Committee (Secretariat)
M. Lucien PICHÉ, Chairman, Organizing Committee
Mme Louise TREMBLAY
Mme Andrée MATTH
M. Pierre-Louis CHRISCI

Chief Interpreter : Mme Andrée FRANCŒUR

CHAPTER ONE

INAUGURAL PROCEEDINGS

CHAPTER ONE

INAUGURAL PROCEEDINGS

The Conference was officially opened on Sunday, 30 August, in the auditorium of the University of Montreal in the presence of His Excellency the Governor-General of Canada, the Right Hon. ROLAND MICHENER, *the Minister of Education of Quebec,* M. GUY SAINT-PIERRE, *and the representative of the Director-General of Unesco,* Mr. JOSEPH HERMAN, *together with many representatives of the political and university life of Canada and Quebec.*

After President ZURAYK *had declared the Conference open,* Rector GAUDRY *addressed a welcome to him on behalf of the Association of Universities and Colleges of Canada, the Conference of Rectors and Principals of Universities of Quebec and the University of Montreal.*

The Right Hon. ROLAND MICHENER *then greeted the Conference on behalf of Canada and the Canadian people and spoke of the place of the university in contemporary society.*

M. GUY SAINT-PIERRE, *who followed, traced the main lines of university reform in Quebec and described his own view of the social rôle of the university.*

Mr. JOSEPH HERMAN *then spoke of the work of Unesco in the field of higher education and of co-operation between his organization and IAU.*

Finally, Dr. C. K. ZURAYK *devoted his presidential address to some reflections on the nature and mission of the university in the difficult times through which it was passing.*

The inaugural proceedings ended with the adoption of the rules of procedure for the Conference and with the appointment of Conference Committees, Panels for the theme discussions and the Chairmen, Vice-Chairmen and Rapporteurs. These are listed at the beginning of the present report.

Dr. ROGER GAUDRY

President of the Association of Universities and Colleges of Canada and of the Conference of Rectors and Principals of Universities of Quebec

It is a great honour for me to be your host and a great pleasure to extend a most cordial welcome to you on behalf of the universities and colleges of Canada and in particular on behalf of the Universities of Quebec. The Association of Universities and Colleges of Canada is made up of more than fifty universities and institutions of higher education throughout the ten provinces. Almost all these universities will be represented at this Fifth Conference of the Association and in the course of this week you will, I am sure, have the opportunity to become familiar with the main features of higher education in Canada.

The Conference of Rectors and Principals of Universities of Quebec brings together the seven universities of this province, four of which are French-speaking and three English-speaking; you will in fact find four of these universities here in Montreal itself and, if you so wish, you will have the opportunity of visiting them.

As in other countries of the world, higher education has been developing in an extraordinary way in recent years and several of the Canadian universities you will find represented at this Conference, have only been in existence for a few years. Although our social and economic problems differ quite considerably from those of many other countries, we too have had our share of student protests, although the last academic year passed off in relative calm.

All my colleagues in the Canadian universities share my happiness at seeing the International Association of Universities meeting in Montreal. Our city is particularly well suited to a Conference like this. The languages we speak here are the two official languages of the Association, the city also bears a bilingual stamp; but above all you will find here an authentic international spirit which makes it one of those cities best fitted for activities of this kind.

We wanted these inaugural proceedings to be held in an academic setting, even if the meetings of the Conference themselves, for reasons of efficiency, have to be held at the hotel. The themes which have been chosen as subjects for

discussion during the Conference are more immediate than ever. Those in Tokyo in 1965 who suggested we should discuss "international university co-operation" and "the university and the needs of contemporary society" showed a remarkable capacity to see into the future, for the importance of these themes during the last five years has continued to grow.

In conclusion, I would like, as Rector of the University of Montreal, to say some words to you about this University in which you are gathered today. As the largest French-speaking university outside France, the University of Montreal, with its academic staff of 1,500 and its 20,000 students, this year celebrates its 50th anniversary. We are therefore particularly proud to receive you here.

The Canadian Universities, in co-operation with the Secretariat of the Association in Paris, have for a long time been engaged in preparations for this Fifth Conference of the Association. The local Organizing Committee has done everything possible to make your visit to Montreal both successful and pleasant. My colleagues and I are entirely at your disposal to enable you to derive the fullest possible benefit from your stay with us. Welcome to Canada, welcome to Quebec, welcome to Montreal and welcome to the University of Montreal.

HIS EXCELLENCY THE RIGHT HON. ROLAND MICHENER

Governor-General of Canada

Mr. President, I am very happy that I have been asked to welcome this brilliant assembly on the occasion of the Fifth General Conference of the International Association of Universities. Your presence here is itself a token of your devotion to the cause of higher education and a mark of your concern to perfect your knowledge, while at the same time sharing your experiences and your faith in the value of a free exchange of ideas. In our contemporary world such a faith in rational dialogue should be common to all. It is regrettable that this is not so. Nevertheless, you set an example which the whole of society would do well to emulate.

As Governor-General, it is my honour to welcome you today on behalf of all the Canadian people. I know that they would want me to pass on to you their most cordial wishes for a fruitful congress.

From the beginning our country has always set the greatest store on university education. Our first college, recent as it may be compared with European institutions, dates from 1663. Over the three centuries which have passed since that date, advanced studies have followed closely the march of colonisation towards the West. Today some 16 per cent of our youth of university ago is in fact studying in universities and other institutions of higher education.

In the face of this great assembly of academicians in the city of Montreal, I am reminded of one of our Canadian humorists who was a professor at McGill, Stephen Leacock, and as I look down I feel the same way. He said "I owe much to my professors and believe me some day if I live long enough I shall pay them back".

Throughout the world nations have recognized that facilities for higher learning are an indispensable element of modern civilization; nevertheless, today the academic community faces serious problems in most countries. In the western European tradition which we follow in Canada, universities have been centres for the free development of ideas on all subjects, intellectual as well as public. It has been taken for granted that academics ought to enjoy the liberty of speculation, research and teaching. In general, universities have been self-contained communities apart from the larger collectivity and somewhat insulated from the social disturbances outside their precincts. Today we see the phenomenon of small militant organizations which thrive near universities because of their tolerant academic environment. Such groups, often more destructive than constructive, contend that the assumption of free enquiry merely disguises an imposition by the academic community on itself of established dogmas.

In their search for dramatic reforms and their disregard for the rights of those with whom they disagree, they work to exacerbate existing problems of curricula and of organization within the university and to destruct our academic system which they identify with the decadent social structure. I have neither the competence nor the presumption to offer solutions. Indeed from the themes adopted for your discussions it is certain that you yourselves will be wrestling with these problems for more than one round. Nevertheless, it is clear that if academic communities and with them the larger society, are to prosper, the challenges which they face today must be met and the conflict which they now endure must be brought to an end.

I wish you well in your efforts to achieve these results.

I do hope that your concentration on university problems will not prevent you from enjoying something of Canada. You have come to a happy land, we are not over-populated, we have plenty of fresh air and fresh water awaiting to be polluted.

We are heirs to most of the important cultures of Europe and have no greater racial diversity than is found there. We are blessed with only two official languages and the exponents of both French and English enjoy a reasonable domestic harmony and in any event neither party really wants to go home to mother. Furthermore, we love tourists: the traditional hospitality of the Quebecois, the spectacular scenery and exibitions and excellent facilities for travel are matched by similar attractions in the Atlantic region, Ontario, the Prairies and British Columbia, not forgetting the northern territories for those of you who have a taste for the boundless Arctic, and of course there are Canadian universities to welcome you in all parts, Mr. Gaudry has said, some sixty of them. I wish you a good holiday.

M. GUY SAINT-PIERRE

Minister of Education of Quebec

It is a great pleasure for me to be amongst you today just as you are preparing to embark upon a fruitful period of reflective discussions together.

I want to tell you personally of the interest which Quebec feels in all the motives by which you are guided. We feel that this year in particular the themes of your gathering are very closely linked with what is happening in the world today and to pass over their development in silence would be to do a great disservice to our society. The theme of "international university co-operation" alone conjures up the assurance of a world without frontiers, a pooling of universal knowledge that transcends the mean lust of one people or another for power. As for the theme "the university and the needs of contemporary society", this provides both vast and complex food for thought. The University of France under Louis IX was also led to ponder over its rôle, which was later continually redefined. The dilemma of the university in relation to society has been sharply brought out by the dissension of recent years. Challenged from without, it is healthy and necessary for the

university to take a close look at itself and indulge in a sort of overall introspection.

I shall not keep you away from that task for long. Nevertheless, I would like to remind your assembly that many features of the problems which move you to act and ponder have their counterpart in Quebec. The university, in Quebec, has developed at an increasing rate since the beginning of the last decade. Let me give you some account of this development and at the same time pay due tribute to the minds of those behind it. By force of circumstance, the university in Quebec had to live for a time in a world of its own. At the time when the education system was really beginning to get moving, at the beginning of the sixties, the bulk of the effort had to be put into training the disseminators of knowledge, the lecturers, research workers and teachers. Even if the needs of research are still just as crucial in 1970, we can say that Quebec has, in a relatively short space of time, managed to train a real university staff. Now that this objective has been largely achieved, it is time for the university in Quebec to turn its antennae more deliberately towards the society around it. Thus we can say that the élitist attitude according to which university knowledge was the property of a caste whose sole function was to pass an enslaved culture down from generation to generation, is now becoming extinct, here as in several other countries of the world. The movement to democratize culture, which has been at work in Quebec for some years now, must be carried further, but it has already borne its first fruit. Educational reform in Quebec has been centred around the creation of new ways of access to the university. This is the purpose behind the setting up of technical and vocational training colleges which lead directly to university. The introduction of an options system, the emphasis put on refresher training, and finally some tentative efforts towards life-long education have brought into the university a considerable number of students from outside the traditional intellectual élite. Thought should now be given to an improved regulation of the rate of intellectual production, which would bring it into better line with the demands of society, while not for all that overlooking the needs of pure research and disinterested thought. The university does indeed tend to act as a leaven or catalyst in the contemporary world, but an effort still has to be made to bring about co-ordination between the technological world and the university world. Breaking down the barriers between faculties, student participation in working out syllabuses, the development of teaching methods to give greater importance to group learning are all manage-

ment factors whose implementation has a direct bearing on the social rôle of the university. In this way the university is becoming a source of change and no longer acts merely as a custodian of traditional scientific and cultural values. As we are considering the theme of management, I am very tempted to say to you that a university should, to a certain extent, be managed like a business. It is quite obvious that the selection criteria for cultural production are different from those for industrial production. Nevertheless, the university in Quebec has felt the need to improve its management methods; over the last few years nearly 2 million dollars have been spent on modernizing the university management machinery throughout the province. The changes made in university management have been of two kinds; on the one hand, making the administration more efficient in material terms and, on the other hand, establishing a permanent relationship between the university and the outside world. Most of the universities in Quebec have for several months been carrying out structural reforms intended to improve access to university education, to link education more closely to the needs of society, and to simplify the procedures for student enrolment and payment of course fees. Certain institutions, such as the University of Quebec, have tried to introduce into their charter provisions for student participation in the decisions of their University. Apart from the co-management experiment at the University of Quebec, attempts at participation have been encouraged in the other university institutions. However, participation in university management is still not a tangible reality in Quebec. The experiments have proved that adjustments were necessary on both sides. Participation implies the handing over of part of the university authority to the students. This hand-over of authority must be freely accepted by the administrators. But it also calls for some extra efforts on the part of the students in the matter of human relations. They have to learn the art of discussion and acquire the discipline of democratic processes of all kinds whose apprenticeship is a matter of generations rather than weeks or months. The experiment is now continuing. Participation, management, co-management, co-operation, democratization are words whose meannings vary considerably from one individual and ideology to the next. We feel, however, that most of these concepts, applied to the idea of human progress through the intermediary of the university, give birth to a new humanism. In so far as this new humanism, which has probably been neglected by the technological revolution, succeeds in spreading outwards within an open and decompartmentalized university, we shall be able

to say that the university really is capable of changing society. Through its research, the university puts itself at the service of suffering humanity, and through its openness it can also give society something better than a weapon; it can give it an overall vision of the world that enables it to come to the service of the progress of civilization in all sectors. Whatever paths progress may take in the future, the university, by inspiring society with fresh *raisons d'être*, will have fulfilled a very great rôle.

Perhaps it would be right to point out by way of conclusion that if society is to take an active part in fashioning and managing this tool, the university, then the university itself also has the right and the clear duty to take active part in the management and fashioning of society in all its ramifications.

Mr. JOSEPH HERMAN

Representative of the Director-General of Unesco

The Fifth General Conference of the International Association of Universities is being held in a period of increasingly sharp recognition, all over the world, of the paramount importance of education, and a recognition also of the need to renovate education. It is at the same time becoming more and more clear, thanks, among others, to the activities pursued under the banner of International Education Year, that the place occupied by education must be enlarged in the life of society as well as in that of individuals. In this general context, the activities of the universities take on a very special importance : directly or indirectly it is the university that educates the educators, the university which trains the organizers and planners on whom the renovation and extension of education largely depends. The universities therefore, in this respect, have an almost immeasurable field of action and consequently bear an exceptional responsibility.

The same is true in the field of development, which in its essentials is so closely linked to that of education : it is the university which trains technicians and development planners, and development would become an empty word if—not to speak of the fulfilment of the other pre-conditions—the universities did not provide their countries and the international

community with the essential agent of development, which is man, man with all his knowledge and his technical know-how, but also his sense of responsibility.

And—let us emphasize this, because people sometimes forget to mention it—the university occupies a crucial place in yet another sphere : we live in an age when the scientific knowledge we have about man and the world around him, is advancing at a bewildering and almost uncontrollable rate; now the university is not only the most important centre for scientific research itself, it is also the primary transmitting agent through which the results of research find their way into the most diverse areas of education; it is largely due to the universities that scientific results, as they are incorporated into the body of knowledge and the way of thinking of future specialists, become transformed into a force of immediate value in the service of development; finally, it is the university which, by passing on knowledge and research methods, forms the essential factor in the continuity and permanence of science.

It is not surprising that, situated as it is at the meeting point between education and research, between often highly abstract theory and the most pressing practical needs, between action for development and reflection on its conditions and consequences, the university should also reflect, sometimes dramatically, the conflicts, crises and problems of the world we live in.

It is therefore a very great pleasure for us at Unesco to find that the questions you have put on your agenda and the papers which you are examining reveal a profound understanding of the responsibilities of the universities and of the essential, and at the same time delicate, tasks they are called upon to accomplish. And it is probably no accident, but rather the natural and very satisfying outcome of long and cordial co-operation and a great community of ideas between IAU and Unesco that—taking into account, of course, the inevitable differences in our methods of work, our points of view and the possibilities open to us—the problems that you intend to examine in the coming days are the very problems around which Unesco's activities in the university field are organized; activities, I would say in passing, that we wish to extend and strengthen considerably in the coming years, precisely in view of the growing importance, in the world today, of the work of the universities.

You will talk of the relationships between the university and the needs of contemporary society—now it is from this

angle that we are trying to approach most of the theoretical problems that we are inviting the world university community to examine, whether it be the democratization and the institutional status of the university, whether it be the problems of university youth, whether it be the relationships between research and the other aspects of university work, or a host of other problems.

You will talk of international university co-operation—*and it is perhaps this that lies at the centre of our practical preoccupations, especially if we add the words : for development.* When Unesco endeavours to achieve increasingly tangible results through its research on degree equivalence, when we at Unesco try to give increased assistance to those of our Member States which want to develop, modernize or simply establish their own higher education, when we attempt to set up some regional institution or establishment which will make it possible to step up exchanges of all kinds between universities in various countries, when perhaps we sketch the contours of a future international university, what we have in our minds is international university co-operation : a co-operation which serves development and the achievement of the highest ideals of mankind enshrined in the Charter of the United Nations.

There are, therefore, between our preoccupations and yours, areas of common ground which are both natural and fundamental; I am sure that your discussions and the results of your General Conference will bring them into still greater relief, and I am firmly convinced that co-operation between our two organizations, based on an equally firm spiritual community, will become, in continually changing patterns, increasingly broad and increasingly flexible, still more active and still more fruitful.

It is with this conviction that I convey to your Conference the greetings and warm wishes of the Director-General of Unesco and that I wish you, in this splendid setting of the city of Montreal, useful and instructive exchanges of view which will be the guarantee of a brilliant future for your universities and for the Association in which they are united.

Dr. CONSTANTINE K. ZURAYK

President of the International Association of Universities

It is indeed my distinct privilege and honour to welcome you—representatives of member universities and of organizations concerned with higher education—to this Fifth General Conference of the International Association of Universities. This gathering, impressive by its size, its quality and the world-wide range and diversity of its representation, is genuine evidence of the Association's growing rôle in the international university community and of your own faith in its purposes and your support of its activities.

We have met in order to review the work of the IAU since our last, memorable Conference in Tokyo in 1965, and to reflect together on our Association's future course. But, in line with our past tradition, we shall also be engaged in the consideration of some of the most significant aspects of our work as university men and women. The life of our Association cannot be separated from the lives of its individual members. The Association is, in fact, its corporate membership. Its meetings offer unique opportunities for the exchange of ideas and for the enrichment of experience—on the broadest possible level—in regard to the basic preoccupations of our university institutions.

I am sure you will agree with me that the two themes chosen by the Administrative Board for consideration at this Conference—"International University Co-operation" and "The University and the Needs of Contemporary Society"—are highly relevant to the present university situation, and I am equally confident that our discussion of them in our forthcoming sessions will prove profitable in widening our vision, stimulating our thought and strengthening our determination as we try, individually and collectively, to recognize the challenges which they involve and to respond to them.

However, in the few moments at my disposal at this opening session, I shall not try to deal directly with these two themes, for we shall have six sessions in the coming three days to deliberate on them. Nor do I propose to speak on the affairs of our Association, for a whole day—Thursday—has been allocated to this subject, and another day—Saturday—will be devoted to the measures which the Conference will take for the pursuit of the Association's work in the coming five-year period. I should like rather, with your permission, to present a few general remarks on the essential meaning of our meeting

at this critical moment in the history of universities and of the world as a whole. These remarks do not claim any special validity or originality, and I do, indeed, feel presumptuous in presenting them to this assembly, many of whose members have made eminent contributions to the study or to the practical treatment of the basic problems of higher education today. Nonetheless, I feel that some general context for our meeting should be delineated, and I venture to do so today, in the hope that it may be useful for our deliberations in the next days of this Conference.

Our meeting here, it seems to me, is, first of all, an affirmation of our faith in the institution to which we belong—the University. Coming from all the regions and the major cultural traditions of the world, from universities of various origins, histories and scopes of activity and of influence, from countries of different ideologies, political systems, social structures and levels of economic development, we all represent an institution in whose survival and progress we are deeply concerned; otherwise, we would not have dedicated our lives to it, nor, speaking more strictly of this Conference, would we have taken the trouble to come from near and far to deal with some of its salient problems and to reinforce our co-operation in its favour.

This institution, as we are all keenly aware, faces grave difficulties. It is pressed on every side by numerous, huge, urgent and often conflicting demands from its society: to educate larger and larger masses of students, over longer periods of time, in diversifying and increasingly costly specialties; to participate, and often to take the lead, in the accelerating and proliferating advance of knowledge; and to render multitudinous direct services to its community and nation. Partly as a result of these heavy and compelling demands, but also, because of the serious political, economic, social and cultural disturbances in all present-day societies, as well as of the universities' own failure to adapt themselves to the new requirements—our institutions are suffering serious internal stresses and strains, violent and widespread agitations, and the pain —or shall I say the agony?—of perplexity and of uncertainty about the future. Their primary challenge, at this critical moment, is that of survival. Will they continue to exist and to render their particular contribution to society, and, if so, how and in what form?

We, who have met here today, undoubtedly have different views on the changes which our universities will have to undergo in the pressing years ahead, but I doubt whether there

is any difference among us about the necessity of the preservation of the institution as such, or about our responsibility in ensuring this preservation. If the university has, throughout its history, made its own distinct and valuable contribution to its society and to human civilization in general, then it is the first responsibility of university men and women, not so much towards themselves as towards their societies and towards the whole of mankind, to strive for the maintenance of this institution so that it may be able to weather successfully the external storms and internal turbulances which rage around and within it. The affirmation of our faith in the university—which our meeting expresses—is equally an affirmation of our responsibility in ensuring the continuance of its service. But institutions, like individuals, do not survive by mere existence, nor would this survival—even if it takes place—be assured or justified. The condition for the assurance and the justification of survival is renewed creativity, growing out of a genuine self-regeneration. Without such self-regeneration, sheer continued existence becomes the road to obsolescence, decline and death.

This leads us to another meaningful affirmation—the affirmation of our faith in, and our responsibility towards, the progressive and enhanced creativity of our institution. Here, two requirements impose themselves jointly : a clear recognition of the essence of the university tradition, i.e., of the qualities which characterize the work and life of this institution and whose dilution and dissipation bring about its decline and destruction; and, on the other hand, the application of these qualities in the building of tomorrow's world. The fulfilment of these two requirements means the combination of what is most authentic in the past with a discerning and commanding vision of the future. It would make of the university not so much the product of what has been, as the creator of what ought to be.

Universities today are undergoing many rapid and diversified changes : in administration, in structure, in curricula and programmes, in research activities, in relations to governments and to the private sectors of their societies. Many studies are taking place, along national, regional, and international lines, on the causes, forms, and implications of these changes and on the policies and methods which should be elaborated to deal with them. New techniques are being devised, various plans are being elaborated and all sorts of reforms envisaged or actually executed.

All of this is useful and necessary and should be pursued

with vigour if the university is to adapt itself to the demands of the day. But this adaptation would not serve the true purposes of society and of the university—and may indeed run counter to these purposes—unless it safeguards the characteristic function of the university in the persistent cultivation of reason and in the single-minded struggle to become its embodiment and its representative. And when we say: "reason", we do not mean merely the application of rational thought to the discovery and the transmission of knowledge or to the training of the new generations in the methods and techniques of scientific investigation; we mean the development of the qualities which underlie these operations and which manifest themselves in active, creative rational endeavour: curiosity and discipline, passion and objectivity, freedom and responsibility, dissent and dialogue, openness and dedication, thoroughness and integration, inventiveness and order.

Allow me, in this connection, to quote the concluding paragraphs of my prefatory notes to Prof. Janne's remarkable report which will be the basis of our discussion of our second theme: "The University and the Needs of Contemporary Society":

All of this presupposes one vital condition: *the determination of the university to remain the locus of rational discourse and of deep concern and dedication.* While admitting the legitimacy and the urgency of society's growing needs, the university would dissipate its resources and might indeed end by becoming more harmful than useful to society, if it tried to be everything to everybody. Its particular function is the advancement of knowledge and of human welfare through the cultivation of reason and through free inquiry and dialogue. And as genuine freedom involves responsibility, the pursuit by the university of its fundamental task should always be inspired and sustained by a deep sense of dedication and a compelling urge for relevance. Whenever the university's faith in reason and its yearning for relevance are weakened, and it becomes a prey to the rule of force or to indifference and irresponsibility, it loses not only the secret of its usefulness and the root of its strength but even the support and the justification of its existence.

It is through this faith and yearning that the university can become *a truly critical community.* As such, it perpetually questions ideas, needs, values, institutions and all that lies around it, as well as within itself. It does not take refuge in the security of any dogma, ideology or system nor

seeks salvation in any illusory or false sense of stability. It is more radical than any particular revolution, because it submits every new acquisition to the active and responsible contestation of reason; and it is more permanent than any established order, because it fashions and represents the "order" of innovation and creativity.

In aspiring towards this "order" within itself and to its realization in the human community, the university will be fulfilling its own particular function and *responding to a vital, perhaps the most vital, "need" of its society.*

Our affirmation of our faith in the continued creativity of the university implies thus an affirmation of our attachment to its positive heritage, of our responsibility towards it, and of our determination to safeguard it and to enhance its quality.

However, this attachment to the heritage of the past must go hand in hand with the satisfaction of the second condition, namely, the application of the earned capacities and values of this legacy in the building of tomorrow's world. The university's fundamental task, in Whitehead's words, is the "creation of the future": it preserves and transmits so that it may better create.

In the complex relations between universities and their societies, the former face two challenges which shape their destinies: the one is their ability to adapt themselves to the requirements of their societies, while the second, and more decisive one, is their capacity to go beyond mere adaptation to become shapers and renovators of the world around them.

To respond to this supreme challenge, to participate "in the creation of the future", universities must live and work on the thresholds of the unknown. It is only in this way that they have contributed so magnificently to the discovery of new knowledge. But important as this discovery is, it is not the only type of pioneering which is needed today for the proper preparation of tomorrow. At the risk of oversimplification, let me cite three of mankind's basic needs, all of which demand vision, alertness, perseverance and pioneering thought and action.

First, is the need for a consciousness of the solidarity of the human community. It is superfluous to repeat that the technological advances of modern civilization, some of whose most dramatic manifestations are taking place before our eyes, have broken barriers, shortened distances, and brought us physically nearer one to another. They have also put in our

hands hitherto unimagined sources of power. But that physical proximity has not been accompanied by social and intellectual affinity, nor have these sources of power been utilized mainly for the welfare of the peoples of the world. On the contrary, we seem to be much more deeply divided than ever, and we possess the capacities to let these divisions lead to mutual destruction and to the annihilation of the civilizations that have been built so slowly and painfully by the previous generations of mankind. Our fundamental need, therefore, is a deep and widespread perception that human solidarity —across differences of race, nationality, ideology, and cultural tradition—is not merely desirable and beneficial, but has come to be, more than ever, the prime necessity for the progress, even for the very existence, of mankind. This human solidarity cannot be achieved unless it is nurtured by a deep sense of loyalty to our common humanity and unless the universal in us transcends and comprehends our particularities.

Secondly, this universal loyalty and solidarity must rest on, and be continually supported by, political, economic and social justice. It cannot arise in a world of political and military strife, of violated rights, of widespread hunger, disease and ignorance. A sense of mankind's fundamental unity implies a struggle for the achievement of the dignity of man, whoever or wherever he may be, for the removal of all those injustices and inequalities that disgrace that dignity, and for the achievement of the good life for all the masses of mankind. And "the good life" does not mean merely an acceptable standard of living, nor the provision of material goods; it means the realization of the highest and best in the human personality. It goes beyond economic development to the development of the human intellectual and moral capacities which can genuinely fulfil the "revolution of rising aspirations" that grips all the peoples of the world today.

This leads us to the third fundamental need—the need for a proper scale of values. The disarray in the world today is largely the result of perverted values and of wrong choices. There are of course conflicts of values within societies and among them, but these conflicts would not have been damaging —they may indeed have been salutary—had our priorities and decisions emanated from adequate knowledge and proper motivation. If we are to realize the "good life" for all of mankind, are we sure that we really know and seek "the good?" We do not need a very deep study of our present state to be convinced that the ambiguities, deficiencies, and falsities of our desires and choices are to a very large extent responsible for the

various types of malaise and for the expressed and the latent discontent which are rampant in the world today. Thus, if a better world of tomorrow is to be realized, it must emerge out of the quest of a sound order of values guiding the endeavours of men everywhere for the remaking of man in his genuine dignity and full integrity.

Do universities have a rôle to play in the creation of the future, by pioneering in making the necessary responses to these three and other fundamental human needs? It is, I am sure, our conviction that they do have such a rôle, that, in spite of their present trials, they will carry out this rôle, and that, by doing so they will succeed, not only in maintaining themselves, but also more significantly, in turning their trials from causes of weakness and division into sources of renewed resoluteness and added strength.

For this pioneering task—in a time of radical and widespread change and constant innovation--universities will have to elaborate new policies, methods and procedures in their educational and research activities; they will have to devise more suitable means of administration, organization and planning; they will need to seek and to find ampler financial and human resources; and, in general, they will be called upon to pursue with determination the search for better ways to carry out their increasing obligations ahead.

But, above all, this pioneering task demands that the universities be authentic forerunners of the future. It is not possible for them to help building a better world unless they have already achieved that world in themselves. They cannot be agents in the creation of the future unless they themselves have already become that future. They will fail to realize "the good life" for society unless they in fact incarnate and symbolize the values which constitute that kind of life.

When we speak of values, we have entered the realm of the "moral". Much has been written about the present crisis of contemporary life and society. Many analyses have been made of the various ills of modern civilization—ills that lie behind the political, economic and social troubles which mar our present world. But is it wrong to assert--particularly in such an assembly as this—that the crisis is primarily moral; that it arises from the pursuit of false ends : power, interest, success at any price, material affluence, and domination; and that it is marked by "a failure of nerve", a sense of drift, and a readiness to abdicate?

The ills of our civilization are reflected in those of the University. It is the supreme challenge of our institutions today to try to remedy the ills within their own body and spirit and to become, in a modest but real sense, the living cells of "the good life" within their societies. This demands of our universities—which ultimately means of ourselves and our colleagues, for the university is primarily its men and women—a clear sense of direction, an attachment to the highest and best that we know, and a resurgence of moral nerve to live by that highest and that best.

One of the dilemmas which our universities are facing is often pictured as a dilemma between detachment and commitment. But there is a much more real and crucial dilemma : the choice between various sorts of commitments. The primary question—which each one of us should ask himself—is not whether university people should be "committed", "involved", or not, but what are, and what should be, the object and the quality of their commitment or involvement. As Professor Janne has pointed out in his report, the university is vulnerable. It has no political, military, economic or physical power to support and sustain it, particularly in times of crisis. Indeed, its only support and sustenance is intellectual and moral, and it will continue to be vulnerable so long as it does not endeavour to become the bastion and the generator of authentic power—the power of reason and of morality. By such endeavour, it will overcome its vulnerability, safeguard its being, and become to its society a source of strength, order and creativity.

In making these remarks, colleagues and friends, I may have erred away from the particular themes of our Conference or from the essential concerns of our Association. If, in your opinion, I have done so, I would rely on your understanding and generosity to forgive these digressions by a retiring president. But I would not be true to my function, unless I expressed the truth as I see it, no matter how deficient or inaccurate my vision may be.

We will not be able at this Conference to solve, or even to cover adequately, the various external and internal problems of our universities. This Conference is an event—indeed an important one—in the life of our Association, and, hopefully, in the life of our universities. On the other hand, the remaking of the university and the fulfil ment of its rôle in the remaking of society is a sustained process. All that we can hope to achieve here is that the Conference will mark a positive and significant step in this process.

It will do so, and the Conference will realize its essential meaning, if our deliberations and actions reflect and affirm our fundamental convictions—our faith in the historical mission of the university as the abode of active, progressive reason, and our no less firm confidence in its pioneering rôle in the creation of the future and in its capacity to achieve, in its own being and ultimately in its society, those intellectual and moral values which are the true guarantee of the health, security and welfare of the future.

As I stand before you today, trying to draw out the essential meaning of our meeting, I cannot help but recollect the sentence with which Charles Dickens began *The Tale of Two Cities* : "It was the best of times, it was the worst of times". This pithy judgement applies also most remarkably to the situation of higher education today. These times are replete with problems, difficulties, and dangers for universities and other institutions of higher education; but they are also pregnant with opportunities and with calls for a brighter and more meaningful future. I feel that I am speaking for us all in expressing the hope that this Conference, by drawing us more closely together around common aims and aspirations, will be helpful in our endeavour to make these times, and those that follow, the best of times for our universities and for our Association.

CHAPTER TWO

INTERNATIONAL UNIVERSITY CO-OPERATION

CHAPTER TWO

INTERNATIONAL UNIVERSITY CO-OPERATION

International university co-operation is obviously of paramount importance for IAU--it is the very reason for its existence,—but it is equally important for each of its member institutions. The university is by definition a co-operative undertaking: it is the place for gathering, exchange, confrontation and expression of knowledge from all places and all times. It constantly appeals to scholars from other countries, even if none is physically present within its walls. Socrates and Einstein are, as it were, permanent and ubiquitous "visiting professors". No university can therefore stand aside from co-operation in the broadest sense, but one would almost be tempted to say that in many fields, this co-operation is more a matter of words than a living reality. Now universities are living organisms, whose calling is to form and inspire living spirits with new life, or to call forth from them new knowledge and new thought. Besides this, they are increasingly involved in the life of the societies upon which they depend, which are themselves "eager for knowledge", but whose relationship to knowledge is a quite different one from their own, since they seek first to exploit it for their own ends. Thus the universities are in danger of being caught off balance. In many cases they are among the essential pieces in a political and economic game over which they have no control and which is sometimes in pursuit of something quite other than international understanding. At the same time, therefore, as they re-examine their relationships with their societies, it is essential for universities to re-examine their relationships amongst themselves. In order to accomplish their specific tasks, contribute to peace and prevent knowledge being perverted into an instrument for struggle and pressure, the universities must help one another. The two themes submitted to the Conference were therefore undoubtedly part of a single whole.

Preparations for the theme of co-operation had been made a long time in advance by the IAU Administrative Board. In 1967 the Board had asked its members and a number of its deputy members to prepare papers on the situation and the needs for international university co-operation in their own country or region. The documents thus assembled were then submitted to a Working Party which met in April 1968 in Paris, under the chairmanship of Dr. C. K. ZURAYK. *This had a very full discussion and drew up a series of observations and conclusions. An account of its proceedings appeared in issue No. 9 in the series of* Papers *of the Association together with the documents mentioned above and an important preface by* President ZURAYK. *On the basis of this publication, the Organizing Committee of the Board had a much shorter working paper drafted in the form of a series of questions for consideration. The conference discussion opened with a plenary session which took place on the morning of 31 August during which the main aspects of the subject were introduced by three principal speakers :* Professor LAMECK K. H. GOMA, *Vice-Chancellor of the University of Zambia,* Professor W. RODEWALD, *Pro-Rector of the University of Warsaw, and* President JAMES M. HESTER, *of New York University. After these introductory speeches and a preliminary exchange of views in plenary session, the Conference divided into two in order to examine each theme in the course of three parallel discussion sessions which took place on 1 and 2 September. A Chairman, a Vice-Chairman and a Rapporteur were appointed for each theme, together with a panel of ten members responsible for guiding discussions, animating them where necessary and seeking to maintain their pattern and avoid too many diversions into matters of secondary importance. The three discussion sessions were followed by a plenary session during which the Chairman gave a short account of the discussions, indicated their main tendencies and drew some preliminary conclusions. This plenary session took place on 2 September, following which the Rapporteur began his work and presented his report to the Conference on the last day, Saturday, 5 September.*

For International University Co-operation, the Chairman was Dr. ROCHEFORTE L. WEEKS, *President of the University of Liberia, the Vice-Chairman,* Professor I. M. TERNOV, *Pro-Rector of the University of Moscow, the Rapporteur,* Dr. L. P. BONNEAU, *Vice-Rector of Laval University. A list of the other members of the panel will be found at the beginning of the present report.*

OPENING PLENARY SESSION

Dr. C. K. Zurayk, *President of the Association*, opened the session and gave some explanation of the way in which the Administrative Board and its Organizing Committee had envisaged the discussion of the theme and made preparations for it. He traced the genesis of *Paper* No. 9 and picked out some of the ideas from his preface to it, emphasizing strongly that far from being a luxury, international university co-operation had become a fundamental necessity of our time. The universities had to carry out increasingly heavy and increasingly diversified tasks without any corresponding increase in their human and material resources, and this gave them no alternative but to work together at all levels. Furthermore, they were being carried along by the headlong progress of knowledge which tended to sweep away all frontiers. Finally and above all, they had to play the rôle of precursor in fashioning a new world order and it was incumbent upon them to strengthen international solidarity by practising it themselves. The subject that the Conference was called to discuss was therefore one of extreme importance. In the short time available, it would only be able to do so usefully if its discussions were strictly organized. The Organizing Committee had also considered that apart from *Paper* No. 9, which was too rich and too long to serve as a basis for discussion, a shorter working paper similar in lay-out to the lay-out of the proceedings of the Conference itself should be prepared. In this way three main areas, corresponding to the three discussion sessions, had been selected : co-operation in teaching and studies; co-operation in research and scientific information; and co-operation in administration and organization. Each of these three areas would be introduced in plenary session by a separate speaker : the first by Professor Goma, the second by Professor Rodewald and the third by President Hester.

PROFESSOR L. K. H. GOMA

Vice-Chancellor of the University of Zambia

It is clear from the IAU *Paper* No. 9 and from previous discussions of this problem at other conferences, that international university co-operation is a highly complex matter.

Moreover, the problem has been bedevilled by gross sentimentality on the part of some people. There is also the danger that universities may be so concerned with the desire to promote international co-operation as to make their academic programmes unreasonably at variance with national objectives. And yet, it is through their impact on their own nations that universities are most likely to contribute more meaningfully to international understanding, progress and happiness.

It is against this background that I venture to make some modest observations briefly on the question of international university co-operation in the field of teaching and study. The Working Party distinguished four possible areas of co-operation : namely, exchange of university teachers; exchange of university students; study programmes and textbooks; and pedagogical methods and techniques. I do not want to repeat the detailed discussion of these, which the Working Party has so ably done in IAU *Paper* No. 9. Nor do I presume to claim originality for all the views I wish to express.

A question that universities must constantly ask themselves, when considering possible co-operation in the field of teaching and study, is this : what sort of human beings do they wish to see come out of these institutions? Does it require international co-operation to produce such human beings? The answer to this must affect our attitude towards who shall teach; who shall be taught; what shall be taught; where shall the teaching be done; and how to teach.

It is also important to make a distinction between international university co-operation and international university assistance in the field of teaching and study. Co-operation here must be viewed as a two-way traffic between universities. At the present time there is, perhaps, far more of one-way than two-way traffic. Strictly speaking, the one-way traffic pattern can only be regarded as an aspect of straight assistance to the receiving university. The obstacles which hamper real co-operation are many and varied. Among the most obvious and important, as others have pointed out, are financial, political and language barriers; differences in university systems and practices, in the general concept of the rôle and functions of a university, in academic standards, and in cultural backgrounds; and paucity of national academic staff in many universities, particularly those in the developing world.

Co-operation with regard to university teachers

If co-operation is to be real and effective, it must be based on mutual respect and equality between the participating institutions. Such mutual respect and equality can only be assured if the institutions concerned recognize, achieve and maintain accepted standards of and approaches to scholarship and university education. And the quality of the teacher is crucial in all this. Low-grade university teachers will find it *most difficult, if not impossible,* to attract, or for themselves to be attracted by first-rate teachers *from/in other universities* abroad to participate in any co-operative teaching venture. High academic standards are, therefore, essential for promoting the international circulation of university teachers; whereas low standards are clearly an obstacle to such circulation. In other words, inferior teachers cannot be expected nor are they able to make distinctively positive contributions to genuine international co-operation.

Co-operation in teaching must also include interchange of teachers to act as "external examiners" in universities abroad. However, in this, as in the case of teaching, there is, at the present time, far more one-way trafficking than two-way at the international level, particularly between universities in the developed world and those in the developing areas—the flow being from the former to the latter. That the paucity of nationals on the academic staffs of many universities in the developing world hampers the flow of traffic in the opposite direction is accepted. But the factor of academic snobbery would seem to operate here quite significantly. Universities in the developed world would seem to suffer from this mania, apparently due to a false belief on the part of some people, that universities in the developing world have little or nothing to offer. If, in a particular field, the best teacher to examine is at a university, say, in Africa, what right has a university, say, in Canada got to deny its students to be taught or examined by the best person? Universities in the developed world have a special responsibility to reduce this constraint on international co-operation. Equally important is the need for universities in the developing world to have greater confidence in each other, so that two-way traffic in external examining between themselves can be increased.

The paucity of national staff in the universities of the developing world affects co-operation in another way. When scholars from abroad go to these universities, their main intellectual contact is with the largely expatriate staff there.

It is questionable whether staff exchanges in these circumstances can be considered as really fulfilling the purposes of international co-operation between the universities concerned.

Therefore, unless clearly more imaginative staff development programmes can be worked out and implemented, this constraint on international university co-operation will continue.

The requirements of the society in which the particular university/universities is/are located may hamper international university co-operation. For example, the requirements of highly specialized technocratic societies, such as those encountered in Europe and North America, may (and do) differ from the requirements of societies in most developing countries, which currently call for broad-based training. University teachers accustomed to working in one kind of society may thus well encounter considerable difficulties in teaching in another. And this has nothing to do with academic standards, which may be equally high in both situations. Staff exchanges in these circumstances, if they are to be effective, must require an ability, on the part of the visiting teacher, to adapt rapidly to local needs.

Co-operation with regard to students

Real and effective international exchange of students must mean that students should be able to move from one university to another abroad without loss of time in qualifying for their degrees, the courses taken in one university being counted towards the degree requirements in another university. A serious objection has been raised against such an arrangement. This is that it implies a philosophy of education which minimizes the need for co-ordinated and integrated courses of study (particularly at the undergraduate level) and the great educational value of the impact of a group of teachers on a student pursuing a full degree course in one institution. It also assumes the existence of common inter-university study programmes.

It seems clear that, partly for reasons of language and *partly for reasons of curricula, switching universities is more* difficult at the undergraduate than at the postgraduate level. This has raised the question of whether, *in these circumstances,* the foreign students should follow the regular courses of study of the host university, essentially designed for the students of the host country; or whether they should have "special

courses" prepared for them, possibly in "special institutions". In spite of claims of successful experiments in this direction, one may express considerable misgivings about the theory and practice of this. The foreign students are not likely to be exposed to the full rigours of the host university as the local students are; their full integration into the university community and society of the host country is impossible; their place as students of the host university can only be incidental or marginal; the quality of the "special courses" or "special institutions" are suspect and may well be inferior; and when they return home, their qualifications may not be accepted, as has happened in many cases, for employment purposes. Admittedly, the foreign student has to make a number of adjustments in order to obtain maximum benefit from his studies in the host country; but he should not suffer the disadvantages of separation.

Because of the needs of development in the developing countries, universities in these countries may and do find it necessary to reappraise and sometimes make far-going changes in their existing academic programmes. This may create difficulties for the foreign students at such institutions. The changed programmes may be so entirely different from what attracted them to the host university originally. This can, therefore, hinder genuine inter-university co-operation.

Where two or more universities are contemplating exchange of students, it seems highly desirable that such exchange should be preceded by an exchange of academic staff. The advantage of this is obvious : the students would be assured that the place where they are going is acceptable to their own teachers at home. For the postgraduate students, this could well be the last straw which might prevent them from being swept into the currents of the brain-drain.

It is also important to ensure that student exchanges do not frustrate the natural or planned development of the home university, as can well happen when significant numbers of the most capable students leave their own university to continue and complete their studies abroad.

Co-operation with regard to study programmes and textbooks

It has been suggested that inter-university co-operation might also be strengthened through common study programmes. I fully share the serious misgivings expressed in

IAU *Paper* No. 9. Moreover, such common programmes, with the possible exception of a very few disciplines, can well frustrate implementation of the concept of the university as an instrument of national development, which is rapidly gaining acceptance, particularly in the developing world.

Co-operation with regard to pedagogical methods and techniques

In the matter of pedagogy, it can be said that university teachers have got away with quite a lot under the cloak of university autonomy and academic freedom. The students and circumstances of today demand clearly more efficient teaching than has generally been the case so far in our universities. The increased numbers of students seeking university education; the diversity of their social and educational background; the growth in volume and complexity of knowledge—all these must challenge the present-day university teacher.

There is, however, the danger that in attempts to take advantage of the new technological methods, the university teaching profession may become so machine-oriented as to lose the human touch. This, to my mind, would be a great tragedy and should be deplored. By all means, let us use these new methods; let us exchange information and experience in this regard; but we must never ignore the need to have men doing the teaching. The various technological techniques can only be aids to the good teacher.

Conclusion

To sum up: the conclusion that inter-university co-operation in the field of teaching and study can contribute to international understanding is hardly challengeable. However, the many and serious obstacles which hinder such co-operation must never be minimized. Moreover, for many universities, particularly those in the developing world, it is not possible (for them) at the present time to meet their obligations to international university co-operation. They can only receive and welcome international university assistance.

PROFESSOR W. RODEWALD
Vice-Rector of the University of Warsaw

The main task of universities today consists above all in training highly qualified senior staff for the economic and cultural needs of the country and in conducting and developing scientific research. This task, among others, is at the origin of the principle—generally accepted today—of the unity of teaching, education and research. And although it may seem obvious that real teaching must go hand in hand with research, it cannot be repeated too often. The Working Party was right to bring up the problem and to observe that the universities would be in grave danger if they allowed themselves to be deprived of the means necessary for participation in scientific research. I want here to express, on behalf of the representatives of the Polish universities —and, I am convinced, on behalf of all those present at this Conference—our gratitude to the Working Party for the way in which it has prepared our discussions. In my paper, which is intended as a sort of introduction to the discussion, I have been asked to look at precisely this problem of scientific research, which forms one of the three subjects under the general theme "international university co-operation".

