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Introduction

Ideas are one of the most human of all the products of humankind. When do they occur? Where do they come from? Who first formed them? Even if people kept a meticulous intellectual diary, they would find it difficult to separate dream from reality, fact from fiction. Ideas begin with the human intellect and spirit which are living, elastic, and dynamic, and provide a sense of direction and values. We are coming to see that matter is not the basic stuff of the universe. It is fixed, sterile, leading nowhere. Fortunately, creativity imagines more than empirical evidence provides a basis for; it makes relations that are not necessarily verified or verifiable; it sees unexpected likenesses and possibilities.

The idea of the “Search For Understanding” arose from reading the basic documents which brought the East-West Center into existence and then comparing the concepts enunciated in these documents with the idea of a university which is generally defined as the “search for truth.” Unfortunately, truth has often been thought of in impersonal terms, sometimes called objective truth. Understanding is always personal. Only people understand. Thus, as an educational institution, the East-West Center had to be developed with people in mind, with the basic mission of seeking out, establishing, and maintaining human relations.

Being a product of the United States Army area and language program of World War II, I believed that the more people know of each other’s language and culture, the better they would understand each other and the more good relations would be enhanced. During the war, I saw Frenchmen and Germans killing each other despite their deep knowledge of each other, and was reminded of similar situations in 1870, the Franco-Prussian War, and in 1914, World War I. Today one thinks of East and West Germany and North and South Korea. Certainly these people know each other’s language, culture, political systems, art, religion, and philosophy, but have been at each other’s throats from the day of separation. I have always been convinced, and still am, that people must know each other’s languages and cultures, but something has to be added.

It occurred to me that there are three basic approaches to international or intercultural understanding: the intellectual, the aesthetic, and the ethical. The intellectual approach is centered generally in the social sciences and the social scientific method. It encompasses descriptive information about the history, the political system, the social structure (family, kinship, city life, etc.), the economic conditions, and other facts about the country or culture being studied. Within the context of the family and other interpersonal relationships, for example, child rearing, psychology, gift-giving, education, and other influences on people and personality are usually described. All such information can be gathered and presented in a highly objective manner. The information gained can be put into books—even encyclopedias—or can be carried in people’s minds.

The aesthetic approach centers generally in the humanities. It encompasses the philosophy, religion, art, literature, dance, and music of another culture. An objective description with
pictures and sound (why not smell?) can be made of each of those aspects of a culture. However, a person must minimally become an occasional participant to understand the beauty, the meaning, and the value contained in the object studied. Such participation can, and usually does, affect one’s values either positively or negatively. At its best, art for art’s sake, making beauty more beautiful, and refining thought can inspire and challenge, manifesting and affecting the highest reaches of human intellect and sensitivity.

The ethical approach to international understanding centers around those gaps or issues that exist between what is and what should be, that have to do with improving the human condition, the quality of life. Most people in most countries are proud to exhibit their works of art, music, and literature. How many are willing to exhibit their way of dealing with mental retardation, crime, slums, old age, and death? Such an approach touches and manifests the profoundest depths of the heart. All knowledge is good, but not all of equal value. Nor does all knowledge demand action. In this ethical approach, knowledge gained through international cooperation is tailored to fit social and human goals. Ideally, the knowledge gained through this approach should result in changed perceptions and behavior, especially in relation to other nations and cultures. As I see it, ethics is an attempt to seek out the behavior people should try to do and the behavior they should try to avoid. This attempt is based upon science and art, not for the sake of science and art, but for the sake of human beings. Life is ethical, both within and across national boundaries. If the human beings living on this one earth can inch closer to a more universally understandable ethic, they will have come a long way toward reducing, if not eliminating, much of their mutual inhumanity.

The approach to problem-oriented, international, advanced education described in the following papers is based upon the above thinking. By working together across national boundaries to provide illumination on mutual or common problems, people move together from the is, closer to the should be. In addition, by committing themselves to each other to carry their part of the burden, and then keeping that commitment, they build bonds of friendship and trust. In my experience of working for some eighteen years in Asia and more than thirteen years at the East-West Center, I have become thoroughly convinced that better human relations and understanding are a result of working together, not necessarily a prerequisite for it.

The essays which follow represent my reflections at different times and stages of the growth of the institution and in my own intellectual and spiritual development. Problem-orientation is as good a way to organize people and knowledge as discipline orientation. It tends to bring out more clearly the interrelationship of all things, the importance of the learning process, the socio-cultural basis of knowledge, and the relation of truth and trust. Although it complements discipline orientation, it does provide a different approach to higher education and is certainly a profound approach to international or intercultural education. At its best it also contributes to international conflict avoidance or resolution, and makes a contribution to development strategy. These are huge claims. But those of us who have experienced it at its best have felt the dynamics, the thrill, of this approach. In an effort to provide some perspective to the essays—for the reader and for myself—I have written a preface to each one.

I would like to thank all of those who have participated in the East-West Center and helped make it a reality. Without the support of the staff, the participants, the Hawaii delegation and others in Washington, and the various boards which provided oversight to the programs, the Center would not be what it is today. I would especially like to mention three people who provided great help and support. John A. Brownell worked with me as vice president for academic affairs for more than ten years and provided stimulation for and refinement of many of the thoughts expressed in these papers. My administrative assistant, Grace Kohatsu, spent hours typing and retyping drafts of these papers from my almost completely illegible handwriting. Of course, my wife Edith should probably be named co-author because there are times when I am unable to distinguish her ideas from mine.

Honolulu
July, 1980
I came to the East-West Center in June of 1967 as deputy chancellor for academic affairs. I approached the task with considerable enthusiasm because of discussions I had had with people in the Center and at the University of Hawaii while being recruited. Almost to a person they had spoken of the great potential of the institution. After I arrived I came to see that although a great deal had been accomplished, the potential about which people talked had been only partially achieved.

After a few weeks at the Center, I realized that I hardly had a job to perform. Although I was deputy for academic affairs, I found little that was academic in the place, either in program or personnel. The Institute for Advanced Projects brought in about thirty academic people a year to do research on topics of their choice. But its content and direction were basically those of the senior specialist, not of the institution per se. The degree students studied at the University of Hawaii where their academic programs were basically laid out for them. The only EWC program that had greater control of its destiny was the Institute for Technical Interchange.

My predecessor, Chancellor Howard Jones, told me on arrival that my major task was developing relations with the University of Hawaii and with educational and other institutions in Asia and the Pacific, and on the United States mainland. However, the budget at that time was divided between scholarships and grants on the one hand and operations—namely, all other expenses—on the other hand. Of the approximately $3.3 million going into scholarships and grants, $2.5 million was used for scholarships for students to study at the University of Hawaii, about $400,000 was put into the Institute for Advanced Projects, and another $400,000 went into the Institute for Technical Interchange. Therefore, in attempting to develop relations with other institutions such as Stanford University or the University of Tokyo, the only question I could raise was, "Would you like grants for some of your students to study at the University of Hawaii?" There was little Center substance with which to relate.

The first two months that I was at the Center I therefore spent most of my time in two activities: talking with people at the University of Hawaii, especially Robert Hiatt, the vice president for academic affairs, Todd Furniss, the dean of the College of Arts and Sciences, and Wytze Gorter, the dean of graduate programs; and reading the basic documents on the East-West Center. I also was in touch with several faculty members, Fred Riggs most frequently. I read the Congressional hearings on the Center, the "Gray Book" written by the people at the University of Hawaii, the evaluations of the Kerr Committee and the Larson Committee, and, of course, the basic legislation that established the East-West Center, namely, Public Law 86-472, dated March 14, 1960.

This document states, in part, "The purpose of this chapter is to promote better relations and understanding between the United States and the nations of Asia and the Pacific (hereinafter..."
referred to as “the East”) through cooperative study, training, and research. . . . In order to carry out the purpose of this chapter the Secretary of State . . . shall provide for (1) the establishment and operation in Hawaii of an educational institution to be known as the Center for Cultural and Technical Interchange Between East and West. . . .

As I pondered this legislation my mind boggled at the revolutionary educational concepts contained in its language. Most education in the United States and elsewhere is competitive and individualistic. At all academic levels students compete with each other for grades and those with the highest grades generally get the best jobs upon graduation. In universities faculties often compete for students, and departments compete with each other for money. At the doctoral level every Ph.D. candidate is trained to be an individual scholar doing one piece of research by himself or herself. The East-West Center was mandated to develop cooperative education rather than competitive, individualistic education. The concept envisioned not one person standing at one end of a rectangular room giving lectures with a predominantly one-way flow of communication, but a place where “people were to give and receive training and share ideas and carry out other activities.”

I saw immediately that such education provided an excellent means for attaining the purposes of the East-West Center. But what does cooperative learning mean? How does a person learn without teaching? Since common wisdom says that camels are horses designed by a committee, could team research produce better results than individual research? Certainly modern society is so constructed that cooperation is a necessity, and in the modern world it is an absolute necessity.

In the midst of pondering the meaning of this legislation, the chancellor and I prepared to go to Washington for hearings with the Bureau of the Budget. I brought along three problem programs that I wanted to try out on people: one on population drawn up by George Kanahele after a conference on that topic, one on communication based on discussions with people in the University, and one on language which I pulled together based on my experience in Asia. However, I felt that such an ad hoc approach was not good enough. The problem approach to education needed a rationale.

About two weeks before we were to go to Washington, I had a telephone call that my sister had died in Zeeland, Michigan. I asked the chancellor if I could go ahead of him and attend the funeral of my sister and meet him in Washington. My son was studying at George Williams College in Chicago at the time and came out to O'Hare Airport to pick me up and drive me up into Michigan where we attended my sister’s funeral. When that was completed, there was a week before I had to be in Washington. I asked my son if he had an extra bed and a typewriter in his dormitory room. He answered in the affirmative. So I drove with him back down to Chicago and out to George Williams College where I spent the week in his room writing a document that I called “Search for Understanding.”

Upon arriving in Washington, I showed my draft paper to the Deputy Assistant Secretary of State for Cultural and Educational Affairs, who was in charge of, or had responsibility for, the East-West Center. His immediate reaction was that the document should be placed on the agenda of the next meeting of the National Review Board. I pleaded with him to give me time to write a second draft since I felt the first one was rather rough.

At the November, 1967, meeting of the National Review Board the contents of my second draft were discussed, ripped apart, put together, and ripped apart again. After the meeting some of my colleagues at the East-West Center came to me and said, “Well, there goes your idea of problem orientation down the drain.” My immediate response was the opposite because some of the members of the Board had told me that they had never had as lively a discussion about the East-West Center. I knew I had struck a responsive chord. I therefore wrote a third draft and circulated it among the staff of the East-West Center for discussion. After receiving comments I wrote a fourth draft, the document which follows.

This draft was discussed at a March, 1968, meeting of the National Review Board, and then again for almost three hours in the office of the chancellor. Those present were the members of the Committee on the East-West Center of the Board of Regents of the University of
Hawaii, the members of the National Review Board, the EWC Chancellor, and me. Questions were raised and discussion went back and forth, asking the meaning of words, the implications of movement in this direction, the possible budget, its relationship to what had taken place in the past, and many more concerns. Finally, Governor John Burns, who was chairman of the National Review Board, said to the group, “I like it. Let’s move in that direction.” And then he turned to me and said, “Ets, be sure you keep something of the past.” He had expressed the consensus of the group.

The next day the phone rang and University of Hawaii president Tom Hamilton asked me to come over to his office. He said, “I won’t beat around the bush, Ets. I have asked you here to offer you the chancellorship of the East-West Center.” We talked about it for some time and I said in the course of our conversation, “Does this mean approval of the plan for development which I have worked out and a mandate to move in that direction?” He said, “Yes.” I said, “I will go home and talk it over with my wife and give you an answer tomorrow.” The next day I went to his office and said, “I accept.” On July 1, 1968, Chancellor Jones took a month’s vacation so that I began my career as acting chancellor, and then on August 1, 1968, I assumed the responsibilities of chancellor of the Center and began preparing for movement into problem orientation.
The purpose of this document is to present a plan of development for the East-West Center in an attempt to rationalize its goals, its activities, and its organizational structure so that it may better accomplish the purposes for which it was established.

The overall goal of the East-West Center as stated in the enabling legislation is to promote better understanding and relations among the people of Asia, the Pacific Islands, and the United States. The basic method suggested is the free interchange of information, ideas, and beliefs in the areas of culture and technology through programs of education, research, and training. The first sentence of the Gray Book states: “Of all the natural resources upon which the world depends for its survival and its sustenance, none is so important as its people.” In it and successive documents, it is made clear that the new dimension the Center seeks in international understanding is the dimension of human resources: people who, on the one hand, have attained a skill or profession to give to society, and who, on the other hand, have worked and played, cooperated and struggled, laughed and cried with each other, and thus have developed those thin bonds of trust and friendship which will form a community in the Pacific Basin.

Since the East-West Center is an academic, though non-university institution (i.e., no academic credits can be earned and no academic degrees granted), the interchange of information, ideas, and beliefs must take place, not just in extracurricular activities, but more fundamentally in and through the academic programs both of the University of Hawaii and the EWC. To accomplish this important feature, the programs must be so planned and structured that dynamic encounter and dialogue take place. The early planners of the Center pointed to this when they said:

While high academic standards are imperative, the Center has been planned to examine and utilize non-traditional or unusual as well as traditional educational methods and techniques in carrying out its objectives. It has been conceived in relation to and based upon the sound academic structure of the University, but not bound by forms inappropriate to its purposes.

The aims and functions of the Center have been under almost constant review since its inception, by highly qualified committees, including the National Review Board. Explicit in their reports and reactions has been a consistent endorsement of the Center’s objectives and of its method: interchange. The latest of these reviews, published by the Joint EWC/UH Task Force in January, 1967, stresses five concepts underlying the Center’s Five Year Program Projection:

1. Interchange among individuals of different nationalities, occupying a common environment, in academic and non-academic situations.
2. Mutuality—a reciprocal relationship among people from different countries in which all benefit and learn from the association.

3. Synthesis—a multi-disciplinary approach to the problems of the Pacific, establishing communication between the physical sciences, the humanities, and the social sciences so that the insights of each are shared by the others.

4. Innovation and experimentation—learning how Asians have learned to learn; how Americans have learned to learn—so that teaching situations can be developed in which they can learn together. The second dimension is to supplement the classroom-textbook-library approaches with actual involvement in society and its problems.

5. Academic excellence—the introduction of a new dimension in academic excellence: the training of an elite, not only of knowers, but of understanders and servers, who are ready and willing to apply their knowledge to the betterment of the human condition.

As a basic means of implementing these principles, the Task Force recommended problem-orientation: the identification of major problems of Asian concern, of American concern, and of common concern, mobilizing a proportion of the Center’s resources to the resolution of each of these problems, and pursuing its efforts for periods sufficiently long to realize solutions.

Examination of the record reveals that quite early in the Center’s life, decisions made about EWC/UH relationships moulded the administrative structure of the Center into a pattern which tended to place restraints on the accomplishment of its objectives and to fractionalize its operations. Specifically, although the original planners placed considerable academic content, and thus initiative, in the Center, the Kerr Report (July 1961) recommended that “the Institute of American Studies, Asian Studies, Overseas Operation Programs, Foreign Student Advisor Program, and English Language Institute should be carried out by the University.” In implementing the recommendations of the Kerr Committee, the University said that “disbanding the International College does not eliminate the need for the functions it performs.” These functions were assigned to the Chancellor’s Office under a Director for Student Programs, and this activity grew into the present Institute for Student Interchange (ISI).

The actions described above had two extremely important influences on the Center:

1. By taking all academic programs out of the Center and placing them in the University, the Center became unable to experiment with and utilize new and unusual methods of instruction, thus lowering its potential for innovation.

2. The structure of the Center changed from a focus on programs to a focus on categories of people and types of functions.

The Kerr Report stated (page 6) that

The present pattern of line item budgeting has a stultifying effect on the dynamics of the University’s development. The legislative approach to the University’s budget needs modification so that attention is focussed on programs and sub-programs, as is done with most of the strong universities in the United States, rather than specific items. Once the budget is allocated, the University should have considerable flexibility in carrying out its programs and should be held accountable for program accomplishment under the broad guidelines of budget allocation. The success of the Center will be greatly enhanced if both it and the University generally can be accorded such flexibility. (Italics added)

The University recommended approval of the above proposal, saying

The second paragraph under section 9 [quoted in its entirety above] is one of the most enlightened and far-reaching statements and proposals in the report, and the Administration recommends that the Regents make a special endorsement of the proposal.

Thus both the Committee of Consultants and the University agreed that approaches to budget (and thus to administration) must focus attention on programs and sub-programs and that administrators “should be held accountable for program accomplishment.”

The East-West Center, however, was not so organized. Programs in ISI were defined essentially by their recruiting, logistical, counselling, and supervisory functions, and policies and controls were established to ensure the student’s fulfillment of his contract with the Center. Emphasis was placed on the provision of scholarships enabling students to engage in
conventional education leading to degrees, mainly at the master's level. Interchange was fostered through a two-hour-a-week seminar for one semester, plus such interpersonal relationships as occur under the casual conditions of dormitory life, cafeteria dining, and extracurricular occasions. Special emphasis was placed upon personalizing the scholarship, that is, guiding the grantee through his academic and individual life while at the University of Hawaii. A great deal has been accomplished. Students have earned degrees, made friends, and to varying degrees learned to communicate with people from other cultures. However, although cross-cultural learning has taken place, no one has learned how it took place. We still lack the data to build a conceptual framework for cross-cultural communication and understanding. Furthermore, the ISI became a separate Institute for the granting of scholarships and the counselling of grantees.

The other Institutes, the Institute of Advanced Projects (IAP) and the Institute for Technical Interchange (ITI), have also tended to become discrete, self-contained entities rather than being part of major programs carried out across the board. Scholars in IAP interact and often cooperate under certain themes. However, they engage in their own research with little relation to the rest of the East-West Center's activities or to what previous EWC scholars have done. A program with more continuity would tend to accumulate data and have greater impact. Similarly, the EWC press, library, conference, and other supportive programs have tended to function apart from any central, all-embracing concept. Neither drawing strength from nor contributing strength to a single, unifying rationale productive of a unique and identifiable output, each has operated largely on its own. The need is for a plan of organization in which the various administrative units of the Center will be mutually reinforcing as they cooperate toward common goals.

In line with the rationale set forth by the Center's original planners and consistently endorsed by successive review committees, in fulfillment of the Task Force's emphasis on problem-orientation, and in order to regain initiative to build content, continuity, and competence in the Center, this plan envisages a gradual restructuring of the Center toward problem-oriented programs. The purpose of this section of the plan is to spell out the overall structure that is envisaged. Before this is done, however, two precautions must be stated. First, it is well known that a constant danger in any institution is that its goals will be lost sight of, or that the means it uses will become its ends. As the Center is shaped and reshaped, care must be taken that its reason for existence will not be lost but rather enhanced. Second, the plan must include an appropriate procedure for reorganization, one that will capture the imagination and support of the staff and provide opportunities for them to fulfill their own potentialities and hopes while making optimal contributions to the purposes of the Center's programs. The first precautions will be dealt with in the succeeding section, while the second will be taken up later. For the purpose of keeping sight of the goals of understanding and better relations, it would be well to spell out sub-goals.

Sub-goals. Three basic factors hinder the clear definition of the sub-goals to which the Center is committed. First is the multifarious nature of its constituency—the grantees, the senior specialists, the trainees, the University of Hawaii and its Board of Regents, the State of Hawaii, the federal government, and the National Review Board—all of whom have their ideas of what the Center is and what it should be doing. Second is the delicate nature of stating the sub-goals of understanding, which are basically emotive or affective, without giving the impression that these goals impinge upon the freedom or invade the privacy of people. (This is true even in a monocultural situation; it is doubly true in a multicultural situation where, beyond the divergent individual goals, there are the divergent national goals, probably suggested most clearly by the term "nation-building"). Third is the fact that, whereas educational goals, which are achieved at a high level of awareness, can be evaluated accurately, the goals of understanding are probably achieved best at a lower level of awareness and are consequently more difficult to evaluate objectively.

In spite of the difficulties, however, it is necessary to state the goals more clearly. The Cen-
ter's goals for participants should, if possible, be stated in behavioral terms so that programs can be designed to create the learning experience for participants which will better achieve the goals. The sub-goals of the East-West Center stated in terms of those who come to participate in it are to help a person to gain:

1. a knowledge of some skill or discipline;
2. the competence to look to the real world for data;
3. a knowledge of the language, history, geography, and social structure of at least one country besides his own;
4. the ability to live and work with people from his own and other cultures;
5. an empathy with at least one culture beside his own, expressed behaviorally in his having made friends from that culture, being able to make accurate generalizations about that culture, explaining how some act or event fits coherently into the overall structure of that culture;
6. the ability to evaluate his own cross-cultural experience;
7. a willingness to interpret to others the understanding he has gained;
8. the ability to solve problems;
9. the courage and the ability to involve himself in potential and actual situations of conflict and to work there for resolution.

In looking over this list of individual objectives, one sees at once that none of them is completely independent of the others. The ability to evaluate his own cross-cultural experience is one of the most important on the list. When a person comes to the Center, he should be helped to realize that he has become part of a great experiment—the search for understanding. The Center should develop ways of evaluating cross-cultural experiences and teach these to the participants. By performing the evaluation of his own experience the participant can gain new insights into his own life and behavior, and help the Center to evaluate its activities, while still protecting his own freedom and privacy.

The sub-goals of the East-West Center, stated in terms of the institution itself, are the following:

1. the discovery, testing, and dissemination of knowledge;
2. the discovery of ways to apply knowledge;
3. the enlivening of education through experiment and innovation;
4. the interchange of knowledge, ideas, and beliefs through people and books;
5. the creation of an atmosphere of serious academic endeavor, open and free inquiry, and unencumbered friendly living;
6. the explanation of the impact of the interaction of people from different countries upon each other;
7. the development of a taxonomy of objectives for international education;
8. the identification of barriers to international understanding and cross-cultural communication;
9. the development of a community of people in the Pacific basin and Asia who have learned to work together and trust each other;
10. the maintenance of this community by keeping the participants in contact with each other.

If we can assume that the above statements fairly reflect the goals of the Center, the next question faced is the kinds of activities which will best achieve these goals. Since the activities performed by any organization are profoundly affected by its concept and structure, careful attention must be given to the kinds of programs and the form of the organizational structure.

Problem-oriented programs. A program is a unified system of activities engaged in by designated people and aimed at certain specified goals. The word system refers to the relatedness and order that must exist among the various activities, forming an overall design. The people who are engaged in the activities of the program must know the ends toward which the activities are aimed, plan the activities, and be competent in performing them. The goals must be stated in terms that lend themselves to accomplishment and evaluation. The program must have an inherent unity in itself, but must also be part of the total system of programs which is called the East-West Center. Problem-oriented programs, then, consist of activities planned and performed by certain people for the purpose of solving (tackling) problems.

The five-year plan envisages the gradual
reorganization of the EWC around such problem-oriented programs. Such an organization, although academic in nature and content, will share only a few of the characteristics of a university, but at the same time be complementary to a university. In a university, scholars are grouped around a common discipline, presided over by a chairman, and are called a faculty. In the EWC, scholars will be grouped around a problem, be drawn from several disciplines, be presided over by a director, and be called a “team.” (The word team has been chosen to connote a group of people with different functions who have the same orientation and work together toward a common goal.) The faculty members of a department in a university are a residential group in the sense that they generally reside on a single campus. Members of a team can be resident on many campuses, with the continuity provided for by the director and staff at the EWC and the members of the team who are on the UH faculty. Thus a team is a device for coordinating a range of activities by scholars who may at times be geographically dispersed.

The team concept envisages a group of older and younger scholars, headed by a director and his staff, initially all in residence at the EWC. A team will consist of scholars who are either members of the UH faculty or who are senior specialists, students from the UH or on EWC scholarships, and trainees from ITI. A team member would be asked to make a rather long term commitment to continue to cooperate on the problems through continuing teaching, research, or other work after returning to his home institution. It is hoped that his home institution would also agree to cooperate in the support of the activities engaged in by the team member. As members of the team come to the EWC/UH and return to their home institutions, they will each form a strand in a growing network of responsible scholars and institutions. As the number of older and younger scholars grows in one country or area, sub-networks will be formed, all concerned in one way or another with the particular problem of the programs.

During residence in Hawaii students will take courses at the UH, assist the senior scholars in residence with their research and writing, find their own place on the team, live with other students in the dormitories, and engage in the various extracurricular activities planned by the EWC staff. Senior specialists will be engaged in research, and some will hold advanced seminars at the UH under an arrangement of joint appointments, evaluate the research plans of students and possibly give lectures to the trainees. UH faculty who are members of a team will join in the research and continue their teaching, advising and other activities, the exact amount of each dependent upon arrangements made.

Members of the team who are at their home institution will give lectures or hold seminars in the area of the problem, will recommend some of their best students for participation in the team, carry out research on the problem as it faces his home country, and give guidance to student members of the team who come to his country for research. It is hoped that the program would have a budget large enough to support these activities and help the team member to support these activities and help the team member to strengthen related research, teaching, library holdings, and public service at his home institution. Minimum support provided to a team member should enable him to carry forward his own research and teach a seminar to graduate students. The important point is that the team members should be provided with enough support so that they can assure their best students an opportunity to go on for advanced degrees and return to become active and productive members of their society.

In addition to the programs for students the EWC has sponsored non-degree training programs. Such activities can also be coordinated with and related to the team approach proposed here. Team members, in addition to their teaching and research activities, would be encouraged to engage in community service related to the needs of their own society and government. Presumably, as the team progressed, specific and useful solutions to current problems would be found. Local application would be necessary and team members should be able to offer technical training and conduct applied research within the community. The decision as to whether such training should take place in Hawaii or in the home country would
have to be decided by circumstance. In general, the training done at the EWC should only be in highly specialized and unusual fields, or possibly for those areas of the Pacific and Asia where training facilities are inadequate and trained personnel few.

Although questions have been raised concerning the advisability of providing scholarships at the Ph.D. level, the kind of program outlined here calls for such training on a somewhat enlarged scale. These grants could be made primarily to those who had received their M.A. under the tutelage of a team member, although provision should be made for those of exceptional ability coming through other channels. Arrangements could be made among team members to supervise dissertation research and advanced study on a cooperative basis. In this way, the team could take advantage of the better facilities of each institution. Since the team approach assumes the long-range point of view, it is felt that the ultimate impact of such a program would be greater than if concentration were placed only on the master's degree. Not only will these doctoral people be the leaders fifteen to twenty years from now, but they will have developed much more ability to communicate, contribute to the solution of problems, become the teachers of teachers, and be the ones upon whom the Center will call in the future for advice and the maintenance of understanding. This team approach, especially as it is tied in with nominations by team members, should give greater assurance that these younger scholars will not contribute to the brain drain.

Several references have already been made about selection. The purpose of selection is the identification of younger and older scholars who can both contribute to and receive benefit from the programs, and who will be able to fit into their home country and institution and hopefully become contributing members there. The kind of selection which is now in operation has many advantages; among them being the reduction of nepotism, the open, democratic quality, and the control which can be exercised by the Center's office of selection. The team approach would move toward a system in which nomination would play a much greater part such as is now the case with the Inter-

national Development Fellowships. It is the assumption of this approach that the members of the team would be fair-minded men who know the kind of experience the program would afford and thus be able to identify those who would uniquely fit into it. This identification and nomination would carry with it the obligation on the part of the nominator to assure the participant a place to work upon his return, an obligation on the part of the participant to acquire the kind of training which would fit him for such a place, and an obligation on the part of the EWC/UH (or other educational institution) to provide that kind of experience for the participant. It might also reduce the present expenditures for the various selection committees in Asia. And finally, the selection would be coordinated in such a way that senior scholars, students, and trainees could be selected to form the kind of team necessary to accomplish the task of the program.

Selection is but one of the common program services which should be provided by the EWC for all the programs envisaged. Other such facilities are publications, translations, library, and conferences. Each program would want to sponsor a publication program which might have such components as a journal, monographs, and books. Although each program would be responsible for generating materials for publication, the EWC Press would centralize the responsibility for reproducing, printing, and distributing materials and assisting in maintaining the professional excellence of the publications. From these programs could emerge several series of publications uniquely identified with the EWC.

Presumably everything will be published in English, but, depending on demand, items could be published in Asian languages. There will also be a need for getting certain professional materials in Asian languages which would have to be put into English for the convenience of those who do not read that particular Asian language. The translation program at the EWC would provide these services, or such work could be farmed out to other translators. In any case, financial arrangements should be made so that each team could finance its programs of publishing and translations.

Besides becoming a general library with a
special focus on Asia, the EWC Library should provide special documentation and archival services for each of the programs. It would not only build up a special collection of international eminence in each of these problem areas, but would provide such services as cross reference (since some team members will have items not held by others), documentation training (since some of the institutions where team members are located will need documentarians), and facilities for rapid reproduction of rare out-of-print items.

Besides the common program services mentioned above, much of the work now performed for advanced scholars, students, and trainees would still need to be carried on. Just as a university provides, through its deans of students, a program of services to enrich student life and help students cope with personal and health problems, so the Center should provide services to students and trainees who continue to need counseling. All participants will need help with housing, visas, transportation, and orientation. And extracurricular activities which will encourage opportunities for informal interchange will continue to be provided. Students should continue to be encouraged to participate in various activities which they help to plan and there will have to be a place where problems of discipline are handled.

Within the EWC/UH complex this means that the UH is basically organized around disciplines, while the EWC is organized around problems. This should provide for a very healthy type of both tension and cooperation. There will be a need for a great deal of participation in the programs on the part of the UH faculty. Indeed, the programs would be unable to operate without close cooperation since related teaching and research activities at the UH would have to be built up, students would continue to need the course work provided, senior scholars would be in residence and very often receive joint appointments, computer and other services might be shared, and many other operations necessary for the success of the programs would have to be provided. Such cooperation could lead to the enlivening of the entire educational endeavor on the Manoa campus.

The educational significance of the problem-oriented program. Education becomes dynamic when teachers and learners are engaged in the solution of actual problems which face real men. Throughout our educational systems teachers present students with fictional problems. In the lower grades, teachers put a problem in arithmetic on the blackboard and ask the students to solve it. Everyone knows that the teacher already has the answer, or that the answer can be found somewhere in the textbook. This pupils are taught that problems are simple and have easily available answers. In higher levels of education, if students are fortunate, they are presented with case studies through which problems are presented. If the subject is business, students may be presented with a problem which a company has to solve. The students are asked to role-play or to discuss the problem and come up with an answer or decision. The committee type seminar, in which students organize themselves as a committee of the whole with a chairman, secretary, etc., and each contributes from his background of training and experience to the solution of the problem chosen, is another excellent technique of teaching problem solving. However, in both these designs the problem chosen is most likely hypothetical, and even if it is an actual problem the students are not responsible for the decision and therefore they are not engaged in a real situation. The educational significance of the problem-oriented program includes the following:

1. It is an actual problem of real importance to which there may be many answers, or only accommodations. (Within his academic experience, the student should also have had some of the case method or the committee approach to problem solving before he tackles real problems. This type of education has proven exceptionally productive at such places as the Harvard Graduate School of Business Administration and the Woodrow Wilson School of International and Public Affairs at Princeton University.)

2. Although the director of the program will be the one ultimately responsible, all the people engaged in and being educated through this activity are dealing with an actual problem and with real lives; decisions taken will have the possibility of affecting men's lives, thus adding the mood of seriousness which education often lacks.
3. Since he is part of a large research program, the student will be aware that he must participate actively in the field project and write up his findings to contribute his knowledge to the solution of the problem. This realization should give definite focus to his class work, helping him to relate this work to his ultimate goal, rather than merely to pass a paper-and-pencil test. His educational experience thus takes on real meaning.

4. If the present educational crisis evidenced by the student revolts on the campuses of American and Asian universities is a crisis of involvement in which students want to know the relevance of their studies and activities to individual and social life, then this problem-oriented design should be a worthwhile experiment aimed at solving that problem.

The interchange significance of the problem-oriented programs. There are several factors connected with the problem-oriented programs which will enhance the interchange so that understanding will be facilitated. Several short statements will be made, partly backed up by research and partly by common sense.

1. People interact more in smaller groups than in larger groups.
2. The more people associate together in small groups which have well-defined goals and values, the more mutuality will develop.
3. People with similar personal goals working together toward a common end will tend to develop respect for and trust in each other.
4. As people continue together in a common task, less communication is devoted to the task and more to the personal relations of the members.
5. People who live under very similar conditions—especially if they suffer the same inconveniences—develop a strong sense of camaraderie.
6. People who work together on a problem and make progress toward its solution learn that cooperation is possible; when these people are from different countries and cultures, they learn that cooperation is possible despite differences—a long step toward understanding.

If the above statements are true, the relevance for problem-oriented programs is immediately apparent. The EWC students will be divided into smaller groups where more and deeper interchange can take place. Each program will have well-defined goals toward which participants will work. The participants, especially doctoral candidates, will share common experiences over longer periods of time. All these factors should enhance the amount and quality of the interchange and produce the conditions for understanding.

Another important factor affecting interchange is that within the design, a student must be prepared not only in the history, method, and technique of his discipline but also must have prepared himself in language and area work. A person going to Japan or Indonesia for field work must know the language and people of these countries.

There is no end to problems of common concern to East and West. The dilemma, indeed, is to define the few with which the Center and the University may logically be concerned, eliminating others. Self-evident are some of the criteria which such problems must meet. They should be:

1. contemporary, present-day;
2. human, as opposed to national, i.e., not limited to one country;
3. consequential to both East and West.

The programs built up to attack the problems can take many different forms.

As we proceed to develop these programs, rather detailed statements should be made for each for guidance of the EWC in setting up its administration, priorities, etc., for presentation to Foundations or governmental agencies for supplemental funding. Each of these statements should clearly indicate:

1. the goals of the program;
2. the activities to be engaged in to achieve the goals and why these activities were chosen over other alternatives;
3. the kinds of people who will be involved in the programs, including a statement of the qualifications of the Project Director;
4. the system of evaluation of the program;
5. the cost.

The following characteristics are essential for each program developed by the East-West Center. It should:
1. have a sound research design;
2. have an imaginative design for both education and interchange;
3. be distinctive, not duplicating work done by others;
4. be directed toward and include people from both East and West;
5. be operational, i.e., lying within the capabilities of the East-West Center, the University of Hawaii, and the Hawaiian community.

It is important to give adequate attention not only to the program itself, but also to the combination of programs. They should be related enough to be able to fit together under a common theme. The following combination consists of five such problem-focused programs which meet the criteria of the above paragraph.

1. Population/Food: the inter-dynamics of food production, marketing, reproduction, public health, migration, etc.
2. Development: economic and/or legal and/or public administration.
3. Higher Education: administration, student problems, international educational exchange.
4. Communication
   Kinds: intercultural, intergovernmental, intergroup, intergenerational, interpersonal, etc., and combinations.
   Means: language, the arts, mass media, etc.
5. Values: thought, philosophy, religion and tradition, especially in relation to technological society (all four of the above programs).

The relationships among the above programs are readily apparent. Other combinations or sub-combinations are possible and their ultimate selection and delineation must await further study. However, such programs will give to the Center a clearer image, help us to clarify the functions and selection criteria of the Senior Specialists, grantees and trainees, give focus to the Conference program, the book selection in the library and the book publication of the Press. In fact, this should help to unify all the administrative units of the Center as they cooperate in the accomplishment of these programs.

As programs are planned, rather detailed statements should be made for each for the guidance of the EWC in setting up its administration, priorities, etc., for presentation to the National Review Board, the Board of Regents, etc., and for presentation to Foundations or governmental agencies for funding.
The Friends of the East-West Center have from the beginning been a source of strength and support for our institution and its people. Each year they hold an annual meeting, at which time they ask some person to speak. In 1968 they asked the new chancellor of the Center to give his views about where the Center was going. The speech that follows is the one I gave on the evening of Thursday, October 31, 1968. I include it here because it indicates the kind of movement that had already taken place across the half year since I presented “Search for Understanding” to the Board of Regents and the National Review Board.

