

PN-HBG-934

69683

**A Review of**  
**"Some Thoughts on the Role of U.S. Universities**  
**in the Development Task - A Third World View"**  
**by**  
**Muzaffer Ahmad**  
**the MUCIA Colloquium**

October, 1988

Prepared by  
**Center for Research on Economic Development**  
In partial fulfillment of  
Contract #PDC-0180-0-00-8121-00  
Bureau of Program and Policy Coordination  
U.S. Agency for International Development

Some Thoughts on the Role of U.S. Universities in the Development Task –  
A Third World View

Muzaffer Ahmad

for the MUCIA Colloquium

OVERVIEW

Ahmad writes at great length — and in confusing language — on the historical and philosophical aspects of social change and development. This, then, becomes the backdrop for his discussion on the role of US universities in Third World development. For this review, only the sections most relevant to the topic at hand (pp. 28–37) are presented.

HIGHLIGHTS OF PAPER

The author believes that educational aid has contributed to enhancing center–periphery relationships between developed and developing countries and to "creating a dependent influential domestic power elite." The colonial system has, in his view, expanded through the educational development programs ("assistance from elite to elite"). Ahmad discusses several aspects of this "dependency model of education".

The role of US educational institutions in the 1990s with respect to development assistance is "to avoid creating a center–peripheral relation in the knowledge industry and knowledge trade". In other words, to create "indigenous capacity for absorption, adoption, expansion and creation of relevant knowledge."

How can this be done?

1. For the assistance program to be socially and economically useful to the recipient country, it needs to be perceived, conceived and elaborated primarily by them with the help for articulation by the collaborating US universities.
2. The center for planning, programming and implementation should be the recipient country/institution, with local counterparts fully involved.
3. Linkages with recipient institutions should be created with a network of US and third–country universities, rather than with just one US university.
4. The assistance should be long–term.
5. Care needs to be taken in selecting expatriate advisors. They should be knowledgeable, but more importantly, sensitive to the need to develop local institutional capacity.

Some thoughts on the Role of U.S. Universities in the Development Task -  
A Third World View

---Muzafer Ahmad

(Contents : Concept of development -- concept of Third World Role of universities -- American Universities and Development Assistance - case study of selected Indian institutions -- Failure of Third world peripheral educational system and some implicit lessons for the future -- The implications of educational assistance in the light of NIEO -- The does for U.S. institutions in the future program.)

---

\* Professor, University of Dhaka, Bangladesh.

Paper presented at a conference on "The Role of U.S. Universities and Development in the 1990's" organized by MUCIA and the Johnson Foundation at Racine, Wisconsin on March 10-12, 1988.

## Introduction

I must express, at the very outset my heartfelt thanks to the organizers of this seminar for being asked to present some views from the third world perspective on the role of the U.S. universities in the context of development in the coming decade when we prepare ourselves to bid farewell to the twentieth century, hopefully in a better shape socially, politically, economically from the global as well as in the narrower national/local viewpoint. At the outset I must put on record serious limitations on my part to do so. First, I have experience of a third world country or at best a region; but third world is a vast and non-homogenous entity which was initially used by Franz Fanon to connote distance, despair and anger. Second, I have limited experience of the U.S. education system -- some at the tip of it as a student for five years as a graduate student in one of the best U.S. universities, as a member of faculty in a university in Massachusetts for a year but essentially remained non-integrated to get an inner view. Thirdly, development as to its meaning, experience and strategy is again an area where much disagreement remains. Hence, this value laden term may and does mean different things to different people. My view grew out of my direct and indirect but accumulated experience. Having said these in expressed terms, I can only beg your tolerance to bear with me for the period of my deliberations. Even when I sound critical, I may do so not only for my incomplete understanding, but also to raise issues which merit deliberations and thought on part of the more able and more experienced people -- here and elsewhere.

### Organization of the Paper

The paper is organized as follows: In the section following the introductory remarks, I have tried to deliberate on the concept of development and draw attention to the inadequacy of the concept and absence of meaningful effort on the part of third world to do so. In the next section I have attempted to draw attention to the nature of the third world as a concept and how difficult it is to treat it as a concept. The next section deals with the role of the university and goes on to discuss the role of U.S. universities vis a vis the developing world. The following section presents the case study of a few examples of educational aid to India which is considered to be a success story in a relative sense. The pen ultimate section deals with the realities of the third world education system which remains a periphery and because of the dependent nature, despite high variability of aided institutions, their contribution to national development and development of knowledge is still much limited compared to potential. The final section deals with the role of universities in the context of NIEO and how U.S. universities can help attain the goals of the NIEO.

## II

### Concept of Development: Evolution and Extremity

Development fortunately is no longer interpreted in the narrow economic sense. Though a complete agreement on what development, or more precisely non-development means is far from there, even then it means a better state of being approached in a graduated and systematic manner. It may indeed be said that recent involvement of development process and experience of constraints to development, however conceived, has made the

concept more inclusive to consider non-economic dimensions or to extend economics to sectors which did not fall strictly within that fold or do not easily lend itself to its treatment. This man-centered idealization and search for social and institutional roots of development has made the concept more agreeable to the university community as a whole in its ideal form than it was in the past and it has crept not only beyond the limits of economics but also that of social sciences. This thrust in the understanding of development in the broader perspective is an important development of significant importance and credit for this goes not merely to the practitioners of development programs or projects but also to the academic in the universities who got involved in the debate and contributed substantially in building holistic conceptualization for integrating non-economic and non-quantifiable factors into the development process and in conceptualizing development in the broadest possible terms. Even though development economics seems to have faded into oblivion or are fading away with reassertion of technocratic classical economics, even though area studies are no longer in fashion, social sciences and development studies as an interdisciplinary and integrated field of studies never got popularized or needed support in the Western educational system. The involvement of U.S. academia in the development programs and projects and through that in the process, has increased over time and gained a much wider affiliation than ever before as a result of expanding national, bilateral and multilateral development efforts. But in the process, the Third world countries mostly remained as bystanders.

