

DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 125 402

HE 007 918

TITLE Higher Education in Asia and the United States. A Cross-Cultural Dialogue.

INSTITUTION Institute of International Education, New York, N.Y.

PUB DATE 72

NOTE 65p.; Papers presented by the Council on Higher Education for Asia and the United States (Hong Kong, June 1970; Nara, Japan, June 1971)

AVAILABLE FROM Council on Higher Education for Asia and the United States, Institute of International Education, 809 United Nations Plaza, New York, New York 10017

EDRS PRICE MF-\$0.83 HC-\$3.50 Plus Postage.

DESCRIPTORS Administration; Area Studies; *Cross Cultural Studies; *Cultural Exchange; *Foreign Countries; Governance; *Higher Education; Language; Management; *Universities

IDENTIFIERS *Asia; *United States

ABSTRACT

The Institute of International Education's Council on Higher Education for Asia and the United States is designed to create the conditions necessary for a regular and fruitful exchange of ideas, plans, and action programs between university leaders from the United States and from the Asia-Pacific region. Discussions held at the Council's planning meeting in Hong Kong in 1970 explored: (1) universities as instruments for the promotion of international understanding; (2) proper mission of a university; (3) governance; (4) usefulness of language and area programs; (5) preservation of freedom in the university. The Nara conference held in 1971 focused on university management and the problems of cooperation and cultural interchange. Background information for the discussions are provided by participants in the Nara Conference. Their brief reports cover university structure and objectives and area-language study programs. (Author/KE)

 * Documents acquired by ERIC include many informal unpublished *
 * materials not available from other sources. ERIC makes every effort *
 * to obtain the best copy available. Nevertheless, items of marginal *
 * reproducibility are often encountered and this affects the quality *
 * of the microfiche and hardcopy reproductions ERIC makes available *
 * via the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). EDRS is not *
 * responsible for the quality of the original document. Reproductions *
 * supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made from the original. *

*A
Cross-Cultural
Dialogue*



HE 117 112

HIGHER EDUCATION IN ASIA AND THE UNITED STATES

A Cross-Cultural Dialogue

Council on Higher Education for Asia and the United States
INSTITUTE OF INTERNATIONAL EDUCATION
809 United Nations Plaza
New York, New York 10017

ADVISORY COMMITTEE

Rayson Lisung Huang, Vice Chairman
Nanyang University

James M. Hester, Vice Chairman
New York University

Edwin O. Reischauer, Consultant
Harvard University

• • •

Kenneth Holland
President

James F. Tierney
Vice President

Pearl G. Purcell
Conference Director

© Copyright, 1972 International Councils on Higher Education, New York, N.Y.

PRINTED IN U.S.A.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

PAGE

Introduction	5
Part I — Summary of Hong Kong Discussions	7
Part II — Summary of Nara Discussions	12
Appendix	21

INTRODUCTION

The United States has long recognized a basic national interest in Asia, an interest expressed most consistently as a commitment to the welfare and progress of the peoples of that area. However, it must be emphasized that United States relations with the countries of Asia have for many years been less than satisfactory. Some of our policies have met with only limited success, others have been outright failures. The frustration and bitter controversy over these policies have produced deep divisions in the American public. If there is indeed a root cause of our problem, it probably lies in the widespread ignorance in this country of Asia and its problems, and a dangerously superficial awareness of what is really happening in that part of the world.

The crucial importance of United States relations with the Asia-Pacific region needs no emphasis. What is needed, however, is a concerted effort to deepen our understanding of the region. One way to do this is to build new bridges and develop new contacts with Asian leaders at the highest levels and particularly with the educational and intellectual community whose members are destined to play a major role in future developments in the region.

In an effort to meet this special need, the Institute of International Education has established a Council on Higher Education for Asia and the United States, the most recent in a series of similar Councils organized by the IIE for the principal regions of the world. The Asian-U. S. Council is designed to create the conditions necessary for a regular and fruitful exchange of ideas, plans and action programs between university leaders from the United States and from the Asia-Pacific region. To encourage frank, open and informal dialogue among participants, Council discussions are completely off the record. Selection of participants is based largely on personal qualifications; no one is expected to represent his or her institution or country in any formal or official way. The emphasis is on a free exchange of views among knowledgeable and influential educational leaders in a setting which permits the development of personal friendships as well as professional contacts.

It is the conviction of the IIE that the future development of the Asian countries will to a great extent reflect the thinking and action of the intellectual leadership in Asian universities and that every effort should be made to bring this leadership element into close and regular contact with its counterpart in the United States. It is fortunate indeed that this conviction is shared by the officers and directors of the Henry Luce Foundation, Inc. of New York. Luce Foundation grants have made possible both the planning and the operation of the Council's program. The Luce family's commitment to service in the Far East has been deep and long

standing. In 1936, Henry R. Luce, who was himself born in China, established the Foundation as a tribute to his father, the Reverend Dr. Henry W. Luce, who had devoted much of his adult life to missionary and educational activities in the area. The Foundation's programs reflect this Asian background. Among other goals, the Foundation seeks to encourage "international understanding between East and West. The specific objective is not to produce Asian specialists. Rather, it is to develop a group of active citizen leaders from a wide range of fields who have an awareness and an understanding of Asia that is all too rare in this country today". The IIE wishes to express its profound gratitude to the Foundation for its support of the Council's activities which are designed to help realize this objective.

The report that follows provides a summary of the discussions held at the Council's planning meeting in Hong Kong in 1970 and the first full meeting in Japan in 1971. The IIE has issued this report to acquaint interested individuals and institutions with the rationale and activities of the Council.

James F. Tierney
New York, New York
1972

PART I

The Hong Kong Meeting, June 21-26, 1970

This was a planning meeting to explore areas of common concern to the participating educational leaders from the United States and ten Asian nations (see attached list).

The discussions were organized around an agenda which focused on five principal areas of mutual concern. Although there was a good deal of flexibility in the handling of the discussions, the agenda proved to be a useful mechanism for eliciting comment on specific problems and topics.

A. Are universities effective instruments for the promotion of international understanding?

Several points were made in the course of the discussion on this topic. It was felt that the effectiveness of universities could be judged only in relation to their particular position in society and that within Asia there is great diversity in both levels and systems of higher education. In some Asian countries the universities have been modeled on Western experience and in fact are under the direction of Western-trained specialists. This raised the question as to whether the universities in these cases are not alien institutions out of step with the movement of society. Universities throughout the region are increasingly subject to political direction and particularly in the under-developed countries are often expected to serve the immediate goals set by the political leadership in the country.

It was noted that the various exchange of persons programs have not been uniformly successful in promoting international understanding and in fact some of them have intensified the problem of the so-called "brain drain." The most successful and imaginative exchange programs are those under the direction of professionally trained staff who select participants on the basis of a carefully designed set of objectives.

The Junior Year Abroad programs, although far from perfect in either design or execution, are of great value in bridging cultural differences. They open windows on the world for young students, and expose them to alien cultures at an impressionable age. These programs should be expanded to cover the nations of the Asia-Pacific region.

The participants were reminded that international understanding is a desirable goal for any university but that in itself international understanding does not automatically result in peace and goodwill. The university should seek to develop programs which expose large numbers of students to the cultures and histories of other peoples in such a way that students might appreciate other cultures with some depth and sensitivity. A superficial and simplistic view of other peoples can be as dangerous as no exposure at all.

Mention was made of a current trend in the United States with serious implications for the future of student exchange programs. In many universities, tuition fees for foreign students have been markedly increased,

and quotas have been established to limit the number of foreign students on American university campuses. This is presumably the result of pressure from record numbers of U. S. students on limited university facilities, but there is a disturbing note of neo-isolationism evident in some of the comments on this development.

B. What are the proper missions of a university (teaching, research, service, others) and how can these be brought into effective relationship to each other?

It was noted that while teaching and research are generally accepted as appropriate missions of a university, the concept of service to society has not yet been fully clarified and understood as a valid mission. In the underdeveloped countries of Asia, limited resources, national manpower requirements and increasing pressure from students to earn a degree which will serve as an "academic passport" have combined to place the university in a difficult situation regarding both its ability to carry on traditional university missions as well as to clarify its perception of the service mission. This latter mission has served to raise doubts about the appropriateness of Western patterns of higher education for many of the Asian countries. In some situations acceptance of a service role has led to undue influence from the political elements in society and in other cases the service role has been largely neglected. Moreover, the teaching methods in some of the universities have been questioned, particularly when these methods tend to be faculty-oriented rather than directed toward student needs and requirements.

Participants from the United States pointed out that clarity of goals and objectives has not always been realized in United States universities and that especially in the last few years the impact of the service role has undermined traditional teaching and research functions.

This confusion over function is symptomatic of a deep-rooted dichotomy evident in contemporary higher education in the United States: nostalgia for the ivory tower and the monastic tradition of scholarship combined with a commitment to make education relevant to a rapidly changing world, and to gear the university to improve the quality of life.

C. What are the principal contemporary problems of university governance?

Discussion on this topic centered on an analysis of the problems facing the university as a result of student disruptions, which have been more or less endemic in the United States since the Berkeley riots of 1964. Student radicalization has led to a greatly increased political role in the management of state-supported universities reflecting public disenchantment with higher education as presently constituted. In some universities, politically appointed boards of regents have assumed the power to make decisions affecting personnel and academic planning, matters which

had traditionally been left to the faculty and administration. The benign neglect which had for years characterized the attitude of boards of governors toward the day-to-day operation of the university has given way to a thorough-going involvement in the running of the institution, often with a vindictiveness which bodes ill for the future of academic freedom.

The problem of student activism was echoed in the comments of most of the participants whether from Asia or from the United States. Participants from Japan described a mechanism which had been adopted by the Japanese government to deal with the problem in publicly financed institutions of higher education. This mechanism, now enacted into law, requires the President of an institution which has been closed because of student action to report the situation to the government, which, after due consultation with specially constituted committee can order the university temporarily closed. Upon such an order faculty salaries are automatically reduced by 20%. If the university remains closed because of student unrest beyond a period of 12 months the government may close the university permanently.

Without exception, participants underlined the difficulty of dealing with student unrest in a manner satisfactory to both legitimate student complaints and the need to continue to carry out the university's missions. The politicization of the university was deemed to be one of the greatest dangers in this situation. Among the problems which have been thrown into sharp relief is a crisis in the management of university affairs. It is clear that universities in general have not been able to respond quickly and effectively to changing situations. The university lacks mechanism and procedures to deal with problems of the kind being faced today and that in the last analysis what is needed is more effective and imaginative management. There was considerable difference of opinion expressed about the desirability of involving students and faculty in decision-making roles within the university although almost all participants were agreed that some accommodation must be made to student demands for a voice in university government. Opinion was unanimous that the authority of the university president must be strengthened and that this office must provide the essential direction for all aspects of university life. Attention was given to the problem of financing university affairs and, as expected, there was considerable diversity of views as to both the nature of the problem and the way it might be solved.

D. Are language and area programs useful methods for improving cross-cultural understanding? If so, how can they be improved?

Participants described the various language and area programs currently in operation in both Asia and the United States and there was general agreement that while these served to expose a limited audience to the cultures of other peoples, they did not in themselves provide the

sole solution to the problem. Attention was given to the need to increase understanding of Asian countries on the part of other Asians. Asians know very little about their neighbors, and university scholars in particular isolate themselves by a provincial outlook which is distressing. Inter-regional exchanges among Asian countries were characterized as minimal and in some cases non-existent. Participants felt strongly that greater exposure to area studies by large numbers of students should be a goal of all universities and that this goal could be achieved by various means not necessarily limited to formal academic programs. In this connection, experiments with educational television and other developments in the application of technology to education might well be encouraged by universities who should be expected to provide leadership in educating the general public in the field of international understanding.

E. What are the main problems bearing upon the preservation of freedom in the university?

The discussion on this topic reflected the diversity of background and institutional connection of the participants but also served to highlight the common character of the problems faced. It was noted, for example, that university freedom is an extremely fragile concept which can easily be destroyed by thoughtless but well-intentioned men. The setting of priorities in the allocation of resources for higher education has often been haphazard, leading to the proliferation of course offerings and general dissipation of university talent and energy. Academic freedom has suffered as a result of an uncritical acceptance of the idea that the university is responsible for speeding economic and social change in society. The university can legitimately be asked to advance national development goals, but it cannot be permitted to become an instrument of national policy. The demand for higher education by increasingly greater numbers of students has highlighted the problem of the poor quality of primary and secondary education in some countries and has compelled the university to give some attention to its responsibility for providing leadership to the lower educational levels. Increasing student criticism has also raised doubts about the relevance of the traditional liberal arts education.

The university community today is subject to severe tensions. Should its energies be directed to the training of generalists or specialists? How much emphasis should be given to teaching — to research? Should the university offer elite or mass education? What should its relations be to the local community and to the larger society particularly in light of the tendency of the community to resist innovation in education?

Without exception, participants stressed the dangers to academic freedom inherent in the current university crisis, and recommended that major attention be devoted in future meetings to the close connection between academic freedom and problems of university governance.

