Traditional Societies in Transition

In a recent article, Prof. John H. Kautsky of the political science department of Washington University in St. Louis had this to say about a world-wide phenomenon that deeply affects all of us at this conference. Let me quote two short paragraphs:

Beginning about half a century ago in Mexico, China, Russia, and Turkey, revolutions -- violent or peaceful, sudden or gradual -- have by now swept much of the underdeveloped world. Though they have differed very widely in many respects, all of them have, more or less explicitly, aimed at the removal of the traditional order and, sooner or later, at its replacement by a modern industrialized society.

...and it is generally intellectuals who assume the leadership of the movements for modernization in underdeveloped countries. These intellectuals are themselves a product of an education appropriate to -- and often acquired in -- an industrially advanced country.¹

The gap between the more modern and the less modern countries is at last being recognized as an educational gap as well as an economic and technological gap. The gap between traditional societies and modern societies -- whether measured in economic goods, political processes, social institutions, or the availability and quality of education -- has grown out of one of the most fundamental transformations in the entire human career. For some 500 years the modernization process has been at work among the peoples of the West, but in other parts of the world the modernizing process has been at work for only a hundred years or less. In still other parts, the people have scarcely begun to change their traditional ways of life. This uneven historical development of the modern in relation to the traditional poses the most basic problems of international politics, economics, and education I can think of. The transfusion of educational assistance flowing from the more advanced nations to the less advanced nations has come to be seen as the very life blood of technical assistance.

¹Dr. Butts is Associate Dean for International Studies, Teachers College, Columbia University.

First, a word about what I mean by "Modern." The social relationships of a modern style of life are increasingly based upon secular and impersonal standards of achievement and performance rather than solely upon regard for the more intimate ties of kinship, friendship, and locality, or the inherited role ascribed to a particular occupation, race, or religion. Modern civilization is marked by a speed of movement, of transit, and of communication unimaginable in a traditional civilization and by a relatively easy social mobility leading from one occupation or one social class to another, a mobility never to be anticipated by the vast majority of people in a pre-modern society.

All in all, the fabric of the intellectual life of a modern civilization has been affected radically by the rational-logical methods of science, by the widening of men's horizons on the cosmos and on nature, by the multiplying of his perceptions of alternate ways of human life, by the application of rational methods of thought to virtually all matters of heavenly and earthly affairs, and by a psychological readiness to adapt to rapid change in the conditions of life and death. The distinctive climate of opinion of modern civilization has been shaped by the perfecting of methods for creating, organizing, acquiring, and transmitting reliable and valid knowledge, by the creation of large scale systems of universal and secular education, and by the development of widespread literacy and mass communication. ²

Now, let me put the meaning of modernization in personal terms as faced today by a "traditional" man or woman in Africa, or Latin America, or Asia, or indeed in some parts of Europe and the United States. He lives in a rural, agrarian society where his efforts to make a living off the land are rewarded by bare subsistence and with little or nothing to spare, if he succeeds in subsisting at all. He knows little of modern machines or technology. He knows little outside of his immediate family, kinship group, or locality. His world of behavior is circumscribed by inherited standards of class or status or occupation. He knows little except through speaking and hearing his mother tongue. He does not expect things to change very much, nor does he feel that he can do much about the conditions of his life or the future of his family. He finds personal security within prescribed loyalties to family and local rulers, through inherited beliefs and outlooks handed down from his ancestors or from the local guardians of religious faith.

But the outside modern world is forcing him to change in many obvious or subtle ways. He must somehow broaden his traditional loyalties to his particular family tribe or locality and embrace a more general loyalty to his new nation, which may now include tribes or groups who have been his ancient enemies. He may find that his inherited social role or class or occupation,

²Joseph W. Elder defines "modernity" as corresponding to "secular education," meaning "that type of education endorsing the establishment of objectifiable evidence for proof of phenomena in opposition to the type of education that endorses tradition or faith as the basis for proof of phenomena." See W.B. Hamilton (ed.) The Transfer of Institutions, Duke University Press, Durham, N.C. 1964, p.141.
which carried with it a recognizable status, whether high or low, may now be changed for the better if he works harder to achieve that change -- or it may change for the worse through no fault of his own if he merely continues doing what he has always done. His mother tongue is no longer sufficient to enable him to be a fully functioning member of his new nation or of the modern world. He must learn to read and write what he had formerly known only orally; formal education is now required where only informal learning had earlier sufficed. Indeed, he often must learn the written language belonging to his ancient enemies or to his former colonial rulers. Strange sounds in words and music come over the radio, and many of these are disturbing indeed.