My predecessor had spent a great deal of time working to get a grant from the Agency for International Development to support a program on population. In June of that year, just before the end of the fiscal year, we received a grant of $3.7 million for the development of such a program. This was a miracle grant because it was based on faith in the future rather than present strength. The Center had no competence in the population field. It was like having a huge tank full of gasoline, but no airplane, not even a pilot. People asked how we were going to use the money. In Washington I was pushed by bureaucrats who said I was not spending it fast enough. The pressures were on to show results. The issues involved were many. Could this population program be a prototype of other Center programs to follow? Would it have the quality necessary to work in Asia and the Pacific as well as the United States? Could we attract first-class people to the program? Would students come? How were our relationships with the University of Hawaii programs to be worked out? These are the questions that were being faced at the time this document was written. As I look back, I am eternally grateful to the people in AID for giving us the money, and to Robert Hiatt, then acting president of the University of Hawaii, for granting us the flexibility to move ahead with that program. Without such support, it would have been much more difficult, if not impossible, to make the transition into problem orientation in the summer of 1970.
Hope Is Born

Across the eons of time men have longed for Utopia. But not in our time. Is it because we have become wiser than our predecessors—and sadder too—knowing that Utopia is beyond our grasp? It seems even beyond our vision now. I do not bemoan our abandonment of romantic wish-dreams; Utopias are just as well forgotten. Historically, they have been remote imaginary systems of social organization which are closed and exclusive. Those who have striven for Utopia, especially those in a hurry, have often become cruel, sacrificing one generation for the next. But I do regret our loss of a vision of the future, our settling for something less than what might be. Many people who have “made it” in the world have settled for what they themselves have achieved, electing to shut out from consciousness the too-painful awareness that millions have not made it. Many who have not made it lead lives of quiet desperation, accepting with resignation the status quo. Still others, especially the young, are so angered by social injustice that they strike out and destroy, resorting to violence as the ultimate form of crying, “Do something!” Most of us detest violence because it transforms infinitely precious and irreplaceable persons into objects of impersonal, inhuman hate. Yet there are many, including some religious leaders, who believe that violence is legitimate in certain situations. Robert L. Heilbroner, in a recent issue of Harper’s, lays the current frustration to “the inability of mild men of goodwill to translate good intentions into effective deeds.” (September, 1968, p. 66) It seems to have been thus for quite a while now. After World War II we looked forward to a shining era of international goodwill, but we were confronted by a large Cold War and several small hot wars instead. Now we seem unable to resolve rapidly enough inequities at home and conflict abroad.

Combined with this sense of frustration from inability to effect change is a vaguely-felt need for direction. William Sheldon, the psychologist, insists that

deeper and more fundamental than sexuality, deeper than the craving for social power, deeper even than the craving for possessions, there is a still more generalized and more universal craving in the human make-up. It is the craving for the knowledge of the right direction—for orientation. (Psychology and the Promethean Will)

This craving is common to us all. The tremendous desire to “get away from it all” and the exceptionally high value placed upon vacations are indications of a general discontent with daily life. We seem to feel that we will find in leisure time activities the meaning and direction we do not find in our normal work. But the pursuit of leisure can often be frenetic. Bertrand de Jouvenal has taken the outboard motorboat as symbolic of our mood. It is “a toy for grown-ups for moving about rapidly to nowhere with a great deal of noise.”

If man is to live meaningfully, he clearly needs hope—that dimension of the human psyche that deals with the future. Yet hope is present in the here and now; it is open-ended,
inviting, luring one to create his own schemes. And it is immensely practical, for it energizes, animates, uplifts, propels. Perhaps what we are is formed by our past, but what we do with what we are is governed by our vision of the possibilities of the future—that is, by hope.

Personally, although I think that many descriptions of the malaise of our times are accurate, I do not believe our situation to be hopeless. The need has been, and is, to find or to create within our societies hopeful men working within hope-filled structures. I am bold enough to assert that the East-West Center, although small and young and still striving to find its true role, is such a structure composed of such people. Your presence here tonight, and your enthusiastic participation in the activities of the Center, are proof that you share this hope.

It is unnecessary for me to recount the history of the Center. You all know it well. Its accomplishments across the few years of its existence are a matter of record. What I would like to spell out for you, however, are some of the newer programs we are planning and our grounds for hope that they will be meaningful for the future.

Our first ground for hope is the nature of the Center itself as a locus for action. There is no blueprint constraining its shape. It need not follow any foreordained scheme of courses, any departmental structure. It does not have to follow the pattern of a conventional research institute or training school. We are free to experiment—to develop our own blend of activities and structures for achieving understanding within the framework of interchange.

The Center is young; hence it is not yet handicapped by inhibiting tradition, or rigidified from long habit. Fruitful styles of operating have evolved; yet we are not obliged by precedent to limit ourselves only to tested patterns. Imagination may be given free play in revitalizing existing programs and conceiving new ones.

The lure of the possibility that together we may here create a new mechanism for significant change is invigorating. The prospect of developing the Center’s full potential for promoting understanding sparks our energies and propels us forward. The Center is an exciting place to work.

Now about our plans, and why we think they hold promise. Our projected programs, focussing on major problems common to East and West, recognize that we have been and are related to Asia and the Pacific in a very deep way. This is a very obvious fact but one which we too often forget. We sometimes talk as though our relationships with Asia began after World War II. However, relationship is not synonymous with involvement. Non-involvement is also a type of relationship. War, for example, is not just a breaking of relationships; it is really a different kind of relationship—a relationship of hostility. Analogically speaking, we must remember that we are all in the same boat. We cannot look at the problems of Asia or the Pacific and yell, “Hey! Your end of the boat is sinking!” The reason why other countries are so critical of our involvement in Vietnam, or our trade policies, or even our domestic policies is that they see themselves involved in our involvement. If we sink, they sink.

As we plan our programs, we must bear in mind that, although we are all in the same boat, differences in ways of thinking, styles of life, and historical experiences constantly stare us in the face when we try to approach our problems together. We must remember that we are not merely cameras, tape recorders, or seismographs able to record facts as they are. The beliefs, attitudes, and emotions which are an integral part of the time and circumstances within which we live in great part determine our images of reality and hence our selection of “facts.” It is for this reason that it is absolutely necessary to have Asian participation and initiative in the planning of future programs for the East-West Center. It is doubtful if we would arrive at truth, to say nothing of being of help to ourselves or others, if the research and training is done in America, on American presuppositions, and for American purposes. At a conference held at the East-West Center this past January, this fact came out very clearly. Many of our Asian friends cast a slightly more than cynical eye at our professions of unselfinterested goodwill. All too much work done on Asia by Americans has been done with ulterior motives or unconscious intellectual arrogance, whether it be the collecting of data for a doctoral thesis, a wish to get some of the “gravy” available to institutions, or the gathering of information for national security.
In planning, furthermore, we recognize that the problems the world confronts are complex and cannot be easily pigeonholed into neat slots of economics, psychology, biology, political science, and philosophy. Such categorization provides a convenient and efficient way of organizing the people who make up a university faculty and the knowledge that constitutes a curriculum, but the problems of real life must be tackled on an interdisciplinary basis, and in this Pacific community on a cross-cultural basis as well.

Two important facts must be mentioned about problems and their solutions. First, social phenomena, like phenomena in the natural world, are increasingly being brought under scientific scrutiny as a basis for finding solutions. However, when an international group of scholars and men of affairs (thinkers and doers) attacks a problem, the value of such activity lies not only in the product (the solution to the problem, let us say) but also, and perhaps even more important, the value lies in the fact that international cooperation has taken place. The barriers to such cooperation are numerous: ideology, culture, language, religion, and so on. However, a man who has come through such an experience has come to understand that cooperation is possible in spite of these differences, and that that understanding is itself a small-scale resolution of the problem of lack of understanding.

The second fact about problems is that they are not puzzles. This may sound rather trite but the distinction is profound. A puzzle has a known set of steps to arrive at a predetermined single answer, and the solution is in hand when that answer is arrived at. Unfortunately, our educational system uses puzzles rather than real problems for educational purposes. For example, a so-called problem in algebra is really a puzzle, for the answer may even be given in the teacher’s handbook if not in the back of the textbook itself. Besides teaching children how to work algebra, we may also be teaching them that problems have one simple answer, and that somewhere that answer can be found. Real problems may have no answer or many answers. To some problems there may be only accommodations and compromises. In a university classroom, that solution may be best which is most consistent, simplest, and takes in all the data. In real-life problems, it may be impossible to get all the data, the so-called solution may be very complex, involving a choice among difficulties to be faced, and thus may have many inconsistencies. In academic problems, that answer may be best which is most objective, while in real life we may have to be very subjective, taking into account all the emotions connected with the problem.

One other vital aspect of the East-West Center programs as I see them, is that they must be to some extent disturbing. The human animal is a chameleon, able to adapt himself to his environment. Without doubt this quality is part of our self-preservation mechanism without which we might perish or go mad. However, there are definite dangers in adaptation. Men have adapted to such urban monstrosities as Los Angeles and Tokyo. They have even adapted to the conditions of war and famine. Some aberrations have become the normal state of affairs. When men learn to adapt to such conditions, they remain less than fully or authentically human. One of the goals of the Black Power movement, as I understand it, is precisely to keep this generation of Afro-Americans from adapting to their present living conditions. Sub-human conditions of living should disturb us all. Thus, with our attempt to tackle important common problems, with the multi-cultural background of the people who make up the Center, with our concern that present-day men not adapt to sub-human conditions, the East-West Center is bound to be a place disturbing us out of our complacency.

What does all this mean for the future? You will remember that last year, Charles Frankel, then Assistant Secretary of State for Cultural and Educational Affairs, mentioned in his speech to you the possibility of our moving into problem-oriented programs. Since that time the National Review Board has given its blessing to this concept and we are in the midst of planning experimental programs. Such programs, although academic in nature and content, will not duplicate university programs but be complementary to them. Whereas in a university, scholars are grouped around a common discipline, presided over by a chairman, and are called a faculty, in the East-West Center, par-
participants will be grouped in programs centered around a problem, be drawn from several specialties, and be presided over by a director.

Each program will have several projects whose members will constitute teams—groups of people with differing functions who have the same orientation and cooperate to achieve a common goal. Whereas faculty members of a department in a university are residential group in the sense that they generally reside on a single campus, members of teams may be resident on many campuses, with the continuity provided for by the director and staff at the East-West Center and by members of the teams who are on the University of Hawaii faculty or temporarily in residence at the Center.

The team concept envisages groups from Asia, America, and the Pacific initially in residence at the East-West Center. A single team will be made up of members of the University of Hawaii faculty or senior specialists, students from the University on East-West Center scholarships, and possibly trainees from the Center’s Institute for Technical Interchange. A team member would be asked to make a rather long-term commitment to continue to cooperate on the selected problem through continuing teaching, research, or other work after returning home. Team members coming to the East-West Center/University of Hawaii and returning home will form strands in a growing network of related people and institutions. As the number of team members grows in one country or area, sub-networks will be formed, all concerned in one way or another with carrying on the work of the project. This network assures the continuity of contacts across the years.

Field projects are envisioned for each program. As a research, education, and training laboratory, such a project would bring together scholars, students and trainees from East and West under new and different conditions of study, work, and living. It would be in the field project that students would do their theses and dissertations.

The choice of the problems to be tackled becomes highly significant. We can define a problem as a deviation or gap between what is and what ought to be. We have already moved into a program on population as part of a larger program on food and population. Other such programs in the general areas of development, higher education, cross-cultural communication, values, and so on, are being contemplated, each significant to both the United States and Asia. Some problems have already been confronted by some of our institutes. The East-West Center Press has published books in some of these areas, and can play an increasingly important role in disseminating the findings and outcomes of the programs. The library has developed strength in books and services which will be invaluable to these programs. Thus we have a firm foundation upon which to build.

Of course, at the same time we will continue to carry on our present programs.

I am confident this new problem-oriented concept will bring fresh dynamism to the East-West Center, as well as strengthening the bonds of cooperation with the University of Hawaii, institutions on the mainland, in Asia and the Pacific. Let me explain for a moment how this concept is being translated into specific terms with our first program, a wide-ranging study of population dynamics of vital concern to both East and West. We have been working on this for several months but this is the first time the Population Program has been described in public since the initial funding grant was approved by the Agency for International Development.

AID has now allocated $3,741,173 to the East-West Center to finance a five-year program on an international, multi-disciplinary basis. The touchstone of the program as envisaged is the quality of the life of men, whether this be in countries of Asia, the United States, Hawaii, Honolulu, or on Waikiki. It will include various aspects of family planning but will extend far beyond that in exploring the implications of population in a variety of fields such as public health, economics, anthropology, sociology, to mention only a few of the academic disciplines involved.

The most immediate effect of the new program has been to bring the University of Hawaii and the East-West Center even closer together. For example, Acting President Hiatt and the Dean for Academic Development, Robert Kamins, are on the executive council of the Population Program. An Academic Committee has been formed to develop and revise university curricula in population studies, and
in some cases there will be joint appointments to the University and the Center. The Academic Committee is headed by Douglas Yamamura, Chairman of the University Sociology Department, and he also is one of the five Americans who will serve with ten prominent Asian population specialists on the program's International Advisory Committee. Chairman of that committee is Philip Hauser, Director of the Population Research and Training Center at the University of Chicago.

Sam P. Gilstrap, Deputy Chancellor for Administrative Affairs, is serving as Acting Director in organizing the basic framework of the program while we are seeking an academician of international stature as permanent director. Mr. Gilstrap will continue to direct the administration of the program.

Discussions already have been started with community leaders and state officials to determine how the Population Program can mesh with practical training programs here in Hawaii, and a field research station will be established at a suitable location in Asia or the Pacific area.

Applications are being taken for a number of Asian graduate students to come here next February to study for master's or Ph.D. degrees while working in the program. They will be the first of a growing number of senior scholars and graduate students who will come to the Center to work under the concepts I have outlined earlier.

I believe that you can see how programs like these fit into the general scheme of things and fit the criteria described earlier: Asian involvement; interdisciplinary and cross-cultural approach; focus on real and disturbing problems. In order to accomplish all of this, a great deal of ingenuity and energy will have to be expended. With the setting of high goals, there is also the risk of high failure. However, the temper of the times and the meaning which such an endeavor can give to life are more than worth the effort and the risk. Failure in any enterprise can be precluded by narrowing the subject, lowering the sights, and diminishing expectations. Naturally, success will also be slight. And possibly hope may wane.

And so we come back to where we started, with hope and direction. Our direction comes from our basic commitment to understanding. This must be the touchstone of everything we do, for ultimately, if we do not enhance understanding and improve relations we will have failed. Our hope comes from the people engaged in the East-West Center enterprise. Hope has a personal dimension of affirmation. It is active rather than passive. Very often the expression “I hope” is equated with “I would like.” To put it that way is to be like a child who wants something for Christmas and just waits for Santa Claus to bring it. Those of us who are connected with the East-West Center do not say “We would like” but rather “We will.” We will to understand. To hope is to will, and to will is to do. This demands affirmative action which in turn gives birth to hope. It is unfortunate that in English we can say “I love you,” “I trust you,” and “I believe you,” but not “I hope you.” But that is exactly what we should be able to say. I guess the only way to say it is “I place my hope in you.” For:

Whenever men from different countries and disciplines cooperate in the solution of a problem—hope is born.

Whenever an American student struggles with an Asian language, or an Asian struggles with English to communicate better—hope is born.

Whenever a scholar finds new knowledge, or states old knowledge in a fresh, understandable way—hope is born.

Whenever people learn better techniques for controlling weeds and rodents, for running a library or a hospital—hope is born.

Whenever members of the staff evidence outgoing helpfulness to grantees, visitors, or other members of the staff—hope is born.

All of you who are connected with the East-West Center—staff, senior specialists, students, trainees, Friends of the East-West Center, the Honolulu community—all of you who have taken the stance of willing to understand—I place my hope in you.
FEDERAL INVOLVEMENT IN HIGHER EDUCATION

Preface

Beginning in the fall of 1968, when John Brownell joined us as deputy chancellor for academic affairs, we began to plan for a movement into problem orientation. My first idea was to start a Population Institute and give it about two years to develop, then to start a second institute in 1970, a third by 1974, a fourth by 1976, and a fifth by 1978. By such a plan, five solid institutes could be developed by 1980.

Early in January, 1970, I announced to the staff that that summer we would begin our move into problem orientation. The documents explaining the program had been presented to the University of Hawaii, including their Senate, and had been included in “Academic Plan II for the University of Hawaii” as Chapter 27. About that time, Dr. Brownell, Sam Hata, our fiscal officer, and I went to Washington for hearings on the Fiscal Year 1971 East-West Center budget request. The Department of State gave us, as they generally did, an office as headquarters during our stay there. The first day I was in that office the then Deputy Assistant Secretary of State for Cultural and Educational Affairs walked in the office and showed me a copy of a memorandum from the Bureau of the Budget which listed a number of programs that they were recommending for phase-out, beginning with FY 1972. Among them was listed the East-West Center, with a statement to the effect that “it has not reached the potential envisioned by the original planners,” and, secondly, “it had become merely a part of the University of Hawaii.” I immediately asked what the attitude of the State Department would be and was told that they had no position. I then asked to see the Undersecretary of State for Administration and when I saw him asked two questions: What is the position of the Department of State in this matter? (His answer was, “That’s a good question”) and Could I see the people in the Bureau of the Budget to explain to them what we are doing at the Center (I was told, no, that was the State Department’s job). I asked for a meeting with the Assistant Secretary to discuss the future of the East-West Center.

On Friday afternoon after all of the budget hearings on the Department of State were finished and people were beginning once again to relax in the Department, Assistant Secretary John Richardson called a meeting in his office with all of his staff and the three of us from the Center. His first question was, “Mr. Chancellor, what’s the future of the East-West Center?” I outlined for him our idea of problem orientation as outlined in the “Search for Understanding” and told him that we were already beginning to move into such programs with population. I must have talked for forty-five minutes, at the end of which I said, in effect, that I believed that the East-West Center had great potential, that it should continue to receive federal funding, and even more, that it should receive increased federal funding. Without such support we would not really be able to work with institutions and governments in Asia and the Pacific; and, further, that without increased federal funding the Center could not possibly reach its potential. He said, “Mr.
Chancellor, I agree with you.” At that point his number two man said to him, “Mr. Secretary, if that’s your decision, then we in the Department of State must stop asking how to get rid of the Center and begin asking how to support it.” The Secretary’s reply was, “Exactly.” He brought out some sherry, we toasted each other, and then we parted. The three of us walked back to our hotel about three inches off the sidewalk.

We came back to the Center and I immediately told the staff that we would change into problem orientation on July 1 of that year with five programs and that the three present institutes would be phased out at that time. From that time on the opposition to problem orientation began to build among students, certain University of Hawaii faculty members, and staff of the East-West Center. It came to a head in June of 1970 when a petition was passed around the University and the East-West Center for signatures. Red banner headlines appeared in the Honolulu Advertiser, indicating that faculty had asked the President of the University to stop the move toward problem orientation. President Harlan Cleveland called a meeting in his office, which I was asked to attend. He expressed surprise that people were so agitated, saying that ever since he had come to the University in 1969 he had heard about nothing but problem orientation at the East-West Center and felt that the whole question had been adequately discussed in public. He asked the people attending, secondly, if they had gone to see the Chancellor of the East-West Center to express their concerns. The answer was “no.” He went on to say, “Then why do you use the route of the newspaper?” They said they hadn’t meant to get it in the newspaper, but he indicated that they should not have been so naive as to think a document signed by that many people could be kept out of the paper.

He finally looked at me and said that he had no intention of changing the direction of the Center and that I should keep moving.

Another incident had occurred on the evening of May 4. Because we were moving into problem orientation we had to dismiss from our staff certain program coordinators who had helped students with their work at the University of Hawaii. They were dearly beloved by the students and, of course, we also hated to see them go. However, they did not all fit into the new structure. Also, May 4 was the date of the invasion of Cambodia and the date of the deaths of people at Kent State. The students were highly emotional for those reasons. That night we had a meeting up in the Asia Room. I have never in my life absorbed as much negative emotion. It was at that time that I thought we might ultimately fail in our move.

Soon after becoming head of the East-West Center I was asked to join a local organization called The Social Science Association of Honolulu, which meets the first Monday of every month throughout ten months of the year. Each member is asked to read a paper in turn. In the spring of 1972 it was my turn for developing an essay. I determined to answer some questions that were in my mind, including why there was so much negative reaction to such a highly idealistic institution. Of course, I knew that part of it was because the monies came from the Congress of the United States. But having been trained in anthropological linguistics, I knew that there must be behind it some cultural reason imbedded in American history. I therefore did research in the history of federal involvement in higher education and tried to relate it to the East-West Center. The paper that follows is the result of that thinking.
Federal Involvement in Higher Education

From its very inception the East-West Center has been surrounded by controversy, to a greater or lesser degree, depending upon the social climate and upon the biases of the players. Some call it "an arm of the Department of State" and recommend transferring it to the jurisdiction of the Department of Health, Education and Welfare or the United Nations. Some think it should be absorbed by the University of Hawaii; others urge that it become an independent, non-profit, incorporated institution. Some even call for its destruction. Each such statement implies some degree of dissatisfaction with the Center, not necessarily with what it is doing, but with one or more of its organizational ties—to the Board of Regents of the University of Hawaii, to the Department of State, to the Congress of the United States. Certainly the Center's link with the federal government has been the target of much of the criticism directed at the Center.

The purpose of this paper is to throw some light upon the controversy surrounding the Center by describing the cultural and educational milieu in which the East-West Center exists and, within this background, to trace some of the differing points of view about the Center, and finally, to make a few concluding remarks. It is not my purpose to write a definitive history of federal involvement in higher education or of EWC/UH/Federal government relations.

Presented during the annual meeting of the Social Science Association, May 1, 1972, in Honolulu.

Nor do I wish to judge the rightness or wrongness of this or that policy. I believe, however, that this case study will illustrate a contemporary issue which will assume increasing importance as time goes on.

The problem posed appears to be inherent in the Constitution of the United States since proponents of differing convictions have appealed to the Constitution to support their positions. Article X of the Tenth Amendment to the Constitution reads as follows: "The powers not delegated to the United States by the Constitution, nor prohibited by it to the States, are reserved to the States respectively, or to the people." The argument following from Article X is that since education is not one of the powers expressly delegated to the United States (in fact, the word "education" does not even appear in the Constitution), it is ipso facto reserved to the States or the people. On the other hand Article II, Section 8 of the Constitution reads as follows: "The Congress shall have power to lay and collect Taxes, Duties, Imposts, and Excises, to pay the Debts and provide for the common Defense and General Welfare of the United States . . . ." The argument following from Article II is that since Congress is to provide for the general welfare, and since education is definitely part of the general welfare, therefore it is legitimate for the federal government to involve itself in education. Since the constitutionality of the issue has never been decided one way or the other, the question of the federal role in higher education still re-
mains with us. What is good public policy on this issue?

The fact of the matter is that from the beginning of the Union, the federal government has been interested in higher education. George Washington recommended the establishment of a national university for the training of young men to prepare themselves for governing the new nation. He is supposed to have left certain stocks in his will to be used for this purpose but the bequest was never accepted by Congress and the stocks vanished. His five successors—John Adams, Thomas Jefferson, James Madison, James Monroe, and John Quincy Adams—all supported the idea of a national university. Despite the interest of these founding fathers, however, the idea never got off the ground. Interest again rose soon after the Civil War, and Presidents Grant and Hayes both called upon Congress to establish such a university, but in vain. At the turn of the Century there was again a flurry of interest, mainly in the establishment of a national graduate school to top off the programs of the state universities, most of which were either weak in graduate education or had none at all. However, this idea was opposed, mainly by the Ivy League colleges, which were moving actively into graduate schooling by this time.

There are some institutions of higher learning which have been accepted as national in character or deserving of direct federal support. The military academies are cases of the former. It seems that our society has accepted the policy that the schooling of professional soldiers is the responsibility of the federal government rather than the states. But for a long time these institutions were not recognized as “real” institutions of higher learning. For example, although the United States Military Academy at West Point was established in 1802, it was not until 131 years later, in 1933, that Congress authorized it to grant a Bachelor of Science degree. “The slowness of this evolution was at least partly a result of congressional feeling that it was not the job of the federal government to run a college.” (Rivlin, p. 109) Of course, today all of the military academies are fully accredited institutions of higher learning offering the bachelor’s degree.

One special case of federal involvement is Howard University in Washington, D.C. Howard was established in 1867 to educate blacks. It was established as a private, non-profit organization under the control of a Board of Trustees which is self-perpetuating. The major portion of its operating budget and all of its capital expenditures come from the federal government. The rationale for this kind of arrangement was that education in the various professions was unavailable to blacks in the public universities in the South. Thus, the federal government assumed a responsibility historically reserved to the states but in this case judged to be inadequately performed by them. Today, even though higher education is much more accessible to blacks, the federal government continues its subsidy to Howard. This year the federal government provided 69.5 percent of the University’s budget.

Gallaudet College is another exception. Established in 1864, it provides higher education for the deaf from all parts of the country. It operates as a private corporation which also receives the major portion of its operating budget and almost all of its capital budget from the federal government.

The preponderant reason for the paucity of national educational institutions is that Americans have held to the belief that educational responsibility and control should be decentralized. One of the most forceful documents on this point that I have seen is The Federal Government and Education, The Original and Complete Study of Education for the Hoover Commission Task Force in Public Welfare, published in 1950 by Hollis P. Allen. The report begins by cogently arguing the case for education in a democracy. It goes on to point out that the local control of education was an outgrowth of the isolation of the frontier community, and the religious foundation of the schools. The report then states its basic position as follows:

We have entered this study with the belief that the basic responsibility for education lies in states and in local educational institutions. (p. 11)

The report does give justification for institutions like Howard University and others because they are private corporations and also because

Through long history the government has evidenced an interest in them by continued financial support. The unique place of these institutions in
American life and in meeting needs of special groups therein warrant continued federal support. Were this support withdrawn, definite curtailment of essential services would take place. (p. 175)

The basic attitude expressed, by the Hoover Commission is, however, an article of faith in the American culture.

I won't go through the entire history of federal support to higher education through contracts with schools or grants to individuals. The history of the Morrill Act, the GI Bill, and others is rather well known. However, we should recall the controversy surrounding the ROTC and defense contracts. Actually, the Morrill Act grew out of a rather long history of granting federal lands for the support of education. The motivation for this historic policy was not so much a desire to give federal support but to sell new public lands at a good price. The policy on school support was seen as an inducement for people from the eastern seaboard to go west and buy land. Even then, the character and management of the supported institutions was left entirely in the hands of the states. Without this stimulation, many states would not have begun institutions of higher learning as early as they did, if at all.

The Morrill Act (1862) was a step in the direction of a kind of federal control in that it specified that

the endowment, support, and maintenance of at least one college where the leading object shall be, without excluding other sciences and classical studies, and including military tactics, to teach such branches of learning as are related to agriculture and mechanics . . . (Rivlin, p. 14)

In his first term in Congress, Morrill proposed the establishment of one or two national agricultural schools to be run like the military academies in the sense that one or two young men from each congressional district might receive proper practical, scientific education. The bill passed both houses by small majorities in 1854 but was vetoed by President Buchanan, who argued that federal aid to education was both undesirable and unconstitutional. He was supported strongly by the states' rights congressmen from the South and so Morrill and his supporters could not get enough votes to override the veto.

The provision for “including military tactics” in the bill of 1862 came basically from those in the north who remembered the early Union reversals in the Civil War. This part of the act also foreshadows the fact that much of the federal involvement in education was to come about in times of national emergency. Some of the more important examples are:

—The Morrill Act during the Civil War
—The Smith-Hughes Act creating the Federal Board of Vocational Education during World War I
—The Lanham Act providing aid to schools which were forced to expand facilities rapidly due to the impact of military establishments and war factories during World War II
—The Federal Impact Laws providing money to school systems serving children from military families
—The National Defense Education Act which was a federal response to Sputnik

All of the measures caused little trouble so long as the wars enjoyed general popular support. The Vietnam War has changed this, with the debate again being raised about the validity of federal support to education in general and to higher education in particular. Much of the debate recently has centered around research contracts and the propriety of universities doing research on defense-related matters, particularly confidential or secret research. Since this topic has to do with specific activity and since the East-West Center has a policy of engaging in no confidential or secret research or training, it would take us too far afield to go into this matter in this paper. However, I should mention that the general suspicion of the federal government is found among some of our American grantees. For example, for various reasons, many of our U.S. students come from the mid-West and West. Some grantees have concluded that the Center purposefully selects students from these areas to avoid the Eastern colleges which are centers for student activism and radicalism. Such reasoning is typical of the mood of distrust and conspiratorial thinking held by many throughout the country.

In closing this section of our discussion I would like to summarize the arguments against and for federal aid to education by quoting from two very powerful groups in our society. First from a leaflet published in 1962 by the National Association of Manufacturers.
WHY WE BELIEVE EDUCATION SHOULD REMAIN A STATE AND LOCAL RESPONSIBILITY

The National Association of Manufacturers, throughout its organizational history, has supported the expansion of both public and private education. Why, then, are we opposed to federal aid?

Because, as a matter of governmental principle, education is not a federal function but a responsibility of state and local governments and voluntary bodies.

Because, as a matter of fiscal principle, state and local governments are in a better position to finance tax-supported education than is the federal government. Non-public education, which is a matter of choice, should be voluntarily supported.

Because, as a matter of political principle, intellectual and political freedom are best nurtured by the education system which is least subject to conformity in content and teaching practices and most responsive to the needs and preferences of the community supporting it.

Because, as a matter of educational principle, federal aid is more likely to aggravate than to solve our educational problems.

Because, as a matter of fact, it is not needed.

(Tiedt, p. 86)

The second quotation, which summarizes the arguments for federal support to education, is from the National Education Association in a resolution adopted at its convention in Seattle, Washington on July 3, 1964.

The National Education Association seeks legislation to provide federal support of public education in line with the following principles:

(a) That there be substantial federal support of the whole of public education at all levels and of all types.

(b) That federal programs of specific aids be continued or improved in addition to comprehensive federal support.

(c) That the general federal-support funds be allocated without federal control to state school authorities to be commingled with state public education funds.

(d) That distribution of the federal funds within states permit the same administrative discretion as for state public education funds.

(e) That expenditure of the federal funds be only for the purposes for which the states and localities, under their constitutions and statutes, may expend their own public education funds.

(f) That the legislation be consistent with the constitutional provision respecting an establishment of religion and with the tradition of separation of church and state.

(g) That the legislation contain provision for judicial review as to its constitutionality.

The National Education Association urges its officers, directors, affiliates, and Legislative Commission to develop, seek, and continuously review legislative programs to realize these principles.

(Tiedt, p. 56)

However, in the materials I have read there is a basic agreement on one point and that is that the control of education should be left in the hands of local authorities. For example, in testimony before Congress by the NEA in 1965 the following statement occurs:

Basic to the NEA's policy is an unalterable insistence that the Federal funds be allocated to the states and school districts without Federal control.

(Tiedt, p. 57)

Thus, also, in the matter of the East-West Center, the problem comes not so much in the question of the source of funds but in the matter of control.

From this short discussion of attitudes toward federal involvement in higher education it is evident why relationships among the East-West Center, the University, and the Federal Government have been a persistent problem facing the Center since its inception in 1960.

The problem can be traced back to the months preceding its actual establishment. On April 16, 1959, Lyndon B. Johnson, then United States Senate majority leader, made a speech in Washington, D.C. calling for the establishment of an International University in Hawaii "as a meeting place for intellectuals of the East and of the West." University of Hawaii President Laurence Snyder immediately formed a committee to develop a proposal for such a university. The first concern of this committee was to give this new institution an identity that was clearly educational by making it a part of the University of Hawaii. The UH Committee proposal of April 1959 states:

The curricula, program, staff and financial affairs of this International College will be organized and supervised in the office of a separate college within the University which shall otherwise be thoroughly integrated with existing projects and
facilities of the institution and shall operate as an inherent part of the university. . . . [This International College will be] established and maintained by funds from the Federal Government.

Problems immediately arose over this new institution being an integral part of the University of Hawaii but maintained by federal funds. One was a question of control. On July 9, 1959, the Board of Regents adopted the following statement:

The Johnson-Burns amendment to the Foreign Aid Bill, proposing the establishment of an International Center within the State of Hawaii, thus has the hearty endorsement of the University Board of Regents, irrespective of whether such a center may be an independent federal college or whether it be incorporated within the framework of the University.

We believe that the location of such a college within the University would have advantages. . . . Should the college or center be within the University, its control should be within the University. However, the Board of Regents in such a case would desire an able Advisory Committee of national scope which would assist in establishment of policies, development of programs, integration with present programs and colleges, and logical development of physical plant.

Should it be determined to establish the Center outside the University, we would lend it every cooperation.

Of course, if the Center had been established as an integral part of the University supported by federal funds it would have established a precedent for other universities throughout the United States to ask for federal funds for similar programs within their institutions.

On July 24, 1959, the 1959 Mutual Security Act was signed into law authorizing the Secretary of State to prepare a plan for the "establishment and operation of an educational institution to be known as the Center for Cultural and Technical Interchange Between East and West."

The Plan was submitted to Congress by Secretary of State Herter on December 31, 1959. It incorporated many of the proposals prepared by the University of Hawaii committee and the State of Hawaii committee set up by Governor Quinn.

As recommended by the Hawaii Community Advisory Committee, it should be placed administratively under the president of the University. . . .

5. The central administrative functions of the Center should be carried out by the following offices, to be established and staffed by the University (a) The office of director of the Center, the incumbent to be appointed by the University of Hawaii, to function at the level of a vice president of the University, reporting directly to its president, and to have overall responsibility for the program and activities of the Center.

Hawaii's plans for the Center were spelled out most completely in the "Gray Book" in March 1960 which further developed the concept of an international College within the University.

The following areas should be placed under the Center: English Language Institute, Translation Bureau, Institute of Advanced Projects, Foreign Student Advisory, American Studies, Asian Studies Program, Overseas Operations Program, all foreign students at University of Hawaii.

Chapter VII of the 1960 Mutual Security Act, passed on May 14, 1960, established the Center with the following language:

Sec. 702. The purpose of this chapter is to promote better relations and understanding between the United States and the nations of Asia and the Pacific (hereinafter referred to as "the East") through cooperative study, training, and research, by establishing in Hawaii a Center for Cultural and Technical Interchange Between East and West where scholars and students in various fields from the nations of the East and West may study, give and receive training, exchange ideas and views, and conduct other activities primarily in support of the objectives of the United States Information and Educational Exchange Act of 1948, as amended, title III of Chapter II of the Mutual Security Act of 1954, and other Acts promoting the international, educational, cultural, and related activities of the United States.

Sec. 703. In order to carry out the purpose of this chapter the Secretary of State (hereinafter referred to as the "Secretary") shall provide for—(1) the establishment and operation in Hawaii of an educational institution to be known as the Center for Cultural and Technical Interchange Between East and West, through arrangements with public, educational, or other nonprofit institutions. (italics added)

Arrangements were formalized with the signing of a Memorandum of Agreement between
the State Department and the University of Hawaii on October 25, 1960.

Throughout the discussions various people expressed concern not only about affiliation and control but also fear that sponsorship by the Department of State might negatively affect the Center’s relations in Asia and its ability to attract good students. It was felt that the prestige of the Center would depend upon its close association with the University of Hawaii. The Kerr Report, prepared by a committee chaired by Clark Kerr and consisting of John Gardner, Herman Wells (then Chancellor of the University of Indiana) and Glenn Taggart (now president of the University of Utah) stated:

As an educational program . . . the Center should be closely associated with a university. This association will also serve to emphasize that the Center is a non-political body, not operated by the United States government, a fact which will enhance the Center’s effectiveness among many Asian representatives.

Later that same year Congressman Wayne Hays held hearings on the Center in Hawaii. At these hearings Murray Turnbull, the acting director of the Center, testified as follows:

We have had considerable advice from all over the world that if this program is to carry respect and prestige throughout Asia, it would have to be done as a part of a bona fide university and not as a separate Government agency . . . . This is a deliberate choice in which I personally have been involved.

In a private talk with Dai Ho Chun, who was with the Center from its inception until his retirement in 1970, I was told that although there was not too much fear of federal involvement since the Department of State was not interested in getting involved, he did recall concern expressed by Victor Reuther at the first Consultative meeting early in 1961. Reuther said that the Center should not be tainted with any connection with Washington—AID or State Department—because such connections would kill the Center in Asia.