HONG KONG CONFERENCE

PARTICIPANTS

JOHN F. BROHM, *Director*
East Asia Office
Institute of International Education
Hong Kong

LE THANH MINH CHAU, *Rector*
University of Hue
Hue, Viet Nam

CHIN FUNG KEE
Deputy Vice-Chancellor
University of Malaya
Kuala Lumpur, Malaysia

ROBERT F. GOHEEN, *President*
Princeton University
Princeton, New Jersey

JAMES M. HESTER, *President*
New York University
New York, New York

MASAO HISATAKE
Former President
International Christian University
Tokyo, Japan

CHARLES J. HITCH, *President*
University of California
Berkeley, California

KENNETH HOLLAND, *President*
Institute of International Education
New York, New York

RAYSON L. HUANG, *Vice-Chancellor*
Nanyang University
Singapore

KAMHAENG BALANKURA
Secretary General
National Education Council
Bangkok, Thailand

OKGILL KIM, *President*
Ewha Womans University
Seoul, Korea

CHOH-MING LI, *Vice-Chancellor*
The Chinese University of Hong Kong
Shatin, New Territories, Hong Kong

SALVADOR P. LOPEZ, *President*
University of the Philippines
Quezon City, The Philippines

TAKASHI MUKAIBO
Special Assistant to the President
University of Tokyo
Tokyo, Japan

FRANKLIN D. MURPHY
Chairman of the Board
The Times Mirror Company
Los Angeles, California

PACIFICO A. ORTIZ, *President*
Ateneo de Manila University
Manila, The Philippines

MAURICE H. PURCELL
Conference Rapporteur
Director of Admissions
Borough of Manhattan Community
College
New York, New York

PEARL G. PURCELL
*Vice President and Special Assistant
to the President*
Institute of International Education
New York, New York

EDWIN O. REISCHAUER
University Professor
Harvard University
Cambridge, Massachusetts

KENNETH E. ROBINSON
Vice-Chancellor
The University of Hong Kong
Hong Kong

S. SUBANU, *Acting Rector*
Satya Wajama University
Salatiga, Indonesia

JAMES F. TIERNEY, *Vice President*
Institute of International Education
for the International Councils on
Higher Education
New York, New York

WU TEH-YAO, *President*
Tunghai University
Taichung, Taiwan

PART II

The Nara Conference: June 27-July 2, 1971

The first full meeting of the Council on Higher Education for Asia and the United States was held in the ancient capital of Nara, a city rich in the history, culture, and art of Japan, and an ideal site for the kind of dialogue which the Council seeks to encourage. Educators from ten nations in the Asia-Pacific area and from the United States participated in the Nara discussions (list of participants attached). The Conference agenda was designed to focus attention on two major areas of concern: university management; and problems of cooperation and cultural interchange. A summary of the discussions follows.

A. Inter-University Cooperation

In the discussion of this topic, chaired by Rayson Huang, attention was focused largely on two points: first, possible avenues of cooperation, including existing international bodies; and second, some of the problems which inevitably arise when two or more universities attempt a cooperative enterprise.

At the outset, mention was made of the importance and value of sending staff to other universities for further training and development, not only to do research but also to become involved in administration and to become acquainted with different teaching methods. This kind of exchange stimulates and aids the receiving university as well as the sending one.

Attention was then drawn to various international bodies whose purpose it is to promote inter-university cooperation. The first mentioned was the Inter-University Council in London. Government funded, this organization operates exclusively within the British Commonwealth and assists in recruiting staff for universities in Africa, the West Indies and Southeast Asia. Secondly, the Association of Southeast Asian Institutions of Higher Learning (ASAIHL), has a membership of some 45 universities in seven countries — Hong Kong, Philippines, Vietnam, Malaysia, Singapore, Indonesia and Thailand. In the 14 years of its existence it has been concerned mainly with the exchange of staff, but it plans to introduce a program of student exchanges within the next year.

A third organization, the Regional Institute for Higher Education and Development (RIHED), with headquarters in Singapore, was formed in 1970 to enhance the contribution of higher education to social and eco-

conomic development in Southeast Asia. It is aided by the Ford Foundation, which covers roughly half of its costs; the remainder is contributed by the participating countries: Indonesia, Khmer Republic, Laos, Malaysia, Singapore, Thailand, Republic of Vietnam. The important difference between the RIHED and ASAIHL is that the former is an inter-governmental organization formed to carry out research projects in various countries, whereas ASAIHL is a private organization of universities.

A fourth regional body, SEAMEO, the Southeast Asia Ministers of Education Organization provides an additional mechanism for inter-governmental contact. Several participants noted that there is a growing fear of proliferation of regional organizations on ministerial levels.

The discussion then turned to some of the problems which arise in inter-university cooperation. Chief among these are finances, uprooting of faculty, language difficulties, equivalency of academic credits for students, and the administration of exchange programs, especially multi-lateral ones.

One participant remarked that there seems to be a language barrier north of Hong Kong. All regional groups seem to lie south of Hong Kong, and there appear to be no effective regional organizations involving Taiwan, Korea and Japan.

There was considerable discussion of the attitude of other countries toward Japan and of the role of Japan in international exchange. It was pointed out that the commercial pre-eminence of Japan in Southeast Asia contributed to a fear of being overwhelmed by Japan. Other barriers to Japanese participation are the language problem and the memories of World War II.

There was apprehension among the participants from Southeast Asia about the future attitude of the United States toward financing of exchange programs. The question was asked whether a reduction of U.S. military personnel in the area would be accompanied by a corresponding reduction in cultural commitments. The answers from U.S. participants were varied. One opinion expressed was that the U.S. in the future will decrease economic aid and will expect other developed nations to share their part of the load. Mention was also made of the present U.S. balance of payments situation and of increasing attention devoted to internal problems in the U.S. There will almost certainly be fewer dollars going into international programs, and more of the aid that is authorized will probably be channeled through multilateral agencies.

Some of the participants from Southeast Asia emphasized the need for institutions in their area to provide their own resources for inter-university cooperation. This could be done by interesting local foundations, by providing additional lines in their budgets, and by leaving staff vacancies unfilled, using the money thus saved for international programs.

B. University Structure and Objectives: Problems of University Governance and Increase in the Student Population.

The discussion of this topic opened with two introductory statements: one about the situation in the United States by James Hester; the other on Japan, by Ichiro Kato.

In the U.S. setting the question of university objectives tends to be viewed in the context of several other pertinent and related questions: Who should be taught? What should be taught? How should teaching be conducted, and where? What research should be pursued? What other services should the university attempt to provide for the community?

In the matter of structure and governance, U.S. universities are today in a period of great stress and strain, and consequent change. The traditional elements of structure and governance in an American university are three: trustees, administration and faculty. In a private university the trustees are self-perpetuating; in a public institution they are appointed or elected by government officials. The administration is headed by a president, who is responsible to the trustees. The faculty were originally chosen by the president but have now become largely a self-governing and self-selecting body.

Certain long-term trends in this traditional governance can be noted. The trustees originally were directly involved in deciding on objectives — what sort of student body, what kind of faculty and so forth. But once these objectives were decided, the trustees tended to limit their participation to matters of finance, real estate and the selection of the president.

The president originally had almost complete autonomy in carrying out the agreed upon objectives — selection of students and faculty and determination of the curriculum. But gradually more and more responsibility in these matters has been assumed by the faculty.

The faculty through its professional organization, the American Association of University Professors, and through the tenure concept, has achieved considerable independence from the administration in determining admission requirements, degree requirements, course content and methods of instruction.

Into this tripartite system of governance there has come within the past few years a new element: the students. Student groups have demanded and have been granted almost complete responsibility in such areas as student activities, dormitory regulations and discipline. More significantly, students are being included on university committees and boards of trustees where their role is often a critical one, either as advisors or as full voting members.

Together with the emergence of students as a fourth party in university governance have come two other developments which are having a profound influence on the academic structure in the United States. One

of these is the dramatic increase in student population, and the other is the growing government participation in educational matters.

The growth in student population has led to a great increase in state systems of education. California is an outstanding example. This enlargement of state systems has in turn had serious financial effects on private institutions, which have increasingly sought public support, as in New York, for example. But public support of private institutions has in its own turn led to stronger state coordinating boards, and their development must inevitably expand the influence of the state on who is taught, what is taught and under what circumstances.

The participants next turned their attention to a statement about university structure and objectives in Japan. Almost 100 per cent of school-age children in Japan complete junior high school since education is mandatory until that time. About 80 per cent graduate from high school, and about 30 per cent of the high school graduates enter universities. The total number of students attending universities is about 1,500,000 — 20 per cent in state universities, the remainder in private ones.

Tuition fees in the state universities are nominal, roughly \$35 per year, whereas in private universities fees run to about \$200 or more per year. The government is beginning to subsidize private universities, but not yet on a large scale. In both state and private universities the president is elected by the vote of all faculty members.

The discussion which followed these introductory remarks centered mainly on education for the disadvantaged and its impact on the maintenance of academic standards. In the United States the two most prominent methods of treating the problem are a system of awarding scholarships, especially in private institutions, on the basis of potential rather than past performance and, in some public institutions, notably the City University of New York, the adoption of a system of open admissions.

The effect of both of these methods on the maintenance of academic standards was a matter of great concern to many of the participants. It was pointed out, however, that in the United States in the 19th century the educational system had adapted itself both through the establishment of land grant colleges in rural areas and the taking in of large numbers of European immigrants in urban areas to help the disadvantaged, without destroying academic standards.

While concern was still expressed about the effects of open admissions on academic standards, the participants were sensitive to the proposition that education cannot be separated from the needs of society. It must be realized that standards are useful but that they can also be manipulated. When an institution declares that its commitment is to nebulous intellectual standards as opposed to the needs of society, it is headed for deep trouble.

C. Problems of Cultural and Intellectual Interchange: Cultural Differences and Value Systems in Asia and the U.S.

Discussion of this topic, chaired by Ichiro Kato, revolved around two main situations, that of Americans vis-a-vis Asians and that of Southeast Asians vis-a-vis Japanese. At the outset it was generally agreed that graduate student exchanges and faculty exchanges presented relatively few problems. It was with undergraduate exchanges that problems were more apt to arise.

In a few cases, American students in Asia were guilty of adopting self-righteous, proselytizing attitudes rather than the attitude of an interested learner seeking entry into a foreign society. For example, some U.S. students in the Chinese University of Hong Kong which represents a traditional Chinese environment, have created problems by their attitudes toward sexual permissiveness, their use of marijuana and alcohol, their long hair and casual dress. All of these are contrary to traditional Chinese mores.

Mention, however, was also made of the opposite situation in which American students go "native" to an extreme degree adopting the dress, religion and customs of the host country in a manner not likely to gain the respect of the host peer groups. One Southeast Asian representative reminded the participants that the reason Asian students do not have the same kind of difficulties in the United States that American students have in Asia is that it is much easier to move from a non-permissive to a permissive situation than vice versa, that is, it is simpler to let go than to adopt restraints. Another Southeast Asian participant noted that American students who were housed in middle-class homes rather than dormitories presented no problems.

Difficulties encountered in exchanges within Asia centered mainly on Asian students in Japan. The problems of foreign students in Japan reflected the tendency of some students from some countries to engage in political activity against their home governments, to the language barrier, and to the fact that Japanese universities had not yet created adequate machinery to handle foreign students. For the most part the difficulties were encountered not by the Chinese-educated Southeast Asians, who seemed to have no trouble in adapting, but by the English-educated Chinese, Indians, Burmese, and Malaysians.

A Southeast Asian participant pointed out that the Southeast Asian countries are so small that they live constantly under the threat of being overwhelmed by the dominant cultures. This is one of the reasons for the anti-American sentiment of some Philippine students.

The same participant spoke of the problem of how to overcome western influence without rejecting the benefits that the West has brought, such as industrialization and democracy. The basic question is how Southeast

Asia can survive in an area where four major powers — Japan, China, the United States and the Soviet Union — are all vying for power.

D. Area and Language Studies Programs in Asian and U.S. Universities: Current Status and Future Prospects.

With Edwin Reischauer as chairman, participants focused on the major trends and problems in these fields.

Language training can be divided into three categories: 1) traditional language studies, such as the study of Western European languages in the United States, and Chinese in Japan; 2) "second" language studies, those languages most important for communication with the outside world; and 3) "new" languages, that is the so-called exotic languages which are studied for reasons of commerce, research or political involvement.

Most participants from the Southeast Asian countries indicated that faced with a second-language problem they had adopted the short-range, pragmatic solution of teaching students to read rather than to speak so that they could read books and journals as training and research tools.

The situation of some countries which are confronted with a multiplicity of languages was described. People in countries whose main economic resource is trade, such as Singapore, require a working knowledge of several languages to make a living. In Singapore, for example, some acquaintance with four distinct languages is needed — Malay, English, Chinese and Tamil.

The situation in the Philippines is even more complicated. Up until the time of Philippine independence, English was the compulsory school language from the first grade. The present official language is Tagalog, but it is spoken by a minority of the population. At present, children in the first three grades are taught their native tongue. In the third grade they begin to study Tagalog, and English in the fifth. In addition, students continue to learn Spanish in high school and college. At the 1971 constitutional convention, the majority of the participants voted to conduct the sessions and draft the new constitution in English, a decision which further exacerbated a delicate situation.

In South Korea most people over 40 years of age know Japanese and the use of Chinese characters. Since Japanese was excluded from the curricula in government institutions after World War II, the most important second language now taught is English. In addition, German, French and Chinese are taught as second languages. Korean students wishing to go on to higher education must have studied three languages.

One participant raised the question of whether English was the proper second language for East Asia, and then answered it himself by observing that English would remain the second language both because of the political situation and because of the difficulty of mastering Chinese characters.

In this connection it was pointed out that English is rapidly becoming the dominant second language today in Japan, China and Russia.

The problem of area study programs in the U.S. were described by the American participants, who spoke of the relative decline in importance of the inter-disciplinary approach, a victim of the perennial quarrel between the specialist and the generalist in academia. Moreover, the neo-isolationist sentiment found in some quarters in the United States, coupled with decreasing financial support, has created a major crisis in area studies.

In Southeast Asia several factors were mentioned that work against area study programs. For example, Southeast Asian countries, most of them newly independent, are primarily concerned with their own national and regional studies and have neither the incentive nor the resources to develop area programs. Moreover, the reaction of small states to political and military pressure from major powers produces a negative reaction against foreign cultures, creating a climate which is anything but hospitable to the introduction of area studies in the school system.

E. Reorganization of Higher Education in Japan.

The final conference session chaired by Kenneth Holland, was devoted to a discussion of organization of higher education in Japan.

There have been many proposals for the reform of the Japanese educational system since the student disturbance of 1967, but those with the highest priority relate to post-secondary education. The university reform plan now under serious consideration seems to make the operation of the system more flexible and efficient, partly through modifications in university regulations concerning faculty organization and appointment, promotion and retirement policies. In addition, the plan calls for the creation of regional graduate schools, which will fill a critical need in the higher education system.

The changes in higher education will begin to be implemented in 1974 on a trial basis, subject to approval of the Japanese Diet.

The proposed reforms have to contend with a variety of conflicting forces:

1. the pressure of the increasing number of students coming at the same time as the attempt to raise requirements. At the present time about 20 per cent of the age group are in universities, and this number is expected to rise to 50 per cent in 10 years.
2. effective administration versus democratic procedures.
3. university independence versus dependence on government support.
4. participation of students and non-academic staff in administration versus the lack of interest of most of the students.

Another factor connected with reorganization is the conservative atti-

tude of the faculty and even of some students, which results in their opposition to reform. An additional reason for opposition by the faculty is that they fear a reduction of their power.