The task of the universities in the field of research takes on a very special significance at the present time when we are witnessing an extraordinarily vigorous development in all the fundamental branches of science, and when the interest shown in the scientific and technical revolution as well as its importance in the life of society are continually on the increase. The notion "scientific and technical revolution" refers to the whole range of revolutionary processes which are occurring in science and technology and which are linked by a common bond running from science to technology and back again. The development of science, the achievements of theoretical thought, the objective knowledge of the laws of nature are an inspiration and a source of profound transformation in industrial life. The essential point here certainly lies in the process of practical application of the results achieved through scientific inquiry. Moreover, in applying these results difficulties are often encountered, which in their turn attract the attention of research workers and in trying to solve them they are led to make further observations. Thus, technical progress gives a potent stimulus to scientific

knowledge; it fertilizes the mind of the research worker, provides science with new means of investigation, and presents it with new tasks. In the light of these facts, the problem of research and teaching in general and, in particular in the university, becomes one of paramount importance at the present day. The rapid development in all the branches of science and technology, as well as the considerable growth in quantity of scientific information flowing from it, is imposing increasingly heavy duties on university staff in their lecturing and research work. What type and kind of research should this be? What about its scope? Should it be fundamental or applied? All these questions are arousing lively discussion in university circles. They become particularly acute on the threshold of the scientific and technical revolution, when the relationships between the world of science and that of technology and material production are being profoundly altered, and when new conditions are emerging for individual scientific creation, resulting from the industrialization of science and the development of team work methods. This leads to fresh difficulties in the orientation and direction of scientific work. At present the rate of scientific development is very rapid throughout the world. It requires large material and institutional means, a plentiful number of highly qualified research workers and increasingly large supplies of apparatus. The seriousness of this matter makes our discussion of international university co-operation in research particularly timely. Experience in recent years has shown that international co-operation among universities has been very useful and effective and that, in spite of certain difficulties of a general or particular kind, it is entirely feasible.

It is our duty therefore to develop this co-operation to the full in all its forms, to shed light on the means and methods which have already been tried and have given the best results, and to discover and define fresh methods so that scientific research can occupy its proper place in programmes of international university co-operation. Quite a number of these means and methods are common to both teaching and research. Others, by constrast, are of more particular importance for the smooth development of research in universities. Among the forms most frequently mentioned, we might point to invitations of professors, lecturers and research workers abroad to give courses and lectures based on their own scientific achievements. Participation of university workers at international conferences, symposia and congresses is equally

important. It enables them to find their bearings better among the details of the various discipline and specializations, often also to become acquainted with modern methods and techniques, and, in addition, to establish personal contact with colleagues in other universities. Organized study courses abroad are of major importance to round off the training of young research workers. The advantages from this are very substantial for both sides and this is so obvious that there is scarcely any need to elaborate upon it. It would however be worthwhile to linger for a moment on the reciprocal assistance that universities could give each other in the training of research workers who are specialized in certain very narrow scientific disciplines. Very good results and important scientific successes are obtained through research organized jointly by universities in different countries, even despite all kinds of difficulties, which are not incidentally only of a financial and organizational kind but often fall outside the competence of the universities themselves. It might also be pointed out here that reciprocal assistance in solving scientific problems—worked out by one of the co-operating universities—might also appear in the programme of international university co-operation. In this case, it is indispensable that there should be an exchange of experiences both with regard to the research itself and also with regard to modern working methods and techniques.

Universities in the developing countries are a matter that deserve very special attention. I am convinced that discussion on this subject will make it possible to decide upon the most suitable forms of assistance. This would above all be a matter of co-operation in the organization of scientific research and help in providing technical and bibliographical facilities for the new teaching and research units that are created there.

Another important problem is that of strengthening bilateral scientific links between universities on the basis of specific tasks to be carried out. The Association could perhaps work out models for the accomplishment of these tasks giving a detailed list of the particular financial and organizational measures to be taken.

The question of international university co-operation in scientific information calls for thorough and specific discussion. While it is true, as I have already said, that we are witnessing a flood of information, it is equally true that only a certain amount of it gets through to the universities. And there are relatively few universities which have managed to

get to the root of this problem. That is why we hear appeals and requests on all sides calling for an exchange of scientific works, periodicals and other scientific information of all kinds. In this respect it would be very desirable to have mutual assistance in bringing out joint scientific publications. The problem of co-operation in the area of scientific information goes beyond the mere matter of data which was considered earlier. At the present time it is a more complex question, and for this reason the Working Party has made it a separate theme for the discussion.

We are realizing that the means and methods of international co-operation among universities in the matter of scientific research are not easy to arrive at. They require prolonged, consideration as well as decisions concerning organization, finance and spheres of responsibility. I would avow my conviction that, in spite of the numerous social, economic and political factors which impede the progress of international university co-operation, we, the universities, through our International Association, shall succeed in organizing and developing this co-operation. Our Conference bears witness to this and the results of our discussion will provide the proof. The achievement of those results is bound to serve the good of mankind and, thereby, the happiness of the individual.

Dr. JAMES M. HESTER

President of New York University

The background paper for this Conference reports complete agreement among the Conference planners on the two purposes of international university co-operation : helping universities in different countries in their essential tasks of teaching, research, and development; and reinforcing international understanding. Although co-operation with regard to administration and organization is more directly concerned with the first of these—helping universities to perform their essential tasks more effectively—the fact that administrative problems have become so serious and so similar around the world suggests that this is a particularly fruitful area for establishing international understanding among those gathered here. The background paper noted that IAU has started co-operative studies in this field and that Unesco has

organized international teams to work on organizational problems for individual universities. But the paper also pointed out that international co-operation in organization and administration has been quite fragmentary by comparison with exchanges in teaching and in research.

A principal reason why there has been so little sharing of experience in institutional management is, I believe, that until recently, many university heads have not found questions of organization and administration particularly urgent or, for that matter, even very interesting topics for discussion. We have tended to accept our own traditional national systems of university governance and administration as largely inviolable and have devoted our energies and international exchanges to other subjects. Only a decade ago a discourse on university administration in a gathering like this would surely have induced a large quantity of deep sleep.

Today the situation is radically different. Now whenever educators meet, problems of administration and organization are among the liveliest topics of discussion. External and internal pressures of enormous magnitude and the greatest urgency have thrust these issues upon us, and we recognize that not only the effectiveness of our institutions but also their very existence (not to mention our own existence as institutional heads) depend upon our ability to find new or revised organizational and administrative forms. Therefore we have developed a very lively interest in the management experience and experiments of others.

Two dominant external forces have raised questions about our practices : pressures for the accommodation of growing numbers of students and the concern of funding agencies about greater cost effectiveness. Both of these forces—numbers and finance—have stimulated legislative committees and ministries of education to undertake studies of higher educational systems at home and abroad. Within my own country, the growing state systems have borrowed heavily from each other's experiences, and governors, legislators, and educational administrators have come together in a number of regional and national organizations. These organizations have as a central purpose the exchange of information and experience on problems of structure and management. Fiscal controls, information systems, programme budgeting, and staged growth are major topics for such exchanges. Similarly, national and regional commissions in countries and areas throughout the world have undertaken comparative studies,

frequently with the assistance of international agencies and foundations. Thus intra-national and international co-operation in matters of administration and organization has come into being and will undoubtedly grow.

Two principal internal pressures for reconsideration of university organization are: radical changes in the field of knowledge; and revolutionary changes in attitudes of faculty members and students toward traditional authoritarian forms of academic governance. The adjustment of existing colleges and departments to new subject matter configurations is a complex problem, particularly when the authority of central administrators is under attack. The ability of democratic bodies to make hard choices and to institute reforms that reduce the power and privileges of constituent members is notoriously limited. At the same time, it is apparent that rigid resistance to the growing demand of individuals throughout the world for a greater voice in institutional decisions can impede progress as well as provoke destructive confrontations. The problem of preserving administrative authority within an increasingly consultative structure has become a crucial issue for many of us.

Perhaps the most typical characteristic of presidents, rectors, and vice-chancellors has been their conservatism and self-confidence in matters of organization and administration. This could be our most serious weakness in the circumstances that confront us today. In part this characteristic resulted from the style for which many of the great presidents, rectors, and vice-chancellors of the past were known. Often they were distinguished by highly opinionated views, authoritarianism and disdain of professionalism in academic administration. Often they were chosen for their reputation as scholars rather than for their enthusiasm for administration, and they accepted the dreary burdens of organization and administration largely in order to enjoy the power and privileges of their offices. It was customary to delegate administration to lower-level bureaucrats, who were, in turn, notorious tyrants. Inefficiencies and rigidities of traditional administrative structures were excused as being necessary to the mystique of academic life. The old autocrats directed their institutions according to fixed concepts which they freely and confidently recommended to new institutions in developing countries as though they were God-given.

We, as individuals, are still affected by residual influences from this past. But we have reason to be uneasy about such

a posture. The general public and boards of trust as well as students are losing their awe of the mysteries of academic life. It is increasingly unacceptable to attribute inefficiency to tradition and privilege. We are expected now to conduct our affairs more rationally than we have thought desirable or have been able to conduct them in the past.

It is clear that those who wish to remain in charge of universities must assume new perspectives. Our basic obligation is to equip our institutions to handle major educational reforms: to be able to accommodate changes in the fields of knowledge, changes in the educational requirements and perspectives of a growing quantity and variety of students, changes in methods of instruction and learning that make more effective use of limited human and material resources. It is now apparent that success in handling these educational issues depends on success in coping with unresolved problems of organization and administration. There is need to clarify the authority of presidents, rectors, and vice-chancellors; the relations between institutions and their boards of trust as well as co-ordinating councils and government authorities; the powers of university senates, college faculties, and departments; the rôle of students in policy development; the rights and responsibilities of individual faculty members and students. All of these issues bear upon the crucial need to increase the educational effectiveness of our expenditures without undermining the freedom and creativity of our scholars. A decade ago, we tended, each in his own tradition, to have fixed answers to questions of this kind. Now we are less certain, and so are our constituents. And because these issues are in flux, we have greater difficulty coping with the disturbing pressures from without and from within that threaten institutional autonomy, institutional integrity, academic freedom, and effective management—not to mention personal safety.

Reliance on tradition is not adequate for our tasks. If the modern university is to be strong enough to cope with its monumental educational problems, it needs organizational and administrative forms which are demonstrably efficient and fair. External pressures demand efficiency. The internal community demands responsiveness. We are challenged to find ways to perform the magic that satisfies both.

Undoubtedly we can help each other. Our national, cultural, and institutional differences still prohibit easy comparisons and direct transfers of experience, but our discussions

together provide useful information, new perspectives and can help us to overcome our natural conservatism. Exchanges can encourage in us the development of a greater capacity to consider new and different ways of solving our problems. Already many of us have borrowed heavily from others. It is indeed a useful function of IAU to facilitate this valuable relationship among the universities of the world.

The CHAIRMAN opened the general discussion.

Br. JOSÉ OTAO STEFANI, *Rector of the Pontifical University of Rio Grande do Sul*, suggested that the discussion should be directed mainly to consideration of the practical aspects of co-operation. All the participants were in fact agreed upon the principle of co-operation, which was one of the main objectives of IAU itself. The universities needed and wanted to help each other but what should be decided was how and in what way they could do so.

Dr. GEORGE BARANESCU, *Rector of the Polytechnical Institute of Bucharest*, recalled that while the need for co-operation was recognized by everyone, it appeared in a rather different light perhaps for a technical university, which was directly influenced by the progress of science. As long as science had been engaged in recording and classifying facts, advanced technical education was more concerned with the particular than the general, but now that science no longer aimed to list, but to explain phenomena and their interconnections, deep upheavals had occurred in the technologies, which had, so to speak, been thrown into the melting pot. Their constant change required not only changes in the content of studies, but also in their form and their conception, and it was becoming more and more difficult to manage the flood of information. Thus co-operation in the technical disciplines was a matter of particular urgency, in the field of research just as much as in that of lecturing and teaching. The universities had special responsibilities in this respect, for, as everyone knew, the law of secrecy too often weighed down upon non-university research. The best results were kept hidden in the interests of private profit, but to the detriment of society, since many other people spent fortunes to make the same discoveries over again. The universities had always been enemies of padlocks and seals and if their co-operation was as yet insufficient, this was often because

they lacked funds. Society should therefore be brought to understand that material support for international university co-operation was not only a necessity, but also a highly profitable investment. The big international organizations had worked out assistance programmes, especially for the developing countries. But would it not also be profitable for mankind to finance research programmes which would be implemented jointly by the universities of several countries and which would attempt to solve very immediate problems, such as that of the preservation of the environment?

Co-operation would perhaps be improved if a committee of IAU could put forward some rules for the presentation of the information which universities published about themselves.

Finally they should look at the very important matter of the training of academic staff for universities in the developing countries. Especially in the technical disciplines, this training was sometimes very difficult to provide on the spot for want of scientific equipment and an adequate industrial infrastructure. The best way out might perhaps be to organize training courses in the more advanced universities, where a large place would be given to research, but some also to teaching methods. That would be an excellent opportunity for co-operation between the already well-established universities.

Dr. Alex Kwapong, *Vice-Chancellor of the University of Ghana*, underlined two points. First of all he felt it was very important to preserve the *reciprocal character* of the co-operative relationship. Co-operation was like horse-riding; a rapport had to be set up between horse and rider, enabling both of them to develop their own qualities. Without this exchange and the concern of both partners to benefit from it, co-operation was in danger of degenerating into a form of colonialism.

At the same time, it had to be realized that co-operation, however harmoniously it might be conceived, could not work if it were not endowed with the necessary resources. And the moment had perhaps come for IAU to take more interest in the concrete means of financing co-operation.

Dr. Abu Sayed Chowdhury, *Vice-Chancellor of the University of Dacca*, recalled that the notion of co-operation was implicit in that of education, one of tasks of which was to

cultivate a sense of universality. The Association could play a particularly valuable part in giving this co-operation a real meaning. It frequently happened at the present day that universities were led to reform their management methods and embark upon experiments which departed considerably from generally accepted practices. Some universities had thus recently admitted students into their senates and councils, and such measures had not been without repercussions in countries where the demand for participation had not yet been made. It would be right in such cases for the universities concerned to consult IAU and for IAU in its turn to consult its member universities about the foreseeable effects of this or that reform. As far as exchanges of students and teachers were concerned, one of the principles of co-operation should be equal treatment for nationals and foreigners. The universities of Pakistan even went so far as to offer better conditions to foreign students, whom they wished to attract. Of course, it was easy to understand that not all universities could go as far as that, but at least it would be desirable for them to abstain from more or less discriminatory practices, such as making foreign students pay higher course fees.

As for teachers, it would be very helpful if IAU were to draw up lists of particularly eminent scholars and professors. Member universities could then seek the help of one or other of them, for example to sit on committees for selection and recruitment of their own lecturing staff.

Professor N. A. BELJAEV, *Pro-Rector of the University of Leningrad,* made the point that the scientific and technical revolution and social progress were conferring increased importance on higher education in general, and thereby, bringing about a change in international university co-operation. It seemed quite easy to agree on the main objectives of such co-operation and it was possible to pick out three. The first was to increase the intellectual potential of each country and of mankind in general. The second was to reduce the gap between different countries. The third was to deepen international understanding as a way to lasting peace and friendship among peoples. Furthermore, to achieve its purposes, co-operation had to be based on equality and mutual understanding between the parties concerned. The experience of the socialist countries had moreover shown that co-operation between countries at different levels of development was only fully effective if it recognized these principles.

Having agreed on those points, emphasis should be put on certain urgent matters : overcoming linguistic barriers, co-ordinating teaching and research, making university life more democratic, establishing degree equivalents between various countries. All those problems were of importance not only for co-operation, they also affected the internal life of every university. For the time being, although it might be quite legitimate for the purposes of discussion, to make a distinction between the internal problems and the external problems of the university, there was very often a close link between them.

In speaking of the areas of co-operation, there was one which should be singled out, because it was acquiring increasing importance : that was the further training of specialists who had already acquired a basic training in their own country.

Then coming to the rôle of IAU in co-operation, it seemed that it should above all be one of information and co-ordination. Only fragmentary and insufficient data was at present available about co-operation programmes and it would be well for IAU to make a systematic and scientific effort to collect and disseminate more complete information.

Professor G. HEIDORN, *Rector of the University of Rostock*, pointed out that the universities of the German Democratic Republic were deeply aware of the need for international university co-operation. Although they had hitherto developed co-operation mainly with institutions in socialist countries or countries struggling for their liberation, they also had contacts with establishments in countries whose social system was entirely different from that in the German Democratic Republic. They had nevertheless become convinced that the development of co-operation between universities depended to a very large degree on relations between the states concerned. Relations based on mutual respect, international law and in particular the United Nations Charter could alone provide firm foundations for inter-university co-operation. That was why the universities and their Association should do everything in their power to see that equitable and peaceful relationships were established between all countries and that the discriminatory measures of which some of them were still victims came to an end. University co-operation would make decisive progress if the United Nations Organization and its Specialized Agencies were to

become genuinely universal, and it was for IAU, which was a world organization, to uphold this elementary principle.

Dr. N. A. HERNANDEZ, *Dean of the Faculty of Medicine of the National University of Cordoba*, suggested that IAU should set up a Central Information Bureau to which the universities would communicate the important discoveries they made and which would distribute the information to other universities.

Dr. W. BUNO, *of the University of Montevideo*, emphasized that his university accepted many students from other Latin American countries and that it was ready to accept any form of genuine co-operation, because it needed it. It must however be realized that university co-operation was sometimes used by certain countries as a method of economic or political infiltration and acted more or less as a Trojan Horse for cultural imperialism, or for imperialism full stop. Moreover, there were many possible models for a university, and they were not easy to graft from one society on to another. One of the mistakes co-operation had to avoid was therefore a hasty and ill-considered transfer of any particular type of university into another country.

Finally it was not true to say that the universities worked solely and always for the welfare of mankind. Some of them engaged in research of a military nature directly intended to support a war effort. And worse still, co-operation was sometimes used to induce a foreign university to co-operate unwittingly in military research; a mathematics institute for example, might find itself entrusted with a project, unaware that it was to contribute to the solution of certain balistic problems. That was obviously an intolerable abuse.

Dr. L. KERWIN, *Vice-Rector of Laval University*, made a practical suggestion : he thought it appropriate that IAU should set up a working party whose mission would be to work out budgetary criteria for international university co-operation. After studying the matter, the working party could for example suggest that each university should devote 1 per cent, 3 per cent or 10 per cent of its budget to co-operation. Of course such criteria would have to be applied in a flexible way, taking account of the special position of the institutions. But if they came to be widely recognized throughout the world, this would assist the universities in drawing up their budgets and obtaining the necessary credits from those who subsidized them.

The CHAIRMAN intervened to underline the importance of this suggestion which had in fact already been made several times in the Working Parties convened by the Association. If the universities really intended to take a hand in co-operation, and not leave it to governments, it was important that they should give a clear demonstration of their intention to devote a part of their resources to it.

Dr. NAHAVANDI, *Rector of the University of Chiraz*, also wanted to make a practical suggestion. He felt that one of the most useful forms of co-operation was the conclusion of bilateral agreements between institutions in different countries. His own university had for a number of years had an agreement with the University of Pennsylvania which, among other things, had enabled it to recruit more than 400 Iranian lecturers, who were in the United States. The Secretariat of IAU would be doing a very great service to the university community if it were able, on the one hand, directly to promote bilateral agreements and, on the other hand, to collect and circulate information about existing agreements; that would enable universities wishing to associate to get to know more about the various types of association in use and to assess their advantages and disadvantages.

Dr. G. S. WISE, *President of the University of Tel-Aviv*, thought that before accepting foreign students, universities should first ensure that they were able to provide not only adequate facilities for study, but also a social and human environment in which they could really feel at home. Whenever this was not the case, rather than accepting foreign students, it was preferable to send professors abroad : these professors could then teach hundreds or even thousands of young people without their having to face the difficult problems of adapting to a foreign environment and then re-adapting to their home environment.

Furthermore, it would be sensible to draw more often on the services of professors and research workers who were in retirement, but still quite capable of making a distinguished contribution to education and scientific discovery. Free of career ties in their own countries, they would find it easier than their younger colleagues to agree to go and work abroad. It would be helpful if the IAU Secretariat could draw up lists of such people.

As for research, with the best will in the world, the possibility of centralizing and disseminating all results seemed to be quite out of the question. Systematic exchanges of methods, on the other hand, would be possible and IAU could perhaps act as a "clearing-house" for scientific methods.

Finally, the importance of financial issues should not be overlooked out of misplaced prudery; in many countries, universities were finding it increasingly difficult to get the funds necessary for teaching and research. It was a serious problem and it would be worthwhile for the Conference to devote some time to studying appropriate ways of overcoming the situation.

Rev. J. W. PADBERG, *Vice-President of Saint Louis University*, while emphasizing the value of bilateral agreements between universities, suggested that it might be useful to form university consortiums, within a country or a region, which would be capable of giving more extensive services to co-operation than any of their members taken individually. There had been a very recent example in the United States : the Associated Universities for International Education, which was made up of eight universities.

Furthermore, to get down to a more basic question, it was very important for everyone at the present time that the universities should help each other in creating complete freedom of teaching and research within their walls and it would not be time wasted if the Conference were to devote some of its attention to the matter.

Dr. A. A. SANTAS, *Rector of the University of Buenos-Aires*, drew attention to a problem which had not yet been raised, although it was of concern to all universities; namely, the training of university teachers. If universities could assist each other in giving better training in the art of teaching — an area hitherto unexplored by most of them—they would be contributing to a change in human relationships and to the establishment of more real understanding within their own walls, which was perhaps one of the best ways of contributing to international understanding.

Mgr L. GILLON, *of the Lovanium University*, hoped, with some earlier speakers, that IAU would lay down criteria for co-operation. It had been suggested some years before that

each university should employ one per cent of its staff each year on co-operation work. That percentage might seem an ambitious one, and a start might perhaps be made at 0.5 per cent rising gradually to one per cent.

At the same time, in view of the increasing practice of sabbatical or scientific leave, the suggestion might be made that anyone taking such leave spend, say, one third of his time in a university in a developing country.

Finally, going back to a suggestion which had been made earlier, it would be a good idea if retired professors were given more opportunity to take part in co-operation. They could supply information about themselves to the IAU Secretariat, which would collect and circulate it to its member universities.

The CHAIRMAN thanked the speakers and adjourned the session.

FIRST DISCUSSION SESSION

CO-OPERATION IN THE FIELD OF TEACHING AND STUDY

Dr. R. WEEKS, *Chairman of the Session,* opened the discussions and asked participants to refrain as much as possible from reading texts prepared in advance so that the discussion might become a real dialogue and not simply a succession of unrelated statements. He also invited the speakers to look mainly at the practical aspects of co-operation and recalled some of the points stressed in the previous day's plenary session: problems of finance for university co-operation; possibilities of inter-university "consortiums": and finally, the organization of co-operation and of the dissemination of information between universities in a spirit of mutual esteem and respect. He suggested as a starting point the theme, "co-operation in the field of teaching and study", proposed in the discussion outline.

Dr. E. G. EDWARDS, *Vice-Chancellor of the University of Bradford,* focused attention on the danger that practical co-operation between universities, valuable and necessary as it

might be, might not provide a swift or profound enough answer to the need for a sense of human solidarity, the importance of which had been emphasized by Dr. Zurayk. The world was fraught with overt crises, and latent ones which might develop very fast, and it was therefore imperative for the universities to attack the problem directly, and not expect such solidarity to grow and flourish as a natural off-shoot of their day-to-day co-operation. He asked what proportion of their resources and efforts the universities were devoting to studying the solution of conflicts, the anatomy of xenophobia, the pathology of racialism, the problems of poverty and of the growing gap between the rich and the poor countries.

IAU seemed exceptionally well placed to stimulate research and university co-operation in these areas. The Administrative Board could perhaps set up an *ad hoc* committee to consider how this could be done.

Dr. JACOB KATZ, *Rector of the Hebrew University, Jerusalem*, thought that the smaller countries had an essential part to play in international university co-operation. Indeed, many developing countries feared that assistance from the "big powers" might be tainted with political or cultural influences, but was not the case with co-operation between countries of comparable size. Furthermore, steps should be taken to combat the brain-drain towards the universities of the rich countries; the inevitable outcome of this was the intellectual impoverishment of the universities of the smaller countries through their being deprived of their finer elements. The uniformity resulting from this brain-drain and from the concentration of intellectual capacity in a few big centres clearly ran counter to the best interests of the international university community and it should be one of the tasks of IAU to see to it that the smaller countries retain their particular university characteristics.

Dr. A. BALCELLS-GORINA *of the University of Barcelona*, spoke out against one mistaken kind of co-operation, which was the antithesis of true co-operation; this mistaken co-operation involved the migration of students who had been weeded out of their own universities by selection procedures. For financial, family, or other purely personal reasons these students were out to get a degree at any price. They helped to increase the pressure on already overcrowded universities

and they were a cause of the lowering of academic standards. The universities should therefore agree on forms of international selection which gave preferential admission to students recommended by the authorities of their home countries.

In addition, the universities should offer a greater number of invitations to foreign professors for sufficiently long periods—during their sabbatical year for example, or as already advocated, after they had reached retirement age, provided that they had not lost their "intellectual usefulness".

Dr. F. Bowles, *Academic Vice-President of Haile Selassie I University, Addis Ababa*, considered that the universities should make more effort to take control of the development of education throughout the world. Working in a developing country, one was in fact particularly aware of the fact that the main guidelines were laid down by governments, planning bodies and a few international organizations, notably the World Bank.

The decisions they took, even more than their financial power, were tending to channel and control the development of education. Their ideas and influence were going to become increasingly strong and their policies were likely to assert themselves more and more. Their methods and their more or less implicit criteria were going to fashion university development.

Nothing comparable existed in the field of international university co-operation and if the universities wanted to take the lead in educational development, they would have to realize what this meant and what it involved, and work out the main guidelines for themselves.

In present day conditions, the universities had a tendency to act in isolation in relation to the bodies which financed them and that was not the way to put them in a position to create the conditions for real university co-operation.

This might therefore be the right moment, as Vice-Chancellor Edwards had suggested, for IAU to set up a committee for the development of university co-operation.

Dr. A. C. Castles, *of the University of Adelaide*, mentioned the United Nations international university project, which in his opinion might form the embryo of an international system of university co-operation and provide the answer to some of the anxieties expressed by Dr. Bowles.

Various proposals had already been made on this subject and it had been envisaged that the new institution would organize close co-operation between the faculties of various universities with a view to advanced studies in various fields. The international university community, and therefore IAU, ought to take close interest in this project and in the possibility it might offer of defining a coherent policy for co-operation.

Dr. S. IRMAY, *of the Technological Institute, Haifa*, stressed the importance of co-operation in inter-library exchanges between universities, and he drew attention to the desirability of studying the possibility of adopting a standard classification system to overcome difficulties encountered abroad by students and teachers accustomed to the classification system used in their own university.

Dr. LOUIS JOUGHIN, *of the International Association of University Professors and Lecturers*, commented on the views of university teachers with regard to university co-operation and began his statement with three observations :

1) The working document was right to say that "nothing is more vital to universities than the exchange of knowledge..." but it would probably be still more correct to say that nothing was more essential for the well-being of society than the exchange of knowledge and that the responsibility for controlling this process evolved upon the university and its components.

2) Responsible professors and administrators were agreed on the principle of academic freedom. It should be noted, for the record, that in the recent past, professors concerned to defend academic freedom had had to contend with the friendly rivalry of university presidents and, together, they had contributed to the martyrology of the university.

3) Professors were fully aware of the essential part played by the administration in the educational process. But supercilious professors would be surprised that an assembly of university leaders should choose to call itself a university assembly. In this large gathering there were scarcely more than a few "trustees", a bare pittance of professors and a handful of students.

This being said, three problems referred to in the

"working document" appeared to call for further examination :

1) The problem of nationalism.

It was now widely recognized that the nationalist mentality was one of the major obstacles to the development of universal values and procedures for co-operation.

It was important to state clearly that "the exchange of knowledge" was too often diverted or paralyzed by modern forms of tribalism. A firm statement was called for on this matter.

2) The problem of university autonomy.

Any well-informed university teacher was a supporter of the autonomy of his university, for the freedom of the university was a guarantee of his own freedom. But the freedom of the institution did not always provide a guarantee of respect for the primary rôle of the teacher in deciding pedagogical policy and practice. A distinction had to be made here.

3) The problem of an international education service.

Only the most fortunate university teachers could hope to work abroad in the conditions of freedom and economic security compatible with worthwhile teaching. As yet there was not even the faintest outline of an international university career structure. This was an area where a difficult and urgent task still remained to be done.

From the point of view of a representative of an organization invited as an observer, three suggestions for specific action might be made.

1) IAU would render a substantial service to the university community by studying the trends towards the participation of all concerned in university governance.

2) IAU would strengthen its capacity for leadership if it were to explore all the possibilities for permanent co-operation with the learned societies concerned with particular disciplines. The time had come to bring about a concordance between the positions adopted by professors and university leaders acting in those capacities, and the positions they adopted as scholars.

The Constitution of IAU recognized the obligation of universities "to develop mutually material and moral aid on an international level". This implied that it should endeavour to

establish standards for the creation of an international university career structure. Such a document would deal explicitly and perhaps for the first time with the problem of academic freedom in a world-wide context.

Dr. G. PAU, *Rector of the University of Sassari* raised the problem of the shortage of academic staff in the developing countries.

In fact, the same shortage was now being felt in the developed countries as a result of the substantial increase in student numbers. It was thus becoming more and more difficult to find staff available for teaching abroad. A thorough study should therefore be made of the possibilities for postgraduate students from the developing countries to finish their studies in the universities of the advanced countries. These students could eventually form teams of teachers capable of working in their home countries or in other countries which needed them. They would not only have the opportunity to acquire knowledge, but also take a full part in the scientific life of the host countries. This would be one way of achieving a better understanding between peoples, which was both a condition and an objective of international university co-operation.

Mrs. PILAR H. LIM, *President of the Centro Escolar University of the Philippines,* expressed agreement with the preceeding speaker's plan for the exchange of advanced students. This would be one of the best ways to overcome the serious shortage of qualified university teachers in the Philippines and in other developing countries. In this regard, it was worth pointing out that the International Federation of University Women offered numerous scholarships to enable women students to finish their studies in the United States and Europe. On their return home, the holders of these scholarships had been able to do useful work spreading the knowledge they had acquired. The bigger universities should allocate more scholarships to the developing countries which did not have the financial means for exchanges of academic staff.

Book exchanges were no less important, for they relieved the financial burden of universities in poorer countries, particularly when, as was the case in the Philippines, book prices were prohibitive.

Dr. N. K. ADAMOLEKUN, *of the University of Ibadan,* repeated that co-operation was a basic necessity for the deve-

loping countries. Nevertheless, it should not be limited solely to forms of inter-university co-operation. The University of Ibadan, for instance, owed a great deal to the Ford and Rockefeller Foundations and to foreign governments, in particular the British and Canadian Governments (in oil technology). The Federal German, Soviet and French Governments had been providing it with lecturers. Co-operation was inseparable from the problems of financing and it should be carried on for the benefit of the developing countries. It was a matter of concern to the world as a whole, for peace could not be ensured if one group of peoples developed to the detriment of others, or if one part of mankind was neglected for the benefit of the other.

Dr. A. C. Joshi, *Member of the IAU Administrative Board*, pointed out that exchanges of teachers in fact most often occurred through the intermediary of government agencies or foundations. It would obviously be desirable for universities to take things in hand but they would then, as already suggested, inevitably have to allot sufficient budgetary resources for the purpose. It was hard to specify the exact percentage of the budget which would have to be devoted to co-operation, but it was quite certain that the universities would have to make a bigger effort than they were at present.

They would furthermore have to make a greater attempt to develop co-operation patterns which were not financially burdensome. One example was the case of a leading professor who might be attached simultaneously to two universities, one in a developing country and the other in a developed country. Each year he would spend several months at one university and several months at the other. For the developing country, this system not only had the advantage of stopping the brain-drain, or at least limiting it in time, but also of enabling some of its best minds to work at regular intervals in centres which were at the forefront of their discipline : in this way the "drain" was not only a temporary one, it also became useful. Likewise, exchanges could be extended among universities whose vacations did not coincide. Lastly, as already remarked, more use could be made of the services of retired teachers.

Dr. S. V. Rumiantsev, *Rector of the Peoples' Friendship University, Moscow*, emphasized the importance of the principle of equality in the relations between universities in

different countries and spoke more particularly about the problem of co-operation with the developing countries. The USSR for its part, was using a variety of methods in trying to help them train their own nationals.

— It had helped in setting up and equiping 22 institutions of higher education in various countries, and was preparing to launch 17 other projects of the same type. The intake capacity of all these establishments would then be 20,000 students.

— Under various agreements, the Soviet Union each year sent hundreds of highly qualified teachers and research workers to the developing countries. The University of Moscow alone had sent some 1,400 over the last 10 years. It was of interest to note that they had not encountered any of the career and reinstatement difficulties mentioned in the working document.

— There were at present more than 11,000 undergraduate and postgraduate students from developing countries in Soviet universities and this number would be increased substantially in the coming years. The Peoples' Friendship University, which was entirely devoted to international co-operation, played a very important rôle in this field and its six faculties at present included 4,500 students from Asia, Africa and Latin America. The course requirements were published in English and partly in French and Spanish, and could be examined by all those who were interested. Comments and criticisms would be welcomed.

Dr. G. Balanda, *of the Official University of the Congo, Lumbumbashi*, laid emphasis on the importance of training qualified national staff for higher education in the developing countries. A university was not only a group of buildings, but also a body of men who were dedicated to a common task and who had to understand one another. However competent they might be, foreign teachers had to be prepared to make an effort to adapt themselves if they were really to become accepted in the surrounding environment, and in particular, by the students. Very often they went away again before this effort had borne fruit. Many were seconded under technical assistance agreements and were likely to be repatriated as soon as some political or diplomatic dispute arose between the contracting parties; others saw co-operation as a way of escape from military service in their own countries; yet others lived in a state of constant tension

fearing that their careers might be compromised in their home countries and they accepted a post there as soon as the opportunity occurred. To overcome this state of affairs it would be preferable for foreign teachers to remain attached to their university of origin and only to be "on loan" to the developing country university. But in the long run the best solution was for the developing countries to have their own national staff. A large number of these future staff would still have to be given their advanced training abroad and in order to increase training possibilities, to enable French-speakers to study in English-speaking countries for instance, great effort should be put into language training.

Apart from this, the developing universities were in need of equipment. Here again they had to have recourse to foreign aid, but they could at the same time make more rational use of what they had by increased specialization and by establishing proper priorities. In some cases, it might also be advisable to set up inter-university centres, such as the training centre for journalists planned in Yaoundé.

Dr. WIRZBERGER, *Rector of the Humboldt University, Berlin*, reverted to the question of the definition of the main lines of a coherent co-operation policy, raised by Dr. Brooks. One approach used successfully by the universities of the German Democratic Republic was to conclude long-term bilateral agreements whose particular scope and modes of application were agreed to year by year. Recently, the universities of the German Democratic Republic had concentrated mainly on sending teachers capable of helping the developing countries at the nerve centres of their own development. This did not rule out reciprocal assistance, since a university which was sent a specialist in stock-breeding, for instance, might send a specialist in African affairs in return. As for the students, the universities of the German Democratic Republic believed it was of great value to accept foreigners for postgraduate studies. They also accepted first-year students, but mainly in certain specialized fields. Apart from this, they attached great importance to the preparation of textbooks and other teaching materials. Inter-university exchanges of artists and sports teams could also stimulate international understanding, and this was another type of co-operation which should be mentioned.

Finally, there might be value in the proposal made earlier that IAU set up a committee with responsibility for questions of co-operation, especially if it were able to ensure that co-

operation was based upon Unesco's underlying principles of universality and was not diverted from its ends by the abuses denounced by Dr. Balcells-Gorina.

Mr. H. G. Quik, *Director-General of the Netherlands Universities Foundation for International Co-operation*, stressed that if the intention was to achieve genuine co-operation between universities, as opposed to mere assistance, the important thing was to establish real community of interests between the partners. For this sense of community to become real, both for universities and members of academic staff, it ought to encompass research. A professor or lecturer on mission abroad liked to be able to go on with his research, and this among other reasons made it important for universities in the developing countries to be endowed with the means to undertake research in subjects and areas which they were well placed to study.

Furthermore, the more students became involved in co-operation, the more vigorous it would be. Many students in developed countries were interested in the problems of developing countries and when they had had an opportunity to go to a university in one of those countries, they very often became active supporters of co-operation on their return home.

Finally, there was one point people too often tended to overlook, namely that co-operation had to be organized and this called for the creation of specific machinery to implement and co-ordinate it. Any effort of IAU to deal with the matter on an international basis would be welcomed.

Dr. A. F. Christ-Janer, *President of the College Entrance Examination Board, United States*, believed that much more should be done to provide information and guidance for students going abroad, so as to put them in a better position to choose their institution and their course of study. A systematic inquiry should also be made to see what could be done to help a student make the move from one educational system to another and derive maximum benefit from it.

Dr. M. V. Belyi, *Rector of the University of Kiev*, emphasized that the development of scientific knowledge and its increased importance in the life of society made the tasks of the university both more complex and more important. Furthermore, since the process extended beyond national

frontiers, it demanded an increasing degree of international university co-operation and at the same time created the conditions for such co-operation. The University of Kiev, for its part, co-operated with a number of foreign universities in a great variety of ways : joint studies of scientific or pedagogical problems; the holding of congresses and seminars; exchanges of teachers, students and young research workers, regular exchanges of syllabuses, textbooks and other teaching and scientific materials; as well as exchanges of artists and sportsmen. Detailed information about all these activities was available to participants in the form of a brochure describing the experience of the Universities of Kiev, Minsk and Kishinev. A point worthy of particular emphasis was that international university co-operation, apart from permitting a valuable pooling of knowledge and experience, also helped each of the partners to arrive at a better assessment of its own work.

Dr. S. O. Biobaku, *Vice-Chancellor of the University of Lagos*, while not underestimating the importance of international university assistance, also believed that it should be replaced, more and more by a genuine inter-university co-operation. Direct links should be established and increased between one university and another or, to put it in another way, a pattern of sister universities should be developed. Links of this kind did indeed already exist, but they were often financed from external sources—governements and foundations, and there was a danger of their being broken off whenever the source dried up. If the universities wanted to protect their links against such changes of fortune and make them lasting, they would have to take more direct responsibility for them themselves. And even if they only had limited means available, some ultimately effective approach would present itself. The mere exchange of two teachers, for example, might initiate a valuable development by preparing the ground for student exchanges based on a sound mutual awareness of the possibilities and real needs of both parties. Even if this kind of exchange continued to be limited from a quantitative point of view, it did have the merit of introducing genuine co-operation based on reciprocity. The suggestion might therefore be made that each university in the developed countries should decide right away to establish direct links, or to pair off with a university in a developing country. An annual report on the development

and progress of their co-operation might then be sent in to the Association.

Dr. H. RUMPF, *President of the West German Rectors' Conference*, recalled that the great increase in national student enrolment in many countries and the need, in some cases, to set a *numerus clausus*, was likely to cause public opinion, and possibly governments, to demand that the universities restrict their intake of foreign students. To counter this danger, the West German Rectors' Conference had recommended that the ratio of foreigners to total student numbers should be fixed at 10 per cent and there was a good chance that this recommendation might be accepted by the Ministry of Eduation and Science. Perhaps the General Conference might adopt a similar recommendation internationally.

Dr. I. SUPEK, *Rector of the University of Zagreb*, emphasized the importance of organizing exchanges of university staff in the social and human sciences, which at first sight were not as universal as the natural sciences. The number and variety of points of view which emerged called for contacts and some effort to break through parochial attitudes.

As for students, it was probably better to give priority to exchanges of advanced or postgraduate students who were generally more mature, better informed about problems in their own countries and, consequently, better armed against the temptation to join the brain-drain. In this connection, it should be noticed that many universities were ill-equipped for postgraduate work and that this was one of the areas where it would be reasonable for them to work together and pool their resources.

Mention should also be made of another often neglected problem. Excellent works were often written in minority languages. Where they were not translated, they remained outside the circuit of international exchanges and these exchanges were impoverished and thrown out of equilibrium as a result. In order to overcome this, an IAU committee might be made responsable for selecting appropriate works and having them translated.

Mgr J. GARNEAU, *Associate Director of the Association of Universities and Colleges of Canada*, deplored the obstacles put in the way of student mobility by the ticklish and some-

times trivial requirements of some universities concerning recognition of foreign degrees. IAU should tackle this problem in co-operation with Unesco. The problem was to define degrees which would be conceived not so much as a form of recognition of the acquisition of a certain fixed quantity of knowledge but rather as the possible starting point for further, extended studies. For some students less fully prepared than others, these more advanced studies might require a longer period of time than the minimum set, but students should not be excluded altogether from the possibility of embarking upon them if they appeared to have the necessary talent.

Dr. W. ZIMMERLI, *Professor at the University of Göttingen and Member of the IAU Administrative Board,* told the meeting that the German Academic Exchange Service had been led to revise its policy for scholarship awards after finding that many scholarship holders from the developing countries settled permanently in Germany, often after getting married. The tendency at present was to make the awards tenable locally in an African university, for instance. The efforts made by the Association of African Universities to promote exchanges within Africa itself had the same aim and appeared very interesting.

Abbot HOUARD, *Secretary-General of the Catholic Faculties of the West, Angers,* suggested that some perhaps modest but immediate results might be achieved by the Conference, if participants put up notices with requests or offers of co-operation which could be put into effect right away.

Dr. H. HARARI, *Vice-President of Education and World Affairs, New York,* believed that IAU and bodies concerned with international university co-operation could co-ordinate their activities around a number of focal points.

First more information should be collected about models of co-operation already put to the test, and in particular more information for the evaluation and analysis of the reasons for their success or failure. Particular attention should be paid to innovation and also to the equitable sharing of exchanges and responsibilities between co-operating universities. The importance of reciprocity had been rightly

emphasized, but that was an idea which had to be given a specific definition in each case, especially when the situations of the two parties were dissimilar.

Apart from this, it was important to work out basic guidelines for co-operation : what needs could it satisfy and how could it be organized coherently without adverse effects for academic freedom and the autonomy of the institutions? In what ways could it be financed and how would it fit into the broader context of the educational development strategy which each society ought to work out for itself?

Dr. E. Evans-Anfom, *Vice-Chancellor of the University of Kumasi*, remarked that while it was inevitable that very young universities should concentrate on teaching, the time eventually came when they needed to develop research ans postgraduate studies among other things in order to stem the brain drain. The "local" scholarships referred to by Dr. Zimmerli, might be very valuable in this respect, but it was no less important that the holders of the scholarships should be really able to find locally adequate possibilities for their study and research; it was therefore important for the countries awarding such scholarships to give systematic attention to the development of such possibilities.

Dr. M. Fog, *Rector of the University of Copenhagen*, was of the opinion that IAU should not try to monopolize the organization of international university co-operation. Many other bodies were also involved; the important thing was to make their activities more coherent and fill the gaps which still remained.

Reverting to various points already discussed, it could probably be said that satisfactory exchanges of teachers already existed between universities in the developed countries. The real problem arose with exchanges between these universities and universities in the developing countries. Suggestions had been made for lists to be drawn up of professors, retired or otherwise, who would be prepared to work for a shorter or longer period in an institution in the developing world. In fact it was most unlikely that many teachers would wish to offer their services in this way. It would therefore be better to reverse the procedure and to publish vacancy lists, in the *IAU Bulletin* for instance, which could then be reprinted in the internal publications of member universities.

Unlike teacher exchanges, student exchanges were prob-

ably better organized between the developing countries and the developed countries than among the developed countries themselves. Special funds were often earmarked for the first kind of exchange while no special financial provisions were made for the second kind. This was one further difficulty added to those resulting from differences between academic systems, and all these difficulties should be in some way overcome.

As for exchanges of curricula, it had been suggested at a meeting of European Rectors in Bucharest that Unesco should try to centralize the curricula of universities throughout the world and keep the record up to date. In such a comprehensive form, however, the undertaking would probably lead to an excessive waste of time and effort; it would end in the accumulation of an immense mass of material which would be completely unmanageable. A better approach would be to strengthen the information service which was already working very effectively within the IAU Secretariat. This might not perhaps be in a position to give direct information about all curricula, but it could refer people seeking information about new or original experiments to the universities or bodies able to provide it.

As for the matter of co-operation in respect of teaching methods, this was something hardly mentioned by the Conference and it would appear to lend itself better to study by smaller groups where specialists could give their colleagues an initiation into new techniques.