Other men, however, had different perspectives. In the discussion on the Act which authorized the establishment of the Center, Senator William Fulbright said on July 22, 1959:

The Federal Government a long time ago—100 years or so ago—authorized the establishment of a land-grant college in my State. There is a land-grant college in the State the Senator represents [South Carolina]. There is nothing new about it. One of the great institutions in South Carolina was established in accordance with the Morrill Act. There is no precedent-breaking aspect in this connection. Hawaii has become a new State. I think this proposal is in accord with the spirit of the Morrill Act, which started some of the greatest institutions in this Country.

On June 24 of the following year John A. Burns gave testimony before the Senate Subcommittee on Appropriation as follows:

It must be emphasized too, that the law intends the center program to be a national one, under the broad authority and control of the U.S. Department of State . . . . Unless it is clearly understood and maintained at all times that this is a national program under national control, one real purpose of the act—to promote the welfare and enhance the prestige of the U.S. as a nation in the Asian and Pacific area—will be defeated, and the center will become instead a smaller, more limited program. . . . The perspective, the range, and the effect of the program will be entirely reversed.

Possibly the best statement of the dilemma was given by Philip H. Coombs when he was Assistant Secretary of State for Cultural and Educational Affairs. Appearing before the Hays Committee in January of 1962 he said:

We have a rather unique and unprecedented relationship between the Federal government and this Center. It is not a direct and regulatory relationship as, say, the Department of the Army has in relation to West Point. We must give them more latitude than that. On the other hand, it is a more direct relationship than perhaps the Office of Education or the National Science Foundation might have with respect to one of its grantee institutions. We are somewhere in between. We must discover the extent to which the Federal Government should supervise and intervene in the programs and administration of the Center without killing the genius of the Center.

The ambiguity came out in the Kerr Committee Report, by implication rather then by explication. On the one hand the Report emphasized the national character of the Center when it said:
The Center should continue to be affiliated with the University of Hawaii. . . . While the University’s major responsibility is to the people of Hawaii and the Center’s is to the entire nation, these are not mutually incompatible. It is essential, however, that the difference be taken fully into account in the organization, administration, and programming of the Center. (p. 2)

On the other hand the Kerr Report recommended the disbanding of the International College, thus taking from the Center its substantive programs. Point seven of the Report says:

The formal education of students and the provision of student services should be carried out by the University of Hawaii and other universities, through contractual arrangements with the Center. The International College should be disbanded.

The formal education of students and the granting of degrees cannot be undertaken by the Center. For this function, the Center should make contractual arrangements with the University of Hawaii and, on occasion, other universities providing proper reimbursement for facilities and services. The Institute of American Studies, Asian Studies and Overseas Operations Programs, Foreign Student Advisor Program, and the English Language Institute should be carried out by the University under the appropriate colleges or administrative units. Services rendered to the Center by these programs would be done by contract.

The functions now performed by the International College would be absorbed by other University units, and that College could then be disbanded as a separate administrative body. (italics added)

The most important word in this statement is the word cannot. Three possible explanations can be given for this statement of inability. One of the original planners told me he felt that Kerr did not want the East-West Center in Hawaii and therefore came out here to scuttle it. Since he wanted it in the San Francisco area, he recommended the removal of all its substantive programs so the EWC would become nothing but a dormitory and hence lose its federal support. Minoru Shinoda, former Director of the Institute for Advanced Projects, gives another explanation. He told me that during the first year it became evident that the Center’s curriculum and staff could not be developed successfully in the short time expected by the early planners. It was therefore felt by the Kerr Committee that the Center should rely on the University for instruction. A third explanation may be that the committee considered the federal government incapable of setting up and running a good educational institution.

In any case, the result of the Kerr Report was that during the first ten years of its history, the East-West Center did not become an educational institution and to that extent the federal government was not actually involved in maintaining one. Of course, funds were given the UH in the form of continuing subsidies for the English Language Institute, the Asian Studies Program, the American Studies Program, and an allowance was given toward the cost of education for each Center participant enrolled in credit courses at the University. The point is that the policy question of the propriety of the federal government establishing an educational institution as stated in the law which created the Center was not raised.

The development of programs with academic and practical substance has again raised the issue, only in a different sense. Although the problem-oriented programs now in the Center were designed expressly to fulfill the Center’s educational and intercultural objectives, upon the recommendation of an EWC/UH Task Force, some have interpreted the action as having been forced upon the Center by the federal government. For example, the Congressional Record (House) July, 1970 (H6429-H6430) records remarks by Congresswoman Patsy Mink in behalf of her bill to move the Center from the Department of State to the Department of Health, Education and Welfare.

As one who has always felt that the Center should serve primarily an educational objective. . . . I feel that these new problem-oriented directions are significantly different from the goals envisioned by Congress in creating this institution. . . .

The tendency seems to be to make the Center more dependent on the goals and aspirations of the State Department and the Agency for International Development rather than an independent

*See for example “Search for Understanding.”
educational institution attuned to the ideals of academic freedom and reasoned discourse.

Congress never intended the East-West Center to be an appendage of American diplomacy but through budget pressures the State Department has gradually been enforcing its will on the institution.

There are two interesting features to her statement. First, the State Department did not force the Center into problem orientation. The change was made for purposes of improved education and interchange. Second, the issue raised is not federal support for the East-West Center but merely a change of agency within the executive branch through which the funds appropriated by the Congress are channeled to the Center.

Another factor to consider in the matter of financing the Center is the frequent recommendation that it attempt to diversify its funding. The main reason given is that diversified funding would lessen the Center's dependency on the federal government and hence make the Center more acceptable in Asia. The original legislation (Public Law 86-472) signed into law on May 14, 1960 stipulates that "The Secretary may, in administering the provisions of this chapter, accept from public and private sources money and property to be utilized in carrying out the purposes and functions of the Center." (sec. 702) Although this provision has been in force from the beginning of the Center, to my knowledge no outright gifts of money or property have ever been made. But there have been gifts in kind (such as travel subsidies for grantees from their home governments) and grants for research. Grants from private foundations amount to less than $100,000 over the twelve-year history of the Center. My understanding is that foundations have shied away because of the Center's federal association.

The final question to be looked at is what this discussion implies about federal involvement in higher education in general and the East-West Center in particular. The look at the future will be based upon certain assumptions which appear to me to be valid.

First, we must change our assumption about the negative reaction of Asians to the federal financing of the East-West Center or other educational projects. During the past year a complete review was made of relationships among the Center, the University, and the Department of State. The three alternatives discussed were to make the Center independent, to make it an integral part of the University, or to keep it in its present more or less ambiguous status. During this review I discussed the alternatives with some of our Asian students. They told me that it was exactly because we were a national institution supported by the Congress of the United States rather than just a state institution that East-West Center grants had prestige in their countries. Furthermore, while recruiting staff in Asia, I mentioned the problem of federal funding both to alert them and to get their reactions from them. The vice president for academic affairs of the University of the Philippines told me that he could not understand why Americans worried about federal funding. The Philippine government supports all higher education there. Similar remarks were made in other countries. The former ambassador from Indonesia to the United Nations, who had been a Senior Specialist at the East-West Center, said in a letter to Assistant Secretary Charles Frankel,

It is clear that the East-West Center is a political creation established for political purposes. If further proof is needed, it is the fact that the Center's budget is part of that of the State Department. Hence the East-West Center has to take all the consequences of being a political institution. Its head has to justify and defend its budget, answer political questions of Congress members in a way satisfactory and acceptable to these politicians. In short, its Chancellor has to have the qualities of a politician. We will see later that he also has to be a diplomat.

It is equally clear that the Center is an instrument of United States foreign policy. Mentioning it is by no means meant as a criticism. On the contrary, it is to underline the value and significance of the East-West Center. Because it is first class foreign policy.

In other words, to a great extent it appears that Americans have been reading their cultural meanings into the thinking of Asians. We should not, therefore, assume that federal support, even if it comes through the Department of State, will be seen by Asians as pernicious.
Secondly, with the cost of higher education rising steadily the amount of federal involvement has increased over the years and is bound to increase even more. Officials of the great state universities justify asking for federal funds by insisting that they are national—even international—in the scope of their interests and the composition of their staffs and student bodies. No such university considers itself restricted to the concerns of the state it is in. Furthermore, certain research performed by universities is not only national or supranational in scope but is too expensive for states to handle. An example is the new National Heart and Lung Institute which will spend over $1.4 billion over the next three years on the initial phase of research on heart attacks. (Reported in the May 1, 1972 issue of Newsweek.) Only the federal government is big enough to collect the amounts of money needed for large-scale research. Currently, out of total expenditures of $75 billion for all types of education, the federal government provides $8.8 billion, with $5.6 billion going to higher education.

Third, it is almost certain that other major funding sources will decrease. The large foundations, such as Ford, Rockefeller, Carnegie, Danforth, etc., will not exist twenty-five years from now as we know them today. Many people in this populistic age are asking if it is good public policy to permit so much money, with such vast social import to be controlled by so few people who are not held accountable by the citizens or their elected representatives. There is no need to relate in detail here how the federal government has moved in on the foundations. If they must spend six per cent of their principal each year, then without adding to it they will be out of money in less than twenty years. Whether or not this is a good trend depends upon one's point of view; but the trend is there. This means that foundations cannot be counted on to make sustaining grants to institutions like the East-West Center even if they want to do so.

The conclusion I draw from all this is that we Americans must continue to change our way of thinking about federal funding for higher education and also about the establishment of national institutions of higher learning. Most institutions will readily accept funds from any source, including federal. However, outsiders often accuse recipients of federal funds of succumbing to undue federal control. The same people rarely make such accusations regarding State or locally funded institutions. Why is it that so many people consider federal money tainted but state money clean? I find it interesting that the citizen's tax dollar can go to the Legislature of the State of Hawaii and thence to the University without becoming contaminated, even though the legislature involves itself pretty deeply in the internal workings of the University. But somehow, when the citizens' tax dollars are channeled by the Congress of the United States, through the Department of State to the University of Hawaii for the East-West Center, their money becomes tainted, even though the Congress and the State Department enter far less deeply into the Center's operations than the State Legislature does into the workings of the University. Such matters as funding, control, and accountability for higher education should become subjects for public discussion so that we can have a more enlightened public policy. As the federal government sets up more national institutes or if it should establish other educational institutions, for example, proper safeguards or buffers should be built in, much like the University Grants Commission of England which distributes and monitors national appropriations for higher education. I am convinced that we need a half-way house, a commission that is semi-government, semi-autonomous, which will give priority thinking not only to national needs, but also the needs of higher education itself. All too often the federal government can distort the balance among the priorities of a university by offering it a large handful of money to do work the government wants done. The same commission could serve as a buffer for institutions like Howard University and the East-West Center.

The second conclusion I draw from this is that the East-West Center must continue to receive its basic operational funds from the federal government if it is to remain in existence. I do not foresee foundations, private enterprise, or foreign governments providing it with its "bread and butter" money. They may contribute to special projects of the Center if they feel
they parallel their interests, but not otherwise. This is why I believe that the set of arrangements worked out between the Board of Regents of the University of Hawaii and the Department of State is the best possible unless there is a major shift in our attitude toward Washington and federal funding, and in the mechanisms used by Washington to distribute and monitor funds for higher education. The basic ambiguity resulting from the Center's dual relationship to the Board of Regents of a state university and to the Department of State of the federal government is reflected in the special role assigned to the Chancellor of the East-West Center, which is described in Article IV of the new Agreement between the parties (yet to be signed).

ARTICLE IV

In recognition of the special Federal relationship of the Center and its separate identity as a National Institution, the Board will designate a Chancellor, who shall not be the same person as the President of the University, and whose designation will be acceptable to the Department, to be primarily responsible for carrying out the Board's obligations under this agreement. The Chancellor will report to the Board through its Executive Officer and, as designee of the Board, he will be responsible to the Department for meeting the basic principles established for the Center, developing its budget and assisting the Department in reporting to the Congress.

Given our present cultural attitudes to the involvement of the federal government in higher education, this is as close as anyone can come to a resolution.
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MEMORANDUM TO THE
BOARD OF GOVERNORS, June 17, 1975

Preface

As the East-West Center began to move in the direction of having its own programs, it soon became apparent that operating under the University was becoming more and more difficult. Probably the most significant aspect in the changing relationships was the advent of collective bargaining. A situation developed in which a labor union and a university in the State of Hawaii could bargain and decide upon working conditions and salaries for East-West Center staff. When their agreement was reached, the bargain was ratified by the State Legislature which provided funds to implement the pay raise. The East-West Center, however, was not given money by the State Legislature and had to go to the federal government for its money. On the one hand we were not allowed to go to Congress for a supplemental appropriation the way government agencies are and, on the other hand, the people in Washington would ask, "Who are those people in Hawaii to tell us how much money the East-West Center employees should receive?" For that reason, and others, the idea of separating from the University of Hawaii began to emerge.

The details of that incorporation process are given later in this set of documents, so I won't go into it at this moment. The paper that follows is a memorandum from me as head of the Center to the Board of Governors which was established by the Legislature of the State of Hawaii to run the corporation.

Even by 1975 the controversy surrounding the East-West Center had not subsided. Most people looked only at the name and therefore believed that the goal of the Center was cultural and technical interchange. My understanding, derived from the reading and talking I had done, was that interchange was a method to reach the goals of understanding and better relations. I also realized that there were many different meanings of the words "cultural" and "technical." There were even people at that time who said that since the West is technical and the East is more spiritual we can share our technology with them and they can share their culture with us. Not only was this a misreading of the documents, but it was also quite a misunderstanding of the technological sophistication of people in Asia and the Pacific, and of the spiritual heritage of the West. Since I knew most of the Governors did not know the East-West Center well, I felt an obligation to write them a memorandum to explain my ideas of why the Center was doing what it was doing, by presenting first an explication of the basic legislation that established the Center; second, the milieu in which the Center found itself operating, and, third, some rationale for problem orientation.
Memorandum to the Board of Governors

The East-West Center has been a controversial institution from its inception. Part of the reason may lie in the fact that it was established by the United States Congress and funded through the Department of State. As I see it, the most important reason for deep differences of opinion is that the EWC is a unique institution. People know what a university is, and a research institute, and even a think-tank. But what is an educational institution whose purpose is the promotion of understanding and good relations East and West through cooperative research, study, and training? The Center has no blueprint, no tradition or model to follow. Although this situation presents difficulties in the development of the institution, it also provides the Center with the freedom and flexibility to explore and experiment with different ways of attaining its goals.

The Center, as you will find it as of July 1, 1975, is composed of five programs administered by five institutes, plus open grants administered by the Chancellor’s office. Each program is problem-oriented and conducted by an international staff of people from different countries and representing different disciplines. A comprehensive set of policies and procedures has been developed to provide the Center not only with sound operation and management but also with a style that befits the goals sought and the socio-political milieu in which the Center exists. Both the selection of problem-orientation (as distinct from discipline-orientation or geographic area-orientation) and the program policies and project criteria are based upon our understanding of the legislation which established the Center and gave it its mandate, our perception of the socio-political circumstances within which the Center is working, and a philosophy aimed at creating a new type of educational institution through which to promote understanding and good relations. In other words, each of us lives out our own perception of reality. We administrators at the Center are no different. Therefore, I feel it incumbent upon me to spell out as clearly as possible our view of reality as it affects EWC programs.

Explication of the Basic Legislation

First, then, I would like to present an explication of Public Law 86–472, May 14, 1960 (attached, appendix A). I believe a careful reading of that law will show a richness of concept and therefore the nourishment that the Center derives from it.

1. The name given to the Center is Center for Cultural and Technical Interchange Between East and West. There has always been an intellectual tension between those people, on the one hand, who argue that the Center should do more with cultural activities and those, on the other hand, who want to place more emphasis on technical programs. The problem arises from the way one defines “culture” and “technic” or technology. Broadly speaking, culture is that complete interrelated system of thought and behavior, ways of thinking, believing, talking, and living, that are common to a group of people or society and by which they operate. This definition includes not only song and dance, litera-
ture and philosophy, but also science and technology, the computer and the hand plow. Such an approach considers the common cooking pot to be as significant to culture as a Beethoven symphony. In fact, one could ask whether a person could learn and understand a second culture better by listening to a Beethoven symphony or by interacting with a family around the cooking pot. The one does not exclude the other. In fact, the two are interrelated as can be seen from the fact, for example, that it takes a great deal of technics, both as technology and technique, to produce a Beethoven symphony. The point is that, as we see it, both culture with a capital “C” (or high culture) and technology are part of a larger culture as defined above.

2. The purpose of this chapter (in P.L. 86-472) is to promote better relations and understanding. This is the heart and core, the beginning and end of everything that happens at the East-West Center. It is the touchstone by which everything that happens must be evaluated. The Center could produce the greatest solution to the food problem or design the finest curriculum for learning a second culture, but if through the process it does not promote better relations and understanding it has failed to carry out the purpose of the law. This purpose provides a dimension which few other educational institutions have. In fact, most other institutions of higher learning only ask themselves whether the research is interesting, the teaching sound, and the training accurate. Promoting better relations and understanding is an exceptionally difficult task not confined to knowing only the history and philosophy, the religion and literature, the political and social system of some other country. In that sense, the Germans and the French know each other exceptionally well, and still, within a period of seventy-five years between 1870 and 1945, they fought each other in three major wars, using their knowledge of each other to frustrate each other. Something else must be added. In order to understand the “and”—the relation between the understanding and good relations—the phrase might well read “to promote understanding for better relations.”

Promote better relations and understanding between the United States and the nations of Asia and the Pacific. The Department of State has given its interpretation of the geographical mandate for expending directly appropriated funds as including all those nations from Iran across the great Asian land mass to Korea and Japan, and the Pacific as all those islands stretching from Japan through Australia and New Zealand. However, it excludes South America or the other two countries of North America. The Act of Incorporation provides for a broader interpretation for the expenditure of non-appropriated funds.

Through cooperative study, training, and research. The word “cooperative” here is taken to mean cooperation between people from the United States and people from the nations of Asia and the Pacific. Therefore, the study, training, and research that is done at the Center should be so designed to encourage cooperation. Although research by individuals can take place at the Center, the major thrust should be team research, so designed that there are people from the East and West engaged together in the search for new knowledge. The study and training programs should be cooperatively designed, implemented, and funded. The problem-oriented programs themselves were chosen to promote cooperation, which is seen as the operational definition of understanding and denotes minimally an absence of bad relations and hopefully sets the stage for developing good relations. (The project criteria developed by the staff of the East-West Center are attached, appendix B.) In other words, both the search for solutions to problems and the style of the search are important. The style should be cooperative.

Where scholars and students in various fields from the nations of the East and West may study, give and receive training, exchange ideas and views. In a sense this is an explication of the previous phrase about cooperative study, training, and research. At the Center there should always be a two-way process with no one side, East or West, always being the teacher and the other always being the learner. Although the Center is in the United States, Easterners should always be included among the teachers and West erners among the learners. There should be a free flow of ideas and views, criticisms and suggestions. Only in such a context can understanding and cooperation flourish.

Promoting the international, educational, cultural, and related activities of the United States. The East-West Center is an American institution whose
goals are within the compass of the foreign relations of the United States. However, as an educational institution the Center must assiduously stay clear from either promoting or executing the foreign policy of the United States. The goal of the Center does not include the necessity to persuade other people of the rightness of America's governmental policy on such things as the Vietnam War, the reversion of Okinawa, the recognition of the People's Republic of China, or the Kashmir dispute between India and Pakistan. Rather, having been established by Congress representing the 214 million people of the United States, the Center is viewed as the desire and commitment of the American people to know more about the people of the East and, in turn, have the people of the East know more about Americans, and especially to be able to cooperate together in building a better world.

The Secretary of State shall provide for the establishment and operation in Hawaii of an educational institution. Congress directed the Secretary of State to establish an educational institution, which is a place where knowledge is discovered (or created), tested, disseminated, and applied. Such an educational institution does not necessarily have to give degrees but learning can take place if the programs are structured properly. Because of its mandate, the Center must avoid becoming merely another university, just as it must avoid becoming a technical assistance agency. Of course, a great deal of education should go on at the Center and it is hoped that everything done is of assistance to somebody, somewhere. But the Center cannot be a typical institution of higher learning, nor should it be diverted to technical assistance, which is the function of the Agency for International Development. The Center must continually strive to strengthen its role as an educational institution where people work together, live and eat together, and especially learn together in an atmosphere of equality and mutual respect.

The Secretary shall provide for grants to [various kinds of people] to attract such scholars and authorities to the Center [and] to enable such students to engage in study or training at the Center. The interpretation of this passage is that, in general, the congressionally appropriated funds shall be used to bring people to the Center. Working together at the Center provides these people with an experience different from what they would get were the Center to send its people out to Asia or the American mainland to lecture and give training, or were participants sent to other educational institutions for study. The latter types of activity, of course, may be incorporated in Center activities but should not be the predominant experience of those who receive grants, fellowships, and scholarships from the Center.

Making the facilities available for study or training to other qualified persons. This has been interpreted to mean that, given funds other than those directly appropriated by Congress, the Center can bring people from other areas of the world to be involved in its programs. Secondly, it means that qualified men and women can come into Center programs even though they do not receive financial grants from the institution.

The Secretary may accept from public and private sources money and property to be utilized in carrying out the purposes and functions of the Center. This provision means that funds can and should be raised from public and private sources for the use of Center programs. Across the fifteen years of existence of the Center comparatively little effort has been put into such activity. However, with the development of cooperative problem-oriented programs, cost-sharing and fund-raising from public and private sources are being given major emphasis.

The mandate of the Center as seen from this legislation can be stated as follows:

**East-West Center Mandate**

1. Develop an educational institution, national and international in purpose and support.
2. Develop cooperative programs of research, study, and training with the University of Hawaii and with people and institutions on the American mainland and in Asia and the Pacific.
3. Provide grants to bring scholars, students, and other authorities to the East-West Center to study, give and receive training, exchange ideas and views, and conduct other activities in Center programs.
4. Make the facilities of the Center available for study or training to other qualified persons.
5. Promote better relations and understand-
ing between the United States and the nations of Asia and the Pacific through all of the above activities devoted to cultural and technical interchange.

**World Changes Affecting Center Programs**

The goals “to promote better relations and understanding” and the means of “cooperative study, research and training” are particularly appropriate to the emerging world of the last quarter of the 20th Century. Every educational institution comes into existence at a certain time and place in response to certain circumstances and must remain responsive to changing circumstances. To be germane to East-West relations and understanding, the Center must also adapt. The following perceptions of developing conditions over the past twenty-five years or so are an attempt to illustrate the relevance of the Center’s programs and style.

1. During the post-World War II period the world has significantly changed from a bi-polar world of ideology to a multi-lateral world of multi-faceted problems. Although ideology still plays a role in international relationships, it certainly is not as dominant as it was in the late forties, the fifties, and the sixties when the clash between capitalism and communism was at its peak. Today, world problems dominate. We see some 80 million people added to the world annually. Hunger and malnutrition are rampant. Inflation-cum-recession is threatening the economy of the entire world. Super-affluence and careless consumption in some countries threaten the supply of resources. Pollution endangers our environment and overcrowding menaces the life of our cities. All countries face these and other problems, but no ideology has magic solutions for them. And these problems must be solved. In an article in *Scientific American* of September 1974 (“The History of the Human Population,” pp. 41-51), Ansley Coale set forth the premise that “in less than 700 years” if the present population growth rate continues geometrically, “there would be one person for every square foot on the surface of the earth.” Of course, the population problem will be solved one way or the other before we get that far—through famine or violence or through intelligent cooperation. The point is that today problems, rather than ideology, predominate and future relations will most likely be determined by our ability to work together to solve them rather than by embracing some ideology.

2. Although a vast number of independent nations have arisen since World War II and nationalism is stronger today than ever, paradoxically the nations of the world are of necessity becoming more and more interdependent. In fact, it is becoming more difficult all the time to separate national domestic affairs from international affairs. The search for energy and raw materials, the devaluation of the dollar, the extinction of whales, the use of communication satellites, the conduct of the Vietnam War, the formation of transnational corporations, the deterioration of the environment, all these and more are evidence that we live in an interdependent world in which nations not only do but must interact as never before. No nation is an independent island of self-sufficiency. To make this interaction benign, people must learn to cooperate cross-culturally and internationally.

3. Since World War II mankind both East and West has lived more and more in man-made environments. People are flocking, for example, to cities which are built with man-made technology. Although there is the danger of enslaving ourselves to our mechanical servants, there is also the great possibility of getting these servants to work for us, relieving us of the more inhuman, back-breaking toil. But man-made environments, with all their technology, evidence certain important characteristics. First, change occurs most rapidly in them. The great cities, created by technology, are the industrial, communication, intellectual, and cultural synapses of the world. There one finds the huge factories and the headquarters of business, the TV and radio stations, the mass circulation newspapers, the international airports, the great universities, and the great concert halls, theaters, and cathedrals. The small towns that have been changed most over the years are those that once were close to and now have been incorporated into the orbit of the exploding metropolis. So man-made environments change most.

Second, the man-made technological society is of necessity a cooperative society. If bus drivers, school teachers, telephone operators, or garbage collectors go on strike the society can come to a virtual standstill. If a person fails to
cooperate by forgetting to put gasoline into his/her car before going to work in the morning and then runs out of gas on a busy bridge or in a busy tunnel, cars will be backed up for miles and thousands of people will be late for work. In the technological society cooperation is essential.

4. In struggling mightily to develop their countries, Asians have dealt with the quality of life mainly as standard of living but also as meaning of existence. Certainly many countries have moved toward greater affluence. Furthermore, they have improved their universities and built many excellent research institutions such as the Korean Institute of Science and Technology (KIST) in Seoul, the International Rice Research Institute (IRRI) in Los Banos, and the Asian Institute of Management (AIM) in Manila, the National Institute of Development Administration (NIDA) in Bangkok, the Bandung Institute of Technology in Indonesia, and the Regional English Language Center (RELC) in Singapore. In the Pacific area three new universities have been established over the past decade and a half: the University of Guam, the University of the South Pacific in Fiji, and the University of Papua New Guinea. The Asian universities seem able to take care of scholars through the Master's degree and beyond. The Pacific universities are offering good Bachelor's programs. Such universities and institutes not only provide a base for educating people of the country and region in which they are located, but also are excellent intellectual points of contact at which to establish East-West cooperative relations on a basis of genuine partnership in the universal quest to improve the quality of life.

5. Modern society has become a knowledge society characterized by vast research, data processing, information storage and retrieval, mass education, and mass communication. Knowledge proliferates at such a pace that a scholar or manager finds it difficult to keep up even in his own field of specialization, to say nothing of related fields. In such a situation men from different fields with different specializations and working at different professions must learn to communicate and work together, especially in attempts to apply knowledge to the solution of practical problems.

6. Given the changing East-West relations something has to be added to the post-World War II exchange-of-persons programs. Immediately after the war, people needed and wanted the new knowledge which was produced in abundance in the West, especially in the United States. Actually, a certain kind of prestige was attached to educational grants for study in the West. Now, not only have excellent educational and research institutes been established in the East, but also the Western way of life is perceived by many to be less attractive, less ethical than it once appeared. On the other hand, the day is past when a Western scholar with a pocket full of money could go to Asia, hire local people to help him collect research data and one day take off with all his card files and tape recorders full of information to become an instant expert at home. The day of what some Asians called “intellectual imperialism” is over. Research into varying cultural areas must be collaborative. Easterners and Westerners must get together as partners and colleagues in a common task, rather than visiting dignitaries or experts in each other’s territory.

Probably the most important task in a world of different levels of affluence and power is to foster dignity, equality, and respect. The people of every country desire not only quality of life at home but equality of relations abroad. When people do not receive what they feel to be their due, anger is born; when people are treated as inferior, hatred is born. The task is to design programs which foster equitable, reciprocal relations in which both sides maintain their pride.

7. World War II changed most East-West relations from a vertical relationship of colonialism to a more horizontal relationship of free nations. However, the relationships were not those among equals. The United States emerged from the war strong and unscathed while the nations devastated by war needed rebuilding, and those recently established needed development. In the situation the West, especially the United States, provided technical assistance for the building and rebuilding. Although at its best an altruistic gesture, this assistance created a donor-recipient relationship, with the West feeling the glow of the ability to help and the East the pain of the necessity always to receive. In fact, some in the West
even identified superior technology with superior intelligence and morals. For stable relationships, the donor-recipient syndrome must be changed to one of partnership in which people cooperate for the common good.

8. The idea that the more affluent countries have a responsibility to assist the less affluent countries began to be articulated and practiced after World War II. It is a new concept on the political level and therefore has many pitfalls as well as many advantages. It is now generally accepted that any nation which wants to develop (i.e., improve the quality of life of its people) must do so itself—but not necessarily alone. Although science and certain technology can be borrowed and imported from abroad, creativity from within is ultimately the only answer. The local creation of a better way to pump water from one rice paddy to another or to thresh the grain may do more for development than the importation of an automobile factory or a steel mill. Improving the quality of life is not ultimately a matter of technology, nor of GNP, but a movement of the human mind, the uplifting of the human spirit. Sensitive Asians declare that they want to “modernize,” but on their own terms, maintaining their own spirit and identity.

9. With the rapid changes occurring in the Asia/Pacific area of the world and the greater impact the events there have on the rest of the world, we human beings are going to have many difficult learning tasks if we are to emerge into the 21st Century with some modicum of good human relations. First, we are going to have to learn to live with uncertainty. No one knows what the future holds or if we will be able to find solutions to the great problems facing men. People will have to play roles for which they have no specific training or experience. The security of knowing one’s job and one’s competence in that job will not always be present. Secondly, we will have to learn to accept mistakes by each other so that a spirit of adventure and innovation will prevail. Seeking solutions to problems will involve risk taking, but few will have the courage to take risks if some mistakes are not accepted as part of the cost of coping with new situations. Third, we must learn to communicate new ideas and methodologies, new concepts and understandings across the barriers to communication—academic disciplines, professions, cultures, and languages, even groups and committees. This implies the necessity to learn the patience necessary to take the time to communicate. Administratively it means taking the time to design activities that are cross-disciplinary, cross-cultural, and cross-professional. Finally, we need to learn humility, i.e., learn that the world does not depend upon us alone, certainly not on individuals in isolation. We must come to see that we need each other’s insights and inspirations, help and cooperation.

Rationale for Problem-Orientation
What kind of learning situation should be devised so that the learning tasks can at least be started, if not accomplished. We are experimenting with problem-orientation. We do not call ourselves problem-solving, for we recognize that the Center, as one small institution in this large world, cannot solve the world population, food development, or cross-cultural communication problems. However, problems provide a focus for both learning and organization. Of course, disciplines also provide an organizing principle and opportunity for learning. Universities have been so organized for a long, long time. Many of the disciplines have rationales in the form of philosophies of history, science, or literary criticism. It does not take a great deal of thought, however, to realize that the way universities have divided up the world is not the way the world at large is actually divided. The East-West Center has been organized around problems since 1970 and will continue to be so organized into the foreseeable future. The experience then has supported the validity of this arrangement. It works! Why?

1. Problems provide a basis for cross-cultural, cross-disciplinary, and cross-professional cooperation. None of the great problems facing humans today can be solved by economists alone, or sociologists alone, or physicists, engineers, or philosophers alone; nor by Americans alone, Germans alone, or Indians, Indonesians, or Filipinos alone. Urban renewal, bridge building, and developing new teaching materials demand not only technical but also, and probably more significantly, social and human skills. Cooperation is needed. In an educational institution that is problem-oriented, cooperation is essential and
tackling real problems together can lead to mutuality, collegiality, and respect when the problems are adequately defined and the attack on the solution properly designed.

2. Educational programs organized around real life problems which include actual people provide a beginning experience in living with uncertainty. Many of the “problems” used in classrooms are simulated. Actually they are puzzles rather than problems. Puzzles usually have known answers and are so contrived to test a person’s ingenuity in finding that answer. Real life problems may have no “answers,” only accommodations; may have no solutions, only different alternatives, each with a different set of difficulties to be faced. In turn, each “solution” may be the genesis of a new or second generation problem since both problem and solution are interrelated with the total environment. Such problems may be man-made but are never contrived. Of course, problems also arise in academic disciplines, generally from the inner logic of the discipline itself. Such problems are in many respects different in kind from those in the world outside academia, since they arise from difficulties in classification, description, or explanation with the basis for decisions about alternative solutions being logic, simplicity, consistency, or what is called elegance. Most solutions to academic problems are intellectual, possibly demanding changes in thinking but not in behaving. Much of today’s research tends to focus on simple systems which are manageable. This is true of both the biological and anthropological studies, for example, even though the most important part of man is the interplay between this bio-psychical animal and his total social environment. Simplicity and manageability can give people a sense of security, but it may be false security. Real world problems arising from complexity, whose solutions are not readily apparent, or demand change in both thinking and behavior, can form a basis for educating people to cope with change and uncertainty.

3. Problems provide goals for research, education, and training. Within a typical university, open-endedness, the situation in which a professor is unrestricted in the subject or method of his or her research, is considered the ideal. Certainly, the world has benefited from that endeavor. However, on the one hand, open-endedness is more idealistic than realistic. As someone said, “Chance favors the prepared mind.” Hunches, for example, are not derived from nothingness. Madame Curie set out specifically to fill in a gap in the element chart. On the other hand, given the situation in the world today, more stress must be placed upon what Rene Dubos (Reason Awake) calls mission-oriented research. Problems are gaps between what is and what could be, possibly what should be, and therefore the goals or mission of research, education, and training are the discovery and dissemination of knowledge to close the gap and help solve or alleviate such problems as overpopulation, hunger, poverty, pollution, and violence. Of course, problem-orientation does not negate the value of discipline-orientation or the attitude of intellectual open-endedness. Academic disciplines are not only valid in their own right but can be used as tools in the search for solutions. However, different kinds of people will emerge from the two educational processes. People who study and do research in problem-oriented educational programs should come out of the process as solution-oriented people.

In practical terms, problems or problem-orientation provide the Center not only with goals for research, education, and training but also with criteria for the selection of staff and participants, the choice of acquisitions for resource materials collections and conferences, and the decision on what books to publish. As staff are selected academic competence and content are built into the institution. These people provide the programs with continuity, a memory system, so that what is done this year is based upon what was done last year, and what will be done next year will be based upon this year’s activities. The staff and programs provide the means for fulfilling the mandate of Congress to develop an educational institution.

4. Problems can be an intellectual integrating force. There is probably no greater cry in our present divided, broken world than for holism, the ability to perceive the relationship between parts and wholes. We know now that no person can do merely one thing. Everything is interrelated. But no one comprehends all of the interrelatedness. However, an educational program focused on problems can make people sensitive to relationship of different kinds of knowledge. It can
educate people to communicate across the boundaries of culture, discipline, and profession.

In a broader sense, the search for the solution of problems demands a combination of thought and action, an integration of theory and practice. The solutions to problems are not effectuated by thought alone or action alone. Thoughtless action can lead to disaster, while actionless thought can be sterile. People not only think their way into behavior but also behave their way into thinking. In an educational program based on problems, people are not evaluated only on their ability to manipulate progressively more difficult verbal symbols or philosophical concepts but also on their ability to act, or at least to propose action. Problems open up the opportunity of testing out ideas, i.e., for reality testing.

5. Tackling problems creates future-orientation. Although a study of the past may be necessary not to repeat past mistakes, mankind now faces problems that have no precedent. No one has ever experienced a nuclear war. No one has experienced a world population of seven, fourteen or twenty-eight billion people. Nor has anyone ever experienced the destruction of the atmospheric ozone layer. Nor can we experiment with them to find the results. We must learn to conjecture, to think of the results of our actions. Few educational systems help people learn how decisions are actually made, and fewer still train people to anticipate the results of their decisions.

Also, although human beings from different nations and cultures have had different pasts which were not too related, it is becoming apparent that most people will experience similar futures which are very interrelated. Most education, especially at the primary and secondary level, has as one of its basic aims the transmission of a cultural heritage from one generation to the next. In fact, the educational system itself is based upon the cultural heritage it teaches. An international institution, rather than emphasizing different cultural heritages which tend to show how men differ, can better emphasize the future in which we all have a stake. In that way people from different countries can learn to face the future together in an attempt to perceive what dominoes will fall once the first one is pushed over. More than any time in human history our decisions are based upon our view of a joint future.

