DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 096 931 HE 005 959

AUTHOR Lewis, W. Arthur
TITLE The University in Less Developed Countries. ICED Occasional Paper No. 11.
INSTITUTION International Council for Educational Development, New York, N.Y.
PUB DATE 74
NOTE 28p.

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.75 HC-$1.85 PLUS POSTAGE
DESCRIPTORS *College Role; Community Responsibility; *Developing Nations; Educational Finance; *Educational Responsibility; *Foreign Countries; Governance; Government Role; *Higher Education; Institutional Role

ABSTRACT

This document discusses the role of higher education institutions in less developed countries and the responsibility of these countries to higher education institutions. The university's role in these countries is reviewed in relation to the university as bearer of the culture, trainer of skills, service agency, and the university on the frontiers of knowledge. The responsibilities of society to the university suggest that: (1) infringement by the government on the university be done with due care, after proper consultation and advice; (2) the government should give adequate financial support for agreed to programs; and (3) the university authorities should be supported by the government and other responsible opinion in their attempts to enforce discipline. (HJM)

The University in Less Developed Countries

W. Arthur Lewis

International Council for Educational Development

Occasional Paper Number 11

International Council for Educational Development
680 Fifth Avenue
New York, N.Y. 10019

The University in Less Developed Countries

W. Arthur Lewis

Printed in U.S.A. August 1974

PREFACE

Americans are approaching a quarter century mark of educational assistance in the developing countries - although the antecedents go back to early missionary and humanitarian movements. Not surprisingly, therefore, the 1970s show signs of being a period of stocktaking and review, already expressed in such activities as the ICED project on Higher Education for Development (HED). The stocktaking (and soul-searching) involves not one but most of the major donor agencies twelve in the case of ICED/HED--all of which are concerned with reexamining where they have been and what lines they should follow in future educational assistance.

The question being asked more often than any other is: are higher educational institutions serving the most urgent community needs of the people while not neglecting the advancement of knowledge and enrichment of culture? The temptations of the reviewers may be to consider the role of institutions instrumentally and too narrowly. However, a university is more than a means to an end; it has to be more than a glorified service station. Its attributes are many-sided and some conflict with one another. It is a part of existing culture, yet a force for changing it through social change. It is a bearer of culture, but in Arthur Lewis's words, "far from transmitting the culture, is rather part of the forces that are eroding traditional society" (page 6). It is an agency pro-

viding services for development, but also an institution for the advancement of knowledge. It is a citadel for scholarship and a strengthener of social conscience. It has local, national, and international missions that are interconnected, and multiple purposes that cannot be defined in simple unequivocal terms.

There is a place for the grand simplifiers in social thought but those who would understand higher education in the developing countries need a guide through complexities and debated issues. Professor Arthur Lewis of Princeton University is supremely well qualified to serve as such a guide. He was born in St. Lucia, British West Indies, in 1915, educated at the University of London, and appointed to his first faculty post in 1938. He has served as Vice-Chancellor of the University of the West Indies in Jamaica and is now James Madison Professor of Political Economy at Princeton. His writings are followed by thoughtful observers of the international scene around the world, and few men combine his administrative and scholarly experience in the LDCs. The present paper was given in January 1974 at the University of Ibadan in Nigeria to the Vice-Chancellor's Conference, and despite the author's words of modesty in introducing the subject, it has already stimulated lively discussion among authorities who have seen it. His comments bear directly on all the ICED has undertaken to do and especially on Higher Education for Development. We seek through its publication to bring it to the attention of the wider audience concerned with higher education in developing countries.

Kenneth W. Thompson
Director
Higher Education for Development

I am both flattered and puzzled by your invitation to introduce your discussion of this topic, and have approached the task with no little apprehension. My experience of universities in less developed countries is brief and episodic. I am not a philosopher of this subject, or a regular stud of its literature, to which in any case I have not had access ile preparing in Barbados for this ordeal. I see my role therefore as not much more than that of the pampered dignitary whom the professional teams invite to start their play, with the privilege of throwing the first ball.