Mgr L. GILLON, *of Lovanium University, Kinshasa,* raised the matter of salaries of foreign academic staff seconded to the developing countries. In some cases the salary was paid entirely by the government of the sending country, in others it fell entirely upon the shoulders of the receiving university. The best solution in many instances was perhaps a sharing system : the receiving university paid the foreign teacher what it would normally pay a national teacher, out of its normal budget, and the sending government or university then supplemented this from its own resources. This system was healthier, because both parties were involved in a commitment. It enabled the foreign country to send more teachers, and it created a link between the teachers and the receiving university which was very often lacking if they were paid entirely by an external body.

The problem of career security for expatriate teachers had recently been complicated by the democratization of uni-

versity management bodies. These bodies, elected for short terms, often hesitated to enter into long-term commitments and did not dare promise members of academic staff reinstatement on the career ladder after a spell of several years abroad. This was a point to be brought to the attention of students who were concerned about assistance to the developing countries.

Rev. Father DAGHER, *Rector of the St. Joseph University of Beirut*, pointed out that the psychological aspects of sending academic staff to the developing countries were at least as important as the financial and technical aspects.

Highly qualified university teachers often failed because of their inability to adapt to new working conditions, to understand the psychology of their students and to take a real interest in the problems of the host country. In the last resort a friendly attitude was of greater importance than technical preparedness.

Mr. H. G. QUIK, *Director-General of the Netherlands Universities Foundation for International Co-operation*, returned to the question of lists of university lecturers available for co-operation and lists of vacancies in universities in the developing countries. Experiments of this kind had already been made, notably by Unesco, but the results had been most disappointing. There were probably many reasons for this, but the main lesson to be learnt was that such a system simply did not work. It would be much more profitable to draw up lists not of individuals, but of universities, which were anxious to give or receive assistance in various fields, and IAU could perhaps play a part in the process of matching institutions interested in co-operating.

Rev. Father E. B. ROONEY, *of Fordham University, New York*, reminded the meeting that IAU had been created to fill a gap. There had been many international organizations in existence representing different sectors of university life, but there had been none for universities as such. The subsequent development of the Association had been so gratifying that there was at present a temptation to entrust to it all university problems. There were however some matters which obviously fell within the terms of reference of Unesco or other organizations. Unless IAU was selective in its activities, there was a danger that the Association would sink under the burden of its responsibilities.

Dr. R. H. SMUCKLER, *of the Michigan State University, East Lansing*, drew attention to the leading part played in international co-operation by university departments and individual specialists in the various disciplines. It frequently happened that they took the initiative in establishing links with colleagues abroad whose work they knew, and in such cases the university authorities should give them a free hand and place no obstacle in the way of this form of co-operation which was not imposed from without, but was a natural product of scientific work itself. It was to be remembered that a co-operation programme would never really succeed unless it aroused the genuine interest of teachers and research workers. Teachers and research workers might even help to finance it either out of their own departmental budgets or through appeals to the scientific organizations, which they knew better than the university authorities.

It remained true that the universities could promote and strengthen co-operation and it was desirable for them to establish a coherent policy for co-operation. The setting up of an IAU committee as proposed would help them to do this. The committee could consider ways of overcoming the barriers to international exchanges, collect and circulate information about programmes of co-operation, study matters such as sabbatical leave, career conditions for teachers seconded abroad etc., and help universities to develop a policy in these areas which would favour co-operation. The committee might perhaps also envisage the possibility of co-operation with the other international organizations, in particular with the specialized scientific organizations, while at the same time endeavouring to define the specific rôle of IAU.

Dr. P. TEYSSIER, *Rector of the University of Dakar*, said that the whole problem of student exchanges was governed by policy in the matter of scholarship awards, which was of fundamental importance. The intake of the University of Dakar included 50 per cent foreign students, nearly all African and the vast majority of them scholarship-holders. In fact, in African economic conditions, study abroad presupposed in almost every case the award of a scholarship. More often than not governments provided these scholarships and laid down the main lines of the policy for their award. Nevertheless, universities and professors also played an important part, since they were the people who selected candidates. An important form of co-operation was thus established which might avoid the disorganization which had been reported

in international student migration; it made it possible to select students qualified in the fields most useful to their own countries and to send them at the right moment to the right country. The scholarships policy might also contribute to cutting down the brain-drain, since governments which awarded scholarships to their nationals could legitimately demand several years' service in return.

Dr. L. EVANS, *of Columbia University*, shared Mr. Edwards' belief that the universities should make a much more vigorous contribution to examining the "problems of peace", in other words, to analyzing the factors of tension in the world and considering policies which might eliminate them. To be effective, research in this field should be denationalized and should enlist the participation of men from different countries. It would also be a good thing if the research led to the publication of textbooks edited by teams of mixed nationality.

There was also room for increased international co-operation between university libraries, particularly the big research libraries. This meant not only increasing exchanges of books, other publications, micro-films and micro-cards, but also studying common problems such as the introduction of uniformity into classification systems or, in a more technical field, the problem of the rapid deterioration of paper in use for 100 years. An IAU committee might possibly take up such matters of inter-university library co-operation, unless it was felt that Unesco was in a better position to do so. There were also plans for setting up an international association of research libraries.

Dr. K. BREWSTER Jr., *President of Yale University and Member of the IAU Administrative Board*, stressed that the peculiar and original structure of the Association should govern the general policies underlying its working programme. Three main features were apparent : IAU was universal in that it included members from most countries of the world; it was in no way directly dependent on governments, even if the independence of its members towards their own governments was sometimes limited; and it was essentially self-financing through the contributions of its members. These features meant that some kinds of activity were closed to it, but that it was eminently qualified to undertake others.

It could not perhaps replace governments or inter-

governmental organizations in funding and organizing ambitious aid programmes, but its independence and its universality could nevertheless enable it to make an effective contribution to removing some of the obstacles which stood in the way of co-operation. Among these obstacles, some were of political or legal kind, such as the sometimes arbitrary restrictions imposed upon the free movement of university staff, and it was important to make governments realize that such obstacles were extremely detrimental to the full development of intellectual and scientific life. It was certainly incumbent upon each university to do all it could to bring about liberalization within its own country, but IAU could perhaps do more than it had so far to foster international action. Other obstacles were of an economic kind and IAU would probably make a very useful contribution to international exchanges if it were able to persuade the international airlines to grant travel concessions to university staff and students. The Association, together with bodies like Unesco or the World Bank, might also consider ways of establishing a Fund to solve the foreign currency and exchange difficulties, which often had a parlyzing effect on co-operation.

These were just a few examples but even to undertake this kind of action effectively IAU needed more resources than it had at present. It must be recognized that funds of the Association were not adequate for its purposes and that it was consequently likely to cause disappointments. This raised the question of the conditions under which it might accept funds from external sources.

Dr. H. PFEIFFER, *Secretary of the Alexander von Humboldt Foundation, Bonn,* said that his Foundation granted post-doctoral scholarships to young foreign research workers, but did not require all their work to be done in Germany. They were free to spend quite long periods working in institutions in other countries and they were given the means to do so. This was an attempt to "denationalize" co-operation. Scholarship holders were no longer considered as scholars of this or that country, but as scholars of science.

Dr. I. SUPEK, *Rector of the University of Zagreb,* spoke of the study of the problems of peace, the importance of which had already been stressed by several speakers, and pointed out that the Pugwash Conference was interested precisely in

problems of this order. Unfortunately not enough was known about its activities. IAU might perhaps contact the Conference and study ways of achieving a broader diffusion of the results of its analyses. Meanwhile, it should not be forgotten that it was perhaps through the spirit and inspiration of their everyday teaching, in all disciplines, that the universities could make their most valuable contribution to peace.

Dr. N. K. ADAMOLEKUN, *of the University of Ibadan*, underlined the importance and fecundity of student exchanges for co-operation, the spirit of which was often embodied in them in an exemplary fashion. Students of the young universities of Africa, for instance, were often hesitant and uncertain through lack of experience of university life and it could be very stimulating for them to live side by side with fellow students coming from countries where the university tradition was of longer standing. The University of Ibadan had itself made some excellent experiments, in particular with American students, for whom it had organized a one-year course. Some had decided to stay on and complete their studies in Ibadan, which was a clear proof of their interest in different societies and their readiness to co-operate. It was therefore to be hoped that IAU would give the fullest possible encouragement to exchanges of this kind.

Dr. I. KATO, *President of the University of Tokyo*, explained that Japan was in a rather special position, at the frontier as it were between the developed and developing countries. Consequently she entered into two types of exchanges : on the one hand, she sent students and young research workers to the United States and Europe; on the other hand, she accepted students from the developing countries, in the main from Asia. However, these exchanges encountered extremely serious linguistic obstacles caused by of the exceptional difficulty of the Japanese language. It was necessary both to give a good knowledge of English, French or German to Japanese scholarship holders going abroad, and also, and this was still more difficult, to teach Japanese to foreigners. Despite this, Japan was at present receiving some 4,000 foreign students and hoped to receive more in the future.

Dr. F. T. DALUPAN, *President of the University of the East, Manila*, said that he did not want to add to the proposals already made, but he wanted to stress again how much the universities in the developing countries needed the co-operation

of those in the developed countries, and to make an urgent appeal to these latter universities. Whenever they possibly could, he urged them to send out lecturers and teachers, during vacations for instance, and to meet part of the travel costs. In the case of the Philippines, language difficulties were not very great, English was everywhere the language of instruction. The university structures and curricula were in the main based on American models, which were quite well known throughout the world; this should also facilitate exchanges. Apart from this, the universities in the Philippines were urgently in need of books which they found very hard to acquire in view of the successive devaluations of the peso. Any assistance in this field would be particularly welcome. Likewise, laboratory and research facilities were very limited. Here again, they had to rely on assistance from foreign universities in the training of their teachers and research workers. There was in fact an imperative need for co-operation in all fields. Even so, co-operation could become fully effective only if it was based on coherent guiding principles and IAU would perform an immense service for the university community if it succeeded, as many speakers had suggested, in formulating some general principles for co-operation.

The CHAIRMAN proposed that the session should now take up the matter of co-operation with regard to University Administration and Organization.

Dr. A. W. BURKS, *of Rutgers University, New Jersey,* referred to an exchange organized between a group of American universities of different types and vocations—including Rutgers University, the University of Michigan and Columbia University—and a group of Italian universities, under the auspices of the Conference of Italian Rectors. There had been an extensive exchange of views and experience with regard to all aspects of university organization, management and structure. The Italian rectors had spent five weeks in the United States and their American colleagues had visited them in Italy.

These exchanges had been of great value, in part perhaps because they had been altogether free and off the record. One lesson which seemed to emerge was that it was best to regard some conversations as confidential- those about some decisions taken by governments or by boards of governors, for

instance. It was also interesting to note that during the discussions the need had become apparent to establish a set of guiding principles for co-operation. On this point the conclusions reached were similar to those arrived at by several members of the Conference and it was perhaps worth recalling that some attempts had already been made to formulate them. The organization Education and World Affairs, for example, had set out a number of principles which were being applied by several American universities. In particular it was stipulated that research conducted within a co-operative framework should never be secret and that the sources of funds for the programmes should be clearly known in order to avoid more or less clandestine or camouflaged projects.

Sister CATHERINE WALLACE, *President of Mount Saint Vincent University, Halifax,* commented that universities in the developed countries liked to stress the importance of the in influence on society, but they did not always have good grounds to be proud of their handiwork. The world we lived in, which had been largely shaped by the developed countries, was a world where peace did not prevail, a world where pollution had reached dangerous proportions. The universities in those countries were not therefore in all points worthy of imitation and perhaps one of their most useful contributions to co-operation would be to draw attention to the mistakes that should not be repeated and to examples that should not be followed.

Furthermore, it was not true that the universities in the developing countries were condemned to accepting unilateral assistance because they had nothing to give in return. They could bring something very precious to co-operation : the values of which the developed world was perhaps in greatest need.

One of the gravest mistakes made by Canadian and American universities at the time when they were themselves developing was perhaps to have closed their doors to women. The societies of these countries had probably not yet recovered from that mistake and it was very important for the universities of the poorer countries, which needed the friendly co-operation of both their men and their women, not to make the same mistake.

Dr. ELSTER, *Rector of the Technical University of Ilmenau,* stressed the need for long-term planning in university co-operation, planning which should fall within the general

context of university planning and that of the planning of society in general, and therefore of the State. But although the broad lines of planning policy, including scientific exchanges, came from the State, that did not, in the Socialist countries at least, mean a stifling of the initiative of universities and individual research workers. There was in fact a profound underlying concordance between the objectives of the university and the objectives of the State, whose Constitution itself stipulated that science must form the foundation of its policy. Within the framework of global planning, the university had an active and responsible rôle to play in co-operation. The University of Ilmenau, for instance, had concluded a number of long-term agreements with universities in other Socialist countries and, despite political discrimination against the German Democratic Republic, it was anxious to extend its international relations as fully as possible. The scientific symposia which it organized each year bore witness to the progress already made in this respect. However, it was in collaboration with their governments that the Socialist universities believed they could make their best contribution to international understanding and peace.

Reverend Father Ismael Quiles, *Rector of the University del Salvador, Buenos Aires,* stressed that co-operation between universities as institutions, in matters of organization and administration in particular, raised problems which were more complex and delicate than those encountered in co-operation in fields of teaching and research between departments or individual scholars. It was necessary to respect the particular character and traditions of each institution and might be dangerous to transfer structures and administrative practices from one country to another. Such transfers, if made unilaterally, would be contrary to the spirit of co-operation which should, wherever possible, be bilateral and result in mutual enrichment. One way of ensuring genuine reciprocity would be for co-operating universities to set up working groups which could discuss problems and take account of the characteristics of each participating institution.

The rôle of IAU was unlikely to involve financial or material contributions; its principal concern should be to stimulate recognition of the need for co-operation and of its importance for society and for the universities themselves. This was a very important task and everything depended on it. If the need for co-operation were more widely and profoundly recognized it would be easier to find the financial support needed for it.

Dr. K.-H. WIRZBERGER, *Rector of Humboldt University, Berlin*, remarked that one of the important administrative problems likely to arise in future was that of the organization of "life-long education". This was not simply a new function which could be added to existing functions without changing them. As soon as it was decided not to set out to provide young people with a fund of knowledge sufficient for a lifetime, but to try instead to train them in the art of life-long learning, it was necessary to re-think all the curricula. The universities in the German Democratic Republic had already begun to tackle this task with the assistance of people from outside the university and with the help of their students. Student participation in the formulation of policy in matters of organization and governance was another important problem and it would be well to be rid of a number of prejudices. It was really quite strange to find that those who denied the ability of students to show maturity, a critical attitude and discernment in the conduct of university affairs, expected them to demonstrate these very qualities in their academic work. In fact, students could play a unique rôle in various fields of university life. Having open minds, not yet deeply marked by the routine and habits of thought of a particular discipline, they were well fitted to contribute effectively to the integration of the various parts of the university and to the creation of the interdisciplinary links which endow the university with a certain superiority over other highly specialized institutions. Moreover, they are the best placed to know whether teaching is really research-related, to notice the weakness of examination systems, and to suggest more effective ways of evaluation, and finally to say whether university education is really what it professes to be not only the training of the future specialist, but the education of the whole man, of the citizen. It was for these reasons that the universities of the German Democratic Republic had started to admit students to their governing bodies; they had done this some ten years ago without being prodded by disorders and agitation. Students were thus collaborating in the taking of all important decisions and learning at the same time to use their democratic rights and to assume their social responsibilities.

Dr. S. LOPEZ, *President of the University of the Philippines*, commented on his experience as the representative of his country at the United Nations and subsequently as President of a university which enjoyed various forms of assistance. In the United Nations there was a marked tendency

to favour multilateral rather than bilateral aid which was always suspected of being used for political or ideological ends. This was no doubt a very good thing and the fullest encouragement should be given to all forms of multilateral co-operation. However, it was an illusion to think that bilateral programmes could be dispensed with completely. Nations behaved very much like people and liked to be praised for their good deeds. It was therefore unreasonable to expect them to channel the greater part of their aid through the intermediary of international organizations where it would become more or less anonymous.

However, it was also necessary to recognize that the situation created difficulties, because for some years students in a number of countries had been mistrustful of foreign aid. They were no doubt excessively sceptical, but they feared the effects of foreign influence on the cultural institutions of their countries, believing that their greatest need was to find and strengthen their national identities. This was a worrying phenomenon, for it was in the nature of the university to open itself to the outside world.

In the circumstances, diversification of the sources of assistance would probably constitute the best solution, ensuring that no one of them became too dominant.

The situation could also be improved if, instead of dealing with the governments of the developing countries, the governments of the developed countries placed the funds they were prepared to give for co-operation directly at the disposal of their own universities. These could be made responsible for providing aid to developing countries, on the basis of agreements concluded not between states but between universities. The Conference might wish to recommend this.

Dr. U. A. Dzaldasbekov, *Rector of the University of Kazakhstan*, was of the opinion that the great diversity of curricula in different countries made it difficult to arrange student exchanges. It would be helpful, therefore, to draw up common curricula, at least for the first two years of study in basic subjects. Students would then be able to continue their studies in any other country. Curricula for more specialized and more advanced studies posed different problems but it would be very useful if uniform standards could be adopted for the content and level of basic studies.

IAU should also try to develop a fuller exchange of information between its members in various fields of teaching and research. This would make it easier for a university to

direct its students, research workers and teachers to the institutions in other countries where they could most profitably continue their work.

Much still remained to be done also by way of improving and rationalizing teaching methods. This was another field in which it was desirable to develop closer co-operation between the universities of different countries.

Dr. N. K. ADAMOLEKUN, *University of Ibadan*, suggested that because universities were established in particular social settings which inevitably conditioned their structures and methods of governance, co-operation was more difficult in matters of university organization and administration than in other fields. Nevertheless, comparative studies of university administration and meetings between administrators from different countries could be very useful. It remained for each university to extract from the different types of organization those elements which appeared best suited to its own needs.

But it was perhaps useful to make a more general point. It was not true that universities in the developing countries viewed co-operation with scepticism. They wanted to make as large a contribution to it as they could, but were aware that for the time being they would receive more than they gave.

Sir CHARLES WILSON, *Principal of the University of Glasgow*, emphasized that in all forms of co-operation it was of the utmost importance for each partner to respect the other. It was also important for each of them to be genuinely interested in the enterprise, for the success of co-operation depended in the last resort on the enthusiasm of the participants. The idea that the relatively under-developed universities had nothing to contribute to co-operation should not be allowed to gain ground, and it was certainly not hypocritical to say that the experience of working in them could be exciting. Glasgow doctors, for example, had learned a great deal in East Africa.

Co-operation in matters of organization and administration would no doubt remain confined to a relatively limited field. One of the most useful forms was to be seen at the General Conference itself: the exchange of ideas between Vice-Chancellors, Rectors and others engaged in the administration of their universities. Seminars organized by the older universities for young administrators from universities in developing countries could also give excellent results and subse-

quently facilitate the establishment of links between institutions. It might also be mentioned that in some countries groups of universities had together organized training courses for administrators. IAU would do well to inform its members of what was being done in this field.

So far relatively little had been said about one important form of co-operation : that carried out through the intermediary of international organizations more limited in their scope than IAU—the Association of Commonwealth Universities, for example. Between them these organizations disposed of a dense and complex network of activities, which IAU could not replace but to which it could give the sanction of universality.

Dr. A. S. CHOWDHURY, *Vice-Chancellor of the University of Dacca*, recalled that lawyers were apt to say that the best constitution for a country was the one which worked best. This was no less applicable to universities. The best form of organization was the one which operated most effectively in the context of a particular university situation and social environment. It was impossible, therefore, to establish universally applicable norms. The matter of student participation, for example, did not always present itself in the same way. In Dacca, the students were consulted in academic matters through the intermediary of their association, which was financed by the university itself. But they were not represented on the governing bodies. It was to be feared that the traditional student-teacher relationship founded on affection and respect would be seriously harmed if, for example, students, were to be called on to participate in the appointment of staff. It was nevertheless important for universities to keep themselves informed of what is taking place in other countries so that they could evaluate and adopt the experience of other institutions. To stimulate the collection and circulation of such information IAU should try to set up standing committees to deal with particular questions. On the basis of the documentation collected these committees should try to establish norms and indicate guide-lines for co-operation and development of higher education.

Mr. BRAHIM BOUTALEB, *Mohammed V University, Rabat*, commented that in the intellectual no less than in the material sphere there could be both a dynamic process of increasing wealth and a dynamic process of increasing poverty. The

poor countries, the proletarian countries of contemporary society, were likely to be the victims of the latter. To check this disastrous process it was necessary to recognize the absurdity of speaking of universities in the plural. There should be a single university with sections in all countries, each receiving a fair share of the common resources. It was to this task of unification and of equitable sharing that IAU should devote itself. But this would require IAU to move toward direct action and not just remain a forum for discussion. Co-operation, in fact, was not really a suitable subject for intellectual discussion—everyone was agreed on its objectives—and this was why the present discussion was less well attended than the one on the university and the needs of contemporary society. What was important from now on was to find the means and then to put them to good use.

Reverend Father TH. M. HESBURGH, *President of the University of Notre Dame*, pointed out that man was now virtually in a position to place the entire resources of human knowledge and thought at the disposal of all the inhabitants of the planet. The combined resources of television, communication satellites and computers offered such vast opportunities that they could not be ignored when discussing university co-operation, or even more important, education on a world-wide scale. It was now possible to store information in a very small physical space and yet to make it available almost instantly anywhere in the world. It was thus possible to conceive of a quite small centre which could store all human knowledge, all the riches of science and culture and from which any piece of information could be obtained in a few seconds simply by dialling a number. Three stationary satellites were sufficient to cover the whole world and to bring the teaching of the greatest scholars to a television screen in the remotest village. The use of such resources, would, of course, pose a series of new problems, particularly political problems. But it was necessary to know that these resources existed and could certainly be put to use if the countries of the world were willing to allocate to them a portion of their present expenditure on armaments. There were no longer any technical obstacles; knowledge and culture could be made accessible to all and the entire wealth of humanity could become really the wealth of each individual.

Professor L. SABOURIN, *University of Ottawa*, said that in response to requests, the Centre for International Co-

operation of which he was a Director, was setting up training programmes for administrators from universities in the developing countries. These would include seminars in the countries concerned and training in Canada. The task was a delicate one in that it was necessary to avoid simply transposing experience from Canada to situations for which it would not be suited. It seemed that few universities had so far taken initiatives of this kind and comments and suggestions would be welcome. This was possibly a matter which IAU might wish to study.

Mr. W. H. ALLAWAY, *University of California*, emphasized that the contributions of universities in developing countries could be very valuable. The experience gained in them by students and teachers from developed countries—their living contacts with other cultures and societies—were very rewarding and should not be underestimated. But international exchanges were expensive and a careful study should be made to ascertain which forms of exchange gave the best results. An international group, with which Mr. Allaway was associated, was making a critical analysis of programmes of co-operation being carried out in a number of countries and hoped to benefit from the support of IAU and its members.

Dr. W ZIMMERLI, *University of Göttingen, Member of the Administrative Board*, recalled that IAU had already made a comparative study of several systems of university administration and that this had been published as a *Paper* of the Association.

Dr. G. BALANDA, *Official University of the Congo*, referred to a question which had perhaps not been emphasized sufficiently during the discussion : the need for foreign teachers to adapt themselves to conditions in the country in which they were working.

Another problem, not mentioned so far, was that of young graduates in the developing countries. Many of those sent abroad to study certainly returned but then, instead of becoming teachers, they took better paid posts in industry or government service. He suggested that instead of sending foreign teachers, the bodies providing international assistance might "top-up" the salaries of such young graduates if they agreed to teach in universities.

Dr. T. A. LAMBO, *Vice-Chancellor of the University of Ibadan,* observed that, because they were so important, themes such as "co-operation " and "education for international understanding and peace" had been discussed at very many meetings; in consequence all that could be said about them in general terms had already been said. The ideas put forward at the present Conference had no doubt all been put forward elsewhere at one time or another. Despite the difficulties to be faced the time had now come for action. It was necessary, for example, to recognize that co-operation was not simply a matter for presidents, rectors and vice-chancellors. Co-operation could only become a reality if teachers, research workers and administrators were also convinced of the need to make it work. IAU could help by organizing small meetings, perhaps on a regional level, at which representatives of the different sections of the university community could discuss in detail those aspects of co-operation of direct concern to them. It might also try to get ten universities in developed countries and ten in developing countries to co-operate together. If this led to useful results a report could be presented to the Sixth General Conference.

The CHAIRMAN thanked his colleagues and closed the session.

SECOND PLENARY SESSION

Dr. C. K. ZURAYK, *President of the Association,* opened the session and called on Dr. R. Weeks.

Dr. R. WEEKS, *Chairman of the discussion sessions on co-operation,* gave a brief account of the discussions which had taken place and of the conclusions which appeared to emerge from them.

At the outset the group had expressed its full agreement with the views expressed by Dr. Zurayk in his preface to *Paper* No. 9. International co-operation was not a luxury nor merely a useful adjunct to university life—it had become indispensible. There were many reasons for this, some related to the nature of human knowledge and its development, others to the rôle of the university in society and in the creation of a new world order.

However, if it were to be profitable and not be self-defeating by leading to a situation in which one university became dependent on another, co-operation had to be inspired by a number of basic principles—including reciprocity, equal partnership and mutual respect. It was in this context that assistance, which was often still needed, should be transformed into real co-operation. But however valid the principles might be, it was necessary for all concerned to recognize that there could be no co-operation without considerable and sustained expenditure on it.

The development of co-operation also implied taking full account of the obstacles to it—these might be economic, linguistic, academic (differences between systems) or political and social.

From this background a number of elements for a policy on co-operation began to emerge. Some of them were of more direct concern to the universities themselves, others to IAU, to other international and intergovernmental bodies, and others still to individual governments.

A paramount responsibility of universities was to make the results of research available to the international community, and to resist the tendency to shroud research in a cloak of secrecy. They could also take financial and administrative steps to facilitate co-operation—for example, by reserving part of their budgets for co-operation and by taking account of it in establishing the terms of service and tenure of academic staff. They could circulate information about their programmes of co-operation and analyses of the positive and negative results achieved, and in some cases join their efforts in consortia, which could tackle particular tasks. Special attention should be paid to the training of teachers and to the establishment of sustained bilateral links between universities in developed and developing countries.

A number of suggestions had been made for action by IAU and the Rapporteur would be including these in his report. The nature of the Association placed limitations on its resources and on the kinds of action it could take. It would not be possible for all the suggestions to be adopted and choices would have to be made. One suggestion made by a number of participants was for IAU to set up a special commission on co-operation. One of its main tasks would be to define the particular rôle of IAU in international university co-operation, bearing in mind the work which was being or could be carried out by other bodies active in this field.

Among the suggestions directed to the major intergovernmental bodies was one for the creation of an international

fund for university co-operation which might be established under the aegis of the World Bank.

It was also proposed that governments should place the funds they were prepared to allocate for co-operation at the disposal of their own universities which would then arrange for their expenditure in direct co-operation with universities in other countries.

Finally, one participant had drawn attention to the vast potentialities of modern technology for the future of co-operation, notably through the use of computers, television and communication satellites.

This brief outline could not reflect the richness of the discussions nor was it intended to take the place of the synthetic report to be presented later by the Rapporteur. The object had merely been to inform the plenary session of some of the main topics raised by participants.

The President thanked the speaker warmly for this résumé and opened the general discussion.

Dr. LUTHER EVANS, *Columbia University*, referred to the proposal before the United Nations for the creation of an international university. A number of preliminary studies had already been made and the matter would be considered by Unesco at the next session of its General Conference. The proposal was clearly one which IAU should consider. Among the suggestions made, one was for the new institution to have a campus in each region of the world and for it to be a graduate institution concentrating on the study of problems of special relevance to the United Nations. This seemed to be a project which, given the right conditions, merited support. If it engaged in work at an advanced level in the social sciences, the international university should devote itself primarily to the fundamental problems of international comprehension and the elimination of tensions. An understanding of the profound changes occurring in certain conflicts could only be reached on the basis of a study of different cultures and regions. The research and study carried out by the university would also help it to devise new curricula for study in the relevant fields and even produce textbooks free of prejudices which could be used by other universities.

It would be important for the university to be free to pursue its work and it should not therefore fall directly under the control of the United Nations and Unesco but be governed by an international administrative board emanating from the existing universities.

Dr. A. C. CASTLES, *University of Adelaide*, referred to proposals for another type of international university. These did not envisage the creation of new campuses but were based on the idea that existing universities should designate certain members of the staff who, through the intermediary of an international secretariat, would co-operate in programmes of postgraduate study and research. This formula differed considerably from the one put forward by Dr. Evans and could offer a solution to some of the problems which had been raised. It merited further careful examination, notably by IAU.

Dr. J. BAUGNIET, *Honorary President of IAU*, pointed out that every university worthy of its name should strive to be international, just as every university situated in Europe should be European. It would be most unfortunate if the quality of being "international" appeared to be vested exclusively in a single institution. However, the existence of a United Nations institution could be justified if it were to devote itself to particular tasks which could not be undertaken by other universities, or which they could only tackle partially. There were very serious problems—that of pollution, for example—of world-wide importance and of such magnitude that the universities of different countries could scarcely come to grips with them. This was also true of certain questions of law and international relations. If a United Nations institution with an independent governing body could take up such problems at the highest possible level and at the same time provide for the international exchange of scholars and highly qualified young research workers, it could be of great value.

Dr. I. SUPEK, *Rector of the University of Zagreb*, also stressed that all universities were international and that the title should not be reserved for one particular institution. He considered it dangerous, moreover, to set up a new international body which might degenerate into a bureaucracy. The most important task at present was to organize co-operation between existing universities, particularly at the level of postgraduate studies.

Co-operation between developed and developing countries was without doubt absolutely necessary but it should also be remembered that it was necessary too between developed countries. In the human and social sciences, in particular, international exchanges constituted one of the best ways of

ensuring the meeting of a multiplicity of points of view and of breaking down national dogmas.

Television could also play a valuable rôle, particularly in presenting facts. But its availability should not be allowed to overshadow the importance of personal contacts between teachers and students. The use of television, moreover, called for special vigilance as programmes were often subject to strong governmental influence.

Mr. J. HERMAN, *Representative of Unesco*, confirmed that the General Conference of Unesco had been asked by ECOSOC to present to the General Assembly of the United Nations its opinion with regard to the possible objectives and conceptions of an international university. The Secretariat of Unesco had started to study the problem but its work had not yet reached a stage at which conclusions could be drawn. Unesco would be consulting universities and their organizations, and certainly had no intention of proposing an institution similar to those already in existence, likely to try to take over their tasks or to weaken co-operation between them.

The President thanked Mr. Herman for the comments and assurances he had given the Conference. He believed that it would not be appropriate for the Conference to try to express an opinion on proposals which had still not been clearly formulated.

Dr. O. OLIVEIRA, *Association of Brazilian Universities*, hoped that the final report would stress, even more than Dr. Weeks had done in his excellent summary, the importance of co-operation in matters of university administration. It was true that some universities feared the imposition of structures which were not adapted to the trends of their own national and cultural settings, but all were anxious to learn about the best methods of management and planning used in different parts of the world. It had been said that administration was the art of the arts—of making all other things possible. Co-operation in this field would almost inevitably lead to the improvement of co-operation in others by liberating resources and by ensuring their rational use.

Dr. A. C. JOSHI, *Member of the Administrative Board of IAU*, also hoped that greated prominence would be given to the importance of regional co-operation within the wider

framework of international co-operation. The most difficult person to love was often one's neighbour and co-operation between neighbouring countries could help to reduce antagonisms and to develop human solidarity.

The President thanked the speakers warmly and recalled that the final report would be presented by Professor Bonneau.

REPORT BY Dr. L.-P. BONNEAU ON INTERNATIONAL UNIVERSITY CO-OPERATION

Both IAU *Paper* No. 9 and the Working Paper for the discussion of the theme 'International University Co-operation' look to the emergence of 'some guiding principles for university policy international co-operation'.

Those who were present at the plenary and discussion sessions probably feel that a more thorough and prolonged effort will be needed to define such guiding principles in a manner acceptable to the majority of university people. Nevertheless, and despite the dullness of some of the sessions, I am happy to report that taken as a whole the written and oral contributions did appear to reveal a certain consensus.

It was obvious to the participants that the separation of "co-operation" from the other theme, "the university and the needs of contemporary society", placed a limit on the scope of their discussions, although these inevitably included references to the nature of the university and to the needs of society. In order to maintain an orderly discussion, the suggested framework was adhered to as closely as possible and this report is presented under the headings used in *Paper* No. 9, namely :

1. Co-operation in the field of teaching and study;

2. Co-operation with regard to research and scientific and scholarly information;

3. Co-operation with regard to university administration and organization.

1. *Teaching and Study*

The majority of the contributions on this topic dealt with assistance rather than with co-operation. It seems, indeed, that in many cases co-operation is still only a one-way process—from a well-established university towards a developing or poorly-endowed one. Whilst not ignoring the signi-

fleance of such assistance, which constitutes a major preoccupation of many international bodies, I shall adhere in this report to the stricter definition of "co-operation". This, I hope, may help to bring out some of the guiding principles referred to above.

a) If one examines the question of teaching, it quickly becomes obvious that the main problems confronting universities are the following : the selection of staff is difficult because recruitment procedures vary widely and are often ill-defined ; the "donor" university and frequently only the member of staff concerned has a say in determining the subject matter to be taught, the length of the appointment and the time of year when he can be made available. The result is that the receiving university may be unable to make full use of the visiting teacher. There is, therefore, need to find a mechanism which could help to ensure that needs and possibilities of meeting them are matched more satisfactorily. It was suggested that IAU could play an important rôle and if a working group were to receive the record of the discussions at the Conference, it could make proposals for a project in keeping with the limited resources of the Association. This working group, having examined the difficulties arising in connection with the choice of subjects to be taught, the length of visits, and suitable times of year, might suggest practical ways of minimizing the difficulties and of deriving greater benefit from exchanges of academic staff.

Two points call for attention, no matter what kind of mechanism is envisaged. The first is the attitude of the member of staff taking part in this form of co-operation. He must be ready to place himself completely at the disposal of the receiving university. This implies a desire to be of the greatest possible service and not to impose his own views on what should be done or thought. It also implies a cordial attitude towards the host country and its people.

The other point, frequently forgotten, is that members of academic staff can often themselves initiate fruitful exchanges and establish strong ties without any action on the part of the university authorities except for the giving of their approval.

b) Guiding principles for student exchanges emerge less clearly from the discussions and published texts.

The pessimistic view draws attention to students ill-prepared to follow courses in the institutions which receive them; to students who propagate subversive ideas; to students who, where they are sufficiently numerous, attempt to impose unacceptable behaviour on receiving institutions; to

institutions which are unreceptive to student demands. On the other hand, optimists point to the ever-growing number of students who benefit from study abroad and who return to their countries to strengthen them by being better prepared for the tasks which lie ahead.

Apart from those guiding principles which apply equally to staff and to student exchange, namely, the need for goodwill and a friendly attitude to the host country, a special effort must be made to secure agreement between the countries concerned with regard to specific curricular content; the level of study (undergraduate or postgraduate); the volume of exchanges; and currency problems.

c) International co-operation with regard to study programmes and textbooks was only taken up marginally in the theme discussions. What emerged, however, was that courses of study offered to foreign students by universities which receive them in relatively large numbers are not necessarily the same as those offered to their own nationals. There is often a language problem which both "receiving" and "sending" universities must tackle in a direct and systematic manner : the student should never be left to rely on his own resources. When numbers are sufficiently large the receiving university can usefully modify the profile of certain courses of study to take account of the different geographical, historical, sociological and economic contexts from which the students come. From the few references in discussion to the subject of textbooks, nothing emerged which has not already been dealt with in *Paper* No. 9 and there are, therefore, no new guidelines to suggest.

d) Co-operation with regard to pedagogical methods and techniques was also discussed very little except for a reference to the possibilities which modern technology opens up for universities in this field. The picture painted may have seemed futuristic to some but it was certainly stimulating to the imagination. It revealed mankind at peace using the resources at present devoted to war to build a refined stratum of the noosphere in which all the knowledge accumulated by man, the wisdom of individuals throughout the ages and the heritage of their intellectual creativity would instantaneously be at the disposal of the entire population of the planet. Communications systems, satellites, videotapes, information processing centres—all these techniques which the university has not yet fully mastered—would be at the service of a world university.

Even if one cannot as yet perceive a practical route to the

fulfilment of this vision, I am sure that in looking to the future IAU should not underestimate its significance for the dissemination of knowledge and for the launching of projects for co-operation. In this sense it may, in the long run, prove to be one of the most important results of the discussions.

This résumé does not, of course, cover all of the points raised during the discussion of this topic. Not all the matters referred to in *Paper* No. 9 were considered and for a more thorough enumeration account should be taken of the discussions and of the following :

- Exchange of Teachers
- International List of Teachers for Posts Abroad
- List of Vacant Posts
- International Information Centre
- Better Use of Existing Services
- Rôle of Recruiting Services and their Limitations
- Increase of Numbers
- Changes in Career Systems favouring Co-operation
- Optimum Use of Available Funds
- Scale of Funds
- International Financing
- Obstacles arising from Travel Restrictions
- Linguistic Obstacles
- Legal and Administrative Obstacles
- Student Exchanges between Developed Countries
- Exchanges between Countries of Different Economic Levels and Regional Exchanges
- The "Equivalence" Problem
- Study Programmes and Textbooks.

Thus it can be seen that the principles to which I have drawn attention deal more with the spirit in which co-operation should be carried out than with practical instructions for undertaking it. These practical matters are well developed in *Paper* No. 9, and derive from the widè experience of institutions which have been playing a leading rôle in international university co-operation.

2. *Research and Scientific Information*

Most participants seemed to be primarily and almost exclusively concerned with the flow of students and academic staff and with the means of controlling, directing and intensifying it. This presumably explains the apparent lack of interest in co-operation in the field of research and scientific information. Several participants, however, made a sugges-

tion which, though not constituting a guiding principle, could be examined to assess its feasibility and possible lines of application. This was for an international inquiry into human solidarity.

It was not decided whether such an inquiry into the bases of co-operation could best be undertaken in a single university, in a number of selected universities, or in groups of universities which would set up special institutes. Whatever the form, it was felt that the undertaking should be carried out on a large scale, involving persons of the highest competence in the relevant fields, and be supported, morally, and if possible also materially, by IAU and other important international organizations. Attention should be directed to questions such as : the psychological prerequisites for co-operation; the fundamental causes of racial conflicts and international disputes which prevent or undermine co-operative effort; the reconciliation of national interests and the promotion of intellectual development; and the major difficulties which universities everywhere encounter in fulfilling their basic mission, the pursuit of knowledge, which by its very nature involves co-operation.

The rôle which IAU might play in this was not sufficiently well defined for this report to include precise suggestions. A number of participants considered the matter to be one of considerable urgency and felt that is should constitute one of the major preoccupations of IAU during the coming five years.

Co-operation with regard to scientific information gave rise to little discussion, though its potentialities were stressed, as already mentioned above.

3. *Administration and Organization*

The further one got from the very practical matter of exchanges of staff and students, the less interest there appeared to be in the topics suggested for discussion. Co-operation in the field of administration and organization was only touched on in a very general manner; several participants seemed to be of the opinion that the question did not arise and that in the field of administration and organization, there could be very little useful exchange. Even allowing for the oversimplification, inevitable in a summary report, it may be said that very few participants appeared to believe that the new management methods adopted by government and industry during the past twenty years are of relevance to university administration. This may be another question for study to

which IAU would wish to give priority in co-operation with OECD and other regional or international organizations. IAU could use its own channels of communication to keep its members informed of the results of experiments, whether successful or not. Similarly, in more general terms, it was strongly urged that bodies such as IAU should make arrangements to pass on information about models devised by universities to promote or facilitate international co-operation, to report on their success or failure, and to provide information about new schemes of co-operation.

Two particular questions of relevance to administration and organization were raised by participants :

a) A working group could be set up to look into particular matters such as the proportion of its budget that a given university should allocate for these purposes, thus establishing a norm taking account of the particular situation of the institution and its resources; minimum administrative norms for the transfer of personnel files and the range of information and amount of detail to be included in them; suggestions to help universities taking part in international co-operation or wishing to do so, to ensure that their general regulations do not constitute a barrier to co-operation.

b) It was also suggested that the general question of the flow of funds constituted an urgent problem which should be given priority by IAU. Difficulties arose because some universities were in countries with stable economies and readily convertible currencies, whereas others were not.

Some rather general suggestions were made for the establishment of an international fund by the World Bank or some *ad hoc* body. But the principal result of the exchange of views was to stress the need first to establish clearly the nature of the problem and then to draw up a precise plan for helping universities to overcome it.

One problem meriting further consideration is that posed by the mechanisms for co-operation devised by different governments. They frequently take the form of bilateral agreements and these are often coloured by national political interests which run counter to the fundamental purposes of the university. It was suggested that multilateral agreements provided a better guarantee of respect for university objectives but that it was even more important for governments to agree to consult their universities before signing such agreements.

Finally, reference was made to the proposal before the

United Nations for an international university institution. Discussion of this was not conclusive, and it would seem that while IAU should regard the matter sympathetically, it should seek assurances with respect to the feasibility of the proposal and the prospects for its success as well as with respect to its originality, for it should not duplicate existing institutes or institutions.

⁂

This completes my report. Participants will not be able to find mention of all the points raised during the discussion, but this does not imply any judgement on the validity of those omitted; it merely means that in the perspective of guidelines for IAU action during coming years they are less important than others which have been included in the report.

A summary of the action programme which this assembly might wish to recommend to its Administrative Board might be phrased in the following terms :

IAU is a world-wide organization bringing together institutions sharing the same aims : the transmission of knowledge and the pursuit of truth. It is completely independent in that it is financially supported by its members and thus enjoys freedom of action limited only by the resources which its members are able to provide. Above all, it is independent of governments. These characteristics make IAU the best placed of all world-wide organizations to promote, and to carry out within the limits of its resources, programmes such as those of international university co-operation.

Many people in the world believe that this can constitute a very important contribution to the establishment of the lasting brotherhood of man.

CHAPTER THREE

THE UNIVERSITY AND THE NEEDS OF CONTEMPORARY SOCIETY

CHAPTER THREE

THE UNIVERSITY AND THE NEEDS OF CONTEMPORARY SOCIETY

It is quite unnecessary to emphasize that the present crisis in the university is first a crisis in its relations with society. It is true that the university is being criticized for the way it does its work; its teaching and management methods are under attack, and even its research work arouses mistrust and suspicion. But this challenge to teaching and even to science seems more often than not to be inspired by a challenge to the status of learning and the ways it is passed on within society. This means that no internal reform of the university can really succeed, unless it is geared to an acceptable and accepted conception of the social rôle of the university.

In preparing for the Conference discussions on such an important theme, the Administrative Board of IAU asked Professor JANNE *to prepare a study which was published in* Paper *No. 10 of the Association.* Professor JANNE, *a distinguished sociologist, and also a former Rector and former Minister of Education, seemed especially well-qualified for this. With the help of a questionnaire prepared in co-operation with the Secretariat of the Association and sent to a number of prominent university people in different parts of the world, he was able to complete the documentation he had already assembled. Following a full discussion of his report in draft form by the Administrative Board at its 1969 meeting, arrangements were made for its publication. At the same time, the Conference Organizing Committee, as in the case of the co-operation theme, agreed that a shorter working paper should be prepared. The Conference discussions of the theme opened with a plenary session on the afternoon of Monday, 31 August, and the main aspects of the subject were introduced by three principal speakers :* Professor JANNE, *of the Free University of Brussels,* Dr. G. MASSIEU HELGUERA, *Director of the National Polytechnical Institute of Mexico (who was unable to be present, but whose paper was presented by one of his col-*

leagues, Professor LEON LOPEZ), *and* Professor UNGKU A. AZIZ, *Vice-Chancellor of the University of Malaya. Following these opening speeches and a preliminary exchange of views in plenary session, the Conference divided into two in order to examine each theme in a series of three parallel discussion sessions which took place on the 1 and 2 September. A Chairman, a Vice-Chairman and a Rapporteur had been appointed for each theme, together with a panel of ten members responsible for guiding discussions, animating them where necessary and seeking to maintain the pattern and avoid too many diversions into matters of secondary importance. The three discussion sessions were followed by a plenary session during which the Chairman gave a short account of the discussions, indicated their main tendencies and identified some preliminary conclusions. This plenary session took place on the 2 September. The Rapporteur then began his work and presented his report on the final day of the Conference, Saturday, 5 September.*

For the University and the Needs of Contemporary Society, *the Chairman was* Professor E. LAPALUS, *former Rector of the University of Clermont-Ferrand, the Vice-Chairman,* President LINCOLN GORDON, *of The Johns Hopkins University and the Rapporteur,* President J. F. LEDDY, *of the University of Windsor. A list of the other members of the panel will be found at the beginning of the present report.*

OPENING PLENARY SESSION

The Chairman, Dr. C. K. ZURAYK, opened the session and commented on the significance of the theme which the Conference was to discuss. It was perhaps the most important problem for the universities today. It certainly seemed to be the most central, inasmuch as a study of all the other problems always brought one back to it in the end; it was no longer possible today to talk of curricula, admissions, or research policy without reference to some concept of the relationship between the university and society. It was therefore, whether one liked it or not, a central factor in any reflection on the present or the future of the university.