Development today is no longer conceived as the business of economists alone, as development is also analyzed and examined in social, cultural, educational, scientific and technological, legal, spiritual, institutional and political dimensions. It is the interdependence of these factors on economic factors and vice versa which, though forgotten in partial or short-sighted approach, is a fact that surfaced from analytical history of development process of many societies. There was always a group of academics, particularly non-fangled model-bugs, who emphasized the need to look at the society as a whole and in the broader context than what can be caught in a simplified set of quantitative relations.

Development: Some Historical and Philosophical Digression

You will notice, I have not attempted to define development as such. I have merely stated that development need be understood and discussed in the broadest possible terms. There is indeed a school of social philosophers who doubt whether development is scientifically definable and those who carry the legacy of platonic and protagoenian notion of the basic morality of change and in that sense development is intrinsically worthless as superstratum only changes. However, Heroclitos not only accepted change as reality but argued that changes are patterned after well defined general laws which are dialectical in nature. Despite these philosophical arguments, from the ancient Greek philosophers we get no working set to account for social change and development. Compared to their towering intellect, mine is a particle in the dust. I am not able to perform any better.

However, it should be emphasized that development became a manifested concern only when dramatic changes in material culture with burgeoning population, proliferation of invention and colonization it became realizable through deliberate action and considered desirable; such actions resulted in new forms of social production, ownership and consumption in the wake of changing circumstances caused by the Industrial Revolution. The new social forces of production and economic reorganization emerged manifesting them in such developmental responses as Protestantism, Enlightenment, Liberation and Socialism. These were all assaults against traditionalism and in favor of institutionalization of development and change. This to my limited understanding is what, for example, Weber's studies in inter-relationship between capitalist economy and protestant ethics show. The question that has to be pondered over is whether the decolonization process or the development strategy backed by the intellect of the West has been able to create such conditions of social change and have the academics advocated and practiced an approach that keeps social development a dependent variable consequent to the aid-induced economic activities which are determined by dominant national interest and the lobby of the donor countries? I am afraid the concept of human development which came as a consequence of Enlightenment did not permeate into the concept of aid for development as these were still built generally around virtues of hard work, patient effort and slow results. This lapse is visible when one sees the developmental studies and evaluation which forget the value and need for transition from autocracy (i.e. military rule) to democracy based on universal suffrage, from law, or practice of law based on power to equality before law, from concentration of wealth to rational distribution of production resources,

from illiteracy to universal education, from group domination to national consensus, etc. This is not to say, the Academia in the U.S. are not aware of this but when they work as direct agents of development agencies, they seem to be liberated from such concepts barring few exceptions and recent realizations.

The reason may lie in the fact that while Enlightenment did produce a framework for the understanding of development, but it failed to evolve a causal basis thus leaving social sciences in the ivory tower of idealism which produced arbitrary forms of utopianism. The social sciences as a whole, despite counter currents, may not still be effectively free from this legacy. This to me appears to be the basic reason for non-emergence and growth of development studies in the academia in the U.S. and elsewhere. Thus, to date as per this tradition, development of men was expected to result in and result from final fusion of reason and self-interest but it has so far not fused effectively even at a minimum level with reason to create conditions of rapid development. Even the historical theory of development which sees reasons as one that connects one great moment defined as the culmination of painstaking process providing meaning to human existence and experience, with another, did not effectively abnegated the void and it resulted in the culmination of materialistic "theory" of social development.

#### Development: Marxian View

It was left to Marx who viewed development as a social and a secular question, and who insisted on a specific interest laden and also value laden dimension of the problem. He sought to enumerate principles of development in terms of the progress of socio-economic production and

found the relegation of land and land owning class as a stage of development in the process of social production. He conceived that next stage of development would be rise of labor and its class affiliate. This carried the implication of replacement of state power by social authority. Marx thus built the first system of social science in terms of development by relating it to social interest groups and development was conceived as a class task. He concluded that only after the fall of bourgeois society and bourgeois consciousness could there be national development and it would not come harmoniously. The U.S. political ideology being actively antithetical to it, the U.S. academics generally ignored this approach, even attempted to provide alternate approach, which are similarly limited in nature as they were products of reactions in a cold war climate. However, in recent years, methodical and critical studies of Marxism in the U.S. have increased and contributions of neo-marxists in the U.S. are quite visible. But, they still remain outside the mainstream of development debate.

Development: Failure of Third World to Conceptualize

I should in all fairness add that no towering intellectual effort is noticed in the third world to conceptualize development or development process by themselves. This is so, largely because older civilizations and older seats of learning were destroyed or made dysfunctional in the colonization process and also because in these countries the modern intellect is a product of the first world, even when it is marxist. In addition there has been a denudation of the capable intellect through the process of brain drain or through the corruption that so called consultancy services has brought at the doorstep of the intellectuals.

Being greatly inhibited by the Western intellectual hegemony, they are capable of extending it horizontally and at times vertically but they have lost the capability to look at the phenomenon from within through a process of experimentation and logic in search of meaning of past, present and future existence as a group of individuals searching for a better destiny.

### III

#### Nature of Third World: Commonalities

Third world, I have mentioned earlier, is a respectable term in place of others outside the developed capitalist first world and socialist second world. But what is the third world? We know that it is a non-homogeneous entity. We also know that almost all of them were, either directly or indirectly, subjected to mild or severe colonial rule for long or short periods. We also know that this colonial rule had been generally exploitive, repressive, and divisive in nature; it ate into the natural vitality of the old nations; and it did not create any newer ones and left them in a state of man-made under development fighting against itself without appropriate institutional structure for growth and integration. But the social, cultural, political, economic, spiritual, educational and legal impact of direct colonization and decolonization still awaits a full and formal scientific investigation by the academics of the third world as well as those of the first and second. The studies so far available are partial, often not substantive, and biased. This impedes the understanding of the third world itself. The academics of the west including those of the U.S. have fared no better. As a consequence the diverse nature of under development is not understood in its entirety and intensity as well as extensity. This understanding is

vital for the understanding of development in, as well as of the third world. We further know that for these countries there is a long way ahead to progress but not much time to cross the distance while the impediments created by national or group interests of first and second world through the global network of institutions and duopoly of intellectual property, military might, political acumen, and all these in conjunction with economic power and technological innovations is collectively creating an environment of forced deprivation for these countries as well as dependence--economic, political, military, psychological, moral and what not.