6. Research on the solutions to problems is also peace research. First, an inadequate supply or the unequal distribution of food and other resources accompanied by a rapid increase in the number of people in this world can lead toward increasing conflict and violent solutions. It may be true that conflict is a part of human life and cannot be eliminated. In fact, if peace can only come by eliminating conflict, then the future looks pretty bleak. However, by learning to cooperate in the solution of common problems we may learn how to manage conflict and keep it from becoming violent. This cooperation must be learned with only a scant knowledge of each other's cultures. Although such knowledge is important, it does not necessarily get people to get along. Getting in the harness together working toward common goals demands a mutual commitment. Since a large element of life is promise-giving and promise-keeping, with the possibility of promise-breaking, problem-orientation provides the discovery and testing grounds for the development of trust. Minimally, people may come to see that trustworthiness has more to do with individual personality than with cultural character or national identity.

Projections for the Future

Our past five years' experience has convinced us that problem-oriented programs have great potential for accomplishing even more than has been accomplished today. We have, therefore, looked ahead through 1981 and projected the following:

1. The present five programs will be fleshed out to a size which we judge to be a critical mass of academic staff, i.e., eighteen to twenty faculty-type researchers, backed by about fifteen program support staff in each institute. Today, for example, the Population Institute is already at that level, Communication is close, but Food, Technology and Development, and Culture Learning are not even half way to this mark. Our idea of a critical mass required for the mature development of our programs was developed back in 1970 and has been reaffirmed by our staff, based in great part upon the apparent strength of institutes compared on the basis of staff size. This critical mass is de-
dependent upon, first, the manner in which the problem areas are analyzed, generally by focusing on four or five subdivisions of the problem; second, the need for breadth of nationalities, disciplines, experience in public life as well as academe, and depth in particular areas that people are working on; third, the number of participants which can optimally be involved with our international staff and with each other in programmatic activities during any one year; and fourth, the kind and number of institutions in Asia, the Pacific, and the United States with which an institute can comfortably and effectively cooperate.

In addition to the five institutes, two more programs are presently in the planning stage—one Environment and Policy, and the other Urban Life. Our present thinking on Environment and Policy is the result of individual consultations and meetings held with experts from both the United States and Asia. Although the pollution of air, land, and water could be one way of dividing the task, the consultants, because many institutions and agencies were at work on these, recommended that there were three other more basic international needs: first, environmental perceptions and attitudes, a determination of exactly what the environmental problems are and the education of people about these problems; second, individual and group motivations and incentives, a study of the cultural, legal, and economic sanctions and their impact on human behavior vis a vis pollution; and third, environmental management, the development of institutional capability for testing and implementing alternatives, including policy considerations with local, national, and international agencies.

Urban Life is an attempt to get the great humane ideas coming from the humanities and the insights of the social sciences and professions operative in the framework of the urbanization process. Therefore, three types of people will be involved cooperatively in this program: first, people from history, religion, philosophy, literature, drama, the arts; secondly, imaginative thinkers from the great human service professions such as social work, public health including medicine, the legal profession including the penal system, education, and recreation; third, social scientists, city planners, and architects. The international consultants meeting in Bangkok recommended that, on the one hand, the issues tackled should concentrate on the quality of life: inadequacies in the legal/political/social systems, lack of alternative life styles, non-realization of urban potential, conflict creation, and inadequate education. On the other hand, certain cross-cutting themes should predominate, such as indicators of the quality of life, theories of planning and implementation, values, justice, growth (or no growth), and resource requirements.

Therefore, by 1981 our plan is to have seven institutes each with a staff of 30 to 35 people, and an administrative staff to support these programs. Another alternative would be to restructure present institutes by consolidation and/or markedly to redefine the problem foci. In addition to the new program building, we shall need a program support building to house media facilities, physical model laboratories, computer facilities, lecture halls, and conference rooms.

2. In order to accomplish the above programs, a great deal of effort must be put into increasing federal appropriations for these programs which will amount to about $6 million above mandatory increases, and a concerted, well-planned fund drive in Asia, the Pacific, and the United States. Our goal in fund-raising will be to raise up to one-third of the total East-West Center budget from non-appropriated funds by 1981, i.e., one dollar outside for each two dollars of directly appropriated funds. Appropriations have grown from $5.2 million in FY 71 to $9 million in FY 76. External funding has increased to $3 million in 1975. Our goal by 1981 would be to have approximately $16 million from the federal government and $8 million from external funding, excluding any money for capital improvements.

Several interlocking assumptions lie behind this program development and fund-raising effort. First, the Center will need to develop excellent programs with highly qualified, competent staff members, not only because we want to be excellent for the sake of excellence and the fact that Asian institutions prefer to cooperate with excellent institutions, but also in order
to raise money in Asia or in the private sector of the United States. Second, as our programs become more mutual and cooperative with Asia and the Pacific, fund-raising in that area should become easier. The Center must increase the international input into its programs and activities. To the extent that the Center remains tied to a donor-recipient syndrome of the West, teaching the East in a one-way process, the amount of Asian-Pacific financial support will be limited. Third, it is easier to raise money for specific projects than for staff personnel. Projects which are focused on areas of direct concern and relevance to various governmental agencies and educational institutions and are designed to attack the problems involved in these concerns will attract cooperative funding. Fourth, it is easier to raise money for participant scholarships than for basic program support. In the past most cost-sharing arrangements have been support in kind and in cash for participants. Generally, this support has been confined to professional participants and has included such items as transportation costs, stipends, maintenance of salary at home, and overhead cost for the specific project. We are already looking to expand these cost-sharing areas for fellows and degree seeking students.

Fifth, the United States Congress will continue to provide appropriations for basic budgetary support. External funds will be sought to increase the number of participants, to support specific projects, to build buildings and develop endowment. Sixth, the types of participants will remain the same—degree-seeking students, fellows, and professionals—but the mix may change. Greater emphasis will be placed upon professional and research participants to achieve a better balance within our degree-seeking student programs. Within the degree student category greater emphasis will be placed on doctoral candidates, including joint doctoral research interns and possibly research assistants, to increase the potential of involvement of these participants in cooperative Center activities.

We recognize that there are certain constraints on external fund-raising for the Center, especially in Asia. First, there is little history of federal or private United States institutions raising funds in Asia. Second, although there is a long history of fund-raising carried out by United States educational institutions, especially those in the private and religious sectors, there is little history of national educational institutions raising funds in the private sector of the United States. In fact, the goal of many of the great foundations is to be innovative but after the program is launched to attempt to get federal funding to support the long-range program. Third, the University of Hawaii itself wishes to raise funds. Plans will have to be worked out in such a way that the two institutions are not seen competing destructively with each other. Fourth, the question of the intent of the Department of State in establishing the East-West Center will raise certain questions in Asia. The corporation will have to make abundantly clear that the East-West Center is educational and autonomous.

This memorandum is long but it outlines the view and vision of the Center as seen by EWC administration. The Center is both a developing idea and institution. Much care will be necessary in guiding it toward its real potential. We look forward to working with you in this challenging task.

APPENDIX A

The Mutual Security Act of 1960
(Public Law 86-472, May 14, 1960)
CHAPTER VII—CENTER FOR CULTURAL AND TECHNICAL INTERCHANGE BETWEEN EAST AND WEST

Sec. 701. This chapter may be cited as the "Center for Cultural and Technical Interchange Between East and West Act of 1960."

Sec. 702. The purpose of this chapter is to promote better relations and understanding between the United States and the nations of Asia and the Pacific (hereinafter referred to as "the East") through cooperative study, training and research, by establishing in Hawaii a Center for Cultural and Technical Interchange Between East and West where scholars and students in various fields from the nations of the East and West may study, give and receive training, exchange ideas and views, and conduct other activities primarily in support of the objectives of the United States Information and Educational Exchange Act of 1948, as amended, title III of chapter II of the Mutual Security Act of 1954, and other Acts promoting the international, educational, cultural, and related activities of the United States.

Sec. 703. In order to carry out the purpose of this chapter the Secretary of State (hereinafter referred to as the "Secretary") shall provide for—
(1) the establishment and operation in Hawaii of an educational institution to be known as the Center for Cultural and Technical Interchange Between East and West, through arrangements with public, educational, or other non-profit institutions;

(2) grants, fellowships, and other payments to outstanding scholars and authorities from the nations of the East and West as may be necessary to attract such scholars and authorities to the Center;

(3) grants, scholarships, and other payments to qualified students from the nations of the East and West as may be necessary to enable such students to engage in study or training at the Center; and

(4) making the facilities of the Center available for study or training to other qualified persons.

Sec. 704. (a) In carrying out the provisions of this chapter, the Secretary may utilize his authority under the provisions of the United States Information and Educational Exchange Act of 1948, as amended.

(b) The Secretary may, in administering the provisions of this chapter, accept from public and private sources money and property to be utilized in carrying out the purposes and functions of the Center. In utilizing any gifts, bequests, or devices accepted there shall be available to him in accepting and utilizing gifts, bequests, and devices to the Foreign Service Institute under the provisions of the title X, part C of the Foreign Service Act of 1946, as amended. For the purposes of Federal income, estate, and gift taxes, any gift, device, or bequest accepted by the Secretary under the authority of this chapter shall be deemed to be a gift, device, or bequest to or for the use of the United States.

(c) The Secretary shall make an annual report to the Congress with respect to his activities under the provisions of this chapter, and such report shall include any recommendations for needed revisions in this chapter.

Sec. 705. There are authorized to be appropriated, to remain available until expended, such amounts as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this chapter.

APPENDIX B

EAST-WEST CENTER PROJECT CRITERIA

Each project should:

a. be multinational in focus, in staff, in composition, or in dissemination. It is desirable to have all four.

b. be cooperatively designed, implemented, supported, and evaluated. Evidence of cooperation includes cost-sharing, co-directing, co-sponsoring, co-hosting, and exchange of staff and participants.

c. be related to problem and subdivision objectives as defined by the respective institutes.

d. professionally involve EWC program staff as members of an interdisciplinary team. At least one EWC program staff member will be a principal investigator/coordinator.

e. be carried out at the East-West Center, although some project activities may be carried out elsewhere.

f. involve a cross section of EWC participants and program staff.

g. include participants who come from both Asian/Pacific countries and the United States and who return to their respective institutions and countries of origin to share and use their experience.
EWC INCORPORATION

Preface

By the spring of 1976 my turn for writing an essay at the Social Science Association of Honolulu once again came around. With approximately forty members, ten writing essays each year, a person’s turn comes up once each four years. When the secretary of the Association called and informed me that my turn had arrived, he suggested that I write about the significance of the incorporation of the East-West Center. Although our time for reading a paper is thirty minutes at the most, once I set my pencil to paper I found that I suddenly had more to say than could be included in that period of time. The paper that follows is a record of incorporation documented to the greatest extent possible for those who some day may wish to probe into it further.

Although I tried to be as objective as possible in writing this document, I recognize that I was writing it from my point of view as head of the East-West Center. To some it may sound too harsh or critical. I hope not, because I recognize that many, many people, especially in the University of Hawaii, were helpful in the process. The understanding of the members of the Board of Regents at that time was sensitively directive, and I especially would like to express my gratitude to their two chief executive officers with whom I worked closely in the process of incorporation, namely, President Harlan Cleveland and President Fujio Matsuda.
I would also like to thank Gordon Ring, my staff aide at the time, for doing a great deal of the leg work and documentation on this paper.
East-West Center Incorporation: The Process and Significance

The purpose of this paper is to set forth the significance of establishing a public non-profit educational corporation to operate the East-West Center. Why go through such an agonizing process? Why did the process take such a long time? Why the deep feelings? As I reflect on the process during which we worked first to achieve autonomy for the Center and then to form the public corporation established by Act 82 of the Hawaii Legislature on July 1, 1975, I find in my memory a multitude of fascinating and sometimes contradictory impressions. I wonder now whether we would have made the enormous effort if someone had told us at the beginning of the innumerable hurdles to overcome and human anxieties to assuage. There are times when naivete and idealism are useful, for without them the first steps of a thousand mile journey would never be taken. Having reached autonomy through incorporation and now having lived with it for a year, I am convinced that the journey was worth the effort. But if I had been able to view that path from the beginning all the way to the end, I might have put my feet up on my desk, read some good books on linguistics or international relations, and postponed indefinitely any further thoughts of incorporation.

In order to understand the significance of all this, it is necessary to go back to the Center’s origin. From the beginning the East-West Center has been an experiment. I don’t know that Lyndon Baines Johnson, Jack Burns, the Congress, or the people at the University of Hawaii would state it quite this way. However, one look at the legislation establishing the Center demonstrates that this was to be no ordinary institution. Three parts of the Congressional legislation which established the Center in 1960 indicate both the tension and the intellectual nourishment inherent in the concept of the Center. The name of the institution is the Center for Cultural and Technical Interchange Between East and West. The purpose and means for fulfilling these purposes are spelled out as follows:

SEC. 702. The purpose of this chapter is to promote better relations and understanding between the United States and the nations of Asia and the Pacific (hereinafter referred to as “the East”) through cooperative study, training, and research, by establishing in Hawaii a Center for Cultural and Technical Interchange Between East and West where scholars and students in various fields from the nations of the East and West may study, give and receive training, exchange ideas and views, and conduct other activities primarily in support of the objectives of the United States Information and Educational Exchange Act of 1948, as amended, title III of chapter II of the Mutual Security Act of 1954, and other Acts promoting the international, educational, cultural, and related activities of the United States.

Finally, the nature of the institution is spelled out as follows:

SEC. 703. In order to carry out the purpose of this chapter the Secretary of State (hereinafter referred to as the “Secretary”) shall provide for—

(1) the establishment and operation in Hawaii
of an educational institution to be known as the Center for Cultural and Technical Interchange Between East and West, through arrangements with public, educational, or other nonprofit institutions;

(2) grants, fellowships, and other payments to outstanding scholars and authorities from the nations of the East and West as may be necessary to attract such scholars and authorities to the Center;

(3) grants, scholarships, and other payments to qualified students from the nations of the East and West as may be necessary to enable such students to engage in study or training at the Center; and

(4) making the facilities of the Center available for study or training to other qualified persons.

The basic legislation therefore provides for the establishment and operation in Hawaii of an educational institution whose program will involve cooperative study, training, and research in which cultural and technical interchange takes place among scholars and students who have been given grants to come to the Center, all for the purpose of promoting better relations and understanding. The uniqueness and challenge of this arrangement was the establishment by the federal government of an educational institution to promote better relations and understanding thus supporting the long-range foreign relations goals of the United States. The basic question was not just whether the idea was sound but whether an institution so conceived and so dedicated could long endure.

Like people, institutions flourish or wither depending on not only what they intrinsically are but also on how others perceive them. The best conditions exist when the interior reality and exterior perception are the same. As I see it the Center has always needed six identities, or six parts to its identity. They are:

1. A national identity. Having been established by the Congress of the United States, the Center had to be seen as beneficial to the entire country and all the states. Congressmen from Maine or Michigan would be reluctant to vote funds for an institution perceived to be a part of another state.

2. An international identity. Since the purpose of the Center is the promotion of better international relations and understanding, the Center must be perceived as beneficial to all the countries involved, not merely as technical assistance to lesser developed countries but primarily as an equal partnership enterprise trying to enhance the quality of life of all people through mutually relevant educational programs.

3. An institutional identity. To be an institution in its own right the Center had to be able to institute (or initiate and implement) policies, procedures and programs befitting its nature, purposes, and relationships. No institution can flourish if it is tied to the policies and procedures of another institution even though some purposes may be overlapping. The Center not only had to have its own programs, policies, and procedures but had to be seen to have them.

4. A programmatic and educational identity. The program carried out by an educational institution will determine whether that institution has quality and is attaining its goals. Furthermore, of all the factors that make up an institution its programs will have greatest impact on its identity. We are what we do. The institution becomes known for and identified with its educational programs. The Center is no exception.

5. A physical identity. Not only is a man's home his castle, but it also identifies him. Where is it located? Does he own it? What kind of structure is it? Does it meet his requirements? How does it fit in with his surroundings? Businesses, churches, and governments also recognize that their buildings will identify them as modern functional, medieval Gothic, or contemporary bureaucratic. Educational institutions are the same.

6. A legal identity. An institution should be able to enter into contracts, set the terms of these contracts, perform services, and receive the funds, including overhead, for these services, hire and fire people, and perform other legal functions pertaining to its existence and operation.

The importance of the original legislation and its interpretation and of the six identities was evidenced by the factors that led to the idea of giving the Center autonomy through incorporation, by the various deep concerns that surfaced during the process of moving toward
incorporation, and by the residual problems that will or may have to be disposed of some time in the future.

There is no question that this unique joint enterprise between the federal government and the State of Hawaii, through the University of Hawaii, accomplished a great deal in promoting East-West mutual understanding and cooperation over the fifteen year period, 1960-1975. However, certain problems persisted which could not be ignored indefinitely. Eventually, they resulted in the effort to gain autonomy for the Center through incorporation.

The first problem, basically due to the ambiguity of the Center's institutional identity, centered on management. Because the Center was operated under a contract between the Department of State and the Board of Regents, the Regents naturally felt it their statutory duty to operate the Center according to State and University of Hawaii policies and regulations. However, because the Center was created by Congress and is therefore a line item in the federal budget, people in Washington felt it their duty to see that the Center, in spending federal funds, adhered to applicable federal policies, rules, and regulations. Although some characterized this arrangement as creative ambiguity, I have characterized this management aspect of the problem as the "Kleinjans' Law," that an institution governed under two different sets of policies and procedures (federal and state) tends to get the short end of both. External audits and studies through the years have focused on this management issue. Although the recommendations of these studies varied, they all indicated concern for the conflicting lines of authority and responsibility. Most recently, a November 1974, federal audit pointed out that "The Chancellor of the Center is responsible to two bodies of authority: the Board of Regents and the Department of State. . . . Accordingly, from the standpoint of effective contract and grant administration, the Chancellor of the Center, in our opinion, is in an untenable position."  

The second problem centered on national identity. Both the University and Congress claimed responsibility for bringing the Center into being. The imprecisely defined set of relationships among the Center, the University of Hawaii, and the federal government forced the Center to walk a delicate tight rope between the interests of the University of Hawaii and the federal government.

Concern for the Center's national identity was continuously expressed by congressmen over the years, most memorably in remarks made in Congressional hearings by Brooklyn's crusty, former Congressman John A. Rooney, who for many years chaired the House Appropriations Subcommittee which reviewed the Center's budget. In 1964 he remarked that:

". . . this was never intended to be a WPA project for the University of Hawaii. . . . This Center was intended to be a federal project, and one which would redound to the best interests of all the people of the United States of America, these being federal moneys. It was never intended that the taxpayers in my congressional district would pay the cost of educating the students in the University of Hawaii, a State institution, any more than we would contribute to the University of Nebraska. . . ."

At the same Hearings, Congressman Frank T. Bow of Ohio stated:

". . . I have a definite idea that this is something we are doing in the national interest and not in Hawaii's interest, and I think it is time to let the world know that this is the United States of America doing this. . . . we should begin to operate this Center as an adjunct to the United States of America. Instead of hiding the fact it is an operation of the U.S. Government, I would be in favor of putting a neon sign saying it is an adjunct to the United States of America."

In the face of this confusion of identities, it is not surprising that the Center's budget did not increase for several years. Congressmen from Maine and South Carolina had difficulty understanding why the federal government should be providing funds to a state university in Hawaii.

There was also a lack of a clearly defined international and legal identity for the Center. Because Congressionally appropriated funds for the Center came through the Department of State, many people perceived it as "an arm of American foreign policy." This perception made it difficult to establish a strong international identity for the Center. Across the years there were constant suggestions to broaden the
Center's funding base both into the private and international sectors. However, because some saw the Center as a part of the University of Hawaii and others as part of the Department of State, potential donors saw their gifts as gifts to the University or the Department. This perception was strengthened because the Center had no legal basis for accepting funds directly. They had to be channeled through either the Regents or the Secretary of State. Furthermore, by statute, members of the University Board of Regents had to be residents of the State of Hawaii. Therefore, there was no possibility of getting international participation in the governing of the Center. Thus, the close relationship with the University of Hawaii precluded a legal identity and in turn made it difficult for the Center to establish an international identity.

As a consequence of these identity problems, various proposals for providing autonomy to the Center were made over the years. The concept of incorporation can be traced back to the original plans for the Center. Ten days after Senate Majority Leader Lyndon B. Johnson launched a trial balloon for establishing an “International University” in Hawaii “as a meeting place for the intellectuals of East and West,” a group of nationally known educators including John Gardner (then president of the Carnegie Foundation) and Philip Coombs (then secretary of the Fund for the Advancement of Education) came together to advise Senator Johnson on his concept for an “International University.” They recommended that “the project should be carried out through a federally chartered separate institution. They had a great fear that if it is too closely associated with the State university that it would lose its identity and fail in its purpose.”

In Hawaii, one of the early proponents of establishing a State of Hawaii public corporation to operate the Center was Honolulu Attorney Richard S. Mirikitani. His proposal, made in 1961, bears many similarities to the present arrangement. It called for the establishment of an “agency of State government independent of the administrative control of any single department or institution” with “the authority to negotiate and contract with the U.S. and other public as well as educational and non-profit institutions, both domestic and foreign.” He noted that this arrangement would “minimize bureaucratic restrictions and controls and thus give the director maximum freedom to create an outstanding instrument of international understanding.”

Later that year, the president of Chaminade College, the Very Reverend Robert R. Mackey, anticipating cooperation between his College and the Center, wrote:

To effect this community participation it would seem that the administration of the Center should be separated from the University of Hawaii. The administration could then contract with the University of Hawaii, mainland colleges and universities, other institutions of higher learning in Hawaii, the Community Theatre, the Bishop Museum, the Art Academy, the Honolulu Symphony, etc., for the necessary services. The major contract could still be had with the university.

Governor John A. Burns, who had been instrumental in working with Senator Johnson to establish the Center, made a proposal in 1963 that would “have the State, via the Governor, take responsibility for the East-West Center” and establish a commission to “serve as the contracting agency in Hawaii with the State Department on behalf of the Governor.” He noted further that “eventually the State could create a public corporation which would provide and assure continuity.”

Dr. Alexander Spoehr, the Center’s first Chancellor, wrote in his letter of resignation in December, 1963, that “I believe that the Center will succeed as an instrument created in perpetuity only if it is placed under a nationally constituted board of trustees which truly reflect the national mission assigned to the Center.”

The Beginnings

By 1971 three significant events had taken place. The presidency of the University had changed, the entire membership of the National Review Board for the East-West Center, which had been established in 1965 representing the national interest to advise the Department of State on the Center’s programs and operations, had been replaced except for its chairman, Governor Burns, and the Center had established its problem-oriented programs. At the first meeting of the National Review Board in 1966, it was decided to continue the Advisory Board to advise the Center. The Board was comprised of individuals from various fields, including education, government, business, and non-profit organizations, representing different regions of the United States. Its role was to provide guidance and support to the Center in its mission to promote understanding between the East and West.

The National Review Board continued to meet annually, providing valuable input and feedback to the Center. It served as a valuable resource for the Center, helping to shape its programs and initiatives. The Board’s membership was regularly updated to ensure a diverse perspective and representation. Its contributions were instrumental in ensuring the Center’s success and its continued relevance in promoting international understanding.
Board with the new members, considerable concern was expressed about the land and buildings and subsequently about the administrative arrangements for the Center. The first serious review of the relationships among the Center, the University of Hawaii, and the Department of State was therefore initiated that year by the National Review Board. It recommended a study “to review in concert with the University every aspect of the past, present, and probable future relationships between the Center, the federal government, and the University.”

A Working Committee composed of representatives of the University, the East-West Center, and the Bureau of Educational and Cultural Affairs of the Department of State was set up to review the following areas outlined by the permanent chairman of the National Review Board, Governor John A. Burns:

1. Financial and structural relationships between the East-West Center and the University on the one hand and the Center and the federal government on the other.
2. Provide the Chancellor of the East-West Center the basis of authority commensurate with his responsibility for the expenditure of federal funds in pursuit of the objectives and policies of the Congress and President of the United States with respect to the East-West Center programs and facilities.

As a result of these deliberations, a revised Grant-in-Aid Agreement and a Memorandum of Understanding were signed by the Department of State and the University of Hawaii in July and August 1972. The major thrust of the revisions, however, dealt with the third point. The Memorandum of Understanding specified an area of 21 acres on the Manoa campus which “shall be dedicated to its [the Center’s] use in perpetuity for programs of the East-West Center...” The other major provision was an agreement that the University of Hawaii would request state funds for the construction of a building or buildings to be completed in a manner adequate to meet the requirements of the East-West Center to provide space equivalent to the space now being utilized by the University of Hawaii in those buildings (Moore and Edmondson Halls, and John F. Kennedy Theatre) constructed for the East-West Center with federal funds.”

This was an important step toward clarifying and correcting the land and building issue which had affected relationships for years, but which continued to vex the whole process of incorporation. Further, the issues of financial and structural relationships and the chancellor’s authority were not resolved.

Although there was a continuing concern for resolving these issues, the results were evidenced in talk rather than action. The situation could have continued indefinitely had not certain pressures come along which led to the first serious consideration of incorporation in 1973. The test of any relationship is how it responds under pressure.

The first pressure was the implementation of annual funding for our federal budget as required by federal auditors. As a consequence of the change to annual funding, the former practice in which uncommitted funds were carried over from one fiscal year to the next was ended. Therefore, it became increasingly important to maintain accurate, detailed, up-to-date information on current funds and expenditures in order to avoid underexpenditure or overexpenditure of Center funds allocated by the Congress. It has not been unusual for us to receive a phone call at 8 a.m. from Washington requesting significant budgetary information before the close of business that same day in Washington. With a six hour time difference, the Center had only three hours to produce the figures! The University of Hawaii accounting system, which was designed to meet the requirements of the State of Hawaii, was not adequate to meet the unique requirements of the East-West Center. Not only was it too slow, but the University’s own financial requirements were often higher on the priority list. The University had to meet State Legislature deadlines, which usually came at about the same time as our deadlines.

The second development that placed pressure on the arrangement was the implementation of collective bargaining for all public employees in the State. Because Center staff members were in the State system, they were organized under five different collective bargaining units of the State of Hawaii. These units did not fit the
Center's unique personnel structure; they were designed to meet the overall requirements of the State system. For example, the assignment of the Center's research staff to the administrative, professional, and technical unit, did not take into account their academic credentials. But more important, when these contracts went into effect on July 1, 1973, pay increases for Center employees were not provided by the State of Hawaii but had to be obtained from the federal government. Consequently, there was a situation in which two groups of people in Hawaii (the University and the union) decided on salary increases, but neither provided the funds to implement them.

The National Review Board requested at its January 29-30, 1973, meeting that "the Chancellor of the East-West Center and the Department of State . . . approach the union of which Center staff are members to discuss the unique organizational and funding problems of the Center and that the University collective bargaining representatives be made aware of this concern and this approach." As a result of these discussions, an amendment was added to the Unit 8 contract covering most Center employees stating that pay increases for Center employees would not take effect until approval was obtained from the Secretary of State or his designee. This resulted in a five-month delay in implementing the pay provisions of the Unit 8 collective bargaining contract for our employees. The result was extremely bad for staff morale.

The third development was the serious budgetary crisis confronting the State and University at that time. Actions were taken to reduce State and University expenditures by freezing some salaries, halting merit increases, and eliminating or cutting down on such services as student health, visa service for foreign students, and grounds maintenance. Although the Center is funded by Congressional appropriations and receives no State funds for its operations, these policies were applied to the Center. The Department of State, for example, in authorizing the pay increase and the supplemental budget request, specifically authorized pay increases for Center executives. The University did not permit these raises since they had not authorized any for their own executives. The Center was caught in a bind between two organizations which could negate each others actions regarding the Center.

The trigger event for me personally was the loss of an opportunity to attract a top scholar to the Center to head the Population Institute. In December 1972, the director of the Population Institute resigned to take a position with the Population Council of New York. We began searching widely for a successor. One of the great demographers in the United States had just retired from a top position and we approached him to assume the directorship for a three-year period. His wife was also a demographer, a world renowned specialist on Chinese and Japanese populations. The two of them would not only have given the Center high quality and prestige, but also would have made us one of the few, if not the leading, center for studies on the Chinese population. Because he was past the normal State retirement age of 65, the man's appointment was cleared by me both with the President of the University and the Board of Regents Subcommittee on East-West Center Affairs. I then went to Washington for budget hearings at the beginning of March, 1973, and stayed on in Washington until the end of the month for a meeting of the National Review Board. Since the candidate lived in Washington, I planned to contact him and his wife and try to nail everything down. However, the Board of Regents had given me instructions not to make a final offer until the appointment had cleared the full Board. I waited for word. Nothing came. I continued to call Honolulu asking the Deputy Chancellor to check on movement. Nothing yet. Three weeks passed. I finally called and said that I absolutely had to know when the Regents would act. Word came back that it would be at least another ten days! I immediately called the candidate to tell him the situation. He informed me that just the day before he and his wife decided to stay on in Washington.

I was completely frustrated. For reasons that the East-West Center had nothing to do with, I had been unable to make the final offer. When I returned to Hawaii, I wrote President Cleveland to express my deep disappointment in the processing of the appointment. . . . I have seldom felt greater frustration. . . . Because the transmission
was not expedited, I was unable to take the final step to make him a *bona fide* offer soon after my arrival in Washington despite all prior preparation. I am not only concerned about not getting the . . . [people] but also about the impression of inept management and the resulting effect on the attractiveness of the Center.  

When the National Review Board Executive Committee met on April 9, 1973, I took the opportunity to tell them of these pressures and that I could not be responsible for developing quality programs under this dual arrangement. We had spent tremendous energy trying to build up excellence and make the system work. But it failed when we needed it most.

The Executive Committee, after a great deal of discussion, took several steps designed to alleviate these problems. First, it passed a resolution stating that the Executive Committee in:

*Considering the need for an accounting system within the East-West Center that can respond promptly and appropriately to the requirements of the federal planning and budgeting system, including the requirements for information regarding the annual funding level, obligations, and outlays, recommends that the Department of State request the Board of Regents of the University of Hawaii fully and promptly to implement the provisions of Article V... of the Agreement between the Government of the United States and the Board of Regents...*  

Article V called for the establishment of an accounting system for the Center separate from all other University of Hawaii accounts... in accordance with generally accepted accounting principles of the Federal Government in sufficient detail to reflect all direct and indirect costs of whatever nature incurred in the performance of this grant.

Assistant Secretary of State John Richardson formally submitted this resolution to the president of the University of Hawaii on July 3, 1973.  

Secondly, regarding collective bargaining, the Executive Committee suggested that the Center “could work toward greater flexibility in terms of its appropriations and personnel systems.” I pointed out that one solution might be “to coordinate the Center’s personnel and salary systems with the federal government and thereby be synchronized with federal salary raises rather than with University raises.”

James Purcell of the Office of Management and Budget who was an observer at the meeting noted that “the proposal of synchronizing the Center’s salary increases to the Federal Government’s is worthy of study.” I asked him about our ability to receive funds if we came in by ourselves for a supplemental budget out of phase with other federal agencies. His reply was, “Forget it.”

At a luncheon meeting with two Board of Regents members, Robert Cushing and Harold Eichelberger, on June 28, 1973, these same concerns were discussed. Mr. Cushing asked what would be the effect on the Center and the University if the Center was handed back to the Department of State? I replied that I could not give a definitive answer. However, I could see a number of pluses and minuses. I was then asked to prepare an issue paper outlining the advantages and disadvantages of five different arrangements ranging from the continuation of the present set up to the establishment of the Center as a State of Hawaii corporation or a federal institution similar to Howard University.

In October, 1973, I was again in Washington for budget hearings. One afternoon I received a phone call from President Cleveland asking me how the hearings were going. I responded that they were proceeding as well as could be expected. He then told me that he had just made up his mind to resign as president of the University of Hawaii effective the following summer after spending five years in the position. I suggested getting together for a talk, and we met in a Washington hotel over a couple of long drinks. He told me he wanted to find a place where he could think and write about world problems. I told him that such an arrangement was very appealing to me also, and that by the following summer I would have been at the Center for seven years, half the life of the institution. On the other hand, I felt that the Center could move closer to its potential of getting people East and West to work together on world problems if it were given more autonomy and became more international. I suggested that this might take several years, possibly to the end of the decade. However, if there were a possibility of working toward that goal, I would like to take a crack at it. He
looked at me and said that if that was where I
wanted to go, he would lend all the support he
could.

On Wednesday noon, November 7, 1973,
the Regents' Subcommittee on East-West Cen-
ter Affairs met at the Center to discuss a pro-
posed salary system for Center employees com-
parable to the federal G-S scale which would
resolve the collective bargaining issue and to
prepare for the meeting of the National Review
Board Executive Committee later in the month.
Members of the Board of Regents felt that one
implication of establishing a separate salary sys-
tem for the Center could be the reassignment
of Center employees under a separate bargain-
ing unity. Because they had just completed ne-
totiations with the union they were reluctant to
see the Center become a separate unit within
their jurisdiction about which they would again
have to negotiate.

During the meeting I had to leave to receive
a phone call from Senator Fong's office report-
ing that there was still no answer from the fed-
eral government on the pay increase negotiated
by the State bargaining unit. I returned to the
meeting and reported the conversation, saying
that it appeared we might have to wait until
the following spring to implement the Univer-
sity-union agreement. When the question arrose
if there wasn't some way out of the dilemma,
Regent Eichelberger referred to the issue pa-
pers of the previous summer and asked what
advantages might accrue if the Center were
operated under the federal system. I suggested
setting up a separate corporation, possibly
along the lines of the University Research Cor-
poration. President Cleveland noted that in ad-
dition to clarifying certain managerial prob-
lems, the biggest advantage would be

in the increased ability for the East-West Center
to develop more cooperative, mutual relationships
with the Asian/Pacific countries and that the gov-
ing board for such a corporation would gradu-
ally become more international as funding be-
comes international.19

It was agreed that the possibility of restruc-
turing the Center as a corporation should be
explored in detail.

Two weeks later on November 19, President
Cleveland reported the results of this Regents'
Committee meeting to the National Review
Board Executive Committee in San Francisco.
The Executive Committee agreed to set up an
"ad hoc committee to look into the question of
incorporation and/or a new relationship with
the University." This ad hoc committee,
which included representatives of the Center
administration, the Department of State, the
University administration, and the Regents,
took the lead in carrying out a detailed exami-
nation of the feasibility of incorporating the
East-West Center.

The next year and a half, until July 1, 1975,
was devoted to a complicated juggling act of
trying to keep the many diverse parties con-
cerned with the East-West Center more or less
in agreement on the direction that should be
taken as the Center moved toward incorpo-
ration. Progress was slow and uneven, occasion-
ally characterized by two steps backward for
each step forward. There were many times
when I felt like a pretty inept juggler. Several
balls would be dropped, and I was uncertain
whether I could pick them up again, or
whether if I tried, I might drop the others in
the process. Or, that while I was trying to jugg-
gle tennis balls, someone had thrown in a can-
non ball or two. There were other times when
I realized that I was not the juggler any more
at all, that the momentum of the process had
moved to other parties, and I was only a by-
stander. We seemed caught in a kind of Hegel-
lian historical process moving us inexorably
from thesis to antithesis to synthesis. The expe-
rience was exhilarating, exciting, frustrating,
depressing, confusing, and anxiety-generating,
all at the same time.

Perhaps I should pause for a moment to pro-
vide a scorecard of the parties involved in the
process. On the national side were the:

1. Congress, which authorized the Center in
1960, and has provided the bulk of its
funding support through annual appro-
priations.

2. Department of State, which was desig-
nated by Congress as the responsible Ex-
ecutive Agency to establish the Center and
through which annual budget requests are
made and federal appropriations are chan-
neled, and specifically the Bureau of Edu-
cational and Cultural Affairs which was
assigned as the liaison bureau for working
with the Center.
3. National Review Board, established in 1965 to represent the national interest and advise the Department of State on the Center's programs and operations.