After this short introduction, the Chairman described the preparations made for the Conference discussions and then gave the floor to the author of the background paper, Professor Henri Janne.

Professor HENRI JANNE
Honorary Rector of the Free University of Brussels

As the Chairman has already said, the report I was asked to prepare was published in *Paper* No. 10 of the Association and you have all had an opportunity to see it. You will have realized the extreme complexity of the subject and its many implications. It goes far beyond the university as such. In fact, the university is profoundly affected by its political, economic and social context and in its turn has an effect on that context. The problems we are dealing with, are therefore difficult to isolate and define. In the end, I made up my mind to look at them in the order shown in the table of contents, but I am far from satisfied either with the approach or with the contents.

First of all, I decided to present the various concepts of the university, and the traditions which have influenced them, throughout history. The first upheavals in these traditions in the West came, as we know, in the wake of the industrial revolution, so that in the 19th Century three fundamental types of university emerged : the French or Napoleonic type, the German type, especially as defined in the theories of Humboldt, and the English type with the Oxford and Cambridge tradition and Cardinal Newman's theory. These types of university have, of course, tried to adapt themselves, though not without difficulties, to the evolution of society and the pressures we are studying today. At the same time, two other types of university appeared and soon became involved in a struggle with the same pressures and the same difficulties, but in varying degrees according to their context : the American university and the Soviet university, both of which also have to respond to the progress of science and the needs of a changing society.

After presenting these types of university, I tried, using the material I had managed to collect, to assess and describe the familiar phenomenon of the increasing number of needs to which the university has to respond. First, there is the flood of students, which is of considerable impact. The increase in numbers may indeed vary from country to country, but it is everywhere very large. Then there is the increase in the number of research functions. There are the pressing demands made upon the university from the outside world. There is an increasing tendency to look upon university staff

as experts whose job it is to make a direct contribution to solving the problems confronting governments, businesses and large social organizations in our various countries. And the consequences of this development are clear : almost everywhere the infrastructure of our universities is bursting at the seams. Buildings and teaching equipment are inadequate. The size of the teaching staff is generally not growing as rapidly as the number of students. The university is having to bear a more and more crushing financial burden, and there is, moreover, also a break up in the structures of university study. New specializations have to be created, there has to be greater differentiation between the levels of study, short courses have to be introduced for technicians and postgraduate study has to be developed considerably in the key sciences. All this is the universities' spontaneous response to decreased selectivity which is a consequence of the increase in student numbers. However, it must be realized that these quantitative problems also alter the quality of situations, structures, contents and methods. In this way I was led to consider the question of the new tasks of the university. Undoubtedly, these new tasks often correspond to older ones, but their meaning has undergone a profound transformation, and they call for the employment of different means. In the advanced countries, as in the developing ones, the universities are subject to the pressures of economic development. Everywhere, they are expected to be a growth factor both by training men and through scientific discovery. Besides this, they are subject to the pressure of social demand. People, families, the young, tend more and more to consider that access to university is a kind of right, so that the problems of selection arise in a quite different way than in the past. This social demand is reflected in a tendency to democratize university education. And so, the universities are now being obliged to meet a demand which comes from all age groups. Through refresher, re-training or promotion courses, they are having to fit into a system of life-long education, and it will not be long before they are accepting students from the most varied age-groups. All this puts the problems of university teaching in a new light. The teacher no longer finds himself standing only in front of young people--whose mental attitudes are incidentally greatly changed--but also in front of adults who can no longer be treated as pupils. Finally the university is confronted with the problem of its critical function, either because it feels the duty to take up a position in relation to social upheavals, or because external pressure or a section of its members invite,

or even forces it with some violence to fulfil this function. So that our universities might come to be described as universities of (social) "awareness" and of "anticipation". Not that they are all succeeding in thinking ahead of the confines of present day knowledge and demands, but at least they know in their heart of hearts that if they fail to do so they will become disqualified in the eyes of society.

However, all these problems bring out one fact which had not been very clearly recognized until now. The university is a prey to internal contradictions. I have tried to enumerate these contradictions briefly in the Report (p. 75), but the shortness of the list should not conceal their seriousness. The university can no longer stand outside the general educational context, for it no longer trains a small proportion of the 18 to 25 age-group, but an increasingly large percentage of it. Nevertheless, as it becomes integrated into the educational system as a whole, it persists in its demand for autonomous development and a specific character for its studies. There is obviously a tension between this claim for autonomy and the acceptance of public control which becomes inevitable once the universities—as is very largely the case, even in the United States—start to derive most of their resources from the public authorities. At the same time, the universities are facing the social demand which they wish to satisfy and the economic demand which is very often at odds with this social demand. The university has not abandoned its tradition, whereby it educates an élite, but, besides this, it is accepting a democratization of university life which, ultimately, leads to a university open to all. In selection, the university is caught between guidance, which is intended to place the student on a course appropriate to his aspirations and abilities, and traditional selection of a negative kind, which purely and simply eliminates the student who does not seem fit to go on with what he is doing. The university is also torn between the idea of democratization and participation, and what might be called the traditional technocracy: that of the titular professors and heads of research units. It is caught between the extreme specialization, into which it is being pushed by the increasingly sharpening spearhead of technology and the sciences, and the need to train the adaptable, "polyvalent" men called for by the sheer rapidity of change. There is a conflict within the university between its teaching mission and its research mission, which is tending to grow considerably in the more advanced countries. There is a conflict between the cultural mission of the university, its old universalist humanism, and its prac-

tical, pragmatic tasks, directed towards economic development and the training of men for specific jobs. Within the university quaint—some would say antiquated—traditions persist side by side with the most advanced achievements of modern times. A professor responsible for the operation of a cyclotron will perhaps find himself solemnly handing a Latin diploma to a doctor *honoris causa*. Lastly, the university is caught between the notion of service to society and that of criticism of society. In short, there is a set of contradictions and tensions running right through the university, even if their extent may vary from one situation to another and even if here and there the first signs of synthesis are beginning to appear. University reform is an attempt to reduce and resolve these contradictions. Now, in order to do this, it is important for the university to try first to know itself, and therefore to become the subject of its own research. In other words, to take the most synthetic discipline, it should study the sociology of the university.

That is the general layout of the Report that I have presented to you. I would now like to add a few remarks which may be helpful in the conduct of our discussion. In the first place, it must be realized that although the problems I have referred to are general and affect more or less all universities, they arise in specific situations which are themselves very varied and particularized. The universities of our time are at one and the same time very different and very much alike. They differ according to the context in which they are situated : advanced Western-type societies, advanced socialist-type societies, and developing societies. Then there are further variants within these three types : the developing societies, for example, follow either the socialist model or the Western model. And within a single group, tradition may be very varied. We are therefore dealing with very different institutions and no two are alike. An attempt to take these specific characteristics into account was made by sending out the questionnaire that we prepared in co-operation with the Secretariat of IAU. The replies received appear to constitute a reasonably representative sample.

However, universities are also very much alike. In the great majority they still educate the same 18 to 25 age-group. They are the ones who everywhere provide society with its general and technical executives. They give this training in the light of the highest development of science and technology to which they have access. They play as full a part as they can, even if it is only a small one, in the development of scientific

research. They form a community of teachers and students. They apply selection procedures to assess results achieved, whatever the differences in method may be. And finally, they seek to maintain a form of university life which is regarded as constituting a valuable training for adult life. The university continues, at least by inclination, to be a particular way of life. One of the paradoxes of the contemporary university is, one may say, this condition of difference and similarity.

Having said that, if I were called upon to give a personal definition of the fundamental principles of the new university education, I think I would list four : equality of opportunity; guidance in place of negative forms of selection; education throughout life; and participation.

In conclusion, I would like to draw attention to one or two particularly shrewd observations from Dr. Zurayk's remarkable preface. In particular he says that we must always be clear about what the universities themselves can do. We must, he says, plot their real field of action, that is, their real responsibility. And I think this is essential for our discussions : It is important that we go away from this Conference with a clearer idea of what is incumbent upon the university itself. At the same time, Dr. Zurayk adds that the university must make society realize the inadequacy of its resources in relation to the increasing demands made upon it. This is an essential political problem, which is moreover bound up with the preceding one, for the university could do much more and much better by itself, if it were given the means.

Dr. Zurayk also points out that the present situation, although fraught with grave dangers, is at the same time full of rich possibilities. We are not in a blind alley, as we sometimes fear, but at a turning point, the turning point of the great reform of the university. Finally the President says that the university must remain the geometrical locus of a rational discourse and the focal point of a genuine commitment. The formula is a particularly felicitous one and all its terms must be carefully weighed. Rationality is the essential condition of all scientific life, but without commitment, that is, without the devotion of teachers and students to what they believe, the best conceived reforms will remain ineffectual.

I will end, this time with a personal remark. The university today is under attack, or at least under discussion. It is an institution which can only live if it is accepted by society. The fact is that it costs money and is becoming more and more expensive. The university institution is everywhere becoming

one of the stars of politics. As far as it is within its power, the university must therefore provide proof that it trains the kind of man needed for human development in any given situation, and that it does so efficiently, which means making economical use of the resources available to it. But it must also persuade society that, in order to serve mankind, it must remain autonomous. It must remain the centre for changing ideas, values and social structures. It has a critical function which it cannot give up, but this also imposes a further duty on it, which is that of creating or recreating a climate of freedom of expression and ensuring democratic participation within its walls of all members of the university community.

The CHAIRMAN thanked Professor Janne and asked Dr. León Lopez to read the speech of Dr. M. Helguera, *Director of the National Polytechnical Institute of Mexico*, who had been prevented at the last moment from coming to Montreal.

Dr. M. HELGUERA

Director of the National Polytechnical Institute of Mexico

The subject I have written about has been discussed in a masterly way by Professor Henri Janne in *Paper No. 10* of the International Association of Universities. I would like to take this opportunity to offer him our most sincere congratulations. We shall add only a very few points to the discussion of the fundamental problems covered in his excellent study.

It does, however, provide a point of reference for the comparison of the problems which arise in the developing countries, and in particular in the countries of Latin America.

Latin America differs in many respects from other developing regions. Once the conquest had been consolidated, mainly in the area dominated by the Spaniards, there was an initial development of university education which led to the foundation of several large universities during the 16th Century.

As we all know, these institutions were rooted in the purest humanist traditions of the Renaissance. They did not, in our view, serve for utilitarian purposes, but were inspired by noble ideals. Although these universities were certainly

linked to the Catholic Church, it is noteworthy, and this is something unique in the history of the great conquests, that over a period of twenty or thirty years following their arrival, the Spaniards founded universities such as those of Santo Domingo, Mexico and la Mayor de San Marcos in Lima. Later, other universities were founded at other periods of our history.

It may perhaps be felt that these earlier university structures corresponded to the needs of the society of the day. Unfortunately, with the coming of national independence many universities revealed serious defects in their operation and their quality. At the end of the 18th century in Mexico for example, the universities responded more to the needs of the church than to those of the country.

Later, at least in the case of Mexico, the university institutions made almost instinctive and unplanned responses to the demands of society, even though they continued to show some defects in their academic organization : a large number of part-time professors, very limited research activity, excessive reliance on the lecture method, a low teacher-student ratio, etc. We believe that some of these anomalies can also be found in other Latin American universities.

At present the crucial problem for our universities is that the structures of higher education are not yet firmly established. This makes more difficult the task of meeting the demands of society and the objective needs of the programmes worked out by the State for its development. The problem is partly one of improving the traditional academic structures and methods which in principal have shown themselves to be viable, and partly, one of responding, as we have already said, to the needs of our environment, not forgetting those which result from the extraordinary speed of scientific and technological progress in all fields.

In many developing countries, there is a tendency to sacrifice the quality of learning in order to admit larger numbers of students.

The problems are made worse still by the differences in origin of the students who form a socially and culturally heterogeneous mass. Professors, as Prof. Janne points out are in the habit of speaking "the language of ideas" of bourgeois culture; they do not make their mark on groups of students unprepared to take in their monologue and unable to understand the meaning of "university discourse". The cultural level of the students has in fact fallen markedly. They feel lost because they have not received the cultural background neces-

sary to make them feel capable of filling the rôle allotted to them in the society to which they belong. Very often they show an indifferent or contemptuous attitude towards the very nature of that society, its problems and its anxieties, although they are there every day for them to see. In Latin America, far too many marginal groups exist with a way of life that we might describe as sub-human, and the number of students who take an interest in these problems and who are aware of their implications for their country and for themselves is very limited.

The task of making students and professors aware of these problems is one that cannot be put off until tomorrow if we want the university to be a more efficient agent for progress in society.

The work of the university, which is an essential factor in preparing and implementing state development programmes, must not be merely passive; it must be highly critical, particularly in relation to the establishment of a scale of priorities for the problems that have to be considered. In countries where the people responsible for different aspects of planning do in fact come from schools of university level, a very effective integration has been achieved which makes the task easier.

With regard to the matter of introducing new teaching techniques and methods, we believe that developing countries like those in Latin America should not become preoccupied with the controversy between the new techniques of remote teaching by radio and television, and the concept of the "open university" on the one hand and the methods based on direct teacher-student relationships on the other. These new techniques should be studied closely but they should in no way be regarded as an answer to the problem of student overspill. They must be taken for what they are, an aid to teaching, and one which often turns out more expensive and less efficient than the classical methods.

Another look should be taken here at the problem of quality and quantity and the results of experiments made in various countries should be recorded and analyzed.

It is necessary to study the psychological and philosophical problems raised by replacing the professor or his assistant by a machine or a television set. What new characteristics and mental attitudes are likely to arise out of these changes? In what way will the university community be affected by them, and what changes can be foreseen in the academic hierarchies? These are just some of the questions which have to be taken

into consideration if reasonable use is to be made of these methods.

It is clear that the complexity and continued progress of the modern world call for a more scientific and efficient administration and planning of higher education and its institutions.

However indisputable the need for planning may appear, it must nevertheless occur without in the process changing the ultimate purpose of these establishments and still less their nature as an intellectual avant-garde. We do not know the optimum point to which the efficiency of universities can be raised, without their becoming like major business undertakings manufacturing a series of uniform products : in this case graduates conforming to certain quality standards and inserted automatically in their places on the employment market.

Planning along these lines might lead to an excessive pragmatism detrimental to the function of the universities, as centres of criticism at the highest level, of creativity in which the highest individual qualities of the teachers and students are preserved.

Dr. UNGKU A. AZIZ
Vice-Chancellor of the University of Malaya

Among the many dualisms confronting the university is the fundamental pair : change or be changed, and in fact this is a pair of pairs. Either we change or the university changes society or its members, particularly the students and the staff, or society will change the university. To be changed, as some of us know, is to experience anguish because the change is forced rather than voluntary so if any message can be given : keep the university fresh by changing, in order, to use the language of our students, to keep it cool. More seriously, a process of change or changing and being changed in fact goes on all the time and we have to resolve this problem or this dilemma by assuming that the two pairs are really interacting all the time and cumulative, but if we wish to reduce the anguish of being changed, then I think two characteristics are important, one is responsiveness and the other is flexibility.

Now my task is made both easier and more difficult by two things. One is the very splendid paper which Professor

Janne has just introduced to us and which I am sure everyone has read and re-read many times, and the President's beautiful introduction. Secondly, by the individual and collective wisdom of this Conference where I am a mere novice from a very young university, so I will try to do my best to contribute towards the opening of the discussion by shedding a little light on the things that we are to discuss, concentrating on the concept of governance. First I think it is rather important for us to be clear. I think we all know what it is, otherwise we would not be here representing universities, many of us vice-chancellors, presidents or chancellors of universities. Surely we know what governance is, but in order to facilitate discussion it will help if we agree to be clear about one or two things. If we say, in the language of public administration or business administration, that governance is decision-making, this is still not clear enough. I think there are two aspects of governance that have to be separated whenever one is discussing it. First there is the question of making policy and secondly there is the question of implementing the policy. These can be quite different matters and when we talk about participation in university affairs or constitutional structures of universities it is useful to focus our minds on these two levels, what the governance in about, how and by whom it will be carried out and one can neutralize the other.

Now I feel that it will be helpful if I could say a few words about the forms of governance. As I see it, we can separate governance, as we can in political science, into direct and indirect forms. The direct forms are very obvious within the university academic governance, that is in the British system certainly what is called the Senate and the Academic Board, the decisions made by the body of the senior staff with perhaps some participation of non-senior staff and students and then what I have called the non-academic. In the English language, or I should say, the language of the English university system, this is called the lay members of council. No doubt it related to the history of the university which was originally a religious institution but when we take this into emergent countries, and we are no longer dealing with largely Christian groups of people or people with any religion at all, perhaps the word "lay" is a bit misleading. It would be better to put them into their place and call them non-academics as compared to the academics, and they would be members of boards of trustees or councils and so on, and thirdly there is of course the administration headed by the chief executive officer who is the vice-chancellor, president or principal. This is the structure

that typifies the university and then you have the academic structure. I know we all know this, but I am merely listing them so that we all know what we are talking about in the sessions to come. You have the senate, you have faculties and there are various boards and committees specially set up to deal with particular systems, and on the non-academic side you have some committees which will deal with financial matters, and probably with appointments and questions of salary. Then under the administration you get the customary type of university administration and in every other document you read the word "modernisation", and now there is so much emphasis on modernization and people are trying to anticipate the problems by saying "please be humane as well as efficient". Maybe this is so.

Now this is the direct structure, but behind it all lies the indirect structure which is not, to my knowledge, very extensively discussed. You hear a lot about lobbies in parliaments and systems of indirect pressure to bring about decisions in the governmental structure. Within the university what are these indirect structures, these pressure groups? The most familiar one is the students, the student representatives, both those who are with the university and those who come from outside, and staff, unions, associations. Professional lobbies, doctors, engineers with their professional associations sometimes having a direct relationship with one or other of the university direct structures. Then you have the alumni, and then, let me not forget, coming from the developing countries where one is aware of the needs of contemporary society only too frequently, the government, ministries, ministry of education and various other ministries who are interested in teaching engineering or medicine or dentistry or agriculture in the university and these indirect bodies are very often able to play an influential rôle in the governance of the university, and just to look at the formal direct structures may be rather misleading and that is why I wish to mention them so as to complete our picture.

Then when we look at the form, we hear, we read and in the document before us too the word comes again and again. We all know what it means but if we were to write down definitions without consulting our neighbours in this room now I am sure among 500 people you would get 300 or 400 different definitions of what is democracy and what do we mean by the democratization of the governance of the university. We might say that the trend today is towards increasing participation in the governance of the university, especially in the

direct formal structures, because on the indirect side the participation has always been there. In this question of sharing or participating in the university I would like to mention three concepts that need to be separated out very clearly when we are dealing either with students or alumni, staff unions and such like bodies, and they represent three rather different forms of sharing in the governance of the university and these three I have called : participation, negotiation and consultation, and they again are actually quite different forms or relationships which allow bodies to participate in the governance of the university. By participation I mean the direct membership of bodies like councils or senate or faculties. Many universities now have put students on these bodies with varying experience. You have all the rights and you should have all the obligations of other members of such bodies. This is participation. This is very different from consultation where bodies are set up that allow for students, staff associations or unions to meet the university authorities across the table and to be heard and one can arrange the institution in such a way that their right to be heard is well established and that they shall be heard and may be heard on a whole range of subjects or on any subject, depending on the way in which the consultative body is set up. But consultation is very different from participation. It may be a step towards participation in different universities. It may be preferable for both sides to have consultation rather than participation because, just to give you a simple example, if you have participation, let us say by students, in a faculty, it makes decisions about the kind of things that interest the students, time-tables, curricula and so on. If they feel very dissatisfied and outvoted and it is unlikely that students are going to have a majority vote in a faculty or in a senate, then they become more frustrated, likewise with the junior staff. In a situation like that it would be better if the university concerned was confident that it was sufficiently responsive, that its institutions were not too conservative, sufficiently flexible to have consultation, so that it could hear very frankly and very adequately the point of view put by the students or the staff.

Then I have mentioned that there is a third type of sharing and it is used in a very broad sense : negotiation, where you have very commonly the formal negotiating institutions where the union meets the university management or administration or whatever you want to call it, or the students have a board in which student representatives formally meet university representatives which may consist of academic and non-

academic members of council and senate. At that point negotiations are made, bargains are struck. You have a definite system of procedures for establishing how the students or other bodies are to participate in the decision-making in the university. It is very important to separate out these three forms and to define them and to explain them to all concerned, so that there is no confusion and there is no illusion because in the part of the world I come from where there are not too many universities but where there is almost the same kind of problems as everywhere else, it has been my experience during th short time I have been vice-chancellor that many people confuse these forms of participation, and as a result of the confusion you produce new problems.

Before I conclude, I want to say something about change and some major areas of governance which are worth looking at in the course of our discussions.

We have heard the question of admissions, trends of admission, the numbers, the increasing range of subjects, of faculties, the establishment of new universities, language policies. We are, as a matter of great interest to persons like myself coming from countries where the language problem is a major national issue, here in Montreal where one can see many interesting examples of how language problems are being dealt with, but these are very relevant to the emerging universities. Salary structures, how shall decisions be made about the salary structures in the national and in the international market? What scale of values is relevant? Student facilities. How shall money be distributed? How important are these in the decision-making process? Anything from the establishment of union houses, sports complexes, theatres, cultural policies in university besides such mundane things as accommodation. I feel that some examination of these issues in relation to possible structures of governance and changes in structure will help to clarify our thoughts as we go along.

I think that out of all I have read and that I have seen in the paper and in other situations we have to accept as a matter of faith that contemporary society needs trained manpower and there is no escape from this. Without this, modern society with all its increasing rate of progress and its increasing rate of other things which some of us may not think is progress, it has to have an increasing number of trained persons and therefore I think we have to accept as an act of faith that the university is the institution which is obliged to produce this professional manpower. What may have begun, especially in the developing countries, in Asia or in Africa, as

just an idea that everybody has a university, we have got to have a university, to graduate from a university with letters after your name means a good job in government, it gives you prestige. But now we have to conceive the university as an essential element in the development process itself and if this is accepted as an act of faith without much questioning, then other aspects may be discussed. Does the contemporary state, the contemporary society need an arena which might be the university where ideas are tested, where, as we have been told, criticism can be made? This could be a subject for controversy, could be a subject for discussion. Whether the university is the ideal place or not, I personally think it is, but the other side of the argument can be produced and this is something that we should discuss. Likewise, the question of research which is directly related to finance more than anything else. Can the university be the main area in which research in the social sciences and in the national sciences is carried out for development? Research in an essential ingredient for university teaching. I do not think anybody questions that, but the scale of research required by a modern state, the pressures behind the type of research may require, certainly in the developing countries, specialized institutions should take over the burden, rather than have this done by the university. Then, finally, there is this question of administration and the development of the administration. How are we to assess efficiency in a university? Those, especially vice-chancellors, who are ex-economists, like several of us in this Conference, tend to resort to quantitative measurements that are extensively used in governments and in business. But is this adequate? I think there must be some reconciliation between the ideals which make a university something different from other institutions of teaching, education and if we are to meet these ideals these simple measurements cannot in themselves be an end, although, certainly in the developing countries, it may be necessary to develop, in the sense of development administration, to develop the administration of universities so that it has, as I said at the beginning, the characteristic of responsiveness and flexibility and this can be achieved by using many of the modern tools that have been developed, but it is up to the members of the university, and especially to their senior members to make sure that whatever they do is tempered by a great humaneness that has always characterized the university from the earliest times that man has known it.

The CHAIRMAN thanked the speakers and opened the general discussion.

Professor V. ONUSHKIN, of the *International Institute for Educational Planning* (Unesco), referred to a study carried out under his direction by his Institute on the subject "planning university development". Started at the beginning of 1969, this study was seeking to elucidate a number of the problems already mentioned at the Conference and, ultimately, to enable universities to respond better to the needs of society. It was trying first to analyze the most important and interesting trends in university development, to single out and extend the most valuable experiments attempted in this connection, and to mark out the difficulties and the shortcomings. Secondly, it sought to develop a set of tools and methods which would help those responsible for university management to detect hidden or only partially tapped reserves, allocate their limited resources efficiently and adapt the university to the social and economic needs of the country. Finally, the study was expected to produce a set of recommendations on the use of modern management methods in a variety of situations.

The work was being carried out in two phases. First, a systematic examination of the answers to a questionnaire prepared in collaboration with IAU and sent out to some 100 institutions in all parts of the world. Second, an analysis of some problems in greater depth through a limited number of case studies. A number of universities had already sent in replies to the questionnaire, so that a provisional analysis had already been possible and the main points from this were contained in a document which was available to members of the Conference. Any co-operation universities were able to give in the study would be most welcome.

Dr. R. FRONDIZI, *Member of the Administrative Board of IAU*, emphasized that the notion of need itself, on which all the discussions would hinge, was extremely ambiguous and called for clarification. From the methodological point of view first of all, how could needs be defined? Statistical forecasting techniques, were, of course, well-known but these were only effective in societies with sufficient social and political stability, and almost unusable in vast regions of the world, and particularly in Latin America which was prone to political change. When policies changed, needs also

changed and all forecasts went by the board. From the semantic point of view on the other hand, the word 'need' did not represent an unambiguous reality. At first sight it seemed descriptive, but in fact it was largely prescriptive. At least it was very often attached to a conditional proposition : there was a need for something, if one wanted to obtain a particular result and not simply because one did not already possess that thing. The notion was one which should therefore be handled with care in the course of the discussion.

Professor M. T. NIZIN, *Rector of the University of Kazan*, commented on the statement in Professor Janne's report that in many Western countries, the student population did not correspond to the social structure and the great majority of students were recruited from the privileged strata of society. Besides being a flagrant social injustice, that was a waste of human intelligence as well. It had to be accepted that intelligence was more or less evenly spread through all the levels of society, and thus society itself suffered from not giving educational opportunities to young people from the less privileged strata. It would be a good thing if the composition of the student population were to reflect that of society as a whole.

As far as the University of Kazan was concerned, the workers or their children made up 35 to 37 per cent of the total numbers, and the collective farmers or their children 10 to 12 per cent. Thus there was seen to be some over-representation of the white-collar workers and to remedy that situation, the university, taking the social factors into account, had introduced a set of measures intended to pick out the most talented boys and girls, including preparatory courses for young workers, study groups and "olympiades" in mathematics and various sciences, establishment of a one-year preparatory department for young workers, etc. All these matters were covered in detail in a brochure which was available to the Conference, but the essential thing to emphasize was that it was important for the universities to make systematic and vigorous efforts to spot talented young people, prepare them for study and educate them under the best conditions.

Mgr O. DERISI, *Rector of the Catholic University of Buenos-Aires*, referred briefly to Pope Paul VI's encyclical "populorum progressio", in which the Pope laid particular

insistence on the need to preserve and strengthen the place of humanist training in the university so that, in all its scientific, technical and cultural activities the university should remain in the service of the individual and of society, subordinating material progress to genuine human development.

Dr. A. KHAN, of the *Centre for Educational Research and Innovation of OECD*, referred to a programme launched by the Centre which might well interest all universities, even though the OECD was not a world organization and comprised only a group of so-called developed countries. The programme was concerned with the management of institutions of higher education and had been started about two years earlier. The objective was to devise and construct new organizational models for universities, to improve their management, budget forecasting and profitability calculation methods, etc. and lastly to carry out experiments which might eventually be followed up. The experiments were being conducted in the universities of Bradford, Lancaster, Copenhagen, Nijmegen and Gothenburg. They were to be concluded in June 1971. One of the most important problems which arose over new management methods was that their democratic character had sometimes been disputed, especially in Europe. It was important therefore to know whether they could be decentralized and enable all members of the university to participate. In addition, it had been found that the universities, even in the developed countries, only had threadbare and inadequate information systems. These ought undoubtedly to be developed, but there again the question of access of all members of the university to the information arose. The problems were difficult and the success of the undertaking would largely depend on finding a solution to them.

Rev. Father ISMAEL QUILES, *Rector of the University del Salvador of Buenos-Aires*, thought that apart from the critical rôle of the university, emphasis should also be put on its creative rôle. The university must make a contribution to the conception and development of possible models for a better society.

Dr. JAIME BENITEZ, *President of the University of Puerto Rico*, observed that if one wanted to be quite frank, the discussions had so far demonstrated both the need for and the

impossibility of international university co-operation. As already emphasized, real co-operation was not possible between institutions which differed too much. The universities were in fact very different and they would continue to be so, as those in the over-developed countries changed at a still more rapid rate than those in the developing countries.

The need and the impossibility represented one of the contradictions of university life. Professor Janne had rightly emphasized their seriousness, and the most difficult of them to overcome was perhaps that between the requirements of objectivity and those of commitment. With regard to objectivity, emphasis should be put on the extent to which we easily succumbed to the stereo-types of our own society. In the developing countries, there was always a tendency to put one's own disappointments at the door of the imperialist powers. And it appeared that in the over-developed countries there was an equal readiness to put the blame on other governments. What in fact they should first try to do was to see their own faults, without making any concessions to outside pressure. The universities should certainly take notice of the outside world and make a flexible response to it, as Professor Ungku Aziz had rightly said, but it should also count integrity and intellectual honesty among its principal virtues.

Dr. S. Pascu, *Rector of the University of Cluj*, agreed with Professor Janne about the importance of a university sociology. The scientific and technical revolution had made the university one of the most important social institutions, the one which had to change most rapidly in response to the ever-changing needs of society. It had to look to the future and, in order to sketch out its future profile and the cultural models of the society of tomorrow, it had to combine different disciplines, in particular economic science and sociology. Sociology, in particular had an important part to play both in a forward-looking study of the place of the university in society as well as in the solution of the problems of the internal life of the university itself.

That was why the University of Cluj had encouraged a number of research projects started over the last few years by its Sociology Centre. In particular, studies had been made of the problems of combining vocational or specialized training with general education, the problems of student selection and guidance, students' problems of adapting to university life and their problems of integration into society. The results obtained

had made it possible both to improve the working of the university and also to draw up a number of recommendations to agencies or bodies outside the university. The research would be continued in the future, in particular into the structure and functions of the lecturing staff.

The University of Cluj was certainly not alone in undertaking such activities and exchanges of experience on the subject might be of great interest. The European Centre for Higher Education, whose establishment had been recommended by a meeting of European Rectors held in Bucharest in association with Unesco, could probably play a very useful part in this respect.

Dr. F. KALIMUZO, *Vice-Chancellor of Makerere University* drew attention to the dangers inherent in polarizing societies into two types, Western and Eastern. That would be to forget all the societies which were neither the one nor the other and intended to go on being themselves. Now in such societies, which might be very different from one another, but which shared a common desire to "get off the ground" and soar as high as possible, the universities had a very original rôle to play. That rôle was not one of preservation, nor even of adaptation, but rather of innovation and creation in all fields : in the field of training senior staff capable of production and men capable of invention, in the field of technology and in that of idealogy. The universities were the driving force behind the revolutionary movement which put life into society, they were not its critical analyst. Their problem was less to safeguard their independence, than to create the conditions for real interdependence with the surrounding environment. They were not moving towards a renaissance, they were present at a birth. They had to generate both the heat for social reform and the light for the progress of the spirit. It was important not to lose sight of that very original adventure on which they had embarked.

Professor S. H. SIRADZINOV, *Rector of the University of Tashkent*, referred to the experience of the Central Asian Republics of the Soviet Union and of Kazahstan, an experience which was interesting from many angles. Only fifty years earlier, there had been almost total illiteracy and it had needed the October Socialist Revolution to provide them with an education system which answered their needs. In 1920, when the Soviet

Union was still suffering serious economic difficulties, Lenin had signed a decree setting up the University of Turkestan, later to become the University of Tashkent. Other universities had subsequently been founded and the regions concerned were at present endowed with a system of 150 higher education establishments. Those establishments were training personnel the great majority of whom were of local origin and took their part in the development of the country. It should also be mentioned that the first universities had set up a scientific infrastructure in the region which had made it possible to create academies of science, which in their turn had promoted a considerable development in research. Finally higher education had made a substantial contribution to the emancipation of women in those republics, which, starting from a characteristic level of under-development, were now going through a period of expansion comparable with that of the other republics of the Soviet Union. A brochure giving more details about the developments was available to participants.

Dr. N. A. Hernandez, *National University of Cordoba,* drew attention to the problems of the mass university. In many countries, including Argentina, the universities had to accept a very large number of students who did not have the necessary grounding to become real undergraduates. And the problem which IAU could help in solving was to find out how students could be trained, not only from the scientific point of view, but also from the cultural, and even the behavioural point of view, to become university students in the full sense.

Dr. O. L. Farrag, of the *American University of Cairo,* referring to comments made by Dr. Frondizi, stressed the importance of defining the word 'need', this being the only way to establish priorities, or alternatively, a hierarchy of needs. A distinction could probably be made between individual needs, whether conscious or otherwise, the institutional needs of this or that institution within society, and finally, the needs of society as a whole. It was between those three levels that priorities had to be established, and that could not always be done on the basis of a scientific analysis of needs, it must also be done in the light of the specific possibilities of an institution. A university might, for example, be ill-equipped to meet a need theoretically recognized as a priority and it might therefore choose to concentrate on satisfying another, perhaps

less urgent need, but one which it could effectively fulfil. All those points had to be taken into consideration when deciding which way the university should move.

The CHAIRMAN thanked the speakers and adjourned the session.

FIRST DISCUSSION SESSION

THE SOCIO-ECONOMIC FUNCTIONS OF THE UNIVERSITY

Dr. E. LAPALUS, *Chairman of the Session and Vice-President of the Association des Universités partiellement ou entièrement de langue française*, formally opened the session and reminded the participants of the general outline proposed for the discussion of the theme.

Although the search for universally applicable solutions was often a rather futile undertaking, it would nevertheless be useful to try to pick out for the final report some of specially relevant and indicative attitudes in university life throughout the world in order to give an idea of the general trends in the universities today.

After making these suggestions, the Chairman gave the floor to Dr. Spinks.

Dr. J. W. T. SPINKS, *President of the University of Saskatchewan*, stressed the significance of the educational budget in contemporary society. The continuing growth in student numbers, and the substantial investment represented by each student, raised questions about the way the educational budget was drawn up and its efficiency in our society. In most countries, the university budget accounted for a large proportion of provincial, or State, expenditure depending upon whether it was drawn up nationally or by regions, and any increase was bound to be to the detriment of other major public services, such as health, for example. This raised a very serious problem.

The CHAIRMAN drew attention to the importance of the problem of forecasting future needs and structures and

the implications of these factors for student selection and guidance.

Dr. A. A. SANTAS, *Rector of the University of Buenos Aires*, wondered where the definition of needs should begin, and what criteria and what approach should be used, taking into account both the working and the non-working population.

Dr. M. V. OYENUGA, *Professor at the University of Ibadan*, pointed out that the assessments of society's needs varied considerably from one country to another depending upon the level of economic and social development. In the developing countries, the distribution of students between science and arts studies was a difficult problem to solve. Thus, although it seemed desirable in Nigeria, as in some other countries, that 70 % of the students should be scientists and 30 % arts students, the very high cost of science studies, staff shortages and inadequate facilities made it difficult to follow these guidelines. The general distribution pattern for student numbers in Nigeria was laid down by the Ministry of Economics and Development and it formed an integral part of overall planning. In addition, the Ministry issued general directives to the universities concerning the scale of importance of problems for consideration and the objectives they should strive to achieve. For want of means, however, it was often quite impossible for the universities to carry out such directives in full.

All these factors should give incentive to more active international co-operation between universities in the developing and developed countries, not only in research, but also in finance and resources.

Prof. R. SVAMANANDA, *Vice-Rector of Chulalongkorn University*, emphasized that, since the beginning of the industrial era, agriculture had ceased to be the one and only source of revenue for the South-East Asian countries.

In view of the growth in population and the development of industry and agriculture, these countries needed year by year a greater number of engineers, doctors, lecturers, research workers and managers.

These needs were naturally appreciated by the people of

these countries and they were becoming more ready to guide their children into open careers, such as medicine, commerce, technology or business management. In this context, the setting-up of advanced institutes of technology at university level seemed more advantageous than introducing too broad a spread of courses in the universities themselves. Students did nevertheless continue to be more attracted by the prestige of university courses than by technological studies. Even so, knowledge for its own sake did not always ensure access to one of the professions and the degrees awarded by universities were not always geared to social demand. The fact that resources were limited made it necessary to arrive at some estimate of needs, such as that made in Thailand as part of the national economic development plan.

Dr. S. E. NAHAVANDI, *Rector of the University of Shiraz*, commented on the desirability of relating the structure of higher education to the needs of society. There were two quite distinct aspects : one quantitative, which could only be resolved by the planning authorities or the law of the labour market, and the other qualitative, where it seemed that the university had a very big rôle to play. The fact was that, in most cases, the teaching given in universities in the developing countries was a direct copy of that given in the industrialized countries. It was the duty of the universities to bring about a revolution in ways of thinking by adapting teaching and learning processes to qualitative national needs. Universities could also give their governments advice on planning problems and the preparation of development plans.

Dr. A. A. KWAPONG, *Vice-Chancellor of the University of Ghana*, referred to what the previous speaker had said about the rôle of the university and planning machinery in the developing countries. One of the most obvious facts today was the inequality in growth rates between the developed and developing countries : the former were rapidly increasing their wealth, while the latter were becoming still more impoverished. This inevitably caused acute difficulties for the university authorities, who lacked financial resources and qualified staff. Furthermore, one danger to be avoided was that of passing on problems which arose in industrialized countries by sending out experts unaware of the specific

problems of the new environment into which they moved, since all they then did was to bring with them their own set of fixed ideas. Was it right, merely because the developed countries were trying to cope with the problem of pollution, to claim to be solving the development problems of the poor countries by carrying out ecological studies, or even by carrying out demographic studies just because they happened to be all the rage in the industrialized countries at present?

It would be all to the good if IAU made some specific suggestions for a change in this state of affairs. IAU might also try to develop appropriate machinery or methods for ensuring a rational distribution of the resources available throughout the world for university co-operation. Lastly, on the matter of student unrest. This too was largely an exported disease, in particular through television. It was clear that lecturers and students had to work together in teaching and in research, but management problems would have to be solved in relation to available resources and practical considerations; great principles, such as participation did not in themselves provide the answer.

The CHAIRMAN suggested that the discussion should return to the question raised earlier, namely, where should the definition of needs begin?

Dr. K. AFSHAR, *of the University of Teheran,* questioned the use of the two rather over-worked terms "developed" and "developing". They in fact denoted separate points in the continuous process known as development. The essential aim was to reduce the gap between developed and developing countries, not to increase it through using expressions which seemed to suggest a difference in kind between the two. Questions of development, forecasting of needs, and introduction of new educational policies, should normally be answered within the framework of each national budget, with the help of the university and in relation to the investment capital that was to be set aside for the purpose. As for the changing structures to be anticipated in the future, it could be estimated that there would be an increasing need in the next two decades for doctors, engineers and teachers.

In this connexion, consideration might be given to setting up an IAU Committee, responsible for making studies of the conditions under which development problems would arise in the future.

Prof. H. A. Oluwasanmi, *Vice-Chancellor of the University of Ife*, pointed out that, whereas the needs of individuals, like those of society, were limitless, the resources available to satisfy them were sparse and inadequate. A choice had therefore to be made, in particular in the developing countries where needs were many and pressing, of those needs which could be satisfied and should be given priority. From this standpoint, the universities should undertake research aimed at singling out the most urgent needs and tackling them in an efficient way. In Nigeria, for example, the universities should both try to meet the need for highly qualified manpower and at the same time to decide in what areas of research it could be most usefully employed, these would include agriculture, public health, and also nuclear physics since this should not necessarily, as people sometimes seemed to think, remain the exclusive preserve of the richest countries.

Finally, the universities should take more interest in adult education. IAU should make a study of the matter and help universities to make a selection from among the problems involved in order to be able to respond in the best possible way to the demands of the social environment.

Dr. J. A. L. Matheson, *Vice-Chancellor of Monash University*, showed some scepticism about the question of forecasting needs and planning the work of universities. He referred to the several disappointing experiments made in Australia in an attempt to keep a close account of the places available in the medical schools, where the cost of studies was extremely high, and yet the government had not given its approval to the introduction of a distribution pattern for student numbers in the various faculties. It had, however, agreed that the university share of the national budget should not be increased on any account.

There was a certain lack of co-ordination between the number of degrees conferred by the universities and the needs of society. Other alternatives to traditional university education should be sought. For instance, some degrees, such as the Ph.D. in Chemistry, did not always correspond to posts offered by society.

Many students were compelled to work in professions which were not directly related to the subject they had studied. In chemistry, in particular, industry could not take all the research workers who came out of higher education. However, it had to be admitted that many students were not

prepared to go through university studies and that holders of degrees did not always know how to adapt themselves to changes in the labour market.

The universities should therefore pay close attention to this problem and teach their students how to refresh their knowledge and adapt their psychological behaviour so as to be capable of responding to variations in the social and economic environment.

Sir SAMUEL CURRAN, *Principal and Vice-Chancellor of the University of Strathclyde in Glasgow*, emphasized that the range and enormous variety in the needs of society obliged universities to set limits on what they tried to achieve. In such a situation, although the universities did not always completely fulfil their rôle, that rôle was bound to remain relatively modest in the face of the multiplicity of economic and development demands. It might be very dangerous indeed to give the impression that they could achieve everything. But it would be a good thing if the universities, which often existed in a vacuum, at least had some direct knowledge of the sectors of society which contribute to development.

Mrs. MINERVA C. T. LAUDICO, *Executive Vice-President of the University of San Miguel*, emphasized that courses in medical technology were especially popular in the Philippines, and were a great success with the students.

Unfortunately, the number of students following these courses was too high in relation to social demand. That was why an effort was being made to channel the students into other careers, though without great success. As a result, quite a lot of students on graduation went abroad to Canada, the United States or other countries.

That was one important problem for discussion, together with the question of whether or not it was necessary to integrate intermediate vocational training courses into the universities.

Dr. G. E. MEULEMAN, *Acting Rector of the Free University of Amsterdam*, believed that the definition of the needs of *society and the identification of* those who should be responsible for meeting them constituted a fundamental problem calling for further discussion.

At the same time, it seemed that the discussion was beginning to assume that the mission of the university was to meet the needs of society. Everyone was all the more ready to accept this since there had always been a link between university curricula and the needs of society. But this relationship had now become much more apparent as a result of the new approach to university financing which made the universities dependent upon national institutions. This was quite a recent development; in the past, universities had thought first of the needs of their students, and only then about the needs of society. The new situation presupposed the introduction of a series of selection procedures. The setting of criteria for university admissions might not pose problems in the sciences, but certainly did so in the humanities.

Dr. J. BENITEZ, *President of the University of Puerto Rico in Rio Piedras*, recalled that universities in developing countries, because of their acute lack of resources, could not always accept all prospective applicants. They therefore had no alternative but to take selective measures in order to pick out the most talented candidates.

The development problem was marked by what could only be called two scandals : under-development and over-development. In the case of Puerto Rico, the development of the country had, relatively speaking, proceeded at as fast a rate as that of Japan. An example of this was the growth in student numbers, which had now reached some forty thousand and the ever broadening range of responsibilities of the university towards society accompanied by the introduction of professional training courses had been introduced. However, watch should be kept to see that this new rôle was not in any way dictated by outside pressure, as this would be a direct threat to its independence or autonomy.

Dr. L. A. DORAIS, *Rector of the University of Quebec*, pointed out that if the university was to be financed by the public authorities it should be capable of matching up to its rôle and reputation in the work it was doing, and it should show some degree of flexibility in the opportunities it offered to students. Nevertheless, selection and planning should be viewed with some circumspection. Forecasting might make it possible to say in a general way what careers offered openings for employment, but it could not predict with any

certainty what technical innovations might meanwhile occur to change the pattern of social demand. Estimates in fact proved to be valid only for periods of three or four years and it did not seem feasible for a university to re-adapt at such short intervals. It was thus preferable to allow the university to make its own policy choices both in the sciences and in the humanities.