Let me start by telling you how I have divided the subject, so that as from time to time you are awakened from your reveries you may recognize how far I have gone, and estimate how much more is to come. "Divided the subject" is too pompous a phrase, since it implies that I have tried to be comprehensive. The subject cannot be exhausted in a brief introduction, or by an amateur speaker. More precisely let me give you the four headings under which have been marshalled the various topics which will pop up as I try to assess the special problems of the university in a less developed country (LDC).

These headings are:

The University as the Bearer of the Culture.
The University as the Trainer of Skills.
The University on the Frontiers of Knowledge.
The University as a Service Agency.

The University as the Bearer of the Culture

The relative stress on the role of the university as the bearer of the culture and its role as the trainer of skills is not everywhere the same. In a country where only one percent of the age cohort goes to university, the stress is on training for the jobs which are waiting for them. But in the United States with 40 percent admission, most of the graduates will go into jobs requiring no special training of university type. They are going to sell insurance, or be executives in television studios, or sit in government offices. Hence comes the American emphasis on higher education as first and foremost the transmitter of the culture: the maker of the intelligent citizen, the good American, or as we used to say in the nineteenth century, the cultured gentleman.

The American literature on this subject is large but is not helpful to us. The British, it used to be said, designed their public schools and universities in the nineteenth century in the belief that they were the inheritors of Periclean Athens; their role was to make the cultured gentleman, knowing something about every aspect of human knowledge, well-mannered, and an active participant in public discussion. This inheritance has now passed to the American educators, who are forthright in articulating it.

The situation in less developed countries is complicated. For there are senses in which the university, far from transmitting the culture, is rather part of the forces that are eroding traditional society. Much that the traditionalists weep over, and think so special to their own geography, is really no more than the universal culture of poverty, which could not possibly survive development. But the university is one of the destructive agents so, despite the small ratio of the cohort which it gets, it has inescapably to define its creative cultural role, and to make its contribution to the evolving patterns.

Let us treat separately two different aspects of "culture," namely social relations and aesthetics.

Traditional social systems are breaking down fast in LDC's. Extended kinship is giving way to the nuclear family. Religion is losing its authority. Tribal, princely and other political allegiances have been overthrown. The youngster has to find a new code defining his rights and obligations and modes of behavior in relation to other categories of persons. He needs a new code of social ethics.

The students who pass through our hands are particularly bereft of signals because they are joining a new class, which has not previously existed in LDCs, and for which no traditional code exists within their own cultures. They are creating a new middle class of professionals, managers, scientists, artists and so on. When this class emerged in Western Europe, slowly from the fifteenth century onwards, it inherited the code of the medieval guilds: pride in the craft, honest workmanship, honest dealings with the client, the goal of "zero defect." This same code exists in all countries which have a tradition of fine handicrafts, especially in Asia, where sometimes the handicraft workers have been as much as 15 percent of the labor force. Latin America and Africa also have their handicraftsmen but, except in Sudanese West Africa, these are a small part of the labor force. The new middle class has therefore to grow into an ethical code which is not a part of its tradition. It is the old ethical code common to all those religions and philosophies which are social-oriented, rather than spirit-oriented; but it has to be articulated in new circumstances.

LDC universities have done this part of their job poorly, mainly because we have not recognized its urgency, and have not set up our programs to deal with it. Our graduates, however much admired for their technical proficiency, tend to be scorned in their own countries for their lack of social

conscience, their desire to get rich quick, and their lack of responsibility in dealing with their clients. Some of this scorn derives from expecting too much from ordinary human material; but there is a hard core of truth in the complaint.