There followed a general discussion on democratization of universities. One of the participants stated that in a recent visit to Europe he found that some European universities have gone to extremes in this direction. In Germany for example the head of the university is elected by faculty, junior faculty and students, all having equal votes. A North American participant noted that in the U.S. there has been no significant movement toward democratization of the university decision-making. All that has been done is to widen channels of communication. The students are consulted but, except in a few cases, do not vote in elections of academic officials.

In the university of Malaya, on the other hand, there is one body which is the legal representative of the students — the student union. It represents the whole student body and shares in decision-making. The students in Malaya are evidently concerned and participate fully. This was contrasted with the difficulty found in sustaining effective representation and responsibility on the part of Japanese and American students in periods of relative calm. Interest is usually limited to radicals of both extremes. In Japan academic freedom of the faculty is very jealously guarded. As in the U.S., so in Japan, students are consulted informally but do not generally participate in decision-making on matters which affect the faculty.

At the conclusion of the session, participants considered plans for future sessions of the Council. It was agreed to hold the next meeting in late June 1972 in Indonesia, based on an agenda which will include staple topics (inter-university cooperation, university governance, inter-cultural exchange) and special problems (language teaching methods, training in science and technology, trends in the social sciences). Rounding out the agenda will be a topic of critical concern to all the participants, the role of universities in developing an intellectual basis for world citizenship.

NARA CONFERENCE

PARTICIPANTS

UNGKU A. AZIZ, *Vice Chancellor*
University of Malaya
Kuala Lumpur, Malaysia

LE THANH MINH CHAU, *Rector*
University of Hue
Hue, Viet Nam

ROBERT F. GOHEEN, *President*
Princeton University
Princeton, New Jersey

JAMES M. HESTER, *President*
New York University
New York, New York

KENNETH HOLLAND, *President*
Institute of International Education
New York, New York

RAYSON L. HUANG, *Vice Chancellor*
Nanyang University
Singapore

JUNTARO KAMAHORA, *President*
Osaka University
Osaka, Japan

ICHIRO KATO, *President*
University of Tokyo
Tokyo, Japan

CHOH-MING LI, *Vice Chancellor*
The Chinese University of Hong Kong
Shatin, New Territories, Hong Kong

SALVADOR P. LOPEZ, *President*
University of the Philippines
Quezon City, The Philippines

RICHARD W. LYMAN, *President*
Stanford University
Stanford, California

TAKASHI MUKAIBO, *Provost*
The University of Tokyo
Tokyo, Japan

FRANKLIN D. MURPHY
Chairman of the Board
The Times Mirror Company
Los Angeles, California

TAE SUN PARK, *President*
Yonsei University
Seoul, Korea

MAURICE H. PURCELL
Conference Rapporteur
Director of Admissions
Borough of Manhattan Community College
New York, New York

PEARL G. PURCELL
*Vice President and Special Assistant
to the President*
Institute of International Education
New York, New York

PUEY UNGPHAKORN
The Faculty of Economics
Thammasat University
Bangkok, Thailand

EDWIN O. REISCHAUER
University Professor
Harvard University
Cambridge, Massachusetts

SUMANTRI BRODJONEGORO, *Rector*
University of Indonesia
Djakarta, Indonesia

JAMES F. TIERNEY, *Vice President*
Institute of International Education for
the International Councils on Higher
Education
New York, New York

CHEN-HSING YEN, *President*
National Taiwan University
Taipei, Taiwan

APPENDIX

Participants in the Nara Conference prepared brief reports on *University Structure and Objectives* and *Area-Language Study Programs* as background information for the discussions. These papers are reproduced below.

HARVARD UNIVERSITY — CAMBRIDGE, MASSACHUSETTS **Students and the Changes in Governance**

While Harvard is a private university, its governing bodies were created in the seventeenth century by the Colony of Massachusetts Bay and cannot be changed except through the legislature of the state, that is, the Commonwealth of Massachusetts. As a consequence, formal change in their structure is unlikely. These governing bodies consist of the "Corporation," officially known as the President and Fellows of Harvard College, a seven man self-perpetuating group, and a Board of Overseers of 30 persons, elected for six year terms by the alumni. Most decisions are made by the "Corporation" but require the approval of the Overseers, which is legally the senior body. Under the Overseers there are 44 visiting committees (chaired by members of the Overseers and consisting of other alumni and knowledgeable persons drawn from other universities and society in general), which annually inspect and report on the functioning of the various faculties, departments, and special areas of activity of the University. While the two governing bodies are theoretically responsible for all aspects of the University's operations, they limit themselves in effect to major financial and administrative decisions and the selection of the President and the Deans, while under their loose policy guidance the various schools (or faculties) of the University exercise a wide degree of actual autonomy in faculty appointments, degree programs, and other matters bearing on Harvard's basic functions as a center for higher education and research.

While the pattern of governance varies somewhat among the individual schools, that of the Faculty of Arts and Sciences is central to the whole University and is most relevant to the concerns of the participants in this conference, for all of Harvard's more than 6,000 undergraduates and close to a third of its 9,800 graduate students come under this faculty.

While the Dean of the Faculty of Arts and Sciences and the various subordinate deans and administrators are appointed by the governing boards and have authority over most administrative matters within the faculty (the Dean himself, for example, decides the specific salary levels of full professors), the supervision of all educational programs, the real decisions on faculty appointments, and the basic decisions on the academic and parietal controls over students rest with the faculty as a whole, or with its constituent departments. The faculty decides on the general educa-

tional requirements for undergraduates and within these requirements approves the various concentration programs proposed by the various departments or inter-departmental committees. It also approves the various graduate programs (mostly Ph.D.) proposed by these same groups. The appointment of Teaching Fellows and junior faculty (Assistant Professor and various types of special Lecturers) are essentially made by the departments themselves, within the budgetary limits set by the Dean, while tenure appointments (normally full Professors) are proposed by the departments and are then passed on by *ad hoc* committees set up for each individual case, consisting of the President, the Dean, two or three faculty members from related departments, and two or three professors drawn from among scholars in the field of the appointment at other universities.

In order to perform its decision-making function, the faculty is organized in the following way. Most important decisions are voted at monthly meetings of the whole faculty, usually presided over by the President, but no substantive legislation is considered to be final unless it is printed in the agenda of the meeting circulated well in advance to all faculty members, and revisions of the organization and rules of the faculty must be submitted to a vote by printed ballot circulated to the whole faculty.

In order to guide the decision-making processes of the faculty and serve as an advisory council to the Dean, a Faculty Council is elected by proportional representation from the whole faculty (four tenure and two non-tenure faculty members from each of the major areas of the Natural Sciences, the Social Sciences, and the Humanities). This body, which meets weekly with the Dean, has a series of subsidiary committees to help it in its duties. A three-man Docket Committee, elected from the Council, supervises the flow of business to faculty meetings. Members of the Council, together with other members of the faculty selected by the Dean with the Council's advice, and elected student members constitute three committees on Undergraduate Education, Graduate Education, and Student and Community Relations. These three committees consider all questions within their fields of competence and present advisory opinions to the Council and through it to the faculty. Student members are also being added to various other appointive faculty committees, such as those on the Library and Athletics. In addition students elected from the various "houses" (the residential units for undergraduates) together with the House Masters (who are members of the faculty) constitute a Committee on Houses and Undergraduate Life.

A Committee on Rights and Responsibilities administers the "Resolution on Rights and Responsibilities" passed by the faculty on April 14, 1970. It consists of elected members of the faculty and elected students (the exact composition and the method of electing students are still not fully decided). It has the duty of examining through a quasi-judicial

process student infringements of the "Resolution on Rights and Responsibilities," such as violence or other infringements of the rights of others, and making disciplinary decisions. However, severe disciplinary actions, such as dismissal or suspension from Harvard, require final action by the faculty. A separate University-wide faculty committee is being created to pass on cases of faculty infringements of the "Resolution."

The above structure of governance reveals little formal change from the traditional pattern in which all legal authority was vested in the governing boards, but the various faculties actually enjoyed wide autonomy in all academic matters. Within this structure, however, there have been three major changes during the past few years in the actual methods by which the University and, in particular, the Faculty of Arts and Sciences are administered:

- 1) The governing boards and their appointive administrators (the President and deans) now consult very widely within the faculties and student bodies of the University before making decision affecting these groups;

- 2) the faculty has become a much more effective decision-making body by developing the structure of councils and committees outlined above and making membership in the key bodies elective rather than appointive;

- 3) students have been formally brought into various committees of the faculty which play an advisory role or, in the case of the Committee on Rights and Responsibilities, serve a judicial and disciplinary purpose; and

- 4) there has been a great shrinking in parietal controls over students, as the University moves away from the older concept that it stood *in loco parentis* and the student body comes to be accepted as being made up of responsible young adults.

The first change is well illustrated by the process in which a successor to President Pusey has been chosen and he in turn has approached the problem of selecting Deans. In previous cases the governing bodies, no doubt, did some consulting with those whose judgment they valued, but their choice of President or deans was usually an exciting revelation for the Harvard community as a whole. This time a "search committee" of the "Corporation" methodically consulted by letter every faculty, student, and alumni member of the Harvard community, followed this up by detailed consultations with representative members of these groups, particularly the faculty, and revealed from time to time the shrinking list of those they were considering for selection as President, before finally announcing their decision, approved by the "Corporation" and Overseers. This decision was accepted with approbation (or at least apathy) by all elements of the University community. The newly selected President, Mr. Bok, then formally consulted with the Faculty Council on several occa-

sions regarding the appointment of Deans in order to discover the wishes of the faculty.

The second change illustrates the greatly increased role on the part of the faculty as a whole in decision making. The old pattern was essentially for an apathetic faculty to give rubber stamp approval to most decisions approved by the administrators and the appointive faculty committees. Now the faculty itself, through fully or partially elective committees and much more meaningful faculty meetings, gives far more careful consideration to the decisions for which it is responsible. It should be stressed, however, that many of the most essential academic decisions and the selection of faculty members and subordinate officers of instruction are, as before, largely in the hands of the individual departments.

The third change is obvious from the student membership on the various committees. On the whole this has worked well. Students on such committees, as they become exposed to the complexities of the problems and the arguments of faculty members of the committees, develop attitudes not as much at variance with faculty attitudes as more casual student opinion would suggest. The chief problem is the election of student members. The usual elective bodies are the students of the Graduate School of Arts and Sciences as a whole, the Freshman Class, and the various house residential units for the remainder of the undergraduate student body. These are, of course, rapidly changing groups, not well known to each other, and there is sometimes little interest among students in serving on some of the committees.

The role of the student body in University governance is largely advisory (except in the matter of disciplining their own members), and there is no student role in faculty appointments. (The one case in which students have been allowed to play a role in such selections, the newly created Department of Afro-American Studies, is generally considered to have been a mistake which has contributed to the difficulty of that department in achieving stability and status.) However, thought is being given to reducing the almost exclusive emphasis on scholarly achievement and promise in making faculty appointments and finding ways to include teaching achievement among the criteria. If this change is made, student judgment may come to have a supplementary, advisory role in the selection of faculty members.

A final word of warning is necessary. Things are still somewhat in flux at Harvard, and it may be some years before one can judge whether the four major changes in the methods of governance at Harvard outlined above have been an appropriate and adequate response to the pressures of the time.

Edwin O. Reischauer
May 1971

THE CHINESE UNIVERSITY OF HONG KONG

Structure and Objectives

The Chinese University of Hong Kong Ordinance provides for the establishment of a federal institution, in which the principal language of instruction is Chinese, in order

- (a) to assist in the preservation, dissemination, communication and increase of knowledge;
- (b) to provide with the Colleges regular courses of instruction in the humanities, the sciences and other branches of learning of a standard required and expected of a university of the highest standing;
- (c) to stimulate the intellectual and cultural development of Hong Kong and thereby to assist in promoting its economic and social welfare.

This is The Chinese University of Hong Kong in summary—its structure, its objectives, and its programmes of studies—as conceived in the Ordinance of the University.

Structure

The Chinese University is a federal university comprising three Foundation Colleges and the Central Activities. The three Colleges are Chung Chi College, New Asia College and United College, founded years before the establishment of the University in 1963. The Central Activities include, *inter alia*, the central administration, the Graduate School and the School of Education, the University Library, the Research Institutes and Research Centres, and the Department of Extramural Studies.

“Central administration” is no more than a convenient collective expression for the personnel directly responsible to the Vice-Chancellor. The truly *central* administration is the Administrative and Academic Planning Committee, which consists of the Vice-Chancellor and the College Presidents as members and the University Registrar as secretary. It meets once a week in a frank and cordial atmosphere to discuss major policies, approve appointments, ensure uniform action whenever necessary, scrutinize recommendations to the Senate and Council, and advise the Vice-Chancellor on various executive actions.

Undergraduate teaching is conducted by the three Foundation Colleges. But the supervisory, planning and policy-making machinery in academic matters—the Senate, the Senate Academic Planning Committee, the Faculty Boards and the Boards of Studies—is federal, the membership of all these bodies being university-wide. Intercollegiate teaching — with courses open to students of all three Colleges—is the aim; in the current academic year over 140 intercollegiate courses in 17 subjects are offered.

Post-graduate teaching comes under “Central Activities”; yet its policy-making organ, the Graduate Council, has on it the College Presidents as well.

At the head of the policy-making and planning bodies of the University is the University Council. Besides four educators from the United Kingdom and the United States, Council members include the Vice-Chancellor, three representatives from each of the three Colleges, and fourteen from the business and professional community, with the Chairman elected from this latter category. The Council is the supreme legislative and governing body of the University.

The three Colleges came together on the conviction that their common objectives can best be attained through concerted efforts. Without sacrificing the individuality and entity of each constituent College, The Chinese University aspired to be a truly federal, viable institution of higher learning. This vision has become reality through the mutual trust and willing co-operation of all concerned constituents.

Objectives

The Chinese University of Hong Kong is, quite naturally, pledged to the preservation and promotion of Chinese culture. As a constant reminder to its students and staff, the University has chosen as its motto: Po Wen Yueh Li, which is at the heart of Confucian philosophy. It means:

“By extensively studying all learning, and keeping himself under the restraint of the rules of propriety, one may thus likewise not err from what is right.” (Legge’s translation)

An Institute of Chinese Studies has been established to promote scholarship in Chinese Studies in Hong Kong and overseas (especially Asia and the West) by serving as an international centre for Chinese Studies capable of effectively assisting other academic and research institutions and scholars in this field and maintaining close and continuing co-operation and interchange with them; to develop a well-integrated programme of teaching and research in Chinese Studies viewed within the context of Asian and world developments; to provide interested local and visiting academic members of the University with the necessary facilities for training in order to help them strengthen their teaching and research abilities; and to encourage the exchange of knowledge and experience in Chinese Studies through an effective programme of publication, academic conferences and research seminars.