Nature of Third World: Non-Homogeneity

However, the divergence amongst the Third world countries and contradiction as well as non-integration within these countries is important to remember. This vast conglomerate has such tiny countries as Hong Kong (1 thousand sq. km), Singapore (1 thousand sq. km), Mauritius (2 thousand sq. km), Trinidad and Tobago (5 thousand sq. km) Lebanon (10 thousands sq. km) as well as such giants as China (9561 thousand sq. km), Brazil (8,512), India (3,788), Argentina (2,767), Sudan (2507), Algeria (2382), Zaire (2345) and Saudi Arabia (2150). Such variation is also noticeable in terms of population. There are such small units as Mauritius (1m), Botswana (1.1m), Butan (1.2m), UAE (1.4m), Mauritania and Kuwait (1.7m) and such populated countries as China (1040.3m), India (765.1m) Indonesia (162.2m), Brazil (135.6m) and Bangladesh (100.6m). In terms of per capita income, there are those with the lowest such as Ethiopia (U.S. \$110), Bangladesh (U.S. \$150), and some with the highest per capita income such as UAE (U.S. \$19,270) and Kuwait (U.S. \$14, 480).

There are countries with high average annual growth rates in real GNP as the Republic of Korea (6.6%) or such low average rates as Bangladesh (0.4) or even negative rates such as in Ghana (-2.2), Niger (-2.1). Some of these countries experienced high growth of the manufacturing sector such as UAE (20.2%), Cameroon (18.4), Yemen (16.5), China (12.4), Libya (11.5), Pakistan (10.1), Republic of Korea (9.0), Turkey (7.9) and some others very dismal growth such as Paraguay (0.3%), Zambia (0.4), Jamaica (0.8), Morocco (0.7), Papua New Guinea (0.9), Guinea (1.4) and Bangladesh (2.0). Besides there are others which had negative growth. Similar is the diversity in Agriculture viz UAE (13.3), Rep of Korea (6.3), Jordan(6.4), China (9.4) and Somalia (7.9) experienced high average annual growth rates, while Ecuador (0.2) Venezuela (1.5), Yugoslavia (1.3), Colombia (1.8), Peru (1.9), Jamaica (1.9), Philippines (1.7), Liberia (1.1), Mauritania (1.6) amongst others experienced low growth. There were many that had negative growth rates in this sector.

There are economies which are primarily agricultural, getting more than 50% of GNP from that sector such as Tanzania (58%), Somalia (58), Burundi (61), Nepal (62), Mali (50), Bangladesh (50) amongst others. There are others where industry has come into predominance, such as UAE (67), Kuwait (58), Libya (57), Saudi Arabia (56), Congo (54), China (47), Algeria (48) amongst others. These include oil-rich and mineral rich countries. A Third category seem to have a major service sector viz Hong Kong (68), China (57), Senegal (52), Morocco (50), Jamaica (58), Jordan (64) amongst others. These facts establish the diversity in the nature and structure of the economies in the Third world.

The Third world generally demonstrates the prevalence of mixed economy with both private and public sector working in harmony or in conflict situation. Some have accepted the ideology or goal of socialism such as China, India, Zimbabwe, and Cuba, but there exists variation in the nature and performance of socialized sectors. Others have adopted public sector as a vehicle for promoting basic industries as well as private entrepreneurship. Many practice planning, varied in approach, content and direction in its comprehensiveness, in its flexibility, in its realism and so on. The capacity and capability to administer regulation, direction and enterprises also vary widely amongst these countries. The search for a new economic alternative by many of the Third World countries for example Libya, Yugoslavia, Tanzania to mention a few, have not matured into a viable and real one yet. The limitations lie not in their desire but in their inability to produce visionary social philosophers with great sense of compulsions of historic realities and realism to enthuse people to yield reasonable results quickly. The limitations also come from the intricate web of international linkages, lures, pressure in and around such efforts. Third world thus in effect remains a mixture of affected adaptations of capitalist and socialist systems often not providing the best of the both worlds.

The Third world countries also vary widely in terms of social indicators of levels of development. For example, primary school enrollment is low for countries like Bhutan, (25% of age group), Niger (28), Guinea (32), Ethiopia (32) and very high for countries viz Burma (102), Madagascar (121), China (118), Sri Lanka (103), Zambia (100), Indonesia (118), Philippines (107), Zimbabwe (131), Peru (116), Turkey (113), Tunisia (116), Mexico (116), Singapore (115), etc. The female

participation rate is lower, but shows a similar pattern, the difference between male and female being lower in countries which have attained very high rates of enrollment. The importance of education, particularly primary education in development is an established fact. Participation at the secondary level is very low for many Third World countries e.g. Rwanda (2), Tanzania (3), Bhutan (4), Chad (6), Uganda (8), Yemen (10), Papua New Guinea (11), Mauritania (12), Guatemala (17), etc. At the other end of the scale are another set of countries viz Republic of Korea (91), Kuwait (82), Syria (79), Trinidad and Tobago (76), Sri Lanka (61), Philippines (68), Peru (61) etc. The discrepancy between male and female participation is much wider at the lower end while it is much reduced or eliminated at the other end of the scale. It is the graduates from the secondary school system who are potential entrants to institutions of higher education at home and abroad.