Our governments are much concerned with this, and are adducing their own remedies. The current favorite is to impose some form of national service on all university graduates. Some think, like the Chinese, that it should be done before university entrance, and that it must be manual work, with preference for farming. This is hard on those disciplines, like music or mathematics, where an interruption of intellectual excitement may hamper intellectual growth. Other governments prefer service after graduation and may be content that the graduate then practice his profession, whatever it may be. Some form of national service may indeed be the only way of getting teachers and professionals to work in the isolation of rural areas. Whether it also achieves the objective of giving the graduate a greater social conscience, I do not know.

The traditional approach of the university to its role in developing the social conscience is to emphasize the value of teaching the humanities and the social sciences to all students, because these are the subjects where the great problems of man's relationship to man have been intensively debated over three thousand years. The Americans, recognizing that most of their 40 percent do not have a middle class or professional family background, make these subjects compulsory for all their students. I shall therefore leave this topic by crystallizing it in the following questions: should an LDC university require all its undergraduates to take some courses in the humanities and social sciences? How would this indoctrination, which normally emphasizes the democratic values and independence of mind, fit into the political framework which LDC's seem to be adopting? And is it really possible to teach to 20 year olds in college basic ethics which

they should have learned in secondary school at 15 or at home at 12?

Arts and the University

Now turn to aesthetics, where the solutions are a little easier. Universities have not prescribed music or literature or painting or other arts as compulsory subjects of study. But good universities have always promoted those activities, and tried to make them part of the students' environment: whether by maintaining concert halls and performances, theaters, art galleries and the like on the ordinary budget of the university or also by subsidizing the students' own societies for the enjoyment of the arts.

Unfortunately our universities tend to be particularly barren in these respects. This is mainly because the arts are the special interest of the middle and upper classes, and most of our students do not have such backgrounds. By contrast, today there are relatively few working-class students in the English universities. English students arrive from homes where they have been introduced to the arts at an early age, and from secondary schools which have made some effort in these directions. Most LDC students on the other hand come from homes which do not have a book, and the parents of a large proportion are illiterate. However, we know what our universities have to do; our chief problem is how to persuade our Senates and Councils to allocate more money for aesthetic activities, at the expense of departmental budgets.

LDCs have, however, a problem which most developed countries escape, namely, disagreement as to what culture is to be transmitted. Western universities at home have no doubt that their task is to promote Western music, Western painting, Western literature, and so on. As the Western university spread into India, 115 years ago, it also assumed that it should promote Western culture in India, although India has its own superb traditions of music, painting,

sculpture, architecture and so on. A similar assumption in other continents has produced a violent reaction, and now everywhere LDC's emphasize the desirability of teaching and developing their own artistic traditions.

This is easier in some places than in others. My own West Indies, for instance, has no aesthetic traditions of its own, the original inhabitants, the Arawaks, having died out 300 years ago. We have, of course, since then developed a popular music of our own, but when it comes to classical styles, whether in dancing, music, painting or theater, our aesthetic background includes large elements from Western Europe and India, with trace elements from China and various parts of Africa. Our most aggressive spokesmen demand that we should reject everything except what comes from Africa, and students have, for example, gone so far as to disrupt a performance of Mozart on our university campus, claiming that "Mozart is not a part of our culture." What line is the university to take in such circumstances?

My own prejudice is simple: I think that the whole human achievement, whatever its geography, is part of the heritage of each one of us, wherever he may be, and that the "cultured gentleman" who neglects the opportunity of benefiting from all nationalities of aesthetic experience is the poorer for doing so. However, I do not want to answer questions about the directions in which each country should develop its arts, beyond suggesting that variety is the spice of life. I want only to emphasize that the university which does not devote substantial sums to these purposes is neglecting one of its more important obligations.

Dilemmas of Plural Societies

Now, when one is talking about culture, whether aesthetics or social relations, LDC's have an additional complication: namely the fact that, especially in Africa and Asia, our

countries are not homogeneous, but are deeply divided by race, religion, language, or tribe. Our political scientists used to think that the basic political division in all societies is between the haves and the have-nots. Bitter experience has shown that in our countries, as seen by our own politicians, this "vertical" division has trivial political significance when compared with the "horizontal" rifts.