On the State of Hawaii side, were the:
1. University of Hawaii, including the Board of Regents, administration, faculty, and students—each constituency of which did not necessarily agree with the other with regard to the East-West Center.
2. State of Hawaii administration, including the Governor's Office, the Department of Budget and Finance, the Department of Accounting and General Services, the State Retirement System, and the Department of Personnel Services.
3. Hawaii State Legislature, through which the corporate enabling legislation would pass.
4. Collective bargaining agent representing the Center's staff.

And caught in the middle was the East-West Center including the:
1. Administration concerned with keeping all the balls in the air while continuing to operate Center programs.
2. Staff concerned about their jobs and livelihood.
3. A few degree students, concerned about lobbying and “brokering” their demands with everyone else on the score card.
4. Senior Fellows and professional participants wondering what all the fuss was about.
5. The Friends of the East-West Center who rallied to the cause of incorporation.

The Process

During the process of incorporation many issues surfaced which relate to the interpretation of the original legislation and the six identities of the Center outlined above. I would like to trace four of these issues in some detail since they not only illustrate the major matters confronted by the people involved and therefore are tied to the significance of incorporation, but also point to residual questions to be settled as the Center continues to mature. They are: the composition of the governing board; land and buildings; degree granting and the number of degree students; and autonomy from the Department of State as well as from the University of Hawaii. Before getting into these I would like to trace briefly the events leading to the completion of the basic documents necessary for incorporation.

Shortly after the November 19, 1973, meeting of the National Review Board Executive Committee, at which the Ad Hoc Committee on Incorporation was formed, I went to Washington for discussions with the Department of State and the Hawaii Congressional delegation. The general advice from the Department was to move cautiously. The State Department was not initially enthusiastic regarding such a major change. However, as we checked with the Hawaiian delegation, received their advice and concurrence, and delved more deeply into the matter, enthusiasm increased. As a result, the State Department assigned William Cunningham to investigate the entire matter and prepare a position paper for the Department of State. Both Senators Fong and Inouye urged serious consideration of federal incorporation in order to identify the Center clearly with its legislation and statutory source of funds. Inouye suggested looking at the Smithsonian Institution as a model for the governing board, especially since it includes members of each house of Congress. However, not only did the various members of the Ad Hoc Committee conclude that it would be wise to move as to obviate any necessity of going back to the Congress to change the original legislation because this might raise the question of the existence of the Center, but also the State Department favored a State of Hawaii charter which would emphasize the unique federal-state joint enterprise that had nurtured the Center since its establishment.

When I returned to Hawaii, Harold Eichelberger and I visited Governor Burns on February 22, 1974 in order to gain his advice on incorporation. His conclusion was simple and straightforward: “I think this is the way it should have been set up in the first place. I am for it. You have my support.”

The National Review Board Ad Hoc Committee on Incorporation met on March 3, May 10, and June 20, 1974. The University of Hawaii representatives on this Committee generally favored a go-slow approach in which the
possibility of incorporation should be examined, but at the same time all avenues for achieving the objectives of incorporation without actually incorporating should also be thoroughly explored. The Department of State representatives favored moving expeditiously toward incorporation. Cunningham presented the State Department's position at the May 10 meeting. He stated "the department's approval of incorporation of the East-West Center and the advantages that we see in such a setup. . . ."21

Cunningham subsequently noted that Assistant Secretary Richardson approved this statement and requested him to prepare a fuller statement of the Department's position for the June 20 meeting. At that meeting Cunningham stated that:

...the objective that we seek—that is, the Department of State seeks—is autonomy for the East-West Center. . . . The University owes its existence to the state, the Center owes its existence to the nation. There is a legislative basis for both, in the separate parliaments of both. The University has duties to the state; . . . The Center has duties to the nation. . . . The arrangement that we now have . . . between the Department of State and the Board of Regents, for the operation of the East-West Center . . . has produced an anomaly. The Regents choose a Chancellor who reports to the state but is responsible to the Federal Government . . . we think it is time now, because of the growth of the East-West Center and because of the many changes that are taking place in the Center, in the University, and in the environment in which both live to correct the situation and to dispel these anomalies. . . . So we have concluded that the method by which autonomy should be sought for the Center is through the establishment of an independent corporate entity with which the Secretary of State would conclude his grant-in-aid agreement for the operation of the East-West Center.22

Cunningham next listed the four advantages to be achieved by incorporation:

...to develop its own administrative structure and fiscal system; . . . to promote [and] encourage internationalization of the governance and financing of the Center; . . . to place the responsibility for governing the Center in the hands of trustees who are free to concern themselves solely with the Center's goals and operations; . . . and [to provide] greater visibility, nationally and internationally.23

The work of the National Review Board Ad Hoc Committee led to a recommendation accepted by the National Review Board at its June 21, 1974, meeting to continue working in an affirmative, positive way toward the principle of incorporation . . . and those steps that can be taken short of incorporation, but not inconsistent with the incorporation . . . [in order] to go forward in both of those aspects, it would be necessary to start putting together things in writing . . . in the nature of a letter of intent.24

At the meeting both Assistant Secretary of State Richardson and Acting Governor Ariyoshi strongly endorsed incorporation. During the meeting Chairman John Maclver asked me what documents would be necessary to accomplish incorporation. I stated that we would need a corporate charter, an agreement between the corporation and the Department of State, an agreement between the University and the corporation, and an internal management and personnel document. Because the earlier drafting of such documents had led to sharp reactions from some University representatives who felt that we were moving too fast and had apparently already made a decision to incorporate although the University had not yet arrived at that conclusion, it was agreed that the best approach was now to draw up a general Memorandum of Principles which would outline the contents of each of the documents rather than the documents themselves.

The Memorandum of Principles was prepared by a local attorney, Gerald Sumida, who was selected after consulting with both President Cleveland and Governor Ariyoshi. The Memorandum "set forth the fundamental principles that underlie the establishment of the Corporation to administer the Center and that would ultimately be embodied in the basic legal documents required to establish the Corporation" and defined the relationships between the Corporation, the University of Hawaii, and the Department of State.25

The draft Memorandum was shared with many interested parties at the University and the Center and was carefully reviewed by the
Ad Hoc Committee on September 9. A second draft was further revised on September 30 by the National Review Board, which directed the Ad Hoc Committee to review certain areas and consult further, especially with the Board of Regents and the University Administration. After further consultations, including a joint meeting of the Ad Hoc Committee and the Board of Regents on October 7, 1974, the Ad Hoc Committee at its November 7, 1974, meeting directed Mr. Sumida to prepare the required legal documents for the proposed corporation.

On December 4, 1974, President Matsuda presented the University administration’s position on incorporation to Board of Regents Chairperson Harriet Mizuguchi. He noted that:

...the Board of Regents asked me to develop and recommend an alternative which falls short of incorporation of a separate entity for the governance of the East-West Center but which would still lead to the strengthening of the Center and its programs through clarification of its status, and through redefinition of those statutory and administrative requirements which apply to Center operations. ...the impact of any changes limited to such matters will be minimal to agencies external to the University community and would therefore probably be less than what is necessary to insure that the status of the East-West Center is understood. ...I conclude that the University of Hawaii and the State of Hawaii should move toward incorporating the East-West Center as a separate entity by charter from the State of Hawaii, with a governing body of its own.

In moving toward incorporation, Matsuda recommended, however, that “several specifications” be met including:

...the development of mechanisms to insure the academic integrity of the East-West Center, ...mutually beneficial relationships which currently exist between the East-West Center and the University should be preserved, ...representation on the Governing Board should be sufficient to insure a close working relationship [with the University]. ...The interests of the present employees must be protected, ...The University of Hawaii should agree to all reasonable arrangements regarding the real property which are necessary to advance the purposes of the East-West Center while at the same time protecting the assets and interests of the University.

The draft documents prepared by Sumida, including a legislative bill constituting the charter of a proposed Hawaii educational non-profit public corporation, and agreements between the University and the corporation, and the State Department and the corporation, were reviewed and approved by the National Review Board on December 9 and 10, 1974.

At the December 12, 1974 meeting of the Board of Regents, the Board reviewed President Matsuda’s recommendation and Chairperson Mizuguchi directed the administration to proceed with the development of details concerning the incorporation of the East-West Center.

John A. Burns, as chairman of the National Review Board, formally sent the draft documents along with the National Review Board’s recommendation to the Department of State on December 24. He stated in his letter of transmittal that:

...the unique joint venture in international education and intercultural interchange between the federal government and the State of Hawaii inaugurated 15 years ago will, I am confident, grow and prosper to fulfill and ultimately surpass the vision of those who worked to bring it about. Because I, together with the people of Hawaii and all Americans, are proud and heartened by the achievements of the Center in its short yet full life, I submit to you the recommendations strongest personal endorsement. I foresee that the arrangements proposed in these documents will enhance the national identity and the international reputation and esteem of the Center, while at the same time achieving a broader level of cooperation in the joint effort upon which the State of Hawaii and the Federal Government embarked a decade and a half ago in the service of greater harmony among human kind.

The next three months were devoted to discussions between the Department of State and the University of Hawaii in order to work out the details of terminating the existing Grant-in-Aid between the Department and the University, the transitional arrangements, and reaching agreement on the final Bill for an Act to be submitted by Governor Ariyoshi to the State Legislature.

One of the most important matters addressed by all parties from the beginning of the discussions on incorporation was the composition of
the Board of Governors. If the Center was to be autonomous, the Board had to have autonomy. But to what extent would the members be accountable for the use of public funds? The degree of accountability was expressed in terms of appointed members and the degree of autonomy in terms of self-electing members. If the Center needs both national and international identities, how many governors should come from Hawaii, from the rest of the United States, from the Asian/Pacific area? Should the University of Hawaii be represented? If so, by whom? The President, or a Board of Regents member, or a faculty member or all of them? Each meeting of the Ad Hoc Committee focused on these questions.

During the initial discussions with the Board of Regents Subcommittee on East-West Center Affairs back in November 1973, I had suggested that the new Board might be composed of individuals from the Board of Regents, individuals from the National Review Board, and possibly some international members. During discussions in Washington on November 21 and 22, 1973, I outlined the advantages I saw in a completely self-electing Board. When asked about the viability of such an arrangement, I noted that some of our finest educational institutions (Harvard, Stanford, and Chicago) had done pretty well under self-electing boards. As the State Department position was formulated in early 1974, it adopted the concept of a largely self-electing Board with a few ex officio members to represent the State and Federal interests in the Center. At the September 30 meeting of the National Review Board, Chairman John MacIver summarized the State Department's position by stating,

The Department of State, after listening to the initial concern expressed . . . about preserving autonomy, has said publicly in several of the meetings that they see real wisdom in establishing autonomy within the directors, . . . and not going back to appointing authorities.31

The composition of the Board received lengthy consideration at the September 30, 1974, National Review Board meeting. The Memorandum of Principles suggested a Board with a minimum membership of 12 and a maximum membership of 21 with four selection alternatives ranging from a completely autonomous Board after the initial appointments, to two ex officio and two appointed with the remainder self-electing, to eight appointed with the remainder self-electing.32 The National Review Board concluded that the Board of Governors should consist of four ex officio members, two from the State of Hawaii and two from the Federal Government; that the minimum size of the Board should be twelve and should be self-regenerating after the initial appointments (four by the Governor of Hawaii and four by the Secretary of State); that the maximum size of the Board should be twenty-one; and that the nine Governors between the minimum of twelve and the maximum of twenty-one would be appointed by the original or basic twelve and also be self-perpetuating.34

Thus, the National Review Board adopted a position supporting a largely self-electing autonomous governing Board. (The different expressions—self-electing, self-perpetuating, self-regenerating—point to the sensitivity of the point at issue. The expression "self-perpetuating" was seen by some to be too self-serving with people voting for their own continued membership on the board. No commonly agreed upon, neutral phrase came into use.)

In regard to the potential international members on the Board, the National Review Board passed a resolution:

... recommending that the Board of Governors consider adopting a standing policy resolution which would include recognition of an identifiable American interest of the Board of Governors while including the intent of internationalization.35

The Board of Regents and the University administration generally favored a largely appointed Board in order to maintain clear lines of accountability to the State and Federal governments. As the incorporation Bill was being finalized in early 1975, President Matsuda indicated to the Board that:

The composition of the Board of Governors has been amended in accordance with the directions provided by the Board of Regents. Amendments have been prepared to: (a) Provide that the Governor and the Secretary of State shall appoint three (3) members each rather than two (2) each (in addition to the Governor or his designee being ex officio members); (b) Provide that the maximum membership on the Board shall be fifteen (15) members, rather than twenty-one (21).36
With this suggested revision, the majority of the fifteen member Board (two ex officio and six appointed) would be directly accountable to the State and Federal governments.

The Bill submitted to the State Legislature on March 7, 1974, represented a compromise between the State Department/National Review Board position and the University of Hawaii position specifying a Board which would include “not less than twelve and not more than nineteen voting members” composed of the Governor (or his designee), the Assistant Secretary of State (or his designee), two members appointed by the Governor, two members appointed by the Secretary of State, and the remainder elected by the Board. Thus, the Board would include a majority of self-electing members if the total number of Board members was greater than the minimum membership of twelve.

However, during the review of the Bill by the House Higher Education Committee, significant changes in the Board composition were made in the direction of assuring greater accountability to the State and Federal governments. The House version specified a Board with a maximum of thirteen voting members including the Governor (or his designee), the Assistant Secretary of State (or his designee), the President of the University of Hawaii, five members who are residents of the State of Hawaii appointed by the Governor, and five members appointed by the Secretary of State. This arrangement eliminated all self-electing members and insured a Board with a majority of members from the State of Hawaii.

The House-Senate Conference Committee meeting on April 8 was a latenight into the early morning affair. The composition of the Board was revised so that the Board of Governors would consist of eighteen members including three ex officio members (the State Governor, the Assistant Secretary of State for Educational and Cultural Affairs, and the President of the University of Hawaii (non-voting)); five members appointed by the State Governor, five members appointed by the Secretary of State; and five governors elected by the members of the Board. This final composition represented a reasonable compromise providing adequate representation and accountability to the State of Hawaii and the Nation, five autonomous self-electing members, and the potential (now realized) for including non-American international members on the Board.

Within the legislation the Board was also given certain specific powers such as suing and being sued, adopting and amending by-laws, acquiring property, appointing officers and employees, entering into collective bargaining agreements, and generally carrying out the kind of activities that most governing boards perform. Through the establishment of this Board, the Center gained greater legal, institutional, national, and international identity.

The second great issue, and the one that delayed to the last possible minute the presentation of the incorporation Bill to the Legislature, revolved around land and buildings. It was initially anticipated that discussions between the Department of State and the University on this matter would be completed expeditiously and the Bill for an Act could be submitted to the legislature by mid-January at the beginning of its session. Unfortunately, “the best laid plans of mice and men...” In Hawaii, we are all aware of the value of land. This issue is especially acute on the Manoa campus where the University and the Center share a comparatively small area of land with definite limitations on the potential increase of acreage. Therefore, it was understandable that this issue created a good deal of concern.

It had been stressed by the early planners in Washington that the Center, even if it were under the University of Hawaii umbrella, still required a good deal of autonomy, including its own plot of land. This question of land was deemed to be of particular importance because, given the unique separation of powers between the Federal and State governments in the United States, problems would arise if Federal buildings were built on State-owned land. The federal Interagency Team which prepared the basic report for the Department of State on the feasibility of establishing an East-West Center, “urged the University to agree to deed to the Center the land which has been designated for the use of the Center.” In a status report prepared for Senator Johnson in March 1960 as the bill to establish the Center was being drafted, Bill Gibbons recommended “deeding of land for the Center by the University.”
However, the Center was never given title to the land on which its Federally-funded buildings were constructed; title to the buildings was vested in the University of Hawaii, and unfortunately numerous problems and misunderstandings arose over this matter in subsequent years.

The situation was complicated by the rapidly rising construction costs in Hawaii in 1973. Further, the people in the Department of State realized that they would have to be able to assure the Congress that the national interest had been adequately protected, and the University had to assure the Legislature that it was meeting its obligations and properly safeguarding the interests of the State and University.

The problem of the land centered on the twenty-one acres first mentioned in the early negotiations between the University and the federal government in 1960, and again referred to in the 1972 agreement. In the latter, a specific metes and bounds survey had been called for but had never been carried out and therefore the exact location of the entire twenty-one acres as well as the legal status of this land remained unclear.

As the final round of discussions between the Department of State and the University began in January, 1975, President Matsuda recommended to the Board of Regents that “in view of the uncertainty regarding part of the twenty-one acres ‘designated’ for East-West Center purposes, all references to ‘twenty-one acres’ should be deleted” and it should be made clear that “no conveyance of an interest [in the land] to the United States Government” was ever made. He concluded that “the matter on land and facilities requires negotiation with the Department of State.” Eventually, it was agreed that the designated use of the twenty-one acres for East-West Center purposes spelled out in the existing Grant-in-Aid Agreement would be continued after incorporation so long as the purposes of the Center did not become “incompatible with the educational purposes of the University” in which case the University “is entitled to the release of the encumbrance on the aforesaid 21-acre area of land.” It was also agreed that a specific metes and bounds survey would finally be made by the University.

It was during these discussions that it became clear to me that I was no longer the juggler and the momentum of the process had passed on to others and the “will of the gods.” For good and proper reasons, I felt that the Center administration should not get involved in the ensuing discussions. If I sat on the side of the Department of State, I would be sitting across from my employers (the University of Hawaii). If I sat on the side of the University of Hawaii, I would be sitting across from the source of our funds (the Department of State).

Buildings received even more attention during these discussions. Although the details are complex, basically the issue involved providing the Center with comparable space for the three buildings which were originally built with federal funds for the Center but were controlled and used by the University for general classrooms and departmental purposes. The State Legislature had appropriated $8.1 million to construct a program building for the Center to settle this matter as a result of the 1972 Memorandum of Understanding referred to earlier. Unfortunately, during 1974 construction costs were rising fast and we were informed by the experts that the funds appropriated would not be sufficient to construct a building equivalent in space to the three buildings. The Department of State insisted that the national interest and Congressional concern demanded that equivalency be achieved. Therefore, various alternatives were explored including requesting additional funds from the State Legislature, providing space and buildings on the adjoining St. Francis High School property, or providing certain University dorms to the Center to make up for the lack of equivalent space in the proposed program building.

The resolution of this issue took a great deal of time and the deadline for submitting new bills to the State Legislature was fast approaching. Finally, after some late night sessions during the first week of March, the parties reached a compromise agreement which called for turning over two University dormitories to the East-West Center, thus necessitating the movement of the present residents to other dorm space.

The Board of Regents met on Friday, March 7, the last day for submission of new bills to the new legislature, and formally approved the final package which was immediately hand-
carried to the Governor's Office for distribution to the Legislature in order to meet the deadline.

The initial reaction of several key members of the Legislature was puzzlement and in some instances anger. They wondered why the Bill had not been submitted earlier? Some felt that the Bill was being jammed down their throats; most simply wanted to find out what the Bill was all about. President Matsuda had predicted such a reception at the September 30 National Review Board meeting when he noted that "The Legislature finds it very uncomfortable to deal with a problem that comes up in the middle of a session. Certainly we will have to have a bill ready by, oh, say the middle of January, at the latest."142

The first public hearing on the Bill was held on March 10 and my scenario for the event—one of calm rational discussion—failed to take place. When I entered the room I found it jammed to the wall with University students waving signs about being evicted from their dormitories. The hearing was largely devoted to student testimony, including one tearful lass from Maui, protesting the arbitrary and unilateral eviction from their dormitories. This testimony was coordinated with phone calls from incensed taxpaying parents to their representatives. In addition, the hearing included charges of State Department and Federal pressure on the State of Hawaii; the early departure of certain legislators in a show of protest; and generally a lack of full attention to the basic issue of incorporation.

Over the next few days, largely as a result of the dormitory issue, there were certain statements emanating from the Legislature that the incorporation Bill was either already dead, or at least being prepared for an early burial as headlines of "Death of EWC Bill Predicted" (Advertiser, March 11, 1975) and "EWC Bill Heads for the Shelf" (Star-Bulletin, March 12, 1975) appeared in the local newspapers.

However, an effort was immediately launched by representatives of the University, the State Department, and my office to resolve the dormitory issue and to educate the Legislature about the contents and significance of the Bill. In addition, the Friends of the East-West Center provided strong support for the Bill during this period. Many of us were extremely naive regarding the ins and outs of the State Legislature, but we learned a lot in short order.

One of the most heartening occurrences at this time was the way our staff, on their own initiative, rallied to the cause of incorporation. Although many of them had doubts and uncertainties as to exactly how incorporation was going to affect their own careers, they organized themselves into a powerful and very effective force, from maintenance men to academic researchers. One story that made the rounds was that a secretary and a maintenance man were instrumental in convincing certain members of the House to give the Bill a chance to survive by scheduling an additional hearing. The staff carefully maintained a clear line of separating their efforts from the Center administration's to insure that charges would not be made that this effort was orchestrated by me. Of course, charges of administrative coercion and threats were made in any case.

The next crucial event was the Senate Higher Education Committee meeting on March 12. The only chance to keep the Bill alive was for the Senate to pass the Bill, thus allowing the House to consider the Senate version. As the Committee meeting began, I recall seeing one Senator look at another as if seeking advice, and seeing the other Senator give a thumbs-up sign. I had no idea if that really meant what I thought it meant, but it gave me a bit of hope. My concern at this point was not so much that the Bill would not pass, but that it should at least be given a fair hearing by the Legislature. If the Bill did not receive such a hearing, people in the Congress and the Executive Branch in Washington would have difficulty understanding whether the Center was indeed a joint Federal-State enterprise and whether or not the State of Hawaii considered the Center to be a worthwhile enterprise.

Fortunately, two factors helped to sway the vote in our favor. First, many people, including the University administrators and Regents, community leaders who are members of the Friends of the Center, and legislators were in general agreement with the concept of incorporation. The Hawaii Congressional delegation, including Hiram Fong, Daniel Inouye, and Sparky Matsunaga were strong supporters. In fact, just prior to the Committee meeting Matsunaga phoned Senator Takitani, the chair-
man of the Higher Education Committee, stressing that “incorporation will make things much better as far as funding goes because the State Department is very interested in this incorporation . . . it is very important that something be done to keep the bill alive.” A copy of his recorded statement was distributed to the Committee during the course of the meeting.

The second development was that the State Department and the University, realizing that the dormitory issue had raised a highly emotional red herring which had the clear potential of killing the entire Bill, had worked out another last minute compromise whereby the Center would be given more flexibility in the use of the State funds for the new building. It was expected that by providing the flexible use of the funds and by redesigning the building, equivalent space could be provided in the new building. This new agreement specified that “The proposal involving Hale Laulima and Hale Kahawai [the two University dormitories] is abandoned” and the total amount of funds appropriated for the Center’s program building “shall be available for use and expenditure at the sole direction of the East-West Center . . .” Therefore, the transfer of the two dormitories would be unnecessary. The Senate Committee welcomed this agreement and added one section to the Bill to protect the interest of the students which stated that “The University of Hawaii shall not transfer any interest in any University of Hawaii dormitory to the corporation . . . for a period of three years from the effective date of this act.”

However, land and buildings remained an issue when the Bill was reviewed by the House Committee on Higher Education. The House voted out several additional amendments designed to maintain University and State control over the Center’s land and buildings. Section 14 stated that “No residential dormitory space, except that certain dormitory building identified as Hale Manoa, shall be made available to the corporation . . .” This section appeared to remove Hale Kuahine (the Center’s women’s dormitory which had been built with federal funds and utilized by the Center since its completion in 1963) from Center control. Section 15 stated that “No lands within the University of Hawaii Manoa campus shall be made available by the university to corporation without approval by a majority vote of each house of the legislature in joint session.” This indicated that the continuation of the perpetual use rights for the twenty one acres which had already been agreed to by the University and the State Department, would now require majority vote approval by both houses of the legislature.

Finally, Section 16 stated that “any development and construction of improvements for a new East-West Center program building on University of Hawaii Manoa campus by the corporation shall be subject to prior approval by the university.” This section insured that the University would have approval and veto authority over the construction of the Center’s new program building.

As a result of the House-Senate Conference Committee meeting on April 10, the House provisions were modified. The section on dormitory space was changed so that Hale Kuahine would continue to be utilized by the Center, but only as a residential dormitory. The section on land was changed so that the perpetual use rights to the twenty one acres of land would not require legislative approval. However, the granting of any additional interests in land by the University to the corporation would require legislative approval. The section on the new program building was expanded to require University approval on any subsequent construction within the Center’s twenty-one acres. These final revisions generally provided the Center with the same rights to its land and buildings which existed prior to incorporation.

In summary, incorporation helped somewhat to clarify the land and building issue, largely by requiring a specific metes and bounds survey of the twenty-one acres. However, the ownership of the land and the legal title to the East-West Center buildings continues to reside in the University.

The third major issue to surface revolved around the granting of degrees and the number of grants to be given to students seeking degrees at the University of Hawaii. This issue goes back to the beginnings of the Center. The law specifically states that

“the Secretary of State shall provide for the establishment and operation . . . of an educational institution,” and also for “grants, fellowships and
other payments to outstanding scholars . . . to attract such scholars to the Center” (italics added) and “grants, scholarships, and other payments to qualified students . . . to enable such students to engage in study of training at the Center.” (italics added)

My frequent visits to Washington convinced me that most congressmen thought they had established an educational institution with its own educational staff and programs. References were made in their speech, especially the use of phrases like “your college” or “your faculty.”

Here in Hawaii the Center was seen as part of the University of Hawaii which supplied the educational programs, or part of the State of Hawaii whose agencies supplied the training programs. The Center had become a middle man, taking care of the financial and logistic arrangements.

With the introduction of problem-oriented programs the situation began to change. The document called, “Search for Understanding,” presented by me to a combined meeting of the Board of Regents and the National Review Board points out how the Center had been deprived of developing its unique educational identity. It pointed out how the Gray Book, developed by certain people in the University, had stated in part:

While high academic standards are imperative, the Center has been planned to examine and utilize non-traditional or unusual as well as traditional educational methods and techniques in carrying out its objectives. It has been conceived in relation to and based upon the sound academic structure of the University, but not bound by forms inappropriate to its purposes.

However, a group of consultants came early in the life of the Center and recommended that

the Institute of American Studies, Asian Studies, Overseas Operations Programs, Foreign Student Advisor Program and English Language Institute should be carried out by the university. . . . [However] disbanding the international College does not eliminate the need for the functions it performs.

These actions had the following results:

a) The decision to put all academic programs under the University rendered the Center unable to experiment with and utilize new and unusual methods of instruction, thus lowering its potential for academic innovation.

b) The structure of the Center, instead of being organized around academic programs, focussed on categories of people (students, trainees, scholars) and types of functions (selection, awarding of grants, advising, etc.).

The Regents and the National Review Board approved the recommendation of the “Search for Understanding” document to develop problem-oriented programs into the Center and appointed its writer the Chancellor. In 1970 the Center was reorganized programmatically after a great deal of opposition by some of the staff of both the East-West Center and the University of Hawaii. The major issues revolved around the Center developing its own educational programs with “pretentions to research” and increasing our budget for scholars and trainees. Before 1970 approximately 16% of the Center grant money was spent on students seeking degrees at the University, about 12% on scholars (then called specialists) and another 12% on trainees. A policy was established to hold funds for student scholarships where they were and increase funds for other participants so that ultimately about 50% of our grant funds would be spent on students and the other 50% on scholars and trainees combined. This policy has been interpreted as a slight to the degree-seeking student and to University programs by certain faculty at the University and by some of the East-West Center grantees.

Furthermore, the Center began developing an academic staff.

During the incorporation process, a concerted lobbying effort was made by a small group of degree students from the Center’s Student Association who expressed concern that the incorporation act might result in a drastic phasing down or out of degree student grantees at the Center. They had presented their eight points of concern to me, President Matsuda, Governor Ariyoshi, and the Department of State, but were not satisfied with the responses received, especially when none of us was willing to sit down at the bargaining table and “broker” with them as they insisted was their right. Consequently, their approach to the Legislature was devoted to either building their eight points into the Bill, or if this could not be
accomplished, postponing the enactment of the Bill.

The Manoa Faculty Senate also took up the problem of the number of degree students. In a resolution adopted on December 4, 1974, they say:

Financial Support for Graduate Degree Candidates at the University. Any legislation establishing the Center as an "autonomous entity" should include provisions for a fixed minimum level of financial support for graduate students at the University, in recognition of the fact that over the course of 14 years the University has incurred academic obligations for the education of students brought here by the Center.

The degree-granting problem was a major issue on the Manoa Campus itself but did not surface to any great degree at the Legislature. Some faculty seemed deeply concerned with the possibility of the Center granting degrees while others, including President Matsuda, were much less concerned. Some even stated that they thought a bit of competition would be a good thing.

Neither issue was included in the articles of incorporation but both appear in the contract between the Board of Governors and the Board of Regents.

2. East-West Center Participants; Reimbursement for Enrollments.

(a) East-West Center degree participants seeking academic degrees from the University shall continue to enroll in credit programs at the University under arrangements in existence prior to the establishment of the Corporation, except as modified by this Agreement or otherwise. The annual enrollment of such degree-seeking participants during the five-year period beginning with the academic year 1979-1980 shall be not less than the number of such participants designated below for each of the following academic years:

(1) 1975-76: 330 such participants; 
(2) 1976-77: 275 such participants; 
(3) 1977-78: 280 such participants; 
(4) 1978-79: 297 such participants; 
(5) 1979-80: 338 such participants; 
provided, however, that the aforesaid minimum number of participants for each and every of the aforesaid academic years shall be expressly subject to the receipt by the Corporation of sufficient appropriations from the Congress. If such appropriations are not sufficient to provide for the establishment of either one or both of the two new program institutes currently projected to be established in academic years 1977-78 and 1978-79 respectively, then the aforesaid minimum number(s) of such participants for such academic year(s) involved shall be reviewed by the Board of Governors and the Board of Regents. The Board of Governors and the Board of Regents shall review the minimum annual enrollment of such participants for the academic year 1980-81 and thereafter.

3. Awarding of Degrees.

(a) The Board of Governors shall not grant or award any academic degrees. The parties shall continue unchanged the arrangement existing prior to the establishment of the Corporation whereby the Board of Regents shall award academic degrees to such participants upon the successful completion of their academic programs, and the Board of Governors shall concurrently award a special certificate from the East-West Center. This subparagraph (a) shall not be amended or modified in any way whatsoever during the term of this Agreement except by the express written agreement of the parties.

The final issue revolved around the issue of federal, especially State Department, involvement in the purposes, programs, and policies of the East-West Center. As mentioned earlier, this problem also began with the Center’s inception. One of the reasons for placing the Center under the University of Hawaii was to protect it from such influences.

Actually, the East-West Center, having been established by Congress, is an experiment in whether or not the American federal government can establish an educational institution and make it go. In the last paper presented to the Social Science Association entitled, “Federal Involvement in Higher Education, the Case of the East-West Center,” I traced his-
torically the idea of a national university in the United States. Briefly, George Washington wanted one to train young people to run the new government and develop the huge continent on which the American colonies found themselves. His four successors, all founders of the country, also wanted such an institution. Across history, although various people attempted to establish a national university, none was successful in the attempt. The only institutions of higher learning run directly by the government are the military academies. Howard University and Gallaudet School for the Blind are supported by Congress but have their own independent boards. So the Center is part of an experiment which raises the question whether or not it is good public policy to have a national educational institution. If it succeeds, it will have proved a point.

However, many people are fearful, and given the recent disclosures of the activities of some parts of our government, it behooves all of us to maintain a constant watch. The issue was referred to on several occasions, the most notable being the following:

First, at the June 21, 1974, meeting of the National Review Board, Assistant Secretary Richardson pointed out that

The Center, it seems to me, must continue to move toward an increasing capacity to determine itself how it shall respond to the rapidly changing climate and reality of its international environment. It is a healthy trend, it seems to me, for the Center to increasingly be able to, through appropriate institutional arrangements, manage its own affairs. I would have no hesitancy in saying the word "autonomy" is a good word, provided it applies to autonomy from the State Department as well as autonomy from the State of Hawaii and the Regents of the University.

If one has to think of "autonomy from," I would couple the two together. Really, what we are all talking about is "autonomy for," however. We are talking about autonomy for the purpose of carrying out a mission—which is, if properly carried out, in the interest of all of the parties who are represented at this table and who are represented on the Ad Hoc Committee.

Sensitivity to the issue is thus evidenced inside the government as well as outside.

Second, during the Legislative hearing one House Committee member, Representative Neil Abercrombie, iterated and reiterated that this Bill represented an attempt by the Department of State to gain control of the East-West Center. He stated that the Center "is going to be run by the State Department, no doubt about it . . . This bill is just window dressing." He had noted earlier that the legislature had not had adequate time to review the Bill "to see that proper safeguards are assured, such as prevention of federal spying on foreign countries represented in the proposed corporation." At a March 20 hearing he claimed that participants "would be subject to the whims of the secretary of state" and persons selected to study at the Center would be chosen for "political acceptability." When the House passed the Bill on April 3 with only one dissenting vote, Representative Neil Abercrombie stated that although several new safeguards were added, "the U.S. State Department will try to subvert this document, subvert this Bill . . . to its own end."

Third, the safeguards to which he referred appear in two places in Act 82, the articles of incorporation. The first is in Section 4. Establishment of the Center for Cultural and Technical Interchange Between East and West, Inc., where it states in part:

There is created an educational non-profit public corporation to be known as the Center. . . . The corporation shall be devoted to the educational purposes of this Act and shall not be used to conduct non-educational foreign policy goals of the United States or any other governments.

Later in the document in Section 9. Academic Freedom the following is stated:

The corporation shall uphold and preserve academic freedom in all of the programs and activities of the East-West Center. The corporation shall adopt a policy statement on academic freedom which shall extend to all programs and activities and all participants and staff of the East-West Center. The corporation shall neither conduct nor support any classified activity or research and it shall make the results of its activities and research available to the public.

One of the last items requiring resolution had been this section on academic freedom. Everyone agreed that such a statement was important, especially now that the Center would be removed from the University’s academic
umbrella. The problem revolved around the House version which added a statement that

The corporation shall adopt a policy statement on academic freedom, the standards of which shall be in conformance with the standards of academic freedom as negotiated by the board of regents with the faculty of the University of Hawaii except that all research authorized by the corporation shall be made available to the public.

The difficulty with this addition was that it tied East-West Center policy on academic freedom to the statement of another institution. Not only did it not allow for any consideration of the uniqueness of the Center but also broke the academic tradition of granting each educational institution the right to formulate its own statement. When I was asked by a Senate member for my opinion, I stressed that we were all in favor of a strong statement on academic freedom and perhaps we could solve the problem by using that portion of the Center's existing policy statement on academic freedom which had originally been submitted to the legislature rather than the House version. This was acceptable to the Conference Committee, and so the final statement on academic freedom reinstated the final sentence. With this final issue resolved, the Conference Committee reached final agreement on the Bill and adjourned at 2:30 a.m.

The final compromise Bill was reported out and passed both Houses on April 11 with only one dissenting vote, that of Representative Neil Abercrombie. Governor Ariyoshi signed the Bill on May 14, 1975, the fifteenth anniversary of President Eisenhower's signing of the original enabling legislation, and on July 1, 1975 the Board of Governors of the non-profit public educational corporation met to begin operating the East-West Center. The corporation was born after a two year gestation period.

Significance

The establishment of the corporation by the Hawaii State Legislature was a very significant act not only for the future of the Center but also for the environment in which it exists. The exact significance is still unclear, because the Center is still not quite a year old. We are something like a young person graduating from college who doesn't know the exact significance of graduation but knows that he now has greater potential. The same is true for the East-West Center. The Center is an experiment in international education and its ultimate form, features, and qualities are unclear because its environment cannot be predicted. My hope is that the Center will always be true to its goals and responsive to its environment. In assessing the significance of incorporation, therefore, we must keep in mind the legislation that established the Center, the concept of the Center as an institution with its various identities, and then look at the environment in which it is located. It is possible that these reflections may sound grandiose, but I am reflecting my belief in the ultimate potential of the East-West Center.