Professor Lin Yutang, world-renowned scholar and Research Professor of the University, spent four years compiling a Chinese-English dictionary of modern usage. In his words, “the Chinese language is receiving a linguistic treatment for the first time.” The manuscript has been completed and is expected to be out of the press by mid-1972.

In order to help the secondary level of education in Hong Kong, a four-day Symposium on the Teaching of Chinese Language and Literature was held in July 1970, attended by over 140 high-school teachers. Recently the University has received financial support from the Carnegie Founda-

tion to conduct an in-depth survey and research on Secondary Education in the community.

The University aims at being "a Chinese institution of international character" so that it may attain "a standard required and expected of a university of the highest standing." One of the major objectives is to strive for international standards of scholarship, thus bringing the University into the world of higher learning. Three Advisory Boards on Academic Matters, consisting of prominent scholars from many parts of the world, are consulted by the University from time to time. Serving on the University Council are such distinguished educationists from overseas institutions as the Chairman of the Inter-University Council for Higher Education Overseas, the Director of the School of Oriental and African Studies of the University of London, the President of Harvard University and the former President of the University of California. This University has always been keenly aware of the importance of inter-university cooperation and has made considerable efforts to establish close relations with other institutions of higher education, both local and overseas. There is a continuous stream (structured according to plan) of visiting staff at this University, and both staff and students of the University are regularly sent abroad for further studies under various schemes and exchange programmes. The University is an active member of various international organizations and an enthusiastic participant in international conferences, for the valuable exchange of ideas and experiences.

The ultimate aim of the University is "to assist in the preservation, dissemination, communication and increase of knowledge"—and to do so to the best of its ability. Hence teaching methods, the examination system, the library system, administrative procedures, etc. are under constant review, and improvements are made whenever necessary. Research is positively and conscientiously encouraged, to ensure that faculty members and graduate students keep abreast of the latest developments in the world of learning and contribute to it. Three Institutes have been established, namely, the Institute of Chinese Studies, the Institute of Science and Technology, and the Institute of Social Studies and the Humanities; under them a number of Research Centres.

Great care is exercised in developing the library system of the University. The University Library is primarily a research library for the use of staff and graduate students, whereas the three College Libraries are primarily for undergraduates. The four libraries form one co-ordinated library system. In selecting materials, it works closely with the Boards of Studies, so that acquisitions may reflect and meet the teaching and research needs of the University.

UNIVERSITY OF HUE, VIETNAM

Structure and Objectives

1. The universities in Vietnam owed their creation to diverse and sometimes conflicting motives; at first, it was the need of the colonial power for a small educated class to man the services; later, it was the desire for equality with the nations of the West, the urge for modernization and development, the concern for the preservation of a weakened national culture; there was also the traditional respect for learning, the hope that a university degree would bring social status, the wish to free oneself and one's children from labor on the land.

2. The universities in Vietnam owe much of their present history and pattern to the French. The University of Hanoi—first to be established in Vietnam (1917)—was a "filiale" of the University of Paris. The University of Saigon, formally created in 1955⁽¹⁾ was an identical twin of the University of Hanoi in structure and in curricula. The two universities were, in fact, placed under the same management in the beginning. The Presidential Decree of March 1st, 1957, which established the University of Hue, specifically stipulated that the new university should adopt the structure and curricula of the University of Saigon.

A fundamental feature of the Vietnamese university was that it had imported from abroad a whole set of ready-made value systems, techniques and attitudes and these once implanted on Vietnamese soil had become crystallized and sacrosanct. There was a tendency to imitate foreign curricula, reading lists and examination questions and to adopt "international standards."

From this situation a conflict was generated both within and without the university. The motives of the colonial period for founding the universities were perpetuated in their structure and curricula. The urge of the newly independent state for modernization and economic development did not coincide with the traditional reluctance of the learner toward productive work. Neither could the imported structure and curricula help strengthen national culture. One set of cultural and political ideals found expression in academic circles, another in public life.

A cleavage existed not only between the university and society, but also between different groups within the university itself. Lacking clearly-defined institutional objectives and a strong sense of institutional integrity, the members of the university tended to orient their actions to group interests. A critical division in opinion, beliefs and interests could lead to some opposition between foreign- and local-trained faculty members, and between faculty members and students.

The university lacked a community ethic to generate internal cohesion

(1) A small Center for Medical Studies, considered as the nucleus of the University of Saigon, had already been established in 1947.

and bring all groups working together toward a common institutional goal. There was also the need to define more sharply the university's role in the national community. The university must seek to espouse the values of this community and promote its interests. The institutional integrity of the university and its integration in national life are fundamental tasks in higher education.

3. An old nation but a newly independent state, Vietnam shares the problems of the countries attempting national consolidation and development. Already a divided country, Vietnam is internally split by politics, religion and regionalism. Social progress is slowed down by inadequate popular understanding and the lack of social discipline. Economic development is hindered by the absence of economic infrastructure and shortage of skilled manpower.

Vietnam has been at war for a quarter of a century. The draining of manpower and resources for military purposes, the destruction of human lives and properties, the effects of war on the population, especially on the young people, have crippled this nation.

4. Over a long period of struggle for national independence, survival and development, ideal values have emerged which have often been invoked by political parties, governments, and the press in their efforts to rally popular support.

The following values have been identified:

- (i) Peace, security and freedom from fear;
- (ii) National independence (national defense and territorial integrity); regional and international cooperation;
- (iii) National consolidation: unity of heart and mind as well as political unity of the country; improvement of social and economic institutions, and attitudes, and creation of the "new man", to bring about an integrated national community and system of government that is effective, cohesive and internally united in purpose and action;
- (iv) Democratic ideals (civil liberties, popular acceptance of development goals, social and economic equalization) to be balanced with social discipline;
- (v) Social and economic development in an orderly and rational fashion: development and planning for development;
- (vi) Rise of standard of living and general welfare: health, education and leisure.

5. The university will achieve its integration in national life if it adopts the values of the national community and seeks to promote its highest interests. This appears to be the first and most basic institutional goal for the university to adopt. The other goals in teaching, research and services will derive from, and serve to implement, this fundamental goal.

6. The university must be an institution which has high academic standards, and which commits itself to the education of undergraduate and graduate students, in areas of national and local needs, specifically in languages, culture and history, in economics, sociology and political science, in education and teacher training, in medicine and public health, in forestry, fishing, water control and marketing of agricultural products.

7. The university must be an institution with a heavy commitment to research in selected areas of needs. The whole approach to research and research standards will be reviewed to suit the situation and the needs of Vietnam. Teaching/learning, research and community services should blend more harmoniously and in some areas could be brought into one single program. Research could also be approached earlier in the student's career, even at the undergraduate level.

8. The university must not shirk its social role. However, it should guard itself against over-committing its limited staff and resources to a plethora of activities which are not related to its educational programs. Following are some of the areas in which it seems appropriate for the university to involve itself:

- (i) Inadequate popular understanding is a serious obstacle to social progress. The university is the institution uniquely qualified to promote public enlightenment and thereby to confront the problems of a modernizing society. Extra-mural programs related to studies of practical and local problems of culture, sociology, economics and politics could be organized;
- (ii) The university assumes responsibility in promoting research in, and diffusion of, new techniques and other innovations related to mass education and public health;
- (iii) The university serves as clearing-house for all information related to the social and economic development of the geographic area it serves; staff members can help set up development projects and work as consultants to the government and private groups in such projects.

9. The university aims at producing useful and responsible citizens who:

- Understand the forces that shape themselves and their world;
- can think, judge, decide and are willing to accept responsibility;
- have a concern for excellence and desire for continuous learning; know how to make good use of leisure time;
- have moral and aesthetic sensibility;
- can work with others and are willing to participate in community activities.

10. The university which tries to adapt itself to social change will need an academic structure which will allow for flexibility and diversity. The high cost of responsive instruction is a serious obstacle, but this must not

deter the university from attempting to provide students with more seminars, discussions, tutorials and other forms of small-group instruction. Students should have wider opportunities for independent work. Greater flexibility in scheduling should also be encouraged.

11. The university *clientele* in Vietnam does not consist only of regular full-time students. Up to 60% of the student enrollment is composed of members of the civil service and of the army. Most of these cannot attend class regularly. Some of them are even posted hundreds of miles away from the campus. The needs of these students are varied and there should be a greater range of courses, high- and low-level courses, short and longer courses, part- and full-time courses, day-time and evening courses to satisfy these needs. The whole range of degrees and qualifications need to be reviewed.

12. The academic structure should be such as to allow for greater mobility between different parts of higher education: facility for transfer, for leaving school for a job and for returning to school later. But better articulation cannot be implemented unless there exists a *system* of higher education in the country—a comprehensive system to provide for all the needs of the country in post-secondary education at different levels and in different kinds of institutions with clearly defined functions for each.

The mutual understanding and the cooperation between the different groups within the university, and between the university and its community is the necessary favorable atmosphere in which the university can grow and fulfill its mission.

Le Thanh Minh Chau
June 1971

UNIVERSITY OF INDONESIA — DJAKARTA

University Structure and Objectives

I. The Rector of the University is assisted by three Deputy Rectors,
Deputy Rector for Academic Affairs
Deputy Rector for Administration and Finance
Deputy Rector for Students and Alumni Affairs

and also by two special assistants:

Special Assistant for Research

Special Assistant for Registration (Registraar).

Directly reporting to the Rector:

Chief, Bureau of Public Relations

Chief, Planning Committee

Chief, Computer Project

Chief, Population Studies Center.

II. The University consists of ten (10) Faculties :

1. Faculty of Medicine
2. Faculty of Dentistry
3. Faculty of Public Health
4. Faculty of Law
5. Faculty of Economics
6. Faculty of Literature
7. Faculty of Social Sciences
8. Faculty of Psychology
9. Faculty of Sciences
10. Faculty of Engineering

The University also operates 2 (two) extension Courses :

1. Extension Faculty of Law
2. Extension Faculty of Economics

III. The main function of the Faculties is teaching.

Research is done either individually or by the Faculty Departments. In some cases research is done by *Institutes*, especially founded/created for research purposes (Interdisciplinary approach).

IV. Instruments of Authority :

The Rector of the University is the top-executive of the University. He has the regular meetings with the Deans of the Faculty, for policy formulations and for policy-implementations.

For very important and essential decisions, he can consult the so-called Senate, comprising of all Deans and all full-professors of the University. The Rector also consults with the council of Students which is the Representatives of the Students Body (Student-Government) on matters of importance and interest of the Students.

The Rector reports directly to the Minister of Education and Culture.

V. According to the Law on Higher Education, the University has to fulfill three main tasks/(tri-dharma) objectives.

1. Education
2. Research
3. Public Service :

Education: to train and educate graduates of high caliber and standing, prepare to assume jobs of high responsibility.

Research: to carry out research, in order to advance science and technology for the good of mankind.

Public service:

as an institution to provide services (in its field of expertise) to the public, government as well as the private sector.

- VI. The University is a Government Institution : its budget is appropriated by the Department of Education and Culture.
The University is Autonomous, in the sense of :
 academic autonomy,
 authorized to receive grants (without ties), raise funds.

Area and Language Studies.

- VII. The teaching and Research of languages is done in the Faculty of Literature. This Faculty has the following Departments :
- Department for Bahasa Indonesia (Indonesia-Language)
 - Department for Bahasa Nusantara (local languages, like Javanese, Batak, etc.)
 - Department for English.
 - Department for French.
 - Department for German.
 - Department for Arabic
 - Department for Chinese.
 - Department for Japanese.
 - Department for Russian.
 - Department for Dutch.
 - Department for Sanskrit.

Besides these language studies, the University of Indonesia has also an Institute for Area (regional) Studies, which is on an Interdisciplinary basis, is not engaged in teaching, only for research.

Sumantri Brodjonegoro.

June, 1971

NANYANG UNIVERSITY — SINGAPORE

Structure and Objectives

Structure

As the accompanying chart shows, the overall management of the University is vested in the Council consisting of the Chairman as Head of the University, the Vice Chancellor as the principal executive and academic officer and nineteen other members representative of such bodies as the Senate, the Guild of Graduates and the Government, and of persons prominent in the spheres of education, culture, industry or commerce. The Vice Chancellor as the principal executive and academic officer of the University, has general control over the administrative and academic departments and such standing committees as are appointed by him. He chairs the Senate, which is the highest academic body in the University and of which membership comprises all deans, chairmen of departments,

holders of Foundation Chairs, and two elected members from each of the Colleges.

Objectives

The "objects" as stated in the Ordinance establishing the University are "the promotion of Learning, Arts, Science and Research, the provision of Higher Education and the conferment of degrees" and it shall "establish colleges in schools. . . . where students may obtain a sound classical, scientific, technical and liberal education and advanced instruction in all subjects included in a liberal education" and it shall be empowered "to provide training in the principles and practice of educational methods and to establish vocational and professional schools."

The impetus which brought about the establishment of the University came from the demand for higher education for students from the Chinese secondary schools in Singapore and Malaya after the Second War, a purpose which had been served in the past through the universities of Mainland China. Before the War the Chinese in South-east Asia, with heavy concentration in the then Malaya/Singapore region, by and large considered themselves as in temporary residence overseas and set great store by educating their youth in their own cultural tradition in the medium of their mother tongue and at their own expense. Graduates of these overseas Chinese high schools, if they had the aptitude and the means, generally made their way back to China for higher education as the most natural thing in the World. This happy state of affairs, however, received a rude shock, first from the War and then from the cataclysmic changes on the Chinese mainland. At a time when there had been built up an intensified demand for higher education, the queuers-up for college entrance from Chinese high schools in the Malaya/Singapore region had their customary and, for all practical purposes, only road to higher education abruptly shut off.

While on the one hand the opening to universities in China was shut, on the other, access to what little opportunity of higher education there was available locally was denied to the graduates of Chinese high schools by officialdom on the pretext that these young men and women were not brought up within the accepted system of education, in short, not the product of the English schools. In this predicament what more logical outcome could there be than for the Chinese to set up their own institution of higher education? And this they proceed to do and chose Singapore, the focal point of the region where there was a dense concentration of oversea Chinese, as the site of the first Chinese university to be built overseas.