(It is true that even in European societies some demand is made to preserve and dignify a separate working-class culture, or various regional, folk, or immigrant cultures; but most Anglo-American universities do not take this seriously: even separate dormitories for women are disappearing, let alone the cultivation of "feminine interests.")

In nineteenth century England, the University of London led the way in creating the tradition that the horizontal differences do not matter within the university walls, and in this was ultimately followed by Oxford and Cambridge and the others. This is a recent and insecure tradition, which has not easily taken root in LDC's. Instead, our universities are subjected to one of two pressures. The first is to have separate universities for different racial, tribal, or religious groups. Our university spokesmen have always resisted this, asserting that the communities will quarrel less if their young people are educated together. But even when this point is conceded, we are faced with the tendency of the students to segregate themselves within the university, just as black students in the United States, having clamored for admission into white universities, are now demanding separate curricula, teachers, halls of residence, and recreation facilities.

The other pressure on us, where there is only one university, is to impose quotas, for each race or what you will. This we have resisted even more vigorously, on the ground that it is wrong to exclude a well-qualified applicant of race A in order to admit a less-qualified applicant of race

B; our attitude is rather that there should be enough places for all who qualify. This is not, however, so simple, even leaving aside the fact that one may not be able to afford enough places for all who qualify. It is simple enough if all the students have equal opportunities to prepare for admission; then quotas are needed only where it is necessary to combat prejudice, such as that against admitting women to medical schools, or tribal favoritism of various kinds. But it is also a fact that our basic principle that the prizes should go to those who win in competitive tests is not always applicable in plural societies. One's ability to pass the competitive tests depends not only on innate intelligence, but also on family and social background. If the appropriate background is already monopolized by members of another group, the competitive test serves only to solidify an existing social structure, in which racial etc. inequality is embedded. One cannot break this vicious circle except by insisting on quotas reserved to the underprivileged.

I have said that it is part of our tradition to resist pressures for separate treatment, but where these matters are felt keenly, we are not likely to succeed.

One's attitude toward these matters depends on what one thinks to be the future of plural societies. Pessimists, reading largely from history, assert that they have no future. Sooner or later one group will become dominant economically and politically, and will suppress the religion, language, and culture of all the others, thus enforcing homogeneity within the borders of the nation-state. Others think that the bitterness of these divisions is a passing historical phase, and that just as Protestants and Catholics have learned to tolerate each other in most of Europe (except the Netherlands, Belgium and the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland) so also in due course men will wonder that their ancestors used to fight each other over questions of language or skin color. If you hold to this latter view, however great the pressures, you will keep your university as

open as you can, and will make every effort to cooperate closely with other universities of different complexion.

Personally I incline to the view that this is a passing historical phase, for two reasons. First, the spread of a universal youth culture. For example, Japan used to be held up as an example of a country which had absorbed Western science and technology without affecting the rest of its traditions. But Japan is now rapidly Westernizing itself; its rich are buying up and grossly inflating the prices of French wine (to my great disgust) and European painting and sculpture and other treasures; and its young are modelling themselves upon the young people of California, whose dress, drugs, music, dances, religions and attitudes toward parents and teachers now set the fashion for young people throughout the rest of the world. If the young of all tribes make themselves a common culture, then all other cultures will die out.

Even more important is an element which derives from what the universities themselves are doing. The graduates we all turn out are of a single pattern, quite different from that of their parents; more logical, scientific, open-minded, with fewer allegiances and a different set of superstitions; essentially, all children of the French Enlightenment. Our product is managing the world, whether in the public or the private sectors. A Russian physicist, an American physicist, an Indian or a Nigerian physicist, have more in common with each other, whether in outlook or in life style, than any of these has with a bus conductor from his own country. The university is educating a middle class which is homogeneous throughout the world, and which, within any country, must ultimately scoff at the barriers which are now so divisive. Is this not why our various brands of separatists are so vociferous in denouncing "middle class values"? I may be wrong; there is no lack of highly educated racists. But if I am right, then nothing is more important than for us to keep our

universities as free from sectional division as our political bosses will permit.