At the higher education level, participation is nil or non-existent for many countries in the Third world e.g. Bhutan. The participation is in general low e.g. 1.2% for most low income economies, even in some of the middle income economies. It is relatively high in such countries as the Republic of Korea (26), Argentina (29), Venezuela (23), Uruguay (26), Jordan (37), Ecuador (33), and the Philippines (29). This is an indicator of the recognition of the value of higher education and accessibility to it. This is the potential critical mass for institution to institution cooperation for U.S. and other overseas Universities with such institutions in the Third World countries.

The nature, role and extent of mass communication also varies amongst the Third world countries conditioned by literacy, urbanization and participation as well as in respect of control of and on the media. At

the lower end of the scale are countries like Nepal, Afghanistan, Sudan, Niger, Malawi and at the higher end there are countries like the Republic of Korea, Trinidad and Tobago, China, Argentina, Turkey, etc.

The character of basic social organization, particularly the traditional kinship system, also influence social development process. Countries in Africa in general exhibit strong tribal allegiance but these are not absent in some parts of Asia; whereas in Latin America, the dominant form of social organization is the immediate family group, while the extended family system predominates in most Asian countries.

The importance of the role of middle class as a driving force in growth and change is well documented. Many of the countries in Africa do not seem to have a solid indigenous middle class. Countries with significant middle class seem to be present in most Latin American, Far East and some South Asian countries. Again, some countries in Latin America and the Far East exhibit much more social mobility than those in Central America, Africa or South Asia.

The Third World countries also differ greatly according to political indicators. Many countries have highly authoritarian governments while others have well established nation-wide democratic institutions. Even amongst countries with authoritarian rule some are repressive and others are not, some are characterized by centralized decision making while others have allowed administrative decentralization, and some have effective government control while in others government control is basically ineffective. Amongst the democratic countries the degree of popular participation, nature of political party systems and practice of democratic norms differ widely. In other words, there are countries where political opposition cannot be freely and openly organized and

there are others where this has been accepted as part of the process. Again, the degree of competitiveness amongst the major political parties and choice of effective political alternatives may or may not be present. In some countries political parties have significant class and/or doctrinal orientation, while in others it is highly personalistic or characterized by regional, ethnic, linguistic, and such limiting ties. Over and above all, the political stability of the Third world countries have varied significantly as has the commitment of leadership to economic development and welfare of the common man.

This long discourse on the Third world was intended to explode the myth of one or a few homogenous entity but also to emphasize that the intrinsic ability of these countries to harness its own resources to respond to the extrinsic stimuli for educational, cultural, scientific, technological, and social development is indeed varied and depends on a large number of factors that are rarely considered expressedly in designing the stimulus and aid for change.

#### IV

#### Role of the University: Evolution in Nature

I would like to spend a few moments on the role of the University. What is the University? It cannot and should no longer mean a set of buildings where to a number of students are communicated by various means and methods knowledge by a group of scholars who have studied the matter for long and researched into and about it for quite some time. The university is today more than it was in yester years, a social organization, responsive to the needs of its clients and environments and take into consideration the views of its patrons for transmission,

creation and growth of knowledge and of agents embodied with such knowledge. Thus university today presupposes a society, polity and an economy, and it is conditioned by the past, present and expected future state of that society, polity and economy. Hence, U.S. Universities, despite great diversity in form, size, standard wealth, organization, etc. demonstrate a kind of unity that can be called "American", so does the British, German, Russian and French Universities. It should never be forgotten that U.S. universities are a product of social production system of the U.S. and it responds primarily to that system and whatever manifestation of internationalism may be there, those are merely a necessary extension of that system. The U.S. Universities have no obligation to the system beyond the frontiers except to the extent it serves the national interest of social reproduction. Hence, the output goals (graduates and new knowledge), quality goals (for differentiation) and system goals (Growth, change, experimentation etc.) of the University system, as it should be, are oriented towards its immediate client and patron community.

The change in the conceptualization of university is very vivid from the literature on University education. Some examples are reproduced below:

- 1) "A University is a corporation of society which devotes itself to a search after knowledge for the sake of its intrinsic value" (B. Truescott: Readbrick University, Faber, 1943 p45)
- 2) "The University ideal, which derives form the corporation of masters and scholars of the middle ages, is of a self-governing community concerned with advancing and disseminating knowledge." (A.E. Sloman:The Making of a University, BBC, 1964, p9).
- 3) "There would be widespread agreement with the view that the fundamental characteristic is the combination of research with teaching." (G.L. Brook: The Modern University, Deutsch, 1965 p11)

4) "I shall treat a university as though it had two major subsystems: one for the discovery of knowledge - research; the other for the dissemination of knowledge - teaching." (Q. Rice" The Modern University, Tavistock, 1970, p24).

5) "The purpose of the University is to benefit the community which created and maintains it, and mankind in general, through the advancement and dissemination of knowledge." (J. Seare: The Campus War, Penguin, 1972 p170)

6) The objectives of the universities are:

"(a) to provide instruction in skill to enable its graduates to participate in the national production effort effectively through skill-based division of labor,

(b) to promote mental faculty to produce cultivated personalities

(c) to help advancement of learning and

(d) to transmit knowledge based common culture which sustains standards of citizenship" Robbins Committee on Higher Education in U.K.

7) The University has many different functions in the community. First, it is a symbol and repository of civilization in the sense of belonging to Western Culture and being able to support scholarship. Second, a university is a home for research. A Third important function of the University is information storage. The fourth is teaching young adults both for a professional training and for providing general education. The final function of a university is to serve as a means to of redistribution of income from the community in general towards its youthful intelligent and scholarly inclined citizens. (Harry G. Johnson. The University and the Social Welfare in Keith a Leendsen (ed) Efficiency in Universities Isevier scientific Publishing Company, 1974 p21-28)

### Universities and Interest Groups

These changes have come about because of the interplay of interest groups which can no longer be said to be students and faculty. One of the very important interest groups is the Government which no longer supports a university merely as a symbol of civilization but sees it as a specific institution contributing to the formation of human capital and intellectual property, even if we ignore its impact on social mobility, national integration and income redistribution. While universities earlier depended largely on government and community funding, in developed societies foundations and donors have become an important source of revenue. They are not merely moved by motivations of charity, but seem to have their own view as to the direction of development in teaching and research. The business firms have shown interest in universities not merely for recruitment of experts and executives, but also for research in its own interest. Thus, it can be said that the University, like in the classical age, can no longer determine unilaterally its own means of teaching and research, more and more, it responds to the needs of the patrons and clients. Where do the developing countries feature in this?