As the years pass, the University has evolved into an institution performing a unique function in higher education logically flowing from its traditions, and building its future upon its present strengths. It is first a

Chinese language university but also a multi-lingual institution catering to students from the Chinese stream of education in Singapore and drawing also from the other streams, as well as students from neighbouring countries in the region.

Rayson L. Huang
May 1971

NEW YORK UNIVERSITY

Structure and Objectives

New York University is a multi-purpose institution whose activities are dispersed throughout the City of New York at six principal locations. Its undergraduate colleges include two colleges of liberal arts and science and undergraduate divisions devoted to engineering, education, business administration, and the performing arts, altogether accommodating 12,000 students. Its graduate and professional schools include Graduate Arts and Science, Law, Medicine, Dentistry, Public Administration, Social Work, Business Administration, and graduate divisions in engineering and education, altogether accommodating 22,000 students. The University also contains a School of Continuing Education serving 10,000 students, which provides lower division undergraduate work for adults as well as a wide range of special courses designed to meet the educational need of various segments of the New York City population. The research and clinical commitments of the various schools are extensive.

In such an institution, substantial responsibility has to be delegated to the deans of the schools and colleges. Each of the faculties has control over its own academic regulations. The central administration maintains over-all budgetary control, the appointment of deans, approval of the creation and termination of departments and programs, and the granting of tenure. The central administration is, of course, responsible for providing a wide variety of services to all of the units of the University.

One of the major difficulties of such an institution is achieving any significant sense of institutional unit and purpose. The most effective device for achieving this has become the University Senate, which is composed of four groups: the deans of the 14 schools and colleges, 24 elected faculty members, 16 elected students, and 10 members of the central administration. In the course of each month, each of these groups meets independently, frequently with the President and Chancellor, and also in a combined meeting, with the President as Chairman. The Senate has the power to rule on academic matters affecting more than one college and on rules affecting the academic community, and can advise the President and the Board of Trustees on any matter.

The introduction of students as members of the Senate occurred two years ago, and so far their participation has been highly successful. Their presence is not considered a matter of democratic right but rather an opportunity to be heard and a means to improve the deliberations of the Senate by including the perspectives of students. One student is elected from each undergraduate and graduate division. Students serve on all the principal committees of the Senate and both their attendance and the seriousness of their effort have been excellent. While the deliberations of the Senate have been considerably lengthened as a result of the student participation, they have also become more vital.

One of the principal values of the Senate is that it provides a forum in which major issues before the University community can be discussed and a variety of views expressed and reported in the student press. Actions of the central administration, which previously were undertaken without such broad-based consultation, now seem far less autocratic.

Before student participation in the Senate was introduced, each of the schools and colleges opened up opportunities for student participation on a variety of committees within the schools, including curriculum committees. Efforts to include some students as voting members of the faculties themselves have been unsuccessful and are opposed by most of the deans and by the central administration. Students are regularly included on search committees for new deans.

Deliberating bodies at other universities include representatives of other parts of the academic community, such as research scientists and non-academic employees. This has prompted the question of their inclusion at New York University, and a committee of the Senate is now reviewing the composition of the Senate.

James M. Hester
June 1971

PRINCETON UNIVERSITY

Structure and Objectives

1. Governance:

Like most American universities, Princeton operates under a Board of Trustees in whom all the legal powers of the University are invested.

Ours is a large Board, consisting of 39 members, including the President of the University and the Governor of the State of New Jersey who are members *ex officio*. Most of the other members are laymen (*i.e.*, not academicians), though there generally are a few university administrators and faculty members from *other institutions* on Princeton's Board of Trustees. Through a reform initiated 3 years ago, the Board has come

to include 4 young Alumni Trustees, elected one per year, for four-year terms, at the time of their graduation from college. This brings youthful perspectives into the deliberations of the Board, while keeping it relatively detached from student politics.

Because of its large size, much of the business of the Board of Trustees is transacted through standing committees on, for example, finance, grounds and buildings, curriculum, plans and resources, etc. The Princeton Trustees are by no means a "rubber stamp", but by long tradition they rely on the President and the Faculty for initiative and guidance insofar as academic program and development are concerned. Also, nowadays, student discipline, rules of conduct, and the like are no longer in our case considered to be within the direct purview of the Trustees. The Trustees do take a direct hand in the management of the University's resources and the oversight of its budget, and any new steps which entail a substantial allocation of resources must be approved in advance by the Trustees. (There is attached a statement on how trustee authority is normally exercised and delegated in the various aspects of the University's affairs.)

But perhaps one of the most important functions of the Trustees is to serve as a general bridge of understanding and two-way communication between the resident University community and elements of the general public. On this front, the Princeton Board of Trustees can be said to have been consistently a staunch and able defender of academic freedom.

The presidency of Princeton is by tradition a "strong" one, in that the President is not only the chief executive officer but is expected to lead both the Trustees and the Faculty (both of whose meetings he chairs). Nevertheless faculty and student participation in decision-making is an old, rather than new, custom with us.

However, in the past few years, we have thought it necessary and desirable to extend very considerably the regular, organized means for student and faculty participation. A principal mechanism is the Council of the Princeton University Community, which consists of 57 members drawn from the faculty (18), the undergraduates (14), the graduate students (8), the senior administration (7), the non-academic staff (6), and alumni (4).

The CPUC is a deliberative body which meets at least monthly and which can (and does) debate and make recommendations on any issues of concern that are brought before it. The CPUC also has supervision of rule-making and the enforcement of rules in the University. These last functions are exercised mainly by two standing committees: a Committee on Rights and Rules and a Judicial Committee. The latter adjudicates all cases that involve a serious infringement on the University's mission or functions.

Apart from the CPU, we now also have operating — with greater or less success in the individual instance — student advisory committees in connection with each of the academic departments. For some five years, with considerable benefit we think, a regular program for student evaluation of courses of instruction has functioned under University auspices. There are also undergraduate committees paralleling most of the standing committees of the Faculty — e.g., Library, Course of Study, Student Life — and representatives of these student committees normally meet with the faculty committees.

These various steps toward more "participatory" or consultative governance have entailed greatly enlarged time-demands on the faculty and students who become involved. This is even more so for the chief administrative officers of the University. There is some reason to doubt that many of the best faculty members and students will be willing to continue to give this much time and energy to committee work. But given the current situation, with many latent divisions and tensions on the campus, arising out of deep divisions and tensions in the American society at large, it is hard to see how the stability of the University, and its ability to be a place where the life of the mind can be pursued relatively quietly and consistently, can be maintained without the engagement of substantial numbers of representatives of students and faculty in the direction of its affairs. In the affairs of the modern university elsewhere, when the moderates are not engaged, or become apathetic, the extremists of the left and the right are given the field, and then the essential purpose of the university as the center for rational thought and inquiry becomes rapidly beclouded — or even more seriously mistreated.

II. Size and Organization:

As American universities go these days, Princeton is a relatively small one, and it is also relatively simple (and therefore perhaps relative coherent) in organization.

Thus, in place of a large congerie of professional schools grouped around a core of work in the arts and sciences, Princeton is basically an arts and science university. Its only professional schools are those of Architecture and Urban Planning, Engineering and Applied Sciences, and the Woodrow Wilson School of Public and International Affairs. Both in terms of instructional programs and student life, the three Schools are closely integrated into both the undergraduate college and the graduate school of arts and sciences. And indeed, wherever possible, inter-involvement and mutual reinforcement among disciplines receives emphasis.

As to size, Princeton has only about 5,000 students enrolled, of whom roughly 3,500 (plus) are undergraduates and 1,500 (minus) are graduate students. Full-time faculty number slightly over 600, with part-time

visiting appointments and teaching assistants bringing the total instructional staff up to nearly 1,000. There are in addition some 400 professionals serving in research programs under faculty supervision. The high ratio of faculty to students results from (1) a strong commitment to undergraduate education, so that almost all senior faculty are substantially engaged in teaching undergraduates as well as in research and graduate education; and (2) a strong commitment to research as well as to teaching. About 39¢ of every dollar in the University's annual budget of some \$7 million goes into sponsored research, most of which is funded by Federal grants and contracts.

Thus, we sometimes say, "Princeton is small in numbers, but large in function". By that we mean not only that we consume large amounts of dollars but, much more, that our chosen emphasis is upon intellectual quality and the pursuit of fundamental learning, as against merely vocational or topical pursuits.

III. A Changing Race-track (Curriculum):

At the same time, under student prodding, we have recently been exploring quite aggressively ways in which there can be more ready interplay between the formal curriculum and learning opportunities off the campus. We are seeking to make it easier for able undergraduates, who come with good preparation, to interrupt their studies in order to gain maturity and external experience before coming back to complete their studies. We also see a need to shorten the sequence of study from high school through the college years into graduate or professional school, for substantial numbers of our most highly motivated and well-prepared students.

At the same time, we have been seeking to create a student body which is diverse in terms of social and economic backgrounds, and in the last 10 years we have especially sought to identify and admit substantial numbers of qualified students from minority groups. Roughly 10% of each entering undergraduate class now comes from an economically disadvantaged background (family income under \$7,500). Many of these students need at least the full, normal four years of concentrated study to achieve the bachelor's degree, and they often cannot cope with the degree of independence in their choice and pursuit of subjects which we are accustomed to give students who come out of the better public and independent high schools.

For these and other reasons, the whole form of the undergraduate college and especially its existing broad curricular patterns are now under deep and extensive study at Princeton. There will undoubtedly be some marked changes emerging within the next few years. They will, however, almost certainly occur within the context of a basic commitment to the

idea of a university as a place where free inquiry and thought are prime values—a place where the essential (though not sole) business is the cultivation of the life of the mind. In this respect, Princeton probably continues to operate in the “classical” Western tradition in larger degree than many other American universities and colleges where more applied and more vocational concerns have a fuller and more dominant play.

IV. Funding:

Princeton is a privately established and funded university. This means that it is heavily dependent on student fees and also on the income of accumulated endowments. Since World War II, with the growth of research activity in the sciences and engineering, Princeton has also been heavily dependent on Federal funding for its activities in research and graduate education. It is now apparent that student fees and the benefaction of individual donors cannot be increased at a rate sufficient to meet the needs and opportunities confronting the University—over and above the requirements for research.

Various recent national studies have, indeed, shown that the universities which have aimed the most consistently both at academic excellence and at social responsibility are in the greatest financial difficulties—and that for some of them the dangers are very great indeed. This is the case with Princeton despite an endowment of some \$400 million and tuition charges now raised to the level of \$2,900 per student per year.

In company with other private and public universities, we are thus forced to look now, as never before, to the Federal government for general support of our basic educational enterprise. When such broad-scale Federal support can be brought about—and in what form—with what possible consequences to the independence of our institutions—are paramount questions for us at Princeton today, as they are also at almost all private colleges and universities in America at this time.

Robert F. Goheen
May 1971

Statement of Policy on Delegation of Authority Adopted by the Board of Trustees of Princeton University October 24, 1969

In order to clarify the actual practice and procedures followed in the governance of the University, the Board of Trustees declares its intent, in matters of policy as well as of operations, to continue to delegate broad authority to the President and, through him, to the Officers of the Administration, the Faculty, and the Students as more specifically set forth below. While the Trustees may and do delegate authority in wide areas, they cannot either delegate it irrevocably or consign to any other parties their final responsibilities under the law and the terms of the Princeton Charter.

Policy initiative in almost all areas rests with the president and various

members of the resident University community. Beyond this there have evolved, generally speaking, three modes by which Trustees share or delegate, normally through standing or special committees, powers and responsibilities in University operations and decision making.

General Review: In electing members of the Faculty, the Trustees are guided almost entirely by the recommendations of the President and the Advisory Committee on Appointments and Advancements and exercise their responsibility through a continuing review of the quality of the President's leadership in the maintenance of a highly qualified faculty and by a periodic check of the integrity and efficiency of the procedures followed in the appointment and advancement of faculty members. In matters of curriculum, the creation and abolition of courses, the establishment of requirements for degrees, the prescription of academic procedures, and in most matters within the purview of the University Research Board, the Trustees have delegated their authority to the President and Faculty to be exercised through the appropriate bodies and officers of the University. Procedures for recruiting new students, criteria for admissions, and continuing relations with the leadership of schools are the responsibility of the President and the Director of Admission acting pursuant to policies determined with the advice of faculty and student committees on admission, subject to the general review of the Trustees. Oversight of student life and discipline, including the formulation of rules of conduct and dormitory regulations, has been delegated to the President and Faculty to be exercised through various faculty and student groups in accordance with the constituted procedures.

The functioning of the Library is supervised by the Librarian under the direction of the central administration, with the advice of faculty and student committees, the Trustees' concern being directed to the overall quality of the Library and the effectiveness of its operations. Likewise, in the areas of health and athletics the Trustees exercise general oversight, together with occasional professional advice in matters of health and medical care. Requirements for physical space and services are formulated by the several departments in collaboration with the central administration and subject to general review by the Trustees. Plant operations are entirely in the hands of administrative officers. The preparation of the annual budget proceeds through a complex process under the direction and supervision of the central administration, with detailed review by the Trustees, largely through their Committee on Finance, in the light of available funds and previously established priorities.

Prior Review: It is assumed that major changes in policy and any substantial new claims on funds will be brought to the Trustees for review before final decisions or commitments are made. The Trustees thus exercise a prior and general review in such matters as the allocation of a signi-

ificant proportion of the University's resources, the setting of priorities for development, changes in instructional method of broad bearing for the institution, the determination of tuition and fees, steps to be taken to improve the social and living conditions of students, plans calling for new construction, the establishment or abolition of departments or schools, changes in admissions policies affecting sizeable categories of potential students, and changes in relations with outside educational and social institutions and governmental agencies.

Authority Directly Exercised: In matters concerning financial health and physical properties the Trustees participate directly in the formulation of policy and the conduct of the business of the University. The Trustee Committee on Finance directs the investment of University funds and supervises the management of the off-campus real estate of the Corporation. The Trustees establish fund-raising policies, approve major development programs, help to identify important sources of potential financial support, and raise funds. Through the Committee on Grounds and Buildings, and with the advice of the President, the Faculty Advisory Committee on Architecture, and other resident members of the University with relevant interests and competence, the Trustees actively supervise long-range physical planning, the determination of architectural styling and landscaping, and the general condition of the University's physical plant.