The University as the Trainer of Skills

One has to begin by recognizing the revolt in some student quarters against the university as a place for "training fodder for capitalist employers." This is largely an American phenomenon. When 40 percent of the age cohort is in college, it is inevitable that what most of them do there will have little bearing on the jobs they ultimately get. Hence the university is not for them a place for training. It is a place for spending four years as enjoyably as one can; choosing only such subjects as interest one, and abandoning them as soon as one reaches into fundamental theories or models which demand too much intellectual exercise; skipping exams, or at least examination grades. The college is seen as a young people's Eden, which they may regulate as they please, without interference from adults, whose only duty is to pay the bills. The advantage to the adults is that the young are shut away in institutions while they grow up, especially as their preference for inelegance offends our sense that form ranks equally with substance. It is also thought (but incorrectly) that to keep them off the labor market reduces unemployment. I need hardly add that the number of serious American students is greater than it ever was; all that has happened is that the non-serious have multiplied even faster, and have become shamelessly strident.

Echoes of this disturbance are heard in our LDC universities, since, as I have remarked, everything that starts in California ultimately comes to all of us. It has some relevance to overpopulated LDC universities, such as those of India, where the struggle between the students and their universities has already had such devastating effects on higher education. But in Africa and the Caribbean, where the demand for trained graduates still exceeds the supply, hardly any serious

person doubts that one of the principal functions of the university is to train the middle class for the jobs it has to do. This attitude is fortified by the fact that the cost per student is such a large multiple of national income per head; though this would not matter so much if students were paying the cost of their education out of loans, as they should be, since one could then provide all the places for which there was demand.

Now come to the perennial question of which skills are fit to be taught in a university and which are not. The traditional answer is that the university skills are only those which have a major intellectual content.

In practice, however, our universities are asked to teach (or to supervise other schools which teach) many skills which do not pass this traditional test, for two reasons.

The first is administrative capacity. LDCs are short of administrative talent; we have reached a stage of modernization where we have learned the tricks of managing things and ideas (science, power stations, open heart surgery, pianos) but not the tricks of managing people. So when you get a university with a good Vice-Chancellor, a good Registrar and a good Bursar, you ask them to take responsibility for as much postsecondary education as they will swallow (medical technologists, agricultural assistants, primary school teachers, technical institutes, etc.). This makes sense if the university does indeed have a first-class administration; but when it has not (as is more often the case in LDCs) it is easily overburdened.

The second reason for trying to bring as much post-secondary education as possible under the wing of the university is to give this kind of training social status and intellectual prestige. Any ambitious student who gets good O' Levels wants to take a university degree. Also people with

degrees get higher salaries than people without. Hence all the non-university institutions are starved of good talent, and in many LDC's the crucial shortage is not of university graduates but of intermediate personnel. In a free market the salaries of technicians would rise relatively to those of skill-less and mediocre graduates in Arts, but since the government, which is the principal buyer, bases relative salaries on tradition rather than on scarcity, the market situation cannot right itself.

Faced with these problems I have never been able to get hot under the collar about what is properly or not properly a university subject. I am even willing to accept mortuary science, which you can study in such highly respectable American institutions as the University of Minnesota, Wayne State University and Temple University. Each community should settle such issues in accordance with its circumstances.