### Universities and Educational Aid

In the context of the developing countries, the inducement has come from educational aid provided through foreign aid programs as part of the foreign aid policy of the Government. In other words the universities function as part of the state apparatus in the marxist sense and in doing so they do not assume any responsibility to meet the expectations or need of the developing countries alone but quite importantly, that of the donors. This is somewhat unlike the situation in the first and second world.

Despite deep and generous humanitarianism of the people of the United States and at times imaginative initiatives taken by the government, private foundations and voluntary agencies, the U.S.A. has supplied aid on a declining scale over the years and the rationale for aid, except for security, foreign policy reasons and commercial interests, do not find a ready support on Capitol Hill. The criterion for allocation of aid seem to be historical association, global importance, security relevance, commitment to democracy and free market and economic performance in the narrow sense of the term. Humanitarian action aimed at relieving immediate difficulties and the very poor remain separate from general aid package. The administration of AID rests with a vast bureaucracy attached to the Department of State, besides there are innumerable foundations and organizations who work in the field with limited and sharply focused programs.

#### U.S. Universities: Assistance, Foreign Students and Impact

The U.S. universities in general have responded to this aid climate positively by providing facilities for training, to citizens of developing world as part of this aid push; by sending experts and teachers to the developing countries under designated aid program, organizing research on development problems both in U.S. universities and the field and so on. However, there has been no detailed evaluation of the role of the universities in development assistance.

There are reportedly 350,000 students from foreign countries in American colleges and universities today; this is less than 3% of students enrolled in institutions of higher education in U.S.A. Although the U.S. enrolls more foreign students than any other developed country, but ranked in terms of percentage of total student body, it is in second

decile. Majority of these foreign students are undergraduates and community colleges together are attracting most of the foreign students in the U.S.A. However, nearly 50% of the graduate students are at the major research universities of the U.S. The preferred field of study, in order of participation are Engineering, Business Management, Natural and Life Sciences, social sciences, humanities and agriculture. The share of women students have come close to the 40% mark in recent years. As to the geographical distribution, a little more than 1/5th comes from middle eastern and other OPEC countries, another one-fifth from Pacific and Asian countries, nearly one-sixth from Latin American countries including the Caribbean, about similar number from whole of Africa, one eighth from South Asia and other Asian countries and the rest from East and West Europe. Not all of them come under development program, but most of them have assistance from the universities, Foundations and similar other organizations. Development assistance covers no more than 8% of the student body.

The impact of a large body of foreign students have been perceived to be important for (a) contribution to scholarship worldwide and emergence of international centers of excellence; (b) contribution to international understanding through potential influence of stay in U.S.A. on people who are likely to play a leadership role in their own countries and (c) contribution to economic relationships because of continued interest in the U.S. even when they return home.

#### Universities and Faculty Exchange

Besides the students, there has existed faculty exchange programs at the core of which is the Fulbright program, but foundations have also helped considerably in its growth. Because of America's emphasis on

fundamental research, interdisciplinary work, experimental work in social and biological sciences, etc, the U.S. universities are attractive to foreign faculty members for learning to bridge the gap in knowledge, for cooperative research and for experiencing a new outlook on familiar subjects. Such exchanges have promoted growth of linkages between university systems or groups of schools; direct exchanges between U.S. universities and those abroad, faculty exchanges around specific projects and Department to Department or faculty to faculty exchanges on their own initiatives. Such exchanges are largely limited to universities in developed countries or those who have been able to create and sustain such linkages (i.e. Republic of Korea, India). Here again, besides dominance by developed European countries, dominance would also be noticed in respect of disciplines, as well as institutions that have benefited most from these exchanges. This inequity has not allowed the spread effect to gather critical momentum in most of the Third world countries.

#### U.S. Universities as Resources for Development Assistance

American universities since World War II have played an important role as a resources in development assistance to LDC through government and foundation programs for educational, economic and technological development. Such assistance was often in the nature of unilateral and unidirectional assistance and in some cases in also nurturing a collaborative relationship. It is indeed true that the full potential of American Universities is far greater than that has been tapped so far and they are indeed capable of transferring the know how of integrating the higher education system with national development efforts if sustained and programmed efforts are articulated in a collaborative relationship

with a commitment on both sides and resources made available to do so. In other words, program related institutional development and research linked to the felt need and problems of the recipient country has to be the approach and these should be supported and sustained through a period of maturity rather than randomly distributed as assistance for individual development for a short period in such fields or in such manner that has little relation to the development problems that the country concerned feels as immediate and important. Not many of the development assistance provided through American universities could claim this orientation or a legacy of lasting success.

#### BIFAD and U.S. Universities

As an example, one can look at the BIFAD program which has very active university participation and which grew out of concern about hunger and malnutrition in the developing countries. The component of this program, which supposedly gets 55% of AID's budget, are research, training, extension services, and advisory services. How are these functions discharged? First, this program supports collaborative research in American universities with LDC or international research institutions on agricultural related problems that are of mutual interest in U.S.A and LDC, but generally conceptualized by the former. Second, this program provides grants to U.S. universities to strengthen their capability in teaching research and extension work in LDC's. The idea is to build institutional and human resource skills primarily in the U.S.A. and secondarily through them in LDCs. Third, the operation of this program provides opportunity to land grant and sea grant universities in the U.S.A. an advisory role to AID regarding development of priorities and projects in LDCs involving research, training extension and advisory

functions. An evaluation by some Congress members indicated that such research grants have permitted the selected U.S. universities to duplicate the functions of International Agricultural Research Centers and allowed researchers to pursue personal research interest and little benefit has actually accrued to LDCs. AID itself is reportedly suspicious of capacity and validity of U.S. universities contribution to the development process in LDCs.