Rev. Father HARRY SAWYER, *Vice-Chancellor of the University of Sierra Leone*, explained that needs were subject to continual change and could not be expressed in terms of immutable and interchangeable concepts.

The considerable extension of social science teaching and its introduction into the university, together with specialized courses for engineers and junior executives, was creating a new situation in which a whole ideological current, which might be called "technical humanism", was developing. Under these circumstances, care should be taken to see that the personalities of students were not distorted by these recent ideas and that technological development did not in general take precedence over human achievement.

M. BERNARD DUCREY, *Secretary-General of the University of Geneva*, wondered exactly what society they should try to define and what place should be given to the university within that society.

As needs grew in number, the traditionally-held concept of the university changed and a new idea of its rôle had to be sought.

Whereas in the developing countries the choice of priorities was a matter of urgency and could no longer remain the exclusive preserve of the universities, in industrial societies at least, the demand for social and cultural development could not be overlooked.

This "spiritual supplement" which was needed by developed societies presented an invitation to universities to make their presence felt by starting to undertake new activities in this field or, at the very least, by setting a place aside for disinterested and apparently useless work.

Finally, people quite often spoke of student pressure, but pressure from certain industrial circles was no less apparent and represented an equally great danger for the universities.

Dr. H. JANNE, *Professor at the Free University of Brussels*, pointed out that there was no point in engaging in polemics or ideological battles when faced with matters of plain fact.

The truth was that the general structure of degrees no longer corresponded to the structure of the working population or the employment market. This was the result of an inadequate information system and poor student guidance from secondary school onwards.

Here was an area where it would be an advantage for universities to co-operate closely with employers and state institutions in forecasting future trends in the working population, since the training of graduates often lagged behind social and technical evolution.

If a good information and advisory framework were set up, the danger of bad career choices leading to failures and difficulties for students could probably be reduced.

Forecasting employment needs, where the overall calculations would have to be periodically up-dated and clarified by qualified bodies, was the business of the state, not of the university. It had to be recognized, however, that the state was often negligent in this respect, even in sectors such as education where accuracy was easy to achieve.

The CHAIRMAN suggested that consideration now be given to the integration of middle level professional training into university education.

Mr. PAUL B. J. CHU, *of the International Labour Office*, stressed that university training, social demand and the structures of the working population were interrelated. For that reason, the International Labour Organization had itself been concerned with this problem and, since the previous year, had been trying, for forecasting purposes, to prepare an international employment programme as an attempt to specify what categories of people should be trained to meet the future needs of the various economic sectors of society. The task was a very complex one and the Organization had decided to approach it on a regional basis starting with the Americas. This had given birth, in particular, to the Ottawa Plan, which had been followed by similar plans for Asia and Africa. At the same time, but on a national basis, the ILO was trying to stimulate pilot projects with the participation of representatives of big national institutions, various sectors of the economy, educational planners, and members of uni-

versities. This might prove to be a good method of defining the needs of society and thus keeping the universities informed about the type of training they should introduce in order to meet these needs.

In addition, the International Labour Organization was obviously closely interested in vocational training and life-long education.

Dr. FASSI-FIHRI, *of the Mohammed V University in Rabat*, made the point that no decision should be made to integrate specialized institutes systematically into the university without taking local conditions into account.

In the case of the developing countries, integration was often desirable, because it led to economies in buildings and teaching staff. But universities set up in colonial times were very slow to adapt to the economies of developing countries. The developing countries were often more in need of management executives than engineers, who often could not find appropriate employment. It would thus be preferable to give priority to training of technicians, failing which there was a danger that doctors would soon be without nurses, engineers without foremen and officers without sergeants.

Measures of this kind would furthermore be an effective method of preventing graduate unemployment and the "brain drain".

Rev. Father F. E. MACGREGOR, *Rector of the Pontifical and Catholic University of Peru*, observed that training executives was a difficult problem. The difficulty stemmed from two causes. One was that we did not readily accept the idea of selection among men, above all when the only criterion was the fact of having attended a certain type of institution. The other was that university degrees conferred a much greater prestige on their holders than degrees from technical institutes. These were points in favour of integration.

On the other hand, from the economic point of view, educational costs were turning out to be much higher for the university without, for all that, any guarantee of a return on investments, particularly in view of the complexity of university management.

It would therefore be taking a very great risk in the developing countries to concentrate technical training in

the universities with the result that they would represent the bulk of all expenditure on education.

This was a very difficult, and a very immediate problem in Peru. Perhaps technical institutes could be linked with universities, without being completely integrated into them.

Prof. G. VIGNOCCHI, *Rector of the University of Modena*, spoke about a number of experiments in student selection and specialization, which had been made in Italy in association with industry or private companies.

The experiments had involved making satisfactory breakdowns of students in relation to social demand in order not to have too many lawyers, doctors or engineers, for example, but without in the process compromising the principle of autonomy. In Modena, professional training had been provided in relation to regional needs. It was well known that the regions had acquired a new status in Italy and the university had a rôle to play in this. Some were trying to undertake joint action with the help of certain social and professional groups and State administrative services. Within the framework of IAU activities, it would be a good idea to extend interuniversity co-operation by publishing a bulletin, listing needs, policies to be determined and action to be undertaken at university level, with the help of the State and private bodies.

Furthermore, steps might be taken to obtain recognition of degrees by other universities. Thus in Italy, efforts had been made through the intermediary of the Conference of Rectors to draw up a list of equivalences between degrees awarded in Italy, France and the Federal Republic of Germany.

The CHAIRMAN again put the question whether it was necessary to integrate middle level institutions into the university or to set up specialized insitutions.

Rev. Father J. DUCHUET, *Chancellor of the Faculty of Law and Economic Sciences at the Université Saint-Joseph, Beirut*, informed the participants of the creation of three centres for banking, management and labour studies which had just been attached to his Faculty.

These centres covered a social milieu different from, and much wider than, the traditional faculties. Students from these traditional faculties had the opportunity of interesting

and varied contacts and it was also possible for their lecturers to enjoy fruitful relationships with teachers from the social and economic sector, who came to give part-time courses at the centres.

Dr. SARUP SINGH, *Pro-Vice-Chancellor of the University of New Delhi*, stressed the point that a large number of young people were very keen to go to university, but many of them, unfortunately, because of their less-privileged social origins and low level of culture, were not prepared to follow studies of that kind. This was particularly obvious in their sometimes inept handling of English, which was often simply grafted on to their mother tongue. Finally, although many young people did not always find employment on leaving university, they were still very attracted by the prestige conferred on them by that type of so-called liberal education.

To avoid these pitfalls, it had been necessary at the University of Delhi to introduce courses which combined the advantages of a general education and professional training. With this end in view, the University had reached agreement with various public and private bodies, and with industrial firms and institutions such as the Medical Council and the Agricultural Board, to introduce technical and professional courses financed in the main by these bodies. After following a pre-university preparatory language course in order to obtain a good command of English, and a course in economics, the students could later opt for traditional university education or choose professional courses leading to careers as advanced technicians.

It was evident that all the measures were inspired by a deep concern to give students the broadest prospects and the least restricted range of choice in relation to their abilities and compatible with development conditions in their own countries.

Dr. A. GERLO, *Rector of the Free University of Brussels*, believed that no systematic decision should be taken to introduce into the university types of education which were of an entirely different kind, because the ultimate purpose of the university was already very clear. Its primary vocation was research, which meant the creation and communication of knowledge resulting from original discoveries or doctoral theses. There could be no future for the unification of

higher education unless an initial distinction was carefully made between four kinds of higher education—university, technical, economic and artistic; otherwise the university would be sidetracked from its essential rôle which was the promotion and advancement of knowledge.

The present difficulties in non-university education were a consequence of the inferior status which was generally assigned to it. Proper value had to be put on this kind of education in its own right, so that the students did not feel themselves to be the poor relatives of the university.

Furthermore, to avoid situations where students followed university courses when in many cases they were not prepared for them, systems should be set up as soon as possible to make it possible for them to change courses, and even to move into technical education or vice versa because a scientific vocation was sometimes slow to appear.

Dr. F. P. THIEME, *President of the University of Colorado*, emphasized that in view of the wide range of functions which the university already had to perform, an effort had been made to create new categories of colleges: the "junior colleges" and the "community colleges". These colleges were springing up rapidly. Some were institutions which gave teaching in the social sciences and the humanities, and some were more clearly specialized in technological studies. These measures were relieving the university of burdens which did not properly belong to it and making it possible for students to make a free choice of career in the light of their own abilities and social demands.

Dr. Thieme reminded the participants that a number of students were present and that it would be interesting to hear them express their views and aspirations.

The CHAIRMAN took this opportunity to point out that the student delegates had the same right to speak as the other members of the Conference.

Dr. PIERRE-PAUL PROULX, *Administrative Director of the Conference of Rectors and Principals of the Universities of Quebec*, explained that the setting up of collegiate institutions, such as a system of general and vocational training colleges, outside the university system, seemed to have provided an

initial answer to the question whether or not to integrate intermediate training into the university's structure. These arrangements would, however, be inadequate unless permanent contacts were established with the industry and business circles. It was very useful to maintain this kind of relationship, among other things because recruitment of teachers for vocational training was often difficult.

Dr. H. A. OLUWASANMI, *Vice-Chancellor of the University of Ife*, drew attention to the fact that solutions to the problem under consideration were closely dependent upon the local conditions in each country. Very many universities were not equipped to provide technical training, at least not on a scale appropriate to needs. However, in view of its many teacher training facilities, the University of Ife had agreed to take charge of an Institute of Education catering for future teaching staff. Furthermore, universities could assist technical colleges by advising them about the best methods to use in the acquisition of knowledge, without necessarily going so far as to integrate them.

Dr. A. A. SANTAS, *Rector of the University of Buenos Aires*, said that the problem could not be considered seriously before some assessment had been made of the levels of economic, political, social and cultural development of the countries concerned. It was not so much a question of whether the universities in the developing countries could or should take active part in training executives or technicians, but rather one of arriving at a comparatively accurate estimate of social demand so that the number of people looking for jobs was in keeping with development priorities and the needs which had to be met. Once that had been done, it would be possible to take a decision either to give the university a direct part in the training of technicians, or to give it the rôle of assisting the specialized institutions. Society itself must also be prepared to give these intermediate executives which it needed the place they deserved, in particular in terms of salary and prestige.

The CHAIRMAN then opened the discussion of problems of university aspects of adult and "life-long" education.

Dr. EDWIN K. TOWNSEND-COLES, *of the International Congress of University Adult Education*, was happy to see that

there was a growing recognition that adult education and life-long training represented an increasingly important part of the work of university staff. The universities seemed to be in a good position to take on these responsibilities and quite a number of them were already beginning to do so.

Although the variety of situations made it impossible to put forward a very complete project as a guide in this matter, it was highly desirable that mention be made of it in the final report and that it should appear favourably among the interests which had held the attention of the Conference.

In addition, it was important that the universities should make a thorough study of teaching methods for adult education. This was bound to lead to new teaching techniques of benefit not only in life-long training, but also in higher education as a whole. University co-operation in this domain should also be extended; this was in fact one of the goals of the International Congress of University Adult Education, a non-governmental institution recognized by Unesco, which organized conferences and published an information revue.

Dr. NATHAN PUSEY, *President of Harvard University*, explained that in a number of American universities there was a marked increase in the amount of post-doctoral research, which could be considered one of the highest forms of life-long education.

In addition to this, universities, and, in particular Harvard, were making increased efforts to open their doors to people who already had vocational experience and held responsible positions in various professions. At Harvard, this had begun with a one-year course for journalists, and the experiment had been extended, in particular to businessmen. These courses were extremely flexible and did not involve formal instruction leading to a degree. The resources of the university were simply thrown open to be used freely by the people concerned. Contacts were thus established, which were often of great value to the university staff.

Dr. J. W. T. SPINKS, *Vice-Principal of the University of Saskatchewan*, emphasized the importance not only of adult education itself, but also of research into methods of teaching adults and pointed to the existence of numerous programmes in Canada which were aimed at improving the position of

adults in particularly unfortunate circumstances. The universities were participating in these programmes by giving advice on teaching methods and this led them to undertake vast research projects on the problem with the assistance of authorities from very varied disciplines and walks of life. In this way, "big research" programmes were springing up in the social sciences, similar to those which had long existed in the natural sciences.

Sir SAMUEL CURRAN, *Vice-Chancellor of the University of Strathclyde*, referring to the intervention of the President of Harvard University, stressed the fact that many bodies or private companies were not in a position to dispense with their directors or executives for a whole year. For this reason, a system different from the one at Harvard had been devised at the University of Strathclyde. It consisted in organizing courses in collaboration with certain industrial firms, for example in chemical engineering. The courses were held on a part-time basis, mainly in the evenings, on the companies premises, and they were also open to staff of other firms. The necessary funds were provided by the firms concerned. Unlike the Harvard situation, the engineers who participated in these refresher courses could gain a Master's degree or even a doctorate, and many of them took advantage of this.

Dr. N. D. SUNDARAVADIVELU, *Vice-Chancellor of the University of Madras*, stated that 70 % of the Indian population was illiterate. This had a paralyzing effect on workers.

The universities could probably overcome these difficulties by making full use of all resources they had available, in particular the large number of graduates they produced each year, by making use of them in a general literacy campaign. If every graduate were to enlist in this campaign for a period of one year, illiteracy would soon be wiped out and efforts had in fact already been made in this direction.

Dr. E. N. DAFAALLA, *Member of the Administrative Board of IAU*, fully appreciated the acuteness of this problem, but he also considered that a careful distinction should be made between the general education organized by the university for the general public and the education which formed part of literacy courses. In the developing countries, the uni-

versity was very often unaware of the way of thinking of the people, or was at least in danger of remaining isolated from the society as a whole. Consequently, apart from literacy campaigns which could often be successfully entrusted to students, it was important for the university to make a direct approach to the general public and to organize courses and lectures on the geography, the economy, or the sociology of the country, for instance, which were designed to make people more aware of their environment. Several encouraging experiments of this kind had been attempted in Africa, and not least among their merits was to have completely changed the attitude of the public towards the university. For, once an atmosphere of confidence had been established between the university and the people, the way was open for the university to play its part efficiently within that society.

The CHAIRMAN then introduced the next item of discussion : the critical rôle of the university in determining social needs. Referring to an earlier speech, he emphasized that the critical function of the university should not be understood solely in a negative sense, but could also include an aspect which had been described as "creative".

Dr. E. GEORGIEV, *Pro-Rector of the University of Sofia*, emphasized that the university, bringing together as it did the élite of the nation, should play a particularly important rôle in determining social needs and should take most active part in the progress of society in all fields.

Furthermore, since the university's ultimate aim was to solve the theoretical and practical problems of the scientific and technical revolution, it was incumbent upon it to train graduates who were not only fit to work in the most varied sectors of community life, but also capable of acting as a driving force in the transformation and scientific organization of this community life.

To this end, new teaching methods had to be used in giving training in the techniques of rationalization of production, methods of planning research activities and more generally, the integration of science and industry, in order to give an all round qualification.

These few remarks showed clearly that it was impossible to undertake anything in society without the critical and dynamic participation of the university.

Dr. J. BENITEZ, *President of the University of Puerto Rico*, said that freedom of research and speech implied freedom to criticize social trends and even government policy. It was important, however, to distinguish clearly between the freedom of the university as an institution and that of its members as individuals. The tradition in the United States, for example, was that the university as such did not take a stand in relation to government policy but it did seek to include within its ranks persons holding the widest possible range of opinions and to create a climate in which they could express themselves freely. Pluralism, one of the great virtues of the traditional university, was at the moment seriously threatened by the intolerance of extremist groups on all sides.

Dr. C. S. WISE, *President of the University of Tel-Aviv*, emphasized that university participation in defining the economic policy of each country was a very recent thing. It was a new idea which had only seen the light of day with the increased rate of technological development.

Formerly, the university had given liberal or specialized education and had had no direct involvement in determining social needs. In this latter rôle, the university should behave prudently, for its own specific tasks did not enable it to meet all the needs and serve all the purposes that society set for itself.

Although the university was very closely involved in the requirements for life-long and adult education, it should be careful not to take on responsibilites which, by their very nature, were foreign to it. A good deal of the upheaval of recent years perhaps stemmed from the university's failure sufficiently to understand and make known the peculiar essence, and therefore the limits, of its mission.

M. BERNARD LEXALLOIS, *Student at the Catholic Institute of Paris*, recalled that if the university was a centre for critical thinking about social behaviour, it must at the same time remain open to the general problems which arose in society and attentive to the criticisms and protests which were directed at it by society.

However, the university in some countries appeared as an ancient, inward-looking institution inclined to overlook the urgent needs of the surrounding social and economic environment. Students coming from that society to which they would in due time return, could therefore provide a useful

element of criticism of what was in many ways a rigid form of education. In fact, they had often played this role in recent years, but more generally it was to be hoped that society would endeavour to make its problems known and to play a critical rôle within university institutions.

Miss BARBARA LEWEL, *of the University of Michigan*, made the point that the university, as a centre for intellectual creation, had much to gain from further integration into the social system.

The University of Michigan, for instance, was taking part in drafting a reform of medical studies in the United States. In this work there was collaboration between university staff, who were not pressed by immediate problems, and practicioners, who, on the contrary, were constantly faced with such problems and had to solve them. Concerted action of this kind could probably be profitably introduced into other disciplines. Thus the university, while still holding on to its freedom, would then be able to move towards a closer integration with the overall social system and all the various educational services which society needed.

Mr. K. ASHBY, *of the University of Durham*, believed that an excessive specialization among research workers might prove to have a paralyzing effect.

Scientists or technicians should not confine themselves to their own particular sphere of work, but should show themselves particularly aware of the problems which stir our society, through their possession of as varied a range of knowledge as possible. This requirement, linked as it was to a continuous extension of knowledge, called for the establishment of a broad, flexible system of communication at all levels, both within the universities themselves and between the universities and other social institutions, not least among them, the government.

In a society riding on the flood tide of technological development, administrative inertia and the compartmentalization of knowledge often paralyzed long-term programmes of concerted action. Take for instance the problem of pollution, whose seriousness was just beginning to be recognized. Ecologists often had an inadequate training in chemistry, for example, or in other disciplines which would enable them to act more effectively. The beginning of a solution to this might be found if the university were to provide specialized courses for ecologists, in particular in chemistry, and if public

opinion and the competent authorities in each country were to recognize the magnitude of the problem. This goal was only attainable if men were given a sufficiently broad and general training to enable them to communicate with one another at any moment.

Dr. D. T. THOMPSON, *of the University College of Rhodesia*, observed that the university was in a paradoxical situation comparable to the position of the individual in the so-called technologically advanced countries.

In assimilating more and more extensive knowledge a human being became enriched and this made it possible for him to achieve a fuller awareness of his own personality and thus of his otherness. But at the same time, society compelled him to participate in vast community enterprises and expected him to act in conformity with the collective spirit which its institutions secretly encouraged and thus drew him towards conformism.

The same was true of the university. Its essential rôle was to stimulate a keener awareness in each one of us and to prepare the human mind for knowledge. It had more and more means at its disposal to become the conscience of society, but at the same time, society increasingly expected it to put its resources at the service of economic goals which were partly foreign to it and which it did not set for itself. There was a contradiction here which could not be said to have been resolved.

SECOND DISCUSSION SESSION

UNIVERSITY GOVERNANCE

The CHAIRMAN, Professor LAPALUS, opened the meeting and suggested that the discussion begin with a study of problems connected with democratization of university governance that is to say, problems of the participation of students and young lecturers.

THE DEMOCRATIZATION OF UNIVERSITY GOVERNANCE

Dr. V. MERIKOSKI, *of the University of Helsinki, Member of the IAU Administrative Board*, offered a number of thoughts about student participation and explained that

some particularly radical proposals had been made about this in his country both at national level and on the university councils.

In December 1969, the Cabinet had submitted a bill to Parliament based on the principle "one man—one vote". According to the provisions of this bill, the Council was to become the supreme body of the university. Its members were to be elected by direct and proportional suffrage and each person who belonged to the university community, whether he be professor, research worker, student or member of the administrative and technical staff, was to be granted the right to take part in the election on a completely equal footing.

In fact, as a result of various changes of fortune, the bill had not been adopted before the end of the government's term of office. The text of it however gave rise to a very lively debate and raised considerably the level of public awareness to the point of making it one of the most heated centres of controversy during the campaign leading up to the election of 15 March 1970. It should be mentioned that even earlier, in January 1970, a pamphlet written by Dr. Merikoski himself, had been published opposing the bill and that it had not been without repercussions in the political world and upon public opinion in general. This pamphlet was intended to demonstrate that the government bill, while claiming to be democratic, diverged from the accepted principles of democracy and, in certain respects, even ran contrary to them.

Since the student body was continually changing, and since each student spent only a relatively short time at university, that sense of responsibility essential to any democracy could not take firm root among the students. There was thus a danger of making the life of the university completely political. For this reason, it was not necessary for the students to be strongly and proportionally represented on the representative bodies of the universities. As emphasized in particular by the representatives of the Socialist countries at the meeting in Dubrovnik convened by Unesco that summer, where Dr. Merikoski had represented IAU, there were probably good grounds for putting more accent on qualitative rather than quantitative representation in the matter of student participation.

What was more important was that the opinions and wishes of students should be known and taken into consideration when decisions were to be taken.

Having said this, it should not be forgotten that the trad-

itional system of university management needed reforming and that the problem of student participation was one that could not be avoided.

To this end, it would be a good thing if arrangements were made to set up an international documentation centre which would gather information and publish reports on experiments and successful administrative reforms in the universities. The work of this centre could be planned over a period of something like five years, this being the minimum time needed to institute reform with respect to student participation.

Dr. A. GERLO, *Rector of the Free University of Brussels*, voiced a number of reservations which he felt concerning the remarkable report by Professor Janne on the subject of democratization of university management.

The unease which reigned in education and which could be most conspicuously seen in higher education, was a natural phenomenon. The history of teaching taught us that there is always a rift between society and its educational institutions. Teaching practice, which tended to be essentially conservative, had difficulty in keeping up with the evolution of society. Thus in every epoch the school was at least a quarter of a century behind life. It clung to the vestiges of the past more than any other social institution.

Although thorough-going reform had to be made when the gap between the school and society had become too great, the systematic practice of making a clean sweep was unreasonable. It was unthinkable to have a school where the whole set-up was constantly being revised. That was the situation we were faced with at present.

It was no use thinking that the university should be governed by a paritary authority which would be composed of four groups, namely, professors, lecturers, research workers, students and workers and employees. This in other words would be the "one man - one vote" system. These four groups had every right to make their voice heard on the governing bodies of the university, but it was pure demagogy to consider the rôle played by each of these four groups in the university, educational and scientific research institution, to be equal.

The university was a school within which there was a hierarchy based upon competence; certain people were there to receive training and others were there to give it. Regardless of place or regime, the student-lecturer relationship was

in its essence a constant where there was no equivalence except in the condition of each as a human being.

The "anarchical egalitarianism" which was leading to the destruction of the university had to be opposed. It was unthinkable that a lecturer should be nominated by the representatives of these groups, and not by the majority of his peers. If other criteria were brought into the nomination of lecturers, the subjective and the arbitrary then became the order of the day. Genuine democracy meant in essence the primacy of the criterion of competence.

When the lecturers were in a minority on the body which governed the university, the groups represented became antagonistic. Universities had to be governed by a united body and not by opposing groups.

Apart from this, many universities had introduced new structures and new forms of management without the slightest guarantee of a resulting improvement in the working and the yield of the university.

This kind of experiment was fraught with great risks and should therefore never be spread over the whole educational system. Experience had already shown us that the governing bodies on which various groups from the university community held seats, did not give an objective, proportional representation of the various kinds of opinions. The great majority of students for instance, did not wish to attend numerous and sometimes interminable meetings... Consequently—and this was the case in many universities—certain so-called "active minorities" were represented on the Council in a way which was out of all proportion to their real importance in the university.

All one could expect in such cases were extreme measures rather than proposals inspired by the needs of university education and contemporary society.

One consequence of this system might be the creation of private institutions beyond the control of the State and parliament, which would maintain an indispensable scientific level, recruit the best lecturers and research workers and establish the *numerus clausus*.

Finally, it seemed possible for rectors to arrive at a compromise between certain extreme claims and the need to maintain the level of studies; the adoption of such compromises would inevitably lead to the destruction of the university. In the light of this, it would be in the interest of the university and of democracy itself as a whole that some texts should be adopted, the general lines of which

would be as follows : participation of all groups according to their specific tasks and responsibilities in the management of the university and, on the basis of their respective competence, the right of everyone to information, but at the same time resolute opposition to any claim of an extreme and ruinous kind for the university.

Dr. N. A. Beljaev, *Pro-Rector of the University of Leningrad*, gave an account of the experience of his University, which at present has more than twenty thousand students, in connexion with student participation in university affairs.

One of the important features of the Soviet system of higher education was the participation of the student in all aspects of university life. The institution of autonomous student management was an organic element in the Soviet system as a whole; the concept corresponded to the principles of Soviet socialist democracy, according to which each of its members should take part in the management of the State. The participation of the students in management helped to give them a sense of responsibility and at the same time relieved the university staff of a number of administrative tasks. Student participation took various forms; in particular, student delegates sat on university and faculty councils, which had considerable powers. They were responsible for election and re-election of faculty deans, lecturers, course directors and assistants. The student delegates participated on these councils as fully-fledged members.

The student management bodies as such were of two kinds. A "Student Council" was elected within each faculty. This Council considered plans for the coming academic year as the allocation of time, disciplinary matters, housing and the granting of scholarships.

A "Special Student Council", elected once a year by the students community on each university campus, was responsible for the organization of day-to-day life.

IAU and its Administrative Board could make a major contribution to the main aim of further democratizating university activities and enlarging student participation in organization and administration, by informing member universities of successful and positive experiments in different parts of the world. Impetus should also be given to a study of such problems as the nature of management bodies which might be introduced and the relative rights of the administration and of the students in matters of university management.

Since the universities in the Soviet Union constituted an organic part of society and were intended to satisfy the needs of society, the question who should decide what the needs of society were and the issue of university autonomy and independence with regard to society and the State simply did not arise. The State, after consultation with scholars and specialists from the university, defined needs, presented recruitment plans to the universities, and drew up plans for the specialized branches. Furthermore, the financing, training and employment of graduates were also in the hands of the State.

Dr. KAROLY NAGY, *Rector of the University of Budapest*, recalled that in some countries the democratization of university *management* was a *new problem*. *In Hungary the* problem had been resolved several years ago. Each university now had a Rector and a Senate. The Senate included the Rector, the deans of faculties and five delegates from each faculty. The delegates were elected by the teaching staff of the faculties. Among them, there were professors and young lecturers. The students were also represented in the Senate and accounted for 25 to 30 % of the members. The councils of the faculties had a similar structure and included the Vice-Dean, the heads of departments or institutes and ten elected representatives of the teaching staff. The proportion of students representation was again between 25 and 30 %. The students' representatives were elected by all the students, and that was one of the reasons why there was no student movement in Hungary.

Professor HENRI JANNE, *of the University of Brussels*, was convinced that the principle "one man, one vote", in giving an absolute majority to the students, could never provide the kind of management the university really needed. But other *forms of management seemed to be no less open to criticism.* Management of the university by business circles, for instance, represented an undoubted threat to its impartiality and its independence. On the other hand, to regard the university as a corporate body of professors would be to give it a traditional and even conservative power structure with no guarantee at all against the possibility of power struggles and political conflicts.

Participation should essentially concern the general management of the university, while not necessarily excluding scientific and methodological questions altogether. All sectors

of the university community should have their say, but the relative strength of their voices should be weighted in a way appropriate to the particular subject under consideration.

For the general running of the university, one might consider dividing the university council into five equal parts : academic staff, research-workers, students and, finally, administrative and technical staff would each hold 20 % of the seats and these four groups, holding 80 % of the seats, would work in co-operation with a fifth group representing the views of the outside world, thus providing the element essential to stop the university from becoming isolated and inward-looking.

Voting on the council would be on an individual rather than a block vote basis and the proceedings of the council should lead to well-balanced decisions reached in an atmosphere of mutual confidence between students and lecturers, which should gradually emerge after an initial period of trial and error and running-in of the new structures.

Dr. H. Nahavandi, *Rector of the University of Shiraz*, informed the meeting that the charter for the reform of higher education had been promulgated in his country in July 1968.

This charter had swept away the existing structures in the universities and provided for broad student participation in university management. It entrusted to them the management of scholarships and social activities, for example, and gave them the right to information on financial matters. The charter further gave the universities themselves greater autonomy in relation to the administrative authorities. Finally, it recognized the basic authority of the academic staff in directing teaching and research. Given the special competence of the academic staff and the permanence of their position, it seemed essential to maintain this principle.

It must be emphasized that the world was today facing growing demands on the part of young people for information and participation. Their claims should be received sympathetically, but it went without saying that participation should go hand-in-hand with the right to study in a free atmosphere. In the present state of affairs, it was probably worthwhile reaffirming this right and it was the duty of responsible people in the universities to ensure respect for it.

M. B. Levallois, *Student at the Catholic Institute in Paris*, remarked that a person's concepts of the organization of university management was strongly influenced by his concept of education and training.

Students were less and less prepared to play a passive rôle and tended more and more to see education as a process of developing a number of potentialities. Growing recognition of the fact that student-teacher relationships were changing and that education was a training ground for responsibility and even for human accomplishment, meant that student participation could no longer be confined to certain limited sectors. The best way for the university out of its present difficulties was for it frankly to associate the students with its essential buisness : teaching, research and in the planning of courses of study.

It was essential for the various members of the university community to take their share of effective responsibility and for changes to be made as smoothly as possible and in a progressive way. It was no use offering as a model a sort of inevitable revolution every forty years as a way of catching up on events.

Finally, the repeated references to the right to study were an implicit admission that student participation was bound up with a negative form of protest. This protest should on the contrary be positive.

At the Catholic Institute, the representation on the academic senate, which is the main governing body, is made up of one third academic staff, one-third students and one-third deans of faculties. The members of the administrative staff participated effectively in the life of the Institute.

Professor Tirso Mejia Ricart, *of the University of Santo Domingo*, stressed that there were three ways in which the contemporary university could respond to the needs of society. These were respectively, democratization of university governance, critical activity of university within society, and participation in development.

In the first place, the university should provide the place and the opportunity for all social categories to take real part in its various undertakings. This principle could well serve as one of the criteria for the selection of academic and administrative staff and of students, and also provide the underlying philosophy for drawing up curricula and courses of study. At the same time, the university should be democratic not only within its own governing bodies but also in its relationships with all sectors of society. With this end in view, it would be the responsibility of the university to promote the development of democratic attitudes among all members of the social community. It would have something

to gain from an enlargement of the scope of its activities by giving very special attention to raising the level of non-university education.

In the second place, in view of the need felt by our present society for rapid development, the critical function of institutions of higher education could contribute among other things to changing the traditional behaviour of individuals.

Finally, the university should participate in the process of development and economic growth.

It might be hoped that these three criteria would provide the key to the problems of the management, autonomy and modernization of university administration, as well as to the problems of student selection and guidance in relation to social demand. They further made it possible both to give expression to the democratic principles of a policy of participation which society needed and to give the university a true sense of its mission in the world.

Dr. SURAJ BHAN, *Vice-Chancellor of the University of Punjab*, stressed that it was impossible to ignore what was commonly known as "student activism". We had formerly been accustomed to hearing people speak of student agitation, but that had been only short-lived and had quickly come to an end. Now the student movement had come to represent a kind of "social upheaval" both in the developed countries and in the developing countries, the former suffering from an excess of wealth and the latter from a crisis of poverty.

The protest movements of certain extremist groups, such as the "Naxalites" in India, were marked above all by a deep mistrust of any system based on parliamentary democracy. Such a system was a tool of the "Establishment" and was therefore by its very nature incapable of bringing about any real change in the present social order which was what these groups wanted above all to destroy, without much concern for the possible consequences.

Nevertheless, a number of distinctions should be made between the various categories of students. There were those who were first and foremost interested in their studies, and who thought that a university degree could open up rich prospects for the future. They were the minority. There were others more involved in political agitation, but they too were relatively few in number. Finally, there was a last category somewhere between the two whose attitude was one of "wait and see"; for them participation had never had any attraction.

In general the motives for discontent varied from one country to another, but in India two kinds of explanation stood out clearly. One was the disenchantement of the student community. Since the coming of independence the young had been lulled with false promises of the advent of a new golden age which has never come. Another perhaps more important reason stemmed from the under-employement of a large proportion of the students coming out of university. As degree-holders, these students suffered grave disappointments faced with the prospect of unemployment. The solution of this problem would remove one of the essential causes of student agitation and perhaps even eliminate agitation itself.

Although participation in university governance was having a certain degree of success with the students, it was nonetheless a fact that most of them were indifferent to it.

Participation was something that should be approached with special prudence because it might be a source of conflicts and an instrument for domination. It was nevertheless desirable to establish a genuine dialogue between students and teachers in the conduct of university affairs.

The students had a right to take part not only in the running of their own social activities but also in the running of the university itself.

Nevertheless, direct participation of students in certain fundamental governing processes, such as the nomination of academic staff and their promotion, should be resolutely opposed. The students did not seem qualified to sit on governing bodies, both on account of their lack of maturity and also on account of the extremely short time they spent at university. If they were to be given one or two seats, they would certainly want to claim still more. In any case, participation should only be accepted in so far as it was felt to be educationally desirable, it should never become the tool of demagogy or appeasement.

Mrs. B. E. Gutierez, *President of the Philippine Women's University*, said that she would like to make the voice of at least one women's university heard and pointed out that in her university, which had just celebrated its 50th anniversary, co-operation between the student body, the administration and the teaching staff had been very satisfactory up to the present time.

However, the pattern of this old relationship would have to be changed and the time was ripe to allow students to

participate more fully in all forms of university life, including the planning of academic work and the introduction and assessment of curricula. This implied the establishment of an authentic dialogue between all the parties which made up the university community.

The dialogue should be conducted in an atmosphere of freedom, an atmosphere where the freedom of one group was never allowed to encroach upon the freedom of others. Whether directed towards university planning or towards the application and correction of policy decisions, all criticisms and ideas were welcome, for they stimulated a spirit of innovation and creativity. It was to be noted that in matters of "contestation", women students did not lag far behind their male comrades and their dynamism was a valuable driving force for change. Curricula would have to be thought out afresh in order to give the students a better grounding in national affairs and enable them to play a more effective part in achieving the objectives set by their countries. Courses and curricula had to be adapted to contemporary circumstances, but not at the expense of an understanding of fundamental values such as those of the family which constituted a basic concept in the women's universities in the Philippines. The university community ought to be a society devoted to learning, where ideas could be exchanged freely in an atmosphere of mutual understanding.

Regarding student participation in university administration, there was a student management body at the Women's University which was empowered to take decisions concerning its own activities. Furthermore, students held seats on the Academic Council and the Administrative Board, but only took part in discussion of matters which were of direct concern to themselves.

These institutions and the measures which had been taken should contribute to furthering the democratic participation of students.

Dr. WINKLER, *Rector of the Karl Marx University, Leipzig,* emphasized that in the era of the scientific and technical revolution, which in the German Democratic Republic was proceeding in socialist conditions, science was having an increasing influence as a direct productive force, and that was why there was a need for planning and direction in the sciences. In the Democratic Republic, this planning followed the guiding principles of socialist economy. These conditions

combined to delineate new prospects, guide-lines and structures.

With regard to university management and student participation, a number of specific statements could be made about what was happening in the German Democratic Republic.

Forms of action adapted to the university had been introduced, and an attempt was being made to organize participation as part of an integrated whole in which all component elements of the university community were directly involved.

In this way, the rector of each university institution worked in collaboration with the representatives of student organizations, and with the pro-rectors and heads of the subject sections (departments). The sections being specially important, for they were the basic units for teaching and research. In the course of their education in the sections, students did important research work as well. New democratic bodies had also been set up in the university. The first of these was the University Council. This was an assembly including the Rector, members of the teaching staff, students and members of the administrative staff. It drew up development plans and also decided on the future activities of the university. The second body was the Social Council, which included members elected from among the students and the teaching staff, and representatives of public life and of bodies with which the university co-operated. The purpose of this Council was to review the way in which the rector and his associates fulfilled their responsibilities and to make recommendations on matters related to the development of the university. The third body was the University Scientific Council. On this Council, professors, young lecturers, and students--who held 21 % of the seats - discussed future plans for scientific work and the organization of teaching and research activities, and took decisions on the awards of degrees.

It might be added that the students were not looked upon as passive entities who needed continual exposure to external influences. They were citizens who had the same rights and obligations as other citizens with regard to participation in the life of their country and of their institution.

Mr. RICHARD C. REFSHAUGE, *Student at the Australian National University, Canberra*, said that the meaning of student participation in university management was not

always clearly understood. In the first place, people criticized students for wanting to think about society and challenge it. This was hardly consistent with the right to criticize society with complete freedom which they claimed for the university. Students claimed the same freedom vis-à-vis university leaders as university leaders themselves claimed vis-à-vis the government. Even if one did not agree with all their forms of protest, students had to be allowed the right to forge their own destiny and to find their own solution to the problems they inherited from their elders.

Secondly, careful attempts were being made to circumscribe the areas in which students were entitled to participate. Some people would like at least to exclude them from decisions which had a bearing on academic syllabuses and in particular on appointments. In fact, these were areas where they ought to have their say, since they were after all probably in the best position to assess the quality of the teaching which was given to them and since their future depended upon it.

Dr. K. Afshar, *Professor at the University of Tehran*, suggested that the student movement throughout the world could probably be explained by the fact that we had not succeeded in giving students the fullest opportunities to use their abilities. He urged that no time should be lost in doing so, for it was a generally accepted fact that the future belonged to the younger generations.

Since the student movement was a world-wide phenomenon, it was well suited to international treatment and the Association could perhaps recommend its member universities to admit a small minority of students to their councils and to give them broader participation in the management of matters which were of direct concern to them.

Dr. T. Carnacini, *Rector of the University of Bologna*, explained that in Italy the problem was not so much to enable students to co-operate in management, but actually to get them to co-operate.

The concept of the "University", forged in the Middle-Ages, and notably in Bologna, presupposed the active support of the students in all forms of university life. However, especially since the troubles of the last three years, this support had no longer been forthcoming. There would probably be a return to better days, but only in an autonomous

university would the students be likely to show interest in participation and a grasp of the need for genuine co-operation. This was in fact one of the principles of the Italian Constitution which gives each university the right to organize itself autonomously within the framework of the law. Unfortunately, the law at present being prepared in Italy did not provide such a framework; in fact it attempted to control everything and there were good grounds for fearing that it might not leave room for an autonomous form of organization to flourish.

Dr. H. Rumpf, *President of the West German Rectors' Conference*, commented that the present discussion clearly showed that there was no one satisfactory answer to the question of student participation in the university.

The Federal Republic of Germany was at present going through a period of experiment. As authority in matters of higher education was vested in the governments of the eleven provinces (Länder) there were several forms of legislation in existence.

The affairs of some universities were managed on a paritary basis by professors, lecturers, students and representatives of the non-academic staff. In others, by contrast, the professors still held the majority of the votes. The results of these various patterns were often very varied and the similar systems might work well in some universities and badly in others. This appeared to depend very much upon the personality of the rector. However that might be, most members of the academic community were convinced of the necessity of adopting a policy of participation. It was probably the only way the university could fully meet the needs of society and channel the critical activities of teachers and students along positive and creative lines.

It was the view of the Conference Rectors, however, that the introduction of participation should be related the specific functions that each individual exercises in the university and according to certain guiding principles. It was quite legitimate, for instance, that in matters of teaching the students should enjoy a high degree of participation. Likewise, it was probable that all universities would soon grant one-third of the votes to students in the elections of the rectors, deans, and other senior officers.

However, a general rule of so-called *minima legalia* had been established. It implied three things. Firstly, university titles and degrees could only be awarded or granted by

competent persons. Secondly, the appointment of a lecturer was decided by the majority of his peers. Thirdly, research policy must be determined by those who were capable of carrying it out. In other words, the research workers themselves.

Dr. A. A. KWAPONG, *Vice-Chancellor of the University of Ghana*, emphasized that the very complexity of the problem meant that there could be no strict and definite rules for the introduction of a policy of participation. The Conference would not be able to propose any universally applicable solution. It was specially important to guard against introducing practices which might be completely alien to the situation and to the institutions of a particular country.

In the United States, for instance, an extremely closely knit institutional system, the extension of higher education to almost the entire population, and extremely acute political and social problems, such as the civil rights movement, the fight against poverty or the Viet-Nam war, called for solutions utterly different from those that could be considered for Ghana or for Africa in general. The problem was to bring the appropriate measures into line with the social and institutional logic of each country.

It might moreover be more advantageous to leave it to each party in the university community to pass on information and exchange ideas on various matters such as national development for example, rather than try to allot to each of them a fixed quota of participation in the management of the university, which would in the end only be arbitrary and restricting.

The Dubrovnik Seminar, which Dr. Merikoski had mentioned earlier, had shown that what the students wanted to have above all was high quality education and satisfactory living conditions. They did not want to sit on a council just for the sake of being there. They also wanted the deeds of the university to live up to its words. But they could make their voices heard in a great variety of ways.

In order to maintain a true spirit of co-operation and dialogue, IAU could supply information about the various forms of participation which existed in different parts of the world, but it should not recommend any one of these forms as being a universal ideal.

The modernization of University administration

Reverend F. E. MacGregor, *Rector of the Pontifica University of Lima*, said that he was very much in favour of the modernization of university administration but he drew attention to the fact that modernization was made more difficult in systems where the appointment of people to administrative posts was linked in general to their academic careers. In some countries only titular professors could become rectors. Though the two careers might be of equal standing they called for entirely different kinds of ability which were not necessarily to be found in one and the same person.

It would be useful if IAU were to issue a recommendation stating that the status of professor should not itself constitute a *sine qua non* for becoming a university administrator or university head.

Dr. J. W. T. Spinks, *President of the University of Saskatchewan*, believed that new management techniques should be introduced wherever operations costing millions of dollars were involved, as was the case with the universities.

Administrative and financial departments should be modernized and provided with data processing equipment. Appropriate training should be given to the administrative staff and this could be done in particular by professional societies, such as the "Association of Registrars" or the "Canadian Association of University Business Officers".

In the interest of efficiency and economy the administrative staff of the university should include an sufficient number of full-time executives and secretaries. Although it did not always provide a guarantee of good organization, an organigramme should also be established so as to ensure an appropriate distribution of responsibilities within the university. Without planning in this area the dangers of confusion were immense. Moreover, an attempt should be made to convince members of the teaching staff that the administration and the administrators had a legitimate rôle to play in the university, and vice versa. Establishment of satisfactory communications between all those engaged on the same task was an essential part of good management.

Modernization and organization were to less essential, for the teaching staff as well. It would often be worthwhile setting up bodies to study problems such as salary scales, retirement schemes, etc. In addition, the publication of an inter-university bulletin would help towards increasing the

number of exchanges between lecturers and might also help to remove the mistrust felt by lecturers towards the university administration.

The responsibilities of the administration were bound to increase in future. More assistance than at present would have to be given to lecturers in drawing up realistic long-term plans for curricula and equipment, and in translating these plans into operational budgets. Regardless of the size of the institution, a close watch should always be kept on expenditure in order to see that the optimum yield was obtained from resources and buildings. The setting up of an institutional research bureau could make a great contribution to this.

Professor Henri JANNE, *Honorary Rector of the Free University of Brussels*, singled out four essential aspects of the university management process : study of the problems to be solved; taking of decisions in the light of the policies adopted; implementation of these decisions and, finally, checking and evaluation of the results achieved. This called for the setting up of instruments of four distinct types ; study and planning bodies; university governing bodies where decisions emerged from a free exchange of ideas; an administration to carry out the decisions; and the supervisory bodies—their rôle which was often overlooked was to analyze systematically the extent to which the objectives had been achieved and to present their conclusions to the decision-making authorities.

These few thoughts gave one ground for thinking that good management was not incompatible with a genuinely democratic way of life—quite the contrary. The university had often preferred to devote its resources to research and teaching rather than to administration, but it had also often wasted part of its resources. Proper management of the finances was more than ever necessary and it was essential to allocate sufficient funds to ensure efficient and coherent administration.

Dr. J. WALKER, *of the University of Birmingham*, stressed that the demand for information made by administrative staff, students and the general public was increasing considerably, quite regardless of the management structures adopted. It would be useful to make a study of the problem of information circulation within the university and to find out what machinery was best suited to this work.