A much more serious problem is that of the number to be trained. This depends first on the structure of the economy. The biggest user of graduates is the services sector, followed by industry and mining, and lastly by agriculture. Since services employ more than 50 percent of the labor force in the USA, and agriculture only about 5 percent, the demand for graduates is enormous, and anything less than 20 percent of the age cohort would produce a serious shortage. Whereas in LDC's, where agriculture employs half the labor force or more, even 1 or 2 percent of the cohort can produce a glut of graduates.

Apart from structure, the economy's capacity to absorb graduates depends also on their salaries, relative to per capita national income. This ratio is very much higher than in developed countries, making the cost of services too high for the economy to afford as much as it needs. As educated numbers increase, the ratio falls and absorptive capacity automatically increases, so the way to create demand is to

flood the market; but this is a painful and politically dangerous process.

Most LDC universities admit too many undergraduates, and then have high dropout rates (not to speak of those which have too many students, but are prevented by their governments from failing more than x percent). This relates to the desirability of giving other postsecondary schools a higher status, and deflecting more students there. Another issue is the desirability of establishing community colleges of a comprehensive kind, offering 2- or 3-year courses from O' Level in both technical and academic subjects, so that only the tested move on into the university. This would mean that the university could raise its admission level, and take fewer students.

Universities try to insist on determining for themselves what their entrance level should be, but this position is hardly tenable. The university has to relate to other educational institutions. For example, rural secondary schools have difficulty in attracting and holding the kind of teachers required for sixth forms, so if, in the absence of community colleges, the university insists on entrance only at A' Level, it is discriminating against half the secondary school population. On these matters university senates tend to be reactionary; so inevitably the government, which pays the bill, will want to have a say in determining university entrance levels. And this in turn will react on the demand for student places.

Besides the total number of students, there is the question of the relative numbers in different subjects. Usually there are not enough in mathematics or the scientific professions, while there are too many in social sciences (especially the "soft" social sciences) and in law. Humanities also tend to be starved, relative to the need for secondary school teachers.

Here again the government may be expected to take a hand, by fixing maximum quotas for social science and for law. It is true that the basic solutions are rather to teach more and better science and mathematics in the secondary schools, and also for the government in its own salary structures to pay more for graduates in the subjects which are in short supply. A quota probably does not help much in deflecting students toward the highly scientific subjects, but at least it cuts down on the cost of producing a lot of low grade social "scientists" and may also push some students toward the more practical kinds of training which they now avoid.

Universities claim autonomy in determining what subjects they will teach, but they seldom deserve it. Senates are reactionary, and are slow to admit new subjects even of a highly scientific nature. LDC governments are everywhere involved in deciding what subjects shall be taught, at their expense, and this is inevitable.

(I have not asked whether our professionals are too highly trained; the answer is that we need all sorts.)

The University on the Frontiers of Knowledge

To advance the frontiers of knowledge is rather a recent function of universities; knowledge used to be advanced rather by gentlemen scholars outside the universities. Nowadays, though, all the best universities claim that the advancement of knowledge is their pride and joy. From this it follows that they must hire only staff with first-class creative minds, use them in teaching only for 8 to 10 hours a week, enforce "publish or perish." However, the number of first-class creative minds is small; they get better job satisfaction working in the well-equipped laboratories and libraries of U.S. institutions (not to speak of better pay); and

frequently don't much care for teaching undergraduates. So many of our LDC universities, clinging to the research ideal and its corollaries, get the worst of both worlds: they have to pay salaries competitive with Oxford and Cambridge, and to limit teaching hours, without getting much creativity for the money.

This is a British trap; the United States is not caught in it. The United States has 1,500 degree-granting institutions, of which less than a hundred expect to advance the frontiers of knowledge. The rest hire teachers at lower salaries and work them 20 to 25 hours a week. The 100 or so are supplemented by a great many research institutions, public and private, which have no students, or have only graduate students. India is travelling the same way. The money now goes increasingly into wholly postgraduate institutions, like the new Jahawarlal Nehru University, or into research institutes which have no teaching function.

