

Projection of Agricultural Science Abroad: With Special..

630.711 California Univ., Davis. International NTIS
H262 Agricultural Institute.

Projection of Agricultural Science
Abroad: With Special Emphasis on the Com-
mitment of the University. Charles M.
Hardin. July 1969.
18 p.

1. Agricultural education. 2. Education, Higher.
3. Universities and international development.
I. Hardin, Charles M. II. Title.

1969
PA-445-263

630.711
H262

A.I.D.
Reference Center
Room 1656 NS

July, 1969

PN-ALJ-243

The Projection of Agricultural Science Abroad: With Special
Emphasis on the Commitment of the University

Charles M. Farlin
International Agricultural Institute
University of California, Davis

At long last the prime role of agriculture in economic development is recognized. Some are even saying that any successful modern agriculture must have a scientific base--and, therefore, that technical assistance programs should stress research. But deeds do not match words. Since World War II we have spent over 100 billions of dollars on foreign aid. Not more than half of one per cent has gone to help agricultural production. A much smaller fraction has been spent on agriculture in university contracts--perhaps .05 of one per cent. For long-term research as recommended in this paper, there has been virtually no support--only talk.

The need for agricultural research can be simply put. Often poor countries must double, triple, and quadruple their yields. As they do, they will experience a sharp rise in risks to their crops and products from drought, disease, insects, and rodents. Radical increases in yields and their maintenance in the face of enlarged dangers both require a strong agricultural science. This science must be institutionalized. That is, it must be embodied in men and women who are members of recognized professions. In the U.S., this means colleges, universities, and research establishments with rigorous criteria for advancement which give some security to careers and some assurance that careers will be productive. Such institutions must be large enough to support not only the agricultural sciences needed in the region, but also the basic sciences and mathematics. All this costs money,

but the costs for us have been dwarfed by returns--estimated at 300 per cent per year for investments in agricultural research and extension in the United States.

I want to make it clear that I am emphasizing the plant and animal sciences and engineering, with some attention to social sciences. Other things are needed for agricultural production. But I believe that we should concentrate on what we can do. At present many voices are urging that agricultural development overseas requires simultaneous advances on many fronts. Thus Mr. William S. Gaud, formerly Administrator, AID, said in 1967:

"Over the last ten years...I think we have come to realize more and more that the problem [of development] is not only an economic problem, but it is also a question of social reform and political development..."

Mr. Gaud listed the things necessary to increase food output: more and better agricultural material such as seeds and fertilizer; more and better distribution systems and farm to market roads; agricultural research and extension; agricultural credit; reasonable farm prices and relatively cheap agricultural inputs; land reform; access to consumer goods; an adequate level of trained manpower; and "efficient institutions capable of administering such programs". It follows that to help improve a country's food production we must help it remake virtually all its social, political, and economic institutions!¹

I submit that we cannot do all these things. South Vietnam, where 30 per cent of our AID effort now goes is tragic evidence. Given the violence in our cities and on our campuses--and given the bitter and

¹Footnote on page 2-a.

Footnote 1

There has been much presumptuousness about what this nation could do overseas. In his excellent book, To Move A Nation: The Politics of Foreign Policy in the Administration of John F. Kennedy, Roger Hillsman discussed the strategy of guerilla warfare which he thought had much more capability than was ever finally achieved, for example, in Vietnam, where he explained the failure by the lack of stress on the political element. "What was needed to meet the guerilla threat successfully, we felt, were reforms to organize mass parties and social and political programs that could become the basis for modernization." (p. 426). Similarly the prestigious study "Basic Issues" of the Jackson subcommittee on the conduct of American foreign policy (1964, Praeger, p. 24) properly bespeaks the need in many countries deeply involved in far-reaching political, economic, social and military programs for analysis of "great depth and sophistication..." The report goes on to ask "What strains are these programs putting on the political system? Can they be carried without political collapse? Which groups are gaining power and influence and which are losing? What political adjustments would strengthen the system? Are they feasible?" So far so good, but then the report adds: "How can the United States assist the process of adjustment?" Thus enters the unwarranted assumption that we can really manipulate these polities. It is much easier to see this now several years after the tragedy of Vietnam but we ought to learn this lesson. There are some areas in which we can well be modest and offer, if asked, only analyses, letting the host countries take it or leave it as they choose. Politics is certainly one of these.