Dr. G. E. Meuleman, *Acting Rector of the Free University of Amsterdam*, said that the thought it was agreat exaggeration to maintain that a good professor did not make a good administrator. A university could only enjoy the kind of management it needed if the person who took on administrative responsibilities was also in touch with research and teaching problems.

An excellent lecturer was of course not always a good rector, but some of the qualities required of each of them were basically very similar.

People appeared prone to forget the history of our universities rather too quickly. Most of them had been governed by professors and it was surely not fair to say that they had been badly run. In fact the best professors had often been the best rectors.

Dr. H. Dow, *of the University of Melbourne*, said that it was all very well to talk about democratization and the modernization of management, but one only had to count the number of women taking part in the present meeting to see how little progress had been made.

Dr. E. G. Edwards, *Vice-Chancellor of the University of Bradford*, argued that the introduction of new administrative and planning systems led one to think much more rigorously about the definition of the objectives of the university and about its rôle in general.

The efficiency of the university could not be measured by such simple and unambiguous parameters as those which were used in a business firm, such as the rate of profit. The university needed more complex sets of measurements, because its objectives were complex and the question was whether it was possible to separate them or whether in fact they formed an indivisible whole.

Take, for example, the case of teaching and research. Looking at this from a strictly economic and profit-making angle, it might well be possible to demonstrate the desirability of organizing research and teaching in separate institutions, and one might likewise argue that small faculties were not economic and that it would be better to combine them in certain selected universities. But this would raise the question of the concept of the university. There were certainly some traditional notions about the rôle and the nature of the university, which members of the university tended to take

for granted, but which might well be challenged one day by the general public and the government on grounds of efficiency. The universities should, therefore, take a close look at their objectives and at their inter-relationships, before it was too late and before decisions had been taken more or less behind their backs. Here was a subject of study that might be proposed to IAU.

Mgr. Octavio N. DEIRI, *Rector of the Pontifical Catholic University of Argentina*, agreeing that everyone was fully aware of the importance of the administration, felt this should not lead to an over-estimation of its rôle. To give it pride of place would only encourage the university to adopt technicratic and bureaucratic attitudes. The administration must remain an ancilliary, while the important policy decisions should properly be taken by the academic bodies.

Dr. O. M. OSMAN, *Vice-Chancellor of the University of Khartoum*, emphasized that modernization of university management was often rendered impossible by the proliferation of regulations and statutes. The University of Sussex, which was a young and progressive institution, had therefore attempted to lighten and simplify its administrative structure and its whole committee system.

Although it was possible to send graduates to Europe to prepare their doctorates and to train for university teaching, there were no similar opportunities for the training of competent administrators.

The creation of special courses in administration lasting for perhaps one year and leading to a diploma would therefore be very desirable. IAU might help to promote this idea.

Dr. J. BENITEZ, *President of the University of Puerto Rico*, said he was convinced that no subject showed better than administration the difficulty, not to say the impossibility, of making generalizations about the university.

It was evident that the problems posed by management varied according to the size, situation, tasks and fields of "commitment" of a university.

Moreover, there seemed to be a kind of dichotomy between the functions of the university administrator and those of "leadership" in the true sense. Nevertheless, in the bigger universities, at least, the wide variety of responsibilities such as the preparation of curricula or the planning of future acti-

vities meant that the president or the rector had to be both an administrator and a "leader".

It had often been demonstrated that an outstanding professor did not necessarily make an excellent administrator, but it was nonetheless necessary for the administrator to be capable of identifying himself with the basic aims of his institution and to reveal personal qualities beyond the limits of purely technical competence.

University autonomy

Links with other Universities and with other Social Institutions Academic Order and Social Order

Dr. N. A. Beljaev, *Rector of Novosibirsk State University*, stressed the paradox of the contemporary situation. On the one hand, scientific knowledge was increasing in importance, while on the other, the constant input of new discoveries continually cast doubt upon its validity.

The time was past when the aim of university teaching could be confined merely to inculcating a fixed body of knowledge, it had rather to train research workers capable of educating themselves, of analyzing new situations and of finding their own bearings, through the regenerating activity of their own experimental work. None of this could be achieved outside the research process itself and independently of the work actually done in the research laboratories.

However, lack of funds and highly qualified assistance, often make it very difficult to initiate all the students into research, the more so since research could no longer be the exclusive preserve of the university. The setting up of specialized research institutions was becoming essential. But this raised a question : how was research to be tied in and co-ordinated with teaching in general? The experience of Novosibirsk University was of interest in this regard. The university was in a pilot city in the field of scientific innovation, and fruitful co-operation had been established between the university and the research institutes of the Academy of Sciences. In spite of differences in their administrative systems, these institutes co-operated closely with the university in particular by providing research workers to teach there on a part-time basis.

The benefits were obvious. On the one hand, it gave the students full scope for laboratory work. On the other hand,

the students were trained by highly qualified teachers and they were able to move from one institute to another, which gave valuable flexibility to their training.

Finally, the living contact between the university and the other social and industrial institutions gave students a sense of their responsibilities in public life, and this was at least as important as professional training.

The matter of student representation was directly linked to that of social responsibilities. Soviet universities did not consider the problem in isolation but in the context of the multifarious activities that made up university life.

Students took part in all university activities whether it be deciding on teaching methods or working out the content of courses.

At the University of Novosibirsk academic committees made up of students had been set up in each faculty. These committees made recommendations to the university authorities about the effectiveness of the curricula of the seminars and of teaching.

These committees opened up dynamic contact between students and teachers and were found to be much more useful and fertile than purely conventional forms of representation.

The CHAIRMAN, Professor E. LAPALUS, commented that the phrase "university autonomy : links with other universities and with other social institutions" probably required some explanation. Among the problems it covered was the harmonization of the life of different universities and possibly of their specialization, and of the ways of moving from one to the other, etc.

Dr. J. KATZ, *Rector of the Hebrew University of Jerusalem*, did not think that a rector could be judged solely on his qualities as an administrator.

To guard and assert its independence the university should have at its head a person who belonged to it and who was elected by the academic community. This was learnt in the Middle Ages and the idea should be kept and developed.

This could be easily seen, moreover, among students who demonstrated their dissatisfaction when the university had no real expression to its autonomy and fell under the influence of economic or industrial pressure groups.

But university autonomy had its limits, since its funds came from many sources. It could not alone determine its budget. It therefore had to tread a narrow tightrope, not

ignoring sources of income which were its life blood, but still remaining master of itself, that is of its administration and future policy decisions.

Dr. H. Rumpf, *President of the West German Rectors' Conference*, drew attention to the fact that the Scientific Council, which was responsible for making recommendations on university policy, had suggested that the universities should be controlled, not by rectors, but by presidents, who might be businessmen with extensive managerial experience.

However, the new electoral colleges, of which the students formed a part, were ill-disposed to entrust the control of the university to people from outside.

In some cases they had elected a lecturer as president instead of a professor, which was not necessarily a bad thing. At all events a university head was now required to negotiate with a variety of quite different groups and in particular with the political authorities themselves. Apart from the qualities mentioned by some speakers, the head of a university should therefore also possess a certain talent for politics.

Dr L. A. Dorais, *Rector of the University of Quebec, Montreal*, believed that besides modernizing the management of individual universities, it was necessary to set up bodies such as conferences of rectors, the directorates of higher education or interuniversity councils, in order to establish some concordance between the activities of the institutions within a country.

This meant that the autonomy of the university was relative and not absolute. It should be intact from the standpoint of thought and intellectual creation, but it could not remain sealed off when it came to determining objectives and policies. The university could no longer develop in a vacuum, unresponsive to the other social and educational institutions which surrounded it, and which should together follow a policy of concentrated and efficient development.

Dr. Deveze, *of the University of Reims*, stressed that there could be no complete autonomy for the universities since their funds were derived largely from the state, the provinces, the municipalities and from other economic authorities.

University autonomy was not a matter of awarding degrees, initiating courses of study or organizing the appli-

cation of science, it resided in the freedom of the university teacher.

The university could not deliberately disregard the social and economic context within which it was placed and the specific needs of its country, but it should not for all that forget its primary vocation which was the advancement of science in co-operation with the universities of other countries, and the promotion of human progress. The increased number of exchanges between nations made it better able to fulfil its universal mission. Its rôle was not to pass systematic judgement on the society around it, but to show, through the independence of its teachers, a critical and positive freedom.

In France, a country which had long suffered from excessive centralization, the election of Administrative Councils by the whole of the university community ought to bring about progress in autonomy. This was a slow process which had been going on since the enactment of the law creating a new framework for higher education. The representative bodies of the university community were elected jointly by the professors, the academic junior staffs, and the students, who sometimes held as many as 40 per cent of the seats.

Finally the Council for Higher Education and Research, shortly to be set up, would itself be elected by the elected bodies of the universities and should make it possible to provide an even broader basis for the principle of autonomy.

THIRD DISCUSSION SESSION

Reform of university teaching

Student Participation in Determining the Content of Teaching and in Assessing Performance

Rev. F. E. MacGregor, *Rector of the Catholic University of Lima*, retraced the broad lines of the history of the regeneration of university life in the countries of Latin America. The Latin American university was a very special case which did not fit into the classification suggested by Professor Janne at the beginning of his report.

In 1918, just after the Russian Revolution and at a time when the countries of the South American Continent did not have such close relations with the United States as today, a group of students met in Córdoba in Argentina and published what was called "El manifesto de Córdoba".

These students had set out to describe what the rôle of the university in Latin America should be in the future. Two main points emerged from this text : the first defined the university as a community; the second asserted that this community was part of society as a whole and could not exist apart from it.

But the students did not stop at fine words, they made sure they were put into practice. To give substance to the university as a community, they demanded that the decision-making power be shared among the three main constituant groups : the academic staff, the students, and the former students, who were to provide the link with society at large.

Moreover, new relationships grew up between the university and society. Apart from its teaching and research functions, the university now assumed a social function : this was to further the development of society through the education of adults, through vigilant criticism of society and through participation in social and economic life.

The picture which thus emerged of the Latin American university applying these principles in a variety of ways was a profoundly original one, and it could not for instance be regarded as identifiable with the Soviet model or with the North American model.

It was difficult to make an overall assessment of results achieved. There were good universities in Latin America and others less good. One thing did however appear certain after several decades' experience : student participation could not be considered as a panacea for all the ills afflicting the university.

Professor Henri Janne, *Professor at the Free University of Brussels,* explained that he did not claim that all institutions of higher education were covered by the five types described in his report.

It was a matter of historical fact that since the 19th Century these models had had a more or less profound influence on university development. Having said that, the Latin American experiment undoubtedly seemed original and interesting. However, the excellent documentary information sent to Professor Janne in response to his questionnaire dealt mainly with the growth in student numbers, increases in budgets, new areas of specialisation, and newly created institutes. It did not touch upon the problems so interestingly raised by the Reverend MacGregor.

Dr. C. F. Scheffer, *Rector of the Catholic School of Economics, Social Sciences and Law of Tilburg,* said that after the student unrest in the Netherlands in 1969, a University Bill had been drafted. This reform set out the principles of a policy of participation based on equal representation of the various sections of the university community on the University Council. However, students were not satisfied by the draft Bill and they claimed self-management in university administration as well as in the preparation of curricula and in the appraisal of academic performance. The reform envisaged by the students had been christened "project education". It provided for small working groups to be set up with responsibility for organizing university life at all levels and with the academic staff simply active as advisers to them. All traditional forms of appraisal, especially examinations, would be abolished and replaced by the group which would make its own assessments.

Each group would set its own targets, plan its activities and lay down conditions for the awarding of degrees.

It should be added that many members of academic staff supported the idea and were making experiments with them.

In fact such teaching methods raised very serious problems, mainly through the abandonment of any form of individual assessment of performance. It was highly desirable that the General Conference should declare its hostility towards the adoption of any teaching system which did not include individual examinations.

Dr. I. S. Audu, *Vice-Chancellor of Amadu Bello University, Zaria,* believed that each university ought to settle the matter of student participation in the light of its own particular situation. The contageousness of student demands limited the universities' freedom of manœuvre and turned the problem of participation into a general prob'em. A general comment might therefore be to the point : Where a student went up to university for the sake of his own cultural enrichment and intellectual enlightenment, it was quite legitimate that he should participate fully in decisions concerning the teaching he was given; by contrast, if he entered the university for training in the performance of a useful social function, the university had a duty to ensure that the training he received was adequate. If one took medical students as an example, it was obvious that they should not themselves decide upon the content of their course and that it would be a grave social danger to allow them to do so.

Dr. O. M. Osman, *Vice-Chancellor of the University of Khartoum*, wished to comment on the quality of education rather than on its content. Many members of staff stuck closely to their notes during their lectures and did no more than repeat them from year to year. It was very difficult for the administration to form a real assessment of the quality of a teacher. There was a breakdown of communication which should be put right. Students should perhaps be invited more regularly to give their opinion about the teaching they received.

Dr. Lincoln Gordon, *President of The Johns Hopkins University*, returned to the problems of the modernization of university administration, and university autonomy. He emphasized that the boards of trustees of American universities were essentially composed of non-university representatives of public life and the economic world. The system had been criticised as likely to compromise university autonomy, but in the conditions prevailing in the United States it worked well. It was wrong to say that businessmen who were members of university governing bodies took advantage of their position to further their own interest; in many cases they protected the autonomy of the university more effectively than any other body would be capable of doing. Here again, the picture had to be looked at in the light of the cultural and social context of each country. In the United States the system introduced had proved satisfactory.

What did, however, threaten to eat away the real autonomy of the universities was their lack of financial independence. It could be anticipated that in the coming years costs would go up more rapidly than available resources. It was important, therefore, that the universities should manage those resources with maximum efficiency, and modernization of management could be seen as one of the ways of defending autonomy. It was moreover very desirable that the universities should have a completely free hand with part, at least, of their resources, failing which, originality in teaching methods and scientific ideas would be stifled.

Miss Pauline Chao, *Student at Yale University*, insisted that students rejected the idea of the university as a neutral and autonomous community within society. They had come to realize that the university was first and foremost a social institution destined to interact with the community whose resources it used or even exploited. The old idea of the

university as closed community of scholars should be completely revised.

M. G. DAILLANT, *Head of the Research Service, IAU,* referred to the work "Teaching and Learning : An introduction to New Methods and Resources in Higher Education" written as part of the joint Unesco-IAU programme in higher education by Messrs. Norman Mackenzie, Michael Eraut and Hywel C. Jones.

The idea for this study had grown out of a meeting of a group of experts in Paris in 1968. Following the meeting, the Rapporteur, Mr. Mackenzie, had been asked to make a further study taking the discussions of the group as its starting point. The interest of the work stemmed from the fact that it had been prepared by an expert in educational technology but was addressed to non-specialists, that is to say, the ordinary practitioners of university teaching and those concerned with the administration of higher education.

A wide gap had in fact been found to exist between the academic staff as a whole and the specialists involved in pedagogical research. Moreover, the use of new methods very often gave rise to confusion, since there was a temptation to apply them in order to solve some of quantitative problems arising in higher education, without any proper understanding of the benefits to be derived from them.

This was one of the reasons why Mr. Mackenzie made a special study of the teaching objectives to which the new techniques were applicable and of the administrative repercussions of their use on the structure of universities.

New methods could no longer be grafted on to old systems; their introduction reverberated throughout the whole edifice of university administration and thus affected the aims of the university. This gave further food for thought about the objectives of university institutions.

Dr. A. BLAZEJ, *Rector of the Technical University of Bratislava,* spoke of the comprehensive five year training courses for engineers which had been introduced in Czechoslovakia. The first three years were devoted to general education followed by two years of specialized studies centred around problems students would face in industry. It was also essential for this training to be open to graduates already engaged in professional work; this was an important aspect of postgraduate study, to which great attention was being paid

in Czechoslovakia today--there were 48 courses of this type in Bratislava--and to which IAU might also pay special attention.

Dr. A. M. LAZAREV, *Rector of the University of Kishinev,* stressed the importance of evening and correspondence courses in adult university education. Full advantage had not been taken of the wide possibilities they offered because these possibilities were underestimated in many countries. As Professor Janne had said in his report, it was only very recently that they had been given real recognition.

Correspondence and evening courses should in fact be accorded as much respect as traditional education in the faculties. They resulted in a democratization and extension of university education in general. Broad social sectors of the community, which for material or other reasons had previously been unable to follow courses, were now in a position to do so. The democratization of community life made it possible to recruit talent from every strata of society, it was also important to provide the material means for the development of this talent. In addition to this, new prospects were opening up, for the developing countries in particular, in the more rapid training of graduates. Finally, these forms of education brought with them a more rational and effective employment of scientific and teaching staff as well as of material and financial resources of the university for the benefit of the community.

All these ideas had become realities in the Soviet Union, the Socialist countries and in certain other countries. As Professor Janne had pointed out, university training for the adult population enjoyed a very important place in the USSR and had been greatly extended to cover social, economic or technical activities.

In 1969 alone more than 269,000 specialists had received training by evening or correspondence courses in the USSR. During the last ten years, the intelligentsia of Soviet Moldavia had increased by 37,167. The importance of such matters should eventually be reflected in the recommendations of the General Conference.

Dr. E. F. SHEFFIELD, *of the University of Toronto,* mentioned a research programme into the characteristics of good university education which had been undertaken in his university. Initially a questionnaire had been prepared and sent to 7,000 graduates of various faculties in 19 different

universities to collect elements for the definition of a good university teacher. The majority of those replying entered university in 1968, 1963 or 1958, and were able to name two or three excellent teachers, but 40 of them said they had never been fortunate enough to meet one. It was interesting to notice that quite a number of teachers who had enjoyed the sympathy of their students had later played or were still playing important rôles in public life : for example, Dr. Cyril James, Honorary President of IAU, Mr. P. E. Trudeau, Prime Minister of Canada, M. R. Bourassa, Prime Minister of Quebec, or M. Jean-Guy Cardinal, Minister of Education for the province. Twenty four of the teachers named had been asked to write an essay on their conception of education. All their answers were different and this seemed to indicate that there were many ways of teaching well. Every teacher was confronted with a very wide range of minds in his classes and they did not all react in the same way to his teaching. There were various degrees of "compatibility" between teachers and students. This partly explained the long list of good lecturers recorded by the survey. Not all the votes had been cast for a few stars of the educational world. In fact the survey revealed that the signs by which teaching of real merit could be recognized were rather traditional, in other words, competent work and an intelligent attitude towards relations between teacher and student. The survey would be published, in French and English, probably under the titles "Professors as Teachers", "Les professeurs en tant qu'enseignants".

Dr. O. OLIVEIRA, *Executive Secretary of the Council of Brazilian Rectors*, gave information about an experiment in student participation in social life in Brazil with which he had been closely associated.

In 1966 the University Economic Development Movement had been started under the patronage of Roberto Campus, former Ambassador to the United States. Its purpose was to help students establish contact with the national community. One of its enterprises, the Houdon project, deserved particular attention. This involved sending student groups into the remotest areas of Brazil, in particular Amazonia. It was a large-scale operation requiring the movement of between six and seven thousand students twice a year from one end of the country to the other. They travelled together with members of academic staff, went to live for two months in "backward" societies attempting to tackle their problems with the means they had available. Among them were doctors, dentists,

engineers, sociologists, etc. This experiment had brought students to an awareness of their country's problems, of which they had quite often been ignorant. It might further lay the foundations for that "vertical solidarity" which was too often absent in developing societies.

One way of stemming the brain drain, was for the academic staff to be paid at international rates. But the result of this was that their salaries were sometimes 50 times higher than the minimum wage. Such a discrepancy might well create an unbridgeable gap between the various strata of society unless measures were taken to establish genuine communication between them.

Mr. JULIO CÉSAR MARTINEZ, *Student at the Autonomous University of San Domingo,* emphasized that student unrest had become more and more pressing in Latin American universities since the Córdoba Manifesto of 1918. The students, like the teaching and administrative staff, claimed full participation in university governance. But this was a world problem extending far beyond the frontiers of Latin America and there should be a greater student participation in the next General Conference.

Dr. A. GERLO, *Rector of the Free University of Brussels,* referring to Professor Janne's statement, singled out four main principles for university reform : equality of opportunity, guidance, life-long education, and lastly, participation, within which he distinguished between the practice of teaching and research in small groups.

This analysis gave rise to a number of comments.

Firstly, equality of opportunity implied that teaching should not be done in small groups and that the university should give a much bigger place to self-education and to evening or correspondence courses.

Secondly, the development of audio-visual techniques and in particular education by television would be reflected in a recrudescence of *ex cathedra* courses, which had been violently condemned of late.

Thirdly, the claim that all university education should be done through the "project method" advocated by some Dutch students was a retrograde assertion. It amounted to a claim for privileges for those who were able to follow university courses, while ruling out mass education; whereas a

considerable squandering of intellectual capacity was still to be found in many countries.

This was not in any way to misconstrue the often indispensible process of education in small groups. But side by side with this it would be necessary for a long time to come to retain *ex cathedra* teaching, that is to say, the professorial lecture.

The Chairman suggested that the last part of the session be devoted to item 3: the rôle of research for university teachers and students and the place of pedagogical research in the university.

Dr. Fassi Fihri, *Director of the University Centre for Scientific Research of the Mohammed V University, Rabat,* explained that the education and training of high level personnel satisfied the most immediate needs of society. This was why there might be a tendency to consider them as constituting the foremost task of universities and to relegate research to the second rank, if not eliminate it altogether. It was essential for IAU to draw the attention of universities to this danger, since research was a fundamental necessity for professor and student alike.

Nevertheless, a distinction could be made between several kinds of research. There was first "pre-teaching" research, where the professor prepared his lectures and organized the material for presentation to and discussion with his students.

A second kind of research, just as simple as the first, was that pursued as part of a course and often leading to a published work. These two kinds of research were an integral part of education.

However, there were other kinds of research, lengthy and laborious, which were quite unrelated to educational development. These were all very well for universities which had the means to undertake them. But it was questionable whether they had any place in the universities of the developing countries. The universities could, however, contribute to the development of their country through applied research leading to short- and medium-term results. As for pedagogical research, it must be noticed that teaching techniques were at present very complex and that pedagogy had become a science. It was important not so much to have extensive knowledge but to know how to pass it on. In July 1970, a Unesco seminar had been held at Rabat to study techniques and methods of biology teaching in African countries. It was then realized how ill-adapted this teaching was to their national and cultural

conditions not least by the examples used as illustrations in teaching.

In this context, pedagogical research should aim to study the processes of understanding and assimilation peculiar to students in each country with a constant eye to their motivations. Science, being universal, could not be given a national character, but it should be made more accessible to the students as well as to the largest possible section of the population.

Professor H. JANNE, *Honorary Rector of the Free University of Brussels*, considered that even if research should become an activity which improved all teaching in the university, it should not for all that serve as the sole criterion for the appointment of academic staff.

University education required above all that the teacher should have something to say; in short, that he should be a seeker with a creative mind. Better a teacher with a rich culture, even if he were somewhat uncertain in his teaching methods.

Mr. LOUIS JOUGHIN, *of the International Association of University Professors and Lecturers*, referred to a report on college and university administration which had been prepared since 1967 by a group of people representing the Association of Boards of Trustees, the American Council for Education, and the American Association of University Professors. The intention had at first been to draw up a list of responsibilities and rights of members of Boards of Trustees, and of the teaching and administrative staff. But these separate elements had subsequently merged and finally taken on the appearance of one single problem. It had also become clear that it was better to start from the notion of the function to be performed, rather than that of the prerogatives of one group or another. The question then became one of discovering what should be done by each in the preparation and implementation of educational policy. The report finally admitted that higher education had not so far recognized the urgency and acuteness of student problems. In this regard, three comments should be made.

In the first place, the student wanted to be master of his own personal life and would no longer bow to the restricting regulations by which he was hedged in, for example, in halls of residence. This was an established fact and there was no need to discuss it at length.

The second comment concerned the involvement of the student in determining the general policy of the university. Here, the decisive factor should be that of competence and a careful examination should be made of what the student could contribute and what he could not contribute to the management process.

The third point was that young people today were generally more mature and cultivated than their nineteenth century ancestors. It was rather difficult for them to see the university as an autonomous and neutral entity on the fringe of society; but it was at the same time very hard for them to find outlets for commitment to that society. The beginning of a solution to the present difficulties would probably be found if the universities could help students to take an active part in the life of society.

The CHAIRMAN, Professor LAPALUS, closed the discussion and informed the meeting of the great pleasure he had felt in seeing the interest everyone showed in the study of the theme. He thanked his colleagues very warmly for their participation.

CLOSING PLENARY SESSION

Professor C. K. ZURAYK, *President of the Association*, opened the session and asked Professeur Lapalus to comment on the discussions he had chaired.

Professor E. LAPALUS, *Chairman of the discussion session*, said that one of the speakers had suggested that the theme might just as well have been entitled "Society and the Needs of the Contemporary University". This inversion was more than just a humorous quip, for the discussion brought out clearly the dialectical nature of relations between the university and society.

The session had on the whole been well attended and had aroused lively interest. As might have been anticipated, the discussions on student participation had been the most animated. This seemed in fact to reflect a profound and probably positive general need. But behind it lay an enormous variety of situations and interpretations. The solutions chosen varied from country to country as well as from one area of decision-making to another, and it would be vain to imagine

that one single formula could find universal application, regardless of the political, economic, social or cultural context. The debate was therefore far from closed.

The problems of determining social needs and of student guidance had also given rise to interesting discussion. A number of different points of view had been put forward and one particular idea which had emerged was that, although the university could not alone be expected to define the needs of society, it must participate in the process of definition and learn to gain enough credance with the public authorities to be listened to as a trusted adviser.

The question of integrating intermediate vocational training into the university had also demonstrated the extent of differences in situation and point of view, so much so that the same arguments had on occasions been used to justify opposite solutions. This would only come as a surprise if one overlooked the fact that when conditions varied the same objectives might well call for different approaches.

Continuous training and adult education had been recognized as fundamental requirements of contemporary society. But the approaches varied from country to country. In many they as yet constituted a very new field for the universities, but some encouraging experiments had already been made.

It had also been generally agreed, with some shades of opinion, that the university had a critical rôle to play within society, provided that such criticism bore a positive and constructive stamp. Several speakers hoped for mutual recognition by society and by the university of their respective requirements.

The need for and reciprocal character of exchanges had come up again in a quite different connexion : university management. It had been pointed out that although a good teacher was not necessarily a good administrator, a good administrator could not afford to be ignorant of what made the essential stuff of university life; there had therefore to be a constant interaction between teachers and administrators, particularly when management methods were becoming more elaborate and more complex. Modernization of teaching was linked with modernization of management to the extent that the use of new techniques must itself be carefully calculated and managed in the light of objectives. The new techniques, he emphasized, could not be regarded as a panacea for the quantitative problems of higher education. They had valuable qualitative properties of their own which had to be explored and put to good effect within the whole complex of university life.

As for research in teaching methods, this ranged from the teacher's own thinking about his work—and research was then inseparable from the teaching process itself—to systematic studies conducted in specialized institutes. Whatever the approach adopted—which often depended on resources—it seemed that a greater effort had to be made to adapt teaching given to the needs of the students and also, for example, to the special conditions of the developing countries.

On all these points a great need for information had been felt, which IAU, in collaboration with Unesco and other organizations, might usefully help to meet.

The CHAIRMAN thanked Professor LAPALUS warmly for his introduction and opened the general discussion.

Rev. Father J. DUCRUET, *of the Saint Joseph University, Beirut*, observed that there had been no tendency in the discussions to exaggerate the objective nature of the needs of society nor the infallibility of long-term economic and demographic forecasts. These were none the less areas where the universities of certain developing countries were particularly poor, for the only information they had was provided and often oriented by governments. It would therefore be extremely helpful for them to be better documented on what universities in other countries were doing in the way of forecasting needs and adapting their training policies.

Dr. S. SINGH, *Pro-Vice-Chancellor of the University of Delhi*, also insisted upon the importance of information and on the rôle which fell to IAU in the matter. Of course, the Association could not gather exhaustive documentation on all subjects, but it could perhaps, despite the possible disadvantages of the method, send out questionnaires to member universities asking what they were already doing or proposing to do on a number of the important issues mentioned during the discussions. In any case, it was important that the Association give as much help as possible to those of its members interested to know what was going on in other parts of the world.

Dr. F. KALIMUZO, *Vice-Chancellor of Makarere University*, sounded a warning against a certain attitude of demagogy and resignation which could well lead the universities to abandon their responsibilities towards the students.

Dr. N. PUSEY, *President of Harvard University*, made a number of observations about the critical rôle of the university and said that in his opinion it was very difficult to propound any general rules. There were countries where the universities could criticize those responsible for political or economic policy; there were others where they could not do so without imperilling their very existence. Each university must seek its own way in its particular situation.

There was, however, one important point which had not perhaps been stressed sufficiently during the discussions. There had been a tendency to consider the university as a service institution and to disregard the interests of the members of the universities themselves. Now, in developed societies at least, one of the important functions of the university was to provide scholars with propitious surroundings in which to work. It might therefore be hoped that the final report would not altogether overlook the needs of scholars and intellectuals, whose interests had as much claim to be defended as did those of other groups in society.

Mr. R. REFSHAUGE, *of the National University of Australia*, warned that if it was often enough repeated that the university was a community of scholars people would finally come to believe it. Several consequences followed from this idea. If the university was a community dedicated to rationality it did not have to ask itself where an idea came from, it had in the first place to evaluate the idea itself. Moreover, to say that it was a community was to say also that all its members had the right to participate in decision-making. Lastly and above all, the community became a reality only when confidence reigned among the various elements composing it. Teachers should not fear students merely because they were students, nor should students attack teachers simply because they were teachers. Once a dialogue had been established, it was arbitrary to try to confine it to a certain category of questions. Students were warned against intellectual apathy, they were told their minds were more than mere blotting-paper to soak up ideas. But if they were encouraged to show a critical sense inside their own discipline, why should they be prevented from questioning the discipline as such, from examining the value and benefit of including it in the curriculum?

Dr. S. LOPEZ, *President of the University of the Philippines*, wished to speak from experience in favour of student

participation. At all the levels defined by Dr. Aziz – consultation, negotiation, participation – the University of the Philippines had for some time been moving towards co-management. For a year it had had one student, elected by his 20,000 comrades, on its highest governing body, the Council of Regents, which was formed of 12 members. The presence of this student had been a source of great stimulus and he had shown a remarkable sense of responsibility. It was therefore quite unfair to tax students with irresponsibility. It was perhaps taking a risk to admit them to the highest bodies of the university. But was that risk any greater than when businessmen or government representatives were admitted? And if the university wished to be a democratic factor in society, it should not itself remain impervious to democratic procedures.

Dr. W. Bunge, *of the University of the Republic, Montevideo,* explained that he had worked all his life, as a student, young teacher, professor, dean and rector in a university with co-management and he too believed the experiment very positive. The students did indeed show a great sense of responsibility on the Councils, and they had a lot of new ideas. Why should a university be better run by a closed professorial body, working in a vacuum, quietly nurturing its petty or great feuds and friendships, and surviving by co-opting from within its own ranks. It would be objected that the students were not qualified, for instance, to nominate professors. But was there any real certainty that the minister or the bishop, who in some universities was responsible for nominations was any better qualified?

Dr. A. A. Kwapong, *Vice-Chancellor of the University of Ghana,* emphasized that the problem of participation should be set in context. It was in fact a problem which had been discovered in certain parts of the world and then exported to others by television and radio. Some people came close to preaching participation as a sort of panacea for all evils, but it was quite clear that no single formula could suit all universities. The important thing was to establish lines of free and continuous communication between teachers and taught. But while the university was indeed a democratic institution, it was also of necessity an aristocratic institution, for it relied on the competence and knowledge which some of its members possessed in larger measure than others. In the end there could be no golden rule and the essential thing was to recog-

nize that what was good for one university was not necessarily good for all the others.

Dr. J. MATHESON, *Vice-Chancellor of Monash University*, noted that the discussions had centred largely around notions of effectiveness and expediency, and on the whole very little had been said about the notion of morality. It had often been said that the universities were the conscience of society and it would be very sad if they forgot this. The most disappointing feature of contemporary university life was the extent to which some students and even some teachers were prepared to distort the truth when it suited them. And the same was true of the outbreak of violence in the university. For a vice-chancellor to be kicked by a student was not shocking because this was no way for a student to behave towards a vice-chancellor, but much more basically, because it was not the way for one human being to behave towards another human being. This deterioration in the moral climate should be a serious preoccupation for the universities and their International Association. It would be essential for them not to determine their actions and recommendations solely by what was effective, but also by what was fair and right.

The Reverend Father QUILES, *Rector of the University del Salvador, Buenos Aires*, expressed the hope that the final report might include references to the problem of research, and in particular to research applied to the needs of the university's own country. Teams of teachers and students should endeavour to identify the needs and problems of their society and try to find scientific solution to them. That would put life into research, contribute to development and enable students to feel a sense of involvement in socially useful work.

M. A. MPASE, *of Lovanium University, Kinshasa*, believed that the problem of participation was often put wrongly —students' behaviour was not necessarily the same when they were sitting on a Council, where they no doubt were capable of showing understanding and responsibility, as it was when they were face to face with their comrades and had to explain to them decisions which had been taken. There was a danger of their getting carried away by the crowd, or else of perpetual disavowal by the students of their own representatives. But the university could not exist beset by conflicts and perhaps the most important thing was to know

how to difuse them in good time by means of good communications.

The CHAIRMAN asked Professor JANNE, author of the report presented to the Conference, whether he had any general comments to make on the discussions.

Professor H. JANNE, *of the Free University of Brussels,* said that he would merely make one or two personal remarks on points he felt to be of particular importance.

First, participation : it seemed to reflect a profound need in young peope and one that was gradually growing. In the long run, the absence of any participation seemed therefore to be ruled out. But what was equally ruled out was the "one man, one vote" pattern, which had been proposed in Finland. The idea of the university dominated by a majority of the taught was inconceivable. It was all therefore a matter of weighting responsibilities among the various groups, and here the solutions could be just as varied as the situations warranted. The essential thing was to find at the start a formula acceptable to all parties.

Another important point which, for want of time, had not been covered thoroughly in the discussions, was that of the use of new teaching techniques in the university. These could have far-reaching, and at first sight paradoxical effects on the structures of higher education. To take television, for example : it was a decentralizing factor in the sense that it could reach students dispersed in space, but it was also a centralizing factor in the sense that it broadcast from a central point standardized teaching material which was in some ways reminiscent of the professorial lecture. The various computer-based teaching machines, by contrast, were an individualizing factor in education, enabling the student to learn at his own speed. But they were also a centralizing factor since, so long as individual homes did not have the necessary equipment, they brought the students on to the university campus. The proper use and judicious combination of all these methods would thus call for complex organizational measures. In certain respects higher education would become more and more similar to an industry, in the sense that it would have to deal with larger and larger masses and apply increasingly rigorous profitability criteria. The word "industry" might sound a false note in some ears, but what then of the words "craft apprenticeship" which would be quite a good description of what the university was doing today?

For the university to try to respond better to certain specific needs of society in no way meant abdicating its humanist and cultural functions. In any case if it wished to avoid causing deplorable human waste, it must try to inform students better about the nature of their studies and about where they would lead. At present students entered university with only sketchy, haphazard or erroneous ideas of what was in store for them. This situation obviously favoured the upper classes, who had a better knowledge of the rules of the game and of the advantage of various professions. A great deal of effort must therefore be put into guidance. It was the job of the public authorities to make more or less long-term forecasts of employment trends, which was a difficult, though not impossible task (one only had to remember, for instance, that in the educational sphere it was possible to make highly accurate calculations of the number of posts required for a given period). It was up to the professional organizations to make their needs and possibilities better known, and it was the university's business to inform students about the nature of the various courses of study and the aptitudes they called for. This was one of the most important requirements which would have to be met in the coming years.

The CHAIRMAN warmly thanked Professor JANNE and the other speakers warmly, and declared the sessions closed.

REPORT BY Dr. J. F. LEDDY ON THE UNIVERSITY AND THE NEEDS OF CONTEMPORARY SOCIETY

The theme presupposes a clear understanding of the essential nature of the university and of the condition of contemporary society, yet definitions of general acceptability, much less of universal validity, are difficult to formulate and to sustain. Both the university and society have, in recent decades, entered a phase of dynamic and turbulent development which leaves old certainties and settled opinions deeply shaken and even discarded. Many of the issues of the current debate were identified in the sensitive and judicious analysis of Professor Henri Janne whose basic paper was a most helpful point of departure, and of return, in our

discussions, a tactful document which stimulated without discouraging the expression of other opinions.

It is not intended now to offer a full summary of the points which he has made, but rather to attempt a distillation of both his essay and of the wide-ranging comment which it aroused. Such efforts rarely give much general satisfaction, especially in such circumstances as the present when we have considered problems of world-wide extent, in an almost contradictory variety of cultural and political systems, yet with your indulgence, I shall try.

Until a few years ago, the university was on the whole an institution of a settled and known character, passing perhaps through a moderate evolution, gradual and slow-paced, an accepted but not a much noticed feature of the national scene throughout Europe and the Americas. After troubled origins and even violent episodes in the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries, the universities had generally moved into quiet waters, but not into the main stream of national life, occasionally subsiding from tranquillity to stagnation, now and then to be revived by gentle reforms. The prestige of the European prototype was so great that it was closely duplicated without question when higher education began to be promoted on other continents in the nineteenth and twentieth centuries, in much the same spirit of respectful imitation as that which required the Parliamentary Speakers of new African countries to wear the traditional eighteenth century wigs of their English counterparts.

The historical experience of the medieval universities had demonstrated the necessity of cohesion and autonomy, in the defence of academic freedom against threats from outside pressures, and so had led to the development of the theory and practice of community and immunity, as M. Janne neatly expressed it, basic positions still widely held, and regarded, in the view of many, as the essential safeguard of any university. As to its functions, it was the recognized objective of the university to preserve and to transmit knowledge, with a broad universality, an aim which was ultimately augmented in the nineteenth century, with a new dimension, the extension of knowledge through research.

But, lurking in the background, under the thrust of both remote and immediate influences, new and intense pressures were building up which, almost without warning, in the last ten years, with swift and dramatic force, have been shattering the traditional pattern, confronting us with a radical alteration of the university as we had always known it and which we

had assumed would remain relatively unchanged in our lifetime. In retrospect, we can see that some of this was inevitable, given the Industrial Revolution with the resulting need for technological advancement, and the subsequent explosion of knowledge, especially scientific, in the past twenty years. If this was all, the universities would today be facing problems grave enough, troubled by the inadequacy of their own structure and by pressing financial anxieties. But, to compound these problems, we have suddenly been confronted by a flood of students, without precedent in history. There is no member institution in this Association which has not doubled its enrolment in the last decade, and there are many which have tripled or even quadrupled their registration. Moreover, all over the world, there had been a rush to establish new institutions, and at this meeting there are represented scores of universities which did not even exist when we met in Mexico City in 1960.

The cost of all this, in our respective countries, has been crushing, and now leads to further grievous troubles, since, by the time enrolment has doubled, expenses have more than doubled, as inflation moves on for five or six years, and as the universities enter new and expensive professional fields, graduate studies and research projects. It is a common experience that when enrolment has doubled the budget has quadrupled. Yet, while this is happening, the public authority is coping with rising expectations in other sectors of the social domain, for increased welfare, medical services and provision for the aged. It is clear that in many countries university expenses have outpaced the increase in national resources. Therefore, they can be met only if other needs are denied or postponed. And so we are brought face to face with the necessity of determining priorities, about which we will all hear much more in the next few years. To put the ultimate question—for whom shall we provide if we cannot take care of both, as few countries can, the deserving aged or the aspiring young? Which shall prevail, our warm compassion in response to personal indebtedness to our parents for yesterday, or our shared ambition responsive to the hopes of our children for tomorrow?

Such challenges we cannot avoid, and they compel us to consider the basic questions which have haunted us throughout this Conference, the nature of the university and the needs of society. Addressing himself to the first question, M. Janne, adopting an interesting summary proposed by others, has brought to our attention an analytic table,

involving the opinions of such diverse persons as Cardinal Newman, Professors Jaspers and Whitehead, Napoleon and Lenin, which certainly offers a wide option of basic assumptions. Incidentally, it is unlikely that any single declaration of university aims could entirely bridge the gap from Newman to Lenin, but as a cheering example of near success, perhaps from an unlikely source, I venture to quote to you these words from the charter of Trinity College, Dublin, founded in 1591:

"... for the benefit of the whole country, whereby Knowledge, Learning and Civility may be increased to the banishment of barbarism, tumults and disorderly living."

The chief contrasting attitudes can be further summarized with the observation that they divide the available speculation between two poles, on the one hand those propositions which place the accent on the individual and the autonomous university privileges maintained for his protection, and, on the other hand, those theories which emphasize society, compelling the compromise of widely-conflicting claims, for the general good.

Dealing with these essentials, we had much helpful clarification from various sectors, but I would think it obligatory for me to report that, while many of us had no difficulty with the crisp analysis of M. Janne, there were three important interventions which should be disclosed to you, namely :

1. The dissatisfaction of many participants, familiar with North America, who felt that the reference to the distinguished Cambridge philosopher, Whitehead, was not altogether applicable to the United States on the basis of his brief residence, in old age, in Harvard. Long before this, there had been the emergence of a fully-developed concept of the state university, and of the land-grant college, institutions for which the philosophy of Whitehead was a welcome but rather late validation.

2. The protest of representative of certain Socialist countries who accepted the statement that they conceded priority to the initiative of the State, but who considered that the document failed to do full justice to their concern for the intellectual development of the individual.

And,

3. The strong conviction of representatives of various institutions in Latin America that the summary in question

was not altogether fair to the particular experience of that continent in the past fifty years, following the Córdoba Manifesto of 1918, which gave emphatic affirmation to the concept of the university as a community, independent but deeply related to society, even obligated to project itself back into society.

Looking at the question of the essential character of the university, especially from the standpoint of its autonomy or of its subservience to society, there is no point in attempting to gloss over the rift in our membership. There are those, attentive to the record and to experience as they interpret it through history, who argue that there is something special about the university under which it stands somewhat apart from other institutions in society. It has, and must have, its own inner regulation, an autonomy required by the defence which it needs for the pursuit of truth and for its independent criticism of society. And there are others for whom this concept is idle day dreaming, an *élitist* and separatist illusion, remote from reality, for whom the university is just another social institution, important but nonetheless subsidiary, derived from and responsive to society as a whole. Does the university change society—or serve it? Is it the product of its environment or the creator of it? These are not mere debating questions, for they are of immediate practical significance in a variety of ways.

Again and again we encountered the issue—is it the business of the university to strengthen the existing régime, politically and culturally, or to improve it? Looking at it from the standpoint of eager "activists", is the university a "tool" or a "means" for various "ends", or does it have an independent objective of its own, not to be subverted to other aims? These were questions of essential significance in discussing our main theme, against the background of the certainty that the pressure of enrolment would and should increase, since it derives especially from the extension of opportunity to two groups of young people, previously little accommodated in the university, that is, to women and to the children of economically disadvantaged families.

At this point there is some temptation to reverse the title and to begin to fret about the needs of the university, rather than those of society, and indeed some of our delegates did not hesitate to make exactly that transposition in their various interventions. However, the tendency was restrained by the general concession that university developments must be planned in close reference to the evident needs of society.

It is not easy to summarize this aspect of higher education in the world today but one can safely single out three representative systems : the universities of the Soviet Union as an example of central planning in close co-ordination with the authorities of the State; those of the United Kingdom involving a mixture of central planning and of independent or autonomous decisions, and those of the United States still operating largely in a decentralized and relatively uneo-ordinated network, with the decision-making process widely diffused at a variety of public and academic levels.

By reflex, as the financial needs of the universities become more urgent, they will be assessed more closely by citizens resentful of growing taxation, and determined that educational expenditures be fully justified. The taxpayers' "backlash" is not without its salutary aspects since it can force an educational institution to look realistically at its priorities, or lack of them, and to do so in balance with the programmes of many other organizations in society. The needs of society, in any State, are so complex, with social, cultural, economic and political dimensions, that they are not always easily ascertained or specified with much assurance. They can change quickly and abruptly and so they sometimes baffle the academician accustomed to slower and to his mind more rational processes. The needs of society are unlimited, but the available resources are not. And who is to determine what are the justified and not merely the proclaimed needs of society? Answers to that question were as varied as the background of the participants who ranged across the entire spectrum, from total state control to the position that scholars were themselves members of society and of the body politic, and that universities ought to function as the conscience of society. However diverse the conception of the university in this respect, there was large agreement that it did operate in such a way as to bring much change to society, and that it could not be indifferent to that undoubted fact, and to the responsibility which it implied.