In addition to what has been indicated above, it is understood more generally that the Board may contribute advice and criticism to the shaping of academic programs and the conduct of affairs in the University. If the Board is to assess general policies wisely, it must be fully and currently informed and be alert and sensitive to particular conditions and requirements. Members of the Board often have experience and competence that can be helpful to the University in its dealing with specific problems, and their advice is most valuable in the early consideration of new policies.

It is the stated intent of the Trustees to continue the general arrangements described above. Modifications of these arrangements may from time to time be adopted in order to improve the University's pursuit of its essential missions and to give the Trustees the benefit of wider points of view in the exercise of the power and authority vested in the Board by the law and the Charter of the University.

STANFORD UNIVERSITY — STANFORD, CALIFORNIA **Structure and Objectives of the University**

There is perhaps more debate and disagreement in the United States today than ever before concerning the "structure and objectives" of the university.

The present structure is attacked as being undemocratic and hierarchical. Decisions, it is said, are made by individuals and oligarchies not responsible to the people most affected by them—the students. The institution of the lay Board of Trustees or Regents, which is perhaps the most peculiarly American contribution to university government, is attacked for having allegedly used its ultimate authority to make the university the servant of the most powerful elements in the society, big business and the government, in particular the military establishment.

This may seem ironic, since the lay Board was long seen as a protective buffer, safeguarding academic institutions from undue interference from outside—a protection often lacking when governments have direct authority over higher education.

The extent to which traditional structures have been modified in response to such criticism varies from one university to another, especially in the private sector, where change is generally possible with fewer bureaucratic and political constraints than exist in the state systems of higher education. Some Boards of Trustees have added faculty members or students to their membership, and some, responding to the charge of being monopolized by older people, have changed their selection procedures to assure the inclusion of at least a few recent graduates. In general, however, governing boards remain largely composed of older persons, and drawn mostly from the ranks of people experienced in business and civic affairs.

The selection of university presidents tends to be accomplished with the aid of more elaborate consultative mechanisms than was once the case. Often both faculty and students are given important advisory roles, and the faculty enjoys at least as much actual influence in the choosing of the president as the governing Board, because of the faculty's greater familiarity with the academic profession, from which most candidates are drawn.

Once installed, the president has substantially less power, relative to other elements in the university, than was true even a few years ago. This has come about for several reasons:

- 1) The faculty plays a more active role, exercising powers long held but often allowed to remain dormant, and sometimes claiming new and expanded ones as well.
- 2) Students, rebelling against authority in all forms, and often failing to recognize the limited nature of the president's power, have singled him out to be the primary target of confrontation tactics, with or without coercion or violence.
- 3) The enormously increased role of the Federal Government, especially in the support of research and postgraduate training, has created direct ties between individual faculty members and government agencies, bypassing the university administration to a considerable extent, and

influencing the choice of academic activities in which the university shall engage.

- 4) The growth in sheer size and complexity of universities, and of their external relations, has resulted in the growth of bureaucracy within the institution, which inevitably places constraints upon the president's freedom of action and of decision-making.

At the same time the faculty, despite the development noted in (1) above, has become less and less certain of its role, and correspondingly more susceptible to pressure from students. Under attack for allegedly overemphasizing research (as opposed to teaching), for overspecialization, and for neglect of pressing social problems that do not fit neatly under the rubrics of established academic specialties, many faculty members seem ready to plead at least half-guilty. This often leads to concession-making or compromise when students demand an increased voice in the making of academic policy. Usually—or, perhaps one should say, thus far—this stops short of giving students a voting role in the process of appointments and promotions of faculty. But a consultative or advisory role for students is no longer rare.

At first glance one might think that the students did not share in the faculty's uncertainty as to the objectives of the university. Certainly dogmatic assertions on the subject are not lacking. But in fact most students, even at the more controversy-ridden institutions, are reported by social scientists who have studied the matter to be at least reasonably satisfied with the established mixture of objectives that characterizes American universities. In a way this is hardly surprising, since heterogeneity of purposes has been among the most remarkable aspects of higher education in the United States. Virtually all American universities combine professional and career training of the most practical kind with study of the liberal arts and of esoteric subjects. At the Faculty Club, Professors of Sanskrit rub elbows with Professors of Mechanical Engineering or Hotel Management (although actual communication among scholars in widely separated disciplines is often slight). Thus in a sense there is "something for everybody" in the American university curriculum.

But this has entailed weakness and vulnerability to criticism, as well as strength. Because the university does provide practical training for careers in business and the professions, it finds itself derided as merely a glorified apprenticeship program for positions in the Establishment. The fact that humanistic study and social criticism are also nourished by the university, and that its role as the leading patron of the arts has never been more prominent, gets lost from sight when such attacks are launched. And faculty in the humanities and the arts, aware that government money flows far more freely into the support of science and technology than to them, feel neglected even though, by the standards that prevail elsewhere

in the world, they are very far from being impoverished.

Perhaps the principal reason for the self-doubts and uncertainties as to direction that afflict universities today, however, is collapse of moral consensus in society at large and on the campus. Because moral consensus is so palpably unattainable, moral discourse also withers. The withering is aided, too, by the extent to which humanistic fields have been conquered by the attempt to introduce scientific or would-be scientific method. Small wonder that many students become enamoured of neo-romantic or anti-intellectual avenues towards truth, if they are taught that the only kind of intellectualism that is worthwhile is that which deals in numbers, quantification, scientific measurement.

If the universities can at least partially stabilize their leadership (somehow the university presidency must be made an existence that a person can endure for more than a two or three-year span—); if they can recover somewhat from the crisis of confidence that has overtaken them, it is entirely possible that their more publicized difficulties in maintaining order on the campus may be diminished, and their prestige in the broader community restored.

Richard W. Lyman
June, 1971

NATIONAL TAIWAN UNIVERSITY — TAIPEI, TAIWAN

University Objectives and Structure

National Taiwan University operates under the general guidance of the Ministry of Education for the purpose of turning out enlightened, useful citizens capable of leadership or great individual endeavors in various fields of intellectual discipline as well as worldly enterprises. There are about 12,000 students (including 800 graduate students and 150 foreign students) in 39 undergraduate departments and 38 graduate institutes (16 offering doctoral degrees). The graduate institutes, affiliated with the undergraduate departments concerned which operate under six colleges, do not form a separate administrative unit.

850 teachers (not including assistants) carry on instructional work and research. Reasonable contact has always been maintained between the university and the community, particularly in agricultural and engineering fields and the medical service. Some form of international cooperation also exists in the Colleges of Science, Law, and Liberal Arts.

The university president is not a fund-raiser in the American sense but he is a budget-fighter on several fronts, namely, the Ministry of Education, the Cabinet, and the national law-making body. In conducting the university administration, the president is assisted by the Administrative Council whose members include three business deans and six academic deans.

At present, eight foreign languages are offered, namely, English, French, German, Spanish, Russian, Latin, Japanese, Korean. English is universally required and practically useful to a student during almost his entire career in the university. In addition, one other foreign language is required in most cases for reading purposes. Besides English, the most popular are German and Japanese.

There are as yet no area programs as such in National Taiwan University, although much attention has been given to American Literature, American History, and U.S.-oriented political science. The University expects to play an important role in the Center for American Studies now being organized under the auspices of the Academia Sinica.

Chen-Hsing Yen
April, 1971

THAMMASAT UNIVERSITY — BANGKOK, THAILAND

Structure and Objectives

1. Every university in Thailand, including Thammasat, is essentially a government department. Teachers are civil servants and receive civil service scale salaries. The main source of funding is from national budget in which appropriations are itemized and strict control over expenditure is exercised by the Budget Bureau and the Minister of Finance. New departments or facilities cannot be established without the approval of the National Education Council, which also control university curricula. Each university has a University Council, which is the supreme policy-making body within the university; but every University Council is chaired by the Prime Minister and its members are mostly rector, deans, other high civil servants, some retired civil servants, and in a few exceptional cases, representatives from alumni and the private sector. Academic freedom is tolerated within the narrow limits of civil service disciplinary rules.

2. About two years ago, the National Education Council (NEC) initiated a movement towards some University autonomy, e.g. block grants from the government instead of itemized grants, freedom to pay teachers differently from the civil service scale, teachers to be taken out of the civil service and civil service discipline, etc. The proposal was recently accepted in principle by the Cabinet, subject to details being worked out and submitted to it. Work is being done on the details by the NEC staff and a number of enthusiastic university teachers.

In almost every student demonstration recently, the students would march to the National Assembly and the Prime Minister's Office, and very frequently they would demand to see the Prime Minister, their chairman, in person. The result is that the Prime Minister has asked that university statutes be amended so that he would no longer be the ex-officio chairman of universities. The bill to that effect is in Parliament.

3. In Thammasat, the Rector is the chief executive; but there is no deputy-rector, yet. Instead, there are a Secretary-General, responsible for administrative affairs, an advisory committee for academic affairs and another advisory committee for student affairs.

The Rector, the Deans and the Secretary-General meet normally once a week to discuss policy, administration, appointments, budget, student affairs and other affairs. This body, called the "Deans' Meeting", is not recognized by the University Statute, but it is an effective body, de facto.

4. Thammasat is a humanities and social science university. It has six faculties: Law, Political Science, Commerce and Accountancy, Economics, Social Administration and Liberal Arts, plus an "Independent" department of journalism. Each faculty is headed by a Dean appointed for terms of four years, renewable. The Rector's term of appointment is two years, renewable. The Secretary-General serves at the pleasure of the Rector and the government.

Some faculties are subdivided into departments. Liberal Arts has eight departments ranging from mathematics to librarianship and linguistics; Political Science has four departments; Commerce and Accountancy two and Social Administration two. Law and Economics faculties are not subdivided.

5. In the past, each faculty tended to be self-contained; i.e. each selected and recruited its own teachers in all subjects taught in its curriculum. Coordination among faculties was minimal. Starting in 1970, there has been better cooperation and coordination among faculties with respect to curricula, teaching staff, time-table, etc. For instance, now the linguistics department in the Faculty of Liberal Arts is responsible for language teaching for the whole university, etc.

6. Thammasat has on the average some 10,000 students and until recently about 100 full time teachers, mostly in the Faculty of Liberal Arts. The other Faculties had relied principally on the special part-time teachers, recruited from government departments. The present policy is to increase the number of full time teachers and to seek special lecturers outside the university only for specialized subjects. The number of full time teachers now is about 300, among them there are yet too few Ph.D.'s, and M.A.'s.

7. With too few and too under-qualified teachers, not much research has been done. Even now, the main task of a teacher, in most cases a new graduate, is to teach and to advise students. Serious attempts at research are made in the faculty of Economics, with the initiative of Rockefeller Visiting Professors.

8. Teachers are not organized, and very few apart from Deans participate in the running of the University or faculties. This state of affairs is now reversed and studies are being made for more teachers' participation and responsibility.

9. Genuine Students' Organization into a Union was only permitted three or four years ago. Increasing student participation is encouraged by a few Deans, although it is not yet accepted officially as a university policy.

10. Originally, Thammasat was created out of the Law School. In 1933, it was established under the name of University of Moral and Political Sciences (UMPS) and generally linked with a leftist politician who went out of power in 1947. Since then, the name of "Moral Science" (Thammasat) has remained, the political component having been left out, although we are still supposed to teach political science as well. The association, in the mind of present day politicians, of Thammasat with past politics makes it more difficult to reform the university. Still some reforms have been made and others are going on.

11. Originally, the main objectives of the Law School and the U.M.P.S. were to produce and train civil servants to man (and "woman") government departments. In this, there was success in the sense that UMPS alumni have occupied important posts everywhere in the Kingdom. The present objective of Thammasat is to promote knowledge by teaching and research, as well as to serve society. Nevertheless, the majority of our students have to earn their living immediately after obtaining a Bachelor degree. Hence, some degree of professional training is necessary in the fourth year of undergraduate curricula. Post graduate programs are part-time programs for most students. There are full time Master programs only for a small number of students at one or two faculties.

Puey Ungphakorn
June, 1971

THE UNIVERSITY OF TOKYO — JAPAN

Structure and Objectives

The present structure of the University is summarized in a separate brochure to be distributed to the participants.

Since the students unrest in 1968, the structure and the system in education, research and administration of the University have been criticized from both inside and outside of the University and it is seriously recognized that it is imperative to improve them to solve the problems raised by the students and to meet the future needs of the society, keeping the basic objectives and academic standards of the university.

A committee was established to prepare a report to the President on the reformation of the university, which was submitted on May 18 and was exposed to discussion by all members of the university.

Ichiro Kato
June, 1971

YONSEI UNIVERSITY — KOREA

Structure and Objectives

Yonsei University is organized into 10 Colleges (three in the Medical Complex) comprising 41 Departments (majors): five graduate schools; and three teaching Institutes. Students are admitted by Department. Total enrollment is about 7,800. All administrative officers are appointed by the President, certain ones with Board approval. At the Department level, faculty fully participate in decision making. On the College level there are usually regular faculty meetings, but these are largely forums, and most decision making is by the Dean in consultation with the Department Heads. On the University level the Academic Council, composed of some 25 Deans and other university officers, meets bi-weekly and makes the regular on-going policy and administrative decisions. Technically its function is advisory to the President but in fact the President seldom overrides its decisions.

Although this system seems to indicate little faculty participation in decision making, the faculty in fact has a very strong voice. It is customary to rotate Deans, Department Heads and other offices fairly rapidly among the faculty (average, 3-4 years) which tends to make them more "faculty" than "administration" minded. In practice the administration cannot put through policies or programs strongly resisted by the faculty, and needed changes and reforms are sometimes difficult to effect.

There is no official student participation in decision making, but the officers of the Student Association have regular meetings with the Deans (by Colleges) and the President. In addition, each Department (major) assigns one or more advisors to each year-class of each department—usually 30 to 40 per advisor. Communications are open and very close contact is maintained, so a broad base of student opinion is known to the faculty and reflected in decision making. This also serves as a channel of information to the students. So far this has proved to be an adequate system, though there is a constant undercurrent of "student power" problems.

At the other end of the spectrum, the Ministry of Education exerts a heavy influence, both directly through specific provisions of various educational laws and indirectly through its implied regulatory and permit granting power. Fortunately, Yonsei's position in Korean society gives it a certain independence not enjoyed by some smaller and newer institutions.