See also the report of the Task Force on International Development Assistance and International Education in NASULGC which declares the experience to demonstrate that: "1. The full development of a country requires a multiplicity of institutions--political, economic, and social..." The report then goes on to imply that the United States is perfectly capable through its universities of assisting poor countries to develop their entire range of institutions (Report of January, 1969, President John A. Hannah, Chairman).

A rather rueful confession by a man deeply experienced in the business of trying to remake societies is found in William P. Bundy's review of Robert Shaplen's "Revolution and Reaction in Southeast Asia", New York Times Book Review, May 18, 1969. For example: "The chapter on the Philippines seems to me brilliant and at grips with the deep problems whose intractability has revealed itself acutely in the last few years--notably the Spanish quasi-feudal system, the uncertain sense of a true national past, and the caricature of democratic forms." And again: "Shaplen is deeply right that time in Southeast Asia has in essence been 'out of hand'--violently since 1945, and in essence before."

expensive failure of our farm program, how can we say that we can help other countries in social and political reform?

But if we try to do all things or insist that we must do all things at once, we may not do the few things that we can--and especially the one thing to which I now turn.

1. Agricultural Research in the Economic Development of Low-Income Countries

I shall skip the evidence of the recent rise in recognition of the need of agricultural science in economic development. But I must stress that rich nations have--and poor countries lack--highly developed agricultural science. The obvious answer to the poor country's scientific needs is help from rich country institutions--for the United States this means from the colleges of agriculture and the USDA.

There is much prima facie evidence that a strong agricultural science is essential to agricultural progress--in Western Europe, in the North American continent, including Mexico, in Israel, in Japan, and in Taiwan. For the less fortunate, lower-income countries, comparisons are invidious and a couple will have to do. In 1963-1964, the United States, with 190,000,000 population of whom 7,500,000 were classified as rural farm, graduated 7,050 Bachelors of Science in Agriculture and related disciplines, 1,859 Masters of Science, and 569 Ph.D.'s. In contrast, Colombia, with only seventeen million people but a rural farm population approximately the size of that of the United States, graduated eighty-odd ingenieros agronomos with degrees comparable to U. S. bachelors. "As late as 1965, Nigeria, a land of 43 million people with an agricultural economy, was graduating less than 200 four-year students annually from its agricultural universities and fewer than 500 agricultural technicians with two years of training."¹

¹ Drawn from a preliminary draft of a paper by Professor Arthur Coutu.

How then to promote the growth of agricultural science in the low-income countries? The answer is not easy. Despite the millions of dollars spent in U.S. technical assistance in Latin America since 1940, T. W. Schultz found only one first-class institution of agricultural science in 1967--in Mexico.

What happened in Mexico? First, the Mexicans recognized that they had a problem. Second, the Rockefeller Foundation's Mexican agricultural program found ways to project agricultural science into a foreign country in proper compliance with local laws and customs, while preserving the institutional integrity that had developed in the United States. In its Ministry of Agriculture, the Mexican government created an Office of Special Studies with which the Rockefeller Foundation cooperated until 1962. At first, this partnership stressed corn, wheat, and beans and, later, other crops and livestock. Entomology, plant pathology, and agricultural economics were added. Soon the cooperative enterprise was institutionalizing agricultural science, that is, building into the fabric of Mexican professional life the acceptance of agricultural science as a career service with satisfying rewards in money and prestige.

In 1944, Mexico imported 431,000 tons of wheat. In 1964, she exported 684,000 tons. Yields had risen from 600 kilograms per hectare to 3200. In 1944, Mexico imported corn, in 1964, she exported 500,000 tons. Meanwhile, 156 Mexicans had earned M.S. degrees, 81 had earned Ph.D.'s and 700 had some advanced professional training. The rate of return on investments in agricultural research in Mexico has been calculated at 750 per cent annually on wheat research and 300 per cent annually on corn research. On total agricultural research in Mexico, the rate of annual return has

been calculated at 290 per cent! Dr. J. George Harrar wrote:

"Twenty years ago, Mexico's twenty-one million people averaged 1,700 calories a day. Today Mexico's 37 million people average 2,700 calories and they have a more varied diet that increasingly includes animal protein."

2. The Potential Role of the Colleges of Agriculture and the USDA in the Projection of Agricultural Science Abroad

Mexico, with the assistance of the Rockefeller Foundation, has shown the way. This model is available to the colleges of agriculture and the USDA--which can adopt it and even improve on it, sometimes acting alone and sometimes in partnership.