His rural way of life and subsistence way of life are confronted by strange people who come from the cities. Our "traditional" man faces the prospect of change whether he stays at home or whether he is prompted to find his own way to the city. Either alternative is deeply disturbing. His children or his wife begin to look different and to behave in new-fangled ways -- and that is still more disturbing. His whole set of beliefs about what is good and desirable begins to be challenged by new gods or new idols. His geographic isolation, his social position, and his psychological security may all be disrupted by speeding motor buses, blaring radios, gaudy magazines, strange tinned foods, styles of clothing that outrage the dictates of custom or even of morality, running water, an unfamiliar job in the city, and all the other trappings of modernization that we in our industrialized society now have more or less learned to live with. But the trauma of learning to adopt a modern style of life in a hurry and of finding a reassuring sense of personal identity amidst such disturbing change is drastic indeed. It is hard enough for those of us born and brought up in a modernizing society. It is worse confounded for those who are caught up in the maelstrom of change with scarcely time to adjust. Fortunately, many of the people who are faced with these desperate personal problems are turning to education as one of the most fundamental means of surviving the transition without recourse to violence or chaos.

Now, we in the West are faced with resurgent peoples who no longer want to be ruled by the West or to be dominated by the West, but who recognize in greater or lesser degree that they need help in transforming their traditional societies into modern societies. In other words, they want to achieve what the West has achieved but to do it under their own direction and not under the direction of outsiders. To put it bluntly, they want to be both modern and free.

Developing Human Resources in Africa

This, then, is the setting in which any viable theory of the role of universities in human resource development must be formulated. It is a setting in which fundamental transformations are taking place. It is a setting which must not be forgotten or ignored as we contemplate what the universities of the world can do to assist in the achievement of peaceful, orderly, humane, and effective measures of national and personal development. In what follows, let me concentrate upon the role of African universities in human resource development. I feel a bit more at home in using them as illustrations than I do with respect to Latin American universities, but I believe that much of what I have to say applies to the underdeveloped world in general.
I should like to present three general propositions and discuss each very briefly:

1. The diverse and often conflicting national aspirations expressed by the new African governments for their universities must somehow be rationalized into a consistent set of educational priorities if they are to be translated into an effective program of higher education and of education for the professions.

2. The fundamental academic assumptions that underlie the university traditions already established in Africa must be reckoned with and, if need be, reexamined, in order that their validity may be tested in the light of these nationalistic aspirations and of a human resource development theory that takes professional education seriously.

3. The political, social, psychological, and cultural values that form the context of African life as it faces the prospect of change from traditional to modern forms should be the continuing subject of careful, objective, and empirical research. Such study should provide the basis upon which to formulate a congruent program of professional education which will bring together nationalist aspirations, inherited university patterns, and the findings of social science research.

Establishing Educational Priorities

Turning to my first proposition, let me remind you of the succinct and authoritative example of African aspirations for African universities as contained in the conclusions listed in the report of the Conference on the Development of Higher Education in Africa held at Tananarive in 1962:

In addition to its traditional functions and obligations to teach and to advance knowledge through research, the role of higher education in the social, cultural, and economic development of Africa must be:

1. To maintain adherence and loyalty to world academic standards
2. To ensure the unification of Africa
3. To encourage elucidation of an appreciation for African culture and heritage and to dispel misconceptions of Africa, through research and teaching of African studies.
4. To develop completely the human resources for meeting manpower needs
5. To train the "whole man" for nation-building
6. To evolve over the years a truly African pattern of higher learning dedicated to Africa and its people yet promoting a bond of kinship to the larger human society.

Now one can agree with each one of these six general propositions separately, but when it comes to delineating in concrete terms just what each means for a particular university program and what it means for educational development in relation to the other propositions, I am not sure how much consistency will emerge. We all know that the goals of education are relatively easy to state in general terms, but we also know that they are sometimes hard to realize in
the curriculum programs that university faculties solemnly draw up in committee or in general debate or that ministries of education hammer out in the stress of administrative obligation or the pressure of political responsibility. The Tananarive conclusions are a significant statement of African aspirations for African universities, but I submit that as they stand they do not provide very precise guidelines for drawing up a curriculum for a university or for defining a program of professional education.