At the University of the West Indies, I became convinced that we had started on the wrong track in adopting the English pattern. We would have done better to have had two separate institutions: one offering undergraduate degrees, and the other concentrating on graduate and professional studies. They would have had two entirely different staffs, with different pay, different teaching loads, and different objectives. The cost per undergraduate place in our university is much too high in relation to per capita national income, and would be smaller if we had started from more appropriate staff/student ratios and from salary scales more closely akin to those of civil servants.

The current situation in most of our countries is not tenable. Our governments are beginning to see through the pretense that we are advancing the frontiers of knowledge (some staff do, of course, but not enough of them for the money), and the unruly behavior of our undergraduate

students has not increased our popularity with the public. I expect a shift of government emphasis away from university research toward the establishment of separate research institutes; these latter, I would hope, would have provision for graduate students, since I agree that the skepticism of the good student spurs the teacher toward a clearer understanding of his own thesis.

I am not arguing that universities should not do research, or that research institutes should not be under the sponsorship of universities. My sole point is that as the number of students increases, we should restrict the number of research-dominated universities and increase the proportion of essentially teaching institutions, on the American rather than the British pattern, which is simply too expensive for us.

The University as a Service Agency

When once a university has started in a new community, its collection of relatively high-powered people can make an enormous contribution outside their walls, and are normally expected to do so. They create scientific societies embracing practicing professionals; they serve on public committees; accept offices of various kinds; and serve as consultants to the private sector as well as to governments. More formally, the university organizes extramural teaching, and perhaps school examinations. It sponsors concerts, lectures, exhibitions and sporting spectacles, which it opens to the public. Well-endowed private universities in the United States are now expected to spend on improving their neighborhoods, even to the point of slum clearance; but universities on the public payroll escape this imposition.

Performance of functions for the whole community, financed from the public treasury, involves some element of political neutrality. It is inappropriate for your one and only

heart surgeon to be a prominent member of some political party, since members of other parties may fear that his knife may inadvertently slip when he performs for them. It is equally inappropriate for your one and only professor of economics, whose salary is paid by all, so to conduct himself that he has only the confidence of and is consulted only by the Chamber of Commerce, or the trade unions, or the government or the opposition. Such conduct does not matter in a developed country where professors are two a penny and available in every hue. But in our countries with one university only, or only one per province, the political professor fails in his duty as a public servant.

Some of our professors have gone to the limit of the obnoxious. We have professors who are leaders of political parties (even the official leader of the opposition in Parliament) and who publish political tracts which are way below normal intellectual standards. Some see their salaries and their eight-hour week merely as a means of financial support for their political activities, doing no research to justify their pay. Some LDC universities are sanctuaries for subversive movements pledged to overthrow society by violence. All of this is defended in the name of academic freedom.

Of course our governments retaliate. If public funds are going to be used to support political activity, they wish to choose the politicians. So the right of the university to choose its own teachers is challenged, and the government seeks a hand. Actually this right, which Anglo-American universities see as fundamental to their autonomy, is by no means universal; it is quite common for those who put up the money, whether it be the state or the church or the private benefactor, to insist on the right to veto teaching appointments. In France, university teachers are appointed by the Minister. Universities on the public payroll may be permitted to exercise autonomy of appointment if they keep out of

politics; if they become havens for political activity they must not be surprised if the politicians take over the appointment of their staffs.

This is not a simple matter. I would like to see our professors practice both less party politics and also more participation in political life.

As for the first half, I think that in an LDC with only one university per province, professors in publicly financed universities should not identify themselves with political parties, and should even try to make it clear that their advice is available to clients of all religions, languages, or tribes. I recognize that this is a limitation on academic freedom, as traditionally understood in British and American private universities. Academic freedom, however, has two parts. The more important part, which I fully accept, is the right, or rather the duty, of the academic to publish the considered results of research, study, or reflection without regard to their effect on existing interests or opinions. On this we cannot compromise without embedding hypocrisy at our core. The lesser part of academic freedom, which I would limit in the before-mentioned circumstances, is the right to participate in party politics. This limitation would put professors into the same category as civil servants, which is what they essentially are in these circumstances. Academic freedom in this latter sense is of recent vintage and narrow geographical extent.