#### U.S. Universities and Technological Development in LDCs

Another area is development of technology and personnel. It has been rightly perceived that LDCs needs new technologies, new institution or institutional capacity, trained personnel for transfer, adaptation and use of science and technology in LDCs. This requires problem oriented long term direct and collaborative program in place of country oriented formal and complicated program with shifting focus. This requires major action in LDCs with supportive action in U.S. institutions in place of the converse. However, much of the training and research in most of the U.S. universities seem to have sprouted from missionary or monetary motives considering international projects as isolated activity; often diffusing energies of the faculty over too broad a terrain and there has occurred in no instance an integration of U.S. universities overall mission with the objectives of developmental role that it is called upon to play. The mission of U.S. universities is still very much inward looking, locally centered and international activities are peripheral to the system.

This inward looking nature can be understood best if one recalls that international and area studies are of recent origin in U.S. universities which carry the strong legacy of isolationism. However in the 50's and 60's foundations and the government support led to a major growth in area

studies. Foreign Area and Foreign Language programs have dwindled in the 70's and 80's. This seems to be a reflection of the reduced concern of the government and the community in U.S. about the role of universities in preparing personnel for broader interaction with people in other countries particularly LDC. This reversal in concern also reduced the capacity of U.S. universities to work in collaborative activities in LDC themselves.

#### IV

##### Educational Development Assistance: A Case Study of India

It may be helpful to discuss some of the successes in educational aid. The countries that come to mind are Republic of Korea and India among others. I shall devote my attention India as a matter of convenience.

India realized very early that the most important ingredient for national prosperity is technology, creation adoption and development of which is rooted into the study of sciences and their applications, as that would result in better and effective utilization of human and material resources and ultimately in her ability to provide better material and cultural amenities for the people at large. Accordingly, the government of India decided to foster, promote and sustain by all appropriate means, the cultivation of science and scientific research in all its aspects; pure, applied and educational; in order to ensure adequate supply of research scientists of high quality through education and training of scientific personnel. Creative talents are to be supported as well as augmented in an atmosphere of academic freedom so that dissemination of scientific knowledge for development and discovery or adoption of new technology becomes a reality in the national

interest. India did not initially receive foreign aid as a means of harnessing modern science and technology. In order to ensure relevance, continuity and efficiency, as well as to create capacity for further autonomous development through unilateral or collaborative research, India set up a number of institutes of technology starting with Kharagpur with its own means then Bombay with UNESCO-USSR assistance, Madras with FRG aid, Delhi with U.S.AID and Kanpur with UK assistance.

In all instances, teams of Indian experts discussed and settled the details for each institutes with the counterpart institutions in aid giving country which helped to set up teaching and research activities as well as trained Indian faculty to function optimally on their own. The foreign assistance facilitated induction of latest technology and created the basis of technological self reliance for Indian economic development. India today, is the eight largest industrial producer and has emerged as an exporter of engineering products to LDC. It should be recalled, while creating these apex centers of excellence, India established 357 Industrial training Institutes (ITI). Six central training institutes for training instructors of ITI with assistance of ILO for five and U.S.AID for one; an Advanced Training Institute for craftsman and technicians, a Foreman training Institute at Bangalore and a central staff training and research Institute for senior personnel in Industry in Calcutta. This vast network was developed in a planned manner and was possible because of existing education infrastructure in India, imagination and vision of their leaders. In setting up these training Institutes Government of India accorded high priority to foreign technical assistance in training manpower with UK as the prime provider. India introduced with UNDP-UNESCO assistance, a program for upgrading the

curriculum and teaching of science in secondary schools coordinated by a National Council of Educational Research and Training. The program upgraded the laboratory and workshops in schools, provided expert services for revision of curricula and training of science teachers.

#### Agricultural Educational Development

India is an Agricultural country and development of agriculture was a priority area. In 1954, an Indo-American team was constituted to recommend ways and means for development of agricultural education. As a result, five American land grant universities under U.S.AID grant provided expert services to develop five Indian colleges of Agricultural and veterinary sciences and two research institutes, trained Indian scholars in the field and build up the library, laboratory and field equipments. In the meantime, the number of agricultural colleges increased to 51 and veterinary colleges to 17. There were demands to set up agricultural universities. At this stage, the Rockefeller Foundation stepped in to draw up a proposal for setting up six Agricultural Universities at Landhiana, Udaipur, Jabalpur, Hyderabad, Bangalore, Bhubaneswar in addition to Patnagar and Kalyani. Later, eleven more had been set up. Of the 19, only 14 had benefited from foreign assistance in the matter of supply of experts, books, equipments and training. USAID had provided much of the needed technical assistance, besides those provided by Rockefeller and Ford Foundations which were directed in part to Intensive Agriculture Development Program linked to these institutions and establishment of Indian Agricultural Research Institutes. The emphasis of all of these programs was on integration of education with research and extension work. In addition, India obtained UNDP assistance

to develop research capability in soil and water management with collaboration of Wageningen University, Agricultural Economics, and Plant protection with help from USDA. Sciences Poultry breeding with help from Japan and U.S.A. and also agricultural engineering. In all these cases, Indo-American collaboration through the University system was found very fruitful. Following this success, the World Bank provided assistance in the late 1970's and U.S. university collaboration was a major component of foreign participation in that case.