In one breath universities are asked to serve the purpose of nation-building, and the next breath they are asked to ensure the unification of Africa. Are the present realities of African nationalism consistent with the ideals of African unity? Should all African universities have a common goal, or should the universities of a particular nation follow a pattern set by the government of that nation? On a continent of more than 30 independent nations at various stages of development is there any one "truly African pattern of higher learning," or may there be diverse patterns of higher education in the making just as there are diverse political and economic institutions in the making?

Should a university's programs of study for developing "the whole man" be equal in status and support to those that meet specialized man-power needs? If a university takes seriously its obligations to develop human resources through professional education, will this goal require changes in admission policies or allocation of students to various fields of study? Should more students be entering the sciences and the technologies and fewer entering the humanities and the social sciences?

What is to be done if a university faculty's conception of "world academic standards" does not exactly coincide with a government's belief that the university should act as an instrument for the "consolidation of national unity," or that its mission is to "define and confirm the aspirations of the society which it is established to serve?" Are intellectual habits of objective analysis and critical thought any the less to be prized for university students and faculties in an African university than elsewhere in the world?

These may be peculiarly difficult questions to answer -- or, I suppose even to discuss. Nevertheless, I believe they must be discussed. In doing so I suggest that certain distinctions need to be made. I would argue that a university does have the obligation to "serve the society" that supports it and that a government may legitimately exert claims upon a university to "serve the nation" by expanding the range of its studies to promote modernization and to prepare teachers for the urgent tasks that face the nation, but I would also argue that a government cannot legitimately require the stilling of intellectual dissent or the stifling of political dissent -- and still claim that it has a university. If it insists upon requiring political orthodoxy from a university community it may have a government teaching bureau or a staff college or even a polytechnical institute on its hands, but it no longer has a university -- whose very life blood is intellectual freedom.

On the other hand, a university cannot legitimately claim the freedom for its faculty or students to stand aloof from service to the nation or to take any political actions they please even though such actions may threaten the security
of the government or jeopardize the welfare of the nation concerned. Intellectual and political dissent should not be equated with disloyal actions; nor should action dangerous to the nation be defended on the grounds of academic freedom. Somehow a university must serve the modernization and nation-building process but still be free to criticize it. Somehow academic and governmental authorities and the public interests must work out methods of consultation, policy making, and university control that bring together the dual claims of national service and of intellectual freedom.

A free nation is built by the process of arriving at consensus through considering alternatives, not by imposing orthodoxy. A university has the obligation to train teachers who possess a loyalty not only to their country but to the principles of intellectual freedom. If it does not do so, it is not aiding the modernization process that leads to freedom. It runs the risk that new generations may never learn what freedom is if their teachers have never known it in their own education. A human resource development plan for an African university that genuinely seeks to adhere to "world academic standards" will not tamper with freedom of thought, the brightest symbol of true modernity.

Reckoning with Tradition

This brings me to my second proposition:

A general theory of human resource development for universities must face the reality of what African leaders say they want with respect to their universities and national development; it must also recognize the strength, the tenacity, and the continuity of the varying overseas university traditions that have already been established and are more or less flourishing in Africa today. And I might add, with some conviction, a flourishing university is a peculiarly resilient, enduring, and tough specimen of human organization. The history of higher education in the world is replete with many instances of university types of institutions that have survived the march of warring empires and outlasted many forms of government and of dynasties. Even the fairly short history of higher education in America, which I know best, shows a strong bias toward tradition and reluctance to embrace change. So our plans for human resource development must include a realistic strategy for the introduction of change and innovation in universities, a strategy to which many educational planners have not given much thought.

Despite the strength of continuity, or as some would say, of inertia in universities, change does come about, and as often as not it has come about from the process of cultural borrowing and international transplanation or influence. I would be tempted to argue that the most vital and creative university institution in history have been those that did borrow ideas and adopt forms from other countries and other peoples rather than those that shut themselves off from outside influences and confined themselves to their own culture-bound institutions. Fascinating as such an historical argument would be, I must abstain from its pleasures at this time to return to the problems raised by the fact that most present African universities have been modelled principally upon British or French university traditions. There is even some evidence that a few of them are in danger of being subverted by a creeping Americanism.
Now, what does it take to change and to adapt these university traditions to African conditions, the better to meet African needs and to build truly African universities? In the view of some, these traditions of western university education at their best make the university a repository of the highest expressions of human intellectual achievement and man's creative expressions. In the view of others, such traditions at their worst display a narrow and pedantic preoccupation with the socially unimportant. The truth probably embraces both judgments in some form. Proud and jealous academic faculties probably view themselves in the former image; impatient and single-minded one-party governments may hold the latter view.