In projecting agricultural science abroad, however, the colleges of agriculture should play a larger part than the USDA--for two reasons. First is the critical importance of educating large numbers of young people in the poor countries in agricultural science; and education is obviously much more central to the function of the colleges of agriculture than it is to the USDA.

Second, colleges of agriculture all share a primary obligation to look to the health of agriculture in their home states. They must address themselves to problem-complexes. The value of the experience of individual scientists, of departments, and of colleges in working on complexes of problems that change dynamically over time can hardly be exaggerated. Such experience is the best available preparation for the projection of agricultural science into comparable situations abroad. Whatever the differences of custom and culture, of soils and climate, of native vegetation, and of agricultural diseases and pests, there is one essential similarity--namely, that agricultural science must continue to cope with complexes of problems which extend endlessly into the future and which restlessly change.

Thus we have powerful reasons that the projection of agricultural science abroad must be from such bases as our colleges of agriculture--and must recognize the peculiarities of institutional development at home. It is not that these institutional characteristics must be recreated abroad with photographic exactness; but the overseas efforts must pay proper attention to their critical essentials.

3. The Critical Essentials of Agricultural Science as Organized in the United States

First, agricultural science has a trait nearly peculiar to it which is of great importance despite the fact that it is only just coming into recognition in agriculture and remains rarely recognized outside agriculture. The product of agricultural science is highly organic. Whereas science often makes its great advances by abstracting, isolating, and rigorously controlling discrete phenomena, agricultural science must also use the "principle of interaction". The dramatic gains in agricultural productivity come from combinations of inputs. Each input is the result of difficult scientific work, but all inputs must be properly combined to achieve notable results. Thus hybrid corn by itself may increase yields only slightly, but with proper fertilization, irrigation, tillage, and plant protection may quadruple or quintuple yields. In area after area, the intricate soil-plant-water relationships must be understood and orchestrated properly in order to achieve potential increases. Change the conditions of soil, of climate, of water quality, of available planting materials, of pests and diseases, of pesticides, and a different situation emerges in which the capabilities of agricultural science have to be orchestrated anew. The successful development of agricultural science thus requires a team of people who are used to working together--this the college provides.

Second, in addition to its organic nature, agricultural science requires time to experiment and to perform its near miracles in improving the ancient techniques of husbandry. Agricultural science has to wait on growth cycles and seasons. Experiments in "applied" science have to be continuously developed and refined. Moreover, time is required to build the institutions necessary to successful agricultural science. In the United States agricultural science came to fruition only in the 1920's and the real evidence of its contribution began in the 1940's with World War II. In World War I, despite the desperate need, more food could be produced only by using more land or more manpower. World War II demanded vast additional outputs which U.S. agriculture supplied on the same acreage and with a labor force that was cut by one-third! These increases in production were immediately stimulated by better prices which made it profitable for farmers to apply new technology. If new technology had not been available through agricultural science, prices could have doubled and quadrupled without producing much additional output. Fortunately, the poor countries need not wait 80 years as the U.S. did for investments in agricultural science to pay off--but to bring agricultural science to sufficient fruition in poor countries will still require decades and even generations. During this period of growth the continuous nourishment from our colleges to theirs will be invaluable.

Third, the lengthy time horizons of agricultural research require that individuals be able and willing to plan careers. Perhaps the central secret of the success of agricultural science in the United States lies in its institutionalization so that individuals can plan careers with reasonable confidence that monetary and professional rewards will be satisfactory.

Only in this way can the long-range problems of agriculture be attacked scientifically. There are many examples of great returns from long-term research, such as the 22 years required to eradicate the screw-worm fly in the Southeast. Such research pays off because of the intense application of individuals who know that their professional success depends on their ability to solve some particular problem or set of problems in agricultural science--and who have the proper institutional framework: professional staff positions, sufficient strength in sister disciplines, a supporting administration which understands the nature of agricultural science, laboratory and library facilities, and the flow of finances which enables them to stay with the job.

These are the principles that the Rockefeller Foundation put into effect in Mexico. Many agricultural scientists still on the staff of the Foundation were recruited in the 1950's or even in the 1940's. Their careers parallel those of leading agricultural scientists in the United States who have been satisfied to stay at home and work on the problems that commercial agriculture constantly threw up to them.