What does this mean in a country in which the technical and scientific professions, for example, agriculture, engineering and medicine, are gravely undermanned, while large numbers of students, left to their own choice, are selecting law, commerce and various social studies, such as psychology and sociology? At what point are certain programmes restricted and others enlarged and promoted, with severe limitation on the freedom of the individual student to choose or at any rate to enter his speciality? These are grave and awkward

questions in many countries and in more and more universities, since a considerable part of the recent surge in enrolment is in social studies, to the disappointment and concern of political and academic authorities who have made provision in excess of the demand for pure and applied science and for the related professions. This problem has been dealt with, decisively, in the Soviet Union, and in a few new countries emerging from colonial status. It has yet to be confronted, as it soon will need to be, in many other countries where there continues to be marked reluctance to intervene in what is still regarded as the essential prerogative of the individual student to select his own area of specialization and of future professional activity in accordance with his own wishes and not necessarily with any reference to the apparent or the declared needs of society. This issue will probably provoke most of the controversy which can be expected soon to arise as universities through the world increasingly seek to relate their programmes to the needs of contemporary society.

In the discussion periods, delegates were invited to proceed methodically through ten questions, several of which have now been covered, at least by implication, and several of which stirred so little positive response that we need not deal with them any further here. Among those which did arouse much interest, and to which I have not yet referred, are adult education, technical and junior colleges, participation of students in university administration, and the rôle of research in the university.

a) It was agreed that a flexible modification of selection procedures and admission standards was desirable in coping with late vocations, in arranging programmes of retraining and upgrading as new skills were required and as established functions become obsolete. Several delegates felt that there was a more fundamental problem here and argued that universities should be training more *adaptable* graduates who could cope effectively with the ebb and flow of technical and professional change.

b) It developed that the relation of universities with junior and technical colleges was a matter of concern in many jurisdictions. Should these institutions be integrated with the university or not? Or should they, as in Great Britain, advance to university status and give their own degrees? What was to be done in offsetting the academic snobbery which was sometimes to be observed in the treatment of the staff and the students of these colleges as

compared to the more favourable social and professional standing of university graduates? It was apparent that many speakers were by no means satisfied with the degree of co-operation and mutual support between the technical colleges and the university, and felt that there ought to be a closer integration.

c) As might have been predicted, the issue of student participation in university government and in academic committees provoked a lively and diverse exchange of judgements. For many the issue was settled by the familiar orthodoxy of the concept of the university as a community of students and teachers. For others, things were not that simple, and some speakers suggested that the current trend to greater acceptance of students in administrative and academic committees was ill-judged and unrealistic, given their limited experience, preference for instant solutions, and uncertain sense of responsibility. Both groups agreed that in any case student participation in university government was no panacea, as illustrated by the problems in Latin America after fifty years of such experience. With their notorious modesty, in which they take a certain pride, Canadian delegates refrained from disclosing that the universities of their country have in recent years moved much further in the direction of student representation than nearly all other members of this Association, with the exception of those in Latin America. The Canadian experience is too brief to permit a confident assessment but is generally viewed with satisfaction.

d) The rôle of research in the university was not fully and directly considered, no one being willing to question openly the long accepted view of the essential union of teaching and research within the university. Yet there was obvious a deep uneasiness at the astronomical costs of research, at the awkwardness of establishing the respective priority of pure and applied research. There seemed to be some interest in the decentralization achieved in a number of countries, taking research out of the university and into a variety of special institutions. It would be an irony if Cardinal Newman's notorious rejection of research within the university context should suddenly win favour, but the problems of research are becoming an acute embarrassment to many universities, and raise a major issue suitable for extended review at our next meeting in 1975.

Throughout the plenary and special meetings dealing with the overall theme there was consistently in evidence an

alternating swing of opinion, with the emphasis shifting from society in general to the individual in particular, and back again. Some steadily maintained in their view of the university a preference for interpretation only in terms of society as a whole, while others seemed instinctively to see it always in relation to the individual. Are these two views in conflict? Are there any areas in which they do in fact coincide in both theory and practice? I am reluctant to see a possible compromise where none in fact has been displayed, but it did sometimes appear that the difference was in the angle of vision and not in the essence of the argument.

Although we all talk about the State, and about society, we do not in everyday life deal with men in the mass. We deal only with individuals. When we are concerned about the needs of society, we attempt measures which will solve the problems of individuals. We are all moved by the fraternal spirit, seeing in others the elements of the rational, the dignity and the worth of the human person which we feel entitled to claim for ourselves.

The university must be many things, and must maintain the universality of interest and activity which long ago provided its name. Whatever else it may be, if it is a house of reason and the home of truth, it will be uniquely qualified to advance with benevolence and effectiveness the welfare of contemporary society.

CHAPTER FOUR

THE AFFAIRS OF THE ASSOCIATION

CHAPTER FOUR

THE AFFAIRS OF THE ASSOCIATION

As the supreme governing body of the Association, the Conference reviewed its past activities, defined the general framework of future policies and elected the President and the Administrative Board responsible for putting these policies into effect as far as circumstances permit.

Two plenary sessions were devoted to the affairs of the Association on Thursday, 3 September. The first reviewed activities carried out during the last five years and the second examined the perspectives for the future work of IAU in collaboration with its Associate Members and with Unesco.

On 5 September, the Conference received the reports of the Credentials Committee, the Constitution Committee and the Elections Committee. It then elected the President, the Administrative Board and a new Honorary President; set the date and place for the Sixth General Conference; and formally expressed its appreciation to all those who had contributed to the success of the Montreal meeting.

FIRST PLENARY SESSION

The PRESIDENT opened the session and recalled that it would be concerned principally with an examination of the work carried out during the last five years. He invited the Secretary-General, Mr. Keyes, to introduce the discussion.

Mr. H. M. R. KEYES, *Secretary-General*, recalled that the Administrative Reports covering the five years 1965, 1966, 1967, 1968 and 1969 had been distributed in advance of the Conference and were in the hands of participants.

These reports made no claim to be entertaining reading. Their chief attempt was to be scrupulously exact. Many of the tasks and duties they recorded were repetitive and they could not avoid an element of monotony. However, this monotony was partly deceptive, just as an account of a walk could be deceptive, if it were merely presented as one step after another in an inconsequential and more or less identical series. The Administrative Reports described and counted

the Association's steps over the last five years. In this sense they were pedestrian. But a walk was more than a series of steps. It got you from one place to another. The short introductory notes printed before each annual report sought to correct the tedium of administrative prose by placing the Association's journey in a wider perspective and the present statement would similarly deal with the Association's progress in more general terms and try to assess its present position in a less bureaucratic way.

Participants would be ready to admit that there were no easy criteria for measuring the successes and failures of an organization like IAU. It would be a platitude to say that every attempt at evaluation, whatever the matter under review, involved a strong subjective element. The pessimist would grieve that the bottle in front of him was already half-empty. The optimist would rejoice that there was still half of it left for him to drink. But at least they agreed about the level of wine in the bottle. The sad fact was that even an evaluation of this limited kind was not possible in speaking about IAU.

This put an administrator in a serious difficulty. For there perhaps never had been an age in which he was so condemned to work with the imponderable and the non-measurable—never one in which he had been more readily suspected of being bogus if he could not produce some form of statistical justification of his work. The historian's pen would find innumerable epithets for the second half of the twentieth century. The "Age of Accountancy" might well be one of them. The techniques of economic analysis were now applied to almost every human activity—and there was no need to remind the Conference that university activities were subject to that process, more and more every day. It was therefore necessary to begin with some facts and figures.

The first fact to be recalled was that the Association was now twenty years old. It had been founded at the end of 1950, at a time when universities throughout the world felt the need to redefine their links with each other in order to defend values which they believed to be at the heart of their existence, and which the most murderous war in history had just proved to be so fragile. The task had been to renew freedom of research and intellectual life and to organize mutual help in a devastated world, and the preamble to the Constitution of the Association bore the mark of these preoccupations. They were still much alive, moreover, but others had soon been added and had modified them. No doubt the

first of these—since it had been one of the most powerful factors of the expansion and then of the crisis of universities—had been their rôle in economic growth and development. In 1955, and again in 1960 and in 1965, in Istanbul, Mexico and Tokyo, the General Conferences of the Association had been largely devoted to this subject. There could be no doubt, however, that this link between universities and development had had a greater influence on IAU than simply that of determining the themes of its General Conferences. To put it crudely, the Association had been able to profit from something like a fifteen-year period of university expansion. And, looking back, that expansion had been exempt from really alarming troubles. There had been talk about "explosions" —but only in the figurative sense, for they had been explosions of knowledge and explosions of numbers. The explosions of Molotov cocktails and tear-gas bombs, the barricades and the street-fighting were still to come. Scientific knowledge, growing at a rate which made a single year more productive that whole centuries in previous history, had invaded every sector of production and even day-to-day life in the developed countries, making the scandal of underdevelopment in vast areas of the world more and more shocking. Education —and especially higher education—was held to be the chief long-term remedy for human ills. In those years, the university had seemed to be the key institution for the future. Some had been busy adapting it to new needs; others had sought to defend its traditional mission. But the resultant tensions had stimulated rather than undermined it. Faced though they had been with growing administrative and financial difficulties, universities had been optimistic places, some of them full of a kind of pragmatic confidence in themselves and in their national and international destinies. They were no longer just "guardians of the intellectual life", as the 1950 preamble to the Constitution put it, but the generators of the future.

Whatever virtues the Association itself may have had, it would be hard to deny that it had been greatly helped along by this dynamic force. And here some figures might be worth quoting. Membership of the Association had risen from 110 university institutions in 31 countries at the end of its first year of existence, to 442 in 82 countries at the beginning of its fifteenth, 1965. This might be regarded as the first quantitative index of the Association's success.

In the years since 1965 one might have expected a serious slowing-down in this growth of membership—for these were

the years which had seen a new university crisis. The most spectacular evidence of trouble was the "student revolt", though it was doubtful if that revolt covered all that was at stake. Obviously the Secretariat was not qualified to analyze all the complex causes of the difficult period so many universities had recently gone through, and were still going through. But one could see that as a consequence of its formidable technical potentialities, knowledge had moved away from the world of *truth* into the world of *power*. Everything to do with science and culture had become involved in political struggles, in the widest sense, on both the national and the international level. It was now evident that if science and culture were liberating forces, they could also be employed for domination and exploitation. Universities —usually against their own wishes, be it said—had become in several parts of the world essential cogs in political machines which were reactionary and oppressive. In consequence they were often criticized and attacked in the most virulent way, often by their own professors and students. As centres of knowledge in nearly all countries, everywhere across the planet, they had to defend themselves against those who, openly or insidiously, wished to gain control of them or those who wanted to bring them to a stand-still in order to paralyze the whole social system.

This was a new situation for universities and many of them had been caught unawares. No doubt they had an interest in facing it together, but there was a temptation for them, given their unprecedented internal difficulties, to turn away from international commitments, or at least to reduce their involvement in them. Such a pessimistic result for IAU had fortunately not occurred—though there had been some small signs of it in the last few months. In fact, to go back to the simple quantitative index, universities had continued to join the Association in steady progression. At present, membership was far higher than ever before. From 442 in 82 countries at the beginning of 1965, it had risen to 530 in 103 countries. This was all the more encouraging if one recalled that the Association's founders in 1950 had hoped that it would one day come to have 200 members.

Lastly, the mention of figures called for a reference to the unprecedented concourse of over 500 representatives and observers at the present Conference. This seemed to show that universities were not willing to neglect international co-operation and that they continued to have confidence in the Association as an instrument for that purpose.

The second quantitative index that could be invoked in describing the Association's present state was its budget. As participants were all aware, the bulk of the Association's income came from membership dues. This method of financing had the advantage of guaranteeing its independence and, what was more, guaranteeing it in a way that was clear and obvious to everybody. This was not without importance in the climate of suspicion sometimes found in international organizations. There was often a determined search to find out who was trying to manipulate whom, and with what financial pressures. But at the same time it had to be recognized that the Association's budget was smaller than that of a small department in a small university. During the last five years—putting aside the separately-financed Joint Research Programme with Unesco—the income of IAU had run at about $185,000 a year, including the Unesco subvention of about $15,000 a year. At this level, the financial situation was reasonably stable, but there could be no question of very ambitious programmes. Membership dues were going up on 1 January 1971 and a number of activities could be developed in consequence, but it was not possible to foresee any spectacular expansion based on income from dues.

The last quantitative index to be mentioned was that of the size of the Association's Secretariat. It had always been very small, and it remained very small. At present it consisted of 3 senior staff, 5 junior staff and 4 secretaries—12 persons in all. The Secretariat offices were provided free of charge by Unesco at its Headquarters and the Secretariat both served and benefited from the work of that Organization.

These remarks on the Association's development, membership, finances and staff provided the background for some comments on the work done over the last five years.

The first task had been to develop as efficiently as possible the documentation and information services that the Association had set up at its foundation. Good progress had been made in building up an important library and a wide network of relations which allowed the Secretariat to maintain a Research Service and an Information Service. These were regularly used by university and governmental bodies and individuals and by other organizations, and it could be claimed that recognition of the Association as a central and authoritative source of information about universities across the world was firmly established. Special mention might be made of the services the Secretariat provided for university and government bodies in matters of the recognition, compara-

bility and equivalence of university qualifications. The information, experience and accumulated relationships which the Secretariat had acquired meant that it was now consulted more frequently than in earlier days about the planning and execution of activities undertaken by other organizations. The Conference had already heard about the study being carried out by the International Institute of Educational Planning—this might serve as an example. However, there was still much to be done in this field, since the *rôle* of information and informational techniques was becoming more and more crucial. Many universities, in fact, had discovered that they did not know very much about themselves. They could not improve their functioning until they had studied and analyzed what they already did. Their knowledge of other universities, particularly on the international scale, was even more limited and the value of international co-operation could hardly be judged at present because it had never been properly tried out. As these rather elementary truths were more widely appreciated, reforms, projects, innovations and the actual creation of new institutions were multiplying on all sides. It grew more and more difficult to keep up with these changes, and human memory—on which members of the Secretariat often had to rely in their daily work—was becoming almost a bigger obstacle than amnesia itself. Remarkable progress was being made in the technical storing of information, but these techniques were too expensive for IAU—they were too expensive for many universities, unfortunately—but, as best it could, the Association must foresee using a bigger proportion of its small resources for this type of work. It was essential for everything IAU did—and it was the information services which had enabled IAU to render its biggest actual assistance so far to the university community.

Replying to requests for facts and opinions, however, was not the only way in which IAU diffused the information at its disposal. Much of that information formed the raw material of its publications. These were its quarterly *Bulletin* and its reference works, the *International Handbook of Universities*, of which the fifth edition was in preparation, and its *World List of Universities*, of which the ninth edition had appeared in 1969. Editors and authors were not the best judges of their own work and it was not appropriate for them to analyze the merits and shortcomings of their publications. The Secretariat's belief, however, was that they provided an indispensable—if imperfect- working instrument for those

who wished to have basic information about higher education in the various parts of the world. It seemed fair to add also that the regular compiling, bringing up-to-date and methodical presentation of information concerning higher educational systems which were very diverse in their structures and in the languages they employed represented an extremely heavy task for a very small editorial team. Moreover, the continued evolution and expansion of higher education meant that these tasks would require more and more work and resources.

The Association's publications programme was run as a service, but it should be mentioned that sales of the *Handbook* covered its printing costs.

The Association not only published reference works. It also edited a series of *Papers* (known to members of the Conference since two of them were among its background documents), as well as various studies and reports.

This led to another important area of the Association's activities, one which would probably become more important still. This was its *Studies*, bearing on problems of common interest to universities in various parts of the world. It would be almost ridiculous to stress that there was no lack of such problems, since university life had become problematic in almost all its aspects. Even when one looked at what were apparently the most internal university problems of all—the content of the knowledge and culture that a university disseminated, the people and the means it used for this, the students whom it educated—the problems involved immediately affected its relations with society in general. The result was that universities and governments, even if they wanted to, could not possibly ignore each others' existence and, if for no other reason, systematic co-operation between a university organization like IAU and an intergovernmental organization like Unesco was highly desirable. In fact, the Association collaborated with Unesco in a Joint Research Programme and much of its energies in the last few years had been devoted to this. It should be stressed that Unesco treated the Association as a completely equal partner in this work. The Conference would hear more about it later but a few words should now be said about IAU's own research programme and some of the possibilities now arising in relation to it.

Up to the present, the programme had been mainly linked to the themes of General Conferences, since these Conferences were an essential part of one of the fundamental purposes of the Association : the confrontation of experience and ideas

and the exchange of opinion among university people from all over the world. But the exchange of opinion at a General Conference could hardly be valuable if it were merely impromptu. And it was equally true, alas, that a General Conference could not do research. It was therefore essential for the work of the Conference to be prepared by individuals and groups well in advance. This was what had been done for the two themes discussed in Montreal during the previous few days, and the Conference would be able to judge the results when the rapporteurs presented their reports.

The question arose, however, of whether the Association should not do more in this direction. Should it not make wider use of the most irreplaceable potential at its disposal —the knowledge and intellectual resources of its member institutions? With the co-operation of one or other of them, it might well organize more frequent seminars on particular subjects and thus combine two of the functions which the Association was particularly well-placed to bring together : the study of problems, and direct confrontation between those responsible for university decisions. Far from being a bureaucratic or technocratic apparatus seeking to impose policies or discourage non-conformist views—it was to be hoped it would never degenerate into that—the Association could thus become more than ever before a way of promoting progress and reform. From the Secretariat point of view, at least, this might prove the most useful line of development for IAU.

The last observations might have gone beyond the scope of a Secretariat report, the main purpose of which had been to indicate to the Conference the state and recent work of the Association in terms of its human and financial resources, and to add some comments on the printed reports which had been distributed. The Conference itself and, above all, the Administrative Board it would elect were responsible for planning the future. But such a break in time was an artificial one, in fact, for the day-to-day tasks of the Secretariat in Paris were turned to the future and it was difficult to speak of them without glancing at the horizon. The Secretariat worked in an atmosphere which was both an academic and an international one, and its members naturally had strong feelings that their duties were also a privilege. They would do their work badly if they had no sense of serving the higher causes to which universities, at their best, had always been committed and of which President Zurayk had spoken in his opening address.

The SECRETARY-GENERAL concluded by thanking the President and the Administrative Board for their guidance over the last five years, and the delegates of member institutions for the support given to the Association.

The PRESIDENT thanked the Secretary-General and suggested that the Conference should now hear an account of the activities carried out under the Unesco-IAU Joint Research Programme in Higher Education. He asked Mr. D. J. Aitken, who had served as Secretary of the Joint Steering Committee for the programme, to make this statement.

Mr. D. J. AITKEN, *Executive Secretary*, began by recalling that the Joint Unesco-IAU Research Programme in Higher Education had been in existence for over ten years. When it came into being in 1959, on the initiative of Dr. Jean Baugniet, then President of IAU, and M. René Maheu, now Director-General of Unesco, co-operation between the two organizations was already well established. However, it had become clear to both that in the field of higher education there was a growing number of problems which might more usefully be approached in direct partnership. It was agreed therefore that a Steering Committee, composed of three members appointed by Unesco and three by IAU and with the Director-General of Unesco and the President of IAU as co-chairmen should be responsible for setting up and directing a Joint Research Programme in Higher Education. The object of the programme was to carry out studies in which the resources of an intergovernmental body and those of an academic body could usefully complement each other in enquiring into urgent problems affecting the organization, operation and functions of university institutions in the modern world, and the Steering Committee was authorized to seek special financial support for these enquiries, where appropriate, from private foundations or other private or public bodies. One of the special characteristics of the research programme had been its ability to bring together in an international setting, not only scholars and university administrators from different countries, but also senior governmental officials responsible for formulating policy in matters of higher education.

The first venture under the Joint Research Programme had been an International Study of University Admissions. This was carried out between 1960 and 1962 with generous financial support from the Carnegie Corporation of New York.

The Director of the Study was Dr. Frank Bowles and he was assisted by an international commission of experts which met under the chairmanship of Dr. Zurayk. Its members included scholars and administrators from Brazil, Chile, France, India, Japan, the Soviet Union, the United Kingdom and the United States of America. At the time of its publication in 1963, Dr. Bowles' report was the first of its kind to deal with university admissions in an international setting--it raised and examined many of the problems which confront universities and governments in the 1970's.

The second study--by far the most ambitious to be carried out so far--was an enquiry into higher education and development in South East Asia undertaken between 1961 and 1965. This comparative study of the rôle of universities in nine South East Asian countries was set up with the co-operation of the Ford Foundation which authorized grants in the amount of $534,000 in support of it. The Commission of experts for the study had been chaired by the late Sir John Lockwood (former Vice-Chancellor of the University of London) and included five members from countries in South East Asia (Burma, Malaysia, Philippines, Thailand, Viet-Nam) and four from other parts of the world (Denmark, France, Soviet Union, U.S.A.). The first phase of the work was carried out under the Directorship of Dr. Matta Akrawi, former Rector of the University of Baghdad; he was succeeded by Dr. R. M. Sundrum of the University of Rangoon and then by Mr. Howard Hayden, former head of Unesco's Division of Comparative Education, and author of the final report of the study. This was published in 1967, together with a series of country profiles and the reports of two consultants, one on High Level Manpower in the region by Mr. Guy Hunter, and the other on Language Policy by Dr. Richard Noss. The recommendations of the study, which were addressed to the governments and universities of the region, included one for the establishment in the region of an Institute of Higher Education and Development, and it had been to this that much of the Steering Committee's attention has been directed during the last five years.

Before turning to this, however, Mr. Aitken referred to an exploratory enquiry which had been started at the end of 1964, also with the financial assistance of the Ford Foundation, into the possibilities of developing and strengthening inter-university co-operation within Africa. The initial work was carried out under the direction of Sayed Nasr El Hag Ali, former Vice-Chancellor of the University of Khartoum and,

at the same time, IAU was providing secretariat and advisory services for a preparatory committee of Heads of African universities which was paving the way for the establishment of the Association of African Universities. Following its founding Conference in Rabat in November 1967, the new Association was asked to assume responsibility for the continuation of the work and, with the agreement of the Ford Foundation, funds not expended on the exploratory enquiry were transferred to it as a contribution to the cost of setting up its working programme.

Since 1965 the major preoccupations of the Joint Steering Committee had been first with the recommendation to set up an Institute of Higher Education and Development made by the South East Asia Study, and second with an enquiry into the use of new teaching and learning methods in university institutions. In South East Asia, the Committee launched, in collaboration with the Ford Foundation, a series of exploratory negotiations with universities and governments in the nine countries covered by the study. These led to a decision to convene a conference of university and government representatives from the interested countries. This took place in Singapore in February 1969 under the chairmanship of Dr. Toh Chin Chye, Minister for Science and Technology and Vice-Chancellor of the University of Singapore. The Conference adopted statutes for the Institute and appointed an Interim Committee of Management to arrange for it to be set up in Singapore. Dr. Toh, as Chairman of this Committee, would present a fuller report to the Conference later in the session and the members of the Steering Committee would wish to express their warm appreciation to him for his invaluable personal help and also thank, through him, the Government of Singapore for its readiness to act as host to the Institute and provide facilities for it. No less, would the Committee wish to thank the Ford Foundation for its continued and generous support - for the first six years the Institute would be financed by matching grants from the Ford Foundation and the governments of the South East Asian countries concerned. The thanks of the members of the Committee were due in particular to Dr. George Gant, Special Representative of the Ford Foundation in South East Asia, who had co-operated with them at all stages of the undertaking. Finally, the IAU members of the Committee would wish to thank Mr. Raja Roy Singh, Director of the Unesco Regional Office for Education in Asia, who had represented IAU at meetings of the Interim Committee of Management

when it had been impossible for the President or Secretary-General to attend personally.

The last five years had abounded with new and critical problems for those concerned with higher education. However, the Steering Committee had felt that it should not engage in more than two studies at the same time and choices had therefore had to be made. The Committee came to the conclusion that it might be particularly helpful to examine some of the questions raised by the use of new teaching and learning methods in university institutions. The achievements of those responsible for new developments in educational technology have revealed new and important potentialities, but they still seemed to be viewed with scepticism if not with hostility by large numbers of university teachers—at least in connection with the teaching of their own subjects. The Committee was also aware that attempts to transfer new methods from one university environment to another had sometimes led to quite disastrous results, particularly in the developing countries. As a first step, the Steering Committee set up a small working party to identify some of the major issues. This met in September 1968 under the chairmanship of Professor G. Mialaret, Director of the Psychopedagogical Laboratory of the University of Caen, and its members came from Belgium, Canada, Chile, France, Germany, India, Morocco, Poland, Sweden, United Kingdom. The rapporteur, Mr. Norman MacKenzie, Director of the Centre for Educational Technology in the University of Sussex, was asked by the Steering Committee to undertake a task going well beyond the compilation of a routine report, and to use the general conclusions reached at the meeting as the starting point for a more intensive study. This he did in co-operation with two colleagues in the University of Sussex, Messrs Eraut and Jones, and in consultation with the Committee and the Secretariats of Unesco and IAU. The result was the book entitled *Teaching and Learning, an introduction to new methods and resources in higher education* which had just been published jointly by Unesco and IAU and distributed to all participants. Arrangements had also been made for the publication of a French edition; this had gone to press and would be available shortly. Though the volume dealt with many matters on the frontiers of educational research and development, it was not addressed primarily to the specialist. Placing teaching problems in the broad context of the contemporary university and of changing social environments and demands, the authors had tried to

formulate some of the key questions which should be posed and answered by those concerned with the growing quantitative and qualitative problems of teaching and learning in universities. The Steering Committee hoped in this way to have made a useful and perhaps novel contribution to thinking in this field.

The business of the Steering Committee was of course to look ahead and the publication of the book on teaching and learning methods was not an end in itself. It seemed to the Committee important to follow it by re-examining the rôle of the university teacher in the light of new teaching methods, new university structures and new attitudes to learning. Arrangements had already been made to hold a small seminar on methods and programmes for the improvement of university teaching. This was being organized under the Joint *Research Programme in co-operation* with the University of Amsterdam and would take place at its Institute of Education in November 1970. The majority of participants would be specialists in educational research but the seminar was not being planned as a highly technical meeting. It was seen rather as an occasion for developing a dialogue between the specialists and other university teachers concerned with the need to adjust to new teaching situations arising from recent reforms and changes in university structures.

The Joint Research Programme has thus developed and changed in emphasis over the years. The Steering Committee was deliberately selective in its approach, seeking to concentrate its efforts on topics which it might be of special benefit to examine in an international setting where they could be exposed to the interplay of the critical appraisal of university teachers and administrators and that of senior government and public officials responsible for higher education. It was this which gave the programme its unique character and distinguished its activities from those carried out separately by Unesco on the one hand and IAU on the other.

The PRESIDENT thanked Mr. Aitken and invited Dr. Toh, Vice-Chancellor of the University of Singapore, who had played a particularly active rôle in the establishment of the Institute of Higher Education and Development in South East Asia, to speak about this important undertaking.

Dr. TOH, *Vice-Chancellor of the University of Singapore*, recalled that he had not yet become Vice-Chancellor of his university when Unesco and IAU decided to establish their Joint Steering Committee in 1959 and to include in their

research programme a study of the rôle of institutions of higher education in the development of countries in South East Asia. He had, however, had the pleasure of following the work closely and of being associated with the implementation of the recommendations of the study. Carried out between September 1961 and April 1965, the study had resulted in the publication of three volumes : the Report of the Director; a series of Country Profiles; and High-level Manpower for Development and Language Policy. Language and high-level manpower problems were in fact particularly acute in the countries of South East Asia which belonged to the third world of developing countries. Much had been said about the way in which they might use their intellectual potential to promote their own development and thus become progressively less dependent on the assistance of wealthy countries, and one of the recommendations of the study had been for the creation of an Institute of Higher Education and Development. This proposal had been supported by the Fourth General Conference of IAU in 1965 and by the Conference of Ministers of Education and Ministers responsible for Economic Planning in Asia which Unesco had organized later that year in Bangkok. Following this, a Preparatory Commission was set up in 1968 to study the problems involved in the establishment of an institute of this kind. Following a series of formal and informal enquiries, the Committee concluded that the interest of governments and universities was sufficient to warrant the creation of an institute, and the Government of Singapore acted as host to a conference convened in 1969 to examine the procedures for its establishment. The meeting had been attended by governmental and university representatives from Cambodia, Indonesia, Laos, Malaysia, the Philippines, Thailand, Viet-Nam and Singapore and of Unesco and IAU. ECAFE, FAO, ILO, the Asian Development Bank and Ford Foundation were represented by observers. It was agreed that the purpose of the Institute would be to promote co-operation between universities and governments in seeking solutions to problems affecting the region as a whole, and that it would be particularly concerned with the study of matters affecting the social and economic development of the different countries. The conference set up an Interim Board of Management and authorized it to open negotiations with governments and to prepare for the establishment of the Institute. So far, seven countries had expressed their readiness to participate : Cambodia, Indonesia, Laos, Malaysia, Thailand, Viet-Nam and Singapore. In

April 1970 a meeting of representatives of the governments of these countries and of Unesco, IAU and the Ford Foundation had studied proposals for the structure, administration and formal establishment of the Institute. It would have its headquarters on the campus of the University of Singapore and would be an autonomous institution administered by a Board of Governors comprising representatives of the governments and universities in the interested countries. The meeting formally adopted the constitution of the Institute and, even more important, approved its budget. It was to be financed by contributions from the participating governments and the Ford Foundation had generously agreed to provide a grant in the amount of $136,000 to help support it for the first six years of its existence. The first meeting of the Board of Governors was to take place in Singapore in September, 1970 and it would designate the Director of the Institute and adopt a working programme.

It was thus ten years before the initiative taken by Unesco and IAU began to bear fruit. Such was the rhythm of university life, but though the time may have been long, the seed had not fallen on barrent ground. The undertaking had been a novel experience, involving the establishment of a new form of co-operation between governmental officials and university representatives. Members of the Conference who had a high regard for university autonomy and academic freedom might see this as an attempt to throw the university lambs into the jaws of the bureaucratic wolves. But it was precisely undertakings of this kind that gave developing universities an opportunity to achieve their full significance. The object of the Institute was in no way to compete with or replace other regional bodies, and its founders did not think that the academics would succeed where the politicians had failed, but in South East Asia, universities were almost entirely financed by governments and were very closely related to them. The universities of South East Asia could no doubt make their most useful contribution in the field of international co-operation and relations, for the region was one in which countries had achieved independence quite recently and which still had much to learn in the conduct of their international relations. It was to be hoped that the Institute would devote special attention to the study of economic and social problems confronting the region as a whole, but it would only succeed in its efforts if governmental officials were really aware of the interdependence of their countries within the region, and if university thinking could reveal how to orient the interplay

of political, economic and social forces to the greatest benefit of the region. It had need of "yogis" to study its problems but it also needed "commissars" to act and implement. This was the rôle of governmental officials, for without the commissars all that was left for the yogis was to meditate in the shade of the palm trees. Universities and their members had made studies which had been of considerable assistance to OECD in drawing up guidelines for social and economic development in Europe. With this example in mind, there was no reason why the Institute of Higher Education and Development should not serve as a catalyst for promoting the regional co-operation, which was indispensable for the establishment of lasting peace in a South East Asia still torn by dissension and war.

In conclusion, Dr Toh again expressed his appreciation to Unesco and IAU, the initiators of the Institute.

The PRESIDENT thanked Dr. Toh warmly and asked him to convey the gratitude of the Association to the Government and the University of Singapore. He then called on the representative of Unesco.

Mr. J. HERMAN, *Representative of Unesco*, expressed his agreement with the excellent accounts just given of co-operation between Unesco and IAU. There was therefore no need for him to make a long speech himself. He did, however, wish to stress the importance attached by Unesco to its co-operation with IAU and notably to their work together in the Joint Research Programme. The Programme now seemed to have reached a turning point and careful consideration should be given to its future development. Perhaps, in addition to studies of the type already carried out, it might be possible to develop new forms of systematic and long-term co-operation between the two organizations which would also be of interest to the foundations. However, the Conference was at present making a review of past activities and this was not the moment to raise questions of policy for the future.

The PRESIDENT thanked Mr. Herman and himself reaffirmed the importance that IAU attached to its co-operation with Unesco, particularly in the conduct of the Joint Research Programme. He then opened the general discussion.

M. B. DUCRET, *of the University of Geneva*, was of the opinion that although General Conferences were invaluable

for the wide range of contacts they offered to participants, they were not, by reason of the very large number of participants, well suited to the systematic discussion of reports so rich in content as that of Professor Janne. He hoped that it would not simply be filed away after the Conference but that each university would continue to study and reflect on it. Moreover, the Association should try in future to organize more small meetings : colloquia or seminars.

The Association should also try to devise ways in which the university community as a whole and the different groups composing it could participate more actively in its work. The member universities themselves could take a first step in this direction by systematically informing all their members about the Association and by drawing attention to the useful practical services it placed at their disposal.

M. Bernard Levallois, *of the Catholic Institute of Paris*, welcomed the presence of a small number of students at the Conference and the fact that they had been able to take part in the discussions on the same basis as other delegates. This was a logical consequence of student participation in individual universities. Though the students should not come to constitute a separate category of participants in the General Conference—which was a conference of universities and not of rectors, vice-chancellors, presidents and professors—it was highly desirable for them to be present in larger numbers. And it was with this in mind that the students taking part in the Conference had drawn up the following statement :

"The students present at the Conference are very grateful to the Association for having received them with the delegations of their universities at this Fifth General Conference of IAU. They believe that the presence of students within the delegations of different universities constitutes, at the international level, a welcome corollary of the introduction of student participation in the universities themselves. They consider, however, that the number of students at the present Conference is too small for them to give effective expression to the point of view of students on the different topics of discussion.

The student delegates present at the Conference therefore propose the adoption of the following resolution :

Desirous of increasing student participation at the level of international university co-operation the Conference recommends that member universities should include in their

delegations to IAU meetings student representatives appointed in accordance with the constitutions of the respective universities."

The PRESIDENT recalled that the Association had always sought to co-operate with international student organizations and that they had regularly been invited to appoint observers to the General Conferences. This time, the Administrative Board had also made it possible for member universities to include students in their delegations—this was the logical consequence of the introduction of student participation— but it was, of course, for each university to decide whether or not it wished to make use of this possibility. The Conference had undoubtedly benefited from the presence of students and the other participants had certainly been interested to listen to their observations and the wishes they had expressed.

Mrs. R. A. BELL, *International Federation of University Women*, spoke of some of the activities carried out by her organization, notably the award of postgraduate scholarships. She also drew attention to the very small number of women present at the Conference and to their complete absence from the list of candidates for election to the Administrative Board. Yet women were as "universal" as men and they hoped for greater recognition of their right to participation in the work of international co-operation.

Mr. PAUL B. J. CHU, *of the International Labour Organisation*, remarked that the co-operation between IAU and Unesco illustrated the rich opportunities for collaboration between intergovernmental organizations and university bodies —particularly when directed to the solution of particular problems. One of the important problems now arising was in connection with the need for universities to intensify research and study of labour problems at all levels. This was one field in which ILO and IAU might usefully co-operate.

Dr. D. VANDEPITTE, *Rector of the University of Ghent*, asked whether the Conference would express itself on matters such as the "one man one vote" system or the abolition of all examinations, on which it might be possible to reach a broad measure of agreement. Given the authoritative standing of IAU, such expressions of opinion could be very effective.

Mr. JUSTICE A. S. CHOWDHURY, *Vice-Chancellor of the University of Dacca,* offered his congratulations to the Administrative Board, its Committees and the Secretariat for the work accomplished and expressed the hope that in future member universities could be kept better informed of activities between General Conferences, possibly through regular publications.

The PRESIDENT recalled that IAU published a quarterly *Bulletin* and that members were entitled to receive up to six copies of each issue. It would, however, be desirable for the *Bulletin* to be circulated more extensively than was the case within some universities, and the remarks of Mr. Chowdhury provided an opportunity to urge all universities to see that this was done as effectively as possible.

Dr. E. N. DAFAALLA, *Executive Vice-President of the Association of African Universities,* wished to thank IAU, its President and its Secretariat very warmly for the great help they had given to the creation of the Association of African Universities and for their continued co-operation with it.

The PRESIDENT in turn thanked the Association of African Universities for its co-operation and then asked if the Conference was ready to adopt the Administrative Reports presented by the Secretary-General.

The Conference *adopted* by acclamation the Administrative Reports for the years 1965-1969 as presented by the Secretary-General.

The PRESIDENT expressed the Association's very warm thanks to the Secretariat for the tasks it had accomplished with such limited resources.

SECOND PLENARY SESSION

The PRESIDENT opened the session which was to be devoted to discussion of the perspectives open to IAU in collaboration with its Associate Members and Unesco. The comments and suggestions which participants would wish to make would be of great help to the new Administrative Board which would be responsible for deciding on activities and drawing up the working programmes of IAU for the next five years.

In the past the Board had made a systematic study of the

working programme and had made regular appraisals of different IAU activities in an attempt to give each its appropriate place in the context of a coherent long-term policy. A number of guidelines had been evolved and these had served the Board during the past five years.

First it had been agreed that whatever activities it might undertake, it was essential for IAU to maintain and regularly improve the various practical services it had developed and which constituted an essential infrastructure for all other activities. These were the information, documentation and research services and the publications, as well as the other services, much more difficult to quantify, it was able to provide for the university community by facilitating contacts between member institutions and by stimulating both the spirit and the practice of co-operation. This was one of the tasks in which collaboration with the Associate Members and Unesco constituted an important element, helping IAU to build up a vast network of international contacts and relations which should be systematically strengthened and co-ordinated. In the opinion of the Administrative Board, it was essential to continue this work.

Second, the Board had been of the opinion that IAU should be selective, undertaking only tasks which it was specially qualified to undertake by reason of its universality and non-governmental character.

Third, most members of the Board had considered that the practice of financing its activities from its own resources constituted a guarantee of its independence and integrity. Thus it had until now only sought and accepted outside help for activities falling within the framework of the Joint Research Programme, where the authority of Unesco as a supernational body was felt to constitute an adequate safeguard.

Against this background, the Board, in discussions at its recent meetings, had identified three choices open to IAU.

It could maintain its activities at their present level, but in a rapidly changing world such a policy of deliberate stagnation would almost inevitably lead to regression; this would be to adopt a defeatist attitude and to abdicate in the face of the urgent calls of the time. Alternatively, IAU could develop its present programme and, without radically altering its content or its financial or operational scale, seek to achieve greater effectiveness by rooting the programme more firmly in its university environment. One line of development could be to organize more frequently and systematicaly, and in co-

operation with member universities, colloquia and seminars on some of the many problems faced by universities today. Up to the present, the Board had felt this to be the right course and in consequence had adopted a revised scale of membership dues which would become effective in January 1971. A third possibility would be to seek the resources needed to embark on new types of activity designed to meet the pressing needs of member universities. Such a policy, however, would almost inevitably involve recourse to outside funds, and the Administrative Board in its concern for the independence of the Association had so far been reluctant to embark on it. Nevertheless, one might ask whether the moral authority of IAU was not now sufficiently well established for it to accept —subject to the necessary safeguards—outside funds for projects of its own choice.

After these introductory remarks the PRESIDENT opened the general discussion.

DR. CHOH-MING LI, *Vice-Chancellor of the Chinese University of Hong Kong and President of ASAIHL*, spoke of the efforts made during the past two years by ASAIHL to establish itself more firmly in its member universities, particularly by involving members of academic staff directly in its activities. Previously the Association had been regarded more as a club for university heads which had little contact with the problems of day-to-day university life. To counteract this, the Administrative Board had made it a rule to meet at each of its member universities in turn. It had also decided that when attending ASAIHL seminars members of the Board should be accompanied by members of their academic staff. Finally, and perhaps this was the most important, it had decided to set up regional disciplinary societies. A mathematics society was already in existence and others would be established shortly. These steps had already given a new vitality to ASAIHL and a number of Japanese, Indian and even Australian universities had expressed interest in taking part in its work. Perhaps IAU might in a similar way strengthen its links with regional organizations which might help it to establish itself more firmly in different parts of the world. It was difficult to make precise suggestions, but the matter was one to which the next Administrative Board might wish to devote attention.

Professor E. M. SERGEEV, *Member of the Administrative Board*, said that during the first 20 years of its existence the

Association had been mainly concerned with general problems of higher education, a fact which was illustrated by the choice of themes for the present Conference. Its rôle in clarifying such problems had been extremely valuable for both young and ancient universities alike and the prestige of IAU had grown, as had the number of its members. However, the very general nature of the problems studied had made it impossible to reach conclusions or make recommendations likely to be of direct consequence to individual universities. It seemed that the time had now come to tackle some of the more immediate problems of a concrete nature which affected universities everywhere. Agreement could be reached, for example, on the solution of problems related to the teaching of the exact and natural sciences, quite regardless of ideological differences. IAU was specially well placed to bring together groups of outstanding scholars to draw up curricula and to write textbooks in the fields of physics, chemistry, biology, etc. It would not, of course, be possible to oblige universities to follow the curricula or use the textbooks, but many would probably be glad to do so and a valuable service would thus have been rendered to the university community. And this could be done without involving very great expenditure and the need to seek outside funds, a course which was to be avoided if the independence of the Association was to be preserved. It would also be useful to hold more frequent seminars on problems such as those related to the equivalence of degrees.

Dr. R. W. Crawford, *of the American University of Beirut*, suggested that IAU could make a particularly useful contribution, notably to universities in developing countries, by making a study of the organization, the structure and the objectives of post-graduate study.

Dr. S. Singh, *Pro-Vice-Chancellor of the University of Delhi*, referred to the question of courses of international studies and of internationally acceptable academic standards. These were matters of importance and possibly the Association might devote special attention to the maintenance of standards. It should not seek to exclude the weaker universities, on the contrary it should try to help them. It was of the greatest importance that every effort should be made to ensure that the differences in economic standards between nations, which could in the long run be remedied, should not be allowed to lead to intellectual inequality, which would be very much more serious.

Dr. E. N. DAFAALLA, *Member of the Administrative Board,* recalled that some of the members of the Association found themselves in a far more vulnerable position than the Association itself in their efforts to preserve their autonomy vis-à-vis those who financed them. It would be very helpful if such universities were able to obtain financial support for certain activities and developments through the intermediary of IAU. This presupposed that IAU itself would seek outside funds, but if it took certain precautions it could do so without any real risk for its independence. It seemed that the time had come for it to move in this direction.

Dr. B. MAZAR, *of the Hebrew University of Jerusalem and Member of the Administrative Board,* was of the opinion that IAU should try to give new stimulus to its relations with its member universities, notably by enlarging the quarterly *Bulletin* and by distributing it more widely. He also believed that one of the most urgent problems now facing universities was that of the status and rôle of young university teachers. It would be specially helpful if IAU were to study this matter systematically.

Dr. S. LOPEZ, *President of the University of the Philippines,* said that he was strongly in favour of the presence of a larger number of students, and of women, at General Conferences. The Philippines were perhaps the most advanced country so far as concerned the status of women in universities; they constituted nearly half the teaching staff.

IAU clearly had an important rôle to play in the field of information and documentation, but the new Administrative Board would no doubt also wish to take up the questions of academic standards and of the quality of university teaching which had been raised by a number of speakers. Some universities were under particularly heavy political pressure to lower standards and the authority of IAU could help in their efforts to resist.

Finally, if account was taken of the present rate of university development and of the shortening terms of office of presidents and rectors it might be felt that it would be more appropriate to reduce the period between General Conferences from five to four years.

Dr. KINGMAN BREWSTER, Jr., *President of Yale University and Member of the Administrative Board,* said that a body

such as IAU should take care to set the right pace for its development. There was always a danger in wanting to move ahead too quickly – but there was also a risk in hesitating for too long. These were matters on which the new Administrative Board would find it helpful to sense the feeling of the General Conference. The President had stressed the two most important characteristics of the Association—its universality and its independence as a non-governmental organization. These should certainly be carefully preserved, but the Association should nonetheless try to be of greater practical service to its members. There were three areas in which IAU could be specially effective : the protection of the independence and integrity of its members vis-à-vis their governments and all other outside bodies they were called on to deal with; the promotion of international university co-operation; and what was quite different, the provision of direct assistance, especially administrative, for the development of education. However, the Association did not really dispose of sufficient resources to engage in effective action in these three areas. This was why the new Administrative Board might wish to study the possibility of using articles 5 and 22 of the Constitution which allowed the Board, or the Secretary-General with its consent, to accept subventions and donations for purposes consistent with the objects of the Association. This was undoubtedly a delicate matter and, as the President had said, proper safeguards were indispensable. One very important one would be to stipulate that outside funds could only be accepted by unanimous decision of the Board. Another would be to ensure that the regular operation of the Association was financed from its own resources, outside funds being used only to finance specific activities decided on by IAU itself. A third safeguard would be constituted precisely by IAU retaining its exclusive right of decision, and allowing no benefactor to impose conditions on the use of funds. A fourth might be provided by the diversification of outside sources of support, possibly with a stipulation that no one source should be allowed to supply more than a fixed percentage of the total outside support. A final safeguard might be to rule that activities should only be undertaken at the express request of one or more interested universities.