The task of reconstructing universities to meet African needs is basically the passing of judgment upon the value of the university traditions that have been transplanted and the finding of ways to reorganize a basically stubborn organism without impairing its essential vitality or destroying it altogether. The task is not only complicated by the confrontation of European university traditions with present African life and culture, but also by the differences in university style that characterize British or French or American traditions as they confront each other in Africa, or as they appear to compete with one another for African educational loyalties.

Personally, I am inclined to believe that there is a still more pervasive problem than that of competition between British or French or American conceptions of university education, namely, the persistent differences of view that exist within the respective national university traditions. I cannot speak with intimate knowledge of the history of British or French higher education. But I sense some differences between the humanistic traditions epitomized by Oxford and Cambridge on one side and the more practical pursuits of the University of London and the newer British universities on the other. We hear that the "two cultures" do not always see eye to eye and that massive changes in British higher education are being contemplated in the recent report of the Robbins Committee, including, I am interested to note, radical proposals with respect to the teacher training colleges. Virtually since the beginning of modern university education in the West some variation on the theme of conflict between the sciences and the humanities has held prominent place. The end is probably not in sight.

What is sometimes not so well known is that similar differences have existed in the history of American higher education. We have in our far shorter history probably surpassed all the rest of the world in one thing at least: the volumes of words devoted to public discussion of the aims of higher education. We have long debated the values of the liberal versus the vocational, the cultural versus the practical, the theoretical versus the technical, the general versus the specialized, and pure scholarship versus service to the state and to the nation. By and large the advocates of scholarship as the prime function of a university have tended to be "restrictionists" in their attitudes toward the service functions. They have argued that a university must be limited and restricted to the bounds of the accepted intellectual and scholarly disciplines. They are likely to be suspicious, not to say contemptuous, of proposals for new courses, degrees, departments, applied research, or services that they feel may dilute the standards of scholarship. Home economists and educationists alike have often felt the sting of these arguments.
In contrast, the advocates of service functions have generally been "expansionists" or "extensionists." They can see good reasons why this or that problem deserves research. The extensionists especially set their stamp on American land-grant colleges and universities as agents for meeting the needs of American national development in the 19th century.

It may be that on balance American higher education has responded more fully to the claims of the extensionists, the vocational and the professional, the practical and the technical, and the ideal of service than have British or French universities with their strong allegiance to the humanities. But my point is that each national tradition has been characterized by a variety of views, if not a conflict of views, concerning the proper role of a university.

Thus, when Africans come to establish their own distinctive university traditions the real choice is not to select from among British, or French, or American models, but to choose among such value alternatives as I have mentioned. It is easy for some planners or human resource strategists to jump to the conclusion that because African and Latin American universities have been weighted into the past too heavily on the humanistic side, therefore the new universities should stress service to national development by greater emphasis upon the scientific, the technical, the professional, and the practical. They may be correct in individual cases.

My own predilection, however, leads me to say that a university that takes seriously the task of human resource development must serve liberal as well as professional and vocational goals; it must serve both theoretical and technical ends; it should have room for general as well as for specialized studies. It should not embrace illiberal or anti-cultural studies. Whether in the humanities or the professions, illiberal studies exalt the ungenerous, the mean, the slavish, or the despotic; they cultivate prejudice, bigotry, narrowmindedness, and conformity in thought and action. Anti-cultural studies whether in the arts or sciences are those self-serving, egocentric, or ethnocentric studies that teach the individual to see everything in terms of himself or the selfish interests of his own group, to judge everything in relation to the way it will serve his private concerns or the concerns of his own particular group or nation.

My university of the future would test all that it does to see if it serves both the liberal and the cultural: the liberal values befitting free men who have learned to be self-governing, intellectually, politically, and personally; and the cultural values whereby the individual is put in command of the resources of knowledge, wisdom, and creativity that may be derived from his local and particular civilization as well as those of the broader international and world civilization.

Having said this, of course, I have only stated not solved the problem as far as African or Latin American universities are concerned. We are still faced with a myriad of academic questions concerning whether the orientation, curriculum, quality, assumptions, and attitudes in African and Latin American universities today are appropriate to the needs of modernization, nation-building and culture. Africanization of the content is a high priority and rightly so, but this correction of an imbalance should be done without inserting an
undesirable ethnocentrism that insists all over again that foreign peoples be judged by the standards of one's own group with the consequent tendency to judge them to be inferior. Can the university degree structure be modified to promote greater breadth, flexibility, and diversity while at the same time maintaining appropriate standards of achievement and of excellence? Or are breadth and standards, general education and specialization inherent contradictions in terms?