First, the Articles of Incorporation enacted by the Legislature of the State of Hawaii establishing an educational non-profit corporation to operate the Center, not only contain language relating to the major concerns but also to the geographical area the Center serves. The original legislation refers to better relations and understanding between the United States and countries of Asia and the Pacific. The present legislation states in Section 5, Purpose of the corporation

(b) To promote among the nations of the East and the West the use of the Center by qualified persons for cooperative study, training and research in matters of East-West significance, and thus lead to better relations and understanding as to such matters.

This provision provides the Center with the means to move beyond bilateral relations between the United States and other countries into the multilateral relationships among any of the nations East and West.

Second, incorporation has provided the Center with a greater institutional identity. Certainly the problem of being accountable to two masters is gone. This past year has been devoted to that adjustment. No one has second guesses to our decisions. The result is that in a sense we are now standing out in the public as it were, naked, without the protection of the University of Hawaii, but on the other hand we are now better recognized as an institution in our own right. The Board of Governors has provided
the Center with a greater national and international identity, a definite legal identity, and a growing institutional identity. The building now being built due to the process we have come through is a program facility which should enhance our educational identity and, with the metes and bounds of the land dedicated for our use in perpetuity, our physical identity. Of course, those concerned with the Center are still struggling with exactly what its identity is. The Center is still often mistakenly perceived in the light of existing institutions such as: (a) a graduate school within a large university where research, education, and service go on in a rather loosely organized fashion; (b) a research institute in which either pure or applied research, often externally contracted for, is carried out as in the Stanford Research Institute or the Brookings Institution, and which is organized more formally than a university, possibly along the lines of business; (c) a continuing education program, in which people who have been on the job for several years need to be updated in their professional knowledge and skills; (d) an international house such as exists on the campuses of several of our large universities and which are set up to house and generally care for and feed international students; (e) a technical assistance agency attempting to promote the economic and social development of the lesser developed countries; (f) an institute for advanced studies such as the one at Princeton, generally in the natural sciences, and at Stanford in the behavioral sciences; (g) an exchange of persons program.

In a sense the East-West Center is part of each of these but is not any one of them. As I see it, we have been and are an educational institution established by the Congress of the United States, governed by a corporation set up by the State of Hawaii, with an international Board and international financing for the purpose of promoting international understanding. Incorporation has increased the possibility of such a complex organization better attaining its goals because it now has its own character and identity.

Third, the Center is also an experiment in international education, as an international institution of higher learning. As mentioned above, we were established by Congress and our charter is from the State of Hawaii. However, we now have an international Board, we are attempting to get international financing, have begun developing an international staff, and, of course, have always had international participants.

The significance of all this lies in the fact that the Center is attempting to carry out its mandate to promote better relations and understanding East and West by building into all the dimensions of the structure of the Center—its programs, staff, financing, and governance—the very elements of our purposes. In this way the Center is attempting not merely to admonish people in classrooms to cooperate and understand each other, but to express this basic principle in all its institutional behavior. Thus, the structure of the entire Center is an attempt to become in itself an expression of what its mandate is to promote.

However, we are not an international institution either in the sense of the United Nations organizations, or the United Nations University. One of the questions which many people are trying to face as we move down the road toward one world is what kind of international institution, especially educational institution, will best move us toward such a goal. Is it better for nations to give money for endowment to a third "neutral" group as in the case of the United Nations University or may it work out better, in fact be a deeper kind of internationalism, for nations to give money to other nations for mutual international benefit. Internationalism has a very thin cultural and psychological base. My experience as Vice President of the International Christian University in Japan was that when intense stress came on the institution, such as during times of student strikes and the shut down of the university, it was necessary to revert to a more monocultural stance in order to solve that problem. We didn't have the psychological base, enough common cultural ways of thinking, feeling, and behaving, to handle those emotional problems. In other words, what I am saying is that the differences in government and financial support between the United Nations University and the East-West Center are important. I hope both institutions succeed. Without stress more than likely both will. Under intense stress, the question
will be raised. With incorporation the EastWest Center has an enhanced probability of succeeding.

Fourth, as stated above, the purpose of the East-West Center is to promote better relations and understanding East and West. At the same time, it is an educational institution. The question raised, therefore, is whether or not an institution of higher learning can have more than one goal, can have more than openness as a goal. In the past some of our earlier colleges had not only an educational but also a religious goal, or the goal of training cultured ladies and gentlemen. The modern multiversity certainly has moved away from such purpose. To meet the goals of the Center, however, the question must be asked not only whether the research, education, and service is interesting and of quality, but also whether it promotes good human relations and understanding? The Center’s administration is often challenged by its younger scholars who think that we do not believe in academic freedom since we constantly raise the question of the style of their research and, at times, even the content. The question must be asked in the East-West Center whether one person from one country working on one thing all by himself is promoting understanding and good relations. He may be. But the connection usually is indistinct. Furthermore, working internationally takes more time and effort to communicate in the process of designing and implementing programs, and staff often feel, therefore, that the institution is retarding the amount or lowering the quality of their work. Thus, the test whether the “so-what” question can legitimately be raised in the process of the discovery, testing and dissemination of knowledge is constantly being raised. In other words, can an educational institution be interested not only in what knowledge is produced but also in how the knowledge is produced and what the significance is and still be an excellent educational institution. Moving out from under the University of Hawaii umbrella will provide the opportunity to test this proposition.

Fifth, having pulled out from under the University structure, we can more easily explore and experiment with different ways of acquiring and handling knowledge. We can ask our own questions, set our own goals, evaluate our programs on their own merits. We are experimenting with the question of whether or not research and development can be a mode for educational work. Can there be learning without a lot of teaching? Can cooperative rather than competitive learning be developed? In most universities, where credits and grades are given, a great deal of the motivation for learning comes from competition among students, especially in the United States where competition is engendered from childhood. Because we are experimenting with these different ways of learning we are having to develop a new reward system unlike the reward system in the university where emphasis is placed upon research and teaching. We also emphasize research, but attempt to use it as a learning process thus placing less emphasis on teaching, at least in the traditional way. The two factors basically motivating us to move in this direction are the fact that we are no longer under the University and therefore people are not as influenced by the usual university model and the fact that in the promotion of understanding and good relations, cooperation is necessary.

Sixth, most institutions of higher learning are organized on the assumption that specialization is desirable, natural, and necessary. In fact, some would add that it is sacred. Certainly, specialization has provided us with a great deal of insight into the nature of the world around us. However, Buckminster Fuller constantly reminds us that all or most cases of biological extinction were caused by overspecialization. Of all the social cross currents pushing us in its direction, the strongest is the traditional academic one which dotes on specialization. Although specialization has merits and specialists are needed for different tasks, the world also needs people who can see the situation as a whole. Some educational institutions must take up the task of training such people and to do so they must be free from traditional academia. Being a free standing institution, the East-West Center can experiment with ways in which we can push back toward a kind of comprehensiveness needed to overcome the isolation and meaninglessness of the individual life, and the international and ideological discord which has led to conflict and violence.
Seventh. the Center is organized around problems. This problem-orientation is distinct from most universities and institutions of higher learning which are in general organized around disciplines. Certainly, discipline-orientation is a legitimate way to break up reality and organize people for the production and dissemination of knowledge. However, it is not the only way. If the Center succeeds in its problem-orientation, it will have provided evidence that institutions of higher learning can be based upon different organizational schemes and have a variety of styles of learning which should provide greater relevance to the academic process.

But in a broader scheme of reference incorporation provides the flexibility and autonomy required for the Center to define the problems it wishes to tackle in the context of the world situation. The East-West Center must relate to the world and problem-orientation provides the mechanism to relate it to the global scene. Events which were once thought to be local or domestic are now perceived to be interrelated with other events in other parts of the world. People are gradually becoming aware that we are all interdependent. On the national scene, therefore, incorporation gives the Center a greater role in defining the American involvement in international affairs and to express the interdependence of all nations. In both its national and international capacities the Center has the potential of building into the traditional exchange-of-persons programs sterner stuff than providing bailiwicks for each other's visiting firemen.

Eighth. Incorporation also has significance for the University of Hawaii. During the process of moving toward incorporation the faculty of the University expressed many concerns; the reduction of the number of degree seeking students, the competition for funds, the continuation of joint appointments and the possibility of the East-West Center granting degrees and thus competing academically with the University. The number of grants to degree-seeking students has been assured for five years in the contract between the two institutions. So far, neither institution has been able to raise significant amounts of outside funds and where they have been successful, there has not been competition for the same funds. Joint appointments have continued. And the Center has agreed by contract not to grant degrees without first consulting the University. However, my perception is that the university community is now being forced to raise the question of its own role and responsibility for international education. When the Center was first started, it was conceived of as the international college of the University of Hawaii. Many faculty continued to think of it in those terms. Now that the Center is no longer part of the university, each institution will have to decide its international destiny. This emerging situation should provide both programmatic and relational health as the university faces the challenge of this new responsibility.

Ninth. Given the composition of the Board of Governors and assuming success in both international and domestic fund raising, the Center can add significantly to Hawaii's becoming known for its knowledge industry as well as an international meeting place. It may even be possible that the Center can play a greater role in helping in the formation of a real Pacific community with Hawaii as its hub. Certainly, the East-West Center, Inc. is an imaginatively unique venture in federal-state cooperation. If these concepts can be explored and then implemented across the years, incorporation may turn out to have been most significant for the State of Hawaii. The potential significance is there.

Tenth. It is impossible for me to speak with authority about the way Asians view the Center. However, the impression I gained from a recent month-long trip into Asia is that both autonomy and the international board have been highly appreciated. The significant change is the beginnings of a perception by Asians that the Center is ours, not only yours. Evidence for this can be seen in the fact that the Republic of China has granted the Center $100,000 this year, the Korean Government $30,000, and the Government of Fiji $5,000. The cabinet of the Government of Thailand has voted to make a grant to the Center, the amount not yet specified. High government leaders in other countries we visited responded positively to the idea of their participating in the Center's support so we are hopeful that more will join. The significance of incorporation from this Asian point of view is that the Center can demonstrate in a positive way how the nations and people East
and West should relate to each other—with equality, mutuality, and respect.

Conclusions

The East-West Center is a growing institution with great potential. Certainly incorporation has been a major step in its maturation process, possibly second in importance only to its establishment. It has not solved all the problems nor provided all the identity and autonomy needed for maturity. These come to mind:

1. Government intrusions. On the one hand we cannot separate the Center from the fact that it was created by the Congress of the United States and placed under the Department of State. The yearly budget goes through the entire process of any government agency. In raising external funds the question of prudence will enter. At what point will Congress say, “Good, now you are out on your own”? At the same time the Center is subjected to government audit. Although of itself a very natural and healthy exercise, government accountants have a way of pushing federally supported programs toward federal policies and procedures.

On the other hand, international financing raises certain questions. What strings will ultimately be attached to the money given? Will it be able to uphold its policies of equity despite source of funds? These and many more questions can be raised. The fact is that the Center no longer has the University as a security blanket and will need all the social support it can get.

2. Programmatic identity. The Center continues to give grants to students who seek degrees in academic programs over which it has no control or into which it has little or no input. Presently a lot of effort is going into trying to resolve this problem. It is presently being studied by an ad hoc committee in the Center. It will be the topic of discussion at the University/East-West Center Consultative Committee. Not only are there problems of student time, coordination of thinking on what is the best program for the student, and all the personal problems associated with the individual grantee, but also the problem of having the educational and programmatic identity of our educational institution be in the hands of another.

3. Land and buildings: Or what to do with success. Should the East-West Center grow in size beyond the present programs now envisaged through the 1980's, the whole question of space will emerge. How many more buildings can be built on that thirteen acre plot of relatively flat, usable space? Will some programs have to move off campus? Can the East-West Center build on the hill across the Manoa stream without getting into environmental problems? Are some of the present buildings expendable?

Given the new energy that is coming into the Center because of incorporation, these questions are bound to arise within the next decade or two.
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In 1972 I was invited to a conference on "Innovation in Higher Education" held at Yonsei University in Seoul, Korea. Once again I took this opportunity to write about the East-West Center because I felt that the Center exemplified the innovating process. Six years later the Chancellor of the Green Bay campus of the University of Wisconsin called and asked me to give the keynote speech at a world conference on innovative higher education. Since he at one time had been Vice Chancellor of the Institute for Advanced Projects at the East-West Center and possibly because he himself was trying to build problem orientation into the Green Bay campus, he asked me specifically to write about the East-West Center. I based my paper on the one given at Yonsei and I once again found myself writing more than I could deliver in the time allotted. I consider this paper to be the most extensive written view of what we are doing, or at least tried to do.
Contextual Innovation

I. INTRODUCTION

"Cheshire-Puss," she began, rather timidly. . . . "Would you tell me, please, which way I ought to go from here?"

"That depends a good deal on where you want to get to," said the Cat.

"I don't much care where . . ." said Alice.

"Then it doesn't matter which way you go," said the Cat.

"—so long as I get somewhere," Alice added as an explanation.

"Oh, you're sure to do that," said the Cat, "if you only walk long enough."

Alice felt that could not be denied. . . .

Lewis Carroll

Rene Dubos points out in Reason Awake that the Cat's answer is often quoted "to express the view that scientists do not know where knowledge is taking mankind, and furthermore they do not really care." (pp. 228–9) In Lewis Carroll's day, it was easier for scientists to be nonchalant about where they were going. Because they had more room to maneuver, less accumulated knowledge, more primitive forms of energy, and smaller populations, their findings had less impact on people and environment. But the human race is in a different situation today. In a book just off the press called The Twenty-Ninth Day, Lester Brown cited the French riddle about a lily pond:

A lily pond, so the riddle goes, contains a single leaf. Each day the number of leaves doubles—two leaves the second day, four the third, eight the fourth, and so on. "If the pond is full on the thirtieth day," the question goes, "at what point is it half full?" Answer: "On the twenty-ninth day." (p. 1)

Brown goes on to say that the earth is a global lily pond, already half full, and that with the next generation it will be the thirtieth day and the pond will be full. Other writers on energy, resources, environment, and food are making the same point.

In fact, this conference on Innovative Higher Education is based upon the proposition that we in higher education must innovate in order for modern civilization to arrive somewhere. We can no longer afford to be nonchalant about innovation.

Since I also have this concern, I am pleased to be here to share some ideas with you on innovation and higher education. In my paper, I will discuss first, innovation, second, the context for innovation in higher education, third, the development of the institution I head—the East-West Center, and finally, some specific problems and challenges related to innovative higher education.
II. INNOVATION

The reasonable man adapts himself to the
world;
The unreasonable one persists in trying to
adapt the world to himself.
Therefore all progress depends on the unreasonable
man.

George Bernard Shaw

Innovation is not new. Whenever progress
was made in the means of tilling the soil, produ-
cing automobiles, or conquering diseases—inno-
vation took place. Without innovation we
would still be living in caves, without fire, and
with a life expectancy of about thirty years. So
innovation has been with us for a long time.

Innovation is a somewhat slippery concept.
Because it is usually a very specific response to
certain circumstances, what is considered inno-
vative of one time or place may already be tradi-
tional in another. Innovation may take quite
different forms in a highly industrialized society
and in one that is less industrialized; in provin-
cial, state, national and international institu-
tions. An open, pluralistic society is likely to
produce more innovative variety than a closed
society. Since institutions do not all have the
same traditions, goals or means, an innova-
tion made without regard to context is likely to
be meaningless or unacceptable. Thus, in a
sense, people can only really talk about change
or innovation in their own institutions. How-
ever, there are enough similarities in people
and their institutions that an example of inno-
vation in one context can be enlightening in
spite of cultural, philosophical, or political dif-
fences. What have we learned about innova-
tion?

Innovation occurs more frequently in times
of crisis than in times of relative tranquility. If
most people in a society or institution are un-
happy about the same set of circumstances, or
if danger is plainly imminent, change may be
widely advocated and accepted. If the group
advocating innovation is small, change will be
more difficult.

Innovation requires an agent: someone takes
the initiative to alter the set of circumstances.
But one person cannot do it alone. He or she
needs help from the context and constituents.
Innovation itself is difficult and disruptive.

The innovators are discontented and their
suggested innovation implies criticism and will
have a cost for someone. Even if people agree
that change is necessary, they are bound to
disagree about its scope, direction, and process.

Innovation is not good in and of itself; in
fact, some innovations may be bad. The inven-
tion of the means to wage chemical warfare has
not really benefited mankind. Innovation must
be evaluated by its goals, the means used to at-
tain these goals, and especially by the results
of the innovation. “By their fruits you shall know
them” can be said as cogently about innovation
as about men and women of faith.

Innovation, although ethically neutral in it-
self, demands value judgments. Therefore, it is
based on an ethic—both of ends and means.
Because of its abstract character, theoretical
science is comparatively neutral, ethically.
Applied science is intrinsically ethical because it
affects people’s immediate lives. Innovation in
an established institution is a kind of applied
social science. Therefore, “Who gave you the
authority to change my life?” is a question that
an innovator will constantly be faced with.
Without a sound philosophy and a valid ethical
position, the innovator will not be able to keep
peace with his constituents, to say nothing of
himself. A good philosophy and ethic will help
the innovator keep ends and means more har-
omious.

Innovation challenges people’s views of the
world and their place in it. Everyone in every
culture desires meaning in life, and meaning
emerges from perceived connections or rela-
tionships—lines drawn between dots on paper
revealing geometric forms, the relation of kin-
ship or association with other people, or the
bonds of harmony or affinity one feels with
nature. Innovation must therefore pursue goals
and use means compatible with human nature
and feasible within social constraints. In many
ways, the most basic task of administration is
the search for, establishment, and maintenance
of human relationships. The administration of
innovation involves the establishment and
maintenance of new relationships. Because in-
novation changes relationships, it changes the
meaning in the lives of people—either increas-
ing or diminishing it, and almost certainly
changing its content. One of the profoundest
questions of development is whether, in attempting to improve the quality of life through technological innovation, the developers diminish the meaning of existence for some people.

Innovation, like any entrepreneurial undertaking, involves risks. Changing a system may weaken it. Changing relationships may destroy them. In fact, the revolution may devour the revolutionary. Thus, innovation has the risk of failure. But, equally important, innovation has the risk of success. Or it may produce mixed blessings. In the manufacture of automobiles, Henry Ford introduced the production line in order to produce more cars at less expense. He succeeded so well that most American families now have two cars, and some have more. But, the United States is now struggling under the impact of that “success”—with air pollution, loss of farm land to roads, the rapid consumption of petroleum products, and the meaninglessness of work on the production line. We tend to forget that human life has many dimensions and therefore humans never can do merely one thing. Lack of knowledge about or ignoring certain dimensions of reality may assure the failure of “success”! In fact, one of the most cogent questions an innovator must answer is, what do we do with success?

Innovation may consist of nothing more than doing better what the institution was established to do in the first place. But success in increasing quality may be accompanied by unfortunate results. The Peter Principle says that “In a hierarchy every employee tends to rise to his level of incompetence.” However, an organization that moves to increase the quality of its endeavor may bypass individuals, rendering them unfit or incompetent in the new situation. Marginal people experience special pressure. The captain of an athletic team may find himself on the bench with an influx of new and better players. Therefore, although innovation may be little more than doing things better, that better may be worse for some people.

Innovation occurs more readily in the material aspects of a society or culture than in its nonmaterial or spiritual aspects. It is relatively simple to add a piece of technology to a society; to change its system of mores is harder. Of course, a new piece of technology often produces unanticipated changes in the system of mores. Fertility control devices, for example, have radically changed sexual morality in the United States.

Innovation takes time. Anyone who wants to innovate must be able to set a new direction and then have the patience and tenacity to hang on. A few years ago I had lunch with the president of one of the best co-educational liberal arts colleges in the United States—one whose graduates are sought out by graduate schools. I asked him, “What’s the secret of your success?” He answered that he was not the person responsible for it. I asked, “Who was?” He replied, “My predecessor. He set high standards and hung on for eighteen years!” Almost a generation! A great scientist once remarked that one of the saddest things of his life was how slowly new ideas were accepted. He felt it took the dying away of at least a generation, after which young people grew up thinking things had always been the new way.

Anyone who wishes to innovate must have a keen sense of timing—of what the Greeks call the kairos, the critical period, the right time, the historical moment. This sense of timing is crucial to any attempt to innovate. The retirements of key people, a change in board leadership, pressure from supporters—in other words, changes in the context—must be used advantageously. In fact, the innovator with a sense of timing may find it difficult to assess his own actions; are they rationally wise or calculatingly opportunistic?

Innovation then is like life in nature: its success depends upon the health and vitality of the seed (the new idea), the ground into which it falls or is planted, the climate during its growth, and the nourishment and cultivation it gets. Innovation cannot be left in some dark, rocky corner of the garden. It can only flourish in a hospitable environment. Therefore, the conditions for innovation must be established and continually cultivated, and achievement must be rewarded. Without such supports, an innovation will wither and die.

For newness or innovation to become effective it must be habitualized. The older generation usually experiences rapid change in ways of thinking or acting as radical departures from the commonly accepted norms or habits. However, as an innovation is institutionalized, that is, as personal behaviors are routinized for cer-
tian purposes, young people (or, for that matter, newcomers arriving after changes have been made) accept the new ways as "standard operating procedure." As Berger and Luckmann put it, "The 'There we go again' now becomes 'this is how these things are done.' " (1967, p. 59) Men with new habits of thought and action are new men, who begin to see new elements and new relationships even when looking at familiar data. In a sense both "reality" and people have changed.

III. CONTEXT FOR INNOVATION IN HIGHER EDUCATION

Columbus would never have thought to sail westward had he not had an image of the round world.

Kenneth E. Boulding

A. Innovation

Innovation in higher education is a profound undertaking, for in essence it is an attempt to create new kinds of men and women. Evidently, our schools are not satisfying our societies; if they were, innovation would be regarded as little more than a harmless pastime of educators. But educators and public alike seem to share the conviction that schooling can influence the direction of people's lives and thoughts. One of the most fundamental changes in man's view of himself and the world is that he no longer feels himself just a helpless victim of "natural" forces. Although natural disasters like earthquakes, floods, and hurricanes are beyond his control, he has been able to lengthen his life through the conquest of disease and to shorten distance through technology. But more profoundly, he creates himself by changing his environment, forming new concepts, and dreaming new dreams. Man has the freedom to use his creative capacities to change his environment and, in turn, his environment changes him. A new institution or a new society creates new men. Henry Higgins in Bernard Shaw's Pygmalion places Liza in a new environment and gives her a new language; he not only passes her off as a person of high society, he actually creates a new person.

We could ask ourselves, therefore, what kind of world we want, what kind of men and women we want, and then try to set up educational institutions to produce such people. Up to a point, this is what most societies do. The difficulty comes when the decision is to produce loyal, supportive citizens who have skills to build the nation. In and of itself, this kind of goal is not bad, for modern man's primary identity is determined by his citizenship and therefore is based upon nationalism. This dynamic rise in nationalism has been especially evident in the period since the end of World War II during which some fifty or sixty new nations were formed or won their freedom from colonial domination. However, this nationalistic trend leading to fragmentation and overaggressiveness is in many ways in direct conflict with a simultaneous trend toward world awareness. This trend toward world consciousness is inevitable, necessary, and desirable.

Of course, there are organized approaches to innovation in experiments with open universities, continuing education for adults, area studies, and the use of audio-visual technology. Certainly many changes are being attempted. A few years ago Harlan Cleveland, then president of the University of Hawaii, reported on a meeting of the State Higher Education Executive Officers where "non-traditional" study was discussed. He reported that the Center for Research and Development in Higher Education at Berkeley had made a survey in which 600 non-traditional programs were identified. Some of the findings were the following: (1) Twothirds of the respondents were innovating with respect to students, location, and method, but not content. (2) Forty-three percent of all the "non-traditional" programs were serving from 25 to 150 students. Only six percent were serving more than 100 students. (3) Most of the programs did not involve cooperation with other institutions. (4) Traditional teaching methods were the norm in the "non-traditional" programs. But (5) there was a tendency to increase the amount of field work and work-study arrangements.

Although Cleveland reported other data, these will serve to indicate some recent developments in the United States. Innovation usually means a change in the who, what, when, where, or how of schooling. A change in the when or the where or possibly the who seems to be most common. To alter the what or the how seems more difficult. A piecemeal approach to
innovation is indicated by the small number of people involved in most new programs. Whether the scale reflects lack of enthusiasm or internal political considerations (Cleveland reported that the most frequently mentioned difficulty was faculty resistance), innovation, to be effective, must ultimately be total—not in the sense that everything must be new (an obvious impossibility), but that it must affect the whole of an institution. Small experimental programs usually die from isolation. Most institutions can tolerate a small innovation tacked on; few can survive fundamental reform without great trauma.

Not only must the whole of an institution be involved to support innovation and make it survive, but it is the whole of an institution that makes an impact upon the members and participants of that institution. If an institution is parochial and inward directed, it will tend to produce people with those characteristics. Of course, it is possible that a society, or one of its parts, might need such people so that its people set up institutions to produce them. My own bias is for people who are more cosmopolitan and outward looking. In fact the following perspectives are an attempt to draw with a broad brush the context within which higher education exists, decides on the kind of world it is trying to build, the sort of people it wishes to produce, and therefore the nature of the innovation it is willing to launch.

B. The Context

Higher education depends upon its relation to other social institutions, to perceptions of the world, and to ideas of knowledge and its acquisition. Each of these factors may prompt an attempt to innovate and at the same time impede its success. Let us take a look at these contexts.

Within the history of the West there were three social concepts embodied in three social institutions, all important to Western life today: Sacerdotium, Imperium, and Studium. In modern English we call them the church, the empire or state, and the school. The community of faith, the community of power, and the community of learning have always been in tension. There was a time in Europe when the community of faith, the church, was dominant, but in modern times the community of power holds sway. It represents the sovereignty of a nation, and through its school system it attempts to pass along the cultural and natural heritage. Nation states establish and support schools at all levels with a slogan like “Education for national development.” In this context, schools are not the dominating power even though some people still talk about the prophetic role of higher education. This critical role is occasionally taken up by students who demonstrate on behalf of change or revolution, but the call for revolution seldom gains a response. The societies are too resistant and the community of power too tenacious. After all, as Kenneth Galbraith has said, revolution is kicking in a rotten door.

Although most people see the lower echelons of schooling, now compulsory almost everywhere, as a place where children learn reading, writing, calculating, and other practical skills as well as their history and their duties as citizens, people in higher education see the university as a different sort of place entirely. In order to be a real institution of higher learning, it must be free from outside restraint and coercion. Scholars must have the freedom to search where they will, ask what they want, say and write what they think as responsible scholars committed to truth and freedom. Certainly, the human race has benefited from the uninhibited discovery, acquisition, testing, and dissemination of knowledge.

In their struggle for an identity and a role, universities have developed certain characteristics. Their research has no goal but openness. To protect themselves from outside interference, they have developed systems of tenure. In most cases they have tried to avoid permitting themselves to become the tool for the acquisition of either secular or sacred power. The only power in the community of learning has been the knowledge and truth which it attempts to discover and follow. Yet the university receives its support from and exists at the sufferance of the other two communities. When it has tried to invade the other communities, it has not fared well.

In the modern world this kind of ivory-tower existence is being challenged. Nuclear physics, human organ transplants, the green revolution, and many other scientific advances in knowledge have profound impact upon society and pose huge ethical problems.
society—one in which knowledge is carefully and systematically acquired and applied—knowledge is power, and those who discover and create knowledge hold power. Furthermore, because the amount of knowledge has become so great that no person can possibly acquire it all, knowledge communities are formed which are in fact communities of power. Imagine what might happen in the world if the scientists working on weaponry for either the United States or the Soviet Union would withhold their knowledge from their governments for a few years or a decade. The point is that knowledge is power, and much of that knowledge resides in universities. The community of power recognizes this fact, whether the universities do or not. As the trend continues, the relation between the community of learning and the community of power is bound to change.

As the relation of the university to the other communities changes, the opportunity for innovation increases. However, this innovation will take place in the relation of the university to the larger context and perceptions of the world. All educational institutions are guided by the law that establishes them and gives them a purpose, by a philosophy of education, by the social context to which they must be responsive to remain viable. As context and perceptions change, the institution should change. Let us take a brief look at a bit of the world context in which higher education exists and some perceptions of learning and values in academics.

First, the world has changed into a baffling multilateral place of multi-faceted problems. In the Middle Ages in Europe, the major problem was the individual’s relation to God. The task of the scholar was to fit all knowledge into that theological framework. Although criticized today as being un- or pre-scientific, that vertical interest provided a focus for the integration of knowledge and produced the Renaissance Man. After the Industrial Revolution, the problem seemed to be the competition for raw materials, which brought in the era of colonialism. Right after World War II, the major problem became the ideological battle called the Cold War and the development of nuclear armaments. However, as the post-war decades moved along, other problems began to dominate. Eighty million people are being added to the world every year. Hunger and malnutrition are rampant. Inflation-cum-recession—what some economists now call stagflation—is affecting the economies of all countries. Super affluence and rapid consumption threaten the world’s supply of resources. Pollution of the environment and overpopulation are threatening to destroy cities all over the world. No nation, religion, or ideology has a magic solution to these problems. We know that we must find solutions to these great problems rather than fight each other over nationalism or ideology.

Second, one of the reasons for the lack of solutions is that these problems are supranationally interrelated. The devaluation of the dollar or the rise in the price of fossil fuels affects all countries and all people. A world economy has emerged in which all countries are dependent on other countries to some extent. We know that countries are not equal in population, resources, or climate. Some countries are blessed with large resources of fossil fuel; others with fertile soil and benign climate; others have no assets to speak of. The call for a more equitable, more just economic order is heard on many sides, and our awareness of our interdependence has led us to a global outlook.

We are coming to recognize that our actions have consequences for other people. As Garret Hardin of the University of California put it: “We can never do merely one thing.” Every action has a chain of consequences. We spread DDT to exterminate the anopheles mosquito to get rid of malaria. The DDT runs into the rivers and the oceans, where the fish eat it. People who eat the fish develop a high level of DDT in their bodies. The Aswan Dam in Egypt was built for good purposes, but the consequences of building it have been catastrophic. The Nile River no longer overflows its banks; now the Egyptians have to use artificial fertilizer because the river no longer provides natural fertilizer. The number of sardines at the mouth of the river is reduced so that many fishermen have lost their jobs. Silt used to build up the alluvial plain at the mouth of the Nile, but now the Mediterranean storms are eating it away, and it is not being built up again—all because dams were built on the Nile for very good purposes. The wheat crop fails in Russia, the United States sells wheat to Russia, and the price of bread goes up for the Ameri-
can family. When an agency of the American
government places silk scarves on its list of
flammable goods which are not to be imported,
Chinese in Hong Kong lose their jobs and a
son studying in Japan has to quit school, go
home, and help support his family. Incidents
like these show the interrelatedness of our
actions.

Third, because of these interdependent prob-
lems, we have had to become more future-
oriented. We try to look into the future to fore-
cast demographic, economic, and political
trends. Such “knowledge” is important for the
man of action. In fact, as Bertrand de Jouvenal
says,

...the only “useful knowledge” we have relates
to the future. A man wishing to display his prac-
tical turn of mind readily says: “I am only in-
terested in facts,” although quite the opposite is
the case. If his aim is to get to New York, the
time at which a plane left yesterday is of small
concern to him; what interests him is the takeoff
time this evening (a futurum) ... . Our man lives
in a world of futura rather than a world of facta.
(p. 5)

In addition, people of action look at the conse-
quences of their decisions. Since the solution to
one problem may be the genesis of another,
whether a decision is good or not depends on
the quality of its results, not on the purity of our
motivations.

But it is not only the interdependence per se
that turns us to the future; the fact of the matter
is that the long-range view is needed to
solve our most intractable problems. By looking
farther into the future as we perceive trends
and set our goals, we will be more able to an-
ticipate the obstacles, focus our search for new
knowledge, preserving meaning in work, and
remaining resilient.

Fourth, modern societies are knowledge so-
cieties with knowledge industries paralleling the
agricultural industry and the manufacturing indus-
try. Modern societies have moved through labor-
capital-intensive industry toward
brain-intensive industry. Research, data pro-
cessing, information storage and retrieval, mass
schooling, mass communication, and the great
institutions of higher learning all deal in knowl-
dge. They are knowledge industries. Their
distinguishing feature is that knowledge is both
their input and their output, and the more
knowledge they use, the more of it there is.

Knowledge is coming to be thought of not
only as organized information (which is one
definition of science), but as applied informa-
tion. That is, information becomes knowledge
when people apply it to some task. In this
sense, societies are moving from manual tech-
nology toward intellectual technology, toward
 technique—the knowledge and ability to con-
trol how things work. This movement toward
 technique is criticized by some humanists who
consider it dehumanizing, making people into
machines. These humanists often forget that it
takes both technology and technique to produce
great art. For example, making musical instru-
ments requires technology; it takes technique to
conduct an orchestra through a Beethoven
symphony. Neither technique nor technology
can be dispensed with without destroying the
symphony and its aesthetic value.

So what we are seeing is a transition from
manual technology (used mainly in agriculture
and manufacturing) to intellectual technology.
This intellectual technology, the ability to
translate new knowledge and ideas into con-
crete form, is the dynamic of modern society.

“Knowledge” as normally considered by the
“intellectual” is something very different from
“knowledge” in the context of “knowledge econ-
omy” or “knowledge work.” For the intellectual,
knowledge is what is in a book. But as long as it
is in the book, it is only “information” if not mere
“data.” Only when a man applies the information
to do something does it become knowledge.

Knowledge, like electricity or money, is a form of
energy that exists only when doing work.
(Drucker, The Age of Discontinuity, 1969. p. 269)

Electricity becomes light when the switch is
snapped on. Information becomes knowledge
(enlightenment) in its use. In turn, distilled
knowledge is wisdom. In a knowledge society,
information is constantly being put to use, and
it is necessary to train people in its use.

In fact, knowledge utilization tends to create
new knowledge. One of the most dynamic
periods in the history of linguistic science in the
United States followed World War II, during
which linguists had been asked to apply their
knowledge to the teaching of languages. In
fact, some of the most rapid advances in knowl-
edge production occur during wars when knowledge utilization is at its most intense.

An essential ingredient in the transition to the knowledge society is good management, which is part of intellectual technology. The “green revolution” was accomplished by a combination of new food technology and this new intellectual technology (management)—the putting together of teams of people with differing knowledges and skills to accomplish the increased production of food. One theme of Jean-Jacques Servan-Schreiber’s book *The American Challenge* is that the reason American business is ahead of European business in Europe is American management practices. The European failure has been due to the inability to transform new knowledge into practical results. The “brain drain” and the technology gap are actually failures in management, he says.

Fifth, the nature of world problems, our interdependence, and the advent of the knowledge society all indicate that our future depends upon human cooperation. Let me give you some simple illustrations. While I was in Washington a few months ago, a car ran out of gas on the Memorial Bridge between Virginia into Washington, causing traffic to pile up for several miles. Probably five to ten thousand people were late for work because one man forgot to put gas in his car. He failed to cooperate. His failure was not only a personal inconvenience; it affected all those other people coming to work at that time along the highway. Terrorists can paralyze an entire city in a hurry just by shutting down the telephone system, the electrical system, or the transportation system. Even the threat of such action strikes fear in those who administer governments and corporations. The power labor unions have is the threat of a strike—an act of withholding cooperation—which can disrupt a whole society or an entire industry. People in modern society have come to realize that if one group of people is unwilling to cooperate, everybody is affected.

The modern knowledge society particularly requires the collaboration of knowledge makers and appliers. Specialists are needed, but most problems cannot be solved by any single specialty. Their solution takes the skills of people with many different specializations. Urban renewal takes more than architects and politicians; it also takes lawyers, social workers, industrialists, and other specialists. There must be a team approach, with each individual contributing knowledge and skills to the problem at hand.

The proliferation of knowledge means that no one can possibly be an expert in all of it. In fact, the only way to become an expert is to concentrate upon a narrow strand of reality and dig deeply. This is the method of research institutes and of doctoral programs in universities. Universities encourage specialization by dividing themselves up into schools and departments and requiring students to major in one area. Each department is held together by a discipline which is the common focus of attention of its members. Most disciplines abstract some aspect from reality and study it in isolation from what it is a part of. In this sense they depart from the “reality” of the society at large. The reason a sociologist or linguist engages in research is to increase our knowledge of sociology or linguistics. Although the disciplinary approach is legitimate and fruitful, it does not encourage members of the academic community to cooperate, integrate their different pieces of knowledge, and relate them to the values, aspirations, and needs of people in the society at large. In general, the universities have provided a good environment for the development of the disciplines. However, interdisciplinary work is still difficult to achieve. Cooperation is difficult.