#### IIME Development of Management Education

Another area of fruitful collaboration was in the field of Management studies. The trade pattern of merchant adventurers and of family enterprises were changing fast with the growth of Partnership firms, managing agency system and public enterprises. The need for a new cadre of professional managers was immediately felt. In 1960, it was estimated that 56% of managerial positions in private enterprises were held by school leavers, 28% by college leavers, 2% with diploma level education and 14% with college graduates. In technical positions the percentages were 38, 36, 6 and 27, respectively. At that time, it was also estimated that manager worker ratio on average was 1:100. Further, the chambers estimated that in the next decades there would be a need of 34,000 new and trained managers. Against this background, two Institutes of Management (IM) was set up at Ahmedabad and Calcutta for providing training in management, to conduct research in management areas, to develop teachers of management and to contribute to the growth of knowledge of management. Selected universities were encouraged and assisted to set up departments of management studies. The Ford

Foundation assisted the development of IIM by arranging collaboration with Harvard and MIT which included deputation of senior faculty for long enough periods to design and develop their own individuality, stature and strength because of autonomy, flexibility, capability, leadership and interaction with local management people and quality management education abroad.

#### Lessons from Indian Experience

The conclusions that one can draw from Indian experience of collaboration with U.S. and other universities are (1) if program is based on felt and studied need, (2) if programs are developed in a collaborative manner and implemented in that way; (3) if emphasis is laid on integration of teaching and research with a view to meet immediate and expanding local needs (4) if foreign universities depute quality people to interact and fertilize local capabilities and (5) if local faculty is selected for ability and commitment, then the foreign universities can effectively contribute to the growth and development of nationally viable and reliable institutions of sufficient stature and strength in order to contribute to the development process in the country and continued collaboration in the future.

#### V

#### Current State of Impact of Educational Aid

It is time that we direct our attention to the impact of the educational aid and development assistance that U.S. and other developed countries have extended to the countries of the Third World. We are constrained to speak in terms of generalities in the absence of any consolidated and concrete data.

### The Past and Colonial Legacy

If one recalls that some of the Third World countries were centers of learning in ancient and medieval times and were active in not only dissemination of knowledge, but also extension or creation of knowledge, then the contrast would be more apparent. Today, the best of the institutions developed through educational aid are basically communicators or transmitters of knowledge and not creators of knowledge in the fundamental sense of the term.

One has to remember that modern educational system is a development that have origins in the colonial era; the substitution of traditional system have always been generally complete due to the economic, social and political gain that new systems held out as against the old. For example, the Hindu system of education which existed in a parallel way during Muslim rule in Indian sub continent, yielded along with the later to the new system introduced by the British rule. As Irene Gilbert pointed out in her book on the Indian Academic profession (Minerva, July 1972) the education system was molded in the culture of subservience and not in the spirit of independent inquiry. This is true of British Academic Model in Singapore and Malaysia, as is also found of the Dutch Model in Indonesia, French Model in Francophone Africa or Spanish and Portuguese model in Latin America and even the American Model in the Philippines. Does this not explain why the large mass of people in these countries put together have failed to contribute effectively to the growth of knowledge over half a millenium of more? It is interesting to recall that many of the leaders of independence movements were products of the universities of the metropolis and rarely of the colonies.

Continuance of Western Colonial Model in LDC's

Has the scenario changed much since decolonization? Unfortunately no. There has in fact, occurred expansion of the colonial system through the educational development programs which have received both multilateral and bilateral assistance. It is important to note that no nation has moved away in any significant manner from basically the colonial model of education which is now protected and nurtured by domestic power elite for similar reasons as was done by the colonizers. Even countries like Thailand with no legacy of direct colonial rule have adopted western colonial educational models which help the process of social differentiation. So has the Chinese whose attempts to have different orientation during the cultural revolution on ideological grounds have admitted failure and readopted the western model. The socialist Third world countries have basically adopted a variation of the Russian system which has its pronounced western roots and is used as a tool of state apparatus for social and political differentiation.

What are the characteristics of this Western model in the context of the Third World? The foremost is the dominance of expatriate teachers or teachers trained in western countries. This results in importation of academic pattern, inputs, process and knowledge not only at the outset, but such dependence continues over time. This link of the Third World system to the academic systems of the west creates a center periphery relation which implies that the Western countries through educational aid become and continuous to remain exporters of knowledge (with ideological overtones) and the educational system of LDC's becomes the subsidiary of that international system. Furthermore, those with opportunities of education abroad become the part of dominant elite group while others

languish as takers of decisions of a dominant social group.

Unfortunately, no one traces any attempt on the part of donors or universities to help overcome this subsidarization process.

Role of Higher Education Institutions in LDCS: Limited and Dependent Nature

However, this is not to deny that the growth of education systems through indigenous and assisted effort have played a key role in growth and development of the decolonized societies. The education institutions, particularly those of the higher education, play a very significant role in the Third World context, even through because of limited access these countries have in effect created a small knowledge elite groups with total psychological dependence to whatever metropolitan system they owe their allegiance to. Because of this educational aid has often been criticized as an assistance from elite to elite and have been considered as an important foreign policy tool for creating a dependent influential power elite within these countries. In this context it is important to recall that in all countries of Asia, Africa, Latin America access to higher education is still limited to less than 5% of the relevant age group.

Another aspect of the dependency model of education is absence of efforts to develop instructional material of a creative nature that are directly relevant to the impressionable intellect and the needs of development of the country. If one survey's the textbook market in the Philippines, Thailand, Bangladesh, Cuba, Saudi Arabia, Ghana or Tanzania this aspect seems to strike one very hard despite variation in languages and at times themes. Literacy has been taken to be of value for and by

itself that its value can be enhanced by motivating creativity often misses the point. Knowledge of high order material in physics or economics seem to be of value for its own sake, question of their context, relevance or application is rarely discussed.

Another aspect of the dependent development in education is lack of autonomy and experimentation in education throughout the system, partly because of the absence of appropriate culture and polity and partly because of psyche developed through such system of assisted development. The onus for change must lie with the developing countries, but could the educational assistance, instead of being mechanical in training and transmission of knowledge, create these needed sensitivity?