I would imagine that the basic question of human resource development facing the universities of the less developed nations is something like this:

Should universities be encouraged to embrace an increased range and diversity of studies that will enable them to train effective leaders to do those things that must be done in a developing society but which have not traditionally been done by universities and which cannot now be done by other agencies of education? For example, should African and Latin American universities offer training for primary school teachers, home economists, public administrators, agriculturists, journalists, business administrators, nurses and librarians as well as for physicians lawyers, engineers, scientists, and secondary school teachers of the academic subjects?

Answers to this question will inevitably be based upon one's conception of what it is proper for a university to do. Answers will also reflect political pressures and social realities.

Considering Political, Social, Psychological and Cultural Values

This brings me to my third proposition.

I have been arguing that an appropriate conception of human resource development must not only reckon with African aspirations but also with the nature of the university traditions in Africa and with the possibilities of change within the African universities of the future. I would argue no less that an effective plan for human resource development must envision programs of professional education in the universities based upon study of the political, economic, social, intellectual, psychological, and cultural context within which universities and teachers must work. This study should spring from a well-rounded, empirically-based analysis of social change which brings together the best evidence concerning the inter-relationships of economic growth, social trends, and personality formation.

Only in this way can we plot the role of higher education and formulate a program of professional education that will genuinely contribute to the process of modernization and nation building. Many scholars have pointed to the serious social gap between the modern-minded, western educated elites of Africa and the tradition-minded masses of the people. Few have worked out just what elements within the western-oriented education were responsible for producing this gap, and fewer still have shown in detail how a new African-oriented education in schools and universities will reduce the gap, change the attitudes of tradition-minded people, and produce the new African personality. A fundamental task of the new African university is to chart the course whereby the new
African professional will be enabled to assume his strategic task in the transi-
tional process of change from a traditional to a modern style of life.

If the university trained professional is to play his part in modernizing Africa,
he must be able to aid his people to recognize generally the nature of their
traditional ways of life and to help them learn how to embrace the broader loyal-
ties of a modern style of life while at the same time achieving a reassuring sense
of personal identity. Somehow, traditional loyalties to a particular family,
tribe, or locality must be broadened to embrace general loyalties to the new nation
and to the old world. Social roles based upon inherited status, class, or occupa-
tion will increasingly be based upon individual achievement. The mother tongue
of an oral tradition will be modified by an international language based upon
written and mass media of communication. A rural and agrarian subsistence
way of life will be confronted by increasing industrialization and urbanism.
Social, intellectual, and geographic isolation will be disrupted by greater
mobility and widening of cultural perspectives. Affective coloration and in-
herited religion will be tempered by rational enlightenment. And obedience to
colonial or regional rulers will be transformed by the obligations and freedoms
of self-government.

According to scholars of the modernization process, these are some of the
characteristics that individuals are required to develop if their traditional
society is to be transformed into a modern society. Far too little attention has
been given to the precise role of formal education or of the university-trained
professional in this transformation process, and yet every theory of social
change lays a heavy burden upon "education" if the society is genuinely to
change without a complete social breakdown or disruption. Central govern-
ments must not simply set out to abolish tradition but must pay more attention
to the way in which traditional social patterns are to be integrated within the
process of modernization if social breakdown is to be avoided. And, of
course, education will play a key role in the process. Here is a vast, complicated,
and fascinating realm for instruction and research in African and Latin American
universities as well as in North American universities.

If we are to take seriously the generalization that education has a key role
to play in nation-building and in the modernization process, then all professionals
must become "modernizers." To aid in this process, the education of professionals
should correct the relative neglect and low priority long given to the social sciences
in most African and Latin American universities. I believe that greater stress and
attention should be given to political science, economics, sociology, anthro-
pology, social psychology, as well as to history and human geography. I
urge that a higher priority be given to such studies as a means of increasing
the usable, empirical, objective knowledge required for general citizen-
ship and for professional leadership in solving the many social problems
facing the new nations and training up the younger generation in habits of
rigorous, reflective, and critical thought.