An additional very important element in the university structure should be mentioned. Yonsei (and other Korean universities) have a wide variety of institutes serving many different functions, but serving primarily as vehicles for cooperatives, interdepartmental and inter-disciplinary re-

search, social action, and outreach. Such funds as may be needed come from special grants for specific objectives, either from the university itself or from outside sources. The Institutes are controlled by Committees appointed by the President, upon the recommendation of the institute. Institutes have proved to be a flexible and effective system for introducing change, taking action, or doing research as each Institute is staffed and directed by enthusiasts and specialists.

Objectives of education are always complex and difficult to analyze and determine, with professed and practiced aims often in conflict and with priorities shifting and situations and personnel change. However, in broad terms, Yonsei sees itself as a trainer of youth for modern Korea; as a stimulator of research both to improve the quality of teaching and to add to the sum of knowledge so as to serve mankind, directly and indirectly; and (more recently) as a direct agent of change in various aspects of Korean life and society, both for the sake of the changes that are needed and as an example of social participation to the students. It is intended that all this be done in the context of, and inspired by the Christian faith.

Of these functions, Yonsei still feels that teaching is paramount, and that the others are justified in large part for their feedback value, for inspiring better teaching. This is not to deny the value of research for the sake of knowledge, nor to belittle the obligation to service. It is simply to reiterate that the university's first obligation is to teach, and that the quality of teaching must not be sacrificed for other values.

In carrying out these functions the university feels a conscious responsibility to be an innovator and an experimenter. It makes a point of introducing new methods and curricula, new areas of research, new fields of service, and although proud of its reputation as an innovator it realizes how much more needs to be done.

Related to this objective of innovation is Yonsei's policy of being an international university of world standards — so much so that it is sometimes criticized as a "foreign" institution. It has made a conscious effort to introduce foreign concepts and influences and to maintain every possible contact with institutions and individuals in other lands. In the past this has meant primarily the United States, but there have also been exchanges with other parts of Asia, and it is hoped to strengthen such ties. We believe firmly that such internationalization strengthens all three of the basic functions, and contributes to innovation. We are convinced that only in such variety can the greatest strength emerge. We are committed to the faith that this is the best way to serve the students, the nation, the world, and Christ.

HARVARD UNIVERSITY — CAMBRIDGE, MASSACHUSETTS

Area and Language Study Programs

The term "area and language study programs" has usually been interpreted as referring to the study of cultures and areas not adequately covered in the traditional educational curriculum. From the American point of view these are commonly thought of as the Soviet Union-East Europe, Latin America, Africa, the Middle East, South Asia (the Indian area), East Asia (China, Japan and their neighbors), and Southeast Asia. Of these, the Soviet Union-Eastern Europe and Latin America areas are in a sense variants of the traditional Western cultural experience, and the first of these fields has become so developed at Harvard as to no longer constitute a special problem. African studies have been incorporated into "Afro-American Studies" and thus constitute a special category, quite distinct from other area studies. Of the remaining fields, Harvard has chosen to put most emphasis on East Asia, recognizing that the limited resources of any university precludes the possibility of extensive development and high quality in all. The description below of the East Asian area and language programs applies only in varying degrees to the other fields, in descending order to the Middle East, South Asia, and Southeast Asia.

Instruction and research in the East Asian field exist at Harvard under a broad variety of rubrics and programs, running all the way from "General Education" to the Ph.D. in "Far Eastern Languages." The whole structure is too complicated to be easily described. But it is worth noting the fundamental principle that the instructional staff, which is divided vertically into disciplinary departments, is joined horizontally by inter-departmental committees and programs, such as the "Regional Studies-East Asia" program, under which the bulk of the study on East Asia at the M.A. level takes place, the "Joint Ph.D. in History and Far Eastern Languages," which is by far the largest of the Ph.D. programs in the field, and the East Asian Research Committee, which brings most of the teaching staff and research workers together in an over-arching research organization.

Instruction on East Asia can be described as existing at three levels: introductory, comparative, and specialist. The introductory level could also be called "remedial," because if a sense of world citizenship is to be developed, there should be adequate instruction at the elementary and secondary level about other great cultural traditions, and this sort of introductory instruction should not be postponed to the college level, where it will reach only a relatively small elite. The chief courses at this introductory level are two Freshman level courses in Chinese and Japanese history and civilization and a middle group course (open to undergraduates and graduates) on Chinese humanities, which between them attract

roughly 600 or more students and thus close to half of the students in any undergraduate class. (A Harvard-Radcliffe undergraduate class numbers about 1,450.) Elementary language work in Chinese, Japanese, Korean and Vietnamese can also be considered introductory, permitting students to test their interest and language abilities before committing themselves to deeper studies.

At the comparative level are a wide range of middle group courses on history, political science, sociology, economics, literature and art on China and Japan (and history for Korea and Vietnam), which are quite comparable to courses in such fields in traditional Western studies and draw comparable numbers of students, some specializing in East Asia but more taking such courses largely for their comparative value. In addition, there are many courses, particularly in sociology, economics, and political science, in which materials are drawn from China and still more from Japan for comparative studies in some aspects of these disciplines.

At the specialist level, there are possibilities for serious concentration on some aspect of East Asian studies for undergraduates, commonly in preparation for more professional training in graduate school; the Regional Studies-East Asian program at the M.A. level; and a broad variety of highly specialized Ph.D. programs. The bulk of the students now coming to the M.A. program have had some language and area preparation either as undergraduates or through residence in East Asia, but for most of them it is nonetheless a two-year program. Those who complete it must achieve a reasonable reading and speaking ability in one of the East Asian languages, a fair breadth of knowledge as demonstrated by the taking of several middle group courses, and a promise of ability as a research scholar, as demonstrated by a seminar research paper. The program does not produce mature finished scholars in the East Asian field but serves as a testing ground in which students discover whether they have the interests and abilities to become fully professional scholars in the field. The various Ph.D. programs, which usually take three to five years beyond the M.A., are designed to produce such scholars in a number of disciplines and special fields.

Generalizing from the Harvard experience in East Asian studies, I would draw the following conclusions regarding the direction area and language studies in the United States should take:

1. Until adequate instruction in non-Western cultures is incorporated into American elementary and secondary education, all college level liberal arts institutions should have "introductory" instruction in one or more of the other great cultural traditions.

2. Such institutions should also have some instruction at what I have called the "comparative level" on one or more of these fields, both through

specialized courses and through courses incorporating materials from the non-Western cultural areas for comparative purposes.

3. Elementary language instruction in at least one non-European language should be set up in all institutions that can possibly afford this, to enable students to ascertain the depth of their interest and the level of their ability before committing themselves to serious graduate study in the field.

4. Any major university should have a diversified program up to the Ph.D. level in at least one of the major non-Western cultures (the very concept of "university" should demand this today), and there should be adequate numbers and reasonable geographic spread of such centers in each of the major cultural fields.

Edwin O. Reischauer
April, 1971

THE CHINESE UNIVERSITY OF HONG KONG

Area and Language Studies Programmes

Area studies are an important part of this University's research programme. Among the several centres under the Institute of Social Studies and the Humanities is the Centre of East Asian Studies, which conducts research on Japan, Korea and Southeast Asia in close cooperation with other institutions and individual scholars. Its major activities are: to promote international interest in the study of the East Asian region; to train experts in East Asian Studies to serve the University; to acquire research materials and reference books; to hold seminars on research projects; to publish research findings; to provide research facilities for scholars from overseas; to participate in international conferences; and to exchange publications. Two research projects have been completed, namely, a transcription of Emperor Tu-due's Sino-Vietnamese Dictionary and a collection of Chinese inscriptions in Singapore, and the results will soon be published.

With the assistance of the foreign governments concerned, the University is able to offer, aside from Chinese and English, four other languages: French, German, and Japanese as minor degree courses, and Italian as an elective. An inter-disciplinary committee has been set up to promote studies in these fields. For administrative convenience, each College takes care of one foreign language programme offered as minor degree courses: — Japanese in Chung Chi, French in New Asia and German in United. However, these language courses are offered on an inter-collegiate basis so that students from all Colleges may attend the courses freely.

Chinese and English language studies are not only compulsory for first and second year students, but full-scale major and minor degree

programmes are conducted throughout the four years on Chinese and English Languages and Literatures.

A Chinese Linguistics Research Centre was established at this University in 1966. Projects undertaken include studies on Cantonese as spoken in Hong Kong, studies of the phonology and grammar of archaic Chinese, and compilation of a dictionary of Chinese bronze inscriptions of the pre-Ch'in period.

The University has committed itself to a programmed development of area and language studies. Steps are taken to promote the interest of staff and students, to provide facilities for study and research in these fields, and to encourage and support them in these studies. In this, as in its other endeavours, the University believes firmly in the importance of international and inter-university cooperation.

Choh-Ming Li
May, 1971

NEW YORK UNIVERSITY Area and Language Study Programs

Responding with enthusiasm to the concept of language and area programs, New York University in the late 1950's introduced programs in four areas — Latin America, the Middle East, Eastern Europe, and South-East Asia. The programs seemed justified initially by the skills at hand of numbers of faculty members in each area. Masters programs were offered and even work towards the Ph.D. Financial resources seemed available in Federal grants — for fellowships, for additional staff, and for facilities.

It became apparent, however, that the very basic ingredient in any well defined area program must be language facility in the target area. NYU has excellent supporting language instruction in Spanish, Slavic, Hebrew, and Arabic — support, that is, on all levels (from beginning courses to advanced and specialized ones). It did not have the capability in Asian languages. It also lacked social scientists in supporting Slavic fields.

In 1964-65 the Graduate School reassessed these programs and realized that a.) the presence of one or two professors (excellent though they may be) cannot make an adequate area program; b.) logistic support and cooperation from all auxiliary departments is necessary as well as from newly created budgets, and c.) that some obligation devolved upon programs and program directors to see to it that students earning degrees should be able to be placed academically. The Graduate School took a hard look at its position with respect to these three points and found that it was spreading itself too thin to accomplish its aims with excellence.

It, therefore, did three things: a.) phased out its incipient programs

in South-East Asia and Eastern Europe; b.) broadened its Latin American program to include Spain and Portugal in a new Ibero-American program; c.) reorganized into four logical sections the Near Eastern Language and Literature program (Arabic, Hebrew, Persian, and Turkish), strengthening the faculties and library collections at the same time. Thus we felt we could work to strength, limit area degrees to the M.A., and arrange for the Ph.D. in one of the regular disciplines, with a specialty in the area field. Thus our graduates would have better employment opportunities, given the then tightly disciplined system of U.S. academia.

We have held to these two programs, and have now gained faculty consent to offer Ph.D. work in Near Eastern Languages and Literatures under the revived impetus for academic spread rather than specialization. Students in both gain from our participation in consortia (with Columbia, Yale, Princeton, and Pennsylvania).

In 1966 we established our Center for International Studies, with faculty and fellowships support from the Ford Foundation, to do library and field studies largely post-graduate (but with some junior fellowships) in law and the social sciences internationally. The department of politics, economics, history, sociology, and anthropology benefited from the arrangement.

The basic ingredients for a graduate program in area studies, within the U.S. system of academia are:

- a.) possession by the student of the elements of a basic discipline (economics, literature, etc.);
- b.) language ability in the chosen area;
- c.) historical and subject matter spread.

A final note might be that to carry on such regional studies programs at a level of real excellence is an expensive undertaking. Library commitments are heavy; intensive small-class language instruction is costly; and the extra training needed to produce a social scientist with regional expertise also tends to make such a faculty member higher paid than average. Also not to be underestimated is the difficulty of persuading representatives of traditional academic disciplines of the value to them of having a regional specialist in their department. Special funding is needed.

James M. Hester
June, 1971

NANYANG UNIVERSITY — SINGAPORE **Language Teaching**

Language teaching has special significance for multi-racial Singapore: not only is it a means to international communication and understanding, but, equally as important, it is a significant means of achieving those

same ends among its own citizens. About 74% of Singapore's citizens are ethnic Chinese; approximately 15% are ethnic Malay; 8% are ethnic Indian or Pakistani; the remainder are of various races. While Singapore was under British rule for 140 years, English was the language of government and much of the island's business community, and a large number of English medium schools were set up. Nevertheless the colonial government did not place any restrictions on the establishment of Chinese medium schools by the immigrant Chinese, who formed the bulk of the population. On achieving independence the new Singapore government recognized four official languages: Chinese (Mandarin), English, Malay, and Tamil, with Malay as the national language. With such linguistic diversity in the country, language teaching plays a paramount role in the curriculum of the Singapore schools from the first year of primary school through university training.

Because so many languages are spoken by significant numbers of its citizens, Singapore has schools in which Mandarin, English, Malay, and Tamil are used as the medium of instruction. Actually, most Chinese in Singapore do not speak Mandarin as a native language, but in their homes they speak Cantonese, Hokkien, Teochew, or some other dialect; they learn Mandarin as the language of the schools. Many Chinese speak not one, but two or even three dialects (and perhaps some Malay) as well as Mandarin. Even though there are schools using all four official languages, over 80% of the schools use either English or Mandarin as the main medium of instruction, with the former outnumbering the latter.

From the first day they enter school, students must begin study of a second language. Most choose English or Mandarin as the second language. (Pronouncements by government leaders strongly encourage non-English speakers to learn English because it is the language of international commerce and is the means of understanding modern technology.) During the first twelve years in school, approximately 1/5 of the students' tutorial time is devoted to the study of language. Some students — who can begin the study of a third language in grade three — will devote an even larger portion of their time to language study.

Emphasis on language proficiency is continued at university level. Both of Singapore's universities have language centres with modern language laboratories, devoted chiefly to second language teaching. The Language Centre at the University of Singapore (an English language university) is primarily concerned with teaching Mandarin to its undergraduates, who are drawn largely from English language schools.

The Language Centre at Nanyang University (a Chinese language university) has a large programme in teaching English to its students, who are drawn largely from Chinese language schools and who must reach a certain standard of English before they are allowed to graduate. (Students from English language schools on the other hand, must meet a

certain standard of Mandarin in order to graduate.) The Centre also offers advanced courses in English beyond the minimum requirement, and each year an increasing number of students are enrolling in such courses. Courses in the Malay language are also available.

In addition to Chinese, English and Malay, a number of foreign languages, including Japanese and German, are taught at the Language Centre as elective courses. It also offers intensive courses in Mandarin for foreign students, with students coming from America, Japan, Russia, and various European countries to devote full time to Mandarin study.