A more important aspect of the dependent development in education, is the continued inability of the institutions to have the required research orientation, continuous development of libraries and laboratories due to the lack of access to funds. As a result, these institutions fail to function as nodal centers of access to knowledge and distribution of knowledge; even when initial endowments may create some limited capacity. As a result the more competent scholars, whose professional allegiance is stronger than national allegiance, gravitate towards the center thus creating a vacuum in capacity that is rarely repaired or replaced. This in turn intensified dependent relationship. This thesis was well articulated by Edward Shils in his essay on Metropolis and science in the intellectual community (Shils (ed.) The intellectual the power and other essays, Chicago 1972). This problem is compounded when educational aid attempts to create islands of Centers of excellence as has been pointed out by David Reisman that the center, periphery relation operates within the national system as well (David Reisman, constraint and variety in American Education, Anchor Books, 1958).

### Lessons From Dependent Development for Educational Development

The challenge before the Third world countries and managers of the Educational AID i.e. Universities in the West is to approach the problem not from a limited so called development perspective for a short time, but one of transforming a consume peripheral system totally into one that becomes producers of knowledge on an equal footing with the center and becomes integrated into the indigenous intellectual and educational system in order to avoid elitism on the one hand and gain strength from its own roots which alone can cure the academic peripheries from becoming the high flying flags of dependence. There is no doubt that the new educational institutions of the Third World are pockets of modernization efforts and they have potential to influence the dynamics of change, but they are in chains and these shackles need be removed in a planned manner by the recipients primarily, but with conscious effort on the part of the donors and cooperators in educational development.

#### VI

### Role of Institutions of Higher Education and NIEO

It is appropriate to indicate the role of the higher education institutions in this regard. It may be recalled that new international economic order directs our attention to the necessity of directing efforts to obtain a life of dignity and welfare for all citizens of the world on the basis of equity, freedom, democracy, participation, solidarity and acknowledgement of cultural diversity and ecological integrity.

Recalling that the universities in LDCs are part of dependent superstructure, it is necessary to redirect the ambivalence of the universities as these institutions provides training and research

outputs, perform a function of social selection of elites, generate norms of values and ideologies, and contribute to legitimization of values; however, they have rarely worked towards ironing out the social contradictions in the dependencia. As a result, there is a need to reorient professional studies as professions are social structures and they must realize the role played by professions in social development in the context of NIEO. This should involve creating awareness including needs of social reform to strengthen process of technological, economic and social change for higher productivity, greater equity and human dignity. The education system performs a desired task of educating and expanding the minds of the students, it should also create a social commitment to become constructively involved in the task of transforming the grave situation of poverty. This is an additional question which educational aid by itself does not address adequately and in some ways may even weaken it. The efficiency oriented country neutral curriculum upgradation of knowledge rarely creates the knowledge based national commitment rather it goes to create frustration in near future for individuals and professional allegiance elsewhere beyond the national boundary. This is where the cultural aspect of education which promote collective learning process to enhance capacity of human groups to understand and solve problems of immediate relevance basically as a self reliant effort takes on importance.

Thus to strengthen technological development of LDCs it is not enough to provide intensive training in Science and technology., it is also necessary to provide adequate opportunity with attendant resources within the social capacity to carry on scientific and technological application for development in the broadest sense of the term. This means

educational programs and development should be integrated into national policies of development through a continuous process of iteration, interaction and meaningful communication for promoting socially relevant development of knowledge through research and experimentation and wider communication of adopted or created knowledge to demystify elitist professionalism.

The institutions of education is thus required to avoid purely academic approach and it should not be pushed to become bastion of revolutionary political actions. The role should be designed to become one of positive social interaction integration with national development process while retaining its sensitive critical consciousness and autonomy which is the soul of its dynamism for socially useful action.

The development through educational aid have not generally created this required social orientation in the institutions so established.

## VII

### Some Suggestions on the Education Avoidance and Development Programs

What then is the role of U.S. educational institutions in the 1990's in respect of the development assistance to the LDCs. To put it in the negative, the role is to avoid creating a center - peripheral relation in the knowledge industry and knowledge trade. to put it in the positive, it means that the educational development assistance programs designed and implemented through U.S. universities must be one of creating indigenous capacity for absorption, adoption, expansion and creation of relevant knowledge. How can this be done?

First, the assistance program has to be considered socially and economically useful from the point of view of recipient country which

means it needs to be perceived, conceived and elaborated primarily by them with the help for articulation by the collaborating universities in the U.S.

Second, the center for planning, programming and implementing activity should be the recipient country/institution where the locally competent counterparts should be encouraged to play a significant and lead role in conceptualization and implementation of the project so defined.

Third, it is important to consider that while it eases administration of a project if it is located in one campus and programs are standardized; on the other hand it enriches enormously if the opportunity for training and research is spread over a number of U.S. and may even be non-U.S. universities offering options in the range of standards, range of specializations, and the range of ideology/approach. This kind of enrichment allows the recipient institutions to create a linkage network for its own purpose, as after all academic enrichment depends not only on cross fertilization, but also on cross currents of thought.

Fourth, the assistance need be of long term say of a decade's duration, through which some maturation of capacity in the institutions as indigenous and independent centers of learning with a minimum standard of excellence of efficiency could be established through a process of gradual and guided transfer of knowledge indigenization of knowledge and programmed and phased withdrawal of expatriates to the background. However, the contact need be maintained through planned visits, exchanges, joint research, workshop, conferences over a longer period. We should remember that an educational system as well as an education institution takes time to gain roots and find its role and direction.

Fifth, care need be taken in selecting expatriate advisors. They need to be knowledgeable, but more importantly, sensitive. They need to guide, but with empathy and clear objective of transferring the leadership, and be flexible without compromising basic principles and objectives. They should not be afraid to make adjustments when justified and expand the program coverage when called for, but the basic intention should always be to created a critical mass of institutional capacity in terms of men, material and orientation that would allow the assisted institutions to bloom into a center of knowledge creation and distribution activity without alienating it from the basic social, political, and economic aspirations of the common man in their own country while maintaining meaningful linkages with such centers elsewhere selectively with defined purpose and relevance on the basis of equal partnership.

However, these need to be consistent with the mutuality of interest of U.S. institutions and there may indeed lie the problem. Hence, care and clarity on both sides are called for.