Many social scientists are struggling with the problems of the inter-relationship
of the several social sciences and the possibilities of an interdisciplinary
or integrated approach to the social science curriculum in the African or Latin
American secondary school and university. Some believe that an interdisciplinary
education is necessary because the real problems of nation-building and
modernization are interdisciplinary. Intensive specialization may be appropriate for training in the technical professions but not for leadership that must face the complicated current needs of Africa or Latin America. Some believe that all university students should be required to take interdisciplinary or integrated courses in African studies or African institutions. This would be a major revolution for some universities; it would be a major academic exercise requiring great ingenuity and great perseverance wherever it is tried.

Whatever the decision about the proposal for compulsory general courses in African studies based upon the social sciences, it seems to me that African universities must somehow find ways to provide students with a measure of concrete experience in political, economic, and educational affairs as well as to pass on to them systematized bodies of knowledge. So great is the demand for trained manpower that for many years to come fresh graduates will be obliged to take up posts of great responsibility without the opportunity for seasoning experience. Universities must somehow shape their program of training in such a way as to fill this gap in practical experience. They must somehow prepare political leaders for their responsibilities as well as give specialized training for skilled personnel in the professions, in management, and in administration of public and private enterprises. This poses a fundamental problem for the role of knowledge in social action. It may rub against the grain of a university tradition that has provided indirect training for administrative and leadership positions rather than direct training. But the needs are so urgent that research as well as training should be mobilized on these problems.

**Approaching the Task of Human Resource Development**

How then should we of North American universities approach the task of human resource development in the universities of Africa, Latin America, Asia, and Europe? I believe basically that we must enter into close cooperative association with them to work out joint programs of instruction, service, and research. We must form a series of university networks in which the universities of several nations join together to work on their mutual problems of national and international development.

The mood of the free world has changed. No longer is it justifiable for agents of a home nation to go among another people to preach, to trade, to govern, or even to advise, to teach, or do research with the primary purpose of benefiting the "senders" and giving little attention to what happens to the "receivers." We now must believe that the world needs international efforts that are genuinely cooperative, that will cross national and cultural boundaries for the mutual benefit of the self-determining values of both societies. Two-way cooperation among equals is the only self-respecting path for education to take. The promoters of international education must recognize this fact and act accordingly.

These, then, are some of the questions that face us: Can we put the best qualities of American education (qualities that have given both substance and vitality) at the disposal of other countries in such a way as to meet their needs and not impose our system upon them? Can we produce a new breed of international American professionals, more sturdy, more self-reliant, more versatile—and more altruistic and knowledgeable—than any we have hitherto produced?
Can we prove to the peoples of the world that the surest foundation for nations that would be both modern and free is an education that enables men to think for themselves with free and disciplined minds, to govern themselves with uncoerced participation in public affairs, and to fulfill themselves with dignity and security of person?

I believe that we can and must do these things. And to do them I believe that we must move quickly and surely to create with our colleagues overseas a network of associated universities. In this enterprise we need the close and continuing cooperation and support of our government, the host governments, the private foundations and donor agencies, and the universities, teacher training institutions, and school systems of both the sending and the receiving countries.

We already have some experience along these lines. We have formed alliances among colleges and universities of a number of countries; we have formed international groups of educational institutions bound together for the selection and training of teachers and the improvement of teacher training institutions. We at Teachers College have done this in the Teachers for East Africa project under AID auspices. We have also done it in our Afro-Anglo-American Program for Teacher Education, in which a dozen universities on three continents work together with financial support from the Carnegie Corporation. Other American universities have established liaison with sister institutions in other countries.

I believe that such arrangements as these provide a clue to the best type of future educational relations among nations. Genuinely cooperative arrangements are the only proper means by which education can promote the modernization of societies among equals. The importation of ideas or institutions from the outside or their surreptitious insinuation within the culture of a people without their consent stamps the importation as "alien goods" and thus a threat to the freedom of the "receiving" people.

Here again an international association of free universities can provide the answer. It not only removes the alien church, the alien government, the alien property owner, or the alien army from the direction or control of the modernization process, it gives the best promise of building the surest foundations for freedom in the future. It relies upon the open and free process of education for the promotion of ideas, not upon secret manipulation or furtive seeking of power. It is under the control of the people concerned and not directed from afar. It is made for those who are determined to direct their own destinies. I believe it can become the intellectual instrument for a coming world-wide civilization based upon knowledge and education, not upon military might or political power or economic superiority or religious authority. It can herald the dawn of a new educational civilization.