Other opportunities are available for Singaporeans to study languages beyond primary and secondary school. The Singapore Adult Education Board, the Teachers' Training College, and other schools in the country offer a variety of courses in languages. Informal opportunities of many kinds are readily available to students studying the language. Daily radio and television programmes are broadcast in the four official languages. Newspapers and periodicals printed in these languages can easily be obtained. Speakers of many languages are found in business and social contacts throughout the city and students have ample opportunity to practice the language they are studying.

The ultimate goal of this great effort in language study is to make Singapore citizens bi-lingual (or multi-lingual), with the ability to communicate effectively in at least two languages. Achieving this goal will aid materially in helping Singapore establish its position in the international community and will also assist in promoting better communication and understanding in a multi-racial society.

R. L. Huang
May, 1971

STANFORD UNIVERSITY — STANFORD, CALIFORNIA **Area and Language Studies Programs**

It is difficult to speak with precision to so broad a topic as "the current state of university area and language studies programs." As one might expect in enterprises as varied as American universities, these programs are found in all manner of conditions from strong and flourishing to barely surviving. Nevertheless, I will hazard a generalization in the form of a paradox: Language and area studies in American universities have never been stronger than they are now, and they have never been in more serious trouble.

Their strength is evident in several respects. Its most obvious manifestation is that every major American university now has more good faculty, more good graduate students, more course offerings, and better library

holdings in fields associated with language and area programs than ever before. This represents a genuine triumph of national educational policy and planning in America. It is the product of early recognition by major philanthropic foundations that the nation was deficient in systematic knowledge of cultures outside its boundaries and that it lacked the capacity to generate either the knowledge or the trained people needed to acquire it. A number of foundations, particularly Ford, Rockefeller, and Carnegie moved to develop that capacity by grants to a relatively small number of leading institutions. In the mid-1950's the national government also entered the field with significant financing for the expansion of university language and area programs. The development of these programs stands as a model of enlightened national policy: early identification of a problem and early efforts to move toward solutions by the private sector, followed by governmental recognition of the problem and action by the government based on the earlier successful experience.

Why, then, at the height of their strength, are these programs in jeopardy? The present problems appear to me to be twofold. The first set of problems is financial, the second is intellectual.

The financial problems are easy enough to describe. In part, language and area programs are simply caught in the financial problems that are afflicting universities, generally. In part, however, they constitute a special case because they have gone through a period of rapid expansion which has been heavily dependent on foundation and government funding. The reason this has become a problem is that the foundations, about five years ago, decided that, since the government was providing funds for these programs, they could use their limited resources for newer and equally pressing needs. Almost simultaneously, however, it became clear not only that the government was not going to fill the resulting gap but that for fiscal and budgetary reasons, its intention was to reduce the prevailing level of support. Caught in this sudden squeeze, a number of institutions suddenly found themselves unprepared to assume full financial responsibility for these very expensive programs. Some programs have unquestionably suffered, although if the final result is a more stable and assured level of support for those that survive, this whole episode will not have been without value.

A second set of problems is perhaps less visible, but in some ways more dangerous to the continued integrity of language and area programs. To put the matter in its simplest terms, these programs have become deeply involved in the controversies over Vietnam and the status of minorities in American society. The programs most directly affected by the Vietnam war are, of course, those having to do with East and Southeast Asia. In the past few years we have witnessed events ranging from attacks on scholars for their position on the war to bitter controversy within faculties and professional associations over the extent to which students of Asia

should put their scholarship to the service of a particular view of foreign policy. One can understand and even sympathize with the deep feelings that produce such controversy and yet still recognize the inevitably baneful effects on faculty and student morals and on the kind and quality of scholarship and teaching that political conflict produces.

Moreover, the product of Vietnam is not limited to Asian Studies. There has also developed a small but significant and strident view that all international studies programs are servants and carriers of American imperialism — political, cultural, and economic. This point of view, for example, lay behind the attacks on Harvard's Center for International Studies — attacks that included sit-ins, mill-ins, and bombs. We can only speculate, and probably not usefully, about how influential this view will become.

Finally, let me mention briefly the controversy on a number of campuses and in national professional associations about the extent to which African Studies, as they have developed in the United States, are relevant to the concerns of Black people in America. We are already seeing, and we will surely see more, challenges to the ability of any White person to teach or study Africa, and efforts to subsume African Studies under the broader rubric of Black Studies. Here, too, we cannot see the end; we may be sure, however, that it will differ in important respects from the present and that some degree of turmoil will accompany the movement from here to there.

I would summarize by saying that it is hazardous to make predictions about any significant aspect of American society. When the part under inspection involves higher education, money, foreign policy, and race, to predict is not only hazardous but foolhardy. Still, I am inclined to believe that the underlying strength of language and area studies provides grounds for at least cautious optimism.

Richard W. Lyman
June, 1971

THAMMASAT UNIVERSITY — BANGKOK, THAILAND

Area and Language Studies Programmes

1. Thammasat offers English, French, German and Japanese as foreign languages. The majority of students are required to take English, which they have learned at secondary schools at any rate. In Liberal Arts, Political Science and Journalism, students can choose any of the four; but still most students choose English.
2. The medium of instruction and examination in all subjects is Thai

(with the exception of the full time Master of Economics programme which uses English throughout). The lack of Thai textbooks and the need for students to keep up with learned journals make it a necessity for students to learn English (or another foreign language). To enter the civil service, university graduates also are required to pass an examination in English.

Until 1970, English was made compulsory for all students for each of the four years in the curricula. Most faculties set their own standard and recruited their own "teachers" of English.

3. The common complaint among thoughtful graduates was that their knowledge of English was worse at the end of the university career than at the end of secondary school education. (And this complaint is not confined to Thammasat graduates.) There are many reasons for this retrogress: (a) too few qualified teachers tried to teach too many students; (b) too often the teachers engaged were not qualified; (c) too often the teaching was only a formality, or even a joke, e.g. teaching English conversation to a class of 200; (d) diversity in the initial knowledge of English of the students in secondary schools ranging from rural schools where English is worst, to missionary schools where students are fluent; (e) no clear objective or priority of objectives in teaching English.

4. Since 1970 the teaching of English has been integrated for the whole university and the linguistics department has been made responsible for this job. Students are pre-classified in their first year according to their initial knowledge, and those whose English is sub-standard have to take non-credit remedial courses. At the same time, the requirement to take English as a compulsory subject is reduced to only the first year standard: after the first year, students can choose English or not in the same way as any selective subject. This will tend to reduce the number of students to be taught. Also priority is given to reading comprehension for all students: only the stronger ones are taught writing, listening and speaking. It is expected that this Linguistics Department will develop into an Institute of English and that it will eventually provide post-graduate intensive courses of English for those who need to continue their studies abroad or to pass civil service examinations.

5. With little basic knowledge of German or French or Japanese at secondary school level, the students choosing these languages cannot learn very much during their university career. Reforms ought to be made in the secondary education curriculum, in particular with respect to Japanese. A few other languages ought to be taught as well at the secondary level, namely Chinese, Malayan and Russian: then the universities could follow up.

6. Because most textbooks are in English (or French or German) and most university teachers are trained in Europe or the United States, students have a great deal of knowledge of what happens in the West. Prince

Wan, our former Rector, has set a policy of urging students to learn more about Thailand and has appointed a committee to prepare a curriculum of "Thai Studies" which will embrace language, history, culture, religion, politics, commerce, economics and social affairs (concentration on Northern Thailand studies has also been initiated by Chiangmai University). Thoughtful scholars feel ashamed that so far the subject of Thai studies has been the exclusive hunting ground of American and European scholars with results which are not always accurate or happy.

7. As far as this writer knows, there is only one Institute of Asian Studies in Thailand, that is in Chulalongkorn University. In Thammasat, in 1970, we began to teach Japanese economic history and Japanese economic development; and this is intended to be the first courses, followed by studies in Japanese politics, Japanese social system, Japanese history, etc. which altogether might turn out to become a comprehensive area study. In my opinion, the other areas that we need to study are China, India and Pakistan, South-East Asia. Each area should be studied in depth and each deserves a separate institute in the long run.

Puey Ungphakorn
June, 1971

UNIVERSITY OF TOKYO — JAPAN Area Studies Program

Systematic research and education on area studies have been carried out in the following courses in the College of General Education as senior courses of undergraduates for 2 and a half years and graduate courses:

- 1) American Area Studies
- 2) English (British) Area Studies
- 3) French Area Studies
- 4) German Area Studies
- 5) Russian Area Studies

In each Courses, the undergraduate curriculum consists of lectures of specific language (10 units, 1 unit is given to a lecture of one hour per week for a semester of 15 weeks), history (4), history of and contemporary thought (4), politics (4), economy (4), literature (4), geography (2), social life (2), science and technology (2) and seminars of 10 units.

Specific researches in area studies are growing in varieties in sizes and fields around almost the whole university. A survey performed in 1941 showed that 660 researchers in this university are more or less involved in this category.

The Institute of Oriental Culture was established in the University in

1941. Major efforts are being devoted there in interdisciplinary (although limited in cultural and social sciences) collaboration in Asian Studies. China has been its major field of research, however, recently efforts have been made to cover other regions of Asia. The Institute has a Documentation Center for oriental studies, established in 1966 and the collection of Chinese books there is regarded as one of the finest in the world.

There is a recent trend to include the regional planning in this category, especially in the case to consider a broad region, sometimes, by means of systems analysis. Some researchers in the Faculty of Engineering, especially in the Department of Urban Engineering, are interested in this field.

A committee was organized in the University in 1966 to prepare a report for the President, surveying the area studies in the university, and recommending some measures of grouping the scattered researchers toward the more effective collaboration. The committee has been looking into the possibility of establishing a large Research Center of Area Studies, but has not yet reached any conclusion, owing to the interruption of its activities by the university disturbances.

Language Studies in the University of Tokyo, June, 1971

There are two major groups in this university, which are interested in language studies, one in the College of General Education and the other in the Faculty of Letters.

The language studies are considered here to be classified into various fields. For example, some researchers study foreign languages as a measure of understanding the culture of respective countries and are classified into the area study group. Some others are grouped into philosophers, historians, social scientists and of course the linguists.

It is needless to say, that the language study is considered to be useful methods for improving cross-cultural understanding, as pointed out in the background paper of this meeting, prepared by the planning group in June last year. In this connection, it is seriously introspected that the language education and studies in this university had been heavily inclined to the studies of languages of western countries and that Chinese was the only major subject in Asia languages.

The University has a Language Laboratory under the administration of the Faculty of Letters (Literature), which is located in the Central Library. The laboratory consists of the Language Laboratory System (L. L. S.), the hearing practise room, the recording and sound recopy facilities and the Linguistic Library. Audiomaterials covers about 50 different languages, including 1480 recording discs and 805 tapes.

63

Ichiro Kato
June, 1971

YONSEI UNIVERSITY — KOREA

Area and Language Programs

Area programs are virtually non-existent in Korea, and until recently language training was almost exclusively limited to English as the first (and usually required) foreign language, with French and German as second foreign languages.

Yonsei University has recently instituted a "Korean Studies Program" at the Masters level for foreign students. Sogang Jesuit University has an undergraduate "American Studies Program", and there are of course Chinese and Japanese elements in many disciplines. The Hankook College of Foreign Studies has the widest variety of programs, but the academic quality of the institution is not regarded very highly in Korea. A few departments at Yonsei, notably History and Philosophy, have de-facto divisions between oriental and western majors, and do introduce survey courses on other Asian cultures. Beyond this there is almost nothing.

Superficially, this is frequently blamed on the narrowly rigid, department-centered system of education in Korea, but in fact it is because there is no real demand for area studies. An increasing (though still small) number of educators are beginning to urge greater acquaintance with the rest of Asia, and the government, in its desire to strengthen its ties with other developing countries, is also starting to adopt a similar attitude. However, students in general see little future for such majors, and employers (including the government) have not yet shown any preference for candidates with the skills and knowledge that area programs produce.

The limited amount of language study can more properly be attributed to Ministry of Education restrictions. Although colleges are free to offer almost any "second foreign language", Ministry approval is needed to offer majors. Recently, however, the Ministry has begun to give permission for languages that the government considers to have diplomatic significance. Most language study, however, has laid emphasis on reading skill and paid little attention to speaking and writing, or to cultural aspects of language. Yonsei has pioneered in attempts to introduce modern linguistic methods, especially in its Korean Language Institute and English Language Institute, but most language teaching is rather traditional.

In looking toward the future, several interrelated changes must be made if area and language programs are to be expanded and made effective.

First of all, there must be created a meaningful demand for persons trained in such programs. The university has a limited, but important, role in creating such a demand, mostly by persuading employers of the advantages of such trainees. There must also be a place in the academic world for these graduates, partly because many of the best students aspire to academic position, partly as an indication that the university itself respects its own product. Other factors that go into creating a demand

are probably beyond the power of the university, but even here the university can play a part in creating an atmosphere of interest and concern within the nation through seminars, international conferences, symposia, etc.

This indicates the second field of action. The university, which in fact often means almost unilateral action by the President, must lead in insisting that an Asian university must look to other parts of Asia, not just to the west. The first step could be the strong infusion of Asian aspects of existing disciplines, such as history, philosophy, economics, political science, and the like. Further steps could include more inter-departmental recognition of courses for certain majors and perhaps even a formal entry on the academic record of a "minor" or "specialty" in some area. The final step of full-fledged Area Studies should, I believe, be at the graduate (Masters) level.

Third, in order to carry out even the elementary programs, suitably trained faculty are needed. This is a problem everywhere, but even greater in Korea and East Asia than in the west, which has a considerable pool of non-western talent and the financial resources to make a brain-drain easy. For Korea (and presumably most of Asia) funds would have to be found from special resources both to send Korean scholars to other Asian countries and invite their scholars to Korea. Yonsei is in a position to start such a program with minimal help from the outside. The principal need would be transportation and some sort of cost-of-living supplement.

Perhaps the most fundamental need of all is to build a realization that Asian countries have something to learn from each other. Korean representatives at various Asian conferences, for instance, tend to come away reinforced in the idea that Korea is far more advanced than had been supposed and really has little to learn from the rest of Asia. Perhaps the most effective way for promoting area and language studies would be to build on national pride, and the idea that such studies will enable the nation to make more of a contribution to the development of the rest of Asia.

Tae Sun Park
April, 1971