These ideas were not put forward as an infallible solution, but it was to be hoped that the new Administrative Board would study the matter and seek appropriate ways of securing greater resources for the Association.

Reverend E. B. Rooney, *of Fordham University, New York*, asked for information about the composition and rôle of the Unesco-IAU Joint Steering Committee.

Mr. D. J. Aitken, *Executive Secretary*, recalled that it was composed of three members appointed by Unesco and three appointed by IAU. The co-chairmen of the Committee were the Director-General of Unesco and the President of IAU. The main tasks of the Committee were to select the themes for studies to be made under the Joint Research Programme in Higher Education, and to take decisions with regard to their financing and the practical arrangements for carrying them out.

Dr. J. Baugniet, *Honorary President of IAU*, was of the opinion that IAU should try to ensure that large-scale projects needing financial support from foundations were undertaken within the framework of the Joint Research Programme and thus benefit from the added guarantees of impartiality provided by the presence of Unesco. He believed also that if IAU wished to give help of a more direct kind to member institutions it could, at their request, designate experts and scholars who would be able to help them, but the member universities concerned should themselves make application to foundations or other sources for the necessary financial support.

Rev. H. Carrier, *Rector of the Gregorian University and President of the International Federation of Catholic Universities*, welcomed the excellent co-operation which had developed between his Federation and IAU. He wondered whether IAU might not seek to inform the university world more systematically about the activities of its Associate Members, particularly in the *Bulletin*.

Dr. I. Dogramaci, *President of Hacettepe University, Turkey*, stressed the value of the documentation and information services provided by the Secretariat and expressed the hope that they could be developed as part of a consultative centre accessible to all members. He hoped that seminars, which provided such excellent opportunities for personal contact, could be organized more frequently and that possibly the period between General Conferences could be reduced to four years. He expressed general agreement with the remarks

made by President Brewster on finance, but had some reservations with regard to the use of a rule of unanimity.

Sir CHARLES WILSON, *Principal of the University of Glasgow and Vice-Chairman of the Association of Commonwealth Universities*, referred to the excellent relations between the ACU and IAU and then commented on the possibility of seeking external funds which was raised by President Brewster. This was a matter to be approached with great caution. The Association should seek to develop further the very useful work it had been doing, and might also embark on carefully selected new activities, but its transformation into a body for raising and disbursing funds could lead to a radical change in its status in the university world, and possibly also of its very nature. Decisions of such far-reaching consequence should not be taken without very careful consideration.

Dr. E. C. DEL POZO, *Secretary-General of the Union of Universities of Latin America*, outlined some of the principal aspects of the co-operation between the Union and IAU and then expressed his agreement with the preceding speaker with regard to future policy. IAU had been of great service to the university community, particularly in Latin America where its moral authority and independence were widely recognized. It was to be hoped, therefore, that it would continue the work which it had so far undertaken with such great success. By accepting external funds IAU would expose itself to a serious loss of prestige, and as in any case it could not expect to be in a position to help all its members, it would also risk the negative consequences of internal rivalries. All this would lead to its becoming a very different kind of organization, probably to the detriment of the fulfilment of its true purposes.

Dr. C. RENARD, *President of the Association des Universités partiellement ou entièrement de langue française*, having stressed that co-operation between AUPELF and IAU had become very firmly established, went on to comment on the existence of organizations having regional or linguistic affiliations. It had been suggested that the proliferation of organizations of this kind might be unwise. However, although excessive diversification might be unfortunate, the movement could be seen as part of a general tendency in the world today;

the revival of regionalism was in fact accompanying and forming a counterpart to the strong trend toward universality. Just like the countries of the world, the universities felt the need for intermediate groups to provide added links between individual universities and their world body, IAU. It was important in all this to avoid too great a dispersion of effort and energy, and IAU could play an important rôle in promoting co-ordination. In carrying out this task, IAU might perhaps in future work more systematically, notably by using a method already employed successfully in the past—the organization of regular meetings of the Secretaries-General of the Associate Members.

The PRESIDENT thanked Dr. Renard for this suggestion which he felt sure would be studied by the new Administrative Board. He then invited the representative of Unesco to comment on the work of his organization in the field of higher education.

Mr. J. HERMAN, *Representative of Unesco,* said that he would confine his remarks to several points of information, since it was not the wish of Unesco to intervene directly in the discussion on the future policy of IAU.

Unesco's Division of Higher Education was working at several different levels. It was, for example, responsible for carrying out major theoretical studies on the structure and rôle of higher education in contemporary society. Some studies of this kind would continue to be carried out under the Unesco-IAU Research Programme, but there were so many matters calling urgently for study that there was ample room also for other studies to be undertaken separately by each of the two organizations.

Another of Unesco's preoccupations was with the problem of equivalence. It was collecting information, compiling an international glossary of degrees and diplomas, and studying problems of equivalences in certain selected fields of study. It was sending experts to member states at their request to help them formulate their own policies in matters of equivalence, and was also organizing a series of regional meetings concerned with the drafting of regional agreements on equivalence which might later lead to the conclusion of more comprehensive international agreements.

Unesco was making preparations for the establishment of a European Centre of Documentation on Higher Education and, as members of the Conference were aware, was also undertaking a study of the feasibility of proposals for the

creation of a United Nations university. Finally, Unesco was continuing, on an increased scale, to send experts to Member States to assist them in the organization and reorganization of their systems of higher education.

The Division of Higher Education was not, of course, the only unit in the Secretariat of Unesco to be concerned with university institutions. Various other departments, for example, were concerned with teaching and research in particular subjects and disciplines falling within their competence and all these activities formed part of a co-ordinated whole.

Although the tasks of Unesco and IAU were in many ways complementary, there was also a very large place for co-operation between them and, given the excellent working relations between the two Secretariats, this co-operation would certainly be continued and developed.

Dr. A. E. Sloman, *President of the Standing Conference of Rectors and Vice-Chancellors of the European Universities*, speaking later in the Conference, welcomed the close relations existing between the CRE and IAU. The Standing Conference brought together the heads of many European universities and its modest resources were devoted mainly to activities promoting the exchange of information. Its existence provided opportunities for its members to understand better the "eccentricities" of their respective universities, for them to exchange views and opinions, and no less important, for them to maintain the personal contacts, thus contributing to growth of a living European university community.

Dr. A. D. Dunton, *Vice-President of the Association of Universities and Colleges of Canada*, referred to the remarks of President Brewster and said that on a number of occasions AUCC had accepted outside financial support without endangering its independence. Moreover, many vice-chancellors and presidents taking part in the Conference had long experience of accepting support from outside sources and had proved themselves well able to defend their autonomy. Might not an association of universities also be able to protect its independence?

In closing the discussion, the President thanked those who had taken part, and said that a summary account of it would be prepared by the Secretariat for presentation on the last day of the Conference.

CLOSING SESSION

The PRESIDENT opened the session and proposed that the Conference should hear the report of the Credentials Committee.

REPORT OF THE CREDENTIALS COMMITTEE

Dr. A. E. SLOMAN, *Chairman of the Credentials Committee*, presented its report, stating that on the basis of information placed at its disposal by the Secretary-General, the Committee was able to report that 307 member universities in 81 countries had duly appointed delegates to represent them at the Conference. The Committee was satisfied that the representatives of member institutions, as presented in the provisional list of participants, had been duly nominated according to the regulations.

The eight Associate Members of IAU had also appointed representatives to attend the Conference.

By decision of the Administrative Board, invitations to appoint observers had been extended to a number of international, regional and national bodies concerned with higher education. Five United Nations agencies had accepted invitations, as had nineteen other international and regional bodies. Similar invitations had been accepted by 37 national academic bodies in 16 countries and by four private foundations.

The PRESIDENT thanked Dr. Sloman, and the report of the Credentials Committee was *adopted*.

REPORT OF THE CONSTITUTION COMMITTEE

Dr. J. BAUGNIET, *Chairman of the Constitution Committee*, said that his task was simply to confirm that there had been no proposals to amend the Constitution and to report that no other matter having a bearing on the Constitution had been brought to the attention of the Committee.

ELECTION OF THE PRESIDENT

Dr. KINGMAN BREWSTER, *Chairman of the Elections Committee*, presented the first part of its report concerning nominations for election to the presidency of the Association.

Two nominations had been made in accordance with the procedures : those of Dr. Veli Merikoski, of the University of Helsinki, and of Dr. A.A. Santas, of the University of Buenos Aires, and their names had been duly posted. However, Dr. Santas, in an official communication to the Elections Committee, had since asked for his candidature to be withdrawn, wishing in this way to recognize the eminence of Dr. Merikoski and the value of the continuity which he would be able to bring to the conduct of the affairs of the Association by virtue of his previous membership of the Administrative Board.

The Committee therefore wished formally to recommend the election of Dr. Merikoski.

Dr. Veli Merikoski was elected President of the Association by prolonged acclamation.

The President declared the election and warmly congratulated Dr. Merikoski, stressing that he had already rendered great service to the Association during his long period of office as a member of the Administrative Board.

Dr. Veli Merikoski, *President elect*, thanked the Conference for the confidence it had placed in him. He added that neither President Brewster nor Dr. Zurayk had mentioned what he considered to be one of his most important qualifications —his inability to make long speeches in either English or French. Speaking in a more serious vein, he stressed again his deep appreciation of the honour which had been conferred on him and his country. He would serve the Association to the best of his ability, seeking in all modesty to be worthy of his distinguished predecessors.

He believed personally that one of the most important problems which would confront universities during the coming years was that of their governance. Solutions would have to be found, he believed, that lay between the extremes of "one man one vote" on the one hand, and the continuation of the exclusive privileges of the titular professors on the other. No doubt different solutions would evolve in different situations, but regular exchanges of information would be very useful. But it was not for a President to commit a Board which had not yet been elected. The principle of "one man one vote" would certainly be applied without restriction within the Board, and the President could only hope that he would be able to succeed in using his single vote in such a way that his

administration would be no more severely criticized in 1975 than the Zurayk administration had been criticized by the present Conference.

This speech by the President elect was followed by prolonged applause.

Election of Honorary President

Dr. A. C. Joshi, *Member of the Administrative Board*, recalled the exceptional services of Dr. Zurayk to the Association and spoke of the humanism with which he had worked to create a spirit of living solidarity within the university community. He proposed, therefore, that the Conference should elect him an Honorary President of the Association.

Dr. C. K. Zurayk was elected by prolonged acclamation an Honorary President of the Association.

Report of Sessions on the Affairs of the Association

The President invited M. G. Daillant, on behalf of the Secretariat, to present a short account of the two sessions of the Conference devoted to IAU affairs.

M. G. Daillant, *Head of Research Service, IAU*, recalled that the Conference had first examined the activities carried out by the Association during the five years since the last General Conference, held in Tokyo in 1965. It heard a report by the Secretary-General, Mr. Keyes, on the period and adopted this, together with the Administrative Reports for 1965-1969.

It also heard a report by the Secretary of the Steering Committee for the Joint Unesco-IAU Research Programme in Higher Education, Mr. Aitken, and a statement by Dr. Toh, Vice-Chancellor of the University of Singapore, on the setting up of an Institute of Higher Education and Development in South Eats Asia. The University of Singapore and the Government of Singapore were to act as hosts to the Institute which was being established as a result of an initiative taken by the Joint Steering Committee. The President expressed the Conference's appreciation of the help given by Dr. Toh and by the

Ford Foundation, which would continue to provide generous financial support for the project. The representative of Unesco spoke of his organization's interest in the Joint Research Programme, and briefly mentioned the lines along which Unesco hoped that it would develop and lead to even more systematic co-operation between the two organizations. The President of the Association then stressed the importance which IAU attached to this form of co-operation, and the Conference took note of the reports and statements which had been made.

After reviewing the work of the past five years, the Conference discussed the perspectives open to the Association in collaboration with its Associate Members and with Unesco. This examination of the future was introduced by the President. Basing his remarks on opinions expressed within the Administrative Board during the last five years, he sought to define the choices open to IAU. It could maintain its activities at their present level, but in a rapidly changing world, such a policy of deliberate stagnation would almost inevitably lead to regression. IAU could also develop its present programme and, without radically altering its content or its financial or operational scale, seek to achieve greater effectiveness by rooting the programme more firmly in its university environment. One line of development could be the more frequent and systematic organization, in co-operation with member universities, of colloquia and seminars on some of the many problems faced by universities today. Or, thirdly, it could seek the resources needed to embark on new types of activity designed to meet the pressing needs of member universities. Such a policy, however, would almost inevitably involve recourse to outside funds, and the Administrative Board in its concern for the independence of the Association had so far been reluctant to embark on it. Nevertheless, one might ask whether the moral authority of IAU was not now sufficiently well established for it to accept—subject to the necessary safeguards—outside funds for projects of its own choice.

During the discussion which followed it appeared quickly that there was general agreement on the usefulness of the Association's work to date, on the desirability of continuing it, and, if possible, of developing its various aspects. The suggestion of more frequent colloquia—useful in themselves and likely to strengthen relations between the Association and its members—was well received. The hope was expressed that efforts would be made to make the work of IAU better known to members of all the groups which go to make up the uni-

versity community and to associate them more actively with it. Particular references were made to members of the administrative staff, teching staff--especially its junior members --and students. Speaking on behalf of the students present, one of them expressed their satisfaction at being able to take part in the Conference and their hope that it would recommend that more member institutions include students in their delegations to future General Conferences.

Turning to another topic, a member of the Board suggested that the Association should pay more attention to practical problems of university teaching, for example, international co-operation in the production of textbooks or the development of courses of study in disciplines where this would be appropriate. It was suggested that academic standards constituted another matter which should be of special concern to IAU.

There had also appeared to be general agreement on the desirability of strengthening co-operation with the Associate Members, and the representatives of a number of them took part in the discussion. One method of improving co-ordination would be to arrange regular meetings of their Secretaries-General; this suggestion will be brought to the attention of the new Administrative Board.

The Conference had been more hesitant with regard to really new activities, such as the provision of more direct assistance to member universities asking for it. To do so would require a significant growth in resources and, doubtless, an appeal for outside funds. Several participants considered that there was no reason for continuing not to make use of the provisions of Article 5 of the Constitution, which permit the Administrative Board to accept subventions and donations for purposes which are consistent with the objects of the Association. One member of the Board proposed a list of precise conditions for the application of these provisions which would fully preserve the Association's independence--of which one was that the acceptance of such funds would have to be by unanimous decision of the Board. All these suggestions would be included in the Conference Report and brought to the attention of the new Administrative Board. So too would the reservations expressed by others who feared that recourse to outside support would undermine one of the Association's chief assets--its moral authority.

It had been recognized that responsibility for practical decisions with regard to the Association's future activities and methods of financing them rested with the new Administrative Board, which would take account of the observations made during the Conference.

The representative of Unesco, Mr. Herman, also made a short statement outlining the programme of its Division of Higher Education.

The report of M. Daillant was *adopted* by acclamation.

Reports on the Themes

At the request of the President, Dr. L. Ph. Bonneau and Dr. J. F. Leddy presented their reports of the discussions on International University Co-operation and on the University and the Needs of Contemporary Society.

The text of each of these reports will be found at the end of the chapter on the corresponding theme.

In accordance with the practice established by earlier General Conferences, the Conference did not adopt these reports, but duly received them.

Election of the Administrative Board

The session was resumed in the afternoon and, at the request of the President, Dr. Kingman Brewster, *Chairman of the Elections Committee*, presented the second part of his report concerning the election of the Administrative Board.

He recalled that 29 valid nominations had been received for the total of 28 seats to be filled by members and deputy members. However, before the Elections Committee met to consider its recommendations, the Chairman had been informed that one of the candidates, Dr. G. Wise, had decided to withdraw, believing that this would be in the best interests of the Association. The Chairman of the Committee wished to record his appreciation of this action.

The task of the Committee, in consequence, had been to make recommendations for the choice of 14 of the candidates to be elected as members of the Board and for the remaining 14 to be elected as deputy members. This task had not been easy, for the Constitution and the procedures for elections required the Committee to take account of the geographical and cultural diversity of the Association's membership, as well as of the personal qualifications of individual candidates. It was not, of course, possible for the Committee to add to the list of candidates but, on the other hand, it was not bound by

preferences which may have been expressed for election of candidates as full or as deputy members.

The Elections Committee's recommendations for membership and deputy membership of the Board for the period 1970-73 represented the result of its deliberations. In presenting them to the Conference, the Committee wished to draw attention to the fact that it had experienced particular difficulty in making recommendations for membership from Asia. With only 14 seats to be filled, the Committee had felt that it could not recommend that more than two be occupied by full members from Asia and it had therefore been obliged to make a choice between the candidates from India, Japan and South East Asia. This it regretted deeply and expressed the hope that the new Administrative Board would study the desirability and the possibility of recommending that the next General Conference should slightly enlarge the size of the Administrative Board, thus enabling it to reflect more adequately both the development of IAU itself and the expansion of higher education throughout the world.

The Elections Committee's recommended list of candidates was then put to the vote and adopted by secret ballot. Those elected were :

Members	*Deputy Members*
ABDUL LATIF EL BADRI, President, University of Baghdad.	O. SHEBANI, President, University of Libya.
R. GAUDRY, Rector, University of Montreal.	Rev. Th. M. HESBURGH, President, University of Notre Dame.
JAMES M. HESTER, President, New York University.	J.A.L. MATHESON, Vice-Chancellor, Monash University, Melbourne.
ICHIRO KATO, President, University of Tokyo.	CHO MING LI, Vice-Chancellor, Chinese University of Hong Kong.
A.A. KWAPONG, Vice-Chancellor, University of Ghana.	M. KABIKUNZIRA, Rector, Official University of Bujumbura.
F.E. MACGREGOR, Rector, Catholic University of Peru.	J.O. STEFANI, Rector, Catholic University of Rio Grande do Sul.

GABER GAD ABD EL RAHMAN, Rector, University of Cairo.

J. ROCHE, former Rector, University of Paris.

W. RODEWALD, Pro-Rector, University of Warsaw.

K.L. SHRIMALI, Vice-Chancellor, Banaras Hindu University.

*A.E. SLOMAN, Vice-Chancellor, University of Essex.

I.M. TERNOV, Pro-Rector, University of Moscow.

C. TUNNERMANN BERNHEIM, Rector, National Autonomous University of Nicaragua.

W. ZIMMERLI, former Rector, University of Göttingen.

O.S. OSMAN, Vice-Chancellor, University of Khartoum.

T. CARNACINI, Rector, University of Bologna.

B. SVESTKA, Rector, Charles University, Prague.

S. LOPEZ, President, University of the Philippines.

S. SORENSEN, Rector, University of Aarhus.

K.-H. WIRZBERGER, Rector, Humboldt University, Berlin.

A.A. SANTAS, Rector, University of Buenos-Aires.

P. MARMIER, Rector, Federal Institute of Technology, Zürich.

* In the course of a meeting of the newly-elected Administrative Board immediately after the Conference, Dr. A.E. Sloman was elected Vice-President of IAU, 1970-75.

DATE AND PLACE OF SIXTH GENERAL CONFERENCE

The PRESIDENT stated that the Administrative Board had been informed at its 1969 meeting that the University of Moscow would be happy to act as host to the Sixth General Conference. He then called on Professor Sergeev.

Professor E. M. SERGEEV, *first Pro-Rector of the University of Moscow*, proposed that the Sixth General Conference should take place in Moscow in 1975 at the Lomonosov State University. It had previously acted as host to many international conferences and was willing to do all within its power to ensure the success of the Conference. He and his colleagues very much hoped that the invitation would be accepted.

Dr. A. E. SLOMAN, *Vice-Chancellor of the University of Essex and Member of the Administrative Board*, said that, seen in the light of the geographic distribution of previous General Conferences, Professor Sergeev's invitation appeared to be particularly welcome. He expressed his personal hope that it would also allow IAU to remain in close touch with Professor Sergeev; as a member of the Board he had always striven to promote the objectives of the Association and had earned the respect and affection of his colleagues. Dr. Sloman formally proposed the acceptance of the invitation.

Dr. H. RUMPF, *President of the West German Rectors' Conference*, thanked the University of Moscow for its invitation which could not but help to strengthen further the international community of scholars and scientists, a task which was of great importance in a world still divided politically.

It was decided by prolonged acclamation to hold the Sixth General Conference in Moscow in 1975.

Before closing the Conference, the PRESIDENT recalled its great debt of gratitude to its Canadian hosts and proposed the adoption of the following text:

> The Conference expresses its deep appreciation to:
> The Governor General of Canada, H.E. the Right Hon. Roland Michener;
> The Government of Canada, and in particular the Minister of Industry and Commerce, Mr. Jean-Luc Pépin;

The Government of the Province of Quebec, and notably its Prime Minister, M. Robert Bourassa, and its Minister of Education, M. Guy Saint-Pierre;
The Association of Universities and Colleges of Canada and the Conference of Rectors and Principals of the Province of Quebec, and notably the President of these two bodies, Dr. Roger Gaudry;
The Host Committee and its Co-Presidents, Dr. Roger Gaudry, Rector of the University of Montreal, Dr. Rocke Robertson, Principal of McGill University, and his successor, Dr. Robert Bell;
The Canadian Organizing Committee: its Chairman, Dr. Lucien Piché, Vice-Rector of the University of Montreal, and its Vice-Chairman, Mr. C. MacDougall, Registrar of McGill University;
The Universities of Montreal which had given receptions in honour of participants and notably Dr. R. Bell, Principal of McGill University, Dr. Léon Dorais, Rector of l'Université du Québec in Montreal, and Dr. O'Brien, Principal of Sir George Williams University;
The Ladies Committee under the chairmanship of Madame Lucien Piché;
The Interpreters;
The technicians and all those who had contributed to the smooth running of the Conference;
The members of the Secretariat of IAU.

This motion was *adopted* by acclamation.

Dr. Jean ROCHE, *Vice-President of IAU*, thanked President Zurayk warmly for the way in which he had directed the work of the Conference after presiding over the affairs of the Association for five years. This period had been one of crisis for universities everywhere and might have had serious consequences for the Association. In fact, the Association had met at Montreal stronger than ever before, and certainly more closely linked with its Associate Members and with Unesco than it had been at the time of the Tokyo General Conference. For this success it owed much to the competence and devotion of its President.

The PRESIDENT thanked all his colleagues, saying that the success of the Conference had been due to the co-operation and the team spirit of a large number of individuals. Its great achievement had been to strengthen the sense of inter-univer-

sity solidarity and to have contributed to the growth of a world-wide university community, indispensable for the development of a world community based on mutual respect, human dignity and the solidarity of all peoples.

Amid prolonged applause, the PRESIDENT declared the Fifth General Conference of the Association closed.

APPENDIX I

LIST OF MEMBERS OF THE INTERNATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF UNIVERSITIES

JANUARY 1971

APPENDIX I

LIST OF MEMBERS OF THE INTERNATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF UNIVERSITIES (JANUARY 1971)

ALGERIA

Université d'Alger.

ARGENTINA

Universidad de Buenos Aires.
Universidad nacional de Córdoba.
Universidad nacional del Nordeste.
Universidad nacional de Tucumán.
Pontificia Universidad católica argentina.
Universidad católica de Córdoba.
Universidad del Salvador.

AUSTRALIA

University of Adelaide.
Australian National University.
The Flinders University of South Australia.
University of Melbourne.
Monash University.
University of New England.
University of New South Wales.
University of Newcastle.
University of Queensland.
University of Sydney.
University of Tasmania.
University of Western Australia.

AUSTRIA

Universität Wien.

BELGIUM

Université libre de Bruxelles.
Vrije Universiteit te Brussel.
Rijksuniversiteit te Gent.
Université de Liège.
Katholieke Universiteit te Leuven.
Université catholique de Louvain.
Centre universitaire de l'Etat à Mons.
Faculté polytechnique de Mons.
Facultés universitaires Notre-Dame de la Paix, Namur.
Faculté des Sciences agronomiques de l'Etat à Gembloux.

BOLIVIA

Universidad mayor, real y pontificia de San Francisco Xavier de Chuquisaca.

BRAZIL

Universidade federal do Paraná.
Pontifícia Universidade católica do Rio Grande do Sul.
Pontifícia Universidade católica do Rio de Janeiro.
Universidade federal do Rio de Janeiro.
Universidade de São Paulo.

BULGARIA

Sofiiski Universitet Kliment Ohridski.

BURUNDI

Université officielle de Bujumbura.

CAMEROUN

Université fédérale du Cameroun.

CANADA

University of Alberta.
Bishop's University.
University of British Columbia.
Brock University.
University of Calgary.
Carleton University.
Dalhousie University.
Lakehead University.
Université Laval.
University of Lethbridge.
McGill University.
McMaster University.
University of Manitoba.
Memorial University of Newfoundland.
Université de Moncton.
Université de Montréal.
Mount Allison University.
Mount Saint Vincent University.
University of New Brunswick.
Université d'Ottawa.
Université du Québec.
University of Prince Edward Island.
Queen's University at Kingston.
St. Francis Xavier University.
St. Mary's University.
University of Saskatchewan.
Université de Sherbrooke.
Simon Fraser University.
Sir George Williams University.
University of Toronto.
Trent University.
University of Victoria.
University of Western Ontario.
University of Windsor.
University of Winnipeg.
York University.

CEYLON

University of Ceylon.

CHILE

Pontificia Universidad católica de Chile.
Universidad de Chile.
Universidad de Concepción.

CHINA (Taiwan)

National Taiwan University.

COLOMBIA

Universidad nacional de Colombia.

Pontificia Universidad Javeriana.
Universidad de los Andes.
Universidad pontificia bolivariana.

Congo (Democratic Republic)

Université Lovanium.
Université officielle du Congo.

Costa Rica

Universidad de Costa Rica.

Cuba

Universidad de La Habana.

Czechoslovakia

Komenského universita.
Universita Karlova.
Ceské vysoké uceni technické.

Denmark

Aarhus Universitet.
Kobenhavns Universitet.
Den Polytekniske Laereanstalt, Danmarks Teknishe Hojskole.
Den Kongelige Veterinaer-og Landbohojskole.

Dominican Republic

Universidad autónoma de Santo Domingo.

Ecuador

Pontificia Universidad católica del Ecuador.
Universidad de Guayaquil.

El Salvador

Universidad de El Salvador.

Ethiopia

Haile Sellassie I University.

Finland

Abo Akademi.
Helsingin Yliopisto.
Oulun Yliopisto.
Tampereen Yliopisto.
Turun Yliopisto.

France

Université d'Aix-Marseille.
Facultés catholiques de l'Ouest.
Université de Besançon.
Université de Bordeaux.
Université de Caen.
Université de Clermont-Ferrand.
Université de Dijon.
Université de Grenoble.
Université de Lille.
Facultés catholiques de Lille.
Université de Lyon.
Facultés catholiques de Lyon.
Université de Montpellier.
Université de Nancy.
Université d'Orléans-Tours.
Université de Paris.
Institut catholique de Paris.
Université de Poitiers.
Université de Reims.
Université de Rennes.
Université de Strasbourg.
Université de Toulouse.
Institut catholique de Toulouse.
Ecole nationale supérieure agronomique de Thiverval-Grignon.

Institut national agronomique.
Ecole centrale des Arts et Manufactures.
Ecole normale supérieure.
Ecole nationale vétérinaire de Toulouse.

GERMANY
(Democratic Republic)

Humboldt-Universität zu Berlin.
Ernst-Moritz-Arndt Universität Greifswald.
Martin-Luther Universität Halle-Wittenberg.
Friedrich-Schiller-Universität Jena.
Karl-Marx Universität Leipzig.
Universität Rostock.
Technische Universität Dresden.
Technische Hochschule Ilmenau.
Technische Hochschule Karl-Marx-Stadt.
Technische Hochschule « Otto von Guericke », Magdeburg.
Bergakademie Freiberg.

GERMANY
(Federal Republic)

Freie Universität Berlin.
Ruhr-Universität Bochum.
Rheinische Friedrich-Wilhelms-Universität Bonn.
Universität Düsseldorf.
Friedrich-Alexander-Universität Erlangen-Nürnberg.
Johann Wolfgang Goethe-Universität Frankfurt.
Albert-Ludwigs-Universität Freiburg.
Justus-Liebig-Universität Giessen.
Georg-August-Universität Göttingen.
Universität Hamburg.
Ruprecht-Karl-Universität Heidelberg.
Universität Hohenheim.
Universität Karlsruhe.
Christian-Albrechts-Universität, Kiel.
Universität zu Köln.
Universität Konstanz.
Johannes-Gutenberg-Universität Mainz.
Universität Mannheim.
Philipps-Universität Marburg.
Ludwig-Maximilians-Universität München.
Westfälische Wilhelms-Universität Münster.
Universität Regensburg.
Universität des Saarlandes.
Universität Stuttgart.
Eberhard-Karls-Universität-Tübingen.
Bayerische Julius-Maximilians Universität, Würzburg.
Rheinisch-Westfälische Technische Hochschule, Aachen.
Technische Universität Berlin.
Technische Universität Carolo Wilhelmina zu Braunschweig.
Technische Universität Clausthal.
Technische Hochschule Darmstadt.
Technische Universität München.

GHANA

University of Ghana.
University of Science and Technology, Kumasi.

GREECE

Athinissin Ethnikon kai Kapodistriakon Panepistimion.
Aristoteleion Panepistimion Thessalonikis.
Ethnikon Metsovion Polytechneion.

GUATEMALA

Universidad de San Carlos de Guatemala.

GUYANA

University of Guyana.

HONDURAS

Universidad nacional autónoma de Honduras.

HONG KONG

University of Hong Kong.
The Chinese University of Hong Kong.

HUNGARY

Eötvös Loránd Tudományegyetem.
Nehézipari Müszaki Egyetem.

ICELAND

Háskóli Islands.

INDIA

Banaras Hindu University.
University of Bombay.
University of Calcutta.
University of Delhi.
University of Madras.
Osmania University.
Panjab University.

INDONESIA

Universitas Airlangga.
Universitas Indonesia.

IRAN

Dânechgâhé Pahlavi Shiraz.
Dâ.echgâhé Mashhad.
Dânechgâhé Tabriz.
Dânechgâhé Tehran.

IRAQ

University of Baghdad.
University of Basrah.
University of Mosul.

IRELAND

University of Dublin, Trinity College.
National University of Ireland.

ISRAEL

The Hebrew University of Jerusalem.
Tel-Aviv University.
University Bar-Ilan.
Technion-Israel Institute of Technology.

ITALY

Università degli Studi di Bari.
Università degli Studi di Bologna.
Università degli Studi di Cagliari.
Università degli Studi di Catania.
Università degli Studi di Ferrara.
Università degli Studi di Firenze.
Università degli Studi di Genova.
Università degli Studi di Macerata.
Università cattolica del Sacro Cuore.
Università degli Studi di Milano.
Università degli Studi di Modena.
Università degli Studi di Napoli.
Università degli Studi di Padova.
Università degli Studi di Parma.
Università degli Studi di Pavia.
Università degli Studi di Perugia.
Università degli Studi di Pisa.
Università degli Studi di Roma.
Università degli Studi di Sassari.
Università degli Studi di Torino.
Università degli Studi di Trieste.
Università degli Studi di Venezia.
Politecnico di Milano.
Politecnico di Torino.

IVORY COAST

Université d'Abidjan.

JAMAICA

University of the West Indies.

JAPAN

Aoyama Gakuin Daigaku.
Chuo Daigaku.
Doshisha Daigaku.
Gakushuin Daigaku.
Hiroshima Daigaku.
Hitotsubashi Daigaku.
Hokkaido Daigaku.
Hosei Daigaku.
Jochi Daigaku.
Kagoshima Daigaku.
Kanazawa Daigaku.
Kansai Daigaku.
Kansei Gakuin Daigaku.
Keio Gijuku Daigaku.
Kobe Daigaku.
Kokugakuin Daigaku.
Kokusai Kirisutokyo Daigaku.
Komazawa Daigaku.
Konan Daigaku.
Kumamoto Daigaku.
Kyoto Daigaku.
Kyushu Daigaku.
Meiji Daigaku.
Nagasaki Daigaku.
Nagoya Daigaku.
Nara Joshi Daigaku.
Nihon Daigaku.
Nihon Joshi Daigaku.
Niigata Daigaku.
Nippon Ika Daigaku.
Ochanomizu Joshi Daigaku.
Okayama Daigaku.
Osaka Daigaku.
Osaka Shiritsu Daigaku.
Rikkyo Daigaku.
Ritsumeikan Daigaku.
Ryukoku Daigaku.

Seishin Joshi Daigaku.
Senshu Daigaku.
Shinshu Daigaku.
Tohoku Daigaku.
Tohoku Gakuin Daigaku.
Tokyo Daigaku.
Tokyo Jikei-kai Ika Daigaku.
Tokyo Joshi Daigaku.
Tokyo Kogyo Daigaku.
Tokyo Kyoiku Daigaku.
Tokyo Rika Daigaku.
Tokyo Toritsu Daigaku.
Tsuda Juku Daigaku.
Waseda Daigaku.

JORDAN

University of Jordan.

KENYA

University of Nairobi.

KOREA
(Republic of)

Seoul National University.

KUWAIT

Kuwait University.

LEBANON

American University of Beirut.
Arab University of Beirut.
Université libanaise.
Université Saint-Joseph.

LIBERIA

University of Liberia.

LIBYA

University of Libya.

MALAGASY REPUBLIC

Université de Madagascar.

MALAWI

University of Malawi.

MALAYSIA

University of Malaya.

MALTA

Royal University of Malta.

MEXICO

Universidad autónoma del Estado de México.
Universidad autónoma de Sinaloa.
Universidad de Guadalajara.
Universidad Iberoamericana.
Universidad nacional autónoma de México.
Universidad de Nuevo León.
Universidad de Sonora.
Universidad Veracruzana.
Instituto politécnico nacional.
Instituto tecnológico y de Estudios superiores de Monterrey.

MOROCCO

Université Mohammed V.

NETHERLANDS

Universiteit van Amsterdam.
Vrije Universiteit te Amsterdam.
Rijksuniversiteit te Groningen

Rijksuniversiteit te Leiden.
Katholieke Universiteit te Nijmegen.
Rijksuniversiteit te Utrecht.
Technische Hogeschool te Delft.
Technische Hogeschool te Eindhoven.
Landbouwhogeschool te Wageningen.
Katholieke Hogeschool te Tiburg.
Nederlandse Economische Hogeschool te Rotterdam.
Institute of Social Studies, The Hague.

NEW ZEALAND

University of Auckland.

NICARAGUA

Universidad nacional autónoma de Nicaragua.

NIGERIA

Ahmadu Bello University.
University of Ibadan.
University of Ife.
University of Lagos.

NORWAY

Universitetet i Bergen.
Universitetet i Oslo.

PAKISTAN

University of Dacca.
University of Peshawar.
University of the Punjab.
University of Rajshahi.
University of Sind.
West Pakistan University of Engineering and Technology.

PANAMA

Universidad de Panamá.

PARAGUAY

Universidad católica Nuestra Señora de la Asunción.

PERU

Universidad nacional mayor de San Marcos.
Pontificia Universidad católica del Perú.

PHILIPPINES

Centro Escolar University.
De La Salle College.
Far Eastern University.
Foundation University.
National University.
Philippine Women's University.
Saint Louis University.
Silliman University.
University of the East.
University of Manila.
University of the Philippines.
University of San Carlos.
University of Santo Tomas.

POLAND

Uniwersytet Jagiellónski.
Katolicki Uniwersytet Lubelski.
Uniwersytet Warszawski.

Uniwersytet Wroclawski im. Boleslawa Bieruta.
Politechnica Gdánska.
Wyzsza Szkola Rolnicza, Poznan.

PORTUGAL

Universidade de Coimbra.
Universidade de Lisboa.
Universidade do Porto.
Universidade técnica de Lisboa.

RHODESIA

University College of Rhodesia.

ROMANIA

Universitatea Babes-Bolyai.
Universitatea Bucuresti.
Universitatea Al. I. Cuza.
Institutul Politehnic, Bucuresti.

RWANDA

Université nationale du Rwanda.

SAUDI ARABIA

University of Riyadh.

SENEGAL

Université de Dakar.

SIERRA LEONE

University of Sierra Leone.

SINGAPORE

Nanyang University.
University of Singapore.

SOUTH AFRICA

University of Cape Town.

SPAIN

Universidad de Barcelona.
Universidad de Madrid.
Universidad de Navarra.
Universidad de Salamanca.
Universidad de Santiago de Compostela.
Escuela técnica superior de Ingenieros industriales de Bilbao.
Escuela técnica superior de Ingenieros industriales de Madrid.

SUDAN

University of Khartoum.

SWEDEN

Lunds Universitet.
Uppsala Universitet.

SWITZERLAND

Université de Genève.
Ecole polytechnique fédérale de Lausanne.
Université de Neuchâtel.
Eidgenössische Technische Höchschule Zürich.

SYRIA

University of Damascus.

TANZANIA

University of Dar es Salaam.

THAILAND

Chulalongkorn University.

TUNISIA

Université de Tunis.

TURKEY

Ankara üniversitesi.
Ege üniversitesi.
Hacettepe üniversitesi.
Istanbul üniversitesi.
Istanbul Teknik üniversitesi.

UGANDA

Makerere University.

UNION OF SOVIET SOCIALIST REPUBLICS

Belorusskij gosudarstvennyj universitet im. V.I. Lenina.
Irkutskij gosudarstvennyj universitet im. A.A. Zdanova
Kazahskij gosudarstvennyj universitet im. S.M. Kirova.
Kazanskij ordena Trudovogo Krasnogo Znameni gosudarstvennyj universitet im. V.I. Ul'janova (Lenina).
Kievskij gosudarstvennyj universitet im. T.G. Sevcenko.
Moldavskij gosudartsvennyj universitet.
Leningradskij ordena Lenina gosudarstvennyj universitet im. A.A. Zdanova.
Moskovskij ordena Lenina i ordena Trudovogo Krasnogo Znameni gosudarstvennyj universitet im. M.V. Lomonosova.
Novosibirskij gosudarstvennyj universitet.
Taskentskij gosudarstvennyj universitet im. V.I. Lenina.
Universitet Druzby Narodov im. Patrisa Lumumby.

UNITED ARAB REPUBLIC

Ain Shams University.
Al-Azhar University.
Alexandria University.
Assiut University.
Cairo University.
The American University in Cairo.

UNITED KINGDOM

University of Aberdeen.
The Queen's University of Belfast.
University of Birmingham.
University of Bradford.
University of Bristol.
University of Cambridge.
University of Durham.
University of Essex.
University of Exeter.
University of Glasgow.
University of Hull.
University of Leeds.
University of Leicester.
University of Liverpool.
University of London.
University of Manchester.
University of Oxford.

University of Reading.
University of Salford.
University of Sheffield.
University of Strathclyde.
University of Sussex.
University of Wales.
University of Warwick.

United States of America

University of Alabama.
University of Arizona.
University of Arkansas.
Boston College.
Brown University.
University of California.
California Institute of Technology.
Catholic University of America.
University of Chicago.
University of Cincinnati.
The City University of New York.
The Claremont Colleges.
Clark University.
University of Colorado.
Columbia University.
Cornell University.
Creighton University.
Dartmouth College.
University of Detroit.
Duke University.
Emory University.
Fordham University.
Georgetown University.
University of Georgia.
Harvard University.
University of Hawaii.
Howard University.
University of Illinois.
Indiana University.
Johns Hopkins University.
University of Kansas.
Kansas State University of Agriculture and Applied Science.
Louisiana State University.
Miami University.
Michigan State University.
University of Michigan.
University of Minnesota.
University of Mississippi.
University of Missouri.
University of New Hampshire.
New York University.
University of North Carolina.
University of North Dakota.
Northwestern University.
University of Notre Dame.
Ohio State University.
University of Oklahoma.
University of Pennsylvania.
University of Pittsburgh.
Princeton University.
University of Puerto Rico.
Purdue University.
University of Rhode Island.
Rice University.
University of Rochester.
Rockfeller University.
Rutgers—The State University.
St. John's University.
Saint Louis University.
Seattle University.
University of South Carolina.
Southern Illinois University.
Stanford University.
Syracuse University.
Tulane University.
University of Utah.
Vanderbilt University.
University of Virginia.
University of Washington.
University of Wisconsin.
Yale University.

URUGUAY

Universidad de la República.

VATICAN CITY

Pontificia Universitas Gregoriana.
Pontificia Universitas S. Thomae Aquinatis de Urbe.

VENEZUELA

Universidad de los Andes.
Universidad de Carabobo.
Universidad central de Venezuela.
Universidad nacional del Zulia.

VIET-NAM (Republic of)

Viện Dai-hoc Saigon.

VIET-NAM (Democratic Republic)

Trùong Dai hoc Tông hop Hà-nôi.

YUGOSLAVIA

Univerzitet u Beogradu.
Univerzitet u Novam Sadu.
Sveuciliste u Zagrebu.
Univerza v Ljubljani.
Univerzitet u Sarajevu.
Univerzitet vo Skopje.
Univerzitet u Nisu.

ZAMBIA

University of Zambia.

ASSOCIATE MEMBERS

Association of African Universities.
Association of Arab Universities.
Association of Commonwealth Universities.
Association of Southeast Asian Institutions of Higher Learning.
Association des Universités partiellement ou entièrement de langue française.
International Federation of Catholic Universities.
Standing Conference of Rectors and Vice-Chancellors of the European Universities.
Unión de Universidades de América latina.

APPENDIX II

LIST OF MEMBERS OF THE ADMINISTRATIVE BOARD

(1965—1970)

APPENDIX II

LIST OF MEMBERS OF THE ADMINISTRATIVE BOARD

(1965—1970)

Honorary Presidents :

Jean BAUGNIET (President 1955-1960)
Rector Emeritus, University of Brussels

F. Cyril JAMES (President 1960-1965)
Principal Emeritus, McGill University, Montreal

President of Association and Chairman of Administrative Board

Constantine K. ZURAYK
Distinguished Professor of History,
American University of Beirut
Former Rector, University of Damascus

Vice-President :

Jean ROCHE
Rector, University of Paris

Members :

Sir PHILIP BAXTER	Vice-Chancellor, University of New South Wales, Kensington.
K. BREWSTER, Jr.	President, Yale University, New Haven.
E.N. DAFAALLA	Vice-Chancellor, University of Khartoum.
S.E. M. EL FASI	Rector, Mohammed V University, Rabat.
R. FRONDIZI	Former Rector, University of Buenos Aires.

A.C. JOSHI	Former Vice-Chancellor, Panjab University, Chandigarh.
B. MAZAR	Pro-Rector, The Hebrew University of Jerusalem.
V. MERIKOSKI	Professor of Law, University of Helsinki.
N. OHAMA	President, Waseda University, Tokyo.
E.M. SERGEEV	Pro-Rector, University of Moscow.
A.E. SLOMAN	Vice-Chancellor, University of Essex, Colchester.
Fr. J. OTAO STEFANI	Rector, Pontifical Catholic University of Rio Grande do Sul, Pôrto Alegre.
W. ZIMMERLI	Rector, University of Göttingen.

Deputy Members :

M. A. BAIOU, Rector, Libyan University, Benghazi; J. BIANCO, Rector, Central University of Venezuela, Caracas; G. BOZZA, Rector, Polytechnic Institute of Milan; J. COURVOISIER, Vice-Rector, University of Geneva; M. O. GHANI, Vice-Chancellor, University of Dacca; A. BALCELLS GORINA, Rector, University of Salamanca; C. IVERSEN, Rector, University of Copenhagen; LIM TAY BOH, Vice-Chancellor, University of Singapore; C. P. ROMULO, President, University of the Philippines, Quezon City; J. S. SALEH, Chancellor, Tehran University; S. STRELCYN, Professor, University of Warsaw; Mgr L. A. VACHON, Rector, Laval University, Quebec; R. L. WEEKS, President, University of Liberia, Monrovia; R. DE ZUBIRIA, Rector, University of the Andes, Bogota.

Secretary-General of Association :

H. M. R. KEYES
Former Fellow of Balliol College, Oxford

The academic posts indicated above are those held by the Members and Deputy Members of the Administrative Board at the time of their election.

Imprimerie Administrative Centrale, 8, rue de Furstenberg, Paris (6e)
Dépôt légal 1er trimestre 1972 - Imp. N° 3133