The career approach is a far cry from the typical technical assistance program in agriculture overseas. University contracts for agricultural scientific development abroad have ordinarily been fulfilled with short-term commitments. Usually, one year is as long as an agricultural scientist may be induced, and permitted, to serve. A year's term may be sufficient for political scientists, sociologists, economists, or anthropologists who may keep their interest in the foreign assignment after they return, profiting professionally from becoming area specialists. They may not go abroad again for five or six years and then to another location. For the geneticist,

however, or the plant pathologist, the soil scientist, the water scientist and the animal scientist, short terms of service are entirely insufficient to develop a proper program. Ordinarily, such scientists can only start work abroad before it is time to return to their home campus where their career interests lie and where their reputation has to be made. So long as we continue short-term staffing of agricultural programs abroad, we shall go on having indifferent success.

A fourth characteristic of agricultural science is that it is exploding. The gains of recent decades on all fronts of agricultural science stretch credulity. If agricultural scientists abroad cease to be active, recognized participants in their own home bases--their colleges of agriculture, usually--they are cut off from their profession. At the same time, we also doom the developing science abroad to a stunted growth because the shoots from which it grows have been severed from the sustaining evolution on the home campus. Agricultural science abroad must be constantly fed from the exploding matrix at home.

4. Institutional Changes Needed--The Colleges of Agriculture and Professional Societies

To achieve a professional career service for agricultural scientists abroad, we have to make changes in our own campuses, in professional societies,¹ and in the national government.

On our home campuses, we must convince our faculties and administration that service overseas must be rewarded equitably with service at home. A few of our best senior men will leave established careers at home in order to go abroad for long terms, and some are needed to lead overseas programs while many others can be used effectively for short terms so long as they work in

¹Footnote on page 9-a.

Footnote 1

Often professional societies accredit work in their disciplines and colleges of agriculture. In consequence, more general and uniform standards of excellence may prevail than would otherwise; but there may also be faults. Scientific societies often control the journals in which professional men must publish the papers with which, to quote Drs. Kellogg and Knapp, "the road to academic promotion is paved." Recently some professional societies and particularly the American Dairy Science Association and the American Society of Animal Science have issued strong statements supportive of international agriculture. Such statements should help give annual meetings of these societies an orientation appropriate for professionals serving overseas and should help make professional papers produced overseas more eligible for publication in the most respected professional journals.

programs with central cores of career personnel. But we will have to rely on steady and large infusions of junior men recruited precisely for overseas service. And yet, as Professor Woods Thomas of Purdue says, the "importance of expanding the supply of young U.S. agricultural scientists capable of working efficiently and effectively abroad has been almost totally neglected in the overall picture of international agricultural development".

In a new program designed to assist India in the development of soil and water technology, the University of California is endeavoring to apply these principles. A series of agreements have been reached between the International Agricultural Institute (IAI) representing the University of California (UC), the Indian Agricultural Research Institute (IARI) representing the Government of India, and the Ford Foundation which look toward the creation of a Water Technology Center (WTC) in New Delhi. The WTC will be an important addition to the IARI which is a prestigious institution serving all of India both in agricultural research and also as a graduate school in the agricultural sciences. UC will break new ground in technical assistance by building its program around long-term personnel. It will also build on a novel commitment-in-depth.

The arrangement with the Ford Foundation is a program with a prospective life of 10 years, to be financed in two-year periods with an evaluation at the end of five years. Three members of the staff of the University of California will begin service in India in the summer and fall of 1969 and plans are to add an additional member in the second year. Two distinguished staff members of the University of California, Davis, who are at present planning to work in India are Dr. Bertil A. Krantz, Extension Soils Specialist,

who is expected to go to India for five years (returning to California for service on the University's staff for one quarter in each alternate year) and Professor Lloyd Doneen, Professor of Water Science. A number of other staff members of the University of California at Davis and Berkeley have indicated an interest in Indian service and names will be announced when arrangements have become firm.

Planning began for the Indian program in August, 1966, and continued in 1967 when proposals to the War on Hunger Division of AID were prepared to request a fellowship program based on appropriations (which, we were told, never materialized) to finance Section 211(d) of the Technical Assistance Act of 1965. This proposal was for work in soil and water science as was a later proposal to the War on Hunger Division of AID to obtain a contract for research to be undertaken in India. At the request of the NESAs Branch of AID, the University of California sent a team of soil and water scientists to India to evaluate university teaching programs and to make proposals to strengthen them in soil and water science.