Application is the test of the “truth” or validity of knowledge, as theory and practice interact. Theory needs reality testing, while practice needs a theoretical framework. The success of the agricultural experiment station in the United States attests to the mutual impact between the needs and problems of farmers and the knowledge sought and found by laboratory researchers. This kind of mutual feedback system enhances the work of both. Failure to build this kind of cooperation between knowledge makers and knowledge users is probably one of the causes of our crises. The concentrated effort of many scientists has produced the knowledge upon which modern technological civilization has been built. The same amount of concentrated effort, however, has not been put into exploring the consequences of its application. One set of people has done the research; others
have done the more “menial” work of applica-
tion; neither group has calculated the long-
range effects. The result has been some unwise
applications. We do not really need more hu-
manistic ideas or loftier ideals. But we do need
people who have the desire and the talent to
device ways of translating good ideas and high
ideals into workable schemes for ordinary hu-
man beings. This challenge implies the neces-
sity to concern ourselves with the common
knowledge of everyday life and to develop the
arts of cooperation, problem solving, decision
making, and management.

Sixth, it follows that cooperation demands
good human relations, but so does the modern
technological society. The environment of such
societies changes much faster than natural en-
vvironments. This places great stress on human
relations, even as the relations become more
important. The movement toward urbanization
is worldwide and big cities change most rap-
idly. New buildings go up. People move in and
out. No one knows anyone else. But big cities
are the synapses of the world, the points where
the world’s nervous impulses pass from one
country to another. There one finds the great
mass media, the television stations, the big in-
dustries, the huge universities, the theaters, the
concert halls, the great cathedrals. The city is
where new ideas, styles, and fads originate.
The city generates change, and change puts
stress on human relations. The big cities do not
foster personal relationships among people, the
kind in which people call to each other across
the street or knock on the window to say “Hi.”

Good human relations are based upon one
fundamental element: trust. Without trust, so-
cial life becomes impossible. Life is basically a
set of promise-giving, promise-keeping rela-
tionships with, of course, the possibility of
promise-breaking. As people interact, they are
constantly relying upon or trusting each other,
often without being conscious of it. I am
amazed in the modern technological world how
often we trust people whom we never see.

Some time ago I flew to Manila from Taipei on
a China Airlines plane. I never met the Chi-
inese pilot of the plane, but I trusted him to
find the way. I also trusted that he and his
navigator would be able to understand Filipino
English and that the Filipinos at the airport
control tower would guide the plane in safely.

With complete trust, I sat on the plane and
relaxed. The people who stayed on the plane
trusted the Filipinos to service the aircraft
properly so that it would fly safely to Indonesia
where the Chinese pilot and the Indonesians
would have to understand each other’s English,
and the whole process would be repeated.

Buckminster Fuller has a poem in which he
tells about a mailman riding on a train, sorting
out the mail with complete confidence (trusting
that the engineers are competent, that the
switchmen are not asleep, that the designers
and the builders did their job well, that the tar-
iffs will be collected so that he will get his pay
next week Monday, and that his family is safe
at home. Trust is essential to good human rela-
tions, which in turn is necessary for the kind of
cooperation needed in today’s world.

Seventh, our rapidly changing world not only
puts stress on human relations; it also tells us
that we must learn to live with insecurity and
mistakes. Change is usually accompanied by
the anxiety of insecurity. We know that the
most important psychological reward that a
nation or institution can provide its people is
security—protection from turbulence. But the
path ahead for most nations—especially those
working for development—is going to be quite
turbulent. Change leads to instability, which
fosters insecurity.

Because of the desire for development,
growth, and change, there is a need for new
ideas, for new approaches to old problems, for
innovation. When these new ideas are put into
action, mistakes will inevitably be made. How-
ever, if honest mistakes are not tolerated at
least up to a point, hope for improvement
diminishes. A philosophy that assumes the per-
fectibility of human beings and perfection in
human performance, will frighten most peo-
ple. The prime example today is the medical
profession in the United States. Doctors have
gone on strike in California because of the
astronomical cost of malpractice insurance.

Because our medical knowledge is incomplete,
and because human beings are fallible, doctors
make mistakes. However, Americans have
come to demand perfection of both knowledge
and skill of the medical profession. When a
doctor operates and the patient dies, the rela-
tives may sue the doctor for huge sums. There
is little allowance for honest error or for the
state of knowledge or skill. More and more court cases are being won by the complainants, and insurance premiums have skyrocketed. Of course sloppiness or malpractice must be guarded against. But the incompleteness of medical knowledge and the fallibility of practitioners must also be kept in mind. A tolerance for honest error is even more important in our rapidly changing world. It is essential that people innovate, test promising approaches to old problems, attempt to work out new ideas, but success is not guaranteed, and all of us must allow for the fallibility of man and the incompleteness of knowledge. In summary, people must learn to live with insecurity and forgive mistakes.

Eighth, reality is known best, if it is known at all, when it is deeply experienced by a willing, acting human being. Reality is more complex, more ambiguous than generally represented in books.

Ever since Gutenberg, books have been the chief source of information in our schools. No one in his right mind would gainsay the boon books have been to the world. However, what is printed in textbooks is several steps removed from reality. Writers perceive things from their point of view and put these perceptions into written form. Furthermore, because they most often write up their “findings” rather than the processes—unsuccessful and successful—by which they came to them, they use a “rhetoric of conclusions,” thus dulling the heuristic stimulus for further inquiry. The impersonal style of most books used as texts hides the fact that someone explored, perceived, thought, decided, and acted. Such a style hides both the complexity of the knowledge-making process and the sense of responsibility for it. Real life is never as neat as the scholar’s summary. In real life people can never get all of the information, and much of what they get is contradictory. This is why simple answers to complex questions are not very educational. The point is that younger people must be educated to look for data outside books so that they will be better able to handle the world outside academia. The professors in our universities too often try to make students into carbon copies of themselves. Although academics are presumably able to work in a spirit of deliberate detachment, people outside academia can not help but care. Emotion is a primary reality in everyday life. Solutions to real problems are rarely simple. Usually the so-called solution is one of several alternatives, none of them adequate; it is in effect a choice of which set of difficulties one is willing to face. The lecture-library-laboratory circuit is not the only, or even the best, place to find data for most of that data is already “digested.” Handling the rough data dealing with real problems involving actual people is more challenging and serious, and therefore more educational.

Ninth, true education includes a confrontation with the ethical and value dimensions of reality. Values, like other kinds of reality, are best experienced in the concrete world. Of course, there are always going to be differences in values and differences in priorities accorded to competing values, so that conflict is bound to arise. Then whose values should prevail? Isn’t it best to have an academy that is value-free and therefore conflict-free? My own bias is that a school’s position should be one of neutrality on values, but its official policy should be to choose faculty who have real conviction, people who know their values, their biases, and explicitly apply them in their work. The difference between a position and a policy is that a position is a firm stance on particular issues while a policy is a customary way of operating, a framework within which to act. An educational institution should adopt a neutral position so that all are free to have values and convictions, and to express them in classrooms, so long as they respect people with differing convictions and values.

Ten, most people do not understand the processes of decision-making. Our universities do not provide experience in increasingly difficult levels of decision-making, except possibly in schools of management. Because we do not teach decision-making processes, most people are ignorant of the constraints on a decision maker—the constituencies that must be consulted, the levels at which deliberation goes on, and all the conditions which cut down the number of options. Several alternatives may be possible, each having advantages and disadvantages. Compromises may have to be made this way or that. The decision finally hinges on which difficulties one chooses to face. In other words, a decision on a real-life prob-
lem less often involves the question of whether difficulties can be eliminated, but most often involves the question of which difficulties must be accepted.

How can an educational institution respond to the questions raised and the context and perceptions elaborated above?

IV. THE EAST-WEST CENTER—A CASE STUDY

A discipline is at bottom nothing more than an administrative category. . . . Faculty who want to teach subjects outside their department’s traditional boundaries often find this difficult, and graduate students who want to pursue a pattern of studies that does not fall under conventional departmental definitions are likely to run into trouble.

Jencks and Riesman

I would like to use the East-West Center as an illustration of innovation because it is being built within the social and world context discussed above. We would be the first to disclaim any pretension that we are fully succeeding, since we face our incompleteness daily. However, since I believe in the essential unity of thought and action, my best example of an attempt to innovate contextually in higher education can only be the concrete reality of the programs we are trying to build. In order to help you better understand what we are trying to do, I will present a bit of the historical context of the Center, for as discussed above, no institution can be understood outside the social forces in which it was established and is maintained.

A. East-West Center Context

The East-West Center was established a year after Hawaii became a state of the United States. The people of Hawaii had always seen their state as a bridge to the Pacific and their desire was to have an institution that embodies that idea. The United States Congress enacted legislation to establish the Center and President Eisenhower signed the bill into law in May of 1960. In October of 1960 the Department of State signed a contract with the University of Hawaii providing for the establishment and operation of the Center, which was built on the Manoa campus of that University.

These features of this legislation and these arrangements with the University of Hawaii not only set the general context within which the Center was to be established and operated but also are unique within the history of higher education of America. The Center is one of the very few educational institutions established and supported by Congress. In the United States institutions of higher learning are generally established and supported by states, municipalities, religious communities or private funds. The tradition has been that, since the constitution does not provide for the federal establishment of schools, this responsibility should be left to the states and the people. But in this act the Secretary of State is empowered to establish a national educational institution. Therefore, the Center had no American predecessors to follow—no predecessors or guides. But in turn, it was free to depart from tradition—to innovate.

The second unique feature is the set of goals given it: to promote better relations and understanding between peoples East and West. No other educational institution that I know of has these goals explicitly. In fact, few colleges and universities state any goals at all except in the vaguest of terms. But all of the Center’s work must be evaluated not only by whether or not the quality of its education is high, but also whether or not it promotes good relations and understanding. These goals provide a dimension of depth and a quality of strength. Minimally, they prevent the Center from becoming monodimensional. Maximally, they give the Center a deeply personal dimension, for good human relations and understanding can emerge and exist only in trust.

A third important part of the context within which the Center was established and operated was the contract with the University of Hawaii and our location on their Manoa campus. This has meant that the programs of the East-West Center should not duplicate university programs. During its formative years, the Center had to remain under the umbrella of the University; yet build and maintain a distinct identity of its own. These conditions called for creativity in fostering good relations and understanding right at home. The problem was to maintain the national identity of the East-West Center within the University of Hawaii while
defining it as an educational institution distinct from the University.

During its first decade the Center essentially was structured along the lines of the enabling legislation which suggested “cooperative study, training, and research.” Three administrative units were established to manage degree study grants, training grants, and research grants. In this capacity it functioned essentially as an exchange of persons program.

The Institute for Student Interchange brought degree students, primarily at the master’s level for academic study. Formal academic work was provided by the University of Hawaii. Room, board, and extracurricular social and cultural activities were provided by the Center. In addition, students received field education trips, generally for one semester, allowing Asian/Pacific students to go to the United States mainland and American students to go to the Asian/Pacific area. While on field study, students worked on research projects, enrolled in other universities, or took advanced language training.

The Institute for Technical Interchange provided short-term training projects for practitioners. Projects, conducted both in Hawaii and in the field, focused on practical training needs in a wide variety of areas including travel industry, agriculture, medical care, and management training. Because projects were designed to meet the specific needs of countries in the area, participating countries contributed to the total cost. The Center provided staff coordination and logistical and financial support. The actual training was generally handled by outside consultants from the University of Hawaii or the larger Hawaiian community.

The Institute of Advanced Projects administered research activities. Professional scholars and public officials came to the Center to carry out research, writing, and the exchange of ideas. They worked in areas of individual interest with a high degree of autonomy. Several supporting services were administered by this Institute for several years, including the Translation Program, the East-West Center Library, the East-West Center Press, and the Conference Program. However, the library, press and conference programs all soon became independent units with their own goals and programs.

This structure kept the East-West Center distinct from the University while still being under its umbrella. However, it had not developed as an educational institution. Therefore, although the Center had made important strides in the direction of promoting understanding and better relations East and West, by the summer of 1967, it was perceived that the Center had reached the upper limit of its creative potential within that organizational framework. A new plan had to be drawn up and implemented. Somehow, educational content, scholarly competence, and continuity had to be built into its programs. Given the several elements of the Center—degree students, trainees, professional scholars, library, press and conferences—the question to be answered was: if the whole of an institution is greater than the sum of its parts, how can these elements be rearranged in order to provide a more dynamic, greater whole?

In addition to responding to these factors in its immediate internal environment, the Center had to respond to the world that was emerging, its perception of learning, the kind of people it was trying to produce, the nature of the relationships it wanted to develop, and the sort of educational institution it should become. What should be the content of its programs? What should be the competence of its staff?

In looking for institutional relations the Center was fortunate. The late 1960s were already
quite different from the late 1950s when the Center was first perceived. This meant that the 1970s would be different from the 1960s. In struggling mightily to develop their countries during the post World War II era, Asians had improved their universities and built many excellent research institutions, such as the Korean Institute of Science and Technology (KIST) in Seoul, the International Rice Research Institute (IRRI) in Los Banos, the Philippines, the National Institute of Development Administration (NIDA) in Bangkok, the Regional Language Centre (RELC) in Singapore, the Bandung Institute of Technology in Indonesia, and others in India and other places. In the Pacific area three new universities had been established: the University of Guam, the University of the South Pacific in Fiji, and the University of Papua New Guinea. All these universities were offering good bachelor's programs and many, good master's programs. How could the East-West Center relate meaningfully to these emerging and developing institutions while at the same time maintaining relations with the University of Hawaii and other American institutions?

B. The East-West Center Development Plan and its Implementation

During the fall of 1967 and the spring of 1968 a number of drafts of a plan for development of the East-West Center were written, called the “Search for Understanding.” After giving a brief history of the development of the Center it spelled out subgoals for participants who came to the Center and for the institution itself. It recommended that problem orientation be built into the Center to make it an educational institution and to provide a setting for interchange.

As noted previously in this paper, institutions of higher education have traditionally organized knowledge around disciplines. History has shown that such a division of knowledge and its corresponding structure in academic organization has benefited the human race. However, the traditional structure is not the only possible way of organizing people for the discovery, testing, and dissemination of knowledge. Discipline orientation can be complemented by some other scheme of cutting the academic pie, such as problem orientation. The two approaches to knowledge have different consequences. Whereas in discipline orientation the questions tackled usually arise from the internal logic of the discipline—its methodology, assumptions, and paradigms—the questions tackled in problem orientation arise from inequities, discrepancies, or anomalies in the “real” world, the world we all live in. Whereas disciplines are generally considered ends in themselves and the scholar’s task is to advance the discipline, in problem orientation, disciplines are seen as tools for solving a problem, and the practitioner’s task is to contribute to the alleviation of a critical situation. Whereas disciplines can use such extra-disciplinary values as simplicity, consistency, comprehensiveness, reliability, and validity,14 when problems are at the center, the values are pragmatic: Does it work? Does it help?

Neither approach is better than the other. Both are needed in our search for truth and our attempt to make a better world. In fact, without the disciplines we would not have the tools to attack the problems. Then what is problem orientation all about?

A problem can be defined as the gap that exists between what is and what should be; or, more modestly what could be. Programs organized around a problem are academic in nature, with younger and older scholars and practitioners from relevant disciplines and with relevant experience gathered into teams to attack the problem. Each member of the team contributes knowledge or expertise. Knowledge is discovered and tested through research and disseminated through journal articles and seminars or workshops. Not all the members of the team need to be in residence all the time. Some may come only for short periods doing various phases of the work on the problem. Enough permanent staff are necessary not only to provide competence but also to maintain continuity so that human relationships are established and maintained, knowledge accumulated, and skills improve.

The kinds of people, knowledge and skills needed depend on the problem attacked, the “state of the art,” the nature and number of other problem-oriented programs within the same institution, and the general goal and purpose of the institution. One can begin to tackle a problem at almost any place, but four basic
questions provide guidance. What is going on? (Facts) Why is it going on? (Causes) What is the impact if it continues? (Effects) What should be done about the situation? (Policy) If the problem of rapid demographic growth is tackled, for example, the first question is the amount and accuracy of the data. If the data is scarce and inaccurate, then the first people to hire and train will be demographers. If you are studying the impact and have colleagues in another program looking at raw materials, energy and food, you can cooperate with them to ascertain effects. And so it goes. There is no magic formula; rather, the problem-oriented institution, like the world at large must be seen as a whole, a system of interrelated parts.

The Center’s development plan argued that problem orientation would provide a focus for the assigning of staff work, the selection of participants, the acquisition of materials for research and the publication of books. It also suggested criteria for the selection of problems from among the vast number in the world: The problems “should be
a. contemporary, present day;
b. human, as opposed to material, i.e., not limited to one country;
c. consequential to both East and West.”

In summary, the plan called for two basic changes: (1) the reorganization and integration of each of the elements (or building blocks) of the Center into problem-oriented programs, and (2) the addition of academic staff who would provide the competence, the content, and the continuity for each of the programs.

On July 1, 1970, the Center was reorganized into its new structure. Five problem-oriented programs were established to focus attention on the areas of international and developmental communication, culture and language learning, the food system, population dynamics, and technology and development. A category of open grants was retained to provide the flexibility necessary (1) to bring in participants who did not neatly fit into our five programs, (2) to provide geographical or country spread, (3) to be a safety valve during times of change, and (4) to permit the Center to explore ideas for new programs.

Each institute provides grants to bring degree students, non-degree students, professionals, and fellows—in a ratio of two Asians and Pacific Islanders for each American—to work with East-West Center staff on areas of common professional concern. As interests and knowledge are shared, cultural interchange develops at both the intellectual and social levels—intellectual interchange as different cultural assumptions and beliefs are aired, and social interchange as participants relax, eat, play and generally live together. Consequently, the Center is able to come closer to meeting two of its fundamental goals. First, the problem-oriented programs provide academic competence so that the Center is becoming a real “educational institution” as originally envisioned. Secondly, cultural and intellectual interchange becomes a basic element of each program in addition to being an extracurricular activity.

The design of our problem-oriented programs enhances the possibility of good relations and understanding. Cooperation is necessary to solve problems; cooperation can be seen as the other side of understanding. In other words, cooperation is the operational definition of understanding. Cross-cultural understanding conventionally means a person’s knowledge of the history, literature, philosophy, and political and social structure of another society. Or, to put it another way, it consists of knowledge about how other people think, see, feel, and act. However, such understanding is usually only cognitive and can be used for many purposes, including frustrating other people. Cooperation toward a common goal, on the other hand, is an active form of commitment and can be carried out in spite of insufficient knowledge of another’s culture. But we find that the two are intimately related: the more understanding (as a cognitive process) the better people can cooperate; the more cooperation (as a common task) the more understanding. So cooperation and understanding are synergistically related: understanding provides the insights which clarify, and cooperation manifests the mutual trust which binds together.

Cooperation must be carried on in an atmosphere of equality, mutuality, and respect. Problems provide such a mood. Although the younger and older scholars gathered around a problem will have different kinds and levels of knowledge so that some will teach while others learn, none of them will have the answer to the problem—if it is a real problem involving ac-
tual people. Therefore, there must be a sharing of knowledge, insights, and cultural perspectives, with everyone learning in the process. This kind of intellectual, scientific, and cultural exchange and cooperation is essential in the attack on problems and is also the very reason for which the Center was established. Such experience should equip men and women for living in the technological society where cooperation is necessary.

Furthermore, no one group of scholars, however brilliant, can solve some of the problems vexing mankind. It is therefore necessary to develop inter-institutional cooperation. The insights and perspectives of one group can stimulate those of another. In the process, people come to learn their interdependence and, when this is done across national and cultural boundaries, the minds of those people are moved toward a world sensitivity, a world collegiality, a better view of the nature of our common humanity.

Still another attempt is to bridge the gaps that have caused not only the fragmentation of knowledge but the separation of men from each other. By design all East-West Center programs are interdisciplinary, international or cross-cultural, and interprofessional, involving both scholars and practitioners. Interdisciplinary work is not new in concept, but it has seldom been practiced successfully in higher education. One of the reasons has been the competition for funds. When scholars were asked to choose, they identified with and asked funds for promoting their discipline first and foremost. After all, people in academia are known by such titles as economist, physicist, or philosopher. Another reason is that interdisciplinary work is often initiated by someone in a discipline with the request that others join in. In such a case the problem is defined and the questions asked within the framework of the initiator’s discipline rather than by the real world. In our work, the real world defines the issues and each disciplinary scholar applies his specialty to its solution. Each participant, young and old, has occasion to integrate knowledge gleaned from many different disciplines. In the process he may gain a more comprehensive view of the complexity of social reality. But, possibly more important, he begins to look for data out in the reality of society and not just in his professor’s lectures, the library, or the laboratory. In fact, the street, the town, the field become his primary sources. He learns to deal with the knowledge of everyday life. His task is to figure out how to make order out of complexity or chaos.

The inter-professional aspect of our program attempts to respond to another area where a great deal of misunderstanding exists, namely, the relationships between the world of government and business on the one hand and academia on the other. It is surprising how difficult it is to get businessmen and scholars together to discuss problems of common concern—especially social problems. The businessman often stereotypes the scholar as theoretical, abstract, or “ivory tower,” while the scholar accuses the businessman or government officer of being too pragmatic, greedy, and self-serving. Granted that there are different points of view; still these people need each other to get the whole picture. Even granting that the scholar is theoretical and the businessman practical, both should learn that theory needs reality testing to be relevant and practice needs a theoretical framework to “make sense.” Furthermore, educational institutions should help people learn to do as well as to think, to act physically as well as intellectually. This is why I like to call our institutes “think and do tanks,” rather than “think tanks.” Both practical experience and intellectual inquiry are paths to learning. When a person’s competence is evaluated by how well he can verbalize, as frequently happens in universities, education becomes a process of progressive sophistication in verbal abstraction and manipulation. Although the manipulation of the symbol system called language can be a fruitful avenue to new ideas, it is through the pragmatic use of concrete reality that a person comes to know what he can do himself. All programs at the Center attempt to bring the thinkers and doers together.

Anyone intimately connected with the Center knows that the above description of necessity must be stated in terms of the ideal. In reality, we are not that good. Some people respond better than others. Some cannot live comfortably with the tensions that are thus built into our programs. Some people have left for various reasons and some programs have been changed as we have learned from experience.
However, as we have gone along we have attempted to institutionalize the many values of the Center. By the third year of our new existence, committees were set up to establish criteria for judging our projects and for promotion of academic staff. The following are some of the project criteria from our Program Policies and Procedures Handbook.

Each project should:
- be multinational in focus, in staff, in composition, or in dissemination. It is desirable to have all four.
- be cooperatively designed, implemented, supported, and evaluated. Evidence of cooperation includes cost-sharing, co-directing, co-sponsoring, co-hosting, and exchange of staff and participants...
- involve a cross section of EWC participants and program staff.
- include participants who come from both Asian/Pacific countries and the United States and who return to their respective institutions and countries of origin to share and use their experience.

Not only are these criteria used as guides that are applied in the development of each project, but they are also used in project evaluation—not merely at the end of each project but in the allocation of resources when working out budgets and expenditure plans. In addition, promotion criteria have been developed, and included in the collective bargaining contract between the Center and the local union. The following are the four basic criteria from Article 14, Promotion of Academic Staff, of that contract which lists promotion criteria:

1. The cooperative Discovery of Knowledge
2. The cooperative Design and Development of Applications of Knowledge
3. The cooperative Design and Implementation of Institute Activities
4. Institutional and Community Service.

The elaboration of each criteria describe the kinds of evidence looked for in each criterion and links each to the project criteria noted above. In this way, we have attempted to build the Center’s unique value system into the fundamental policies which affect allocation of program funds and evaluation of academic staff.

How successful have we been? Values and perspectives do not change easily. But a recent experience convinced me that we are making progress. During our program and budget review hearings this past year, I probed into the style and amount of East-West collaboration in the attack on problems. One of our young research associates who, by the way, has turned down offers of a faculty position by some of America’s finest institutions, asked if he could speak. He said that when he came to the East-West Center he saw one big piece of pie, namely, his institute. He saw that at the East-West Center we did academic work, but also were interested in cultural and technical interchange. His first concept was that the promotion of East-West relations was one slice of the total pie and the larger that slice became the less there would be left of the pie for academic work of the Center. Now, after several years at the institution, he realizes that working in a cooperative fashion, in international, interdisciplinary teams, is not something that is in competition with research and education, but actually, as he said, when the cross-cultural and interdisciplinary work becomes part and parcel of the whole pie, the pie itself becomes larger. I think he’s right.

The number and variety of projects in the East-West Center are many and the kind of work that a staff member performs depends upon the stage of the project, i.e., whether it is planning, implementation, or evaluation. In order to present some idea of the scope of the work and the time and energy needed to carry it out, I would like to present a short description of one of the projects in our Population Institute called “The Value of Children” (VOC). This is the kind of cooperative research that we encourage.

The VOC project is a cross-cultural study to attempt to determine the social, economic and psychological reasons why people have children. The work was carried out in six countries: the Republic of China (Taiwan), Japan, the Republic of Korea, the Philippines, Thailand, and the United States (Hawaii). The project was conceived and organized by James Fawcett, a research associate at the East-West Center.17 Explorative work was first carried out in 1971 in Hawaii among a small number of people representing different ethnic groups. In 1972 a conference was held at the Center followed by a two-day workshop for the coinvestigators of the six countries. At that time they
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worked on the goals of the study, the variables, the conceptual framework, the sampling design, and the time table. The questionnaires had to be translated and back-translated with special attention given to items that caused translation difficulty. They sought conceptual rather than literal equivalence. The questionnaires were administered for pre-test purposes and a core questionnaire was devised with supplementary items added to measure unique cultural dimensions. After the field work was completed, a workshop was held in Hong Kong to compare preliminary results. Research assistants were brought to the East-West Center for training in computer work. Then the investigators again came to the East-West Center to write country results and initiate comparative analyses. Work on the analyses and reports continued in the home countries. The results were published in 1975.

The principal coinvestigators working on the project were an American economist, a Filipino sociologist, a Thai development educator, a Chinese social psychologist from Hong Kong, an American psychologist, a Japanese social psychologist, a Korean psychologist and a Chinese agriculturalist from Taiwan. Articles and reports were published both singly and collaboratively, and volume one (Introduction and Comparative Analysis) of the seven volume series bears the names of all the coinvestigators, five from Asia and two from Hawaii. Not only was this a cross-cultural, interdisciplinary team but also their research results have been favorably received. In fact, the project has now been expanded to additional countries in the Center’s region and has been replicated in other parts of the world.

The principal coinvestigators working on the project were an American economist, a Filipino sociologist, a Thai development educator, a Chinese social psychologist from Hong Kong, an American psychologist, a Japanese social psychologist, a Korean psychologist and a Chinese agriculturalist from Taiwan. Articles and reports were published both singly and collaboratively, and volume one (Introduction and Comparative Analysis) of the seven volume series bears the names of all the coinvestigators, five from Asia and two from Hawaii. Not only was this a cross-cultural, interdisciplinary team but also their research results have been favorably received. In fact, the project has now been expanded to additional countries in the Center’s region and has been replicated in other parts of the world.

With incorporation, a determined attempt was made to have other countries join in the funding of the Center. The basic purpose is to create an atmosphere into which people from Asia and the Pacific can come as partners or colleagues, not merely as guests. To date, seventeen countries are making gifts to the budget of the Center. Thus, incorporation has strengthened the Center’s international identity. We now have international staff members, international participants, an international Board of Governors and international funding support.

The creation of the corporation has in turn caused the Center to continue to innovate. The first concern of the new Board was the quality of all programs, the relations of these programs to Center goals, and the maintenance of flexibility. Furthermore, they concluded that the programs should take a longer range, more global point of view. Subsequently, the Food Institute and the Technology and Development Institute were merged into a new program called Resource Systems and a new institute on environment and policy was begun.

The thinking for the latter program was begun in 1971, prior to the Stockholm conference, and included discussions and consultations in Asia, the Pacific, and the United States with environmental scientists and policy makers. Draft proposals for programs were reviewed by people from the different countries and in 1975 and 1976, two different groups of senior fellows explored aspects of the programs in our Open Grants unit. The Environment and Policy Institute was launched on October 1, 1977.
These have been very brief glimpses at the East-West Center. They hardly cover the subject but by taking very thin slices of our institution, I hope I have been able to show you some of its many dimensions. In many respects, it is easier to write about the theory and philosophy that undergird us than about the practical reality of our daily or yearly existence. Furthermore, the narrative may sound rather smooth, suffering from the “rhetoric of conclusions,” but the road traveled has been rough. Unfortunately, a report is not an historical novel.

V. DIFFICULTIES AND CHALLENGES

Civilization, put quite simply, consists in our giving ourselves, as human beings, to the effort to attain the perfecting of the human race and the actualization of progress of every sort in the circumstances of humanity and of the objective world. This mental attitude, however, involves a double predisposition: firstly, we must be prepared to act affirmatively toward the world and life; secondly, we must become ethical.

Albert Schweitzer

The challenge of innovation is accompanied by many difficulties, and the difficulties of problem orientation are part of that challenge. In this section I would like to list some of the lessons we have learned in trying to develop the East-West Center over the last decade. I will suggest ten, although I could list more or fewer.

1. The tenacity of institutional and cultural tradition is stronger than most people think. Changing people’s ways of thinking and behaving is a formidable task. In fact, the very conditions in an institution that call for innovation and change are the same conditions that work against, or possibly even fight against, innovation. Change always brings to the surface questions of adequacy, meaning, quality, and values by those who are asked to change. “Have I been doing something bad?” When innovation is proposed and implemented, the situation changes from one of comfortableness to one of threat, confusion, and anxiety. Even the names used for the new situation are often interpreted negatively. The names of the newly established institutes indicated to some people that we had scrapped our cultural dimension and had become merely technocratic. In writing about innovation at St. Lawrence University, Bill Romey reports a similar reaction in a note on semantics:

We adopted words such as “open classroom” or “humanistic education” as labels to describe the geometry and orientation of our efforts. Others concluded that if we described ourselves as “open” we must mean that they were “closed.” If we were “humanistic” then they must be “anti-humanistic” at worst or “not-very-humanistic” at least. If our program was “student-centered” then we must mean that they didn’t care about students. (p. 682, footnote)

Not only language but its supporting culture is a very powerful conserving force. Culture is seen by anthropologists to be the system of beliefs, ways of thinking and behaving that are held by a group of people. Anyone who has lived for some time in another culture will have run up against different thoughts and mores. This entire interrelated set of elements that make up a culture is learned early in life and generally absolutized by each member of that culture. Culture not only supports the individuals in their identity, security, and general outlook, but it also places blinders on them as they look at other cultures. In fact, Ruth Benedict has said:

The life of the individual is first and foremost an accommodation to the patterns and standards traditionally handed down in his community. From the moment of his birth the customs into which he is born shape his experience and behavior. By the time he can talk, he is a little creature of his culture, and by the time he is grown and able to take part in its activities, its habits are his habits, its beliefs are his beliefs, its impossibilities, his impossibilities. Every child that is born into his group will share them with him, and no child born into one on the opposite side of the globe can ever achieve the thousandth part. (Patterns of Culture, p. 2)

Possibly, Ms. Benedict went too far in absolutizing the negative side of the way culture binds a person. The point is that it does have an impact on our ability to innovate. Although Americans, for example, pride themselves on their openness to change, few want it when it affects them personally. The conservative people in our societies have a strong ally in their supporting culture.

2. The institution must have a basic goal or
purpose which is stated clearly so that the innovator can readily show how the innovation helps to meet that goal or purpose better. Even then, strong social currents, mainly arising from different expectations and perceptions of the institution, will constantly cut across the path of innovation and tend to push it off course. The East-West Center, for example, has been seen as an agent of technical assistance and I have been chided, even by staff members, for not doing more in the area of technology transfer, institution building in Asia, or other such concepts from technical assistance. Others have seen us more as an exchange-of-persons program, and therefore we are chided for not getting our participants into the community farther. Others see us as a research operation such as the Rand Corporation or Brookings Institution. Still others have seen us as an international house to take care of international students on the campus of the University of Hawaii. Many perceive us as an institution to promote area studies, especially in the fields of the humanities—art, literature, philosophy, religion, and history. It's possible that we haven't done a good enough job of public relations. The kind of institution we are trying to build, however, is not neatly capsulated in the English language by either a single word or phrase because there is none exactly like it. In addition, the very concept of problem-orientation is abhorrent to certain people who accuse us of looking at people as problems rather than as human beings, or looking at Asia as a problem instead of human societies. It's interesting that these same people do not accuse discipline-orientation in the same way, i.e., that an economist sees man as an economic animal, or a physicist seeing man purely in physical terms. I'll never forget the day we had a large meeting of our students back in 1970, during which we discussed the new problem-oriented organization. I was accused of being inhuman, a technocrat, and given many other epithets. When one person said that we were not being humane, I used the Food Institute as an example of something about as closely related to the growth and maintenance of a human being as anything I knew, when from the audience came an American girl's voice asking, "What good is food?" Such a statement almost boggles one's mind. But innovation and problem orientation do have detractors, mainly because different people have different ideas and perceptions about the purposes of the institution and the world in which it exists.

3. One of the most important jobs of the innovative academic administrator is the education of constituencies. Other people constantly tend to read their meaning into your actions. In fact, to the extent that the entire institution is innovating, or moving toward something new, the institution must begin to educate its staff, the financial supporters, the participants, and the people of the surrounding society. The basic difficulty is that at the beginning of innovation there is little if any concrete new reality to point to; only concepts or goals. In a memorandum dated June 16, 1970, circulated for signatures, and presented to the President of the University of Hawaii asking him to stop the change into problem orientation planned for July 1, for example, the writers say "... while the rhetoric about the problem oriented programs is engaging, it is still little more than rhetoric so far." This was only one of eleven criticisms of the change. The problem is that before beginning, all one has is rhetoric. Even during the first few years after the innovation begins, results are difficult to attain and point to.

4. Probably the greatest problem faced in problem orientation is the selection of people. Some scientists work best alone. My advice is, leave them alone, but leave them alone in institutions where they can work in that style. They should not be placed in a problem oriented institution where teamwork is of the essence. On occasion I have been asked, "Wouldn't you want an Albert Einstein at the East-West Center?" The questioner was referring to the Princeton Institute of Advanced Studies. My reply has always been, "Yes, I crave such creative minds, but I would encourage him to work with, discuss his ideas with, and possibly even publish some of his ideas in cooperation with, others, especially those from other countries." Problem orientation needs people who are willing to compromise the language of their disciplines, to get their disciplinary skirts dirty, so to speak, using other criteria than those of their
disciplines to measure the level of quality of their endeavor.

Cooperation is difficult, it takes time. One does not read as many books or publish as many articles. However, some people can do it more easily than others. They will take the time to establish human relationships to increase the possibility of having a greater, more diverse input into the formation of ideas, thus creating a more universal paradigm. They find such work challenging and stimulating. Once they begin to catch on, they both internalize and help create the ethos of the institution.

5. Another very critical difficulty in problem orientation is the definition of the problem itself. This is crucial, for without a clear definition of the problem, administrators will be unable to get people to cooperate toward a common goal. One of the most important distinctions in problem definition is the long-range versus the short-range perspective. Most governments, for example, are interested in short-range problems. They want to know solutions tomorrow, or even today. Given the political process, for example, of the United States, where there are yearly budgets, biennial elections for representatives, four-year elections for the President, and six-year elections for the senators, it is difficult to take a longer-range point of view. It seems to me, however, that institutions of higher learning have the duty to provide society, who is the buyer of our information, with the long-range perspective.

Furthermore, at the East-West Center we are mandated to promote better relations and understanding among the nations East and West. These nations are tremendously diverse, with many different cultures, political systems, and levels of affluence and development. Their short-range problems, therefore, are quite different. The challenge to the Center was to so define the problem and so design activities that Japanese, Nepalese, Indonesians, Filipinos, Americans, Australians, and Pacific Islanders could all participate in the same activity, in the same role, that is, as equals. Of all the challenges we face this has been the most difficult. We have found that by taking a longer-range, slightly more abstract, perspective on the problems, we could better accomplish that purpose.