At the same time I should like to see professors participating more freely in debates on public issues than they now do in most of the third world. Good government depends on the existence of a well-informed and articulate public opinion; and the teachers in the university, with their free time for study and research, are better placed than almost any other group to raise the level of public discussion by communicating information and criticism, from a non-

political party standpoint. We do not get as much of this in LDC's as we need, because most of our politicians do not want an independent public opinion; their motto is that "he who is not with me is against me." Universities should insist on this right (nay, duty) of free comment, but will win and hold it only insofar as they scrupulously steer clear of party entanglements.

I should emphasize that my image of the LDC professor as voluntarily non-partisan, yet active in public affairs, applies only to countries which are trying to maintain a democratic framework, including political opposition. The professor is not needed in party politics when there are plenty of other people for that role. My prescription could not work in a society where opposition is suppressed. In such a society some professors who feel very strongly about government wrongdoing will inevitably become involved in organized anti-government activity, as will some of their students. The freedom and neutrality of a university can be maintained only in societies with a democratic atmosphere; in oppressive societies the freedom of the university almost always disappears in conflict between its members and the government. The essence of my point is that even in democratic developing societies, the freedom of the government-financed university depends on its trying to maintain political neutrality.

Coda

So far I have spoken only of the obligations of the university to society, as you asked me to do, and not about the obligations of society to the university. Let me just sketch three aspects of this side.

First, recognizing as we do the right of the government to infringe on university autonomy in so many ways, we are entitled to demand that what it does be done with due care,

after proper consultation and advice. The government will nominate to many committees and institutions affecting the university: its Council: some form of University Grants Committee: Appointments committees: the Scientific Research Council, and others. Let its nominees be men of substance, accustomed to disciplined thought and behavior. Several confrontations have occurred not between the university and the government, but within the university itself, between the academic Senate and the government appointees to the Council.

Second, the university is entitled to financial support adequate for agreed programs. The university is not entitled to determine by itself either the program or its cost. But once the appropriate machinery has agreed on these matters, its decisions should be carried out. This has to be said because, alas, some of us have to deal with governments which agree and promise, but do not eventually pay up.

Third, we need the support of government and society in our efforts to lead students along disciplined paths. The students of these days are confused as to why they are in the university: where supply exceeds demand they are terribly frustrated, and worried about jobs: also they live in an era where respect for law, authority, and non-violent persuasion is no longer fashionable. So they do things which horrify their elders – from burning down the property to preventing freedom of speech. University authorities cannot cope unless their attempts to enforce discipline are supported by the government and other responsible opinion, including that of the great majority of the student body itself. If not, a minority of students reduces the university to a shambles, as has already happened in many parts of the world

The university cannot fulfill its obligations to a society which does not, in its turn, fulfill its obligations to the university. But to explore this further would outrun my mandate.

International Council for Educational Development

The International Council for Educational Development (ICED) is an international non-profit association of persons with a common concern for the future of education and its role in social and economic development.

ICED's three major interests are strategies for educational development; the modernization and management of systems of higher education; and the international programs and responsibilities of higher education. In each area, ICED's purposes are to identify and analyze major educational problems shared by a number of countries, to generate policy recommendations, and to provide consultation, on request, to international and national organizations.

ICED's activities are directed by James A. Perkins, chief executive officer and chairman of an international board. Philip H. Coombs is vice chairman. The headquarters office is in New York City.

The main support for ICED to date has come from the Ford Foundation, the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development, UNICEF, and the Clark Foundation. Twelve national and international agencies are supporting ICED's 18-month study on Higher Education for Development.

BOARD OF TRUSTEES