On learning of AID's increased financial stringency (June, 1968), the UC turned to the Ford Foundation which had informally expressed a possible interest in a program in India. Discussions with Ford led to a trip to India in November-December 1968 of UC scientists and administrators from which the program already mentioned was tentatively developed.

Throughout, great stress was placed on the commitment in depth of the University. It was emphasized that the contemplated program should be one undertaken by the University and should constitute something of a reorientation of the University, particularly the College of Agricultural and Environmental Sciences and the concerned departments, toward contributing to the

development of the Water Technology Center in India. It was urged that the program should be looked upon as the College's and the departments' programs, not merely as the IAI's program. In a number of meetings with the departments of Water Science and Engineering at the University of California, Davis, the departments of Soils and Plant Nutrition in both the Davis and Berkeley campuses, and the state-wide Agricultural Extension Service, the program was discussed and the departmental or agency endorsement of the program was sought and obtained. Discussions were very frank. Those who had misgivings about undertaking the program had an opportunity to speak. Some thorny problems of the division of responsibility were uncovered and resolved, at least tentatively. For example, the IAI had stressed and perhaps overstressed the degree to which responsibility for the program would fall on the departments. The Department of Water Science and Engineering feared that it would be held accountable for the success of the program including recruitment to staff it. Ultimately it was agreed that the program could succeed only if enough persons volunteered for service in India. It has also been agreed that no one will be dispatched to India from the University of California as part of this program unless he is either on the staff of one of the participating departments at present (preferably at a tenure position) or is of sufficient caliber to be a potential staff member, assuming that his performance is satisfactory.

IAI stressed departmental responsibility as a matter of first importance because professionals serving overseas just as professionals at home are interested in promotion and advancement. Recommendations for promotion and advancement and particularly for advancement to Associate Professor

which implies tenure and from Associate to full Professor require first and foremost the endorsement of the tenure members of the individual's department. Therefore, it is essential that the work a professor does abroad be looked on in the department as a bona fide departmental program. He must not be considered on leave or even in a minor or peripheral part of the departmental program.

The next level of commitment is that of the Dean of the College of Agricultural and Environmental Sciences; and here the principles of the International Agricultural Institute's overseas programs (as laid out above and as exemplified in the emergent undertaking for India) have been enthusiastically endorsed. Indeed, Dean James H. Meyer, who has since been named Chancellor of the Davis Campus of the University of California, has been one of the strongest supporters of the approach and has indicated that the retirements which will occur over the years will offer opportunities for great flexibility for people moving in and out of international service with fairly long commitments overseas. Chancellor Meyer's successor as Dean of the College of Agricultural and Environmental Sciences, it is confidently believed, will fully endorse the same policies.

Following the staff member up the promotional ladder, after departmental and college endorsement, his case is reviewed by the confidential Ad Hoc Committee appointed by the Chancellor on the advice of the Budget Committee. This is a committee of distinguished and ranking professors who serve for three-year staggered terms and who review all professional actions for the campus and make recommendations thereon to the Chancellor whose decision is final.

At this point the problem is to establish international work as of importance comparable to that of the most important domestic work in the College of Agriculture. Moreover, we must gain acceptance for the idea that overseas work may well have to be judged by criteria which, while no less exacting, may be somewhat different from criteria established for professional promotions at home. At this point the attitudes of the Budget Committee become crucial. And so for four years now informal conversations between representatives of the Chancellor's office, of the Dean's office, and of the IAI (all of whom enthusiastically endorse the program) have been held with representatives of the Budget Committee.

At the request of the Chancellor's office, the Davis Campus Budget Committee prepared a statement in response to President Hitch's inaugural address which emphasized the social obligations and responsibilities of the University to work on the urban crisis. The Budget Committee thereupon prepared a strong statement (January 15, 1969) which becomes a part of the instructions of the Ad Hoc Committees so that service in such programs as the Educational Opportunity Program "should be given full recognition as evidence of achievement in one of the areas upon which faculty promotions and merit increases are based." This move was promptly followed by a request from Dean James H. Meyer (February 19, 1969) to do the same for international programs. Referring to the fundamental University policy on international studies and programs as laid down on March 25, 1963, in which the Regents of the University made a departure in favor of international programs involving "long-range, major projects [in] cooperation with and assistance to educational institutions and governmental agencies abroad...", Dean Meyer went on to note the statement on the Urban Crisis Program and

requested the Chancellor to ask for a statement from the Budget Committee to recognize

"that research and teaching in international programs are conducted under unique and different conditions and, hence, provisions for merit increases and promotion will similarly have unique characteristics differing from those of the in-residence academic staff. Nonetheless, such international service can and should be creative and rigorous in its contribution."