Another distinction is between national and international perspectives. Should the problem be defined nationally or internationally? The answer lies more in the realm of politics than of education. The line separating national and international problems has become more and more fuzzy. Few major problems today are purely national in character. The devaluation of the dollar, the 1973 oil crisis, the Vietnam War, and the production of soybeans all have international implications. As I once said during the Nixon administration, Earl Butz, the Secretary of Agriculture, had as much impact on international relations as Secretary of State Henry Kissinger. The challenge is to make all innovative higher education international, intercultural, interdisciplinary, and interprofessional. Not only are our major problems world problems, but people need the constant stimulation of other assumptions, other ideas, other ways of thinking. Only with a constant influx of new ideas can we create the possibility for continued self-renewal and enrichment of human beings, knowledge, and society.

6. Closely associated with the above is that a clear distinction must be maintained between problem orientation and problem solving. The East-West Center does not profess to be problem solving, but problem oriented. An educational institution is not the government and does not either make or implement public policy. However, it can throw light on world or national problems and suggest alternative solutions, in priority order if so desired, for public policy makers and implementers. Furthermore, the phrase "problem solving," creates many misconceptions. One is that problems can be solved, and once solved, no longer exist. Since the world is a system of interrelated parts, if one part of the system is touched, the rest of it is also affected. As mentioned earlier, the solution to one problem may be the genesis of another problem. In other words, problems persist.

Nor should the academic be tempted to think of himself in the role of a government bureaucrat or agent. Rather, problem orientation is an organizational and heuristic device. It is organizational in the sense that it is a way to divide reality, assign work, and develop educational programs. It is heuristic since it is an
excellent means of raising new questions and stimulating interest in the further investigation or pursuit of knowledge. I have come to believe that it is just as legitimate a basis for the organization of the search for knowledge and truth as disciplines.

7. Problem orientation demands excellence, for mediocrity is itself a problem. Unfortunately, in one sense, in the West, the idea has grown that individuals, not groups, have the attributes of genius. As some wag has said, "Camels are horses made by a committee." Most people would say that art is the product of a single individual or genius. Our institutions of higher education also work to produce the individual scholar; doctoral theses are written by individuals; most people in academia rebel against the idea of doing research in teams. How can it be excellent? Compromise, the essence of the social process necessary for team work, leads to the lowest common denominator, they say. Certainly, as mentioned before, it takes longer, especially if done across disciplinary and cultural boundaries. But isn't it possible that people of different kinds and levels of ability can work together toward the solution of a problem and foster a deeper sense of equality and a higher level of quality at the same time? In other words, team work can have both the aspect of quality of the individual and of human cooperation.

8. Innovation is seldom a panacea. There are always the trade-offs. There is little doubt in my mind that the East-West Center of today has more dynamic, more institutional relations, gets people East and West more deeply involved with each other, and is much more of an educational institution than the East-West Center of the 1960s. However, in the process we have lost certain qualities. Because the Center at that time had little internal intellectual structure, it was very flexible, able to accommodate almost anyone's interest. Today's Center is narrower, less flexible. In turn, the Center is gaining identity, especially since it has moved from under the umbrella of the University of Hawaii. On the other hand, because of the weaker identity with the University, and partly because we do not give degrees, many people see us less as an educational institution. The point is that innovation cannot accomplish everything, and when choices are made, certain good things may be by-passed or left out.

9. Within the many different educational institutions needed in a modern society, the existence of some educational institutions with goals beyond open-endedness is healthy. The fact that the Center is mandated to both be an educational institution and promote better relations and understanding among the nations of the East and West generates a rather high level of tension in the institution. On occasion I am asked which is more important, the research and education or the cultural interchange. My answer is, "Yes." Both are important and we will fail if either is neglected. I have come to see that a multipurpose, or multidimensional, institution has a richness that is stimulating. Of all the pressures on my office, one of the strongest is to simplify. So far we have avoided the temptation. Certainly simplicity can promote clarity and intelligibility, but simplification can also cause reductivism and credulity. One of the reasons for our complexity is that we take the world out there as our laboratory, and the world out there is complex.

10. Finally, in order to participate in a problem-oriented institution, people must take a positive stance toward life. Unfortunately, the world today contains a great deal of cynicism. Many people no longer trust scientists, for science has become too complex and they do not understand. Many do not trust administrators because the decision making process is perplexing. Furthermore, there are those who decry technology and denounce scientists as destroyers of civilization. Of course, we may fall into the trap of runaway technology and technique as people, like Jacques Ellul in his book, The Technological Society, propound. In this situation, innovative higher education should aim to develop activities and programs that engender faith, confidence, and trust, hope and positiveness. One of the challenges in a problem-oriented institution is to demonstrate how some of the great ideas can be given practical expression in the affairs of the world.

Here lies one of the challenges for cooperation with the humanities. As stated earlier, problem orientation is basically future oriented. The humanities take a definite historical stance while problem orientation dips into the past.
only enough to gain perspective. Or again, many humanities people believe that literature is for the sake of literature, art for art's sake. Problem orientation focuses on the practical application of knowledge, the value of literature and art in living. Certainly it is possible to combine the historical, legal, ethical, and religious dimensions of the humanities with social and natural sciences and the great human services to improve the human condition.

In my short life, I have not experienced all the great religions or traditions that exist in the world. But I have had a great deal of exposure to many beyond my own. I have come to the conclusion that we do not need higher ideals than peace, love, service, justice, and other similar aims of most religions. The challenge is to find ways in which these ideals can be made operative, effective, in our societies. That should be the goal of all innovations in higher education. It seems to me that problem orientation has that potential, especially if we define a problem as that gap which exists between what is and what ought to be. Innovative educators then can help provide human beings with something to live for, as well as to live with.

NOTES

1. Most likely, this is because pluralism and rapid social change go hand in hand. As Berger and Luckmann say, "... indeed pluralism itself is an accelerating factor precisely because it helps to undermine the change-resistant efficacy of the traditional definition of reality. Pluralism encourages both skepticism and innovation ..." (p. 125)

2. Berelson and Steiner discuss what social scientists have found about social change. (613 f) Some of the statements made on innovation are adaptations of their findings.

3. I use the word "comparatively" because I accept the Christian philosophical theologian Paul Tillich's definition of religion as being the dimension of depth in life, the state of ultimate concern—why were we born, why does the world exist, why do people die? Whenever theoretical science in any field touches the dimension of depth, or gives explanations or answers, however tentative, to ultimate questions, it enters this field of religion and therefore the realm of the ethical. In this sense I differ somewhat from Rene Dubos, who says "from the social point of view, however, the ethic of ends is at least as important as the ethic of means. An entirely different attitude is required to deal with a situation to be explained (by theoretical science) and a function to be performed (by applied science). The first is ethically neutral, whereas the second is intrinsically ethical" (pp. 114-15). I would not say as categorically that theoretical science is ethically neutral.

4. These statements on the dialectic of man and his environment follow Berger and Luckmann, The Social Construction of Reality, where the theory is expounded, and Berger's The Sacred Canopy, where it is applied. One quote from the latter work may suffice: "... the individual continues to be the co-producer of the social world, and thus of himself." (p. 18)

5. For a clear statement on the world economy, see Daniel Bell, "The Future World Disorder," Foreign Policy, No. 27, Summer 1977. Peter Drucker also touches on this fact in his book, Management, p. 735.

6. This relation of trust is not only directly person to person but manifests itself in the acquisition of knowledge in which the researcher trusts what has been written by others, and trusts his own faculties of observation. See Michael Polanyi, Personal Knowledge, especially his chapter on Commitment (Chapter 10, pp. 299-324)

7. Actually, such a philosophy can be dehumanizing as John Passmore points out in his The Perfektibility of Man: "... the classical ideals of perfection banish care only by dehumanizing. ... To achieve perfection in any of its classical senses, as many perfectibilists have admitted, it would first be necessary to cease to be human, to become godlike, to rise above the human condition. But a god knows nothing of love, or science, or art, or craft, of family and friends, of discovery, of pride of work. And can we really count as perfection a condition which excludes all of these, for the sake of eternity, of order, or of unalloyed enjoyment?" (pp. 325-326)

8. Joseph J. Schwab uses this expression in his book, College Curriculum and Student Protest, in which he defines the rhetoric of conclusions as "a body of positive and often unqualified assertions about a subject matter, conclusions unsupported by evidence or argument." (p. 52)


10. See my "Federal Involvement in Higher Education: The Case of the East-West Center," (mimeograph, presented to the Social Science Association, Honolulu, Hawaii, May 1, 1972), in which I trace the history of the attempt by George Washington to establish a national university, through the Morrill Act establishing the land grant colleges, the establishment of Howard University in Washington,
D.C., up to the present day. The only educational institutions established by Congress besides the military academies are Howard University in 1867, Gallaudet College for the deaf in 1864, and just recently a federal charter was granted to Federal College in Washington, D.C.

11. In actuality, these goals go back to the original goal of universities, namely, the search for truth. In English it is interesting, and important, to remember that truth and trust are related etymologically. The word trust comes from Old English treow meaning faithful or trustworthy, and truth derives from Old English truorow which is akin to Old High German getriuwidameaning fidelity or trustiness. Even in Modern English the superlative of true is trust which is but a short phonological step from trust. The point is that the goals of being an educational institution through which to promote better relations and understanding give the Center a mandate to search for truth as objective information, but also to search for truth as personal encounter.

12. In an issue paper written in 1970 called, “An East-West Center Diploma: (a think piece),” I outlined an Asian/Pacific person as someone who can work effectively for development in their own and another culture.

13. In my “Communication and Change in Developing Countries,” (Papers of the East-West Communication Institute, No. 12, July 1975), I describe cosmopolitan nationalists (pp. 12-14) as people who work within their own national boundaries as nationalists, and across national boundaries as cosmopolitans.


15. For simplicity I have lumped the Population Institute with the others at the time of the big change in 1970. Actually, the Center received money from the Agency for International Development in 1968 for work on population and the East-West Population Institute was established in the fall of 1969 soon after the arrival of its first director.

16. In my “On Culture Learning,” (Working Paper No. 13, East-West Culture Learning Institute, January 1972), I distinguish the cognitive, affective and active domains in the process of learning another culture. Each domain has five levels of learning, each successive level manifests a more profound understanding of the culture. The cognitive stages are information, analysis, synthesis, comprehension and insight; the affective stages are perception, appreciation, revaluation, orientation and identification; and the active stages are awareness, attending, responding, acting and interacting.

17. For a longer statement on the nature and accomplishments of this project see Appendix A, which is a statement by Dr. Fawcett.

18. People may, and have, argued that the East-West Center is not an educational institution because it does not give degrees. However, the Center staff and participants are engaged in the discovery, testing, and dissemination of knowledge, and a great deal of learning occurs in its academic programs.

19. See my chapter, “The World as a System: a Framework for Thinking,” in Beyond Interdependence: Problems in Cultural Relations in the Global Community, in which the world is described as being made up of a set of sub-systems—physical, biological, political, economic, cultural and many more—all composed of elements and their relationships, no one congruent with the other but all interacting, and all built up into a world system.

APPENDIX A

J. T. Fawcett
May 16, 1978

The Value of Children Project:
A Summary of Experience

The Value of Children (VOC) project is a cooperative, cross-national research program designed to produce new knowledge about motivations for childbearing. The project stems from a concern about the formulation of effective population policies and the recognition of a critical gap in knowledge relevant to such policies.

Prior to the initiation of the Value of Children Project, virtually no empirical and systematic information was available on the reasons for wanting and not wanting children, i.e., on parents’ expectations about the satisfactions and costs of children. This kind of scientific knowledge is essential for understanding decisions about family size and for the development of public policies that may influence such decisions and societal fertility trends.

As a result of the Value of Children Project, an impressive body of cross-cultural knowledge about childbearing motivations has emerged during the relatively short timespan of six years. Center sponsorship led to the collection of comparative data in large-scale national projects in Indonesia, Korea, the Philippines, Singapore, Taiwan, Thailand, Turkey, and the United States. Comparative studies on a smaller scale were conducted in Japan and West Germany. In addition, the Center’s policy of open sharing of information facilitated replications or partial replications of the study in countries as diverse as Australia, Bangladesh, Belgium, Chile, Hong Kong, India, Malaysia, the Netherlands, and Tunisia.

The Value of Children Project was enriched by the consistent application of principles and procedures involving genuine research collaboration. Co-investigators from cooperating countries were involved in the earliest phases of project development and design. Pre-tests were conducted in each country and all major project decisions were made by consensus. Built into the project were opportunities for frequent face-to-face interaction among the co-investigators, through an initial conference, a series of six workshops held in five countries, and site visits by the project coordinators. The role of coordinator was rotated among three of the co-investigators: an American, a Korean, and a Filipino.
Through such interactions an impressive amount of mutual learning occurred. This was enhanced by the diversity of backgrounds of the coinvestigators, not only in nationality but also in fields of academic training. Specialties represented among the group included anthropology, demography, development education, economics, sociology (including rural sociology), and psychology (including clinical, developmental and social psychology). The willingness and ability of such diverse professionals to concentrate their efforts on a research problem of common interest over an extended period of time was an impressive phenomenon. Without question, all of the participants improved their research skills and gained greatly in breadth of knowledge and cross-cultural sensitivity as a result of this experience.

In addition to the learning that took place through interactions among the coinvestigators, the development and conduct of the project, provisions were included for more explicit learning experiences. The project was launched by a major international conference, at which background papers by leading experts were presented and discussed. Two sequential research phases were included in the design of the project, so that experience and knowledge gained from an initial series of pilot studies could be used to advantage in designing the subsequent large-scale research effort. Throughout the project, the coordinators made special efforts to collect and disseminate to their colleagues pertinent information from the current scientific literature. Junior researchers and students were invited to the project workshops. When the initial data collection had been completed, research assistants were brought to the East-West Center for on-the-job training in techniques for computer analysis of the data. Four of the coinvestigators were awarded Senior Fellowships or consultancies to work on the project at the East-West Center, accompanied in some cases by junior staff who were awarded research internships, and numerous graduate students in various countries have used the project data for thesis research.

The tangible products of the Value of Children project are many and varied. The research instruments developed in the course of the project have been reproduced and made available to interested researchers around the world. The coinvestigators have written seven book-length monographs and more than 40 scientific papers based on the project, and many more are in preparation. Invited papers on the results of the research have been presented and discussed at international and national meetings in Australia, Canada, Hungary, Japan, Korea, Mexico, the Philippines, Taiwan, Thailand, Turkey, and the United States. The proceedings of the initial international conference were published and widely disseminated.

The utility of the project in relation to problem-solving is indicated by the fact that findings from the research have been incorporated in training materials for practitioners working in population programs, e.g. in casebooks for social workers, model texts for population educators, and programmed learning modules for family planning communicators. In the population literature, the project has been widely cited as an innovative effort to develop knowledge with policy relevance (e.g., in a recent Population Bulletin entitled, "The Value and Cost of Children").

On the more purely scientific side, models of fertility behavior have been developed that feature prominently dimensions of the value and cost of children; new projects have been initiated that use different techniques (e.g., intensive village studies) to measure the value of children, and a lively debate has emerged on the relative merits of studies in this area that are predominantly anthropological, economic, psychological or sociological in their orientation.

Another index of the project's impact is the extent to which it has stimulated interest and support among donor agencies in the population field. As a concrete example, it may be noted that the comparative study initiated at the East-West Center has benefited from substantial financial contributions from the Ford Foundation, the International Development Research Centre, the Research Institute for the Study of Man, and Rockefeller Foundation, the Smithsonian Institution, the U.S. Agency for International Development, and the U.S. National Institute for Child Health and Human Development. In addition, many of these agencies have begun to solicit additional research proposals on the same topic, as a means of extending and validating information currently available on the value and cost of children. In Indonesia, for example, work in this area has been explicitly encouraged within the context of a research and training network sponsored by Ford Foundation and Gadjah Mada University.

This surge of interest can be attributed in large measure, we believe, to the exceptional impact of a large cross-national study, with respect to both visibility and scientific value. Comparative analysis of the Value of Children data has revealed striking cross-cultural differences in motivations for childbearing, as well as intriguing similarities across countries and social classes. Such findings raise profound questions about the extent to which fertility is influenced by universal elements in parent-child relationships and motivational structures, and the extent to which cultural values and social systems may exert an overriding or interactive influence. The needs of individuals, as well as the needs of society, must be considered in the formulation of public policies to influence family size. The Value of Children Project has gone a long way toward identifying and highlighting those human needs and it therefore represents, we believe, a significant contribution to the development of people-centered population policies.

At the same time, the project has exemplified the means by which problem-centered, cooperative, interdisciplinary research can be successfully conducted across national and cultural boundaries, with results that are of value both educationally and scientifically.
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CONVOCATION SPEECHES

Preface

I am asked on many occasions to speak about the East-West Center. One of the most frequent occurrences is the annual East-West Center convocation, which occurs in the fall of the year when new students, fellows, and other people arrive for their stay at the East-West Center. Sometimes ideas clicked, sometimes not. Sometimes I used parts of old speeches and sometimes I tried to present something new.

The first of these casual speeches touched upon something that all of us at the Center experience: tension. The Center has relationships among the people who participate in the direction and activities of the Center, namely, the staff and participants and the Board of Governors. It has relationships with the University of Hawaii and the Honolulu community. It is connected with the federal government in Washington in general, and either the Department of State or the International Communications Agency in particular. Further, it has had to develop relationships with governments and institutions throughout Asia and the Pacific. If I were asked to develop a typical university and were given a hundred acres of land and a hundred million dollars, it would be a rather easy exercise, except for the selection of people with quality. But simply put, I would hire a vice president for academic affairs, who would hire some deans, who would hire chairmen, who would select faculty to teach economics, philosophy, or science. Rectangular buildings would be built with rectangular classrooms and a schedule would be set up with fifty minute periods. Students would be brought in, and everyone would know exactly what to do since all the faculty and all the universities of our country, to say nothing of other countries, have been socialized to the behavior expected on university campuses. Of course, I would also hire a vice president for administration, possibly one for external affairs, and a librarian. Sometime down the line one might want a director or vice president for alumni. The point is that there is a rather standard prototype for the development of a university and there are many people who fit into it.

The East-West Center is not such a place, so that in addition to all of the relationships that put tension on the institution, no one who comes here is socialized to the Center's peculiar modes of behavior. How does one know that one is acting properly? Whose ethics prevail? Such questions are very difficult to answer. These pressures bring tension into the institution, and therefore I gave the talk on “Creative Tension.”

At another convocation I examined how we try to teach cooperation; what are some of the perceptions that one has to have in order to cooperate? And so “Learning to Cooperate: A Goal of the East-West Center” was given in 1974.
Creative Tension

I would like to share with you a few thoughts about the East-West Center as we begin this academic year together here in the Manoa Valley. You most likely had images of the Center before you came. Since coming, your images have no doubt changed. By the time you leave, they may change still more. In a sense, this changing image is one factor in making life interesting for you—I hope. By this time, you should have had a great deal of orientation with a lot of good advice. I often wonder how much good advice people can absorb in a short time.

In the May 21, 1973 issue of Contact there appeared an editorial cartoon depicting conflicting images of the Center. At the top the Chancellor of the East-West Center was pictured saying:

The East-West Center—formally known as "The Center for Cultural and Technical Interchange Between East and West"—[The Center's] mandated goal is "to promote better relations and understanding between the United States and the nations of Asia and the Pacific through cooperative study, training and research."

A fundamental aim of all East-West Center programs is to foster understanding and mutual respect among people from differing cultures working together in seeking solutions to common problems.

At the middle of the page was a big YET, and below that some sketches showing grantee fighting grantee, administration and grantee fighting each other, and U.S. foreign policy trampling on East-West Center goals.

I studied the cartoon with a great deal of interest, not just because I was a part of the subject of the cartoon, but basically because I generally agreed with the graphic description. The East-West Center has very high ideals but the gap separating these ideals from realization is rather large. These ideals are the goals toward which we strive. They certainly are not statements of accomplishment. It is like the Boy Scouts in the United States. The Boy Scout manual says in effect that a boy scout is loyal, brave, honest, and true. This is not a statement of fact since I know boy scouts who are not loyal, brave, honest, and true. It is a statement of goals or commitments, of directions and strivings. The same is true of the Center. Our goals set our directions and provide us with guides for our behavior.

It is true that many people think of internationalism in utopian terms. Somehow, they feel, everyone in the international community must be sweet and loving, rational in thinking, and always emotionally rich in personal relationships. To attempt to give credence to this image they and we smile and laugh a great deal. However, I fear that the smiling and the laughter often serve to cover up the real tensions that exist at the Center.

In reality the East-West Center is a tense place, and tense by design. First of all, tensions exist between countries East and West, as well as countries East and East, West and West, and
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North and South. Each country represents its own culture, its own values and design for living. Who can deny that we are a divided world, separated by ideological, national, ethnic, and tribal differences, and torn by civil strife and factionalism? The history of internationalism is rife with tension. People from different cultures have been divided from each other because they act differently, see differently. The rise of nationalism since World War II demands patriotism and creates a heightened sense of ethnocentricity.

Most educational institutions in the countries from which we come are built upon a philosophy which is dedicated to passing on the culture of the society in which they exist. In such monocultural institutions both teacher and learner are expected to have similar experiences and ways of thinking upon which the program of the school can be built. This means that people look to the past for their common culture and traditions. However, in an educational institution which is attempting to be intercultural, there is no such common cultural core to build upon. It is necessary for such international institutions to be teleological in their thinking, to look to their ends or goals rather than a common past for guidance and direction. International institutions must orient themselves to the future. Three problems/difficulties are immediately faced, which bring concomitantly three challenges. First, internationalism has no cultural base. There is only a very thin psychological or social base upon which to build a world consciousness, a global federation, an international community. There is no real international language. English, which is the most commonly used language, has many cultural assumptions in it. Because you students will be using English here at the Center, studying in an American curriculum with textbooks basically written by Americans, the Center is often accused of being too American. But the same would be true if we were in China and used Chinese texts and the Chinese language. Men don't speak language, but a particular language. The same is true of religion. There are many religions and different men adhere to the tenets of one religion or another. There is no one international religion. Although Buddhism or Christianity may claim to be international, internationalism tends to be secular. The challenge is to see if we can build a solid cultural base for internationalism, for the emerging world community.

Second, although we can take a stance toward the future in an international institution, men differ deeply about what the future will be or should be. Some want more technology to enhance the quality of life of their people. Others are demanding less technology and a return to nature. Some feel we are moving inexorably toward a classless society. Others believe that some form of capitalism is better. We are divided on what we might call the quality of life, or even happiness. The challenge is to find commonalities, especially as human beings.

There is little doubt that our different cultures tend to shape us in different ways. The self, or even groups of selves, must be distinguished from other selves and groups. Differences in culture and ways of thinking are wonderful for those differences can enrich the lives of all. They must be fostered. But I have come to believe that they must be given importance.

Probably the most important part of every individual is that which unites him with all other individuals—that which makes him human. The most important feature of the world is our common humanity. We must not come to feel that because of differences other men are a nuisance. We have a common future if we can work together to create it.

The third problem about looking to the future for our inspiration is that we are such slaves of the past. Modern depth psychology has shown in a very convincing way how deeply adults are influenced by childhood experience. The child is the father of the adult. However, the challenge to education and the requirement of the present age is for men and women to gain the courage to rise above their past, above their own experience. What is needed is a new height psychology which will raise our hands to new creativity, our eyes to new potentialities and our hearts to new hope.

It is my hope that the members of the East-West Center community will stretch out thus into the future, in real international cooperation, to build a better world. It is extremely difficult, and takes a great deal of patience, to develop programs that are positive and building, and which help us only to inch toward the goals we hold.
There are other tensions built into the Center. We have attempted and are attempting to build programs into the Center that are interdisciplinary. The tension described by C. P. Snow in *Two Cultures* is a simplification of the tension that exists in academia between people in sociology and economics, to say nothing of people in engineering and economics or philosophy. Of course, there are different schools of thoughts in linguistics, in psychology, in fact, in all disciplines. Getting people to work together across disciplinary boundaries can be fraught with tension.

We are also trying to be interprofessional, bringing together theorists and practitioners, scholars and businessmen or government officials. All the tensions that exist between town and gown, between economic practicality and scholarly theory are therefore inherent in the Center.

You will find that there is tension in the fact that the East-West Center is a national educational institution on the campus of, in cooperation with, and under the umbrella of a state university. Given the basic antipathy of the American people toward their national government, deepened by recent national events, you will find further cause for tensions.

Learning to cope with the tensions that are part of our East-West Center existence is one large step toward reaching our goals. Tension can be coped with in at least two ways: it can be either reduced, or it can be used creatively. We could reduce the number of tensions we have in the East-West Center by eliminating the internationalism, or the interdisciplinary work, or the interprofessional nature of our programs, or creating an institution completely separate from the University of Hawaii. Each of these would reduce the tension but also reduce the richness of our educational endeavor. Therefore, it seems to me that we should accept the challenge to learn to cope with the tensions and use them creatively. The analogy is the violin string. A man cannot make music on the violin unless the strings are tense. There is a point beyond which the tension would break the string. There is also a point of looseness below which the string would fail to make the music. However, with the proper amount of tension music is produced which makes harmony with other musical instruments. In families, among people of homogeneous cultures, there are deep disagreements, fights, and even occasional killings. Can the East-West Center remain part of this dynamically changing 20th century and avoid these tensions? Of course not. However, we should struggle mightily to use the tensions to create harmony with men of all cultures and bring our lives a little closer in line with our goals.
Learning to Cooperate:
A Goal of the East-West Center

First of all, I would like to welcome you to the East-West Center. Each year, each time a new group of staff and participants arrives at the Center I find a thrill running through me. Although you will all fit into some part of the Center, not only do you form a new and different group but also each of you is a unique, irreplaceable person. There has never been anyone like you in the world before, and there never will be anyone else like you again. I hope you will look upon us in the same way. I see myself as a unique, irreplaceable person. Of course, I am not speaking of my function. As Chancellor of the East-West Center I could be replaced tomorrow (and some may wonder why I am not!). But I cannot be replaced as a person. So these meetings, these new beginnings, are exciting for they present new opportunities for human encounter, new challenges for personal growth, new possibilities to expand our personal world.

You are also becoming part of a unique kind of institution. Although we do research we are not merely a research institution. Although we have graduate students we are not a university and we grant no degrees. Although people come here from many different countries we are much more than an exchange-of-persons program. Although we do not teach in the normal university way, a great deal of learning goes on. Here at the Center we are trying to develop an institution that will help us as human beings move into the future with more confidence, with greater quality of life, and with less violence than in the past. Our perspective is the future, partly because we are this unique kind of international or intercultural institution. The philosophical basis for most education is rooted in some one culture. In fact, education, especially at the elementary level, is usually given as one of its primary tasks the passing on of the cultural heritage in which it exists and is thus oriented toward the past.

Usually most people in a school, certainly on a faculty, have a common cultural background. Here at the Center we do not have a common culture or heritage. However, I believe we have a common future. We are linked together as never before. Certainly the energy crisis of this past year has brought home our interdependence. We all are affected by the rapidly-increasing number of people congregating more and more into smaller space, the not-so-rapidly increasing food resources consumed by those people, the impact of our human actions and our technology upon our environment, the increased speed of communications. All these factors, and more, are alerting us to the need for more international scientific and cultural cooperation than ever before in the history of the world.

The problem is that we still do not know enough about how to cooperate. We are divided into different nations and cultures and we must gain greater knowledge of each other's cultures in order to cooperate. In our universities we divide ourselves up into different disciplines. As a result, an economist and an engi-
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neer usually find it difficult to communicate—as do even anthropologists and linguists! We go out into life and enter different professions and occupations and again we see that businessmen and professors find it difficult to communicate and cooperate, to say nothing of artists and public health workers, or philosophers and policemen—although they all deal with human life. The above factors are, in brief, some of the reasons we are trying to develop the East-West Center into an international (intercultural), interdisciplinary, interprofessional institution. Our hope is that your experiences at the Center will help you to see more clearly where the barriers to cooperation are, to help you meet the challenges of living in a “global village.”

Let me suggest two other great social forces in the world that tend to impede cooperation—technology and bureaucracy. I won’t go into a long description of these phenomena and their impact on our lives since others have done this better than I. But maybe we can indicate enough to give us an idea of what we must overcome. Of course, both technology and bureaucracy can be means to more cooperation. Communication technology and information systems can combine us into larger interrelated systems so that we can cooperate with more and more people. However, technology tends to break things into small manipulatable components where each person can be an expert but, as I said about myself as chancellor, each person can be functionally replaced. Instead of providing an overarching view of the world, technology tends to make men see the world componentally, or as fragmented. Bureaucracy, again representing a possibility for cooperation, tends to make society rigid and impersonal. Everything must be in its proper place with a proper name attached or an organization may collapse. The process of decision-making must of necessity, and often by demand, be impersonal. If administrators in an organization make their decisions on a personal basis rather than on the basis of objective criteria, a great deal of inequity can result. So both technology and bureaucracy, with all the good they do for us, also push us in the direction of a functionalized, impersonal existence which Peter Berger has called “homelessness.”

It is within this context that the East-West Center exists as an institution and as a community of people. We are a long way from having solved some of these problems or having attained our goals of mutual scientific and cultural cooperation, of mutual understanding and better relations. I believe we have the ingredients to help us move in that direction as we move into the future together. We are trying to provide situations in which people can build bridges between cultures, close the gap between academic disciplines, and stimulate communication among different professions. In this determined effort we have discovered what some of the things are that must be learned in order to get us into the 21st Century with the best possible quality of life for all and the least amount of violence. I would like to share my perceptions of a few of the learning necessities as I see us move ahead.

First, it is almost a cliche these days to talk about the rapid change that is taking place in the world. This is true in all societies, East and West, whether in one stage of affluence or another. Furthermore, institutions are in a process of change, including the East-West Center. Probably one of the most powerful psychological rewards that nations and institutions can give to their members is protection from turbulence. But the way ahead is going to be turbulent. The path ahead is not neatly laid out. In order to get from where we are to a better future we will experience turbulence. Change creates instability with a concomitant loss of security. And so I believe it is necessary for us to learn to live with insecurity. This takes a great deal of effort on the part of everyone. Certainly there is a need to develop an inner security which does not feel attacked even though change is persistent, and things are done in ways different from those we are accustomed to.

This leads to a second necessity to be learned, namely, courage. Courage is not the opposite of fear, which is a common element of everyday life, especially present in times of change and turbulence. Courage provides the capacity to move ahead despite fear. There are two elements in the world about which courage is needed. The first can be stated in terms of a crisis and a dilemma. On the one hand there is an intellectual crisis which can be stated as follows: Can man—modern man or modern
people—comprehend the technologies, the organizations and bureaucracies which he has devised? Will he be able to get his genies to obey him? If not, they will become his master.

On the other hand this leads to a moral crisis which can be stated as follows: If he comprehends and therefore controls his technologies, organizations and bureaucracies, will he use these forces or these instruments for human or humane ends? If not, he becomes demonic. This I call the crisis.

Now the dilemma. The one horn of the dilemma arises from the tremendous push by those who wish to develop countries, especially in terms of economic development. The other horn of the dilemma comes from the cry of those who call for limits of growth, deceleration in growth, or zero growth. Some even advocate a policy of reduction or subtraction. In other words, they claim that we must de-urbanize, de-industrialize, de-technologize, or we will de-humanize the world. Possibly certain countries are too affluent, hyper-urbanized, and even over industrialized. However, there certainly are places in the world that need to develop more wealth, more health care, more of many things. But development causes change which, in turn, can cause suffering. The dilemma, therefore, can be stated as follows: What level of human stress or suffering, is reasonable or acceptable in order to achieve changes, especially such things as economic development? The other horn of the dilemma is, what level of human suffering is acceptable or reasonable if changes, especially economic development, are not achieved? There must be a moral concern for the human cost of either change or no change. The courage then comes in the making of decisions within these conflicting claims, and within these kinds of moral crises and dilemmas. It will take courage to think new thoughts and try new approaches.

This leads to a third quality that I believe we must learn to move into the future, namely, the willingness to make and accept mistakes. Within the complexity of a rapidly changing world, new approaches are necessary and must be tried. However, mistakes are inevitable. If we develop an attitude, or an atmosphere, in which we demand perfection, or in which we jump on each other’s back whenever something goes wrong, few will have the courage to try new approaches. However, if we can take the stance of trust in each other, recognizing that each of us is attempting to improve the conditions of life on this planet, then we should be willing to take the risks and when mistakes are made by others to accept those mistakes, to practice forgiveness.

A fourth quality that we have found must be learned in our attempt to grope for better ways to accomplish the objectives of the Center and the goals of the future world is the quality of patience. Most of us looking at the world see much that is wrong and therefore the need, the tremendous need, for change. We often want the change now, and thus become impatient and sometimes intolerant. However, we know that it takes time to communicate internationally or cross-culturally. When people are speaking a language other than their native language, they do not always say what they want to say, only what they can say. Therefore, we must take much more time to communicate our ideas and make certain that our ideas get across than if we were speaking our native language. Furthermore, it takes time to communicate inter-disciplinarily. Each academic discipline has developed its own language, its own vocabulary. Very often the same word means quite different things within two disciplines. Confusion results and time is necessary to clarify. Furthermore, communicating across the boundaries of professions also takes time. At the East-West Center, we recognize that it takes time—a great deal of time—to design the kinds of programs which will enhance communication and the kind of interaction which moves us toward understanding and cooperation. This is especially true of those elements of our program over which we have no or very little control. And so I feel that we must learn patience if we are going to move into the future in a healthy manner.

Another way of putting this is to say that we must learn restraint—self-restraint. A person who wishes to cooperate cross-culturally must learn to communicate cross-culturally. In cross-cultural communication a person must develop the ability to withhold strong, often negative, instinctive reactions until he or she is certain of the meaning intended by the other person. The desire to understand the other person’s point of view should motivate all of us to practice re-
straint. In fact, I believe restraint is an essential ingredient of civility and a world civilization.

Next, I believe that we must develop a new consciousness which is bigger, broader, more universal than tribal or national. This demands basic changes in the ways people view themselves and others. From childhood we are generally rewarded for being loyal to our particular group and punished for leaving the group. As one moves into an international experience and toward a more universal stance, a tension arises between the smaller group and the larger group. Personally, I believe one can be loyal to both. But there are those who feel that if one is loyal to the larger group he is disloyal to the smaller group; if loyal to the smaller group, disloyal to the larger group.

I would hope that here at the East-West Center we can help each other develop the necessary consciousness for the larger group. You will find at the East-West Center an attempt to use an approach toward this consciousness which could be called ethical, rather than aesthetic. Certainly, the approach of “high culture” is a legitimate approach to understanding among nations. We should understand each other’s philosophy and religion and learn to appreciate each other’s art, literature and music. This is a rewarding, broadening experience.

But one of the basic difficulties with an approach to a world community which is strictly high culture is that it assumes that men from different cultures can do little more than sit and enjoy beauty together. This is the aesthetic approach.

However, I believe that life is made of sterner stuff. Life is a promise-giving enterprise with the possibility and challenge to fulfill such promises, but also the possibility of betraying such promises. The aesthetic way is good, but I believe it must be transcended. The ethical way demands commitment, humility, openness, and acceptance. This means, of course, the openness to—and acceptance of—differences and commitments across the gaps that exist.

A person with a mono-cultural view of the world will feel that we are calling for a heroic effort of saintliness and the perfectability of man. This is not true. Those who have a multi-cultural point of view realize that no one culture explores the entire spectrum of human potentiality in this world and that by opening themselves up to others from other cultures they are creating the potential for more fully approaching what I would call authentic humanity. We do not know, at least I do not know, what it means to have a world view, to be a universal man. Many have a vague feeling what it might be, usually, of course, at a very high level of abstraction. I think we know now what it is not.

At the East-West Center we are attempting to enlarge the perceptual framework, the intellectual and even moral setting which will permit an enlargement of the human spirit of all of us, participants and staff alike. My plea to you is to join with us in this search and help us develop this perceptual framework. And I feel that if we can together learn some of the virtues which I have enunciated this afternoon, we will have come a bit closer to this ideal and have made another step toward a world in which all people are brothers and sisters.
Kleinjans, Everett
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