And so we return to the Ad Hoc Committee mentioned above. It is composed of one or two members of the candidate's department plus ordinarily three members of rank equal to or superior to that/^{to}which his promotion is proposed. We anticipate that Ad Hoc Committees dealing with promotions or advancements involving professors serving abroad will soon be informed by a statement along the foregoing lines.

At the expense of a rather long and detailed account, I have sought to illustrate what "commitment in depth" means. It is not something lightly undertaken or achieved with a few casual telephone calls. It has to be systematically worked out and then incorporated in those procedures which are understood and accepted by professors and officials operating in the process by which proposals for promotion are reviewed. Thus we are engaged in institution building at home as well as abroad. Only time will tell whether persons serving overseas will enjoy fully equitable treatment with colleagues who remain at home. Unforeseen events such as difficulties in the host universities abroad or problems of relationships there between the program and relevant governmental agencies, may make it all but impossible to carry out a program which will be professionally satisfactory. But we believe that we have reduced the risks of overseas service at the same time that the new potentiality for misadventure in one's career has greatly escalated in the domestic scene of higher education.

5. The Need for Federal Financing

As the program proposed herein progresses, a number of colleges of agriculture usually individually but sometimes in collaboration and hopefully in mutual communication may develop overseas programs of considerable similarity, with long time-horizons, and with career services implicitly possible. When this is done the colleges should be ready for a Twentieth Century Hatch Act such as Senator McGovern, Dr. Barry Wellman, and others have urged. I want to stress the need for federal finances. The program is in the national interest. The Hatch Act provides the model for federal financial support by assuring a flow of funds against which universities, colleges, departments, and individuals may plan programs and careers.

We in the universities must recognize that the drive for a Hatch--or McGovern--Act for overseas programs in agricultural science runs against existing trends. The program planning budgeting system, whatever its other merits, is not good for building colleges and departments and for providing assurance to individuals seeking careers in agricultural science. In addition, there is opposition to the maintenance of a strong agricultural science in the public sector even for domestic purposes in the United States.

If agricultural science is threatened at home it has been aborted abroad. I reiterate, because many may believe that the 100 billions we have spent on foreign aid must have included generous assistance to foreign food production. This is simply not true. By far the bulk of the outlay has been for military purposes. I doubt that more than a half-billion has gone for food production. Apparently a quarter-billion has gone for university contracts, one third for agricultural purposes. No support--

I repeat, no support--has been forthcoming for long-term, career service programs in agricultural science. Congress did authorize funds for such programs in Section 211(d) of the Technical Assistance Act of 1966, but until very recently neither this nor the International Education Act has had a dime from the appropriations committees. AID has been able to squeeze out only a pittance for research. The PSAC remarked: "With such a meager allotment, any marked impact from AID-sponsored research is impossible".

What are the chances that politicians will provide the necessary funds? They have already lavishly endowed the military with precisely what agriculture needs. Since World War II military aid has spread to a great many nations and has changed from simple loans or gifts of weapons to "long-term programs of continuing cooperation with the recipient state, involving a high degree of institutionalization, with exchange programs for training and with the dispatch of military missions to reside in the countries receiving the arms, to supervise their use as 'advisers' and to turn out annually five-year plans for acquisition of additional U.S. equipment".

I continue to quote Senator Eugene J. McCarthy:

"The United States program not only provides the basic material and services required to establish and maintain armed forces, but also the direction and planning for long-term improvement, modernization and the development of the military capability of the country." (pp. 64-65 of The Limits of Power)

So we have in the military all the precedents for long-term assistance with career service and massive material support--at a time when much of the American public and many people in recipient countries are increasingly unhappy about American military activity abroad. I suggest, therefore, that the U.S. universities, and especially the colleges of agriculture of the land-grant institutions, propose an exchange: the arts of peace for the

arts of war. Let us employ the military example of long-term assistance and career services (but with modest material support); but let us do it with technical assistance programs designed to help people feed and clothe themselves--rather than to "search and destroy".

If the universities will take this course, I predict a favorable response from the press, the public, the politicians and even the students. Universities must assert the moral leadership which is their true obligation. It will enable them to move out from behind the barricades to the attack--and to the attack against the right enemy.